PART FOUR

The individual reality: describing, explaining and understanding football supporters
Introduction to Part Four

In an attempt to describe, explain and understand football supporters at the individual level of reality, a total of 58 subjects were interviewed over a period of approximately four years, from 12 January 1977 to 9 March 1981, following pilot interviews. The interview was selected as the main vehicle for data collection in this section because of its flexibility, its ability to build up and maintain rapport and thereby to elicit 'natural' responses, its purported discouragement of exaggeration and its opportunities to correct errors and misunderstandings due to poor motivation, reading ability etc. (1) Further,

'... the interview is probably preferable for certain purposes, especially when the enquiry is concerned to classify hidden crime in terms of its seriousness and frequency .. It is also likely that interviewing will increase the reliability of information on the frequency with which acts have been performed. If questions are asked about a restricted number of items the interviewer can aid the respondent considerably in problems of recall'. (2)

However, I hope that I have not been blinded to the problems

(1) Consideration was given to basic textbooks on methodology and interviewing e.g. H.H. Hyman et al, Interviewing in Social Research, Chicago 1967; R.K. Merton et al, The Focused Interview, Glencoe Ill. 1956; and A.N. Oppenheim, Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement, London 1966.

(2) R. Hood and R. Sparks, Key Issues in Criminology, op. cit., pp.68, 69.
of interviewing in general e.g. the great cost of the method and the possibility of interviewer bias, but it is submitted that, notwithstanding such difficulties:

'(t)here remains the undisputed advantage that the richness and spontaneity of information collected by interviewers is higher than that which a mailed questionnaire can hope to obtain'.  (1)

Twenty-two of the 58 interviewees had been arrested for, and 21 were subsequently convicted of, crimes or offences committed in or around football grounds or during a football match outing; 12 of these 22 had been convicted following arrests in or around Edinburgh football grounds, during season 1977/78. I received names and addresses of all such accused from the sheriff-clerk's office at Edinburgh Sheriff Court. From the end of that season, and moving backwards chronologically, I attempted to establish contact with such persons with a view to obtaining a personal interview with them. The initial form of contact was via telephone (where such numbers were listed against the requisite surnames and addresses in the Scottish telephone directories) or, failing which, being conscious of avoiding an obvious class bias, by letter which took the holograph style found in Appendix F.

The first clause of the second paragraph was omitted as being:

(1) Oppenheim, op.cit, p.32. Cf. Karl Mannheim's belief, already stated, that the advantage of participation in the social process outweighs the disadvantage of a partial and biased perspective.
being superfluous when writing to Edinburgh addressees. The telephone communication was an attempt to put over a similar message to that of the letter though, of course, it was less formally structured and depended upon the responses of the individual at the other end of the phone.

Forty-eight persons who had been processed by the criminal justice system through the Edinburgh courts (following matches played in the city between 29 March and 7 May 1978) were contacted by one or other of these methods: of these, 12 were interviewed. The remaining 36 were accounted for as follows: 22 did not reply to my letter; 5 letters were returned by the Post Office marked 'gone away' or 'no longer at this address'; 4, having arranged to meet me, failed to turn up; one told me over the phone that he wasn't interested; one's sister told me that her brother was in London playing football professionally for an English Third Division side; one's mother refused to let me speak to her son; one's father phoned from Glasgow to inform me that his son was in prison but that he (the father) wouldn't mind claiming the beer on offer(!); and another phoned to tell me that he was off to work in Saudi Arabia for a long time and wouldn't be able to meet me. Of those who telephoned after receipt of my letter, not one accepted the invitation to reverse charges.

The other ten arrested football supporters who were interviewed came to my attention through a variety of informal
social and professional contacts and nine had been found guilty in various Scottish (and in one case English) courts on occasions between 1974 and 1980. Several of the ten had in fact been provisionally classified in one or other of the 'non-convicted' categories (see Table 5 below) and had to be recategorised after the interviews.

Fifteen of the fifty-eight subjects, contacted on football coaches, on football terracings, in youth clubs, schools, or through acquaintances, were retrospectively classified as never having been arrested at a football game though, by their own admission, they clearly 'participated' in misbehaviour which was evidenced, for example, by ejection from the ground by police. This group forms part of 'football hooliganism's' immeasurable 'dark figure', as their criminal behaviour is officially unreported and unrecorded.

The final group consisted of twenty-one regular football supporters who had never been arrested for an offence at a football match and who claimed never to have been involved in any such offensive misbehaviour. Such individuals were mainly contacted through casual acquaintance at football matches, through schools and at youth clubs.

The total research sample may thus be seen in the following table (Table 4, over):
Table 4  The interview sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>arrested (and convicted*) football offenders</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'participating' supporters</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'non-participating' supporters</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL' Ss</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*in all but one case.

A dogmatic positivist would rest content on separating the 22 arrested football offenders (criminals known to the police) from the 36 football fans who had never been arrested at a football outing (controls). He would then seek out (and inevitably find) differences in the social and psychological characteristics of the two groups, preliminary to generalisation.

Such official statistics, of course, reveal only a small proportion of the total number of criminal acts actually
perpetrated and of criminals present at football matches:

'The total amount of criminality, as represented in the statistics, therefore, could vary considerably according to the degree of police vigilance, the deployment of police resources, the willingness of the public to report particular offences and so on, without there being any real change in the amount of law-breaking'. (1)

The liberal positivist admits the inadequacy of such statistics but suggests some improvements in order that use may still be made of the statistics. Therefore, a grey middle category between arrest at football matches on the one hand and non-participation in criminal activity at matches on the other hand is compiled. Although the liberal positivist feels that the bulk of major crimes will be reported as will the more serious offences of minor criminals, he accepts that the official figures may underrepresent minor crimes. Thus, in our study, we find 15 'participating supporters' (see Table 5) so-classified in several cases because they have been ejected from grounds by the police.

However, the 'participating supporters' category also comprises individuals who have been neither arrested, nor ejected, nor even warned by police, but who have 'self-reported' their criminal behaviour at football matches to

(1) Taylor, Walton and Young, op.cit., p.11. These points have already been made in Part II.
me. Thus, a radical positivist stance is also incorporated.

In these more sophisticated versions of positivism, some of the value-assumptions of the system (e.g. that police always act in a uniform way) are teased out, though the legal code is still accepted as representing a consensus. The limitations of the official statistics are recognised though they are not completely abandoned and focus is shifted towards 'football hooliganism' as an interaction process. The encounter at a football match that involves rival football fans verbally slanging each other, the role that witnesses and victims may have, and the part that police officers or stewards may play in the interaction, all take on a new significance.

Here it is recognised that the police exercise an important discretion in dealing with football match offenders and that the use of such discretion is a significant influence on the quantity and quality of the official statistics. K.C. Davis (1) has been conscious of the need to steer a difficult but necessary course between too much and too little discretion in any system which attempts to individualise justice. The first obvious but essential step towards controlling discretion exercised by police officers at football matches is (after Davis) to recognise its existence and/

(1) K.C. Davis, Discretionary Justice, Urbana 1976.
and then to accept that the exercise of discretion often assumes an important policy-making role. Such hitherto low-visibility police decisions can then be controlled by 'openness devices' such as open policy statements, open rules, open reasons etc. so that structure may be given not only to such concepts as the 'arrestable offence' and the 'ejectable offence' but also to the 'arrestable offender' and the 'ejectable offender'.

It would be a very naive interpretation indeed that sought to differentiate between those who have been 'in trouble' at football games and those supporters who have not in terms of the personal characteristics of the supporter alone; those who have a role in perceiving and reacting to the misconduct make a notable contribution to the eventual outcome.

Thus, those convicted of football match offences are hardly a species apart from those who have 'only' experienced ejection or warning, while this latter group boasts no conspicuous differences in demography from those who claimed never to participate in criminal activity at matches: all three groups include a variety of occupations (manual, non-manual and unemployed); all three groups contain council house dwellers and those who live in private housing; all three groups contain supporters of a number of different teams; no group has a monopoly on a criminal record away
from the football setting; all the interviewees but one are male - Lisa 'stands about wi' the rest o' them', gets involved in fights and has twice been caught 'sneaking-in' to the football ground though she has never been arrested; the occupants of all three groups are mostly in their teens and twenties, though arrestees tend to be older than ejectees and non-participants tend to be oldest of all and in their 'maturity' tend to populate the less emotionally-charged and less policed areas of the ground. These last two observations on sex and age perhaps tell us as much about the attitudes of police officers as they do about the characteristics of recorded offenders. Misbehaving females and very young males are not perceived as a 'real' threat: an officer who arrests either is looked upon as a bit ridiculous and he normally wouldn't rate the disposal likely to be handed out in the latter case at the Children's Hearing as commensurate with his efforts.

Such measurable characteristics apart, it would seem that quick-tempered, arrogant supporters (Toch's 'select minority'?), often exacerbated by the effects of alcohol, are particularly susceptible to violent behaviour which may result in arrest:

ALASTAIR: (1) 'I'm quite aggressive. I've got a bad temper but somebody always provokes me/

(1) All names of supporters are fictitious in order to guarantee anonymity.
me. A guy can look at me the wrong way. A teacher at school once pulled my shirt, so I apologised after. I get provoked easily. If I'm in a good mood, I don't bother; if I'm in a bad mood, I'll hit somebody to take my mood away. I got spat on by a Hibs fan so I hit him twice.'

DON: 'I saw this guy with a Hibs scarf and something snapped. I just started hitting him.. it was spontaneous. Something snapped'.

SHUG: 'My wife kens I'm fiery-tempered'.

GORDON: 'I'm right quick-tempered'.

Most of the 58 interviews took place in public-houses in various locations throughout Scotland. Several were conducted in the subject's home, the researcher's flat or at a school or youth club etc. The time spent in each interview varied between one and three hours. Just as Belson and Didcott had dangled a £1 fee, the cost of transport, light refreshments, a pop record and a Churchill Crown to induce co-operation from their 13-16 year old London delinquents, the incentive of alcohol (along with packets of crisps and peanuts) supplied in a convivial and non-threatening social atmosphere was considered appropriate to the subcultural area being investigated here. The pub obviously has advantages as a neutral interview base over the subject's home (where he might be inhibited and anxious) though/

though it has the attendant disadvantages of other customers' overhearing and (perhaps) the effects of alcohol consumption. On the occasions when I was invited back to the subject's home, parents, wife, siblings etc. were usually absent.

The interviewing technique used in each case was based partly on the structured face-to-face, open-ended schedules employed by Martin and Webster(1) which naturally encourage a positivist analysis and included Family tree (Schedule A), Personal history (B), Girl friends and peers (C), Hobbies and interests (D) and Possessions and problem areas (E) in an attempt to ascertain some demographic characteristics of the subject. These interview schedules are found in Appendix G.

These five schedules were supplemented by a very detailed, unstructured, though focused, schedule (Schedule P), more in a phenomenological mould, and compiled by this author with the aim of recording behaviour, and perceptions and meanings of behaviour, of the subjects themselves at football matches:

'... the phenomenologist attempts to identify and describe the essences of experience as directly apprehended, without reference to any

metaphysical/

(1) J.P. Martin and D. Webster, The Social Consequences of Conviction, op.cit, passim, esp. Appendix C.
metaphysical or epistemological presuppositions'; (1)

'In dealing with the question of understanding social action, the main focus is upon the view that the relevant meaning relates only to descriptions of behaviour. It follows from this that the essential aspect of the behaviour is "the lived experience, and the meaning of action cannot be reduced to the external observable effects"'. (2) (emphases in original)

Just as Toch has used interviews to explore the meaning of violence for the person who had engaged in it, I have also employed the same technique to investigate the meaning of misbehaviour at football matches for those who participate in it:

'This emphasis on the phenomenology of violence presupposes that the interviewee feels free to discuss his feelings, attitudes and perceptions in the most natural manner possible, using the language most appropriate to the subject matter and recreating the frame of reference within which he operated at the time of the incidents. He would have to presuppose that his interlocutor could share his assumptions and could understand his vocabulary sufficiently to make communication possible. He would have to presuppose, further, that his interviewer's interest focused on the "relevant" aspects of the situation as he himself saw them'. (3)

(1) McClintock, Criminal Violence, op.cit, p.117.
(2) Ibid, p.118.
(3) Toch, op.cit, p.12. The research method most frequently employed in the naturalistic perspective is participant observation, a research method used in Part III.
The interview method was therefore used not only to elicit as much information as possible but also to obtain greater realism of response. Care was taken at the pilot stage to 'rough out'\(^{(1)} \) ambiguous, double and leading questions.\(^{(2)} \) Interview Schedule F (Appendix E) follows these guidelines. Thus following the pattern recommended by Stacey,\(^{(3)} \) the 'most offensive' questions were generally posed nearer the end of the session.

In this way, it is hoped that the stated intentions to study both the personal characteristics of the subjects and the meaning that their actions has for them, all at the individual level of reality, were in some measure achieved.

Answers to the questions asked were recorded as faithfully as possible in writing at the time and the subject was encouraged to speak freely, and with a minimum of interruption, on his experiences, observations and opinions of the football match event.

---

\(^{(1)} \) in the words of P.H. Mann, Methods of Sociological Enquiry, Oxford 1968, Ch. 6, p. 119.

\(^{(2)} \) Kinsey, for example, is guilty of being presumptuous by asking 'how often?' questions re. masturbation without first asking 'do?' See A.C. Kinsey, W.B. Pomeroy and C.E. Martin, Sexual Behaviour in the Human Male, Philadelphia 1949, pp. 35-82.

\(^{(3)} \) M. Stacey, Methods of Social Research, Oxford 1969, p. 81.
Two important objections to the research strategy should be considered at this stage: (a) the problem of deception and (b) the representativeness of the interview sample.

The problem of deception was considered by Martin and Webster who state:

'In a project relying fairly heavily on the interviewing of offenders as a source of information it is natural to wonder how far the interviewer is likely to be deceived. Can offenders be trusted to tell the truth? If not, what can be done about it? These questions had to be faced from the outset. It is an occupational risk of criminology that readers may assume that information gained from offenders is untrustworthy'. (1)

Their work was solely concerned to ascertain the social consequences for offenders who had been convicted. My research included 21 such individuals (plus one who was arrested and referred to a Children's Hearing) but also considered 15 football supporters who 'offended' without being arrested and a further 21 who claimed not to have been involved as offenders in 'trouble' at football matches. This interviewer does not want to fall into the dogmatic positivist trap of suggesting that the former 21, as 'criminals', alone are capable of deception: any individual may, for whatever reasons, seek to paint himself white instead of black, or black instead of white.

Therefore, in an attempt to validate the truth of interview data/

(1) Martin and Webster, op.cit, p.22.
data provided by respondents in each of my three categories, I included the usual internal checks on honesty (e.g. asking the same question later in a different form) wherever possible and attempted to cross-check information given against independent sources. For example, in many cases, I was able to confirm information given through statements made by subjects' friends, social workers, schoolteachers, procurators-fiscal, or through court statistics and newspaper reports; and on other occasions I had myself been present at incidents that were being described or could confirm their factual statements from my personal knowledge. I was left with the impression that most interviewees did not attempt to deceive me to any marked extent. (1)

In any case, it should not necessarily be assumed that where 'facts' were found to be misrepresented, the subjects were in fact deliberately lying all the time or at all:

'Indeed we are convinced that the majority of untruths put forward (by offenders) do not represent the deliberate deception of the interviewer, but are rather the offender's deception of himself. Many men, in fact, rely heavily on fantasy to create a tolerable image of themselves. In doing so they merely carry further a tendency to be found in almost everyone. As a characteristic it is not very sinister and, fortunately, is usually rather obvious .... Simple conceits of this kind, far from being dangerous, may be informative'. (2)

(1) A conclusion similar to that reached by Martin and Webster with regard to their 'offenders'.

(2) Martin and Webster, op.cit, pp.23,24.
Where inaccuracies were discovered, more often than not they proved to be the results of failure of memory on the part of the subject. For example, many convicted football offenders had difficulty in remembering their date of arrest, the exact time-span between arrest and trial, the number of weeks permitted to pay a fine, the amount of each instal-ment, etc. Where such interview data were clearly inconsistent with factual information otherwise available to me, they were retrospectively altered, after the implications had been considered.

With regard to the 'representativeness' of the interviewed sample and the related problem of non-response, my objective was not simply to be bound by the constraints of a traditional 'criminals' versus 'contrôle' positivist format and thus no 'scientific' claim to 'representativeness' or 'randomness' is made. (1) Instead, much of the research was conducted in the spirit of Becker, Matza and others. Becker set about testing his hypothesis about the genesis of marijuana use for pleasure thus:

'.... I conducted fifty interviews with marijuana users. I had been a professional dance musician for some years when I conducted this study and my first interviews were with people I had met in the music business. I asked them to put me in contact with other users who would be willing

(1) I am, of course, making no (even more .extravagant) claim that a 'typical' football crowd is made up of 22/58 arrested offenders, 15/58 'participating' supporters and 21/58 'non-participating' supporters (reference to Table 4)!'
to discuss their experience with me. Colleagues working on a study of users of opiate drugs made a few interviews available to me which contained, in addition to material on opiate drugs, sufficient material on the use of marijuana to furnish a test of my hypothesis. Although in the end half of the fifty interviews were conducted with musicians, the other half covered a wide range of people, including labourers, machinists and people in the professions. The sample is, of course, in no sense "random"; it would not be possible to draw a random sample, since no one knows the nature of the universe from which it would have to be drawn'. (1)

Matza also rebuffed any positivist pretentions to 'scientific neutrality' in the description of his research designed to test commitment to delinquency:

'I have no notion of the representativeness of the one hundred delinquents. No one else has either, since the question of representativeness cannot be posed until we know the character and shape of the universe. Thus, the question of representativeness, with regard to delinquents, is legitimate but probably premature. The informants were the first hundred delinquents over twelve and under eighteen with IQ's above seventy-five who entered the institution [a training school for boys] after a given date. They were typically interviewed about a month after they entered the institution'. (2)

In similar vein, Lemert studied seventy-two persons serving sentences for cheque forgery and writing cheques with insufficient funds, and three additional cheque offenders who were contacted and interviewed outside of prison.

(1) H.S. Becker, Outsiders, op.cit, pp.45-46.

(2) D. Matza, Delinquency and Drift, op.cit, p.66n.
Thirty of these seventy-five were classified as 'systematic cheque forgers'.\(^1\) Winick's research into the social and personality correlates of narcotic addiction in addict physicians was based on interviews with 98 such individuals in six U.S. states.\(^2\) Some similarities between Winick's research procedure and my own were discernible in that access to his physicians was obtained through a variety of non-law-enforcement sources and they were asked by an intermediary whether they would consent to be interviewed (several of my football supporters were located through schools or social work departments); all those interviewed had agreed to meet with the investigator who conducted the interviews; the interviews mostly took place in the office or home of the respondent (6 of my 58 interviews took place at a supporter's home and a seventh took place in his car workshop); the interviews took an average of two hours; the format of the interview was simple; and the interviewer took notes on the respondent's comments and these notes were content-analysed into various content categories.\(^3\)

Since traditional 'representativeness' was not, then, an overriding aim of my study, non-response (and the fact that non-response is not a random process) was not deemed to be

\(^{1}\) E.M. Lemert, The Behaviour of the Systematic Cheque Forger, op.cit.


\(^{3}\) Ibid, p. 262-3.
an especial 'problem'. In any case, it was felt that there were ethical objections in trying to 'persuade' those individuals who had clearly indicated that they did not want to take part (e.g. the supporter who specifically told me so over the telephone) and that, as non-response was decreased, 'other response biases [would] be introduced, since later responders who [had] needed additional persuasion [would] give lower quality returns and those who were persuaded to join at a later stage [could] hardly be regarded as a random sample of all non-responders'. (1)

(a) Description of interviewees
All but one of the fifty-eight interviewees were male; the solitary female interviewed, a tomboy, was present at a youth club when I went along to interview someone else. She went to the football match every home game and expressed a wish to be interviewed. The considerable male bias in interviews reflects the fact that football crowds are overwhelmingly male and those arrested are almost always male. In the seven years of research, I can only recall a few incidents of females being arrested for football offences in Scotland - one was arrested at the 1976 Alloa v Aberdeen Cup-tie and a 17 year old Aberdeen fishwife and Rangers supporter was arrested during a Hearts v Rangers match also in 1976 and fined £50 for committing a breach of the peace. The latter's court appearance, which I attended, was remarkable for its brevity and for the laughter it attracted from the public benches when the fiscal announced that she had shouted 'Fuck off, you bastards' to rival fans. In 1975, several girls were arrested at an Ipswich v Newcastle match and, more recently, in November 1980, three female Chesterfield supporters who wore tee-shirts bearing the word 'diarrhoea' were each fined £100 and bound over for twelve months for attacking two rival girl fans from Huddersfield.

(1) The outrageous and anarchic punk culture was a dominant youth movement at the time.
The sheriff-clerk's records I was given listing all those arrested at or around football grounds in Edinburgh during season 1977/78 contained no female names. However, even allowing for the small percentage of women attending football matches, a conspicuously minute number of them are given official attention because of their misbehaviour - a fact that indicates something about female behaviour or about attitudes to female behaviour or both. The sexual differential is central to debate in many areas of criminological study. (1)

The supporters interviewed ranged in age between 12 and 40, with the vast majority being in their teens and early twenties. Two twelve year olds were interviewed, 34 teenagers, 16 were between 20 and 25, 2 were between 26 and 29, 3 were in their thirties and one was interviewed on the day of his fortieth birthday. The mean age of supporters interviewed was 19.4 and the median aged was 18. As I have suggested elsewhere, the 'people's game' is more aptly named the 'young male person's game'.

Nineteen of the fifty-eight interviewees were still at school; 5 attended college or university full-time (1 of whom had been arrested and convicted following an incident at a football match and another 2 of whom claimed to 'participate').

(1) See Ch.13 (h), footnote.
'participate'); 8 were unemployed and 26 were in employment. Of the employed, 2 were in apprenticeships (butcher and plumber). Occupations were mainly of the skilled manual class (plumber, welder, electrician, bookbinder, sewing machine mechanic), manual semi-skilled (fishermen) or manual routine (coalman, factory workers). (1) A few, however, occupied jobs rated as bestowing greater prestige: a community worker, a journalist, a sanitary inspector, a trainee CA, a poultry farmer and one who ran his own panel-beating business. (2) The latter was arrested and convicted following events after a football match.

Many who were undergoing education, were 'on the dole' or who occupied less remunerative jobs found lack of money a problem: the most frequent source of loan was the youth's mother. One of the interviewees that I had met at an activities centre was off to watch a junior football match that night and had to borrow 7p from a social worker to get home after the match.

Eighteen of the supporters were not old enough to be married. Of the forty who were aged 16 or over, eight were married. Three married men saw themselves as supporters rather than


(2) Classes 3, 4 or above on the Hall-Jones Scale.
as 'participants', but the other five had each been arrested at a football match, three before their marriage. A number of those interviewed were 'going steady' and some were engaged or on the brink of engagement, processes which tend to hasten their retirement from football match attendance, at least on a regular basis and at away games. One respondent, after reeling off a list of the ten girl friends he's had over the last four years, asked me if I wanted to know which ones he'd 'shagged'! A good number of supporters, however, had a near-total devotion to football (and other all-male pursuits) and, even though some were in their twenties, did not express any interest in a woman or women, past or present. Marriage or a steady heterosexual relationship is, of course, often linked to the maturation process. Male supporters involved in such relationships tend to be in their late teens or their twenties and have usually graduated to the less volatile (and thus less policed) parts of the football ground - if they continue to attend games at all.

Many respondents took greater pride in giving me lists of their male friends and uttered cautionary words like 'You'll need a whole page for all of them'. Most of their friends were acquired while at school (even amongst those who had long since left), therefore invariably lived nearby and usually shared common interests including going to the football match together. Primary and secondary schooling in Scotland, is of course, based on religious sectarianism
and for many supporters automatic allegiances ensue from such a dichotomy: thus the non-denominational (largely Protestant) school is unlikely to boast many Celtic supporters while the Catholic school is most unlikely to have any Rangers fans. Therefore, one Celtic supporter told me that he knew of one Catholic Rangers supporter who 'wisnae right in the heed'. There is an assumption that, if a club is known not to have had Irish origins, it is 'obviously' Protestant i.e. it subscribes to the dominant religious norm in the country. A Protestant (should his Protestantism be seen as an important factor) has a greater number of clubs from which to choose, but if he is at all rabid he is likely to support Rangers or, to a lesser extent, Hearts. A Catholic (should his Catholicism be seen as an important factor), being a member of what is numerically a minority group, may be all the more eager to hang his football allegiance on an overt socio-religious peg (Celtic or Hibernian) and will certainly not support a team (Rangers) for whom he could never play even if he combined the abilities of Pele, Best, Cruyff and Maradona in their prime. Celtic, on the other hand, do not profess a 'Catholics only' policy, play several Protestants in their team and attract some Protestant supporters (cynics have suggested that this liberal stand has been forced upon them due to the narrower choice of able Catholic players in Scotland).
Most of the unmarried interviewees still lived with their parents, usually on council estates. Many had lived in a number of such locations in the same town or city and one claimed that his parents had lived in 42 different houses and had unsuccessfully emigrated to Canada from where they soon returned.

The vast majority were urban dwellers or lived in smaller communities near a city (e.g. Musselburgh, Bonnyrigg or Dalkeith). A few came from smaller towns like Glenrothes, Eyemouth or West Calder.

Each of the interviewees was committed in his support of a certain club side: 14 were Hibs supporters, 11 supported Celtic, 10 Hearts, 6 Rangers, 6 Dundee United, 6 Dundee, 2 Liverpool, 2 Brechin City and 1 Bonnyrigg Rose. Their comments to me related to their attendance at both home and away matches in support of such teams. Such remarks and the attitudes put across are reproduced as faithfully as possible:

'Where it was possible and appropriate, I used the jargon of the user himself'.

(b) Becoming/ (1)

(1) Becker, Outsiders, op.cit. p.46.
(b) Becoming (and staying) a football fan

Most supporters-in-the-making are taken to their first game by their fathers, uncles or big brothers - usually around the age of eight, though a few were introduced to football from the age of five. Some memories had evidently been clouded by the mists of time: Mark, a Hearts supporter, told me his 'faither' had first taken him to Tynecastle when he (Mark) was 'a wee cunt'. Almost all could recall the two teams who played that day and most could remember the final score - even thirty years later in one case.

After a few years of attending home matches in such supervised company, the boys gradually come to travel to both home and away matches in the company of their contemporaries.

Team affiliations are keenly-felt with the boy generally supporting his father's team. The father himself probably followed the footballing traditions of his own father. This cross-generational loyalty together with the fact that few supporters 'change teams' during patches of poor form would seem to suggest why a highly talented team like Dundee United playing colourful football do not attract bigger crowds: a large section of the Dundee community has a long-standing affinity with Dundee F.C., the city's elder club. One fifteen year old Dundee fan - nicknamed 'Dork' - told me they were 'a' Dundee supporters in meh hoose' and that he 'would have got his heid danced on' if
he hadn't towed the line. He had, in effect, been 'brought up to be a Dundee supporter'.

In this way, the boy (after his father) will support his local team. Or he may decide to follow Rangers or Celtic, those imperialists of the Scottish football world with outposts spread across the country, because of their near-constant success:

'I support Celtic 'cos they win everything'

or

'I support Rangers 'cos they win everything'.

Or he may support a team because of its religious associations:

DANNY (from Edinburgh):

'I support Celtic like my Mum, my Dad and my Grandfather because of our Irish Catholic origins'.

MARK: 'Religion means nothing to me but I dinnae like Hibs or Celtic 'cos they're Catholic'. (!)

BOBBY: 'I support Rangers because they're a Protestant team. The Rangers team are all Protestants; the Hearts team are half-Catholic. My Dad, my Mum, and my Granny are anti-Catholic. In Ireland, Catholics breed like rats. The Pope says have as many kids as you can to keep numbers up
in the chapel and the money coming in'.

NEIL (aged 15):
'I'm a Hearts supporter. I'm in an Orange Lodge. I go every third Tuesday; there are a few Hearts supporters in the Lodge but mostly Rangers. I go on marches. I don't like Catholics 'cos of what's happening in Ireland. I'm organising a petition in the school against the Pope coming to Scotland. I'm gonna send it to Maggie Thatcher!'

Occasionally, a boy will break with expectation and refuse to conform:

'All my mates were Hearts supporters, so I stuck up for Hibs'.

And, now and then, a boy will relate to a team simply because he likes the sound of their name, especially where his father has little interest in football. Thus:

'I supported Rangers 'cos I liked their name';

and, (more sophisticated):

'I supported Dundee 'cos they were my home team and United had "United" after the city's name'.

One or two claimed to be discerning football fans even in their formative years:

PETE:  'I supported Hibs at the age of 7 'cos they were a good fitba' minded, attacking
team. They were really skilful and could move the ba' about'.

Only five of the fifty-eight interviewees had ever changed their club allegiance. Typical comments included the following:

PHIL: 'I wouldn't support any other team but Dundee United, no matter how far they went down', and a particularly telling ukase from Calum who, like his Dad, was an Edinburgh-based Rangers supporter:

'When you're ten or eleven year old you don't know much about football - but you never change your team. If you get sick o' the team, you don't go to any match'. (his emphasis)

This remark, I feel, goes some way to explain falling attendances at football matches. There are few football spectators, i.e. neutrals or near-neutrals who attend to savour good football, no matter who plays it. There are vast numbers of 'loyal' 'committed' football supporters who react to prolonged periods without success (by, say, Rangers or Hearts) by staying away from Ibrox or Tynecastle. Such fans are unlikely to make their way to Celtic Park or Easter Road instead. For the supporter (and the majority of those still to be found attending Scottish football matches are 'supporters'), 'good football' does not necessarily entail fast, skilful, attacking play (that's a
bonus) but rather is a description of any game that your
team wins. Calls for better quality football (and the
frequent suggestions for league reconstruction and changing
the rules of the game) to 'attract the customers back' seem
to miss the point that those who are interested in attend-
ing football games are supporters first and spectators
second.

Three of the five who breached the unwritten code and
changed their club affiliations followed a similar pattern:
one Dundee-based Rangers supporter changed to Dundee United,
while two Edinburgh residents (quite independent of one
another) transferred from Celtic to Hibs. All three made
their transition between the ages of 11 and 13 when they
perhaps could be said (if fancifully) to 'be moving out of
the shadow of childhood into adolescence and Piaget's
abstract reasoning: independent thinking, a developing
sense of identity in the local community and a growing
awareness that success per se need not be the sole arbiter
of what team is to be supported may combine to bring this
change of heart:

'I used to be a Rangers supporter 'cos they were
the biggest and best team and had the biggest
crowds'.

The two others (Ken and Jack) changed from supporting Hibs
and Rangers respectively to being Liverpool supporters.
This is mainly explicable in terms of their geographical ambivalence: both came from Eyemouth near the Border and felt it was just as convenient to watch English club football which they reckoned had 'more class', especially since the best Scottish footballers played there. Both retained a passive interest in their Scottish clubs and still wanted them to win: the English First Division was seen as a bigger pond and as providing a higher level of sophistication. Supporting Liverpool was then incompatible with an active interest in a Scottish club. The process may operate the other way round too: several of the Edinburgh schoolboys interviewed 'followed' (through television and the results) the progress of Ipswich, Nottingham Forest and (the) Arsenal and 'stuck up' for these teams in arguments, though they were active in their support of Scottish clubs.

Almost all the supporters (including the Liverpool fans) were equally passionate about the Scotland football team. Arthur, a Hibs supporter with a philosophic bent, was even more involved when he watched his country:

'Watching Hibs and watching Scotland are as different as day and night. I'm a rational supporter when I'm supporting Hibs but supporting my national team means irrationality, nationalism, win-at-all-costs, prejudice, arrogance, wha's like us? I can't explain this irrationality - it must be something in the blood. I'm not a
moron for 364 days of the year, but I delight in being a mindless moron against England once a year. It's good fun acting a fool for one day of the year - like on July 4 in America'.

The Wembley fixture especially was seen as a sort of biennial party at which even gate-crashers were welcome and indeed encouraged. On such occasions local rivalries were essentially forgotten and replaced by a common resentment, antagonism and aggression harnessed and directed towards the English. Such is the passion aroused by the England v Scotland game in some quarters that within a week of the fixture first instalments are being collected by travel clubs towards the next game - two years later. At a vitally important World Cup qualifying match in March 1981 against Northern Ireland, the two most prominent songs from the Scottish supporters were:

'If you hate the fuckin' English, clap your hands'
and

'Bar us frae Wembley,
Ye cannae bar us frae Wembley'.

For most of the supporters interviewed, football is the main hobby and leisure-time interest. It is not seen as

(1) Some corroboration of Arthur's attitude and behaviour on these occasions was obtained, some four years after interview, when I accompanied him to the 1981 England v Scotland match at Wembley. In spite of a drinks ban he easily succeeded in smuggling cans of beer into the ground in his boots and during the game he 'confronted' a nearby English supporter whom he rebuked for making derogatory remarks about Scotland.
simply ninety minutes worth of entertainment but is rather a pervasive social commitment and a vitally important source of identity or affiliation. Other interests were quoted - mainly golf, watching T.V. (especially football), listening to records, going to concerts and youth clubs, betting, playing darts, snooker and pool - but few rated as enthusiastically as the football match and some, like going to the pub, could be accommodated in the match outing. Football attendance was depicted as the complete day out - with a build-up starting several hours (or even days) before the kick-off, the travelling to the match, the match itself, the return journey and the after-match debate all seen as important constituent elements. In the all-male peer group, football is perhaps the most common topic - it's 'good conversation fodder', said one supporter. The only interest that ranked as significantly as watching football was playing football in which almost all interviewees engaged - whether formally in a team or as an informal 'kick-about'.

Supporting the team for most meant attending almost every home game and going to selected away games. Specific away games were chosen because they were near (and therefore inexpensive to reach), because they were far away (going to Aberdeen for many was the best away game as it was a whole day out) or because they were attractive fixtures (cup-ties, important league matches). One Hibs supporter (Mike) often missed home matches to save money for away matches which he
enjoyed more because it was a longer and more fulfilling social event.

A few, at considerable cost, attended almost all their club's home and away matches and easily recalled the last game they had missed - due to illnesses like bronchitis or influenza. Of course, for the Rangers or Celtic fan from outside Glasgow every match is an 'away' match. Many supporters had ventured south of the Border to support their club against English opposition and a few had even travelled on the Continent: one Hearts fan had seen his team play in both Hamburg and Leipzig.

The less committed supporters stop attending matches when their team has a lengthy stretch of poor form, when they take on a Saturday job or have other social commitments like playing football (those practices increase during lean spells), or start 'going steady'. Of the 21 supporters who had been arrested and convicted, no fewer than 8 stated that they had either stopped attending games or had considerably reduced their attendance after the conviction.\(^1\) For three of the eight, it was their first conviction ever; for another three it was their first football conviction; for Harry and Alan it was an addition to a long and varied list of convictions and they vowed it would be their last.

\(^1\) Their more detailed explanations will be documented later, in section (c) of this chapter.
Those who had a number of football convictions were not, however, generally influenced away from match attendance.

Watching their team being beaten 'disappoints', 'dejects' 'upsets' or 'depresses' the supporters, sometimes for days on end:

'I think, "Fuck! the night is wasted"';
'I was greetin' when Hearts got beaten by Wolves'.

Victory makes the supporter feel 'happy', 'pleased', 'brilliant', 'ecstatic' or 'magic', provides vicarious fulfilment, and gives him the chance to 'slag' his mates if they support the losing team. Of course, some victories are sweeter than others and some defeats leave an especially sour taste. George, a Rangers supporter, said:

'To beat Celtic means more than anything else. The worst thing that can happen is to get beaten by Celtic. If we do, we take it out on somebody. The last time we got beat by Celtic, ten or eleven o' us got hold o' three Celtic boys and everybody gave them a punch'.

Kenny described the night he watched Hearts beat Leipzig 5-1 as 'like the first time you fall in love' and Don, another Hearts fan, made no apology for the fact that, in spite of being in their late twenties, he and his mates jumped up and down and hugged each other when Hearts won
the First Division Championship. But for most fans greatest pleasure is derived from beating their local rivals.

Bill, a Dundee United fan, only buys the Saturday evening newspaper if United win; John, a Dundee supporter, only if his team win. In fact, sales of Dundee's 'Sporting Post' and Edinburgh's 'Evening News Pink Edition' fluctuate according to the fortunes of the local teams. Ian, however, is not too bothered if Hearts win or lose as either way it's an excuse for a 'bevvy': 'You either celebrate or you drown your sorrows'.

(c) Perceptions of clubs, teams and players

Most of the interviewees talked a good game of football though they were at their most comfortable when discussing their own team. Several fans could recite the dates and circumstances in which their clubs originated, especially those clubs perceived to have religious identities: Celtic was formed (in 1888) by priests who helped feed the Catholic poor in the East End of Glasgow; Hibs were an Irish Catholic Church team formed in 1875; Dundee United

(1) The circulation sales manager of the Evening News informed me that the 'performance of both Hearts and Hibs does affect the sale of the Evening News Pink Ed. It is difficult to quantify the actual number of copies lost but it is safe to say we sell more copies on the Saturdays when Hearts and Hibs both win (rare occasions nowadays)'.

(2) Nor were indigent Protestants turned away.
used to be Dundee Hibs (formed in 1910); Dundee was formed (1893) when 'twa wee teams were amalgamated thegither'; and Rangers, it was claimed, started as a rowing club in 1873. Interpretations, however, were somewhat jaundiced by supporter bias. Thus George, a Rangers fan, opined:

'Celtic started when a bunch of Catholics came over from Ireland to Scotland and had nothing to do so they started a football team. I don't know how Rangers started, but all the boys on the bus "support" Liverpool 'cos they're a Protestant team. Everton are Catholic, so are Man. United, Man. City are Protestant. I've heard several times that all teams called "United" are Catholic. I don't know if that's true'.

Kenny, a Hearts fan who claimed to have done the research at school, gave an extremely detailed breakdown of his club's beginnings:

'Hearts actually began in 1868, playing in the Meadows in gold and black. In 1874 they were formed into a club and moved to White City Park which was across the road from Tynecastle. The Tynecastle stand was built in 1902 and Hearts went bankrupt in 1904'.

A Celtic fan and two Rangers fans mentioned Hibs' role in the creation of Celtic: the Celtic fan thought Hibs
donated the money used to provide the tables in the soup kitchens; Harry, a Rangers supporter, thought Celtic were going to be called Glasgow Hibs and Bobby ventured that Hibs started Celtic up as rivals for Rangers.

It is almost essential that in supporting some specific team a near-inevitable dislike of its main rival is nurtured. Thus, Celtic fans profess to 'hate' Rangers, Hearts fans 'hate' Hibs, Dundee United fans 'hate' Dundee ... and vice versa:

KENNY: 'I dislike Hibs - you've got to'.

Rangers may have the largest potential support in Scotland, but they are also the most disliked club in Scotland - and not just by Celtic supporters or solely by Roman Catholics. (1) Their supporters are considered to be the worst behaved as well.

The following are just some of the many disparaging remarks made about Rangers and their fans:

ARTHUR: 'I detest Rangers because of the arrogance of the club which increases the arrogance of their supporters'.

IAN: 'I dislike Rangers because of their religious attitude. I would dislike Celtic but at least they/

(1) It is widely accepted that most Rangers fans are - to coin a term - 'Cathogynists'.

they play good football'.

MIKE: 'I dinnae like Rangers; they're the worst team aboot. Half o' their players are dirty, I hardly dinnae go to Rangers games at Easter Road 'cos their supporters start chuckin' bottles about'.

DOUG (a Dundee United fan):
'I don't like Rangers 'cos they only sign Protestants'.

MICK (a Celtic fan):
'I dinnae like Rangers 'cos they don't sign Catholics and their supporters ca'nnae take a slaggin''.

COLIN (a Brechin fan):
'Rangers supporters are not good losers. Nor are their managers, directors or the reporters - many of them support Rangers'.

The Rangers club command widespread contempt because of their religious bigotry; the team are disliked because of their roughness; the supporters are disliked because of their intolerance, conceit and behaviour ('They behave like animals'); and the whole Ibrox set-up is detested because 'they think they've a divine right to win'. Celtic were seen as less biased in the matter of religion, were generally applauded as a beneficent, skilful force in Scottish (and international) football and their supporters were
viewed as less noxious than Rangers'. The Hearts supporters were for many placed in the same class as Rangers' in terms of misbehaviour, a view not exclusively held by Hibs supporters:

LEN (a Dundee fan):

'Hearts supporters can be worse than Rangers; there's no words for them'.

LES (a Dundee United fan):

'Hearts supporters are trouble-makers. The last time they were at Tannadice, six of them went in amongst the United supporters to cause trouble'.

JIM (a Dundee fan):

'The most intimidating supporters are Rangers, Celtic and Hearts'.

SHUG (a Celtic fan):

'I hate getting beaten by Rangers and by Hearts. Their supporters are worse than Rangers. Most of them are freemasons'.

Even Terry, himself a Hearts fan, conceded that the Hearts supporters were 'pretty bad' especially when their team were playing in the First Division.

On the other hand, Andy, also a Hearts supporter, felt that Hearts supporters didn't cause any trouble if they weren't getting any 'stick' from the opposition fans. Verbal
provocation is something most football fans are aware of: one Dundee-based Celtic supporter complained that Dundee United supporters sing Catholic songs even though 'half of them are Protestants'. These same supporters are as capable of singing Protestant songs to taunt the Celtic fans as Catholic songs to intimidate visiting Rangers supporters, a tactic also practised by Aberdeen, St. Johnstone and other supporters at home.

The only other club side who drew some disapproval were Partick Thistle, pilloried for their tedious defensive play away from home while, for the usual nationalistic reasons, England were disliked by a few supporters. Surprisingly, West Germany were singled out by one fan for being a 'very fuckin' brutal team'. Aberdeen (winners of the Premier League in 1979-80) and Dundee United (League Cup Winners 1979-80, 1980-81) won some plaudits for their skilful play and their efforts to break the 'Old Firm' domination.

The Rangers fans tended to hate anything Catholic. A typically terse statement was made by George:

'I don't like Celtic or Hibs 'cos they're Catholic teams'.

He didn't mind being beaten by Hearts so much as by Celtic or Hibernian. This attitude reminded me of the time I was
in a queue at a Hearts v Rangers game and some rival supporters, total strangers, were in agreement that they weren't too bothered who won that afternoon ... 'as long as we beat the Tims'.

However, Rangers supporters don't hold a monopoly in anti-Catholic feeling. Dork, a Dundee supporter, said he hated Celtic supporters because they were Catholic and sang Catholic songs.

Though little affection was voiced between Rangers and Celtic fans, I was surprised to find that several Edinburgh and Dundee supporters bear little enmity for their local rivals. They naturally want to beat the other club in the city but many want the rival club to be successful too:

PETE (a Hibs fan):
'I go and see Hearts if they're playing a decent team. I like to see Hearts doing well, except against Hibs'.

KENNY (a Hearts fan):
'I don't like to see Hibs doing better than Hearts. I'd like to see them second to Hearts'. (his emphasis)

PHIL (a Dundee United fan):
'I like to watch Dundee now and again. I like to see them winning - unless it jeopardises United'.

DORK (a Dundee fan):
'Dundee's my favourite team, but United are second'.


Tam, who had been arrested at a Hibs v Hearts game, disliked Hearts only in a 'friendly way' because most of his mates were Hearts fans. These differences in attitude between Glasgow (and the supporters of the two big Glasgow teams) on the one hand and Edinburgh/Dundee on the other may be attributable to the fact that most supporters of the 'Old Firm' vote according to their religion whereas in the other cities football fans are less dependent on the religious base. Thus, a Catholic school I visited in Dundee contained Celtic, Dundee United and Dundee supporters and a non-denominational (Protestant) school I went to in Edinburgh had Rangers, Hearts, Hibs and (a few) Celtic supporters. In this way, schoolboys in Edinburgh and Dundee would seem to undergo a more tolerant 'social' education some way removed from the blatant football sectarianism of Glasgow.

Nevertheless, irrespective of geographical location, the attractions of football are evident: earlier, it was mentioned as a game whose rules are easily understood by all and that accommodates most physiques and abilities; it is also a conversational keystone of the all-male peer group - many long-standing friendships were made through football - whether over a pint of beer or over the snooker table; and traditional rivalries do much to fuel the interest. One supporter (Arthur) drew a parallel between football and life:
'Football contains skill, passion and courage. It represents so much of life - success, failure, and the will to keep on fighting after a failure'.

Another (John) summed up its importance, thus:

'Football means virtually everything to me. I've missed only one home game in ten years. I watch football on Saturdays, Sundays and on Wednesdays. I play 5-a-sides on Sundays. I plan my holidays round football. I've cancelled arrangements for football. If there's no game on in Dundee, I'll travel somewhere else to see one'.

Though the influence of football may seem to waver little over time, individuals' opinions on the state and health of the game were directly related to how their own teams were then performing:

MARK: 'I'm gettin' a bit seek o' fitba' 'cos Hearts are so bad'.

Interviews were conducted throughout a four year period and naturally individual teams' performances fluctuated somewhat though certain trends in abilities were discernible. Rangers, for instance, were very much in the shadow of their great rivals Celtic. Rangers won the League flag only once in the period (in season 1977/78) and lifted the Scottish Cup and League Cup twice each - but this is interpreted as
insufficient success by Rangers standards. The main complaint of their fans was that there were too many old players in the side and that the manager, John Greig, had remained too loyal to the players he had himself captained before retirement. (1) Such nostalgia, it was argued, should have no place in team selection and the manager, said one, was a 'bam'.

Supporters of the two main Edinburgh sides were also experiencing lean times with the teams yo-yoing between Premier and First Divisions at frantic speeds. Hearts were variously described as 'pretty bad', 'pretty grim', 'rubbish', 'disastrous' and 'crap'. Supporters observed that 'their trainin' cannae be up tae much' and that their main fault was that 'they cannae put the ball in the fuckin' net', a singular disadvantage in football. Some hope was expressed for the future mainly on the strength of a youth policy that seemed destined to bear fruit:

'They've got some nice young laddies'.

Hibs fans were no less scathing: 'very mediocre', 'crap', 'rubbish', 'terrible', and 'abysmal' were the words favoured to describe their performances. There was near-unanimity

(1) Veteran Rangers players Jardine, Jackson and McLean were handed free transfers in May 1982 and the beginning of a 'new era' at Ibrox was announced.
as to what had gone wrong at Easter Road - the club had sold good players that they should have retained (O'Rourke, Gordon, Stanton, Cropley etc.) and thus a skilful unit, which had finished as runners-up in the old First Division in 1973/74 and 1974/75 and had won the League Cup in 1972/73 had been broken up. There was a feeling that both Hearts and Hibs would be better off spending more than a season in the lower division to gather strength for a more sustained venture in the top flight.

When it came to selecting their favourite and least favourite players, only a few showed total bias e.g. one Rangers supporter 'hated' all Celtic players, one Celtic supporter 'didn't like' all Rangers players, one Hearts supporter 'didn't like' all Hibs players. No interviewee praised only his own club's players but rather in many cases admiration was expressed even for rival players. The most acclaimed attributes were skill, endeavour, character, and long and faithful service to a club. Thus, highly-skilled international stars like Pele, Best and Cruyff were greatly admired, so were Kenny Dalglish (Liverpool) and Danny McGrain (Celtic) on the British domestic front. Dalglish received more praise than any other player for combining skill and effort of the highest order though a few felt he was over-rated, while McGrain was described as the 'ultimate professional' (by a Hibs fan). He, too had a few critics - one who felt he was an 'imposter' and another who
reckoned he 'looked stupid when he was being interviewed on the tele'.
Davie Provan was highly rated by Celtic supporters because of his ball-
playing skills, but the players most appreciated by Hearts supporters were
no longer at Tynecastle - Drew Busby (Morton) because of his aggression
and the fact 'he used to get stuck into the Hibs' and Eamonn Bannon
(Dundee United), described as 'the best player I've ever seen for the
Herts'.

Several players evoked a strange ambivalence. Their skills were generally
admired but there was some personal characteristic that was disliked. Into
this category fell Gordon Strachan (Aberdeen) and Kevin Keegan (then
Southampton, now Newcastle). One interviewee felt that Keegan exploited
the game by his over-involvement in advertising and Shug sympathised with
the Celtic supporter who had run on to the pitch and assaulted Strachan:
'It's the way he screws up his nose .. when I'
played football I used to get sent off for going
for boys like that'.

(1) Almost literally so on one occasion: Busby's kicking of a Hibs
player, bordering on criminal assault, was in my opinion an
influencing factor over crowd misbehaviour at an Edinburgh derby
on 7 May, 1978. This has been documented elsewhere.

(2) Celtic were fined one thousand pounds (in spite of several appeals)
by the SFA and the assailant was convicted in court for breach of
the peace and assault and fined following this attack at a Celtic
v Aberdeen game on 8 November, 1980. Celtic's appeal was based on
their belief that the club had done everything required of them to
prevent the encroachment but their plea failed in spite of the
argument of Clydebank's managing director:
'If the United States of America are unable to
stop their President being shot every five minutes,
what chance did Celtic have of stopping an individual?'
On 6 September, 1981, the same player was the target of an attempted
assault after scoring a goal at an Aberdeen v Celtic match. A
Celtic supporter was fined one hundred and fifty pounds.
The aforesaid is, of course, hardly an acceptable plea in mitigation.

Some players were disliked for other idiosyncratic reasons: Larry Lloyd (Nottingham Forest) by Les because 'I cannae stand his fuckin' name'; Ray Clemence (then with Liverpool) by Craig because 'I cannae stand the sight o' him'; and Tommy McLean (Rangers) by Dork because 'I dinnae like the shape o' him or anything'. Others were 'disliked' in a respectful sort of way in that they always served as formidable players in opposition.

Foibles apart, two types of player were generally selected for criticism - the overtly physical central defender(1) and certain/}

(1) It is interesting to note that alongside the ever-increasing use of new law to regulate football spectators (so heavily criticised by this author) there has recently developed an ever-increasing awareness of the existing law that regulates the relationships between football players and thus a movement away from self-help. For example, in 1983 Jim Brown (a former player with Dunfermline Athletic) is to bring a civil action against John Pelosi (a St. Johnstone player) following a violent and damaging field clash during which Brown broke a leg. This will be the first time in Scots law that one player has sued another over a field incident. In 1975, a juvenile player was found guilty of criminal assault at Glasgow Sheriff Court for punching and kicking an opponent on the head. The Sheriff said: 'The consequences of such an attack could be serious, not only for the participants but from the point of view of maintaining good behaviour and safety among spectators'. Under English law, if a player inflicts grievous bodily harm on another or if his conduct amounts to a breach of the peace, any policeman or spectator can at once go on to the pitch and arrest him. On this question of legal intervention into violence on the field, see Alexander McCall Smith, 'Violence in Sport', Law Society Journal, Nov.1978, 441-2.
certain Rangers players (sometimes the two categories overlap). Into the former category were placed Tom Forsyth of Rangers (the most criticised of all the players mentioned(1)) and Roy Aitken of Celtic. Several interviewees employed the epithet 'animal' to describe Forsyth, while others said he was 'too hard a tackler' or was 'far too violent and had a lunatic approach towards the game'. Aitken, said Neil, 'goes for the man if he cannae get the ba'.

Certain other Rangers players were disparaged almost as much as the club itself: Alex McDonald (now player-manager of Hearts) managed to infuriate opposition fans as well. A Celtic supporter thought him 'a stroppy little bastard', a Hibs supporter denounced his 'attitude' towards Hibs players when playing for Hearts, and a Dundee United fan got quite excited when he talked about McDonald:

PHIL: 'I hate that wee shite! Oh, I hate him, I do. He's stupid! I dislike him a lot'.

Derek Johnstone was described as 'big-heeded, though he's nothin' to be big-heeded aboot', 'an animal', a 'poultice', 'fuckin' puddin', and, by several interviewees, a 'cunt'. Teammate Willie Johnston was also a target of the gut-reaction school, one of whom described him as a 'little bastard'.

(1) Tom Forsyth retired from football in March 1982 on medical advice.
bastard', though one Hibs supporter got nearer the mark when he said Johnston wasn't a sportsman and hadn't the temperament for football.

It is interesting that those Rangers players who are so disliked by other fans are the very players the Rangers supporters admire. Crimes of omission and commission are, to them, justifiable whenever a player pulls on the light blue Rangers jersey. Actions which might seem reprehensible to less jaundiced eyes are approved by Rangers supporters. Tom Forsyth, Derek Johnstone and, especially, Willie Johnston were their favourite players:

BOBBY: 'I like Willie Johnston 'cos everybody else [i.e. non-Rangers fans] hates him'.

CALUMN: 'Everybody at Ibrox likes him the best because he's been there a long time. He's still fast in spite of his age. I know he's an animal and he cannae control his temper but I still like him'.

Alan Ball, a former England international, was also condemned - for his arrogance, the high pitch of his voice, his 'provocative manner', and for the fact he was a 'dedicated Scots-hater'.

Supporters were aware of ebullient boardroom figures who run their clubs. Ian Taylor's belief that with the
beginnings of organised English football it became essential to institutionalise financial control of the club in the hands of the 'business-minded' local petit bourgeoisie who ran and financed the club as a hobby (or ego boost) or, less likely, for profit has been mentioned before:

'The central point is that professional soccer is no longer a participatory democracy'.  (1)

This statement has been less true of Scottish football where many club origins were less overtly working class and where professionalisation has been more gradual though, as with England, the entrepreneurs are not always 'petit'. Hearts may, until recently, have maintained a rule denying any shareholder more than 1000 shares but millionaires in the construction industry like the late John Lawrence and Tom Hart(2) have brought their considerable financial muscle and social libido to benefit Rangers and Hibs respectively. Hart's role and influence were well-known to Hibs supporters, many of whom resented his 'dictatorial' image in the club - a dictatorship which it was popularly felt led to the departure of players who didn't agree with him and which reduced the manager to the role of puppet:

Pete: 'Hart owns the team but he cannot get good relations with the players. The manager just does what he's told. Hart's the worst thing that's/

(1) Ian Taylor, Soccer Consciousness, op.cit, p.143.
(2) Tom Hart died in March 1982.
that's happened to Hibs in years. The only thing his money's done was to buy Joe Harper and we didn't really need him and it was because of Hart we had to get rid of him[Hart did not approve of Harper growing a beard]. Hart makes decisions to sell players: That annoys me'.

On the other hand, several Hibs fans admired the way Tom Hart spoke his mind (a characteristic which another fan deprecated, alleging that Hart had 'too big a mooth') and felt that he had done a lot for the club. It was he who was responsible for negotiating and financing George Best's stint at Easter Road and this enterprise had gone down well with the fans, even though Hibs were still relegated that season.

Celtic's helm was felt to be in capable hands. Their present chairman, Desmond White (a chartered accountant), and his predecessor, the late Sir Robert Kelly, received

(1) Ian Taylor has pointed out that the institutionalisation of the football club can be understood in simple class terms. To this end, he documents the increasing hold of the petit bourgeois over directorships, the subordination of the predominantly working class player and supporter to a bourgeois culture and the incorporation of football into the range of respectable national sports - for example, in Scotland, Robert Kelly was knighted and Jock Stein, Willie Ormond, Billy McNeill and Bobby Lennox have featured in the Honours Lists. As for Taylor's belief in the subordination of the working class footballer to the bourgeois culture, research into the class status occupied by Hibernian players concluded that the professional footballer is neither working class nor middle class but rather occupies an intermediate 'privatised' position between the two - A.M. Rintoul, op.cit.
no criticism and the club's public relations were held to be excellent. Willie Waddell (who ascended through the ranks as player and manager with Rangers) was known to have been the main guiding influence at Ibrox as director and former chairman. The current chairman is Rae Simpson, a surgeon. Dundee supporters mentioned the names of Ian Gellatly (an accountant) as chairman and the late John Bett (another construction industrialist) as a director:

JOHN: 'Gellatly pops up every six months with a statement, but he's not in the news every week like Tom Hart'.

Len described directors as 'big money men who are just there to line their own pockets; they sell the good players when they get the chance'. Several fans knew that both Dundee and Hearts were private companies (at the time).

There have recently been successful attempts from the grass roots to change board members at certain clubs, replacing them with more dynamic enthusiasts of popular appeal who claim to represent the 'real' supporters. This occurred at Tynecastle where there was a general disapproval over results and performances and the appointment of Archie Martin as chairman in June 1980 was heavily reported in the 'Edinburgh Evening News'.

This publicity, however, paled into insignificance when
compared to 'The Scotsman's' coverage of the struggle for financial control of Hearts between Kenny Waugh, a millionaire bookmaker and publican, and Wallace Mercer, a millionaire property developer claiming supporter backing. In June 1981, the Hearts board announced their approval of Mercer's bid and within a few days Martin had been removed from the Board. Soon afterwards, the 'defeated' Waugh became director, then chairman-designate, then chairman, at Hibernian.

In November 1980, Jim Clunie was dismissed as manager of St Mirren and the backlash of disapproval resulted in two Shareholders' Action Group representatives joining the board in March 1981. The new chairman, Yule Craig, is a senior partner in a firm of chartered accountants and a JP. The outgoing chairman, Gordon Foulds, was quoted with giving advice to the effect that directorship of a football club was now a time-consuming business and not a hobby. (1)

Perhaps these moves are in some measure indications of a movement back towards a participatory democracy. Though Stranraer F.C. are run by a committee, the football club run as a workers' co-operative is still a long way off.

The supporters' club may be seen as one of the manifestations of such democracy:

The beginnings of supporter clubs around soccer teams can be understood as a means of affirming and institutionalising the control exercised by the soccer sub-culture over its public representatives. In soccer, "control" is the expectation that the club (players, director and manager) would participate in sub-cultural discussions and activities. (1) However, Taylor suggests that such an expectation of sub-cultural control, of participatory democracy, might be 'illusory'. Though the supporter in the 1930s may, through involvement in a supporters' club, have seen himself as being part of a collective and democratically structured enterprise, Taylor stresses that this was probably not the reality:

'Given the increasing hold of the financially-powerful over all the institutions of the wider society, to see pre-war soccer as an exceptional "island" of proletarian endeavour would be absurd'. (2)

Nevertheless, if the supporter was labouring under such a (mis)conception, it helps Taylor explain why working class boys did not invade the pitch in the 1930s:

'Working class boys would see the ground as "theirs" (and the turf as sacred)'. (3)

(1) Taylor, Soccer Consciousness, op.cit, p.145.
(2) Ibid.
(3) Ibid, p.146. I have discussed earlier that I am not convinced that working class persons did not invade the pitch in the 1930s or before then. Nor am I persuaded that all things held dear must never be interfered with: most 'pitch invasions', even today, are celebratory encroachments which support rather than refute a belief in the turf as sacred (see Ch.13). Even the digging-up and removal of bits of the turf (as by Scotland supporters at Wembley) may (perversely) be interpreted as a hallowed rather than profane activity. Desmond Morris, in his The Soccer Tribe, op.cit, has also likened football to a religious order.
If the supporter's view at that time that the football club chairman was responsive to his (the supporter's) wishes might have been illusory then, according to Taylor, such a view in 1970 would undoubtedly be so .... and in the 1980s, for Taylor, would presumably be completely untenable.

The McElhone Committee\(^{(1)}\) saw this need for greater liaison between football club and supporters' club:

'Supporters need to be brought closer to the\(^{(2)}\) clubs and to feel they belong to it. Periodical meetings between club management and officials of supporters' clubs for an exchange of views on matters relative to the problem of hooliganism should be encouraged ....'\(^{(2)}\)

Several writers have drawn attention to the influence a supporters' club (as an offshoot of the football club) may have over its members' behaviour:

'\(^{(3)}\)They\) can play a very important role in connection with the supporters' conduct. When travelling to away fixtures and when actually at the matches a supporters' club whose members are present in strength can exert a tempering influence on the unruly element if they are in the same vicinity. At least one club has a very efficiently organised system whereby numbered tickets are issued for train travel, stewards travel on the coaches and are responsible for the conduct of the supporters. They boast an enviable record of good behaviour'.\(^{(3)}\)

---


\(^{(2)}\) Ibid, para.99.

The McElhone Committee was also aware that not all supporters of a team belong to its supporters' club(s):

'... the football club themselves should take steps to harness this source of support and encourage supporters' clubs to recruit more members in order to get across the message that the club welcomes true and loyal supporters while at the same time discouraging from their grounds the small minority who are bringing disgrace to the club and spoiling the entertainment of the majority'. (1)

It, most certainly, is academic to enthuse over the role of the supporters' club in monitoring and controlling behaviour by use of its sanctions if only a small percentage of supporters are members of supporters' clubs. Of my 58 interviewees, only 19 had ever been in a supporters' club and, of these, 11 were members at the time of the interview. The major reason put forward for belonging to a supporters' club was the cheapness and convenience of travel to away matches it affords. The non-Glaswegian supporters of Rangers and Celtic, for whom every match is an 'away' match, have more use for such membership than, say, a Hearts supporter based in Edinburgh who only attends home matches.

When a supporter therefore stops going to away games or owns/acquires a car, his principal need for membership is abrogated. A few interviewees wanted to join supporters' clubs but found their youth to be a barrier: some of the

(1) McElhone Report, op.cit, para.98.
clubs have licensed premises and insist that members should be 18 years or over. Comradeship and the prospect of an inexpensive drink on such premises are other attractions of the supporters' club.

Several, who had neither private transport nor supporters' club membership, preferred to make their own way to away matches by train or public bus services. A few occasionally travelled on the supporters' club bus without actually being members:

CRAIG: 'I've never joined a supporters' club but I still go on their bus. I just pay a bit extra'. (1)

Paul saw the advantages of membership but 'couldn't be bothered joining' while Jim had gone to an "away game with a supporters' club once but, since they left him behind on the 90 mile return journey, had decided against joining.

Two respondents, both Celtic supporters, had ceased being members because of the type of person the club attracted:

FRANK: 'I was in the Craigmillar supporters' club for two years but I left 'cos half o' them were bammers [nutties]. (2)

---

(1) This researcher has joined numerous 'supporters' club buses' at pick-up points without at any time holding membership - see Chapters 17 and 18. The interloper is welcomed on board a coach that is rarely full and the extra fare he pays is a bonus to club coffers.

(2) I had myself gone to a match in Glasgow with the Craigmillar Celtic supporters' club in the spring of 1977. The outing was documented in Ch. 18.
DANNY: 'I was in the Edinburgh and District supporters' club for a season; I came out 'cos it was heavy - there was too much hassle on the bus from some of the guys. Boys in gangs "filled in" my mate 'cos he was a stranger'.

However, other (Glasgow-based) Celtic supporters in Easterhouse sought the refuge of the Easterhouse supporters' bus to take them on the short journey to Celtic Park and to other Glasgow grounds because they felt it was 'dangerous' to travel by local authority bus which often got its windows smashed. And Calumn, an Edinburgh based Rangers supporter, preferred to travel in the St. Giles branch bus because it was 'cheaper and safer than the train if there's Celtic supporters on the same train'.

Terry, a Hearts fan, had been in three different supporters' clubs - the 'Penthouse' ('the chairman was banned from the club and the club packed in'), the 'Last Furlong' ('the club was disbanded 'cos there was too much trouble on the bus') and was currently a member of the Gorgie club although he no longer went to away matches so often after being involved in 'trouble' in Dumbarton. Both the 'Penthouse' and 'Last Furlong' branches were formed by drinking acquaintances in these public houses, a common method of club origin. Kenny, another Hearts supporter expressed a desire to form his own supporters' club, based on his own local:
'Other pubs have supporters' clubs, so why not us?'

Neil, a 15 year old Rangers supporter, in his fourth year at school, had been banned from travelling on his supporters' club coach because he kept being sick in the vehicle after regularly consuming the best part of a bottle of cheap fortified wine. The club were strictly observing the new **Criminal Justice (Scotland) Act** and Neil had therefore stopped drinking on board.

For some, the supporters' club is an important social institution. Don, aged 30, was not so much concerned about the fine he received following conviction ('anybody's worried about £60 - there's other things you can do wi' the money - but it's no' the end of the world') as the possibility of being banned from his Hearts supporters' club. (1)

Don goes to every away game with them, attends all the club meetings, and is a former officer bearer:

'The club has a rule that anybody convicted gets expelled. It's only happened once when a "young lad" [15/16 years old] got kicked out, but he'd a couple of convictions. With me, they swept it under the carpet - I was delighted'.

Rab, who had been encountered on my trip with the Craigmillar Celtic/

---

(1) The matter was of such concern to him that he took great care not to tell me the name of the supporters' club in question. His comments illustrate the argument (made especially in Parts II and V) that a situational ban can be a more significant social control device than can a penalty of the criminal law.
Celtic supporters' club\(^{(1)}\) told me (from his own experience) that there was no question of being expelled from that club after a conviction. Rab had spoken warmly of his club, nevertheless: the club 'took care of the young lads' by which he meant that the club paid to give them taxis home when pub stops had caused a late return, and also he had revealed that the club would subsidise a member if he were in debt under certain circumstances - a substantial social support service more usually associated with masonic orders (or, more appropriately, with the Knights of St Columba).

Of the 11 interviewees who were still members of supporters' clubs, 4 were entitled to free travel in return for selling a certain number of 'pontoons' (gambling cards with two shutters which are unsealed to reveal two playing cards, the object of the game being to score twenty-one) which boost club funds. One Celtic fan pays a £1.50 membership fee per season and enjoys free travel every week in return for selling 50 pontoons at 10p each, an easy task because his brother buys them all; Andy, a Hearts supporter, opens £4 of pontoons himself to get his free seat; and Bobby, a Rangers fan, would also be travelling without payment had not a club member '"knocked" [stolen] all the pontoons'.

\(^{(d)}\) The/ (1) See Ch.13.
(d) The cost of allegiance

Giving regular support to a football team is an expensive and time-consuming passion.

Almost all supporters - except the old and ageing - wear some insignia or garment demonstrating their team preference. The most popular item is the scarf which has the dual function of publicising the wearer's team affiliation while simultaneously keeping the neck warm on cold and draughty Scottish terracings. Younger supporters sport tammies in team colours as well. Tammy-wearing generally wanes with puberty but scarves are worn well into the twenties: one Hearts supporter interviewed (aged 34) had only stopped wearing his scarf the year before.

The more flamboyant of the adolescent supporters will sometimes wear a number of scarves - one knotted round the neck and one round each wrist being popular sartorial choice. Other supporters, less concerned about regular overt identity and display, choose the occasions to sport their colours more carefully:

IAN (a Hearts supporter):
'I only wear my scarf when we're playing Hibs because it's a traditional derby and you've got to show where your loyalty lies'.

TAM (a Hibs supporter):
'I don't usually wear a scarf except at Hibs v Hearts games'.
LEN: 'I only wear my tammy at big gemmes'.

GRAHAM: 'I only wear a Hibs scarf at away games - to let the other team know we're there'.

Sometimes, however, the choice of whether to sport colours is based on safety perceptions. The wearing of favours at certain grounds under certain circumstances is accepted as 'just asking for trouble'. For example, few supporters of so-called provincial clubs would have considered wearing their scarves etc. on the standing terraces at Celtic Park or anywhere but the main stand or its enclosure at Ibrox in the days of choice before segregation. Even with police supervision, the ostentatious flaunting of allegiance is sometimes felt to be unwise, because segregation is not always enforced in the departure from the ground.

Thus, Craig and Arthur never wear their Hibs scarves to Ibrox; Chris leaves his Hibs scarf in the bus/car when he visits Ibrox because he's heard it's not safe; Danny doesn't wear his Celtic scarf in Glasgow; and Ed does not put on his Hearts scarf away to Rangers, Celtic or Aberdeen because 'they seem rougher':

'It's not so much a problem against Hibs because there are always more Hearts fans!'

It is essentially this numerical superiority that determines who has the 'right' to wear colours. Celtic, Rangers and
Aberdeen, as the best supported clubs in the country, lay down the dominant green, blue or red colour norms at home matches and rival displays in certain locations would be interpreted as provocations to the status quo. On the other hand, a Brechin City supporter claimed that he could wear his scarf unmolested at any ground 'because we're not a threat'.

Several of the arrested interviewees believed that their sporting of colours was a contributing factor in their arrest. Phil used to wear four Dundee United scarves to away matches but, following his arrest at Paisley, he no longer wears any:

'I dinnae bother about a scarf now. Nor do my mates. It keeps you oot o'trouble. Nobody bothers you'.

And Tam claimed he was only 'lifted' because the police interpreted his wearing of a Hibs scarf in the midst of his mates who were Hearts supporters as meaning that Tam was a trouble-maker. Many had been verbally abused or assaulted when their scarves were spotted, as red rags to a bull. Mike's Hibs scarf, which features a smiling portrait of the Pope, was 'captured' and set on fire by Hearts fans.

The younger fan usually adorns his scarf with metal or cloth badges, which sing the praises of his team, insult
the opposition, or declare political or religious affinity.

Mark had over 30 metal badges on his Hearts scarf; Andy went in for badges that 'slag the Hibees ('The Hibs supporters' club meets in a telephone box', 'Hibs supporters go to away games by tandem', 'Mothercare are oot o' dummies, Hibs have got them a', etc); Neil had a 'Union Jack', a Protestant Vanguard flag and two items of insignia proclaiming the 'Rising sons of William' and 'King William III' sewn onto his Rangers scarf; and Bobby, another Rangers fan, sported a giant sew-on King William astride a white horse and the 'Red Hand of Ulster' alongside the usual Rangers badges.

Celtic and Rangers supporters are especially proud to wear the team jersey on match days (Frank was wearing a Celtic jersey when I interviewed him at school) and Alastair liked to dress in all-blue clothing when he went to watch Rangers. Cloth banners suspended between poles used to be popular but have now been replaced by flags that often have political significances: Celtic supporters raise the Irish tricolour while Rangers and Hearts supporters wave 'Union Jacks' and Ulster flags. Andy was ejected from Tynecastle for waving a maroon flag with a small Union flag in the centre while singing a Protestant song at a Celtic game.

Occasionally, the expression of identity can take on a more
bizarre manifestation. Favours can also be tailored to suit the more outlandish youth cultures - skinheads, bikers and punks, the youth movements most conspicuously set apart from the middle-aged establishment. At a Brechin v Dundee United cup-tie, one young supporter was wearing a leather jacket, tartan trousers and had his hair dyed orange and black and in the style of Oor Wullie. In this way, pop cultures and football cultures (both as divisions of youth culture) may merge.

Gate receipts are split evenly between the participating clubs after overheads have been paid. (1) The cost of admission more than doubled during the period of interviewing - from 70p for an adult to stand on a Premier League terracing at the beginning of 1977 to £1.50 during season 1980/81 - but interviewees were near unanimous that this was a fair charge in spite of the unpredictability of the product.

They argued that compared to other purchases (e.g. the cost of beer) and admission prices to other entertainments (e.g. the cinema), the cost of entry to a Scottish football ground was reasonable. Surprisingly, only one of the interviewed supporters was a season ticket holder. This may be explained by the fact that the main benefit of such ownership/ownership/

(1) From season 1981/82, all clubs will keep the receipts from their home league games.
ownership is bestowed on the fan who wants to watch the first team and the reserves at home on alternate weeks. Very few of those interviewed were interested in attending reserve games, preferring to watch the 'big team' when at all possible.

Other costs incurred include the purchase of a match programme and a 'Golden Goal' ticket. About half the respondents brought programmes; some always bought them ('I collect one at every game I go to and faithfully record the score') and had vast collections of several hundred items, while others sometimes bought programmes (e.g. at away games only). Programmes retail for about 20p and a 'Golden Goal' ticket (a lottery ticket containing a time when the first goal of the game is scored) costs 10p to 20p. Nevertheless, for supporter-collectors, programmes have more than just a monetary value and are seen as important momentoes:

CHIC (a Brechin supporter):

'I had to wash and iron my Forfar programme after I'd dropped it in the mud'.

Some supporters buy refreshments\(^1\) inside the ground, traditional inflexibility dictating that this will almost certainly

\(^1\) The standard of refreshments on sale at football grounds will be discussed in the context of football ground facilities (see section (h) of this Chapter).
certainly consist of a pie and a cup of tea or Bovril, purchases which add around 40p to the cost of the day's outing. The cost of transport adds a few pence at a home game and a few pounds if travelling to other towns is involved whether by car, coach or train and is thus a major item of expenditure. Considerable sums of money are also spent on alcohol before, during (considerably reduced by the Criminal Justice (Scotland) Act 1980) and after the match. Only the very youngest supporters interviewed did not take some amount of alcohol before a typical game. (1)

Taking all this together, the average supporter has no trouble in parting with around £5 and £6 at home games and £10 or more for an away fixture. Jack, a Liverpool fan based north of the Border, reckoned to spend £18 every time he saw his team play.

(e) Preparing and meeting for the match

A long lie on Saturday morning to recover from Friday night's excesses, a read of the back pages of the morning paper and a meal taken while watching 'On the Ball' or 'Football Focus' (if it's a home game) are the usual precursors to the Saturday afternoon match. Then, armed with this information gleaned from the media and with

(1) The role of alcohol at the football event will also be discussed at a later stage (see especially sections (o) and (p) of this Chapter).
mounting anticipation, the football supporter dons his football kit: just as John Travolta meticulously greased his hair and slid into a freshly-pressed shirt in his attempt to catch 'Saturday Night (disco) Fever', the football supporter takes painstaking care to get his football match uniform exactly right. His weekday identity as butcher, plumber or whatever is forsaken and he is now a 'football supporter'.

For some, thoughts turn to the next match almost as soon as the referee's final whistle is blown, especially those who are unemployed or who have little or no interest in their jobs. One supporter, of moderate enthusiasm, told me with some precision that he started to look forward to Saturday's match on Thursday evenings.

At home games, most supporters, having followed the above ritual, meet friends in a pub near the ground or in the social club around one o'clock. Tam, a heavy drinker, is in the pub at opening time (11a.m.) while for Len the meeting-time varies:

'If it's a big gemme, I go tae the pub at 11. Otherwise one-ish'.

At the pub, eulogies on favourite players are presented, criticisms are offered of others, and pre-match analyses and predictions are tendered. Information gathered from
the press or through conversation during the week is traded. A few beers are drunk. The supporters depart the pub to walk to the nearby ground sometime after 2.30p.m. occasionally having a 'sing-song' on the way.

Younger supporters meet their comrades at some other convenient location like someone's house or, in Dork's case, at 'meh shops'. Lisa, who is fifteen and the only female supporter interviewed, goes 'doon the toon tae meet other lassies and laddies' and together they make their way towards the football ground.

Some adult supporters have a more itinerant approach to the day. Graham goes for a swim at the local baths at 9a.m., breakfasts at 10a.m. in a Leith pub, drinks three pints of heavy in another pub from 11a.m. - 12.30p.m., moves on to a third pub where go-go dancers perform ('They're rubbish 'cos it's the same ones every week') and there he drinks 6 pints before he and his friends take a taxi to the match.

The rendezvous-point for away games is either a pub (if it is a pub-based supporters' club) or a convenient pick-up point en route. For Edinburgh-based supporters, it has been seen, Haymarket is the usual such spot though even here there are nearby pubs whose facilities are used by waiting fans. Some fans even manage to drink on their way to Haymarket: George, who lives in a perimeter housing scheme,
drinks the contents of four cans of beer with his mate as they travel on the Regional Council bus to Haymarket.

(f) The journey to the match

Supporters travel to away games by a variety of modes - supporters' coaches, supporters' trains, regular service buses, regular service trains, and cars. One of the interviewees claimed to hitchhike to matches on occasion.

Those who travel by car 'chip in' for the cost of petrol. Car drivers were adamant that they themselves drank little or nothing on such occasions though their passengers would usually consume carry-outs on the journey and stop at a pub both on the way and on arrival:

CRAIG: 'I don't usually drink at away matches 'cos I drive the car. I have a few shandies though'.

RON: 'If I'm driving, I have some soft drinks as well as a couple of pints'.

Just as there are certain fixtures at which some fans are reluctant to sport colours, Graham never took his car when travelling to see Hibs play at Ibrox:

'I always go by coach to Ibrox 'cos the car'll get damaged'.

Andy, a Hearts fan, felt it was 'awfy risky goin' tae
Glasgow - especially Parkhead', even by supporters' bus.

Younger, more committed fans tend to go to away games by supporters' coach but alcohol is still an essential ingredient in the day's journeying - in spite of the youth of some of the travellers and, it would seem, in spite of the relevant prohibitions of the Criminal Justice (Scotland) Act 1980. Descriptions of considerable alcohol consumption abounded before that statute came into operation:

ALASTAIR: 'I went on a school trip to Hampden for the Cup Final between Rangers and Hearts (in 1976). The trip was free. I went through a quarter-bottle of vodka and three cans. I was fifteen at the time'.

SHUG: 'I used to drink cheap wine on the supporters' bus when I was young and stupid'.

GEORGE: 'A lotta drinking goes on behind the driver's back. There are no stewards on the bus and the boy in charge of the bus drinks too. The driver gets more in the hat if he lets us drink. Nobody stops the under-aged boys drinking'.

MIKE: 'Most boys o' my age [17 - 19 year olds] take half bottles o'whisky or vodka on the bus and drink it straight. They share it around. I've seen wee laddies takin' cups o' it'.
Some supporters' coaches tried to ban drink on board long before the 1980 Act but enforcement was sometimes haphazard:

HARRY:  'You werenae allowed booze on our bus but I usually managed to get four cans o' lager on. It was usually O.K. as long as you didn't throw the cans out the window'.

Sections 69 - 71 of the 1980 Act, which give statutory form to such proscriptions, have been mentioned before(1) but are quoted verbatim below:

'69. Where a public service vehicle is being operated for the principal purpose of conveying passengers to or from a designated sporting event, then -

(a) Any person in possession of alcohol on the vehicle shall be guilty of an offence and liable on summary conviction to imprisonment for a period not exceeding 60 days or a fine not exceeding £200 or both;

(b) if alcohol is being carried on the vehicle and the vehicle is on hire to a person, he shall, subject to section 71 of this Act, be guilty of an offence and liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding £200; and

(c) any person who is drunk on the vehicle shall be guilty of an offence and liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding £50.

70. Notwithstanding section 92 of the Licensing (Scotland) Act 1976 (restriction on carriage of alcoholic liquor in crates on contract carriages), but subject to section 71 of this Act, if the operator of a public service vehicle which is being operated as mentioned in section 69 of this Act, either by himself or by his employee or agent

permits/

(1) See Ch. 17.
permits alcohol to be carried on the vehicle, the operator and, as the case may be, the employee or agent shall be guilty of an offence and liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding £200.

71. Where a person is charged with an offence under section 69(b) or 70 of this Act, it shall be a defence for him to prove that the alcohol was carried on the vehicle without his consent or connivance and that he did all he reasonably could to prevent such carriage'.

Such state law, however, may prove just as difficult to enforce as the more informal rules of thumb of bus operators or supporters' clubs, especially if a driver feels that the risk of possible criminal prosecution may be more than offset by a guaranteed healthy response to his 'passing the hat round' if he is known to have bent the rules.

I interviewed Bobby, a Rangers fan, on 23 February 1981, just two days after a Celtic v Rangers game, the first big test of the drink embargo incorporated within the Criminal Justice Act. He said that one supporter on his bus that day had been drinking whisky from an Ir'n Bru bottle. The following Saturday, Bobby was on the bus again, this time travelling to a Rangers v Airdrie game at Ibrox:

'There was nae beer on the bus but there was naebody there [the bus was far from full]. The driver was looking for booze - just cans - bottles were O.K.'

Frank, a Celtic supporter, had gone by his supporters' bus
to the same 'Old Firm' game and reported that there was 'nae drink' on board. 'Two polis' had in fact gone on board his bus at Chapelhall to search for drink. Frank was amazed when they only searched luggage racks and coats and did not bother to search the passengers (a power permitted on reasonable suspicion under s.75). He pointed out that in any case police had always stopped his bus on the outskirts of Aberdeen, long before the new law came into force, and that, though even now he was only aged 15, he had once managed to drink fifteen cans of lager on the way to Aberdeen.

Several supporters were of the opinion that they could predict with some accuracy the occasions when police would stop and search the buses (e.g. Celtic v Rangers games) and also the places at which such searches would occur. Calumn was also interviewed by me a couple of days after the same Celtic v Rangers match. The driver of his Rangers supporters' bus had permitted drink on board because he had predicted correctly when the police would stop the vehicle, by which time empty containers had been removed.

On the other hand, Andy travels by what he described as a 'strict' Hearts supporters' bus on which drink was prohibited with success even before the new law. His was a 'non-sectarian bus' where no bottles and cans were permitted except 'bottles o' juice' and where the bus convener ran regular checks on individuals.
Another Hearts supporter, Terry, who used to travel to away games on a pub bus, did not think the new law would make any difference because his bus too had tried unsuccessfully to impose conduct rules two years before:

'The bus company were getting fed up with the mess - beer cans, fag ends and the like. So they drew up a list of rules - no spitting, no swearing, no drinking, no throwing things out of windows. It didn't work'.

The ultimate sanction used was the threat of withdrawal of the bus. The threat had no effect on behaviour, the bus was withdrawn and the club was disbanded.

Most buses, in any case, stop for liquid refreshment at a pub on the way to the ground though many Rangers buses prefer resting at Orange clubs to gather spiritual momentum.

A few, like Ian, had stopped going to away matches because of the expense. Acknowledging the increasing cost, Dundee United provided half-price fares for supporters travelling with official organisations to the replayed 1981 Scottish Cup Final - supporters' second trip to Glasgow in five days.

Activities on board the supporters' coach, from this researcher's viewpoint, have been documented earlier(1) and

(1) See Part III.
the interviewees had little to add. The trips are crude, boisterous affairs but, on the whole, non-violent; the passengers thoroughly enjoy the camaraderie which is often abetted by alcohol consumption, the sing-song and the occasional bit of (essentially verbal) 'aggro' that comes their way:

ALAN (a Hibs supporter):

'When we're going to Celtic and Morton games we usually pass Rangers fans on their buses. We shout and chant at them and they do the same. We never meet them off the buses - I don't know why, but they never seem to stop at the same places'.

The McElhone Report(1) and other sources have rightly pointed out the problems that may arise when supporters' coaches arrive at their destination with too much time to spare. Some interviewees told of events related to early arrival: Phil arrived early at Paisley off a supporters' bus from Dundee. He had been drinking cans on the journey, had time for six pints and few nips in Paisley pubs and was 'blootered' by the time he got arrested. Pete arrived at Arbroath railway station off the Edinburgh train and found he had an hour to spare; he was ejected from a pub and was eventually arrested inside the ground. And George arrived

(1) McElhone Report, op.cit., para.45.
in Birmingham for the 1976 Aston Villa v Rangers game more than six hours before the kick-off:

'We left Scotland on our supporters' bus at midnight on the Friday. I had half a dozen cans of "Special" with me. We stopped at a services near Carlisle for fifteen to twenty minutes for the driver to rest. Other Rangers buses were there and people were kicking in the machines just for the hell of it. We stopped at another service area around 6 o'clock for breakfast but nothing much happened. We got to Birmingham around 8.30 a.m. There were already hundreds of Rangers supporters there. It was the first time I'd been to England for a Rangers game and I'd thought I'd get a doin'. Our mob got bigger and bigger. We ran riot through the market, throwing clothes about. We had a police escort by 10 o'clock. Half of the Rangers fans were paralytic. At eleven the pubs opened and were mobbed with Rangers supporters. We stayed in one pub till twelve, caught a bus to near the ground and found another pub with Rangers supporters dancing on table tops and bar tops. This pub was mentioned in the newspapers. They said "hundreds" of glasses were broken but it was only a few. Twenty of thirty police came in and there were several arrests. One guy on our bus got punched by a policeman so he
told him to "Fuck off". He got "lifted" for that and missed the match but they let him out at 10 o'clock so he got our bus back home. It left at midnight'.

(g) At the football match

Supporters were fairly evenly divided in their preference to stand or sit at the football match. Those who liked to stand enjoyed the more charged atmosphere and occasional swaying of a more closely packed crowd:

ALASTAIR: 'There are too many seats in grounds nowadays. It's a better atmosphere when you're standing and it's just as comfortable'.

ALAN: 'Seats should only be for O.A.P. s. Ye cannae enjoy a gemme sittin' doon: he have tae be standin'.

Generally, it was the younger fan who preferred to stand as he sang and chanted in support of his team. Traditionally, standing has also been less expensive.

Over the last few years, the division between a stance and a seat has become less acute as several terracings have been fitted out with rude bench-style seating, the price of admission to which is the same as the non-seated terracing and thus still cheaper than the more exclusive 'grandstand'. 
Current thinking dictates that this facility is more 'civilised' and minimises crowd trouble. Many of the interviewees agreed with this viewpoint though some, like Phil, had more personal observations:

'I'm sick fed up o' standin',

Seated accommodation, practically all were agreed, cuts down on atmosphere and important moments of the match can be missed if someone in front rises from his seat. Some of the supporters so resented the intrusion of seating into their areas (e.g. at Hibs, Hearts and Dundee) and were so unimpressed with the quality of seating provided that they continued to stand in the seated areas as before:

MIKE: 'I don't fancy Pittodrie, 'cos it's all-seated. I used to stand in the Easter Road shed - I still do. But I preferred it the way it was. So did the other supporters. We used to try and set the wooden benches on fire at first'.

The supporters know how to differentiate between a luxury multi-seated stadium like Ibrox with its towering and comfortable new stands and the growing number of grounds where, out of lip-service to ideals of safety and 'progress', token benches have been hurriedly built on frequently wet and wind-swept terracings - Clydebank, Hearts, Hibs, Dundee, Morton and, in the near future, Raith Rovers. The supporters do not want mutton dressed as lamb.
A compact, covered, modern stadium with good quality seating for the majority (75%) but with standing room for some (25%) was the popular and democratic choice. A stadium along the lines of Ibrox with 35,000 seats and 9,000 places in the standing enclosure - though obviously on a smaller scale in most locations - is what the fans would most like to see.

Most supporters join in the singing and the chanting until they graduate to less vocal areas usually by their twenties:

IAN: 'I used to chant but I stopped at about 18 or 19'.

There are clearly defined areas in most grounds where such exuberant support takes place: a 'shed' behind a goal or in a covered enclosure running the length of the pitch. And within these areas, Marsh et al have pointed out, there is an internal graduation structure: novice, rowdy, hard-case and nutter, etc. (1)

The songs and the chants add to the atmosphere and might mainly be seen as helping to motivate the team or individual players. However, the vocalising takes three main forms - in support of own team/player; against opponents or greatest rival; religious songs and chants. For most of the interviewees the religious songs were offensive, especially to

supporters of teams with no discernible religious affiliation and to supporters brought up in one faith but who followed an 'other' team:

Pete (a Protestant Hibs fan):
'I used to sing the IRA songs, but I decided what's the use of singing Irish rebel songs? We're nowhere near Ireland. Scotland's better than Ireland anyway so why should we sing their songs?'

On several occasions, Catholic Celtic fans and (more rarely) Protestant Rangers fans voiced the opinion that religion should have nothing to do with football:

Sean (a Celtic fan):
'I don't sing the IRA songs; I don't see the connection'.

Harry (a Rangers fan):
'There are no songs I don't like except ones about the Pope and the IRA. The Pope's got nowt tae dae wi' it'.

However, a few supporters, in spite of expressing their opposition to religious chanting in the interview, admitted that during the match they just got carried along with whatever the crowd was singing: though Brian, a Protestant Celtic supporter from Easterhouse, didn't like the IRA songs,
he nevertheless joined in when they were being sung in the 'Jungle'. Alan, another non-Catholic, bows to the crowd pressure when Hibs fans sing Republican songs.

Other fans named religious songs as their especial favourites: the 'Sash' and 'Derry's Walls' were liked most by some Protestants, while some Catholics favoured the 'Soldiers' Song' and 'We're off to Dublin'. One Rangers supporter in particular (George) was really into the singing and chanting - 'I ken them a' and I sing them a' - and proclaimed a particular skill as a lyricist. To the melody of 'The Old Orange Flute', a verse of which he recited to me as follows:

'I married a Fenian called Bridget McGuire,
She ordered my flute to be thrown in the fire,
And as it was burning I heard a strange noise,
'Twas the old Orange flute playing "The Protestant Boys"'.

George has penned his own morbid verse which he 'made up at work':

'I burned down a chapel two Sundays ago,
Some Fenians were in but were too fuckin' slow,
They got to the door and they opened it wide,
So I shot them all down - that's an Orangeman's pride'.

Rangers fans also enjoyed singing 'God Save the Queen'.

Most fans, however, preferred either non-political anthems like 'Sailin', 'You'll never walk alone' and 'Fly the Flag'
(a take-off(!) of the British Airways T.V. advert), to which they would raise their scarves high above their heads in celebration. Or they enjoyed sarcastic or amusing ditties like:

To 'Blaydon Races'

{ 'Away the lads, you should have seen us comin',
  We're only here to drink your beer
  And shag your fuckin' women'.

(h) **Perceptions of ground facilities**

Most supporters felt they got a raw deal inside the football ground: stadia were for the most part 'dirty and dilapidated' and the facilities were 'pretty grim'. More cover, more and better quality seating (already considered) and improved toilet and catering facilities were advocated by the customers, as recommended by the McElhone Report:

'... clubs must provide adequate toilet facilities for men and women and generally improve amenities for spectators'. (1)

(emphasis in original)

Finance is, of course, the obvious barrier to such improvements, as the McElhone Committee appreciated. Nevertheless, some initial outlay would surely generate greater income in the longer term, and sponsorship(2) and monies available to

---

(1) McElhone Report, op.cit, para.88.

(2) For example, Hibs are sponsored by Fishers and Hearts by Alexanders the motor dealers.
'designated grounds' from the Football Ground Improvement Trust to aid compliance with the Safety of Sports Grounds Act 1975 will help. Older fans tended to be the least tolerant of the facilities on offer yet it is these more mature fans who are needed to provide a 'responsible' behavioural balance.

Emotional ties apart, 'good grounds' included Ibrox which, though at the time of writing incomplete, was nevertheless hailed as 'just great' and 'tremendous'; Parkhead which was felt to be modern in spite of its limited seating accommodation; Pittodrie which in spite of the bench seating is largely covered and was described by one fan as 'lovely'; East End Park which was praised for the amount of cover; and Tannadice which affords a good view though some anxiety was expressed concerning the steepness of its main slope. Joe liked Partick Thistle's ground best because it was an easy ground to get into free - a low wall is easily scaled from an adjacent hill.

Scottish grounds suffered from a comparison with those in England, a view coloured by the biennial trip to Wembley, the occasional trip to see an English First Division match, or glimpses of such seen on television:

'You can even have a meal at Old Trafford'.

'Elland Road's the worst English ground I've seen but it compares well with most Scottish grounds'.
Scotland's worst grounds were named as Tynecastle (seen as a 'bit o' a pit' and a 'symbol of urban decay'); Easter Road (a 'dump' with vast freezing terraces and where 'a' the pent's peeling off'); Love Street (a 'hole') and Hampden (a 'piggery' which was felt to be an unworthy home for our national team). Of the smaller grounds, Alloa had won fewest converts:

RON: 'There are no facilities at all. There's no bog - you just piss against a wall at the back. The corrugated iron's turned green'.

TERRY: 'The terracing's a' mud. When the wind blows, dust gets up your nose'.

A few connoisseurs felt able to comment on the quality of some playing surfaces - Morton's pitch is a 'quagmire' and Hibs' has a 'ridiculous slope' (a universal criticism). On the credit side, Alastair assured me that Aberdeen had the best pitch in Scotland because someone who had played on it had told him just that and Martin insisted that Tannadice had the 'best manure in Britain' (his words).

Other specific comments ranged over the lack of cover ('It's too bloody cold to stand on an open terracing', 'The Easter Road shed's pathetic; it looks more like a bus shelter'); non-concrete terracings (as at Hampden and Alloa); catering (often provided by outside firms) which was too expensive
and tedious (lukewarm pie, tea, beef tea, crisps and chocolate biscuits being the usual fare), service which was slow and supplies which often ran out by half-time - Chic complained of 'unhygenic shacks with greasy pies'. Toilet facilities, where they existed, were frequently uncovered and flooded with urine: Len talked of St Mirren's ground having one toilet '3 feet deep in piss on matchdays' and the toilets at Easter Road and Tynecastle were said to be 'running wi' pish'. This writer was very pleasantly surprised indeed on discovering a wash-hand basin in the gents' toilet at Meadowbank Stadium.

(i) **Crowd control strategies**

The major crowd control strategy recommended by the McElhone Report is one of separation - separation of rival supporters queueing at turnstiles, inside the ground and after the match; separation of rival supporters' coaches; and separation of the playing area from the spectators by means of a physical barrier. (1) The separation of spectators from alcohol is, of course, the major aim of Part V of the **Criminal Justice (Scotland) Act** (based on the McElhone Report).

In spite of the fact that such strategies (as with seating) restrict individual liberty and mobility, most of the interviewees agreed that they were necessary at certain games

where there would be a sizeable travelling support:

BILL: 'Segregation at Tannadice at certain games is a very good thing. I'm surprised it didn't happen earlier in spite of the fact it affects me: I can't stand at the eighteen yard line when my team are attacking in both halves'.

Though Danny pointed out that segregation had been practised at Rangers v Celtic games since the 1930s it is a relatively modern response to certain of the other fixtures. Thus, the earliest of the recent spate of segregations had a trial and error nature as Ewan, a Hibs supporter, pointed out:

'The police sometimes didn't give the Rangers supporters enough room at the one end so they spilled over behind us'.

Chris, another Hibs supporter, said that he had often seen supporters of his team hide their scarves up their jumpers in order to penetrate the 'end' of smaller teams in order to provoke trouble.

In their University of Leicester study, Dunning, Murphy and Williams have argued against the segregation of rival supporters as they consider it aggravates disorder by helping fans to define their respective territories more sharply while at the same time driving hooliganism outside
the grounds. (1)

Also against segregation, Tam felt he had only been arrested because of such a policy, Bruce reckoned there was now more bottle-throwing, and Ron also remarked that in his view there was more trouble since segregation had been practised - a labelling-style approach that was also taken by Calumn over fencing:

'If you see a fence you just want to climb it'.

Perimeter fencing was not universally supported. Some felt it was necessary in certain grounds only (grounds with plenty of seating like Ibrox and Pittodrie should be exempt) while others felt that the grandstand areas did not require to be fenced in nor did they need segregation. Those at the front of the terracing are unable to see properly through fencing and Chic felt that it wasn't good for the image of the game.

Current fencing is in most cases inadequate to prevent large-scale pitch encroachment, as seen at Wembley in 1979 and other occasions of celebration. Frank suggested that 18 foot fences were needed and Harry wanted moats dug round the playing area as an alternative to fencing.

(1) Dunning et al, Why Fans Fight, op.cit.
(j) **Homeward bound**

As has been mentioned, segregation of rival fans at big matches continues after the final whistle is blown. Supporters may be directed towards the bus park, railway station or to their cars along a different route from their rivals. At 'Old Firm' games, rival pedestrian fans are kept apart until they have walked a considerable distance from the football ground.

The McElhone Report recommended that football coaches 'should depart from the immediate vicinity of the ground as soon as possible after the match, if necessary with a police escort'(1) and this is indeed what usually happens. Traffic police will help departing buses through the post-match glut of traffic and police cars will usually be positioned on the outskirts of the city to see the buses on their way. The bus will often stop off at some pub on the return journey and in some cases will drop passengers off at a local hostelry on reaching home. In this way, Saturday afternoon may merge into Saturday evening.

Sometimes, however, as with George's trip to see Rangers in Birmingham, the bus is dilatory in leaving for home:

'After the match was abandoned, we walked back to the city centre. There was the odd bit of trouble there. I went to a pub with a tartan carpet/

---

(1) McElhone Report, op.cit.
carpet and somebody pushed over the till around closing-time. Somebody got the polis so we left and walked round the city centre. There were only a couple of hundred supporters left by midnight - we were about the last bus to leave. We still heard windows breaking as we were leaving. We stopped at a service area but Rangers fans were running riot there so the police didn't let us off. They wouldn't even let the driver off to make a phone-call. We arrived back home about 9a.m. It was the best day of my life, 'cos it was the first time I'd been to England for a fitba' match and there was that many Rangers supporters'.

Supporters of the home team either head for the pub after the match (in the past they had to wait outside till the 5 o'clock opening) or go straight home. The young vocal groups leave the ground together and may perpetrate acts of vandalism on property or get involved in conflict with a rival band. In Dundee, supporters leave the city's football grounds and make for the city centre via the Hilltown:

DORK: 'At big gemmes, we go doon the Hill 'cos abody else does. At derby gemmes, we're on one side of the road and United supporters are on the other'.
In Edinburgh, young Hearts and Hibs fans may leave their respective grounds and march in a group towards Princes Street before dispersing. After Edinburgh 'derby' matches Easter Road and Gorgie Road have accommodated confrontations between the rival groups as a result of which several of the interviewees were arrested. Their interpretations will be documented in greater detail later. For the most part, as several Hibs supporters indicated, nothing too serious occurs; and the mood generated by the match may be an influence:

EWAN: 'After the match, I go along with the crowd for a fight and then run away. After that, another couple of pints, then get a bus home'.

ALAN: 'After the game, you see if you can get a wee fight but usually you just end up chasing and running away. There's that many Rangers and Celtic fans we'd no' stand a chance. But everybody else is OK - we wouldnae run away frae Herts. You fight wi' you fists and anything you've got. It depends on the score and whether it's a fair game'.

MIKE: 'We chase other fans after the match - but nothing much happens'.

Alastair, a Rangers supporter, also remarked that 'you only start fighting if you've lost'.
(k) Perceptions of the police and of criminality

Arrested and ejected supporters, as one might expect, had some grudges to air concerning their treatment by the police. These will be documented in detail later.\(^1\) However, many other supporters also had a good deal to say on what they had seen or heard of the police while on duty at football matches.

A number of those interviewed spoke well of the police, commenting that they had a difficult job which they did to the best of their ability or that they did a 'good job'. One Hearts supporter actually wanted to join the police after he left school in spite of being, he felt, 'unfairly' ejected by them at one match.

Other supporters' opinions of the police changed quite dramatically following direct contact:

\textbf{TAM:} \hspace{1cm} 'Before I was arrested, I thought the police were just there and that was all. Having been arrested, I now think the police are agents provocateurs because of the way they segregate fans'.

There were several other allegations of provocation on the part of the police mainly concerning their language, their roughness and their bias:\(^2\)

---

\(^1\) See sections (n) and (o) of this chapter.

\(^2\) Smelser, in his Theory of Collective Behaviour (op.cit, p.263), is of the opinion that a partial enforcement of justice by the authorities may further the spread of a hostile outburst.
SHUG: 'I was with Paddy after one Celtic game. A policeman got him in a close and called him a "fuckin' Fenian bastard". "I'm no'", said Paddy. He's a Protestant in spite of his name'.

Neil claimed he was told by a policeman who was ejecting him from Ibrox to 'piss off, you Orange get' and Ed reckoned the police could be more polite in the exercise of their duties:

'One started pushing me and didn't say "excuse me". I asked him to say "excuse me". I realised I was taking a chance as that's the sort of thing you get arrested for'.

Several supporters alleged that police were biased against visiting supporters. Pete claimed that when he went to see Hibs play at Liverpool the police used "three foot long canes with metal tips - on the Hibs fans only", and Len, Bobby and Jim criticised Perth police (quite independently):

LEN: 'At home gemmes, police are no trouble for us; sometimes we have a blether with them. At away gemmes, police are biased, especially at Perth. They're after personal scores - seeing who can arrest or eject the maist'.

BOBBY: 'At St Johnstone, two CID boys jumped up [in celebration] when St Johnstone scored. They were supposed to be in the no-man's-land
between the St Johnstone supporters and us. A Rangers fan jumped on one o' them. Other police officers in uniform joined in and used batons and feet'.

JIM: 'I've heard from a mate of police being provocative and stimulating trouble at St Johnstone v Dundee'.

Some opined that the Glasgow police were also biased against away supporters:

GRAHAM: 'They keep picking on you'.

CRAIG: 'Some police are alright. But it's different in Glasgow. They pick on away supporters - especially when they ken you come from Edinburgh. At a Hibs v Aberdeen semi at Hampden, I went to do the toilet against the wall like everyone else. A sergeant laid one on us - in the ribs. I was away to swing one on him until I saw who he was - I thought he was an Aberdeen supporter at first. He told me "You're no' in Edinburgh now"'.

And Pete further claimed that Arbroath police had told him that they were not keen to arrest their 'own' supporters. No supporter suggested any plausible reason why the police should be biased against visiting fans, though a few hinted
at the same sort of built-in local geographical bias (e.g. Glasgow v Edinburgh) that football supporters themselves exhibit. If there is any truth in the allegation, it may be based on the knowledge that an arrested supporter from another town is more likely to plead guilty at a court hearing in order to prevent further (and greater) personal inconvenience. On the other hand, Alan claimed it was 'more difficult getting caught at away games 'cos the police don't know you'.

Many other allegations of police roughness - some called it 'brutality' - were made:

SEAN: 'They seem to act a lot without thinking. They just move in and start lashing out'.

EWAN: 'At a Partick Thistle game in Glasgow a wee boy o' 12 shouted something so a policeman kicked him'.

MARTIN: 'At the match last night, I saw the police pull a boy oot the crowd by the hair though another boy behind him had thrown the bottle'.

HARRY: 'The police just grab you if they dinnae like your face. They seem to think because of their uniform they can do anything they want. You can't hit them back or you'll get done for it in court'.

But Bruce expressed his admiration for the fact that he had
never seen police batons drawn at football matches and that they most certainly should use them when 'real trouble' breaks out. (1)

There was some disagreement over the respective merits of the Scottish and English police. Pete, it has been mentioned, was not too impressed with the Liverpool police and nor was Jim when he saw them in action at a Scotland v Wales game:

'Their crowd control was shocking, though it's usually good in Scotland'.

Don felt that the English police on duty at Wembley were 'worse than they are up here' and that they 'couldn't take a joke'. In contrast, Danny, who had been to Wembley on three occasions, thought that the English police had a better approach and that 'you can humour them more'.

Several fans were clearly anti-police whatever the location with a few nursing long-standing hostility towards them. One fan described them as 'rats', another as 'rotten bastards', yet another as 'cunts'. Shug, who has the car workshop, said that he had never had much love for the police and that they were 'fuckin' scroungin' bastards' for the way they kept borrowing his tools. Alan felt they

watched more of the game than the crowd while Rory, a particularly small twelve-year old, observed on a personal note that he didn't really like the police because they often stood in front of him and blocked his view. And John was critical of some of their efforts at crowd control and their meddling in safety limits:

'The police obviously have a duty outside the ground directing traffic. But, at the big matches, they sometimes seem detrimental to the crowd, like when they barge their horses into the crowd. I don't like police interference in crowd limits. 'Hampden can safely hold 100,000, not just 85,000'.

Many supporters took the view, put forward by this writer earlier, (1) that certain types of 'misbehaviour' should be decriminalised in the football match context. Although all fans seem to be in agreement that bottle throwing, can throwing, brick throwing, stone throwing, weapon carrying and fighting at football games should be arrestable offences, they felt that there were some 'arrestable offences' which might be downgraded to 'ejectable offences' and some current 'ejectable offences' and other 'arrestable offences' which should be officially ignored altogether. This was especially

(1) See Part II. See also the general views of the Stewart Committee on the Alternatives to Prosecution (forthcoming).
especially the view put across with regard to many of the
greater heinous manifestations of the breach of the peace e.g.
gesturing, toilet roll throwing, shouting and swearing.
Several of the supporters had themselves been arrested or
ejected for swearing but even those who had never been so
cautioned (and who thus populate the 'dark figure') claimed
that they indulged in the practice and that it was an
acceptable part of the all-male and football cultures:

PHIL: 'Everybody at the match does it [swears].'

GRAHAM: 'Ninety per cent of folk swear at the match'.

CLIFF: 'You shouldn't be lifted for trivial things.
'Physical violence is about the only thing
you should get lifted for'.

ALASTAIR: 'They shouldn't arrest people for swearing,
they should just eject them. You should
get arrested for fighting'.

ANDY: 'Free speech - including swearing - at
players should be allowed'.

ED: 'I go to a football match to get rid of
aggression. I don't see why you shouldn't
shout and swear up to a point'.

Thus, for as long as football remains an essentially
working class, male preserve, there remained a feeling that
the language acceptable to the barrack room, public bar or
other all-male setting should be practised unhindered at
the football ground. Such language, most would concede, should not go unchecked in areas of female intrusion - the lounge bar, the cinema, perhaps even the grandstand at the football match:

DANNY: 'Swearing's just an expression of how you're feeling. I wouldn'ae take a bird tae the match though 'cos a' the bad language. My wee sister - she's 14 - wants to go and see Celtic but I won't take her'.

DEK: 'The obscene language doesn't upset me but it would stop me taking a female or my kids - if I had any. But you should be allowed to swear'.

Kenny, a Hearts supporter, was the most specific in his views on so-called 'bad' language:

'I know my language deteriorates when I go to a football game but I don't really think there's such a thing as swearing - a swearword is just another adjective. At the match, swearing shouldn't be dealt with by the police at all, but beer can throwing, assault, etc. should. Only swearing at the police should lead to ejection and spitting at the police should lead to ejection. Threatening violence and actual violence should lead to arrest'.

Thus, there was support for a subjective contextual perspective on determining 'offensive behaviour'. Bearing in mind the passions aroused, the nature of the environment and the relative homogeneity of the audience, it was felt that the common law breach of the peace was sometimes enforced too harshly. Language which my be considered culpable when used in a Sauchiehall or Princes Street department store is seen as venial when shouted from a football terracing - and this is especially true today when segregation means that such cries are likely to fall on sympathetic ears only and will rarely incite a breach of the peace. 'Misconduct' and 'miscomment' were thus clearly distinguished.

(1) Perceptions of arrestees

Perceptions of those 'arrested' at football grounds are intertwined with a spectator's perception of the police. Those who were most critical of police activity tended to side with supporters being dealt with by police, while those who approved of the police role and its execution held a more censorious view of errant fans. 'Arrested' here is defined as 'taken from the crowd by the police' because at this stage there is no way for an observer to know whether a deviant is being removed with a view to charge and prosecution or is merely being ejected from the ground or dealt with in some other more informal way.
Respondents fell into three specific groups: those who felt no sympathy for arrestees and who argued that they almost certainly would have deserved to have been arrested; those who felt sympathy for - in some cases empathy with - arrested fans; and those who fell between the two stools in thinking that some deserved arrest while others certainly did not.

John said he felt no sympathy for those arrested, irrespective of the teams they supported and Len commented that he was 'all for the arrest of any supporter who deserved it'. A few of those interviewed expressed the belief that if the miscreant was not smart enough to avoid capture, then he deserved to take the rap:

NORRIE: 'I think they're stupid for getting arrested'.

MARK: 'Those that get lifted? I think it's their hard lines. They shouldn't get caught. It's their fault if they're no' sleek enough, if you ken what I mean'.

In this way, those ejected or arrested are seen as 'failed offenders', in that they failed to evade official detection. The crafty criminal, who always manages to outwit his captor, displays greater native cunning and defies inclusion in the official statistics. Avoiding crime and avoiding conviction involve different moral stands.
One specific example of those sympathetic to arrested supporters was cited earlier. Tam uttered another important 'dark figure' statement and perhaps echoed the plea for decriminalisation with his expression of sympathy for those arrested 'as you realised you were doing yourself what they got charged for'. George and Sean made similar points when they claimed respectively that 'nine out of ten cases get arrested for nothing' and that 'lots of times it's not their [arrestees'] fault'. Harry felt sorry for them:

'They'll get a doin' and maybe get charged after it', while Gordon expressed his feelings thus:

'Those arrested? I feel "poor cunt" when they're lifted'.

The more ambivalent expressed their qualified sympathy in the following terms, often via accounts involving their friends:

BERT: 'I sometimes feel sorry for those arrested, but I love to see gangs getting arrested for hitting one guy. I would help any one guy picked on by a gang no matter what team the guy supported'.

PETE: 'Some get lifted for doing things, some get lifted/

(1) See section (c) of this chapter: Shug felt sorry for the fellow Celtic supporter who was unable to control his dislike for an Aberdeen player and ran onto the pitch to attack him.
lifted for nothing. At a Motherwell v Hibs game one guy I know got fined £25 for singing "Tom Hart's a bastard". Their policemen shouldn't worry about that. It's nothing to do with Motherwell. Everybody was singing but they just picked on this one guy'.

BILL: 'I sometimes feel sorry when you get a mob chanting at the police and only one or two get arrested'.

ALAN: 'The majority of boys that get lifted deserve it but some get lifted for nothing. One of my mates got arrested walking along the road in a group. He was just pulled into a car by the polis. He got a hundred pound fine in court for polis assault but he never touched them'.

TERRY: 'Most of those arrested deserve it. But my friend got arrested at a Dumbarton v Hearts game and fined £200 for catching a toilet roll. They must make an arrest each Saturday to prove to the crowd that they're not idle; sometimes they just grab anybody'. (his emphasis)

The least palatable of the comments made perhaps came from Neil, a Rangers supporter, whose thinking on arrestees ran thus:

'It's OK if Celtic fans are hit by a Rangers bottle but it's not OK if Rangers fans are hit by a Celtic bottle'.
(m) On being a victim

Supporters were not over-concerned about the possibility of sustaining injury at the football match as it was generally accepted that that chance was slight. If a match attender was on the lookout for 'trouble' - and several of those interviewed were - then it could usually be found; but equally it was fairly easy to avoid physical and verbal conflict situations if it were so desired.

Those who sought their kicks (sometimes literally) through interaction with rival supporters had both meted out some physical punishment and had been on the receiving end as well: on such occasions the question of who struck the first blow or who was the 'offending party' was seen as irrelevant and it was accepted that participants would come by some cuts and bruises and even get the occasional 'doing'.

Supporters who preferred not to get involved with rivals, nevertheless, sometimes found themselves unwittingly drawn in as a victim either of indiscriminate assault by missile or of direct personal attack having been identified by the colours they wore. Such supporters, in their terracing careers, reckoned to have been victims themselves on one or two occasions or knew of friends and relatives who had been injured.

Thus, Ian, a Hearts supporter, felt that 'football
hooliganism' - like social security scrounging - was an 'overemphasised problem' even though he himself had been assaulted twice in twenty years of match attendance. After one drawn Hearts v Rangers game, Ian stopped at a T.V. rental shop in Gorgie Road with his brother to look at the football results. On seeing the Scottish scores on the screen, Ian had remarked with a smile that Celtic had won. A passing Rangers supporter then 'hit me on the head with a coke bottle and kicked me in the balls'. After another game between the same clubs, Ian was walking along Princes Street in the company of half-a-dozen friends who, after a Hearts victory, were singing and chanting songs:

'A crowd of Rangers supporters came up and put us physically through a store window. We were fighting with them inside the window till we heard police sirens and we all ran off'.

John, a Dundee fan, also reported two incidents of victimisation:

'I've never been hit by bottles. Football's perfectly safe, especially if you go to the stand. More important is the general safety angle - leaving the ground is a problem especially for kids even in a 5,000 crowd. Trouble areas can always be spotted beforehand.

At Ibrox three years ago [1974] I was jumped on by half-a-dozen Rangers supporters after the
match. There was no provocation except that I had on a Dundee scarf. I ran 'cos there wasn't a policeman in sight.

About five years ago I was in a bog at Motherwell when a guy threatened to take my cousin's eye out with a knife. I don't wear my scarf at away matches now unless the team has the same colours as Dundee'.

Bill, a Dundee United supporter, had experienced one 'bad incident', again emphasising the problems involved with rival supporters departing the match:

'After a United v Celtic game I was walking down the Hilltown with my brother and a mate. Somebody kicked me for no reason at all other than I was wearing a United scarf. Eight or nine other Celtic supporters got in kicks and punches. We were taken by surprise; there was nothing we could do. There wasn't a policeman in sight. My brother got kicked on the knee and it's still giving him trouble'.

A friend of Ed's has been hit on the head with a slate. Mark was hit on the head by an empty vodka bottle at East Fife; and Terry had his Hearts scarf stolen by a Newcastle United fan at a bus stop:

'There were 50 o' them and only 2 o' us so I
kept my mouth shut'.

Colin, a Brechin supporter and a regular attender at football for thirty years, recalled only one troubled personal moment:

'I was at a Hibs v Aberdeen game at Easter Road, supporting Aberdeen and wearing my red and white Brechin scarf. One Hibs guy, aged about 25, kicked me in the balls when Aberdeen scored the only goal of the game. I asked him why he'd done it and he said "That's for scoring against us"'.

Such rare incidents apart, most supporters were of the general opinion, here expressed by Alec, that:

'Football's safe enough - if you watch your step you should be alright'.

The occasional fist, boot or bottle may come the way of any supporter, but for most the football match outing is fraught with no more danger than any other entertainment:

ALASTAIR: 'You've more chance of seeing a knife at a disco than a football match'.

Some like Tam in fact argued that it was safer than other entertainments:

'I don't think there's much violence on the terracing. I've been to a hundred football matches but I've never seen anyone really
fighting. I've seen heads stamped on at the Corstorphine Inn but not at football matches. When a breadknife was stuck in a female's head at an Aberdeen v Celtic match a few years ago it was made out to be a regular thing but it's not'.

On the subject of weapons at football matches, most interviewees had never seen a knife there. A few, however, had carried a 'blade' themselves, knew people who carried them or had seen knives being brandished. One or two had actually seen knives being used, though the overwhelming feeling amongst those in the heart of football 'aggro' was that stabbing went beyond the unwritten law of the terracing skirmish and that weapons, when carried, were purely for display:

KENNY: 'I've never taken a weapon to the match. I don't even agree with putting the boot in. I'm quite happy to have a fist fight'.

GORDON: 'I've seen knives being carried by Hibs supporters - it's just to show they're tough. They're never used'.

ARCHIE: 'I've seen knives carried at Easter Road but I've never seen them used. They're just for show'.

MARK: 'I've only seen Hearts supporters with knives
at big games - Hibs, Celtic and Rangers. They're never used, they're just for show'.

Those who themselves carried knives claimed to have done so only for their protection, a plea of self-defence that is unlikely to be accepted in any court of law:

PETE: 'I used to carry a blade two years ago [1975] against Rangers and Hearts for protection. Last week, my cousin and another guy were walking up the street with me after a Hibs v Hearts game. A Hearts fan pulled out a knife. He asked my cousin if he had a knife. My cousin said "Nut" ["No"] but I said I had - and pretended to pull it out. The boy ran away'.

ALAN: 'I usually have a sheath-knife with me at matches. I'd only use it if somebody used it on me. I'd be scared just tae knife a boy'.

Ewan also carried a knife which he'd never used though he had seen one stabbing at Easter Road: a Rangers fan 'went crazy' when Hibs scored and stuck a knife into a Hibs fan.

Golf balls, umbrellas, chains, darts, a scalpel, a sledgehammer and an axe had also been seen at football matches but their use as weapons, as with knives, is seen as a deviant manifestation perpetrated by the 'lunatic fringe'.
or by 'nutters':

'Nutters "go crazy" or "go mad" - they go beyond the fans' limits of acceptable and sane behaviour. In doing so, however, everyone 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 everybody else. But the 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. We can look at what shouldn't be done, which is always an easier task than teasing out what should.

Typical of being nutty would be attempting to beat a fan on the ground to a pulp ....' (1)

(emphases in original)

Thus, Danny, who had himself been arrested during a fist fight, had seen incidents involving his fellow Celtic fans that clearly went beyond the pale:

'I've seen plenty o' knives and umbrellas wi' sharpened points used at Celtic matches. That's what sickened me. At the 1973 Cup Final against Rangers, a drunk Rangers fan wandered into the Celtic shed. About 15 Celtic fans pounced on him and left him like a pound of jam. That sickened me. They should have slagged him, that's all'.

Andy also talked disapprovingly of certain behaviour:

'I've seen a sledgehammer at Tynecastle. A Celtic supporter who was pretty pissed was

swinging/)

---

swinging it around his head. The polis lifted him. I've also seen a lotta knives in socks - people used to think they were big. You don't see knives so often now. I once saw an Aberdeen supporter get slashed with a knife in the street after a match at Tynecastle. It was ridiculous - the boy with the knife even kicked him as well'; and Alastair saw weapon carrying at football matches as deviant and cowardly behaviour:

'Weapon carriers are "nutters". "Nutters" aren't all that hard. If you're hard you don't have to carry a blade. I don't mind violence but not when it's violence like with a knife'.

He then went on to mention two Edinburgh families well-known for their violence and described them as 'crazy' and 'mad' respectively.

On the other hand, Mike seemed representative of that small band of supporters who felt that almost no holds should be barred in the interaction with rival supporters. He had 'aimed a few kicks' at opponents over the years and had once hit a police horse with a half-brick. He had never carried a knife himself though he had amassed several cuts and gashes from being hit by a knife, a broken bottle, a dart and from being beaten up:

'At a Hibs v Celtic game, I was standin' singin' when I got hit by a penknife that a Celtic boy
threw. It stuck in me, there were bits o' blood but I hardly even felt it. My mate pulled it oot, the polis asked if I was alright and I said "Yes". It was a 3 inch blade. I didn't say anything at home. I didn't even tell them.

I was worst hurt at a Hibs v Hearts game. The Hearts supporters came roond to our shed and we ran doon Albion Road after them. A Hearts supporter tripped us up and caught us and stuck a broken bottle in my side. A man helped us up - he was gonna tell the polis but I walked away. I didna want tae say anything. My Dad drove us to the Royal Infirmary and I got nine stitches. At a Hibs v Rangers game I got a dart stuck in my arm. It just left a wee hole'.

Mike seemed to accept all the above as battle scars acquired in the performance of some duty. But even he was critical when supporters injured their own kind. On leaving that same Hibs v Rangers game another dart which was 'just tossed up in the air' stuck in the corner of his friend's eye. It had been thrown by a Hibs fan who 'thought he was gonna hit a Rangers supporter': Mike commented that this was 'no' part o' the fitba'. And he 'felt terrible' (on an emotional rather than physical level) when he was himself beaten up by fellow Hibs supporters at a Motherwell game:
'I never had a scarf on so they thought I was a Motherwell supporter. Three o' them got me in a corner and started to kick us in. I tried to tell them I was a Hibs supporter but they wouldn'ae listen'.

Several other tales of injury caused by fellow supporters were recounted: Hibs supporters, who seem particularly partial to such mistakes, gave Ewan a 'thumping' at a Brechin City game; a fellow Rangers fan walked up to George at Ibrox and 'put the heid' on him for no reason other than that he was drunk; Craig was hit by a golf ball thrown by fellow Hibs fans; Jack once saw one Celtic fan knife another in a toilet at Celtic Park; and Rory and Martin claimed (independently) to have been struck by cans thrown by other Celtic supporters. Such damage visited upon fellow supporters is viewed as particularly senseless: to be molested by the 'enemy' - rival supporters and police officers (the acceptance by many fans of assault by police in ejection or arrest will be discussed later) - both of whom are visibly different is to an extent acceptable, but injury caused by peers is indicative of 'insane behaviour'. 
On being ejected

Of the 58 supporters interviewed, 22 had been arrested, 15 others claimed to participate in what might be regarded as criminal behaviour at football matches, and 21 claimed never to have voluntarily participated in what they perceived to be criminal behaviour at football games. Those of the arrestees who had at any time been arrested within the football ground were, of course, technically 'ejected' from the ground on being arrested but, their arrest apart, seven of the arrestees had been ejected without arrest on other occasions. Seven of the 15 'participants' had been ejected. Therefore, some 14 interviewees had undergone the experience of ejection from the football ground without arrest taking place. As the following table (Table 5) shows, nine of those fourteen had been ejected on more than one occasion: (over/)

An interesting feature of the table is that the greatest number of ejections tended to be collected by supporters who had also experienced arrest at a football match. This may be interpreted as some support for the view put forward by Christie and others that though the official statistics have obvious limitations for criminological use they nevertheless represent a sample of those most involved in criminal behaviour:

'.... the official system does not select its cases at random. By and large it is the case that the small group of officially registered
Table 5  
Ejections experienced by arrestees and 'participants' by number

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>OF EJECTIONS</th>
<th>OF ARRESTEES</th>
<th>OF 'PARTICIPANTS'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
<td>Len Graham</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Andy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2</td>
<td>Phil</td>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>Kenny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td></td>
<td>George</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X5</td>
<td>Pete</td>
<td></td>
<td>Archie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X10</td>
<td>Harry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X15</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total No. of Ejectees | 7 | 7 |
| Total No. of Ejections | 39 | 12 |

criminals have also been involved in the largest amount of crime ....' (1) (emphasis in original)

As/  

As has been mentioned elsewhere,\(^1\) no systematic record of those supporters ejected by the police is generally kept. Therefore, a 'self-report' survey such as this may be a suitable method for trying to understand how often supporters are ejected, the circumstances that provoke ejection and the way in which ejection is implemented. Such responses reveal that it is often a very thin line that separates ejection from arrest, that ejectees frequently gain re-entry to the ground and that, in many cases, police violence is expected and accepted by the supporters either along with or instead of the ejection.

Almost all young football supporters have at one time gained free admission to football grounds by means of a 'sneakie-in' or a 'liftie-ower'. Here, an older person (often a father) will lift a young lad over the turnstile or help him under it while paying for one adult admission:

---

LEN: 'The old man gave me a 'sneakie-in' till I was fourteen'.

LISA: 'I've never paid yet tae get in - I always get lifted over or under'.

This practice, of course, means that attendance figures at football matches are artificially low though the habit has only persisted because it is condoned by the turnstile operators:

---

SANDY: (1) The police perspective on ejection is considered in Chapter 13.
SANDY: 'Celtic's average gate is 24,000 but the real average counting lift-overs is 30,000'.

The custom may, however, be undergoing some erosion as more clubs install 'father and son' turnstiles at reduced rates. (1)

Even so, where it remains, such taking of pecuniary advantage is rarely given any official attention.

On the other hand, a youngsters who is seen gaining free entry in more independent vein by climbing over the wall (or 'sneakie-over') is typically rewarded with ejection. (2)

The ease with which a youngster of moderate agility can scale the wall at Firhill has already been mentioned but discovery there as elsewhere means (at least) certain ejection:

ALAN: 'I got grabbed by a sergeant for climbin' ower the wa' at a Hibs v Rangers game. He threw me oot'.

One of the main duties of the stewards employed by the football club is to prevent such illegal entry. Another of their functions is, together with the police, to stop older supporters gaining cheap entry at the boys' gate: George, though aged 18, still manages to get in at the boys' gate.

---

(1) Even here a 'deception' is possible: it is an easy matter for an enterprising juvenile to find a co-operative adult stranger who will accompany him through such a gate at a reduced price to the juvenile.

(2) A steward at the Hibernian ground did, however, tell me that the police had recently started charging wall-climbers there with fraud.
Anyone caught attempting to take pecuniary advantage in this way is, of course, prevented from entering in the first place and therefore does not require ejection.

Harry and Andy, on separate occasions, were escorted from the ground for waving political flags and another 'ejectable offence' was perceived to be swearing but the entire circumstances have to be considered as some swearing may be officially ignored while other swearing may result in arrest and charge with breach of the peace. For example, Phil believed, after his own experience, that a spectator would only be ejected for swearing:

'You never get "done" for swearing. Everybody at the match does it. You just get thrown oot. I've been thrown oot twice for swearing - I "called one of our players a "stupid bastard" the first time'.

Archie had been ejected for shouting and swearing on five occasions and Mike reckoned his fifteen ejections were the result of either shouting and swearing or for 'pushing the crowd down in a sway'.

The area is clearly one which tries the discretionary powers of individual police officers but, though no guarantees could be given, it may be said that arrest is a more likely outcome when a spectator shouts abuse at a rival group than when he swears at a player on the field. Apart from the actual words used and the intended audience, difficulties of
identification and in finding corroboration may influence an officer away from arrest:

LEN: 'Once I was hauled oot by a polis at a Dundee v United gemme. There was nae segregation at the time and the polis were trying to clear a path. I heard some guy shouting at them 'Aw, fuck off, beat it', but it wisnae me. He told me to get oot'. (1)

Such problems of identifying the actual offender exist beyond the realm of swearing: Chris was 'chucked out' once when a bottle was thrown by someone near him ('I was sick 'cos there was no reason for it [the ejection] at all') and Harry remarked from his personal experience of ten ejections that 'when fightin' starts the polis don't know who it is and 'll grab anybody'. Though in many of these situations there may be obvious art and part guilt, the wrong person is sometimes removed from the crowd. If an officer is not certain he has found the real culprit he may prefer to take the easier course of ejection: thus, he saves face publicly and there will be no forensic analysis of his actions. If this is true, though he should not be removed at all, it is indeed preferable that a spectator should be wrongfully ejected/

(1) I, however, witnessed one occasion (at a Stirling v Celtic game) when assuredly the wrong person was arrested for (and subsequently convicted of) verbally abusing the police. The police evidence in court was not in accord with my understanding of the facts. See Appendix Ω.
ejected than be wrongfully arrested. (1)

Ejection is also more likely than arrest where only one police officer has witnessed the crime and thus corroboration is wanting. (2) Neil has twice been ejected from Ibrox by single officers: on one occasion he threw a pie at a group of Dundee United supporters, thinking he would not be seen in quite a large crowd; however one policeman did see him and he was ejected. On the other occasion, Neil was ejected for possession of a bottle (before the Criminal Justice (Scotland) Act came into effect):

'I'd just finished drinking from a wee Coke bottle. One polis asked me what I was doin' wi' that. I said I was drinking it. He said, "No you weren't, you were gonna fling it." I argued with him but he took me out round the track'.

Mark, too, was ejected from Tynecastle by one officer for 'running at' Hibs fans, and even actual violence may be answered with ejection when observed by only one officer:

Mark, too, was ejected from Tynecastle by one officer for 'running at' Hibs fans, and even actual violence may be answered with ejection when observed by only one officer:

(1) An analogous argument is often put forward against capital punishment in that wrongful imprisonment, once discovered, may to an extent be rectified whereas wrongful execution may not be undone. This view has been given support with the release from prison of Paddy Meehan and John Freece.

(2) In this way, a police officer may be said to anticipate later stages of the criminal justice system in his decision-making. See Ch.13.
GRAHAM: 'I was at Aberdeen - at the Paddock end. Before the match started, this boy I dinnae like, who's a member of our branch and gets drunk all the time and wants to go fighting got on at me. So I punched him. A uniformed policeman saw me and I got flung out'.

At other times, fighting supporters may be ejected, even by two officers:

KENNY: 'I was at a Hearts v Hibs game. We were moving forward towards the Hibs supporters but they started throwing nuts and bolts at us. I got hit on the head. I recognised my cousin who's a Hibs supporter - I don't like him at all but not just 'cos of that. I punched him about two dozen times. Two policemen grabbed me and told me to calm down. They put wrist locks on me and pushed me out the ground'.

Notwithstanding, it would be fair to claim that both fighting and throwing dangerous objects are usually met with the sanction of arrest.

Apart from 'ejectable offences', it is likely that there is such a concept as the 'ejectable offender' i.e. someone whose personal characteristics may influence the police reaction as much as the perceived offence or evidential
requirements. For instance, it is probable that police officers are more likely to eject rather than arrest younger football offenders, while an older man may be arrested for similar behaviour. Such use of discretion would serve to raise the average age of arrestees and reduce the average age of ejectees, and again may involve an anticipation of probable events in later stages of the criminal or juvenile justice systems. Andy reckoned he would have been charged for waving his political flag were it not for the fact he was still at school. And, irrespective of age, a supporter may influence the police response by his demeanour - as Tam found out.

When a supporter has been ejected by the police, it is likely that the ejectee will gain re-entry soon after, usually through paying his admission a second time. In fact almost all of the fourteen ejectees had gone back into the ground at some time and several claimed to do so after every ejection. Pete has been ejected five times, Phil and Kenny have been ejected twice each - but on every occasion they paid to re-enter the ground:

PETE: 'I've come back in every time I've been bunged out. You've got to pay twice, but that's all. I keep away from trouble though when I get back in'.

KENNY: 'After the police pushed me out the ground I paid 70p to get back on the terracing again'.

Others did not even incur the penalty of a second entrance fee. The policeman who had told Len to 'get oot' of the Dundee 'derby' failed to supervise the process fully:

'He didnae take me to the gate. He just left me doon the stairs. I just turned and went back in again'.

Chris, who had been wrongly ejected before half-time at an Edinburgh 'derby', waited for the gates to be flung open twenty minutes before full-time before re-entering and Harry, ejected ten times, also used to re-enter through the open gates but no longer did so since he now realised that 'if you get caught, you get done'. Most of the ejectees, in fact, held this belief that if you were recognised by police back in the ground after ejection you were likely to be arrested and that this would almost certainly be your fate if you were seen committing a further indiscretion:

PHIL: 'I got threw oot for swearing at a [Dundee] United player at a United v Hibs gemme. I paid to get back in again but I got threw oot again when the same copper heard me swearing again. It was quite late on so I got back in through the open gates. The same copper saw me again. He must hae thought "I've thrown that cunt oot twice already - I'll get him". He took me into the pavilion. I was kept there for twenty minutes then I was take to Bell Street [Tayside Police HQ] and I was booked there. I got a warning through the post'.
Mike's fifteen ejections had all taken place at his home ground, Easter Road. This he explained in terms of the different company he kept at home and away games: he remained in the company of supporters' club members at away games thus providing vindication for the caretaker role of the supporters' club discussed earlier. At home though, Mike would compound his original misdemeanour by gaining re-entry through 'going back ower the wa'. He would only do this following first-half ejection and saw no challenge in walking through open gates:

'If it's late on, I just go hame'.

The frequent allegations of police brutality on ejection and the fateful acceptance of such treatment by ejectees were worrying features. Here, no strong criticism is made of the force used by the police in order to effect the removal of deviant supporters from a crowd, though this could be quite tough. Rather, concern is expressed about the verbal abuse and unnecessary illegal violence administered by some officers in making the actual ejection, out of sight and hearing of others and away from the initial fray.

Ejecting police officers, hiding behind a mask of authority, called Neil 'an Orange get' and Mark 'a wee cunt'.

Many ejectees talked of being grabbed by their hair, being pulled over walls and of having 'arms pulled almost out of
their sockets' but these comments were made in the context of the police physically removing an unco-operative wrong-doer from a closely-packed crowd or mêlée situation and such reaction thus may be regarded as 'reasonable force' in the execution of duty. However, Len, who claimed he was innocent, complained that his hair had almost been pulled out by the roots and that the officer had given him the 'Kojak bit' after removing him from the crowd:

'He told me to get my hands on the wa' and spread my legs. I'd see the point if I was a mass murderer. He then gave me a quick fist between the legs - but he couldnae even dae that right'.

Phil said he'd seen several boys 'getting clouts' from ejecting police officers and Mike seemed relieved to report that he had 'hardly ever been beaten up by' the Edinburgh polis:

'I've sometimes been kicked, but nothing hard'.

Such 'victims' either do not know how to go about making a complaint concerning the police, or are aware they have insufficient proof of violence, or accept it as a feature of the interaction. Of course, they dare not strike back because then, as Harry put it, they would not only get 'done' (physically) at the match - they'd also get 'done' in court for police assault:

'The police seem to think that because of their uniform they can do anything they want'.
Alan also told of the implications of being recognised back in the ground after ejection and spoke of the summary retribution that may be visited behind closed doors:

'I got grabbed for climbin' over the wa'. The sergeant took me tae the bogs and I got hit - that was a'. He said, "Next time, I'll charge you". He threw me out. I was gonna pay to get back in but I didn't have any money so I climbed back in again and got caught by another cop. He took me to the same sergeant. The sergeant took me to the police station and I got my head battered. He thumped me and he kicked me. He stotted my heed against the wa'. He told me I should have learned my lesson the first time so it was fair enough'.

Further allegations of police violence, again accepted by some of the wrongdoers as part of the interaction, will be detailed in the next section which deals with what occurs during arrest and the aftermath.

(o) On being arrested and processed

Twenty-two of the supporters interviewed had experienced arrest during a football match outing. The vast majority (18) - as Table 6 shows - had only been arrested on one such occasion:
### Table 6  
Arrests experienced by interviewees by number

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. OF FOOTBALL ARRESTS</th>
<th>NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
<td>Tam Gordon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Len</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Danny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2</td>
<td>Archie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X4</td>
<td>Graham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X16</td>
<td>Harry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, the twenty-two supporters had been arrested a total of forty-two times. Thirty of these arrests took place inside the football ground, twelve occurred outside - 4 before the match and 8 after.

Ejection, of course, is not an elective open to police
officers on beholding misbehaviour outside a ground. Five of the twenty-two arrestees also had convictions for non-football offences or had been brought before a Children's Hearing following incidents away from football: Bruce had been fined for assaulting a dee-jay at a disco; Phil had been fined on four occasions - for gang fighting, stealing apples, driving without insurance and, as a milkboy, for throwing milk bottles at lamp-posts - and had twice appeared before a Hearing for drinking underage; and Mike has made a dozen appearances before a Hearing. Gordon has collected convictions for several breaches of the peace, breaking and entry, fighting Rockers (he used to be a Mod), fighting in a pub, fighting in a disco, punching a girl friend (assault) and smashing the window of the local Chinese take-away:

'I don't like Chinkies - they're impudent wee bastards'.

Such a list pales, however, alongside the record of Harry who, although only 18 years old, claimed to have appeared before a court or a Hearing some 70 times\(^1\) on top of his football convictions.

The thirty-six supporters who had never been arrested for football offences i.e. those who had been ejected only (7), those who participated in 'trouble' though without arrest

\(^1\) This was no idle boast of Harry's. His claims to a considerable criminal career were confirmed by his social worker. Harry's misdemeanours will be outlined in detail in Case Study No.4 in Appendix J.
or ejection (8) and those who took no deliberate part in criminal conflict interactions (21) - had mostly been in some 'trouble' with the police outside the football arena, usually in their youth. Their 'crimes' generally involved playing street football, cheeking neighbours, stealing apples or sweets, breaking windows or playing with fire (a particularly popular practice with teenagers) and were most often dealt with by informal or formal police warnings. A few, however, had collected court convictions or had been sent before a Children's Hearing for misbehaviour unconnected with football. Recorded football offenders seemed neither to have accumulated more nor less 'outside' convictions or references to Hearings than those who had never been arrested at football games.

Alan was fined for trying to steal from a yard; Ewan had been under supervision for smashing windows and had been twice fined for 'borrowing' motor bikes; Lisa was placed under supervision for setting an old car alight; Sandy was placed under supervision for malicious mischief; Ron had been fined for drunk driving and for being drunk and incapable; Dork had been placed under supervision by a Hearing on three occasions - 2 breaches and once for carrying a knife. Several others brought attention to the 'dark figure' with their statements on occasions when they should have been 'done' but were never seen or were lucky. Such revelations, which mostly applied to misbehaviour by
young teenagers, support the belief that by the time they reach adult status a large percentage of Scottish youth comes into contact with official control agencies while others have engaged in illegal behaviour but gone undetected.

Ian, now a community worker, was admonished by the old juvenile court when, as a thirteen year old, he had stolen some recording tape. He drew attention to the feeling of excitement - so beloved of the subcultural theorists - that he and other young lawbreakers experience:

'I went through the usual adolescent stage. I stole records, tapes, sweets - I used to sell the stolen LP's to my mates. And there was a thrill about it. I was shocked when the police came up to my house and I was shit-scared at the juvenile court. The court appearance was a deterrent 'cos I was intelligent enough to realise that I had more to lose than to gain. But I probably would have come to this conclusion anyway without being taken to court'.

The 'usual adolescent stage' is, as Matza suggests, one of 'drift'. Delinquency, both at and away from the football match, is largely episodic and may be easily given up. It was mentioned earlier that Matza's adolescents, in a state of

(1) Matza, Delinquency and Drift, op.cit.
of suspension between childhood and adulthood, spend much of their time with their peers and are anxious about their identity as males and about their acceptance by the peer group.

Returning to those who had actually experienced arrest at football matches, almost all were charged, brought to trial before the Sheriff Court (or taken before the Children's Hearing if aged under 16), pleaded guilty and were sentenced. There thus appeared to be little filtering-out done at these later stages of the criminal justice system with regard to football offenders: once arrested a football supporter will almost certainly be fully processed. Phil, exceptionally, received only a written warning following one of his arrests. The initial police decision to arrest therefore becomes a crucial one.

It has already been suggested that in areas such as shouting and swearing there would seem to be no certain dividing line between an 'ejectable offence' and an 'arrestable offence'. Though a number of supporters were ejected for such behaviour, others were arrested and subsequently convicted for breaches of the peace.

In fact, of the 42 arrests made on 22 supporters, all but one fell under the legal label breach of the peace (though Harry on his last court appearance had been charged with
breach of the peace, resisting arrest and police assault). The exception was Kev who had been charged (in England) with indecent exposure and being drunk and disorderly. On the return train from Wembley, Kev left the train to step on a platform at a stop somewhere in the north of England:

'I had ma tartan scarf and ma kilt on. 'I'd taen ma knickers off and was running aboot wi' them on ma heed. A young English bloke asked me "What have you got underneath you kilt?". I showed him - but an old wifie saw it'.

Looking beneath the de iure breach of the peace tag at the actual alleged misbehaviour, the forty-one remaining arrests fell into one or other of three categories of almost equal size - shouting and swearing, fighting and a miscellaneous category (itself, of course, within a miscellaneous unit).

A few of those who shouted or swore felt they had been harshly treated. Tam, a Hibs supporter, was 'spotted' by police standing amidst a group of Hearts supporters (his friends) at a segregated match:

'They/

(1) Kev, who admitted to being 'well pissed' at the time, was fined £15 in the local Magistrates Court. Six months before my interview with Kev, I had interviewed Lawrence a Scottish rugby supporter who, while 'steamboats at Twickers' on whisky and Guinness, ran onto the pitch and twice lifted his kilt to the crowd before a policeman floored him with a rugby tackle. No further action, however, was taken: Lawrence, a lawyer, displayed deference and politeness via a 'respectable' accent, apologised to the officer and said he'd drunk too much. The policeman led him back to the crowd.
'They asked me my name but I said I had no intention of telling them unless they charged me. So they did! I was arrogant and I'd started treating them with contempt. I called them "fascist pigs" but I didn't swear. It said "breach of the peace" on the charge sheet - that was the only thing they could have got me with'.

Graham also felt he had initially done nothing wrong the first time he was arrested but, as with Tam, events got out of his control after police intervention:

'I was talking to a steward that I knew at the back o' the Hibs enclosure. Two plainclothes polismen came up to me and told me to stop arguin' wi' the boy. I said, "I'm no' arguin', I'm just speakin'. They said, "Yes, you are". I said, "I'm no fuckin' arguin'". They arrested me'.

These same plain clothes officers clearly had a fieldnight as Paul had been arrested (quite independently of Graham) in the very same section of the ground at the same Hibs v Rangers game:

'I was standing at the back of the covered and seated enclosure. A plainclothes polisman told me to "fuckin' sit down". He was swearing at me. I said "Find us a seat". In court he and his mate made up a story. They said that I'd told
them to "Fuck off" but I didn't. I pled not guilty but I was found guilty'.

Jack also had done nothing illegal to begin with - it was his friend who had spat on the policeman. But he made the mistake of over-reacting to the police investigation by shouting:

'What the fuckin' hell's goin' on?'

Shug was another who complained about the police approach. However, his complaint centred round their lack of intervention. After Shug had seen Celtic play at Easter Road he made for his car but there ran into some bother with his fellow supporters:

'About fifty Celtic supporters came up and kicked fuck oot o' the car. They chipped the windows and smashed the headlights. There was a polisman beside us on a motorbike but he never made a move - he just sat there watching. Along the road the polis stopped us. While my young brother was oot speakin' tae them the same polisman that was on the motorbike came up to me and told me to move the car. I said, "Move it yer fuckin' sel'". An inspector came up and asked what was wrong. I called them "a shower o' Nazi bastards". I was taken to Leith police station'.

(1) Cf. Appendix 2 - Court study No.8.
Other supporters felt aggrieved at having been arrested for 'swearing at the game' as opposed to verbally abusing police officers. Ed, aged 34, has been supporting Hearts in the same robust style for over ten years and felt he was behaving no different from usual when he was arrested at an Edinburgh 'derby':

'George Stewart brought down Malkie Robertson in the box. I though it was a penalty, but we didn't get it. I shouted, "Get intae they fuckin' bastards". And inspector heard me and told me to watch my language. I said to him, "What's it got to do with you?" He told two officers in reserve a few yards away from me to arrest me. In court, they said I was disturbin' people round about me. But there were only Hearts fans, police and an 'empty space around me'.

Graham also felt that the police had over-reacted to the subcultural argot when he was arrested at a Rangers v Hibs Cup Final:

'In the last five minutes, the Rangers 'keeper made a save from Hibs. I shouted, "C'mon Hibs, get intae this fuckin' rubbish". I didn't think anybody would hear me above the noise of the crowd. Two plain-clothes police did and I got arrested'.

Again, these incidents make this writer question whether these 'breaches of the peace' are interpreted with a
sufficient grasp of subjectivity. In most cases a breach of the peace is prosecuted not as a criminal wrong in itself but for the potential disturbance that may be caused by those of the lieges who see or hear the breach - conduct calculated to provoke a breach of the peace. Where at a segregated football match spectators group according to their allegiance there need be little concern for the crowd's reaction to abusive language shouted at the opposing team. Further, questionable ethics are involved when such arrest is effected by officers out of uniform who by their position in the crowd might be taken as 'like-minded' supporters.

For Ed, the time period between incident and courtroom appearance was all too short and he was so bewildered that he failed to engage a lawyer. He said that he had spoken to a lawyer some time after his conviction and that the lawyer told him that he should have pleaded not guilty:

ED: 'It was a bit of an injustice 'cos it was the game I was shouting at. It should have been a penalty. How many people swear at at a football game?'

The only penalty that was in fact awarded was the criminal one (of £50) imposed on Ed by the Sheriff Court. It may be that some forensic defence based on an explanation of sub-cultural norms and expectations is needed to clarify what is meant by a criminal breach of the peace by swearing at a football match.
A second category within breach of the peace involves the physical aggression of fighting. Here, my major complaint is that such behaviour is perhaps under-charged and under-investigated. Where rival supporters are seen by police to be locked in combat, the usual consequence is for both to be charged with breaches of the peace. However, the truth of the matter in many cases, had police and court the opportunity, time and inclination to analyse the circumstances, is that there is a discernible 'assailant' and a discernible 'victim'. *Mens rea* should be more fully investigated: the assailant should be charged with the more serious crime of assault while a hearing should be given to a victim's claim of self-defence (a sub-class of necessity). Unfortunately, many supporters in this position are unaware of the legal possibilities of a plea of self-defence which exculpates; or they fail to engage a lawyer who might prepare and express just such a defence.

For example, if one is forcibly attacked by another, one is entitled to use reasonable force to repel the attacker. Further, this right of self-defence is extended to one's right to defend persons other than oneself with reasonable force. Thus, it is no crime to defend yourself, your cousin or your friend from physical attack. Archie was at a Hibs v Celtic game when a Celtic fan 'took a swipe' at him. Archie was seen by police in the act of 'swiping back' and was arrested. Pete jumped in to help when he saw an
Arbroath supporter 'go for' his cousin and he was arrested. Danny watched his friend being thumped in the stomach by a Hearts supporter after an Edinburgh 'derby'. The Hearts fan, according to Danny, was about to kick his friend when Danny intervened:

'I smashed him in the face and fell over a parked car with him. We were rolling about underneath the front o' it. Somebody else pulled my hair. I thought it was the Hearts boy's mate and I was away to thump him when I realised he was a plain clothes polisman. Another polisman in uniform lifted the Hearts guy'.

Both Danny and the assailant were arrested, were charged together with breach of the peace on one complaint sheet, both pleaded guilty and each was fined £60.

The offending Hearts supporter in this incident was Don whom I interviewed a week after Danny. Don was in substantial agreement with Danny's version of the facts though these were never fully presented to the court as both pleaded guilty and neither engaged a solicitor:

DON: 'After the game the Hearts lot were going one way and the Hibs lot were going the other way. There was fighting all round me - I just got caught up in it. I saw this guy with a Hibs scarf on and something snapped inside me. It was spontaneous. I just started hitting
him. His mate Danny jumped in and next thing I knew my arm was up my back. I'd been lifted. I admit I was out o' order'.

Danny had told the arresting policeman that he had just gone to the aid of his friend who was being attacked but the policeman was unimpressed: Danny never mentioned this provocation in court. I told him that he might have persuaded the police or the court that he was carrying out a citizen's arrest on Don for assault on his friend but he replied he hadn't thought of that. Danny's brother, a prison officer, had told him that a not guilty plea would mean a remand for six weeks and Danny 'didn't fancy that'. Danny realised he would have been better off with a solicitor in court but it was 'that short notice' between the Saturday of arrest and Monday's court appearance.

Don's opinion was that Danny was as guilty as he 'because he jumped in' though he did feel that Danny should not have been fined so much.

Other tales of 'provocation' were less convincing. Len attributed his arrest partly to the weather and bad drainage at Clydebank:

'It had been bucketin' ren for the whole gemme.
At the end we had to crawl roond the edge o' a big puddle aboot a foot deep. I got pushed intae
Gordon accepted he had done wrong but objected to the fact he was actually 'lifted' for nothing:

'I was in the shed at a Hibs v Celtic game. It was the Hibs "end" but there were a lotta Celtic supporters there. I got a prod in the back. It was a Glaswegian Celtic supporter, aged about 23, with four younger mates. He said, "Fuck off oot o' here". I thought it was a Hibs scarf he had on at first but it was Celtic. I said, "What do you mean?" He said the same thing again then called me a "fuckin' jerk". I'm right quick-tempered so I hit him in the face - a right good wallop it was. A steward broke us up and told me if there was any more trouble he'd get the police. I said "Right mate" and settled down. A few minutes later Hibs scored. I jumped up. I got another tap on the back. I turned round thinking it was the Celtic boy causing trouble again so I raised a clenched fist to him. But he was just coming to give me a handshake. Before I could shake his hand I got lifted by the polis - 2 raincoat boys. I think the steward must have tipped them off. As far as I was concerned I wasn't actually guilty then, though I did punch him before'.

it by Clydebank fans. I was up to my knees in mud. I just hit the first guy I saw wi' a red scarf'.
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Such 'rough justice' reminded me of a remark made to me by a procurator-fiscal with regard to football supporters he prosecuted in court. He was of the opinion that if they weren't actually guilty of the crime as charged then they were almost certainly bound to be guilty of some other misconduct that had escaped official notice and thus that any conviction was morally acceptable!

On the other hand, Terry felt he had deserved arrest:

'It was a Dumbarton v Hearts game. I was feeling very game for a fight. Long before the kick-off both sets of supporters were fighting before the police moved in. Me and my mate went back later into the Dumbarton fans. We were looking for a fight. One Dumbarton fan tried to hit me but missed completely. We started to fight. The police came in again. Everybody else scarpered. I was left on my own. I got lifted. The policeman said he'd been watching me for a while'.

Shouting and swearing and fighting apart, the remaining breaches of the peace covered a vast range of misconduct. Bruce was charged with urinating against the side of his coach after a long journey through to Glasgow:

'I got lifted by a plain-clothes policeman. He didn't even look like a copper - that was what annoyed me'.

One of Graham's arrests was for damaging a taxi with his flagpole in Edinburgh's Rose Street on the eve of an England v Scotland match. Stan was arrested for running on to the Easter Road pitch, Matt was charged with trying to rescue a friend in police custody and two of Harry's sixteen arrests came as a result of singing provocative songs. Several supporters had been arrested for throwing various objects: Mike for 'chuckin' a bog roll' on to the Love Street pitch at no particular moment in the game - 'You get bog rolls from trains or off toilets'; Phil for throwing beer over St Mirren supporters; Ray for throwing a stone after he had been hit by similar; Ralph for picking up a half-brick when a rival supporter had threatened him with a bottle; and Graham, on another occasion for being on the verge of returning a plastic lemonade bottle which had just been thrown at him.

Both Jack and Archie felt they had been wrongly arrested and convicted for incidents involving spitting on and hitting a policeman respectively. In both cases they argued that the wrong person had been arrested. Archie was mistakenly arrested when a person standing next to him in the crowd punched a policeman on the back of the head.

Jack was taken into custody at a Rangers v Celtic game after his friend had spat on a policeman. He successfully pleaded not guilty to the spitting charge 'cos it wasn't me', but there was no way he would have improved his alibi by giving
the police his friend's name:

'I wasnae gonna squeal on my mate, wis I?'

He did, however, plead guilty to a breach by swearing. And Harry was sent to a detention centre, having been found guilty of throwing a can that hit a policeman.

Several supporters told of resisting arrest and assaulting police officers in the process:

ARCHIE: 'But it wisnae me that threw the can so I shouldn'ae have got arrested in the first place. The resisting arrest was right enough':

Others quoted the remarks they heard spoken by police officers making the arrest. Mike, who had thrown a toilet roll on to the pitch at Paisley, was told by one of his arresting officers that 'You Edinburgh bastards are a' the same'. One of the plainclothes officers remarked with satisfaction on arresting Gordon:

'You're going to the fuckin' nick, boy'.

Again, as in ejection, some complaints were made about the type and the amount of force used by officers in making the arrest. Obviously the arresting officers have to use sufficient force to prevent escape: one arm locked up the back is the favoured grip upon struggling supporters while more co-operative arrestees have their arms held firmly by their sides. But several instances of excessive and unnecessary force were quoted. Graham was arrested for
'arguing' with a steward:

'They had my arm away up my back. That was unnecessary for what I'd done. It would have been fair enough if I'd hit somebody with a bottle'.

Stan, small and slightly built, had his arms 'twisted right up my back' when he was arrested on the field of play. He described the outcome as follows:

'I couldnae squash a grape after it. I thought my arms were broken. They just hung limp for a while'.

The police grabbed Pete by his scarf, almost choking him in the process, he claimed; Gordon had his ear-ring pulled off - 'I didnae have a pierced ear then, it was just a clip'; and Mike implied that the police roughness led to a 'Catch 22' situation whereby you might swear at the police if they hurt you and then ended up being charged with swearing at the police:

'They grabbed me by the neck. It hurt me so I started to swear. I told them tae "Fuck off". I wouldn't have sworn if they hadn't hurt me. They took me roond the terracing and one of them took my name and address. The other one slapped my face wi' his gloves'.

Supporters arrested inside a ground are usually taken to the police charge room in or near the football ground. Here personal/

(1) The process in a police charge room at a football ground has been documented in Ch.11.
personal information about the arrestee - name, age, address etc. - is gathered and pockets are emptied and he may be kept in a detention room until transport to the police station is available or be put straight into a police van. Thus, in Graham's case, after his first arrest at a Hibs v Rangers match:

'They took me under the stand, took my photie, took me to Constitution Street [Leith Police station], then to the High Street [another police station].

Gordon, who was arrested during a Celtic visit to the same ground, described the detention room as being like 'a wee fuckin' toilet'.

A 'paddy wagon' or 'Black Maria' takes arrested fans to the police station where the same questions are asked once more, and caution and charge may be administered. Len claimed he was thrown head first into the 'heat van'. The journey itself presents another opportunity to the unscrupulous policeman for clandestine violence. Mike, who had already had his neck grabbed and his face slapped, came in for some more attention in the confines of the police van:

'While I was sitting in the van, the one who slapped me said "Who do you think you're fuckin' kickin'?" (1) I wasn't kicking anybody so I said nothing/

(1) A.V. Sheehan (in Criminal Procedure in Scotland and France, Edinburgh 1975) states that in Scotland the court proceeding is accusatorial and implies that the pre-trial proceeding is inquisitorial. The incident described here is assuredly not an acceptable instance of the latter!
nothing. He punched me in the stomach - it was pretty sair. He then slapped me once or twice - wi' his hands this time. The other boy grabbed my ear and pulled it. Nobody else was there apart from the driver'.

When Archie was arrested at Berwick, the English police bound him before they took him to the police station:

'They didnae use 'cuffs. They used a piece o' wire, like. The polis boy said he'd never seen anybody get oot o' them. I got oot o' them three times! The fourth time they put them on too tight - they were cutting into my wrists. They had to send away for special cutters tae get me oot o' them'.

Arguably the most significant question that is asked by the police at the football ground or in the police station is 'Have you ever been in trouble with the police before?' It may be that an affirmative reply will increase the chances that the respondent will be processed further while a negative reply might allow for a discretion to be exercised in the supporter's favour. If this is the case then police arrest figures will tend to include a high proportion of recidivists (18 of my interviewees had been arrested once at football matches, 4 had been arrested twenty-four times amongst them; 5 of these 22 arrestees had been 'in trouble' with the police away from football).
Belt, shoes, scarf, jersey and cigarettes are removed before the supporters are placed in cells at the police station. The supporters are usually segregated in the cells on the basis of the teams supported. Harry claimed that he watched police deliberately put two Rangers fans in a 'Hibs cell' knowing they would get a 'doing'. The supporters wait in the cell until they are either bailed out or until the court appearance on the Monday morning (if Saturday arrest) or the next morning (if mid-week arrest). No-one but Jack complained that he was personally assaulted by the police in the cells though Archie claimed that a 'drunk guy at Berwick got some doin'. They slap, not punch, you in case they mark you'; Tam mentioned one guy in the adjacent cell who had spat on the police and had 'two black eyes by Monday morning'. Jack said he got a 'good' kicking in the cell. I just lay doon to it. I thought I was badly done until I saw the next boy. What a kickin' he got'. Shug's troubles came not from the police but from the other occupants of the cell: it was 'crammed full o' fuckin' nutters'. He fought with several of them and remarked that in the cell it was the case of the 'survival of the fittest'. And Archie had the problem of being unable to understand the accents of the Berwick police:

'I kept asking them to repeat everything they asked me. But they thought I was being funny'.

The cells were frequently overcrowded - there were 14 to begin with in Jack's cell and 15 in Don's, Gordon's and
Stan's, and Harry was often put in with the 'drunkies' - and seemed to span a whole range of uncomfortable temperatures. Pete's cell in Forfar (where he was taken after his arrest in Arbroath) was 'dead warm', while the Edinburgh cell that Shug was put into was a 'freezin' cauld dungeon'. Danny also remarked that his Edinburgh cell was a 'dungeon, no' a cell' and that the windows were 18 feet from the ground. He was 'a bit faired' as it was his first time in a cell and it was worse than he imagined. Though Kev had a 'cell to my sel', it was so cold that as he was given no blankets he ripped up an upholstered bench in his cell, removed the contents and lay inside it.

Cell conversation seemed to be dominated by those who boasted about their previous football convictions:

DANNY: 'They were a' bummin' 'cos of the number of times they'd been lifted'.

TAM: 'One boy had about five different charges. He thought it was very good to be arrested'.

Time passes slowly. A few counted the bricks in the cell,

(1) The Sheriff-Principal of Lothian and Borders in 1980 investigated complaints by the Scottish Council of Civil Liberties of 'humiliating' conditions in Edinburgh Sheriff Courthouse. Nine new cells have been added to the seven already in use: these seven, known as 'the cages', measure 9 feet by 5 feet and each held six prisoners awaiting trial. Cell overcrowding is, of course, a problem too in the post-conviction world of the prison.
others (who had drunk considerable amounts) slept. A box of books was provided for the cellmates at Forfar.

Those arrested away from home are unlikely to be released on bail. Jack thought there was no chance of bail if your home was more than 100 miles from the police station. An arrestee's family are informed of the arrest and the supporter may spend a couple of nights in the cell before the court appearance. Pete, who lived in Edinburgh, was treated 'alright' by the Forfar police. His only complaint was their habit of opening the cell door very loudly and shouting 'Are you alright?' every so often - 'to see you werenae dead or something' - and of his inability to sleep as a result. He 'just sat about' in the cell all day Sunday though he was allowed to walk about the police station for exercise at one stage. On Sunday morning he was given cornflakes, a roll and a cup of tea from a 'wifie'; bread, mince and two carrots for lunch; and a 'biled' egg, margarine 'piece', jam 'piece' and a cup of tea in the evening. The menu was 'O.K.', thought Pete. Kev went even further: he was given a 'right good meal'.

Phil, who spent the weekend in a Paisley cell, was not so pleased with the culinary offerings. He was brought tea with sugar but he doesn't take sugar. When he said so, he was told he could take it or leave it. He left it. Later he was offered 'two fuckin' brick-hard rolls' for his
dinner and a number of similar rolls and sugared cups of tea between then and Monday morning. The first thing Phil did on release was to buy two steak pie suppers:

'I was fuckin' starving!'

Jack, arrested at a Rangers v Celtic game, complained about both the food and the drink available during his weekend stay in Glasgow:

'All I got was one boiled egg. I wouldnae say it was hard but if the IRA had got hold o' it they'd have won the war'. (his emphasis)

Though he repeatedly asked for water, he was denied it - a complaint made by several supporters. Jack said that one bloke in his cell, smartly dressed in suit and tie, was so thirsty he scooped water from the WC with a plastic cup and drank from it. The fifteen inmates of Stan's cell asked for water but were denied it for a while. Eventually, a hatch was opened and a big jug of water put in:

'Like animals we all dived for it. I got nothing'.

Len felt the Clydebank police were 'OK' though he objected to the fact that he was only allowed his cigarettes at meal times and he couldn't understand why his belt was taken from him:

'.... as if I was going to hang myself over a football offence'.

Those in Len's cell who were small and fair were paid £1 on the Sunday for standing in an identity parade for a video thief!
Arrested home supporters - and the occasional away fan - were bailed out by relatives or friends. The usual bail required was £5, (1) though Tam, Archie, Ed and Danny had to find bail of £10 and Shug £40. One was bailed out as early as 7p.m. the same evening while others had to wait until the next morning.

Don had come off worse in his scuffle with Danny - in spite of being the offender:

'My folks were out so I couldn't get bail. There was only about two of us left in the cell. There had been fifteen to begin with. My eye was hurting pretty badly. So I asked the policeman if somebody could look at it. He said, "If you're havin' us on, I'll kick your fuckin' head in". Another policeman asked, "Do we need the 'cuffs?" I thought it was a joke as they were twice my size - even the woman policeman was bigger than me. I got taken to the eye pavilion and they gave me ointment and a patch. I was almost glad it was quite serious'.

Those without bail were sometimes handcuffed as they were taken from the police station to the courtroom. Pete thought this was 'fair enough - there was 12 o' us to 2 o' them' but Len, though happy enough about the treatment he received/

(1) The Bail etc (Scotland) Act 1980 retains money bail only under exceptional circumstances.
received from the Clydebank police, was critical of the Dumbarton police who came to take the arrested football supporters to that Sheriff Court. His 'degradation ceremony' came earlier than Garfinkel envisaged:

'The boys frae Dumbarton were bad. They picked us up on Monday morning. They put us in handcuffs - they dinna dae that to murderers or rapists but they dae it to fitba' hooligans. The handcuffs made me feel stupid, low - the lowest I've ever felt in my life. I dinna want that experience again. They handcuffed aboot eight o' us thegither. I was at the front. The boy behind me said something to the police and got a cuff in the lug'.

And Shug in fact described his experience in the cells as 'degrading'.

Those released on bail had to face up to the reactions of the family to their arrest. Danny's mother wasn't too well at the time of his arrest and having the police round at her house later that evening made her worse: 'she was greetin'. Danny's two brothers wanted to 'sort oot the boy' (Don) but Danny thought this was 'going over the top 'cos I wisnae hurt at all'. Gordon's mother was also upset but she improved when he explained to her what had happened and how he hadn't done anything wrong at the time of arrest. Gordon's brother, 'a headcase', wasn't bothered at all. Stan's Dad
was angry and told his son he was an idiot. His Mum 'went mad'. And Archie's Mum 'wisnae pleased'.

Don had an additional pressure to contend with. At home, while he was getting ready for his court appearance, he heard a news bulletin on the radio telling of the crowd events at the football match and mentioning that a number of supporters would be appearing in court. Then he picked up the morning newspaper which contained a headline on the misbehaviour at the match - 'Bloody Sunday'. Don confessed that he was 'worried'. Danny had heard the same radio news and he too was becoming apprehensive about his court appearance. A police officer had been knocked off his horse by a flying bottle, the radio said, and there had been considerable violence:

'I thought I was gonna get put away. I thought "Christ! I might no' be back home the night". I was near greetin'.'

Len, too, was concerned about the possibility of 'getting time'. His arrest had come just after the highly publicised Aston Villa v Rangers match and he felt that there might be a court crackdown on football hooligans.

Many of the interviewees' comments on what happened in the Sheriff Courthouse bore a remarkable resemblance to the conclusions reached by Pat Carlen in her study of
Metropolitan Magistrates Courts. She points out that defendants can spend long periods of time in ante-rooms without explanations and without privacy, that court arrows and directions are minimal and that first-time defendants are usually dependent on oral directions. Ed arrived at the court at 9a.m. and he and the other accused were 'shunted about from court to court' by ushers. Stan sat in the hall of the court building for one and a half hours. Gordon 'hung aboot' the building from 10.30 to 11.30, went to the pub for half an hour where he met a 'lot of Glaswegians who'd been arrested at the same match' and was eventually called at 12.30p.m. Danny said that there was a 'bit of a disaster in allocating the court' and that he had been put in a traffic court at first. The youth who was wrongly arrested at the Stirling v Celtic game sat in the public benches for a whole day awaiting call before being told that he would have to return another day. (2)

When they are eventually called before the court, some of the supporters start off with a conspicuous disadvantage. If there is any truth in the allegation (documented earlier) that the police are biased in arresting more away fans, these same fans seem further burdened in that they frequently appear before the court dressed in their football attire/

(1) P. Carlen, Staging Magistrates Justice, op.cit;
(2) See Appendix E.
attire after a weekend's incarceration. Len observed that at his court appearance at Dumbarton the three local arrestees who had been released on bail arrived dressed in suits and with their hair combed. He and two others from Dundee who had spent the weekend in cells were

'.... covered in mud, stinking and sweaty. We were allowed one wash a day - wi' the red soap ye get at the skale. It takes 20 minutes tae work up a lather'.

Kev, who had been arrested for lifting his kilt, still had 'nae knickers' and 'nae jacket' when he presented himself before the local Magistrates Court. Don, on the other hand, took advantage of his bail by sprucing himself up for court - even going so far as getting his Dad to put a Windsor knot in his tie! His smart appearance was, however, a little spoiled by the patch he still wore over his injured eye. Don had a grazed eyeball and when Danny saw that he still wore the patch in the court he became a very worried man indeed:

'I thought, "Oh Christ ...."'.

It is, of course, impossible to estimate the exact influence a defendant's appearance has on the bench. But it may be assumed that an unshaven, dishevelled football fan, wearing jeans, sometimes clutching his scarf and making his court entrance from the underworld of the cells below does himself no favours. As Carlen points out, space may emphasise
relative status: thus the Sheriff sits in an elevated position while the accused stands below. To have to climb up stairs into the courtroom is an even more humbling ritual implying subjugation and inferiority. (1)

There is a tendency on the part of the prosecuting authority (following police information) to undercharge vertically and to overcharge horizontally (2) in many cases. Thus, as mentioned before, 'assault' is usually charged as a breach of the peace though several manifestations of a breach may be listed as a forensic safety-net: as well as fighting, supporters are frequently alleged to have 'bawled, shouted, cursed and swore'. On top of having thrown a toilet roll (which he admitted), Mike was said to have struggled to get away from the police and to have pushed them (resisting arrest) - 'but I wisnae daen1 that at a'. Shug had to face a 'few other charges' which he denied as well as the breach of the peace for abusing police officers which he admitted. Kev was charged by police with being drunk and disorderly as well as with indecent exposure. Pete claimed that the supporter who was arrested ostensibly for singing 'Tom Hart's a bastard' had 'fighting and everything' pinned on him.

(1) Some later footnotes refer to this researcher's observations during an afternoon spent in a Sheriff court. In that city, custody cases are led by police from the cells above the courtroom. However, this ritual coupled with an ungroomed appearance still indicates that the accused has been in custody. Almost all the custody cases I watched being processed that afternoon wore jeans and had no tie.

him by the police – even though he was 'only singing'. But Tam felt that the allegation of breach of the peace made against him was a 'stick-on charge':

'I might have been drunk and incapable – but that was all'.

Both types of charging are useful opening cards in a game of plea bargaining.

On only a few occasions did an accused supporter plead not guilty before the court. Paul and Graham both denied swearing at the police but were found guilty and Jack's plea of not guilty to spitting was accepted though he pleaded guilty to swearing. Terry, aged 14 at the time, was dealt with before a Children's Hearing.

Many of those who pleaded guilty truly felt that they were guilty as charged. Others denied their guilt to me but were content to plead guilty before the court because of the cost, time, publicity and inconvenience of doing otherwise. Tam reasoned thus:

'I would have pleaded not guilty and got a legal aid lawyer if it wasn't for my Dad. He's a head-master and pleading not guilty would have meant twice the publicity'.

As far as Gordon was concerned, he wasn't guilty either, but 'pleading not guilty means you've got to go through a legal aid lawyer and all that kind of crap'.
Len actually spoke to a legal aid lawyer before deciding on his plea. The lawyer told him that in the wake of the Aston Villa v Rangers game he might get a gaol sentence. Len said he was intending to plead not guilty:

'The boy changed his tune when I said that. He told me maybe I'd only get a fine after all'. So I finally decided to plead guilty. I didnae want to have to travel through again anyway'.

Duty solicitors are not always called out by police to people in custody, except where serious charges are involved. There has long been a case for an effective, round-the-clock emergency service of duty solicitors - and such a need is enhanced by the six hour detention period now permitted by the Criminal Justice (Scotland) Act 1980. About half the accused received some sort of legal advice, always from a duty solicitor.\(^1\) Ed and Danny would have

\(^1\)&nbsp;&nbsp;The duty solicitor clearly has an important role to play in the judicial processing of alleged football offenders. I spent an afternoon in the last week of 1981 observing one such duty solicitor at work in the Sheriff Court of a large Scottish city. Under the Criminal Procedure (Scotland) Act 1975 every arrested person has a right to have intimation sent immediately to his solicitor that he has been arrested and also a right to an interview with the solicitor prior to examination or court appearance. Under the 1980 Act, s.3, an arrested adult (of or over the age of 16) also has a right to intimation of the fact and place of his custody sent to a person named by him. This in practice means his own solicitor or a duty solicitor. The statutory obligation imposed on the police, my duty solicitor stressed, is merely to notify a solicitor: the solicitor does no have to see the accused at this stage.

According/
According to this duty solicitor, Part V of the 1980 Act, which deals with the control of alcohol etc. at sporting events, has been instrumental in reducing the number of football offenders who appear before his court. Before the Act more than 100 arrested supporters would typically be brought before the court after certain games and would warrant a whole day's hearing on a Thursday to themselves. Now they can be processed along with miscellaneous other accused on Mondays.

I spent a Tuesday afternoon with the duty solicitor, the previous four days being the Xmas holiday and without a court sitting. Football matches scheduled for the Saturday had been postponed due to weather conditions and no football offenders were among those held in custody. At 1p.m. we went to the cells above the courthouse where over a dozen persons had been detained. Under the old system a police sergeant might 'suggest' the name of a 'suitable' solicitor to an accused (and perhaps receive a Xmas present in return) but this has been replaced by a duty rota system of three solicitors at a time selected through the local legal aid committee: a convener and two other D.S.'s (one of whom had agreed to accommodate me).

The other D.S. arrived a little late from the pub and the 'carve-up' of the detainees amongst the three lawyers began under the supervision of two legal aid committee employees. Each lawyer was given a table at which to sit and police officers led the detainees to one of them for interview. On the basis of the number of times he was later to bob up in court, the convener had seen to it that he got the lion's share of customers. My solicitor was given five clients.

A card was propped up on the table announcing the solicitor's name and his firm. On a wall above the table hung a notice which read:

'A Solicitor will interview you today. He will represent you free of charge.

If you are advised to apply to the Court for legal aid you my request any Solicitor from the list of nominated Solicitors (which you are entitled to see) to act for you. If you select any particular Solicitor then he will be responsible for the conduct of your case after today throughout the entire proceedings and you may not be able to change him.

If you select a Solicitor his name will be entered on the form you will be asked to sign. Be sure that this is the name of the
Solicitor you wish for your trial etc.

If in doubt ask either the Clerk or the Duty Solicitor today'.

From what I could make out, none of my D.S.'s five clients read or even looked at the notice.

Each interview lasted a few minutes during which time the accused presented the D.S. with a copy of the complaint and the D.S. ascertained the following information: full name; address (and length of time at that address); age; marital status; whether employed or not (none of the five had jobs); their income (from the state); the nature of the charge; his plea; and previous convictions (if any). He later admitted to me that he was 'very short' with most of these clients 'otherwise they'd just ramble on'.

Two of the accused claimed illness prevented them from working - heart trouble and chronic bronchitis respectively. And two swore in front of the D.S.: the man with heart trouble had been arrested for failure to appear for his trial and, on the D.S. asking where he had been instead of court, replied: 'in the bloody hospital'.

Another interviewee, charged with driving while disqualified and without insurance, was asked when he was disqualified and replied: 'Oh Christ, no idea'.

The D.S. informed them all that they could use another solicitor in court or that he could act for them. All five chose the latter option, and the D.S. told them he'd see them in court.

The duty solicitor is paid on the basis of the number of accused he sees. Afterwards he completes and submits a duty solicitor's report form to the Law Society (see Appendix I). He is paid £10 for the first person and £3 each for the next eight (the First Session), and £3 for each person in the Second Session (up to a maximum of four). Third and even Fourth Sessions are only permitted in the unlikely event of the Court continuing beyond 5p.m. My D.S. was not particularly happy with the financial return for his afternoon's work: though the interviews took only 30 minutes and he was on his feet in court for a total of 16 minutes, it was nevertheless an afternoon of his time. He reckoned that he would receive just over £20 for his efforts but had high office rates, lighting and three of a staff to pay. Against that, at least with legal aid the D.S. knew he was guaranteed to receive the payment.
used a lawyer in court if they had had more time between arrest and trial:

ED: 'I spoke to a lawyer afterwards and he said I should have pled not guilty'.

DANNY: 'I'd have been better to get a lawyer but it was that short notice'.

There was a general feeling that a lawyer in court was superfluous if a guilty plea was to be tendered and thus only two supporters had a lawyer defend them in court. Without a solicitor, all the accused would be expected to say in court would be to agree to his name, address and age, plead 'guilty', state his occupation and wage, reply 'no' when asked by the court if he had anything he wanted to say and ask to pay the inevitable fine by instalments. (1)

This is about as far into the surreal world of the court drama that the accused supporter dare venture. As Carlen has suggested, the staging of such justice 'infuses the proceedings with a surrealism which atrophies defendants' ability to participate in them' - a surrealism worthy of Camus, Kafka or Lewis Carroll. (2) The theatre of the absurd and/

(1) On the other hand, if an accused intends to plead not guilty at the preliminary diet and is given a date for trial, he will almost certainly want to employ a solicitor, whose main jobs he will see as securing bail for him at the preliminary stage and arguing in his defence at the trial.

(2) Carlen, Staging Magistrates Justice, op.cit, p.48.
and the court of law have phenomenological features in common and the coercive devices that are used to conceal aspects of social reality are best understood and manipulated by lawyers, not by lay persons. Or, as Blumberg put it:

'Occupational and organisational ideologies, like political ideologies, die hard. A court's job incumbents and members of the legal profession develop a vested interest and an intellectual commitment which inevitably tend to distort their perspectives ... Because of the formidable array of organisational structure, personnel, and power of the criminal court, the accusation of the defendant can be tantamount to conviction'. (1)

Poor courtroom acoustics lead to a communication breakdown and the accused finds that he is outside his usual conversational zone for intimate details:

'To speak plainly, the major existential attribute of court proceedings is that they do proceed, regardless of the structural inability of many of those present to hear what is going on, and despite the structural inability of many of those present to participate in what is going on'. (2) (emphases in original)

When Archie appeared before Edinburgh Sheriff Court he 'couldnae hear what a' them at the bottom were saying', but his appearance before the English Magistrates' Court seemed almost like trial in camera:

'It was strange compared to Edinburgh. It was


(1) A. Blumberg, Criminal Justice, Chicago 1967, p.xiii.
(2) Carlen, Staging Magistrates Justice, op.cit, p.54.
more like a private hearing. The polis wouldn'ae let another guy's mate in tae hear the trial'.

And Shug failed to appreciate that when he was 'admonished' he had not been found not guilty.\(^{(1)}\)

\(\text{(1)}\) My duty solicitor agreed with much of this. He saw his main role as a mediator in language between the court (which uses formal language) and the accused (who uses public language). The presiding sheriff was clearly not keen on communicating directly with the accused, preferring to use the D.S. as the agent of conversation. In court, the D.S. prevented one of his clients from trying to address the sheriff and later told me 'the sheriff doesn't like that'. A female accused who appeared before the same court was visibly frustrated at not being able to speak on her own behalf, had to be silenced by a WPC but nevertheless managed to bang the door on her way out of court. An advantage of a D.S. is that an accused expects him to know the idiosyncracies of the judges, an important consideration in the presentation of any case.

In his court, the sheriff entered from his private door as the assembly stood, gowned members of the court bowed to him whenever they entered or left the court, and participants used reverential euphemisms to address one another: solicitors called the procurator-fiscal 'my friend'; solicitors, the PF and the sheriff-clerk called the sheriff 'My Lord' and 'Your Lordship'. [Sheehan, op.cit, p.142 states that 'the prosecutor is inferior to the judge ... In court, the prosecutor must always address the judge as 'My Lord'. Any disrespectful conduct by a prosecutor could render him liable to proceedings for contempt of court']; and the accused generally addressed the sheriff as 'sir'. In conversation with me the D.S. referred to the members of the public observing from the benches as 'skulls'. He admitted that the interaction between the court professionals was very much an 'old pals' act'.

The sheriff-clerk alone spoke into a microphone. A police officer towered over each accused and orchestrated his every move, barking occasional orders to 'stand up' or 'sit down'. When sentence is imposed in the Sheriff Court, it is not written down for the convicted person to see. It is perhaps not surprising that/
that fine instalments are not always paid on time. Four means warrant inquiries for non-payment in fact preceded my D.S.'s first case. However, in the District Court it is the custom to give the convicted written communication of their sentence.

In his attempt to obtain bail for his clients (his principal duty), the D.S. followed a ritualised court procedure in each of his five cases. The sheriff-clerk first of all asks the accused to confirm his name after which the conversation is left to the 'professionals'. The D.S. gets to his feet and announces in the argot of the court that he appears for the accused, has been instructed to tender a plea of guilty (or not guilty), and moves 'Your Lordship to fix a date of trial and admit the accused to bail'. The Sheriff then sounds out the fiscal as to his attitude and if the P.F. has no objection on basis of no fixed abode or previous convictions bail will generally be granted. The D.S. finally thanks the sheriff in suitable words like 'Obliged, m'Lud'.

The D.S. told me that a good number of accused plead not guilty in order to be released on bail. If they don't get bail, they try and change their plea to get immediate sentence. This was attempted - unsuccessfully - in a couple of other cases the court heard that afternoon. The accused was led out of the court by a policeman while shouting words like 'I'm guilty then'.

Recent legislation has upturned the basic principles of justice that the D.S. learned about at a university. The Criminal Justice (Scotland) Act 1980 has interfered with the accused's traditional right to remain silent: at the stage of judicial examination he may decline to answer questions but his having done so may be the subject of comment by the judge, prosecutor or any co-accused at the subsequent trial. Sheehan, op. cit, pp. 143-4, discussed in 1975 the possibility of revival of the practice of judicial examination. After stating the argument of its opponents: 'as the accused is entitled to the presumption of innocence, and is "required to become an antagonist in a contest in which the State is the challenger, he is therefore .. no longer a participant in the community's investigation of crime", having the right to remain silent and reserve his defence until he is aware of the evidence to be led against him', Sheehan nevertheless supports its revival, arguing that since it is in the interests of society that crime be detected and successfully prosecuted (a view not wholly supported by this writer) it is the duty of all citizens to participate in this process including the suspect/
suspect] The Bail etc. (Scotland) Act 1980 also collides with the presumption of innocence: it is the policy of judges to refuse bail when a person is accused of an offence allegedly committed while out on bail. Two 'wrongs' here apparently operate to negate a 'right'. These statutes together severely dent the due process perception of the criminal justice system and lend support to the crime control model. Further, according to the D.S., the Bail Act produces 'no end of work for everybody' in allowing the bail form to be signed at the police station. The old bail money used to be used as a 'fine' for drunk and incapacibles, prostitutes etc. as it was 'accepted' they would not appear for trial but simply forfeit their bail. This can no longer be done as warrant now has to be taken, executed, etc.

The sheriff-clerk has a very important role to play in the courtroom drama. His work extends far beyond microphone announcements, passing bits of paper to the sheriff and paper-work. On the afternoon I observed the court in session, the sheriff-clerk took the responsibility of declaring the adjective law to the sheriff on two (mildly amusing) occasions. Two Turks appeared in the dock charged with immigration offences. As they spoke no English an interpreter was summoned and he too was placed in the dock - until the sheriff-clerk pointed out to the sheriff that this was improper! On the other occasion, the D.S. who had returned late from the pub re-appeared before the court with his client who had earlier been sentenced to three months imprisonment and announced: 'There has been a slight hiccup, M'Lud'. The problem was that the client was aged only 20 and so by law could not receive such a sentence. The sheriff-clerk confirmed to the sheriff what the law on the matter was after having been asked by the sheriff: 'I can't do that, can I?' The D.S. apologised to the sheriff and claimed that he had 'mentioned' his client's age to the court though he had failed to 'underline' it. Remand for a social inquiry report was substituted.
As if to compensate for this lack of understanding, a few supporters admitted that they had lied to the court.

Although Danny was earning £50 at the time, he told the court he was earning only £25 as an apprentice and Don told the Sheriff he was earning £60 when he was earning more. Ed told the court he'd been watching football for 20 years without getting into any trouble when in fact the period was only 10 years and Len told his lawyer he'd only had two pints to drink but the truth was that he was 'steamin'.

Such lies told to the court serve as a kind of plea in mitigation. With a fine the most likely judicial outcome, the defendant is trying to understate the amount of wealth at his disposal in order to obtain the smallest possible financial penalty and to have it spread over the maximum number of weeks. With these ends in mind, Pete didn't stop at informing the court of the amount he earned: he added that he paid his mother £7 board per week, had bus fares and insurance to pay and had to buy his 'dinners' as well. He was of the opinion that the court should 'go into these things more'.

On pleading guilty or on being found guilty all but one supporter was fined by the court. The fine is, of course, generally the most popular sentence of a criminal court. (1)

(1) Most of the cases where a client was pleading guilty largely consisted of the duty or other solicitor making a 'plea of mitigation' away from imprisonment and towards a fine. It was remarkable, on observing a procession of accused plead guilty in the sheriff court that afternoon, how many of them were scheduled for job interviews the next week and who would miss out on this 'fresh start' if they were gaoled. My D.S. informed me that he always states to the court that he is 'told' that his 'client has a job interview coming up' because 'they could be lying'.
And Terry was processed by a Children's Hearing which does not have the power of fine. If it is true that the statute establishing this system of juvenile justice - the Social Work (Scotland) Act 1968 - is an example of 'legislation by euphemism', (1) Terry offered an instance of just such a tendency, prior to being called before the Hearing:

'At the police station, they stuck me in a "juvenile detention centre" - it was really just a cell'.

Terry was extremely happy with the treatment he received as an under-16 year old. One of the police officers who arrested him told him that he would get 'the kicking of his life' in the cells but he added he would let Terry off on finding out his age. Terry was also driven back to his supporters' bus by the police after being cautioned and charged. He opined that if he had been 16 the police would either have kept him in custody or have made him find his own way home. The Reporter to the Hearing told Terry that he'd be 'let off' because both his school report and social worker's report were satisfactory. Terry was pleased with this outcome and scorned the need for more punitive measures:

'I've learned my lesson. I think I would have reacted worse if they were harder on me. I'd have tried to get my own back'.

Terry knows that it will only need one more incident to get him 'done' so he's cut down on away matches. His mother has also 'stopped' him going to away matches but not with complete success as he still manages to 'sneak into a couple of near ones like Dunfermline and Falkirk' from his home in Edinburgh. He gets home at such a time that he manages to deceive his mother into thinking he's just been to a home game.

Terry apart, the only convicted supporters who had not been fined by the court were Shug (admonished) and Harry. This was very surprising as Harry had been arrested for football offences 16 times and another 70 times on various other charges. Most of his appearances had been before a Children's Hearing but he had been before a court on half-a-dozen occasions. The Sheriff Court had admonished him, placed him under supervision, placed him in homes, and sent him to a detention centre but to the surprise of Harry, his social worker and this writer he had never been fined! This certainly seems like one rung of Sparks' penological ladder(1) that should have been tried by the court before resorting to incarceration; the community service order is another. With his considerable experience of both juvenile and adult justice systems, Harry preferred the greater opportunity of participation that the Hearing has over the court:

I'd/

(1) R. Sparks, 'The Use of Suspended Sentences', Crim. LR (1971), 384-401 at 400.
'I'd rather go to the Panel than the court. In court you tell your lawyer what to say but they don't always say what you tell them. The last time I went and told him I'd like to do community service - in fact that I'd do anything not to be put away. He made me sound worser than I was and I got sent to Glenochil. The judges never ask me to speak. The sheriff hardly ever asks me anything. You get the chance to speak at a Panel - and so does your mother, your social worker and your teacher'.

Fines imposed on the football offenders ranged from £10 (for urinating in public) to £120. Graham was admonished on his first offence, then fined £70, £40 and £120 respectively on the following three occasions. Archie was fined £40 at each of his two appearances and Phil was given a police warning as an alternative to prosecution for his first offence but fined £50 the second time.

Fines between £40 and £60 were the typical 'going rates' and in nearly all cases fines were to be paid by weekly instalments of £3, £5, £6 or £10, by postal order or cheque. Tam was allowed to pay by instalments but after he left the court he decided to pay his £50 fine in one lump sum; Stan was given time to pay his £75 fine at £5 per week but he too paid it all at once from a sum of money he had saved.
Though Danny was given six weeks to pay £60 his brother offered to pay the entire amount. They immediately went to the Sheriff-clerk's office to pay it but the money was refused because the court had settled on instalments! Len could have paid his £50 fine in a month but spread it thinly over four months because he wanted to give the court more work; Archie's mother was in court the first time he was fined £40 and though he was given eight weeks to pay she paid the fine at once - Archie paid it back to her at £10 per week. When the English court fined him another £40 he was at first given no time to pay:

'I told them I had £20 in my pocket and could pay that just now. I actually had £35 on us but I was going to the pub that night. They gave me fourteen days to pay the other £20 and I sent doon a cheque'.

Unemployed persons like Gordon found it difficult to pay fines even by instalments. He claimed he had previously managed to pay his fines up on time but his £50 fine for the football breach was imposed when he had been unemployed for eight months. At the time of interview, he was 'about to get pulled up for not paying'.

On the other hand, if like Graham you were in a job with a

reasonable/

(1) In spite of his financial problems, Gordon insisted on buying a round of drinks when I interviewed him in a pub.
reasonable income plus a generous black economy supplement, paying financial penalties was no great hardship. He had been fined a total of £230 for football offences and at one point was paying off two fines simultaneously:

'It didnae bother me too much 'cos I had a good job at the time. I worked in a woodyard and walked out wi' £60 in my hand each week. I kent a lot o' other jiners at the time and I was on a good fiddle. I was making £70 to £80 a week on fiddles. In a good week I could make £200, but I got made redundant. I'm in the docks now - there's less chance o' fiddles there'. (1)

Those who were fined less than they had anticipated were satisfied with that outcome. Kev thought he got off lightly with a £15 fine for his indecent exposure. Frank was 'happy' with his £25 fine after hearing the previous football offender being fined £60 and Don was also 'happy' at being fined £60 considering 'all the circumstances'.

Others were not so happy. Danny, who was the innocent party in the struggle with Don, felt that his fine of £60 was severe and he was disappointed with the police evidence which...

which made him out to be the aggressor:

'We got banjoed the heaviest'.

Stan's 'face just dropped' when he was fined £75 - he had been expecting a £25 fine though he reflected on the fact that it was his encroachment on the field of play that might have made the difference. Both Ed and his wife (who had accompanied him to court) were shocked when he was fined £50 for swearing. When the Sheriff pronounced sentence, Ed's wife thought 'silly auld eejit' and almost shouted the same from the public gallery: she knew there was a 'purge' of football supporters on at the time but she felt Ed's age (34) was a further disadvantage. Ed told the Sheriff he had five children and his wife was under the impression that Ed had been penalised £10 per child!

But for convicted offenders and their relatives the most hurtful part of the entire process is often the media coverage after sentence. Harry used to be 'quite chuffed' when he saw his name in the papers but now he realised that was stupid. Don's conviction was announced in the evening paper and on the local radio station:

'My Dad was ragin'. He told me, "This is what happens when you're fanatical about football". It was in the papers and he got slagged about it at work. My Mum got slagged when she was down at the shops'.

The evening Tam's conviction appeared in the newspaper, several friends and neighbours telephoned his headmaster
father ostensibly on other matters but nevertheless rounded
off the conversation by asking: '.... By the way, was that
your son's name I saw in the paper?'

The first time Archie was convicted the evening paper
reported only that a 'sixteen year old youth' had been fined.
The second time Archie was old enough for his name and
address to appear in the paper. However, the paper spelt
his address wrongly so Archie told friends who mentioned it
to him that it was someone else.

Ed's wife wasn't bothered about the 'Evening News' report
that her husband had been convicted as she felt that
football supporters were more open to arrest than other
sections of the community:

'It was in black and white that it was a
football match he was done at'.

Kev, however, received national media coverage after being
found guilty of indecent exposure:

'There were reporters outside the court when I
came out. They asked me if they could take my
picture. I thought they were from the local
"Gazette" or something so I said they could. But
the next day the "Daily Record", "Daily Mirror"
and"Daily Express" all had reports and one or two
had pictures. I wisnae too worried aboot that
but my Mum wisnae too pleased.
After I appeared in the papers a boy in Aberdeen who'd been done for the same thing after a match wrote and asked if I'd correspond with him! And I got sent a leaflet from some Jesus freaks telling me about evil and Christ. I tore them up and threw them in the bin'.

Phil mentioned that he used to get a 'hiding' from his mother after a conviction but that he was now too old for that. On hearing of his £50 fine for a football offence, his mother substituted the terse but unsympathetic words: 'That'll serve you fuckin' right'.

The experiences of arrest, custody, court appearance, conviction, sentence and publicity most certainly had effects on the supporters interviewed. It is, of course, notoriously difficult to measure which, if any, of these events had the most beneficial influence over individuals or to make any claims about special deterrence. But looking at their own responses to the process, a number claimed that their experiences had led them to give up going to the match; others had cut down on match attendance; and others had altered their customs at the football match.

Neither Shug nor Ray had been back to a football match since their convictions as they felt that innocent people got 'done'. Tam, Gordon and Matt had not been back either as they felt there was too great a chance of getting involved
in 'trouble' and that it wasn't worth the risk.

Danny had cut down on attendance having been 'a bit faired' of the custody and 'very frightened' about the court appearance. Stan admitted that he was 'trembling' in court but that the experience was of some benefit:

'It taught me a lesson. I can't abide seeing anybody drunk at a match now. It put me off going for a while. I didn't go back that season. I've grown out of the game a bit anyway'.

Pete has only been to a few matches since his fine - it wasn't the fine itself that put him off, he just doesn't want to get into more trouble. After his experience of detention - 'when I heard the sentence I nearly collapsed - I was almost greetin' - Harry only goes to 'wee' games where there is less chance of trouble. And Terry no longer attends away games, just the occasional home game.

Graham appreciates that after one admonition and three fines, 'they can't go on fining me forever'. Next time, he feels, he'll 'get the gaol'. He stayed away from two games after his fourth conviction but has now resolved to stay away from the 'trouble areas'. Jack determined never to go back to a Rangers v Celtic game after his arrest there but to start travelling to see Liverpool instead:

'They're a different class of people at Liverpool'. 
Outbreaks of 'trouble' at football matches were felt to be quite infrequent. When they did occur, they were usually confined to certain groups of individuals in easily defined areas. Not all the young chanting supporters were branded as 'hooligans' though it was within their ranks that the 'trouble-makers' could generally be found: such 'nutcases', 'eejits', or 'adolescents looking for a fight' number, according to one estimate, a 'dozen out of every hundred' and get involved in violent and non-violent misbehaviour away from the football match too. The football match was seen as just one arena of expression for such people.

These trouble-seeking and trouble-making individuals were often associated with certain gangs whose slogans would occasionally be chanted during the course of the game. For example, as Pete pointed out, 'teams' from Niddrie and Drylaw were associated with Hearts while the YLT (Young Leith Team) supported Hibs; in Dundee, the Shimmy, Huns and Fleet were 'affiliated' to one or other of the senior clubs; and the Brig'ton Derry were to be found at Ibrox. Though Yablonsky's picture of continual and uncontrolled gang aggression is not supported, the gangs that gather at football grounds may be described as 'near-groups' in that they have no fixed membership numbers and may engage in violence in a spontaneous search for kicks. However, such

(1) Those respondents who perceived themselves as trouble-makers (present or past) generally discussed 'cause and solution' as applicable to their own experiences, while those who held no such self-image generally discussed the questions in the third party as they felt they applied to other supporters.

(2) L. Yablonsky, The Violent Gang, op. cit.
gangs based on local territorial affinities are now less conspicuous than a few years ago, with wider groupings based on contemporary youth styles now more the order of the day. Thus, adolescent supporters may be punks, rude boys, heavy metal fans or skinheads who may join together in support of one football team and in interaction with the punks, rude boys, heavy metal fans and skinheads of a rival club. In this way a teenager may hold membership of several 'interest groups' simultaneously but with changing priority of significance.

Harry saw himself as having occupied just such a nuto-case 'leadership' role. He had been a member of the Young Clerrie Derry and had been the 'one person that you always get who'll do things for kicks':

'At the match, my mates used to tell me tae 'do' people. I did it because they'd think I was a "scaredy-cat" if I didn't. I'd go up and hit a boy wi' a can 'cos they told me to. I'd do it in the past but I dinnae do it now'.

Mike talked of 'a guy named Sneddon' whom he saw as the 'ringleader' at Easter Road:

'He's aboot 19 and he does a lotta drinkin'. He'll go in fighting himself and he gets other Hibs fans to get other supporters as well. There's a few in their 20's who're a bit daft and they and a few boys aged 17, 18 and 19 lead on the younger ones aged about 13, 14 and that'.
And John talked of 'older nutcases' who enjoy the adulation and encourage younger fans to sing songs, drink under-age and act tough. Such 'nutcases' - young or old - are the psychiatric delinquents found in the researches of Yablonsky, (1) Block and Niederhoffer, (2) Morris, (3) Patrick, (4) or Toch's (5) 'select minority within the subculture who have fully assimilated its violence-prone teachings and who live by them'.

Indeed Toch (6) sees violence as a form of social conduct comparable to other forms of social conduct and assumes that physical force is a characteristic personal reaction invoked by some people with the same consistency that persuasion, retreat or defiance are employed by others. Violence is not blind nor is it random: it takes place "in certain circles, in certain settings and on certain occasions"; it has shape and form, reflects purpose and implies the presence of hidden (if perverted) meanings. Thus, in terms of Toch's psychological themes, Harry may have used violence as a demonstration of manliness and to enhance his role as a 'rep defender'; George uses violence as a 'pressure remover'.

(1) Ibid, Ch.12.
(3) T.P. Morris, op.cit, p.168.
(4) J. Patrick, op.cit, p.206.
(5) Toch, op.cit, p.191.
(6) Ibid.
remover' ('The worst thing is to get beat by Celtic - I take it out on somebody'); and Graham was acting as a 'norm enforcer' when he kicked the innocent Celtic supporter standing next to him after he had himself been hit by a stone.

Football may profitably be analysed as a game both on the field and on the terracing. Just as Eric Berne (1) focused on roles played by people in recurrent interpersonal transactions, Toch likewise saw games as standardised sequences of moves. However, unlike Berne, Toch does not accept that game sequences are pre-determined:

'[...] games spring from personal orientations that produce characteristic opening moves. Thereafter, sequences are cumulatively determined, in the form of actions and reactions by the players. In violence-prone encounters, we find violence built in rather than intended. As we see it, the successive moves of game participants carry increased probabilities of destructive consequences: they carry decreased probabilities of constructive solutions' (2)

Thus, at the football match, players interact both on and off the field and, at times, the respective worlds of footballer and spectator may overlap. Just as Toch has looked at and tabled motives for police assaults, likely 'provocations' at football matches include something a rival fan has said or done, something a police officer or steward has said or done, the opposition scoring an 'unjustified'

---

(1) E. Berne, Games People Play, New York 1964.
(2) Toch, op.cit, p.35n.
goal or an opposition player gesticulating to the crowd, a bad tackle or a disallowed 'goal'. For example, ritualized insults between rival supporters may lead to a violent encounter, in the same way that a prescribed sequence of insults precede duelling amongst German university students and medieval jousting.\(^{(1)}\)

Once incidents of football crowd violence have been reduced to standard game form and understood as interpersonal products, it becomes possible to inquire into the various ways in which different participants play these games. In this way we become more aware of the unique personal contributions of players.

Such 'violence-prone' trouble-makers apart, whenever misbehaviour occurred at football matches it was felt to be perpetrated in the 'heat of the moment' by individuals who had been 'provoked' in some way having first been fuelled with alcohol. The most frequently quoted single 'cause' of 'football hooliganism' was indeed alcohol though, as has been pointed out elsewhere, one must be careful not to infer aetiological links from what may merely be correlations. Or, as Chic put it:

'Booze itself is not a reason - it just brings out certain feelings'.

---

\(^{(1)}\) Ibid, p.192. Toch calls this verbal interaction 'playing the dozens'.

Much has been written and even more is assumed about the links between alcohol and crime, and those who inhabit the Scottish working class male subculture like to think of themselves as particularly well versed in the art of drinking:

HARRY: 'English drink is weak. It's no good. As many English go to the pub but they don't drink as much or drink whisky'.

However, most figures available suggest that Scots are not especially heavy drinkers, when compared to those who imbibe in other parts of the U.K. or when international comparisons are made. And though recent publicity was given to underage drinking by Lothian school pupils, the habit clearly exists elsewhere in Scotland and in other countries. On the other hand, some studies have calculated that:

(1) The Alcoholic-Drinks Survey 1981 produced from 2000 interviews carried out by NOP Market Research found that only 35% of Scottish spirit drinkers drank whisky, compared with 45% of London drinkers and 48% in South and South-West England. The cultural image of Scots as particularly heavy drinkers was also exposed as a myth by Ditton and Phillips in a paper in which they point out that average Scottish alcohol consumption rates are lower than those of the English; Scots do, however, engage in heavier weekend drinking bouts. See J. Ditton and C. Phillips, Drunkenness and the Depression in Scotland, reported in The Scotsman, 26 August, 1982.

(2) Address of Dr. Martin Plant of the Alcohol Research Group at the Royal Edinburgh Hospital to a conference on alcoholism in Liverpool revealing the preliminary results of a survey of the drinking habits of 1000 15 and 16 year olds at five Lothian schools. Reports were given in The Scotsman, 8 April, 1981 and in the Edinburgh Evening News, 9 April, 1981.
that Scotland has a rate of alcoholism six times that of England and Wales. (1)

The McElhone Report and the Criminal Justice (Scotland) Act 1980 accorded primary consideration to the 'problem of drink':

'Nearly all those who gave evidence were firmly of the view that a strong relationship exists between alcohol and violence and that a good deal of the disturbances associated with football is due to the amount of alcohol consumed before, during and after the matches'. (2)


(2) McElhone Report, op.cit, para.20. See also paras.1-8, 21-36. The major prohibitions concerning alcohol within the 1980 Act have already been mentioned.

(3) According to a recent survey, 126 of 200 inmates interviewed at a Scottish young offenders institution and aged 16-20 years were drunk at the time of their crimes; most of their offences were committed in groups and in the two hours after pubs closed. See N. Heather, 'Relationships between Delinquency and Drunkenness among Scottish Young Offenders', British Journal on Alcohol and Alcoholism 16, 2 (1981), 50-61.
football hooliganism just as one must be wary of asserting that rioting in English cities is 'due to' high unemployment. (1)

C. Shaw and H. McKay (in Juvenile Delinquency in Urban Areas, Chicago 1969, pp.384-7) drew our attention long ago to the inherent limitations of much sociological research which would interpret correlations or environmental factors with criminal behaviour as causal associations. The mass media is particularly adept at 'putting words into the mouths' of public figures. Thus, utterances intended to point out correlations are dramatically presented as causative statements. Even Keesing's Contemporary Archives (based on reports in 'The Times', 'The Guardian', 'The Daily Telegraph' and 'Hansard') fell into this positivist trap in interpreting the Scarman Report on the English urban riots (The Brixton Disorders 10-12 April 1981, op.cit, when it wrote:

'Scarman found four underlying causes of the riots:
(1) breakdown in confidence between police and coloured community;
(2) unemployment and social deprivation in inner city areas;
(3) racial disadvantage;
(4) rising level of street crime'

(Keesing's Contemporary Archives, 12 March, 1982, 31371)

while Scarman himself (para. 2.38) had been more cautious in his claims:

'None of these features can perhaps usefully be described as a cause of the disorders ... But, taken together, they provide a set of social conditions which create a predisposition towards violent protest'.

(emphasis in original)

Care should be taken to avoid comforting simple and reassuring deterministic 'answers'. Thus, unemployment may more profitably be viewed as a major factor in the complex pattern of conditions which lay at the root of the disorders in Brixton, Southall, Toxteth and thirty other English towns and cities. (On the English urban riots generally, see 'Black Saturday', New Society 56, 961 (16 April 1981) p.87 and 'Policing Without consent', New Society 56, 962 (23 April 1981) p.138). Unemployment is not just about not having a job.

Parliament debated the unemployment/crime relationship in March 1982 when Prime Minister Thatcher and Home Secretary/
Secretary Whitelaw revealed that they believed unemployment to be a factor in crime levels but not the sole factor. For the Opposition, Mr Michael Foot said he felt there was a 'connection' between mass unemployment and riots.

In America, the President's Commission and Hans Toch (following his phenomenology of press cuttings) arrived at findings similar to Scarman in their consideration of the 1965 Watts riots in Los Angeles. The Watts 'themes' were considered to be 1) police brutality 2) white exploitation 3) unemployment 4) hopelessness 5) anonymity 6) lack of identity. To the above, says Toch, must be added 'riot generated motives' like the excitement generated by collective action, or as a means of entertainment, or as a response to opportunity (Toch, op.cit, p.196).

Toch claims that we encounter apprehension bordering on hysteria in relation to collective violence like urban riots. Football crowd misbehaviour elicits a similar response although it is submitted that few football fans engage in violent behaviour; when football violence does break out, however, it is usually collective behaviour of the 'riot-type', though (as has been pointed out earlier) there are political and processual reasons for it not being charged as a 'riot'. If urban rioting is an overt show of political dissent, then it may be that some forms of 'football hooliganism' are a more subtle demonstration of such. As an analogy conflict theorists like Vold might interpret the conduct of juvenile gangs (as a minority group) as just as much an attack on the dominant (capitalist) system as that of the rioter: a 'good soldier' may reject the status quo by an overt expressive act of terrorism or a more 'disguised' theft: 'Many kinds of criminal acts must be recognised as representing primarily behaviour on the front-line fringes of direct contact between groups struggling for the control of power in the political and cultural organisation of society'. (G. Vold, Theoretical Criminology, op.cit, p.214)
In thousands of cases, individuals take alcohol before going to football matches but do not get involved in misbehaviour; on other occasions individuals who have taken no liquor are arrested, ejected or involved.

Most of the interviewees admitted to having a 'few pints' in a public house before the match and those who travelled to away games most often had a few more before reaching their destination. Some of my respondents regularly drank to excess: Tam was in the pub at 11a.m. on Saturday mornings and drank 10 pints of lager before the kick-off; Kev would have drunk 5 black and tans and 5 nips of whisky before he got to the match. However, for most others, drinking was generally not so heavy with between two and four pints of beer or lager being typical pre-match consumption.

Even before the ban on alcohol introduced by the 1980 Act, a large number of respondents claimed they never took drink into the football ground because it 'interfered with the fitba'. Most of those who took drink in before the Act had now stopped doing so, though a few claimed they still took drink in.

Even during the interviews, some of which were conducted in pubs, one or two supporters showed heavy drinking tendencies. Danny and Tam each drank 7 pints of lager in separate 2½ hour interviews. Tam and Len both joked:

TAM: 'Reality is an illusion caused by severe
lack of alcohol'.

LEN: 'I've got a drinking problem: my mouth's no' big enough'.

In more serious vein, Tam added:

'There are times you can drink and drink ... sometimes I make an exhibition of myself'.

Whenever he returned from the bar, a sizeable measure of lager had already been drunk from his pint.

Gordon drank 3 pints of lager and a vodka and lemonade in 1½ hours and expressed disappointment when the interview was over as he felt like going on drinking. Although Harry drank only 3 pints of lager over a lunchtime interview he claimed to have spent '£13 on booze one night when I got a £40 giro'. And in combining an interview with Chic and a visit to a game some 90 miles from his home, I watched him drink 3 cans of export on the journey up, 3 pints of heavy and 3 malt whiskies in the pub before the match, 5 pints in the pub after the match, another 3 cans on the return journey before heading for a pub near home. Kev reckoned on having 25 drinks on a 'match Saturday'. For the most part though, respondents interviewed in pubs concentrated their efforts on the conversation and alcohol was used merely as a social lubrication to that end. On average, two or three pints were drunk in around two hours.

However, it is impossible to deny the presence and influence
of alcohol in a large number of cases where arrests were made at football events. Tam, it will be recalled, was in 'some state' having downed 10 pints of lager and in retrospect reckoned that he would have been 'humble without booze' in his conversation with the police before arrest. Pete, it might also be remembered, had spent some time drinking in an Arbroath pub from which he had been ejected before he was arrested inside the football ground. He, in fact, had a can of beer in his pocket at the time of arrest but - 'since I didnae want the polis to catch me underage' - succeeded in getting rid of it while the police were not looking. Phil was 'blootered' the second time he was arrested and assured me:

'If I hadnae been drinkin' at Paisley I wouldnae have been lifted'.

On arrest, Len was 'pissed as a fart'; Don was 'quite well on' having drunk 7 pints of lager before the match and 3 or 4 cans during it; Ed had drunk 4 or 5 pints and 4 or 5 nips and felt he would have moved from the area where he was arrested had he been sober; Shug had 'had a lot to drink'; Graham was 'pissed' when he kicked the taxi before heading to Wembley; Kev was 'well pissed' when he was arrested at the Railway station; Stan was incapably drunk; Terry had drunk 'a bit over the usual and was feeling very game'; and Harry had been drunk on several of the occasions he had been arrested.

Other arrestees, while not drunk, admitted that they had been
drinking before the time of arrest. In fact, on only two occasions of arrest did interviewees insist that they had not been drinking at all. Archie was 'completely sober' when he was first arrested and though the fiscal said in court that Ray 'appeared to have been drinking' he told me that all he had drunk that day was tea.

Drunkenness is the basis of a common law charge of 'drunk and incapable' or 'drunk and disorderly' and, of course, is now a statutory offence under s.74 of the Criminal Justice (Scotland) Act 1980. It may be that sober individuals do not shout and swear, throw missiles or get involved in fights at football matches but it may also be that the sober supporter, having committed some such misdemeanour, reacts in a more deferential manner to any police attention and thus is more likely to avoid arrest. Over-use of alcohol may be a factor common to many of those arrested at football matches but it is an over-simple positivist claim that would infer aetiological conclusions from such a relationship. There are many other characteristics common to most arrestees - being male, being young, supporting a football team, wearing a scarf, being a standing spectator, etc. - but nor are these necessarily 'causes' of 'football hooliganism'. Alcohol may unshackle hitherto dormant tendencies ('it helps bring out the truth', said Harry), accelerate loss of control and aggravate the response to official intervention but it may with little confidence be cited as a direct cause of criminal behaviour.
In like manner, it would seem to be an untenable claim to assert baldly that any drug 'causes' criminality. Thus, in interpreting Joe's statement that 'some people sniff glue room' the back o' Easterhoose then go tae games', one must again look to correlations rather than to causative links.\(^1\)

Another factor mentioned by supporters as a 'cause' - but which perhaps should be more properly viewed as a correlation - was religion. Several interviewees were eager to explain 'trouble' at Rangers v Celtic or (to a lesser extent) Hibs v Hearts matches in terms of the different religious affiliations of rival supporters. 'Such crowd divisionism\(^2\) was felt to receive official encouragement from an education system that supports such religious separatism:  

ALASTAIR: 'I think it's stupid having Protestant schools and Catholic schools. They should have mixed schools'.

\(^1\) Heather's research (op.cit, p.61) also pinpointed a group within the general group of 'drunken offenders' where crime followed a mixture of wine-drinking and drug-taking. Youths who are intoxicated by glue have recently come to the attention of ambulancemen and police at Celtic Park. It may be that one unintended side-effect of the Criminal Justice (Scotland) Act 1980 and its ban on alcohol at football grounds is that young supporters are turning to glue-sniffing in order to get 'high' on match days. Carrying a tube of glue into a football match is an easier exercise than smuggling in alcohol and is not against the law in itself. It may also be that increased police activity in the derelict tenements and waste around Celtic Park make sniffing in a large football crowd a 'safer' option. 

\(^2\) See also Ch.19.
Such apartheid, it was argued, fosters an intolerance of anything and anyone 'different' from the beholder.\(^1\)

However, such a practice could hardly be used to 'explain' disorder when, say, Hearts play Rangers or Hibs play Celtic; but it does lead one to a consideration of a sociology of deviance - from Kosinski's 'Painted Bird' to Becker's 'Outsiders' and beyond - wherein any aberration from the beholder's norm may be visited with suspicion, disapproval or antagonism.\(^2\)

As Szasz has demonstrated, social man in the group fears the 'Other' yet he has a functional need for him since, if he did not exist, he would have to create him so that (to borrow from Szasz) by invalidating a rival supporter as 'evil' a supporter may confirm himself as 'good':\(^3\)

ALEC: 'The trouble is that people are brought up - if they're Rangers - to hate Celtic and vice-versa'.

\(^1\) It is, apparently, not illegal to discriminate against someone on religious grounds. In spite of Parliament's clear intention, s.3(1) of the Race Relations Act 1976 defines a 'racial group' to exclude discrimination on religious grounds. The narrow interpretation of 'racial group' was supported by Lord Denning in his 1982 judgment that a headmaster had a legal right to refuse a place to a Sikh boy who wanted to wear a turban for religious reasons. Thus, religious discrimination has received official countenance, perhaps indicating the need for a single, catch-all, anti-discrimination law on the North American model, if indeed legislation is the best avenue by which a society may achieve equality.

\(^2\) See Ch.19(b).

Other deep-seated influences which have implications far beyond the football arena were cited: provocative policing, the 'inferior citizen' status occupied by Scots within the U.K., unemployment and lack of leisure facilities. Ian thought 'social and physical deprivation' and lack of work and work incentives were important factors. Frank complained that his youth club at the community centre was only open once a week, Andy felt there were not enough community facilities and that it took too long to become a member of a centre or a club, and Bobby had been barred from his community centre for telling an organiser 'where to go'. Again, it is arguable whether any of the above can be listed as direct causes of football crowd misbehaviour though they may be viewed as grievances that are particularly hurtful to young people.\(^{(1)}\)

Allied to such complaints were the situational 'provocations' perceived at the football match itself: the anonymity, excitement and group pressures within a crowd; the poor spectator facilities; and events on the field of play.

Supporting a football team is a serious business and it was felt that the tensions involved were exacerbated in the crowd setting:

\(^{(1)}\) These influences resemble many of those pinpointed in the Scarman Report (op.cit.) on the urban riots. In both spheres, correspondents and commentators lapse readily into 'causative' language, though such claims are extravagant.
BRUCE: 'It boils down to groups and numbers.
   You're hard and more aggressive in a group'.

In Matza's terms, an individual conforms to what he perceives to be group norms because not to do so would threaten his status. This is exemplified when (as mentioned before) Brian and Alan find themselves joining in songs to which they are opposed at the match.

For many supporters, the restructuring of Scottish football into smaller Premier, First and Second Divisions has increased tensions to such an extent that they are now unendurable. The high percentage of clubs engaged in promotion and relegation issues to the end of the season may be intended to stimulate interest but the fans found the new set-up too tight for comfort and were bored with seeing the same teams over again: for each supporter who voiced approval because every game now meant something, there were several who felt that 10 clubs in the Premier League were not enough. Supporters advocated a Premier League of either 12 or 14 clubs (support for each was evenly divided) though several wanted a return to the old 18-club top division and Calumn favoured one Scottish Division with 40 clubs playing each other once only throughout the season. Several attempts have been made to increase the size of the top division but all have ended in failure due to the smaller clubs' preference for the status quo.
Spectators' facilities have already been discussed at length but there was an over-whelming feeling that 'if the fans are treated like animals, then they'll act like animals'.

Two types of event on the field of play 'provoke trouble': violent play and poor refereeing decisions:

STAN: 'Bad decisions and bad tackles rev up the crowd'.

Some fans also felt that just watching their team being beaten was sufficient 'provocation' for some to make trouble.

Many tales of robust play and subsequent crowd disorder were related. Danny attributed a pitch invasion by Celtic supporters at Easter Road to the fact that the Hibs goalkeeper had kicked a Celtic forward (though he went on to point out that most supporters on the field were there to avoid bottles being thrown from above). When Drew 'Busby (ex-Hearts) was playing for Morton at Tynecastle and 'chopped Alex McDonald right doon', Mark saw a few cans shower from the 'Shed'. Players who do not accept referees' decisions or who make two-fingered gestures to the crowd or habitually drop their shorts (Willie Johnston) were also held to provoke crowd misconduct. The general feeling was that while most opposing supporters would react to the violence, dissent or intimidation of a player by goading him there were some who acted out their wrath vicariously on the
opposition supporters. Kenny was of the opinion that stiffer SFA penalties were required for erring players and that more police intervention on the field of play was required:

'If you did elsewhere what some players get away with on the field, you'd be arrested and charged'.

Outbreaks of crowd trouble may follow good as well as bad refereeing decisions. John remembered watching Rangers fans invade the pitch (and in his opinion influence the final result) after Colin Stein had been sent off for dissent at Dens Park. Ed was arrested for swearing after the referee had denied his team what he felt was a definite penalty. Several supporters felt referees' decision-making would be improved if they were professionals and that linesmen should have 'more say' in such decision-making. Frank, in fact, suggested that there should be more than one referee - as there is more than one judge in boxing.

If the above factors were seen as 'causes' of crowd misbehaviour, related 'solutions' - as with violent play and bad decision-making - to prevent, obstruct or minimise their occurrence were suggested. Since most fans appreciated that certain 'nutcases' caused much of the trouble at football matches and elsewhere, there was a feeling that little could be done to stop them, though compulsory ID cards (which would be withdrawn on ejection or conviction)
or compulsory membership of supporters' clubs (with the sanction of expulsion) were suggested. Abuse of alcohol was essentially seen as a societal problem though earlier kick-offs, the temporary closing of pubs near football grounds and prohibitions concerning alcohol that anticipated those of the **Criminal Justice (Scotland) Act 1980** were mentioned. Religious separation was so interwoven into the fabric of society that it was accepted a very long time would be needed following a convergent path in education before barriers would be broken down. There was then a feeling of impotence and hopelessness expressed that trouble-makers, alcohol, unemployment, religion, poor leisure facilities and some of the other factors were societal problems and not the problems of football alone and that if the wider society was unable or unwilling to remedy such ills then association football would have little chance of success. (1)

Several supporters felt that the introduction of beer bars into football grounds (as cautiously recommended by the McElhone)

(1) The Scarman Report (ibid.) in its analysis of the 1981 urban riots, also advocated 'wider'solutions, calling for a 'better co-ordinated and directed attack (by the Government) on inner city problems' (Para. 6.6). When the Government announced (on 29 March, 1982) that it was funding a £400,000 sports centre in Toxteth (50% of the bill to be paid by the Sports Council, 50% by the Department of Environment), it may be seen as an attempt to erode the basis of both riotous and hooligan action.
McElhone Committee\(^{(1)}\) was a risk but one which should be taken as football (as well as the wider society) might benefit from the more relaxed, continental provisions introduced by the **Licensing (Scotland) Act 1976**: 

CHIC: 'Beer bars selling beer only from plastic cups would be a good idea. Scotland didn't go wild with the new licensing laws and I don't think it would in football. It would be a big gamble though. But it would prevent panic drinking and there would be no need to sneak cans in'.

Phil, on the other hand, felt that any suggestion to build 'pubs at fitba' matches' was 'fuckin' stupid'.

The situational provocations peculiar to the football ground could be in some way alleviated by more comfortable spectator facilities, more seating and segregation. But the basic competitive desire which pits one team against another, one set of supporters against another, cannot be eradicated as that is the very essence of the game.

Finally, for those who remain caught in the forensic net no matter how great the opportunities to escape, there were four supporters who had faith in the deterrent effects of certain penal measures: Danny believed that football offenders/

\(^{(1)}\) in paras. 8 and 36.
offenders should be 'hit hard' and that 'crackin' sentences like imprisonment were in order:

'I was flappin' in case I was gonna get put away'.

And Bruce believed that some of the fines imposed were too lenient and that stiff gaol sentences should be introduced. Colin and Arthur also wanted more severe fines and periods of imprisonment but added the more moderate rider that deviating supporters should be compelled to report to police stations during match times, and given 'shitty jobs' to do.

Thus, most of the interviewed supporters were uncritical of such terms as 'cause' and 'solution' and were eager to list a few of the more 'obvious' instances of such. Few respondents were critical of this simple positivist approach to explaining football hooliganism though such a mood was captured by Chic when he proclaimed that alcohol itself was no a 'reason'. To that extent, his cautious rejection of pathology, and of epidemic, diagnosis and cure, more closely resembles Matza's naturalism, as accepted by such as Rock and Young:

'Non-naturalistic metaphors of the medical sort must be treated with caution and independently checked unless it can be demonstrated that in all relevant details social influence is communi-cated by means which are directly analogous to the germ or virus; that people have no real control over its diffusion; that their own understanding of the situation is not a determinant of their receptivity; and so on' (1)

(1) Rock, op.cit, p.16.
people accept socialization into drug culture because they find the cultures attractive in terms of solving problems which they face; they do not "catch" drug addiction, they embrace it'.  

(1) (emphasis in original)

To turn full circle, the role and importance of the mass media in reporting football convictions were earlier discussed(2) and it is finally suggested that the media are also an important influence on the popular mind in shaping its positivist assumptions as regards 'causation' and 'solution' of a perceived problem viz. football hooliganism. In this sense, the workings of the media are more subtle, though no less pervasive. The media use their power to create and reinforce the respondents' stereotypes (e.g. that the Scots are very heavy drinkers), colour their views as to why football supporters break the law (e.g. abuse of alcohol, religious bigotry, etc.), and influence their judgments as to what should be done to prevent the occurrence and recurrence of such infraction (e.g. banning drink, meting out tough gaol sentences, etc.). Such pronouncements have proliferated in the general news and editorial pages of newspapers and on television and radio, and few specialist sports journalists and T.V. football commentators have resisted the temptation to give forth their particular brand of positivism in their more specialised columns and programmes/ 

(1) J. Young, The Drugtakers, op.cit, p.42.  
(2) in Part I, but see especially Ch.6.
programmes so revered by the football fan.

In short, it would be no great surprise if the football supporter were to assume and reiterate the views of the media in this sphere as in others:

'Most of what we "know" we have taken on the authority of others, and it is only as others continue to confirm this "knowledge" that it continues to be plausible to us'. (1)

The validity of 'typifications' (2) of deviants can rarely be tested by us and thus we rely on the diffusion and construction of information about deviancy second-hand from the mass media. Describing the causal sequences that lead to a deviant act is just one aspect of deviant reportage that might shape the public conception and perception of a phenomenon.

Rock thus argues that the press, as an intermediary agent of reality construction, distorts and simplifies images of the deviant:

'Deviant stereotypes are created which suggest that the rule-breaking is a homogeneous class of behaviour which is not particularly complicated to understand. Ambiguities and nuances of meaning are frequently eliminated in the process of producing compact, intelligible descriptions. Order is made out of disorder and/


(2) Rock, op.cit, p.27. By 'typification' Rock means an intellectual reconstruction of a phenomenon which is employed both to describe it and to grasp it.
and a structure is forced on confusion...
Complex social phenomena are thus reduced to a
simplistic form which can be presented as
"news". In the attempt to "make sense" of
deviancy, several distortions are commonly
introduced'. (1)

In like manner, Hall et al, in their analysis of the social
production of news, point out that news is (simplistically)
presented to an assumed audience in terms which, as far as
the presenters can judge, will make it comprehensible to
the audience:

'If the world is not be represented as a
jumble of random and chaotic events, then they
must be identified (i.e. named, defined,
related to other events known to the audience),
and assigned to a social context (i.e. placed
within a frame of meanings familiar to the
audience). This process — identification and
contextualisation — is one of the most impor-
tant through which events are "made to mean"
by the media. An event only "makes sense" if
it can be located within a range of social and
cultural identifications. If newsmen did not
have available — in however routine a way —
such cultural "maps" of the social world, they
could not "make sense" for their audiences of
the unusual, unexpected and unpredicted events
which form the basic content of what is "news-
worthy"'. (2)

Thus, a consensus view of society is maintained as a range
of powerful interpretations of how to understand events like
'football hooliganism' — abuse of alcohol, religious
sectarianism, unemployment — is offered:

(1) Ibid, pp.40-1.
(2) Hall et al, op.cit, p.54.
'... the media "take" the language of the public and .. return it to them inflected with dominant and consensual connotations.

The more "creative" media role is not obviously fully autonomous. Such translations depend on the story's potential-for-translation (its news-worthiness) and on its anchorage in familiar and long-standing topics of concern - hooliganism, crowd violence, "aggro" gang behaviour. This process, is neither totally free and unconstrained, nor is it a simple, direct reproduction. It is a transformation; and such transformations require active "work" on the part of the media. Their over-all effect is nevertheless to help close the circle by which the definitions of the powerful become part of the taken-for-granted reality of the public by translating the unfamiliar into the familiar world'.

PART FIVE

Conclusions and an alternative approach
Having supported a football team myself for over twenty years and having engaged in research through a variety of methods - questionnaire, interview, participant observation - for seven years, several main conclusions have been reached. The findings are based on what I have read (thousands of newspaper reports and various articles on football crowd behaviour and general criminological literature); what I have been told (by sheriffs, procurators-fiscal, police officers and football supporters); and what I have seen and experienced myself (in travelling in the company of supporters by coach, train and car, and in attending hundreds of football matches in Scotland, England and abroad). (1)

A major conclusion is that, although association football is the most popular of spectator sports and supporters attach enormous importance to results, there is nothing especially dangerous about attending football matches: it is usually quite easy to keep away from 'trouble' whose location (if it arises at all) can be predicted in advance with considerable certainty. To place the phenomenon of football crowd misbehaviour in its proper perspective, it is no new phenomenon, having been with us since the origins of the game and feared by the agents of social control for that long; sports crowd misbehaviour is not the sole prerogative of football fans, nor is it restricted to Britain, nor is it confined to the professional game.

(1) Apart from my trip to Spain for the 1982 World Cup I attended a Panathanaikos v Chelsea game in Athens and visited the stadia of Barcelona, Bruges, Paris St. Germain and Ajax Amsterdam. Nor did any of these events dampen my enthusiasm for the promotion of self-help as a philosophy and as a practice.
The presentation of 'football hooliganism' as a 'social' problem or 'moral panic', however, is a more recent innovation. The mass media, out of vested interests and from a position of increasing power and influence, have been responsible for conducting a hysterical campaign which has exaggerated the frequency and nature of football crowd misbehaviour. The mass media have been extravagant in their reporting, predicting and sensationalising of football crowd trouble and in emphasising the 'negative' aspects of football. In their hysterical approach, they have orchestrated the call for the increased use of the criminal law and penal control over football supporters, which this author considers to be unnecessary and indeed harmful.

The institutions and agents of social control may also be criticised: the state intervenes too readily and the criminal law is invoked too frequently; individual police officers have been seen to use illegal means to coerce respect, dispense summary justice and interfere with the course of justice; the criminal justice process is not always understood by participants; the powers and approach of the criminal courts are not particularly suited to most football offenders; criminal statistics are misinterpreted. In sum, it may be that the reaction to 'football hooliganism' creates as many problems as it solves.

Though improving privations for football fans (e.g. more seating, better catering facilities) and the various
societal malaises (e.g. alcohol, religion) have been discussed, it is submitted that no general 'positivistic factors' are constantly at work and thus that no 'positivistic solutions' are constantly applicable.

Rather, it is argued that focus should be placed on the dominant sectors of society who have the power to criminalise; that deviance should not be so readily criminalised; and that there is even less need to criminalise behaviour (e.g. swearing on football terracings) that is not situationally deviant in the first place. A call is therefore made for a movement away from the over-used traditional paradigm of the criminal law, though a minimalist philosophy allows 'dangerous' football offenders to be more severely dealt with than at present.

Instead, it is felt that the use of a) the civil law and of b) self-help should be encouraged in the belief that the football ground is an arena ripe for 'situational anarchy'.

Just as a main movement in legal history has seen disputes being settled by (brutal) self-help, then by civil litigation, and finally by criminal prosecution, (1) a reverse process that departs from the criminal law and marches towards resolution of disputes through the civil law and non-brutal self-help is not inconceivable - especially if it is accepted that law (and especially criminal law) is neither necessary nor sufficient for social order and that the emergence of law as a major institution in a society is a symptom of the breakdown of social order. (2)

(1) This notion of legal development by stages is found, for example, in F. Pollock and F.W. Maitland's The History of English Law before the Time of Edward I, Cambridge 1968, Vol.2, p.574 where they remark: 'Had we to write legal history out of our heads, we might plausibly suppose that in the beginning law expects them to help themselves when they have been wronged, and that by slow degrees it substitutes a litigatory procedure for the rude justice of revenge'.

Durkheim, in his theory of evolution of law in society (The Division of Labour in Society, Glencoe 1933), contrasted 'restitutive law' with 'repressive' or 'penal' law. Though it is now generally accepted that his suggestion that as societies progress they move from penal to restitutive law has typically happened in reverse, there are indications of a curvilinear relationship between law and society (suggested by Donald Black) which may be significant as regards future penal trends.

From a minimalist perspective, it is not inevitable that football hooliganism should be seen as an offence to be punished, nor is it essential that football crowd 'misbehaviour' be viewed as an unswerving subject of the criminal justice system. The criminal law is an historical, not a universal, phenomenon. (1)

(1) As Rock (op.cit, pp.147-9) has traced, the basis of primitive and early Western law was personal reparation; the state or society was not seen as victimised. However, with the consolidation of power structures, there appeared a shift in the nature of the victim. The three main developments which accelerated the transformation of the victim from the individual to the state were feudalism (wherein power was assumed by ecclesiastical and secular authorities); the growth of central, regal authority (the king represented the apex of the power hierarchy and was closely identified with a reified state as early as the twelfth century); and the growth of the bourgeoisie (wherein power was assumed and is maintained by an ascendant middle class). The term 'crime' connotes the appropriation of a judgmental function by the powerful:

'The transformation of behaviour into crime must be understood largely as a result of a moral world's active interpretation of that behaviour. It cannot be usefully discussed as if it were no more than a straightforward and rational response of a society to threatening acts. The emergence of law is founded on processes which mediate between behaviour, its construction as threatening by the powerful, and its translation into crime'.

( Ibid, p.149, emphasis in original)

For instance, prior to the introduction of the Criminal Justice (Scotland) Act 1980 the state had tolerated certain activities associated with alcohol at football grounds. From February 1981, the same activities became criminally illegal, following a period when contractual (civil) law had been used to keep drink out of grounds.

Thus, to paraphrase Stan Cohen, a main 'cause' of crime is the criminal law itself and, technically, as Dostoevsky has suggested, legislators themselves are criminals since in making a new law they transgress the old one.
(a) The football match as a civil forum

Thus, it may be that the criminal law, depending upon one's objectives, is unsuitable for dealing with most incidents of football 'hooliganism' (actual and attempted physical assaults, weapon-carrying and other serious misconduct apart). Since the criminal breach of the peace (by far the most frequent recorded football offence(1)), the affray, the mob, the riot and rout in many cases depend on a third party estimate (essentially by police officers) of perceived 'fear'/‘alarm’/‘annoyance’/reactive criminal conduct or whatever on the part of what are, until then, 'innocent bystanders'. Why not leave these bystanders to decide for themselves when they are in fact offended? Such disapproval of misbehaviour at the football ground can be registered within the realm of the civil law by undertaking a private litigation against the offending individual(s) or, more profitably, against the home club or, more equitably, against the club with which the offender identifies, especially where 'gate money' is divided. Thus, in one fell swoop, the individual offender would be freed from the implications of criminal stigma and the avaricious statistical crime mountain on which so many depend for 'evidence' of an increasingly criminal society would not be fed; the club would /

(1) Out of a total of 843 apprehensions at Premier League games in 1976, 645 were for breaches of the peace. (Source: Report of the Working Group on Football Crowd Behaviour, op. cit., p.27)
would be involved vicariously - by being made responsible in civil terms, but again without criminal stigma; a greater 'interest' in achieving law and order would be instilled in the 'law-abiding' football fan and thus an informal social control created and an improved dialogue between that fan and the police encouraged; financial redress for the offended bystander or 'victim' (often neglected) would be available; and the police would be freed from their roles as moral censors, soothsayers and mentors of society, while the individual would be given greater power to determine his destiny. Even the physical assault might be more profitably pursued through both civil and criminal sanctions.

As the Criminal Injuries Compensation Scheme has not been permitted as yet to develop fully the civil consequences of all wrongful acts within the criminal justice system\(^{(1)}\) - which itself may have unwanted side-effects - and in any case involves compensation by the taxpayer, the offended individual may within the football context feel he wants to 'take the law into his own hands'. By greater use of the civil law, the whole complexion and perception of football fans' behaviour might be changed.

\(^{(1)}\) e.g. claims before the Board must be related to personal injury itself directly attributable to a crime of violence and the compensation sought must be at least £150.
It is fundamentally the civil law that regulates the entire football match event: the Scots law on contract and delict therefore requires some elaboration.

If a meeting is held in a public place, the police may attend in the same way as any member of the public and they cannot be ordered to leave or be removed unless they are disrupting the meeting or committing a breach of the peace.

Persons who meet on private property without the owner's permission or the permission of the lawful occupier are trespassers and can, of course, be requested to withdraw. Even then, the Occupiers' Liability (Scotland) Act 1960, having made less rigid the differences consequent to being 'invitee', 'licensee' or 'trespasser', still insists that anyone on the property should not be maliciously injured.\(^1\) However, payment of an admission charge - as at the football match - implies permission granted. Such payment of admission, whether to the stand, enclosure or the terracing, apparently constitutes a form of licence to attend. Thus, a fan who has paid the appropriate admission price cannot be removed from the football ground as long as he behaves himself in an orderly manner (i.e. responds to the general law)

\(^1\) Cf. Dumbreck v Robert Addie and Sons (Collieries) Ltd. 1929 S.C. (H.L.) 51 and McGlone v British Railways Board 1966 S.C.(H.L.) 1 as examples, respectively, of the pre-1960 and post-1960 situations.
law) and does not infringe any of the rules by which he is bound (1) (i.e. respects the specific contractual law).

If he is improperly requested to withdraw, or improperly ejected, he is entitled to sue the club for breach of contract i.e. for the cost of admission. (2) If the football supporter has conducted himself properly and observed the conditions contained in his contract with the club, his licence conferring admission to the ground cannot be revoked before its purpose has been achieved i.e. before the match finishes; and if, as in Hurst v Picture Palaces (1) after refusing to withdraw, he is ejected, he may bring an action for assault. One is left to wonder how many actions by wrongfully ejected football fans there might lawfully be?

The powers and duties of the police in relation to meetings held on what is essentially private property (whether held for public purposes or not) were stated in a Home Office Report of 1909. (3) According to this, the police have no power to enter private property except by leave of the occupiers or the promoters of the meeting or where they have reason to believe that a breach of the peace is being permitted.

(1) Hurst v Picture Palaces 1915 1KB. 1.
(2) Wood v Leadbitter (1845) 13 M & W 838.
permitted. Thus, even if a football club, perhaps deciding that any uniformed police presence provokes greater trouble than it prevents, resolved not to engage or pay the police to control its home match, the police could still, given the occurrence of certain events, secure access.

Further, according to the Report (1), it is no part of the police duties to eject trespassers from private premises (e.g. young supporters caught scaling the walls (2)), but they may, in their capacity of private citizens, assist in ejecting them by using reasonable force if requested by the occupiers or promoters to do so — although they are under no legal obligation to do so.

Where there is an actual breach of the peace the police may, and indeed have a duty to, intervene. In this case, even if they have not seen any such breach committed, the police may arrest without warrant a person charged by another for such breach, where there are reasonable grounds to anticipate that the breach is likely to be continued or immediately renewed.

However, this somewhat narrow interpretation of the police powers by the Report has been broadened in England by the

(1) Ibid, para.8.
(2) though they may be committing a criminal fraud.
decision in Thomas v Sawkins. Here the police forced their way into a public meeting in a hall hired by the promoter who had refused them permission to enter. In the promoter's action for a technical assault, it was held that the police are empowered to enter a meeting held in private premises, not only where a breach of the peace has been or is being permitted, but also when they have reasonable grounds for believing that a breach of the peace is likely to be committed. Thus, from 1935, even if an English football club has decided not to employ police at a match, they are nevertheless powerless to prevent police entry, given the likely occurrence of certain events. The decision in Thomas v Sawkins has been much criticised and, in any case, it cannot be assumed it would be followed in Scotland.

The spectator's terms of attendance at the football ground are therefore presently based on a respect for the general criminal and civil law as well as on the observation of the specific contractual provisions. By going along to watch his local team, the supporter is participating in a mutual contract with his club. This means there are legal obligations on both sides - the spectator pays his £1.50

(1) (1935) 2K.B. 249.

(2) A policeman on duty at a football match told me that it was his practice to eject a fan for a breach of the ground rules and to arrest for breach of the criminal law of the land.
and promises to obey the rules by his conduct and in return the club allows him to view what is hoped will be an entertaining spectacle. The club has written special conditions into this contract which are probably not clear to the average spectator: such terms and conditions will be found on notice boards outside the ground (e.g. at Easter Road), inside the ground (e.g. at Tynecastle), on match tickets, or may be implied.

One of the main attempts of the football club is to exclude liability for spectator injury inside the ground by incorporating such a term into the contract. Injury can take place under three main circumstances: a spectator may be hit by a football (or, more rarely, a player); barriers may collapse and crowds may crush and stumble (as in the Ibrox disaster); or a spectator may get caught up in acts of football hooliganism. Any effort by the football club to abrogate such responsibility for spectator injury must be analysed according to the usual legal rules.

First of all, under the common law, one must ask whether the ticket or notice is part of the contractual document or merely a voucher or receipt. In the football situation, it is almost certainly an integral part of the contract.

(1) Chapelton v Barry U.D.C. (1940) 1 K.B. 532;
    Taylor v Glasgow Corporation 1952 S.C. 440;
    Thornton v Shoe Lane Parking 1971 2 WLR 585.
Such conditions as the football club might want to incorporate into the contract were thus *prima facie* binding if the acceptor (spectator) had read the conditions, or if he knew that there were conditions but didn't read them and they were reasonable and of a type to be expected of that particular class, or if he did not know that there were conditions but he had been given adequate notice of them.

Thus, under the common law, it seems that football clubs were correct to claim that they had contracted out of their responsibility for injury. However, the *Unfair Contract Terms Act 1977* deals with such small print exclusion clauses found in tickets and notices. From 1st February 1978, clauses that seek to avoid responsibility for death or personal injury in the provision of services are void and clauses seeking to avoid responsibility for damage to property are enforceable only if they are 'fair and reasonable'.

By this statute then, if one is 'injured' at a football ground, there would seem to be legal grounds to bring an action against the football club. Thus, if a spectator is on the receiving end of a hooligan act at the football ground e.g. hit by an errant bottle or kicked by a rival fan, he may now invoke the civil law to bring an action for compensation against the club. Such vicarious civil responsibility of the club may be the real key for dealing
with the whole area of hooliganism at football matches.

A general delictual rule is that a 'person' is liable for his own civil wrongs and not for those of another 'person' — culpa tenet suos auctores. However, exceptions to this general rule are to be found in situations of 'vicarious liability' (where liability is incurred by one legal person for the wrongful acts done by another). Vicarious liability arises out of the contractual relationship between the respective parties and may be seen most clearly within the respective (essentially contractual) relationships of partnership, agency and employment where an injured party can sue the person who is behind the actual wrongdoer and who is more likely to be financially able to pay substantial damages or to be adequately insured against such claims (when the injured party will be entitled to the benefit of the insurance). Alternatively, the injured party might sue the actual wrongdoer but he may not always be likely to have sufficient funds for proper payment nor is he likely to be insured against the contingency. Therefore, although the injured party may still sue the actual wrongdoer, he will usually be more interested in establishing that another 'person' is vicariously liable. For example, if an employee is injured at work through the wrongful act of a fellow employee, the injured employee may sue the
employer to obtain financial redress(1): an employer may in fact be liable for a wrong done by his employee even where he had expressly forbidden the employee's action and derives no benefit from it. The two main maxims therefore underpinning the doctrine of vicarious liability are respondeat superior and qui facit per alium facit per se.

Nor is the principle of vicarious liability intended to benefit the actual wrongdoer. The general rule culpa tenet suos auctores overrides the vicarious liability principle to the extent that not only may the injured party sue the actual wrongdoer instead of the superior but also the superior who has been made vicariously liable has a right to recover from the wrongdoer what has been paid to the injured party.

Thus, if I am injured by a fellow employee at work, I may sue that employee or my employer, say, the company. If I elect to sue the company, it may then sue the wrongdoer and perhaps even dismiss him. All this, however, would usually be governed in practical terms by principles of insurance i.e./

(1) In Scotland before 1858, injury caused to employee X by the negligence of fellow employee Y made no difference to the employer's liability: the employer was still liable according to the maxim qui facit per alium facit per se. Bartonshill Coal Co. v Reid (1858) 3 McQ.266, however, absented liability upon the employer where a fellow employee was injured. This decision was not set aside until the passing of the Law Reform (Personal Injuries) Act 1948 which restored that particular vicarious liability.
i.e. the company's insurance company, to which my company would pay premiums, would pay me and the insurance company would then be placed in the position of my company (subrogation) and thus have the right to sue the wrongdoer.

This principle of vicarious civil liability might be extended to the football arena. (1) Thus, if I am injured by

(1) If it is found unconscionable to apply by analogy the employer-employee, principal-agent, or partnership-partner vicarious relationship to the football situation, then perhaps the club-supporter relationship might still be profitably compared to an employer-independent contractor. Though the general rule is that the employer is not responsible for the delicts of the independent contractor, there are exceptions to this rule. Such are examples of personal liability as opposed to vicarious liability. The following are among the situations where the employer of an independent contractor may be held liable to an injured third party:

(i) where the employer (football club?) has been negligent in that he (it?) has
   · 'selected' an incompetent contractor (disorderly supporter?)

(ii) where personal liability is imposed by statute on the employer (club?)
(If a Crown Proceedings Act - in 1947 - can impose vicarious liability on the Crown for the civil wrongs of its 'servants' and agents, then perhaps a Football Club Proceedings Act in 1983 might statutorily impose a vicarious liability on the football club for the delicts of its own supporters - each club might be 'responsible' for its own supporters, especially in Cup matches where gate receipts are still 'halved'. The government has not been shown reluctant to legislate in the football 'field': just as the Occupiers' Liability (Scotland) Act 1960 (which binds the Crown) placed liability for injury caused by dangerous premises through negligence on the occupier, the Safety of Sports Grounds Act 1975 has, in an attempt at preventive action, required the obtaining of a 'safety certificate' by the football club (as occupier) in default of which criminal sanctions are available; and there is, of course, the Criminal Justice (Scotland) Act 1980.)

(iii) where it is a condition of doing something (e.g. playing a football match before the public?) that certain consequences do not follow (bad behaviour?)
   - see Hardaker v Idle District Council 1896 1QBD 335.

Motherwell F.C. have unsuccessfunly tried to have imposed a 'vicarious responsibility' (in the private realm of the Scottish Football League) on a club for their fans' behaviour by demanding that Rangers have two points taken away from them when their fans invaded the pitch at Fir Park with Motherwell 2-0 in front.
a supporter at the football ground, I may sue that supporter or the football club (a limited company). If I elect to sue the football club, it may then sue the wrong-doer and perhaps even forbid him from entering its ground for a period, or ever again. (1) Again, all this would be subject to insurance principles i.e. the club's insurance company, to which the club would pay premiums, would pay me and the insurance company would then be placed in the position of the club in that it would have the right to sue the 'hooligan'.

In this way most instances of 'football hooliganism' would be dealt with - if at all - by the civil law, set in motion by the whim of the offended individual. Thus, the paternalistic police perception as to what they consider to be offensive to the public would be circumscribed by a more direct barometer. The kids in the shed who want to 'knock shit out of each other' (2) (volenti non fit injuria?) can continue to do so as long as they don't 'offend' other fans, any of whom might have locus standi given certain circumstances. Thus, 'injury' might take on a very liberal meaning

(1) Said v Butt (1920) 3 K.B. 497. On 30th January 1978, Bristol City F.C. successfully applied to Bristol County Court for a temporary court order banning a fan from its ground. The fan, who was neither present nor represented in the action, had allegedly on at least two occasions 'created substantial disturbance and bother' and had been ejected from the ground twice. The club only sought injunction until the trial of an action in which it would claim damages for trespass.

(2) Ian Archer, 'The 79,000 Dollar or 80p Question', in M Aitken (ed.), When Will we see your like again?, Edinburgh 1977, p.24.
in that a fan 50 yards away on another terracing might be 'injured' (offended) by two rival fans fighting and bring a claim against them via the club or insurance company though the two fighters themselves might not want to take further action. Or someone on the terracing might be 'injured' (offended) by the incessant swearing of the person standing 3 yards away and claim damages as solatium (comfort) to feelings hurt by insult. (1) It might well be judicially determined that the fighters, swearers and insulters would owe a duty of care to all the match spectators - indeed this might be written into the contractual terms of entry to the ground - and where the injury suffered by the innocent spectator was caused by the legal wrong of the defender (damnum\iniuria\datum) there could obviously be consequences in terms of civil reparation. (2)

(1) Attempts have been made by:
T.B. Smith, Short Commentary, op.cit, p.733;
and in several cases, to have revived the ancient doctrine of convicium which is the deliberate injury to a person's feelings by hurtful words.

(2) The defender would owe a duty of care to his legal 'neighbours' and thus he could not 'injure' his neighbour without making himself liable in damages. Legal neighbours have been described by Lord Atkin in Donoghue v Stevenson (at p.44) as 'persons who are so closely and directly affected by my act that I ought reasonably to have them in contemplation as being so affected'. See Donoghue v Stevenson 1932 S.C.(H.L.)31; Bourhill v Young 1942 S.C. (H.L.) 78.

In my schema, all match attenders would be one another's legal neighbours.
If a 'respectable' fan were so offended, he might act by referring the matter to the police who, in their capacity as private citizens, might eject from the ground those in breach of the terms of the contract by their behaviour, obtain the wrongdoer's name and address and act, if necessary, as witnesses in any subsequent civil action. Thus, the police role at football matches might be shifted somewhat from being criminal law enforcers, order maintainers and principal agents of state control to being social welfare officers. (1) Police action as criminal law enforcers and order maintainers by means of arrest (and, in England, prosecution) might of course take place too but I would submit that except in serious (e.g. assault) cases this would be unnecessary as any civil actions would offer more than adequate sanctions and provide more natural control parameters, offering as they do a better guide to what conduct the public find acceptable in a given environment.

Outside the football ground, before and after the match, where the police may remove or arrest individuals where a breach of the peace occurs or is reasonably anticipated and where they can exercise the necessary authority to prevent obstruction/

(1) These respective police functions are discussed in M. Banton, The Policeman in the Community, London 1964; T.A. Critchley, A History of Police in England and Wales, London 1967; and the Royal Commission on the Police, HMSO, London 1962. The latter lists one of the duties of the modern police force as 'to befriend anyone who needs their help ..'
obstruction or control unlawful assemblies, there is a growing awareness of the uses of the civil law. Tenants' and residents' associations in Derby, Sheffield, Nottingham and Birmingham have contemplated seeking court injunctions to prevent football matches being played in their areas as they claim that vandalism on match days has gone beyond tolerable limits.

In England, the *Riot (Damages) Act 1886* enables persons whose property is damaged or stolen in a 'riot' to claim compensation out of the local police rate. The Act applies only if the 'riot' is 'tumultuous' i.e. so large and agitated that the police should have known of the threat that existed and should have taken steps to prevent any damage. In *Munday v Metropolitan District Receiver* compensation of £175 was granted to a man whose garage and garden were damaged by a rioting football crowd in 1945 at Chelsea's football ground before the match with Moscow Dynamos. The Scottish equivalent is the *Riotous Assemblies (Scotland) Act 1822* and here there is no need even to prove that the 'riot' is 'tumultuous', though there would/

(1) This is perhaps another reason why police are reluctant to bring 'riot' charges.

(2) This Act is especially significant to the shopkeeper or householder as insurance policies often exclude damage or loss by riot of any kind.

(3) 1949 1 All E.R. 337.

(4) The claim arises whether or not those responsible are caught.
would appear to be no liability under the Act for theft of property as opposed to damage.

Section 10 of the Scottish Act reads as follows:

'In every case where any damage or injury shall be done to any church, chapel or building for religious worship, or to any house, shop or other building whatsoever, or any fixtures attached thereto, or any furniture, goods, or commodities therein, by the act or acts of any unlawful, riotous or tumultuous assembly of persons, or by the act or acts of any person or persons engaged in or making part of such unlawful, riotous or tumultuous assembly, the party injured or damni-fied thereby shall be entitled to recover full compensation for the loss or injury, by summary action against the town clerk of the city or burgh within which the loss or injury shall have been sustained, or the clerk of supply of the county .. wherein the loss or injury shall have been sustained, if the same shall not have been within any city or burgh ..'

By section 15, any such action must be begun within one calendar month of the damage or injury.

The legal basis of any attempt in Scotland to have a court interdict a football match from being played would be one of nuisance. A legal nuisance is an infringement of a neighbour's right of comfortable enjoyment of his heritable property with the maxim applicable here being sic utere tuo ut alienum non laedas. Thus, the householder or tenant living near the football ground might allege harmful conduct of a continuing nature or even excessive noise (1) connected with

(1) In a recent case of nuisance, a flock of 70 geese, ducks, chickens and peafowl were ordered from a NW London home as they were disturbing the neighbour's peace and quiet.
the playing of the football match. Appropriate remedies would be interdict and damages and the liability of the football club, as with vicarious liability, would be strict, since it cannot if sued by its 'neighbour' for damages put forward the defence that it took all reasonable care to prevent the nuisance. The club might, however, put forward as a defence that a nuisance which has existed for twenty years or more can no longer be objected to (negative prescription), (1) but any increase in the extent of the nuisance e.g. more vociferous and more nocuous match crowds after that time could still be challenged.

And the civil bandwagon is not only being manned by private individuals: Newcastle-upon-Tyne City Council has sought a court decision that Newcastle United F.C. should pay for damage to fences and park benches caused by their fans who burned them to keep warm while they queued for FA Cup tickets in 1974.

If the football clubs neither seek to claim a measure of civil responsibility nor have such a responsibility foisted upon them by damages actions or other means, they may some day find that they will have nothing to be responsible for, if the clamour for more and yet more criminal statutes continues. Just as James I of Scotland by that Scots Act of 1424 (now repealed by desuetude) sought to forbid the playing/

playing of football all those centuries ago, a similar result might be
effectively in the future by the social controllers through the football clubs' insistency of responsibility.

In such a contractual/delictual context such related notions as the locus
standi of the 'victim' who might sue for (say) solutum in a damnum
injuria datum framework would thus be given consideration. Such a move
might also help resolve the ambiguity of the responsibility of the football
club itself in the context of football offending. This is not to suggest
that the criminal law should never be invoked to deal with any act of
football hooliganism - indeed police intervention is no doubt a necessary
part of the ritual - but merely to advance the view that since most foot-
ball 'offences' are of a minor, indeed trifling and subjective, nature
(as already suggested) the forum of the civil court with its principal aim
of financial compensation might be more suitable when viewed from a variety
of perspectives, if court activity at all is felt to be desirable.

There are several vital distinctions between criminal law and civil law.
Already mentioned is the fact that, as public law, the state (res publica)
uses the criminal 'code' to act against the individual (prosecution) to
try and ascertain 'guilt' (1) bringing with its establishment all

(1) This practice is seen at its most obvious in, for example, Scotland
where prosecution is in the hands of a public prosecutor (usually
the procurator-fiscal or depute) under the control of a law officer
of the Crown (Lord Advocate) and where a private prosecution was
allowed in J. & P. Coats v Brown 1909 S.L.T. 370 but was totally
discounted in McBain v Crichton 1961 S.L.T. 209 where it was decided
that the courts in Scotland would never again inquire into the Lord
Advocate's reasons for refusal to prosecute as such was held to be
inconsistent with the administration of the Scots criminal justice
system. In April 1982 Criminal Letters were given to a Glasgow
woman who alleged she was attacked and raped by three teenagers.
The Crown had dropped proceedings against them the previous
September because of the danger to the woman's health if she gave
evidence. But her subsequent application to bring a private
prosecution was not opposed by the Lord Advocate. In Scotland, before
1587, most prosecutions were left in the hands of the injured party
although the King's (Lord) Advocate usually joined the prosecution for
the King's interest to preserve law and order and out of financial
interest as fines went to the royal treasury. In 1587, the Lord
Advocate was empowered by statute to instigate criminal proceedings
although the parties be silent or would otherwise privily agree'.
This power of the Advocate to prosecute without the concurrence of any
private party made him master of the instance, giving him a near
absolute right to decide who should be prosecuted. See A.V. Sheehan,
Criminal Procedure in Scotland and France, op. cit, p. 108.
the possible consequences of stigmatisation, while in civil law a natural or juristic persona (individual, firm, limited company, etc.) litigates against another. The respective objectives of the different laws are in radical opposition too in that the main purpose of the criminal law is, as has been said, to punish (though the objectives of such 'punishment' are of course manifold) and any attempt at compensation e.g. through the Criminal Injuries Compensation Board is only incidental and in any case comes via the taxpayer, while the civil law has compensation as its main aim with any punitive element again purely ancillary. (1) Finally, the respective standards of proof differ considerably: in the criminal court, there is the presumption of innocence; the accused must be proved guilty 'beyond reasonable doubt' while the civil court insists upon a less vigorous standard viz. that, 'on the balance of probabilities', the pursuer's case is in some way stronger than the defender's.

(1) The blurring of these major differences between criminal and civil laws contained in the Criminal Justice (Scotland) Act 1980 has been criticised by Lord Cameron, a senior High Court/Court of Session judge, who felt that compensation orders for victims of crime should not be issued by criminal courts. He suggested that the determination of damages was best left to the civil courts. His remarks were contained in an address to the Society of Solicitors in the Supreme Courts of Scotland and reported in The Scotsman, 26 March, 1982. To bring a compensatory process into the sphere of the criminal courts is a way of increasing the control of the criminal justice system, which this author does not regard as a welcome development.
All along, there has been a tacit acceptance that the only possible reaction to a misdemeanour on the football terracing is for the police to eject or arrest, thereby invoking recourse to the criminal justice system, as even an ejection is viewed from a criminal standpoint. However, greater reference to the civil 'code' may be a more telling panacea for many footballing ills. The advantages of such a shift of perspective would, I think, include the following - the civil wrongdoer (defender) would not be criminally labelled; the 'victim' (pursuer) would be, directly rather than incidentally, financially compensated; (1) the well-behaved fan and the police might be brought together in co-operation and a dialogue exchanged; and the clubs, as we shall see, would be involved to a much greater extent. Obvious difficulties might be the absence of a clearly definable 'victim'/pursuer (here the football club or the S.F.A. might fill the void as they might allege their 'good names' were being wronged by the 'hooliganism' or that their future income was being affected or indeed, in rare cases, a police officer himself might litigate - though, generally, if no private individual is moved to seek an action there would be no redress) and the 'ethical' problem of using police officers as witnesses in civil causes (nevertheless, at present the police are frequently called as witnesses in civil actions like motor accident damage claims and divorce).

(1) M. Fry in Arms of the Law (London 1957) has vilified the penal system as being over-concerned with the punishment or reformation of the wrongdoer while ignoring the needs of the victim. See also K. Smith, A Cure for Crime, London 1965.
Donald Black has rightly pointed out that:

'The style of social control even defines the style of deviant behaviour - whether it is an offence to be punished, a debt to be paid, a condition in need of treatment, or a dispute in need of resolution'.

(1)

Penal control is the greatest of these four social controls, followed by therapeutic, compensatory and conciliatory controls (2). Penal control, according to Lehtimaja (3) is also the easy way out for a decision-maker confronted by a new social problem. The criminal law has, during this century, increased its range of sanctions from the strictly penal to include therapeutic, educational and compensatory styles and it is generally true that the criminal law increases as other social controls decrease or are assimilated. It is Black's contention that the more unequal (stratified) the society and the greater the social complexity, the more need that society has for a formal and drastic form of social control i.e. a repressive penal style.

It is here submitted that neither the criminal law nor the penal/

(1) D. Black, The Behaviour of Law, op.cit, p.9 (already quoted).

(2) Black, ibid, p.106. F.H. McClintock in his essay 'The Future of Imprisonment' (op.cit) has also distinguished these four controls and in his essays Some Aspects of Discretion in Criminal Justice Processes (op.cit) and The Role of Penitentiaries (op. cit) he has adopted and modified Black's classification of social controls by inserting a fifth (educational) control between the therapeutic and compensatory controls. McClintock's formal and informal control models have the following characteristics: (see chart /over)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Penal Criminal Justice</th>
<th>Medical Therapeutic (+ Social Work)</th>
<th>Educational (+ Social Work)</th>
<th>Compensatory (Civil or criminal law)</th>
<th>Conciliatory (Civil, criminal or Social)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Prohibition</td>
<td>Normality</td>
<td>Educated</td>
<td>Obligation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem</td>
<td>Guilty</td>
<td>Need</td>
<td>Ignorance/ Incompetence</td>
<td>Debt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative of Action</td>
<td>(i) agency of community (police)</td>
<td>(i) agency of community</td>
<td>(i) agency of community</td>
<td>(i) agency of group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) victim</td>
<td>(ii) deviant</td>
<td>(ii) student</td>
<td>(ii) victim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity of deviant or 'problem' individual</td>
<td>Offender</td>
<td>Patient/ client</td>
<td>Ignorant, uneducated or incompetent person</td>
<td>Debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution or Goal</td>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>Help/treatment</td>
<td>Standard, certification or recognition of competence</td>
<td>Payment (in cash or kind)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(McClintock, ibid, pp. 198 and 8 respectively)
penal style of control are intrinsically necessary to the football crowd arena (which is a relatively equal, intimate and homogenous arena - all being characteristics conducive to the growth of self-help) and that private recourse to self-help through conciliation and compensation, in an appreciation of situational anarchy, is the most satisfactory ultimate approach. (1) Declining confidence in the criminal justice system and the 'coming penal crisis' are simply manifestations of the growing political, economic and social conflict and major 'crisis of legitimacy' the state is currently experiencing. State attempts to control and contain this crisis, alas, lead to a more authoritarian law-and-order society as the state slides into a 'more coercive gear'. (2)

Black has predicted the decrease, even the disappearance, of law and the return of anarchy (which he defines as social life/)

(1) Thus, to invoke the criminal law is to adopt an essentially penal style of social control (with such as therapeutic and compensatory elements); to use civil law is mainly to rely on the compensatory form (with a possible incidental penal sanction); the use of self-help adopts an essentially conciliatory style (perhaps with a compensatory element). There has long been a mutual hostility between law and self-help, as evidenced by Pollock and Maitland (op.cit, p.574) who haughtily dismiss self-help as 'an enemy of the law, a contempt of the king and of his court'.

(2) This change to the penal gear is evident in the governmental/social control response to 'football hooliganism' (e.g. the Criminal Justice (Scotland) Act 1980) and in the response to 'mugging', as demonstrated by S. Hall et al, in Policing the Crisis (op.cit).
life without law(1). An entire society may be anarchic, or some of its settings may be anarchic and not others. (2) I am arguing towards an anarchy (i.e. the absence of state control) on the football terracings as just one such setting. Since anarchy does not equal the absence of social control but only the absence of state social control this view is compatible with the stimulation of other social controls of an 'internal' nature that might arise from the mood of spectators, as opposed to the 'external' attitudes and expectations.

(1) 'Law' is itself defined as 'governmental social control' or any process by which the state defines or responds to deviant behaviour, and therefore includes public law like criminal law.

(2) For example, a year-long experiment in self-help was undertaken in the traffic realm when Avon and Somerset Police took all their constables and wardens off points duty during rush hours. During the period there was no increase in accidents, vehicles moved faster and more traffic managed to get through the town centres. This was reported in The Sun, 22 April, 1982. In the realm of violent attacks on racial minorities, members of the East London Workers Against Racism (ELWAR) offer a vigilante-style method of dealing with such harassment. Following a racial attack, ELWAR members offer protection, visit the homes of suspected culprits, and try to bring those responsible to the victim to apologise (reconciliation). This contribution to self-help was reported in The Times, 9 May, 1982. A more general treatment of self-help is found in James Cornford's 'The Revival of Self-help?', in S. Henry (ed.), Can I have it in Cash?, London 1981, pp. 192-7.
expectations imposed by others. (1) In this schema, statutes might be repealed, penalties abolished, and external surveillance ended.

This is to see the use of law (or the lack of such) as turning full circle. Though the earliest societies had little inequality of wealth, modern life has had much individual ownership, culminating in the nineteenth century. Since then, Black points out, a reversal has been taking place and less and less have people been able to do with their land or other property as they choose:

'If this trend continues across the world, the history of ownership will be circular, ending with the communal ownership, and equality, of the past. Once again, who uses what real estate will be a matter of understanding'. (2)

According to Black, law varies inversely with other social control (p.107). As traditional controls (the middle-aged man attending football matches) have diminished, the scope and ferocity of the criminal law have increased. The inverse relationship between informal social control and the state's formal control has also been recognised by Thomas Mathsson (in a paper entitled 'The Future of Control Systems - the Case of Norway') who states:

'The organised formal control which probably most directly influences people's behaviour is the responsibility of the police. Society's need for this type of control increases as the informal social control is being weakened'. (p.11)

Mathsson attributes this weakening of informal social control to the (largely post-War) technological development - industrialisation, urbanisation, automobilisation - and equates its restoration with the abolition of capitalism.

(2) Ibid, p.133.
Accompanying the increasing equalisation of wealth are the increasing equalisations – though some may only be 'dimly visible' – of social classes, races, sexes and ages, with the latter equality wanting even in the earliest societies:

'Hence, the future may have even more equality than the distant past. In any event, the earliest societies had little stratification, and the future may have little again'. (1)

The future, homogeneous, nomadic, non-stratified society will foster the decrease, perhaps the disappearance, of the penal style of social control:

'If trends continue, social control will decrease to some degree, but old patterns will reappear in new locations, with a new significance. Banishment will still be possible, for instance, but only banishment from an encounter, not from home. The intolerable becomes, at most, situational. Similarly, as people increasingly move, alone, from location to location, social control loses its fatefulness. With people constantly moving, and constantly making and losing friends and enemies, the life span of disputes shortens, feuding becomes difficult if not impossible, and mediators and tribunals of all kinds lose their importance. And if a relationship does not last, neither does a reputation won or lost in it. Accordingly, normative mobility, in and out of respectability, increases as much as other mobility. Already a rebellion against dossiers and other records has begun. If this continues, disgrace will become only temporary, and people will have nothing left to hide. In a world of this kind, as in simple societies of the past, social control will mend relationships completely, or completely tear them/ (2)

(1) Ibid.
(2) The football ground is particularly suited to the sanction of banishment – ejection from the ground and time-bans on attendance being examples.
them apart. But, in any case, situations will be all that matter, all that are saved or destroyed.  

The football ground is just one situation or setting that would benefit from analysis in this developing spirit of increasing privacy, declining subordination and permanent but weak organisation. This forum for _ad hoc_ intimacy seems particularly amenable to the abandonment of recourse to the criminal law and the encouragement of self-help, a concept more fully developed by Black in his other major work.  

(1) Ibid, p.137.  

(2) D. Black, The Manners and Customs of the Police, New York 1980. The concept of self-help refers to 'any response to deviant behaviour in which an offended party takes action on his/her behalf, with or without the assistance of third parties other than those who are specialised agents of social control' (p.194n). Black's promotion of self-help is addressed solely to the possibilities of applying theoretical and empirical knowledge and not with the desirability (or otherwise) of self-help as a social policy. The political implications of studying deviance (i.e. the 'connexion' between research, theory and policy) have been aired by Stan Cohen (Images of Deviance, op.cit, introduction) who points out that 'a conception of deviance .. carries within it a range of evaluative, moral and practical implications' (p.21) and that 'criminologists should be more honest and explicit about what their values are and what they are aiming to do':  

'If they want to be technologists to help solve the state's administrative and political problems, let them state this'.  

(p.22)  

Black, though himself wary of matters of value and politics, none-theless proffers some technological advice (see later) and predicts the politically-based reaction to his notion of self-help:  

'Although self-help could be a powerful system of social order, there are those who might criticise the means necessary for its attainment, as well as certain of its characteristics and consequences. Furthermore, a decline of law and growth of self-help would not be equally attractive to all segments of society. Those who enjoy special benefits from law would surely be least receptive to such a development, while others who would gain advantages from self-help would welcome it most'.  

(2) Ibid, p.137.
There, Black argues for depolicing, improvement of physical design and use of technological resources as harbingers of that ideal.¹ Such a minimalist (or anarchic) philosophy lies easily alongside other 'reductive measures' supported by this author: decarceration, decriminalisation, depenalisation. Thus, it is argued that stewards are to be preferred to police officers on duty at football matches; that imprisonment is a futile response to football hooliganism; that the criminal law is invoked too readily in football grounds; and that punitive measures generally are too drastic a response to most football crowd indiscretions.

Self-help flourishes with the absence of criminal law and may be stimulated by administrative, architectural and technological techniques. For example, strengthening the police presence at football grounds is by no means certain to reduce crime at football grounds: the larger and more intrusive a police force is, the weaker self-help will be as supporters become increasingly dependent upon the state.

¹ More dramatic strategies would include altering the distribution of wealth and the ethnic composition of communities.
to define and maintain order. (1) Depolicing, as an administrative strategy may, however, encourage 'positive altruism and voluntary cooperative behaviour'. (2) among a football crowd:

'Everywhere, people would undertake more preventive surveillance on their own, would work out more informal settlements of their disputes with the other parties involved, and would lend assistance to those in need of help more readily'. (3)

Like Black, I am not advocating drastic, overnight depolicing. Given the present great dependence on the police force in the maintenance of public order, a gradual transition to self-help - via the stepping-stone of civil law - is recommended. Indeed, Michael Taylor has argued that a sudden and complete removal of officials could well precipitate/

(1) In its extreme form, this pattern is known as the 'Kitty Genovese syndrome' in reference to a young New York woman whose cries for help were ignored by her neighbours - many watching from their windows - as she was repeatedly assaulted and stabbed. Nobody even called the police on her behalf, each assuming that someone else would, and Genovese died in the doorway of her home (see Black, The Manners and Customs of the Police, op.cit, p.196n). This incident seems remarkably similar to events in daylight one Saturday in 1981 when a young woman was dragged through shopping crowds in central Edinburgh and raped in an alleyway just off a busy thoroughfare. No member of the public intervened, nor did they summon the police.


(3) Black, Manners and Customs, op.cit, p.197.
precipitate a 'Hobbesian war of all against all'. (1) Rather, the gradual replacement of police officers by stewards (an extension of the current Heart of Midlothian policy (2)) is suggested, as one progressive step towards the self-help goal. (3)

The design of physical space provides an architectural strategy for increasing the quantity of self-help. If it is assumed that people are more likely to aid those with whom they are 'intimate' and least likely to help 'strangers' then the elliptical football ground is a natural 'sociopetal' (4) environment:

(1) M. Taylor, op. cit, p.141. On the other hand, as Black points out, at times of crises (e.g. damna fatales like floods and earthquakes) when police services may break down though demand increases, citizens themselves exercise an informal social control which almost always maintains order. Indeed, by 'depolicing' Black refers only to a reduction of social control by the police, not to a reduction of other kinds of emergency service they provide e.g. assistance to the lost, sick and injured. At football matches, lost children are looked after by the police though the sick and injured are attended by St. John's ambulancemen.

(2) See Ch.15.

(3) It is recognised by Black that, along with self-help, other kinds of non-legal social control - of a more organised and specialised variety - would likely increase with depolicing. In a football context, they might include stewards and ambulancemen.

(4) A 'sociopetal' setting is one which encourages interaction; a 'sociofugal' setting discourages this - Black, Manners and Customs, op. cit, p.200.
'Even contact without conversation - including direct eye contact and mere visual exposure - can make helping behaviour more likely between those involved'.

Black, in fact, implies this very point in noting that rooms should be 'made round instead of angular'.

Black also believes that modern technological advances, especially electronic communications, should be cultivated to increase the degree to which people can exercise social control on their own. Though citizens may now summon the police by telephone, mutual aid between citizens may be encouraged for the future through citizens' band radio and other products of the 'technoanarchy':

'...electronic technology is now being developed for a portable telephone that can be worn on the wrist or carried in a pocket or handbag, thereby extending to the streets and sidewalks immediate access to family members, friends, and others who might provide assistance. It should also be possible to design a two-way radio of the same size, with the same functions as the larger citizens' band radio, creating an electronic community in the city among all who happen to tune in, including strangers. What the CB has done for motorists on the highway, devices of this kind could do for pedestrians, fostering a network of concern and putting people within reach of others, able to ask for help or provide it. Still other electronic devices/

(1) Ibid, p.201.

(2) Ibid, p.202. A similar notion of 'sociopetality' is assumed in the teaching method wherein desks are arranged in oval, eye-contact fashion.

(3) Citizens' band radio was legalised in the U.K. in 1981.

(4) This term was coined by Gene Youngblood in Expanded Cinema, New York 1970.
devices could undoubtedly be invented to make people accessible to each other, further transforming the social life of the city, even tribalising settings now peopled by strangers. Combined with rapid transportation, these devices would allow citizens to perform services for each other that are ordinarily viewed as the business of the police. Technology thus may contribute to a new kind of civil order, in which people look after their own affairs'.

Such technological innovation would clearly have implications for self-help both inside and outside the football ground.

Self-help should not be seen as a substitute for other styles of social control such as law but as an alternative with distinctive patterns of mobilisation, agent recruitment, procedures, outcomes, etc. Thus, self-help is a mode of social control with a 'logic and an organisation of its own'.

Black has underlined the major differences between self-help and law (both criminal and civil) in terms of the actual settlements produced by each:

'In matters of public order, the style of social control found in legal settlements tends toward the penal, with expiation through punishment a standard outcome. It is routine that only one side of any conflict is the object of this sanction, while the other is vindicated and supported. This penal style has a severity rarely seen in other idioms of social control.'

(1) Black, Manners and Customs, op. cit, pp.204-5.
(2) Ibid, p.205.
Another response of law to problems of public order is therapeutic in style, with people processed as "sick" and in need of corrective treatment, coercively applied if necessary. Self-help, by contrast, is more frequently conciliatory. Its settlements are more frequently negotiated between the two or more opposing factions involved in a dispute, both or all of whom make some concessions in pursuit of a resolution. If one of the parties is defined as the greater transgressor, this runs through mutual agreement, and it is usual for him or her to supply the offended person or group with compensation of some kind, whether in the form of reparation or simply an apology. It might be added that, since it is generally a compromise reached through give and take rather than a decision imposed upon one party who is defined as a loser, a resolution of this kind differs from civil as well as criminal law. Finally, although civil settlements are as a rule less severe than penal settlements, self-help is likely to be less severe than either'.

(1) Ibid, pp.205-6. I am trying to project 'criminal law → civil law → self-help' as a continuum of social control systems listed in decreasing order of severity. If the transition from the criminal system to self-help is indeed to be gradual such an aim is achieved through use of the civil system as a 'half-way house'. A vast step between two mutually hostile systems (criminal law, self-help) is replaced by two shorter steps between more compatible systems (criminal law, civil law; civil law, self-help). Black (ibid, p.194n) has himself pointed out that in modern America, self-help is more likely in matters legally defined as civil than in criminal matters. Thus, the transitional period between the abandonment of criminal law and the eventual return to self-help will witness a resurgence of restitutive sanctions and conciliatory law.
These differences are explained by several characteristics. Firstly, self-help - whether the dispute is resolved by the participants themselves, or through the 'good offices' of family, friends, situational acquaintances or bystanders - is a radically decentralised style of social control and, according to Black, the relative leniency of self-help and its conciliatory character are conditioned by its very decentralisation as well as the role of individuals in the settlements reached. Criminal complaints, however, are brought by the state itself - 'a centralised group par excellence' - and its system has a formal organisation with headquarters, hierarchies of command and courts.

Secondly, when parties to a conflict do not invoke legal agents of social control but depend upon others in solving their problems by self-help they usually seek the participation of people who are closest to and most like themselves. Even situationally (e.g. at football matches) people with whom the parties have had some contact - as opposed to complete strangers - are most likely to be asked to fill a role of this kind and those who are relatively intimate with the/

(1) Thus, the arbitration process, wherein the parties in dispute submit to a private person or persons for decision and wherein the jurisdiction of the courts is ousted so far as the merits of the dispute is seen as an improvement on prosecution and litigation.

(2) It is Black's belief that, all else constant, social control is most penal and most severe where its organisation is most centralised, and least where the most decentralisation prevails. He further believes that there is evidence that individuals are less punitive than small groups.
the disputants are also more likely to intervene on their own initiative. (1) On the other hand, police and other legal authorities are often socially unknown or even culturally alien to the people whose problems they handle.

Thirdly, law and self-help differ in their variability. Though the legal process may have considerable variability in outcomes at every stage, the self-help process has even more. This is due to the greater diversity of participation across cases handled by the general population (as agents of self-help) compared to the relatively similar backgrounds experienced by agents of the legal process:

> 'At different times, virtually all citizens - those of all sexes, ages, ethnicities, occupations, and other categories - serve as mediators for others and undertake social control on their behalf. They emerge from throughout the population, make their contribution to social order, and fade back again'. (2)

Other differences between law and self-help would include self-help’s lesser emphasis upon issues of procedural fairness, its greater importance of personal network and alliances.

(1) Black also believes that social control is least severe and most conciliatory precisely when its agents are relationally and culturally closest to the parties with whom they are involved.

(2) Ibid, p.207. A third tenet of Black’s philosophy is therefore the greater the variability in participation, the greater the variability in result.
alliances, its lesser orientation toward rules or principles and its more immediate resolution of disputes. (1)

(1) Austin Turk has also questioned the worth of law as an instrument to resolve social conflict (in 'Law as a Weapon in Social Conflict', Social Problems 23 (1976), 276-291. Here, Turk criticises what he calls the 'moral functionalist' conception of law as the most useful means of settling or precluding disputes, a view that has been held by many researchers into law and society. Turk feels the major limitations of such a conception are that it introduces cultural bias into research by defining away the disruptive and exploitive aspects of law; it tends to equate legal with consensual methods or processes of conflict management which are presumed to be more effective than coercive ones; and it encourages research in which natural law and/or functional-systems assumptions are taken for granted. Turk prefers - as do I - the alternative conception of law as power i.e. a set of resources whose control and mobilisation can in many ways generate and exacerbate conflicts rather than resolve or diminish them. He illustrates his viewpoint with twelve 'propositional statements', each one of which exemplifies law as a damaging power. For example, his first proposition is that the availability of legal resources is in itself an 'impetus to social conflict' because the disputing parties cannot risk the possible costs of not having the law on their side: where no legal resources are available, parties would rely on non-legal power. For example, his seventh proposition is that legal procedural norms are often used to exclude or distort information essential to an adequate comprehension of empirical problems and therefore can impede or prevent conflict resolution. This criticism of the legal process is similar to that made by Black and was considered earlier, with reference to Pat Carlen's work, when the court processing of football offenders was discussed in Chapter 20.
If there are indeed 'just too many crimes .. on the statute books anyway',(1) and if indeed the individual is likely to compound rather than correct his deviation after conviction within the criminal labelling process,(2) then why do we continue to march along the criminal avenue in so many areas?(3) Fixed penalty procedure for certain minor offences go

(1) A. Grant, 'Control of Police Behaviour', in W.S. Tarnopolsky (ed.), Some Civil Liberties Issues of the Seventies, Toronto 1975, p.83. Ignorantia iuris non/neminem/haud excusat has become an anachronism. A lecturer colleague has ventured so far as to suggest that 'what this country needs is another Cromwell'(!) - such has been the recent welter of legislation.

(2) See E. Goffman, Stigma, New Jersey 1963, and H. Garfinkel, 'Conditions of Successful Degradation Ceremonies', Amer. J. Sociology 61 (56), 420-461; the Scottish children's hearing system also accepts the statement and, unlike the English juvenile court, prefers to deal with a juvenile by a social (welfare) rather than a legal (court) process. On the other hand, R.V. Ericson in Young Offenders and their Social Work (Farnborough 1975) would disagree with the statement.

(3) Donald Black (in The Manners and Customs of the Police, op.cit, pp.193-4) has expressed similar astonishment at the continued and pervasive use of the criminal law, especially when viewed from a labelling perspective:

'This mode of social control has several distinctive consequences: it dramatises the deviant character of an offence .. and it may escalate hostility between the parties involved. Its patterns of detection and other procedures also affect the nature and distribution of crime itself, making some kinds of conduct in some places more vulnerable to observation and intervention, leaving other kinds in other places relatively immune. Finally, for the offender law tends to be more stigmatising and disabling than other social control and so may even render future conformity less likely. If, however, people were to engage in more self-help rather than relying so heavily upon law, that is, if they were to exercise more social control on their own, a different kind of public order could prevail. In the nature of the case, many incidents would effectively be decriminalised, since they would no longer be formally defined and handled as criminal, and beyond this, many patterns of conduct themselves would surely change in response to new risks and opportunities'.
some way towards avoiding court appearance and conviction but an even more radical way of dealing with minor offences - in the football arena and elsewhere (1) - would be by the increased use of police discretion in arrest, (2) by an increased reluctance to prosecute certain cases, (2) or, most fundamentally, by the removal of certain 'offences' from the criminal code which would leave open the possibility of civil litigation or even use of self-help by private individuals where desired.

Within law, the vicarious criminal and civil responsibilities of football clubs require to be developed, and the relationship between club and supporter needs to be explored. Also bearing in mind the cost of running a football club (Hearts currently pay an annual police bill of seventeen thousand pounds and a rates bill of twenty five thousand pounds) and the implications of the labelling approach, it is felt that there is greater scope for green model sanctions like the ban, and ejection by stewards whose/

(1) The Stewart Committee is at present sitting in Scotland to consider generally the 'alternatives to prosecution'.

(2) W. La Faye's Arrest, the decision to take a suspect into custody (Boston 1965) and H. Wilcox's The decision to prosecute (London 1972) are examples from both sides of the Atlantic of attempts to 'structure discretion' (in K.C. Davis' term) at the arrest and prosecution stages respectively. La Faye concludes that the exercise of discretion by the police is inevitable in the current criminal justice system and suggests the following occasions - I think pertinent to the football arena - where the criminal law may not be invoked: where offences are trivial, e.g. juvenile offences and drunkenness; where conduct is felt to reflect the standards of a community sub-group; or where arrest would cause harm to the offender outweighing the risk from inaction. Wilcox, in his study of police decision-making in a country where police both arrest and prosecute (England) suggests that 'technical breaches of the letter of the law' and 'trivial contraventions, not worth the bother of prosecution' inter alia should not be prosecuted. A common maxim to be followed would seem to be 'prosecution not persecution'.


whose role should be increased (along the lines of the Spanish Civil Protection Service\(^1\) and following Hearts’ lead). Generally, the words of José Ortega y Gasset - that order is not a pressure to be imposed on a society from without but an equilibrium which is set up from within - are supported.

It may be argued that to accentuate the civil law in the way I have done is to take a backward step. But this would not be the first ‘field’ where it was realised that to step back apparently is in fact to step forward in actual terms. In education, the rediscovery of old principles and methods is being advocated by increasing numbers; a timeous retreat does not always herald a defeat. The civil law may be shown to be no less effective a social control than the criminal law, boasts several positive advantages and lacks a few of the disadvantages. It is strategic middle-ground in the gradual transition from the use of criminal law to the use of self-help as the principal style of social control. It is a grey-green before the greenness of self-help. In both senses of the word, the law would become 'civilised'.

\(^1\) See Ch.15.
APPENDIX A


Scottish football season 1975-76 began in the usual fashion in early August with some friendly matches, the Anglo-Scottish Cup and the League Cup. On August 2, the "hooligan brigade ... got off to a fighting start. Trouble spot No. 1 was the Queen of the South ground at Dumfries where a running battle between scores of youths and police produced 15 arrests during the Anglo-Scottish Cup-tie with Hearts". (1) According to the "Daily Record" report of the same match, "Hundreds of fans scattered for safety as bottles and cans hurtled through the air. And as scores of youths ran on to the field, police bundled them back over the barriers. Throughout the first half, policemen moved into the crowd behind the Hearts goal and hauled a number of youths over the barriers on to the track. It was during the half-time break, following the Dumfries side's shock goal which gave them a 1-0 lead, that the "big trouble" started. Two youths being taken over a barrier started struggling and fighting with the police, and the crowd booed and jeered. Suddenly, fans started stampeding for safety as bottles and cans were thrown. Police had to draw their batons before order was restored". (2) "The Edinburgh Evening News" accorded the incident the description "mini riot". (3) A further 9 fans were arrested outside the ground. The affair, both on the field and on the terracings was a classic Country Cousins v City Slickers confrontation. The previous February, when the two sides had met at the

(1) Sunday Mirror, 3 August, 1975.
(2) Daily Record, 4 August, 1975.
same venue in a more emotionally-charged Scottish Cup-tie, there had been 30 arrests.

The same day, at Celtic Park, where Celtic and Derby County were unofficially contesting the right to wear the football crown of Britain, there were 3 arrests, though none were actually made inside the stadium itself. Two youths later admitted in court to bawling and shouting in the Gallowgate after the match and the third was held to have committed a breach of the peace in a street before the game by waving an Irish tricolour.

The only other football grounds where hooliganism was reported on this first day to the new season were south of the Border: "Trouble spot No. 2", pronounced the "Sunday Mirror", "was Middlesbrough's Ayresome Park where police dragged half a dozen youths out of the sun-soaked crowd after fights broke out during the first-half of the tie with Sunderland". One can but recall, as I have mentioned, that things had not been all that different when these North-east clubs had met at the same venue as long ago as 1919.

And at non-League Kettering, 20 fans were ejected during the game with Cambridge United. The game was stopped for a time when a bottle was thrown on to the field and, after further incidents outside the ground, a crowd of Cambridge fans were put on their coach by police and told to head for home immediately. More City Slicker showmanship.

The following Saturday, one Celtic fan had a dream come true: "There he

(1) Sunday Mirror, 3 August, 1975.
was ... standing in the centre circle at Parkhead. But Celtic and Aberdeen already had 22 sober men on the field. So the police ran on and removed [name omitted to avoid any contribution to labelling effect], who had been drinking. Two days later, he appeared in court, having spent the interim in a police cell, to be fined on two charges of breach of the peace and kicking a door inside the ground.

Celtic fans were in more trouble the next Wednesday evening when their team played Hearts in Edinburgh. During the match, which was watched by 25,000, there was a "break-in", 6 arrests were made and 9 fans were ejected from the ground. The arrestees' offences involved combinations of breach of the peace, resisting arrest and police assault. One arrested Celtic fan had been singing Irish songs and another had been shouting political slogans. Celtic (and Rangers) fans see themselves as Slickers wherever they go. After the Tynecastle game, £9,000 worth of damage was allegedly done to Edinburgh shops.

On Saturday, August 16, Celtic were at home to Dumbarton and 6 arrests were made in the covered enclosure opposite the stand when fighting broke out and fans spilled on to the track. At the other side of Glasgow, there were 16 arrests at the Rangers v Motherwell game, the majority occurring outside Ibrox though at half-time supporters at the Copeland Road "end" ran on to the field to escape cans and bottles. There was a violent incident, too, later that evening in the Buchanan Street bus station where Rangers fans and Celtic fans clashed leaving a man lying seriously injured with a stab wound.

(1) Daily Record, 12 August, 1975. The name of the supporter is omitted to avoid any contribution to labelling effect.
In England the same day both the "Sunday Post" and the "Sunday Mail" pointed out that "Manchester United fans topped the soccer violence league"(1) at their match at Wolverhampton where there were 70 fans arrested, most of them Man. United followers. The Wolverhampton police described it as a "bad day" as "hooliganism erupted before the match at Molineux had even started"(2). Two stabbings were reported at this match, too.

Only one year previously, on August 14 1974, at Blackpool, eighteen-year old Kevin Olsson became the first British football supporter to die as a result of violence at a match, stabbed in the heart during a confrontation between 200 Blackpool and Bolton fans.

The "notorious" Man. United supporters had been gaining quite a reputation for themselves - even abroad. In Belgium, a "mob" who had come to support their team against A.S. Ostend roamed the seafront of the town damaging houses, cafes and parked cars. When 6 fans appeared in court, the prosecutor was reported to have said: "The image of the British is of drunken youngsters throwing cobbles and bottles and wielding sticks"(3) And when Man. United fans visited Notts County in April 1975 the scenes were "the worst ever outbreak of soccer violence" in the city, according to one senior police officer. At the ground, one hapless police sargeant, who had been facing 6,000 Man. United supporters, had his helmet pierced just above

(1) Dunning et al., in Hard Enough, op.cit., at p. 344, have pointed out that fans are aware of two league tables: the formal one that deals in league points and the less formal one which deals with "who ran, when and from whom".

(2) Sunday Mail , 17 August, 1975.

(3) "Violence", Football, Vol. 1, No. 5.
his scalp by a "Kung Fu" star (a five-inch metal disc with sharpened points), was simultaneously struck on the head by a large stone and, as he was trying to avoid other missiles, was struck in the back by a chunk of concrete.

Apart from Wolverhampton, other English grounds had hooliganism incidents on August 16. At Ipswich, where Newcastle United were the visitors, there were 35 arrests including some girls. Twenty people were arrested before the game kicked off. In Lancashire, where Burnley were playing Arsenal there were 12 arrests ("a lot fewer than usual", said a police spokesman), at Nottingham where Forest were at home to Plymouth manager Brian Clough had to dissuade fans from invading the pitch and there was a stabbing at the Leicester City v Birmingham City game.

On August 23, there was crowd trouble in Scotland at the matches involving both Rangers and Celtic. Rangers' visit to Motherwell brought 34 arrests and a dozen injuries. The scene was a familiar one: "The trouble started ... in the covered enclosure opposite the main stand. As fists flew, hundreds of youngsters, supporters of both teams, jumped over the wall surrounding the field and spilled on to the pitch to escape". A reinforced police patrol with dogs went into the trouble spots to isolate offenders. Celtic's match at Dumbarton kicked off 15 minutes later when several hundred fans stormed the gates and gained free admission - a favourite tactic of the Celtic fans, who left a middle-aged man lying helpless with his neck broken in 2 places after they had forced a gate in similar manner at Arbroath in February 1975. His spinal cord was com-

(1) Guardian, 21 April, 1975.

(2) Sunday Post, 24 August, 1975.
pletely severed and he was paralysed from the neck down. All in all, Saturday, 23 August was, for the "Sunday Post" "another sad day of soccer shame". To complete the day, in Liverpool 6 mini-buses were wrecked in an "amazing battle" between Liverpool and Tottenham Hotspur fans before their match - the 'Spurs buses were stoned but the occupants managed to retaliate by tearing out seats and throwing them at the assailants through doors and windows. It all seemed rather like a landlubber's equivalent of the concept of "general average" in the law of carriage of goods by sea.

The next Wednesday evening, at the Aberdeen v Celtic game, fighting broke out between rival fans at half-time in spite of the fact the crowd was supposedly segregated according to partiality.

Saturday, 30 August 1975 saw the opening matches of Scotland's new streamlined super league, the Premier League. It was to be something of a gala day, all 5 fixtures being "derby" matches. Unfortunately, highly localised rivalry at football matches often acts as a spur to reckless behaviour. The only incident-free game from the crowd behaviour perspective as far as the opening day of the Premier League was concerned (if we are to believe the media) was the Motherwell v Ayr Utd match, the game of the 5 with the mildest "derby" complexion. At the Dundee V Aberdeen match, there were 2 arrests - one for breach of the peace and the other for the possession of an offensive weapon. After the St Johnstone v Dundee United game, a crowd of young United fans surged through a Perth

(1) The injured man died soon after. Several hundred Celtic fans forced a gate at the away game with Dundee United in 1932.

(2) Ibid.

(3) A local derby is a contest between two teams from the same district.
shop, overturning magazine stands and lemonade racks and breaking a pane of glass. At the Edinburgh "derby" between Hibs and Hearts, 13 arrests were made, all for breaches of the peace in a game where rival fans threw stones and cans at each other. A coach and several cars were stoned after the match. And at the biggest "derby", Rangers v Celtic, played before 69,000 people, 53 arrests were made inside the ground, 25 outside and over 100 fans were injured, 22 of them taken to hospital including a man suffering from stab wounds. "Trouble began when fans apparently took umbrage at the way a police officer carried a dog from the track at the Rangers' end. It seemed to be the excuse they needed. As bottles rained down, hundreds fled on to the track". (1) There was a further outbreak of fighting at the Rangers' end before half-time and bottles and cans were thrown at the Celtic end at the beginning of the second half. Crowd segregation at "Old Firm" games is virtually 100% but, nevertheless, such indiscriminate outbursts continue to prevail. It is obviously not sufficient in some cases merely to deny contact with the rival fans. After the match, there were fights in a car park and buses were subjected to stone and bottle attacks. The same day in Linlithgow, 2 brothers attacked another youth allegedly because he was wearing a Rangers scarf.

Outside the Premier League, 9 Arbroath supporters were arrested during the game at Falkirk and about £70 worth of damage was done to an Arbroath supporters' coach by the occupants - seats were slashed, part of the vehicle's flooring was ripped up and ashtrays were ripped from the seats. In England, on the same day, 50 arrests were made at the Stoke City v

---

(1) Sunday Post, 31 August, 1975.
Man. Utd game, Chelsea supporters severely damaged 3 coaches on a train after defeat at Luton - seats were ripped out and thrown on to the track, fire extinguishers torn from walls and windows and lights smashed, another train coach was set on fire on the way from Leicester to Liverpool, forcing the closure of Crewe station no less, and a buffet car was raided on the way back from Stoke to London (it was suggested by Man. Utd's "ultra notorious" London fans). British Rail, perhaps with justification, described the day as "the worst football Saturday in memory".

If the birth of the Premier League was heralded with a "skelp" on the backside, the second Saturday of its second second season was much more like a Leboyer birth. The only game that had reported crowd trouble was the Hearts v Rangers game at Tynecastle where 6 fans were ejected from the ground and 10 arrests were made - 9 inside the stadium for breaches of the peace and one outside for being drunk and incapable. In the lower divisions, 8 arrests were made at the Airdrie v Kilmarnock game during a clash between rival groups and 3 teenagers were charged with breaches following a terracing incident at the Fife "derby" between East Fife and Dunfermline.

On 13 September, a Hearts supporter was arrested for a breach of the peace at the away game against Dundee and there was also one arrest (for assault) at the Hibs v Ayr United game. On Wednesday the 17th, Hibs played Liverpool in a European competition and there were 3 arrests - one breach of the peace inside the ground and 2 outside (one assault and a drunk and incapable).

On Saturday 20 September, there were 14 arrests at the St Johnstone v
Celtic game including one fan who repeatedly dazzled players and policemen with a mirror.

The following Saturday, Dundee were at home to Rangers with one breach of the peace arrest inside the ground and 2 outside. Down south, Fulham beat Chelsea and Chelsea’s fans invaded the pitch (as they had done at Luton 4 weeks previously) and went on the rampage in streets afterwards.

The next mid-week brought the Liverpool v Hibs return match with several Edinburgh fans being arrested for damaging cars in Carlisle en route to the game and there was one arrest inside Tynecastle during the Hearts v Fulham Anglo-Scottish tie, another "Scotland v England" confrontation.

The first Saturday in October brought an afternoon with no "hooliganism" reported on the terracings. This may have been in some way related to the fact that for the first time since the inception of the Premier League both Rangers and Celtic were playing at home with the result that there was no sizeable "away" support at any Scottish ground that day. This may eliminate, or at best minimise, the possibility of any significant conflict between rival groups of supporters during the matches but, as we have already seen, it offers no guarantee that fans will not squabble amongst their own kind, or select isolated knots of rival supporters for attention.

On 11 October, Rangers visited Ayr where 24 arrests were made inside the

---

\(^1\) Events at this match are described in more detail by Pete in a case study (see Appendix J).
ground for breaches of the peace. During the game, where Rangers were defeated 3-0, the Ayr keeper was hit on the head by a stone. There was a further arrest outside Somerset Park and 4 more were made from a football special train returning to Glasgow afterwards when fireworks were lit and one apparently fell behind a seat starting a fire. The "Sunday Post" the next day set forth a story on its front page in somewhat bolder terms than the drama may have warranted under the banner, "Fans set fire to Rangers Special". With Guy Fawkes Night looming, fireworks were again in evidence the same day at the Hearts v Dundee United game where one fan was summoned under the Edinburgh Corporation Order 460 (2) (a) (1) which deals with the throwing of fireworks.

In England, the "Sunday Post" reported that "Manchester United fans were knocked off the top of the violence table" since, even though over 70 fans were arrested in their game at Leeds, most of those arrested actually came from Leeds. Three policemen received hospital treatment and scores of windows were broken after the game.

18 October brought with it 2 main Scottish games with crowd incident - each involving one half of the "Old Firm". At Celtic Park, Hibs were leading Celtic by 2 goals to nil on an extremely foggy day. After Hibs had scored their second goal, Celtic fans invaded the pitch, stopping play for 3 minutes. The scoreline was the same only minutes from time when the fog had become so dense that the referee abandoned the play, thereby giving Celtic another chance. Seventeen arrests were made at the game.

(1) Sunday Post, 12 October, 1975.
(2) Ibid.
In Motherwell, where Rangers were again visitors, this time on Premier League business, missiles were hurled at the Motherwell and former Rangers player Bobby Watson, as he was taking a throw-in. Watson, well-known for his strong religious convictions, had tried to act as peace-maker when the crowd had spilled on to the field during the previous meeting of the clubs in August but had ended up racing for safety as angry fans had rushed towards him. In this game, too, he was being singled out for treatment: "I hope your bible blows up in your face!" shouted one fan. Also in Dundee, the local "derby" at Tannadice brought 5 arrests for breach of the peace and one for police assault.

Of a match played on Monday evening, October 20, the "Sunday Post" wrote: "Gangs of youths roamed the terraces looking for trouble ... Rival teenage gangs clashed. After the game there was window-smashing and other all-too-familiar incidents. Where did it happen? Not at one of the big-crowd, tense European ties - but at Forfar! A select side there was playing Arbroath - and, to crown it all, it was a charity match."

The final Saturday in October had a Celtic v Rangers League Cup Final at Hampden Park with the kick-off brought forward by 2 hours to 1 pm. From the 59,000 crowd there were 12 arrests outside, 10 arrests inside and 11 people were hurt including a man who claimed he had been attacked by a youth wielding a hammer, but police described the match, according to Rangers v Celtic standards, as "one of the quietest games for years". At the Hibs v Aberdeen game, one arrest was made inside Easter Road Park for

(1) Sunday Post, 26 October, 1975.
assault while at Dens Park, Dundee I watched young Dundee supporters intimidating Motherwell fans as a primitive response to the fact that the visitors were notching up a convincing 6-3 victory and their team was totally helpless to do anything about it. Three fans were ejected from the ground by police. Meanwhile, in England, Manchester United's fans were again making their presence known, this time at West Ham in what the "Sunday Post" described as a "terracing battle" but which may have been confused to some extent with a crowd crush. One hundred and two people were injured (9 requiring hospital treatment), 132 were ejected and 38 were arrested, but, as at the Leeds "clash", the majority of those arrested (22) were home supporters. As is usual in these situations, after fighting broke out on the terracing, spectators spilled on to the field of play and the game was halted. Many shops near Upton Park had boarded their windows for fear of vandalism from Man. Utd fans and most of the local pubs remained closed until 7.30 pm. It is difficult to say with any certainty whether such reaction to anticipated "trouble" improves or exacerbates the "problem".

The following mid-week brought one arrest for breach of the peace inside Tynecastle where an under-23 international between Scotland and Denmark was being held and 10 arrests for similar at the full international between these countries at Hampden.

The first Saturday in November featured yet another Celtic v Rangers contest, again with a 1 pm start and with a 120 yd fence having been erected

(1) Ibid.
at Celtic Park to keep the fans off the field. If the police arrest statistics serve as any useful basis for comparison (and this is doubtful), then this time the early lunch-time kick off seemed to have done little to mollify the situation with 20 arrests made inside the ground, 30 outside and 20 fans requiring hospital treatment. And the crowd was smaller on this occasion by some 4,000 people. Over in Edinburgh, there was another "derby" game, too, which brought 19 arrests inside the ground and 3 outside. Of the 22 arrests, 17 were for breaches and 5 for police assault. Again, I noticed a seasonal flavour at the game when a firework was tossed into the Hibs support - this was reflected in the official police returns where it was noted that one further fan had been summoned under the ECO 460 (2) (a) (1). Twenty-nine more fans were thrown out of the ground.

On Saturday, November 8 a stand steward sustained a fractured face bone when he was kicked by a Celtic fan at the Dundee v Celtic game. The steward who had been going to football regularly for 25 years later was quoted as saying, "This is the first time that anything like this has ever happened to me." At the start of the game, a Canadian visitor had the equivalent of £1500 in Canadian dollars stolen. This is another occasional crime perpetrated at football matches: at a Dundee v Rangers game the previous March several spectators were the target for pickpockets including one man who lost £70 and when Rangers were again in Dundee, to play United, a month later, the police gave a warning to intending spectators to be on the alert and to keep their valuables well

(1) This researcher's interest in football crowd behaviour was stimulated at an early age when a "banger" was placed in his jacket pocket and subsequently exploded leaving a hole in his jacket at a Dundee United v Partick Thistle game in 1962.

guarded at the turnstiles, during the game and when they were leaving. According to a police spokesman the most common strategy is for 2 or 3 people to jostle a victim and make their theft.\(^1\) During the Hibs v Dundee United game of November 8, one arrest was made inside the ground and one outside - both for breaches of the peace.

On the 15th of November, 5 breaches of the peace arrests were made at the Dundee United v Aberdeen match, with 4 of them hailing from Aberdeen. At the Hearts v Dundee game the same day, I saw 2 cans and a piece of glass thrown on to the pitch. Fans in the stand enclosure at Tynecastle pointed out the glass thrower and he was led away by police. Only one arrest was made according to official returns - and this an Edinburgh man who splashed water from a puddle onto a Dundee player. In the English Fourth Division, the chairman of Brentford was carrying out an interesting citizen's arrest: "I became embarrassed for my wife and children and other people who were there at the abusive language. So I left the (directors') box and told one youth who was being particularly abusive that he was under citizen's arrest. A policeman then arrived and took him away."\(^2\)

Saturday, 22 November saw 21 arrests centred round the Hibs v Rangers game - 18 inside, 3 outside, and all for breaches of the peace. There were also 2 ejections. During the match, again I watched missiles being thrown on the field as Rangers were beaten 2-1 - several cans, a bottle and a glass tumbler which just missed several policemen and the Hibs.

\(^1\)\textit{Dundee Courier}, 5 April, 1975. Picking pockets at football matches has an organised basis and is hardly an example of football hooliganism.

goalkeeper.

And, on the final Saturday of November, in spite of the usual crowd segregation undertaken by Tayside Police at Tannadice Park, 4 fans were arrested inside the ground at the Dundee United v Celtic game for breaches and 10 arrests were made afterwards. One incident directly after the game involved the smashing of a window of the United manager's car.

We entered December on a somewhat wild note. Four fans were arrested inside Pittodrie, where Grampian Police, too, maintain a policy of segregation, but outside the ground, where Rangers suffered yet another adverse result: "Trouble flared ... as Rangers fans went on the rampage through Aberdeen. They were disgusted by their team's 1-0 defeat at Pittodrie— the first time they had lost a League match in Aberdeen for more than 10 years - and they took their revenge on the city". (1) After the game, shop windows were smashed and vehicles were damaged, rival fans engaged in a "running battle" using bricks taken from a housing development as missiles and a lorry containing a cargo of hay was set alight. Chip shops and pubs delayed their opening times and a dance hall refused to let the fans in so they stood "chanting outside, and throwing glasses and cans of beer in the direction of the police and the dance hall attendants". (2) Fourteen arrests were made in the city of Aberdeen and the Royal Infirmary dealt with about

(1) Sunday Mail, 7 December, 1975.
(2) Ibid.
100 injuries. And it didn't end there: "Unhappy" Rangers fans stopped off at Arbroath on their way home resulting in 5 further arrests: "Gangs of youths, one estimated to be about 60 strong, terrorised the centre of Arbroath ... late on Saturday night and early yesterday. A busload of Rangers fans were attacked by a gang of over 50 local youths in the town's Lordburn car park. The bus was damaged and 2 windows in it smashed. A number of house and shop windows were smashed in the area and motorists reported that their cars had been damaged by vandals walking on their roofs". A senior police officer with the Eastern Division of Tayside Police was reported as saying: "This was one of the roughest nights we have had in Arbroath ... I think if Rangers had won it might have been a different picture".

Meanwhile, the other half of the "Old Firm" were on business in Edinburgh once more. At the Hearts v Celtic game, which kicked off unusually at 1 pm to avoid a clash with a rugby international at nearby Murrayfield, 15 arrests were made inside the ground and 7 outside. Of the 22, 19 were for breaches and 3 for being drunk and incapable. A further 31 fans were ejected and several beer cans thrown at rival groups during the match and fighting broke out after Celtic scored the only goal of the match.

(1) From season 1982-3, Aberdeen F.C. will revise their crowd segregation measures: visiting supporters will be accommodated at the Beach end, the traditional gathering-place for home supporters since the 1970s. The new arrangements will include routes for keeping rival supporters apart after matches.

(2) Dundee Courier, 8 December, 1975.

(3) Ibid.
And the other half of Edinburgh's "Old Firm" was involved in an interrogation by police. A coachload of Hibs supporters on their way to Dundee were quizzed by police after a bar mirror was stolen from a hotel in Auchtermuchty. In the First Division, 3 arrests were made at the St Mirren v Kilmarnock game when fighting broke out in the covered enclosure opposite the stand before the kick off and in the second half.

In England, there was a pitch invasion and some fighting at the Norwich City v West Ham United fixture. Ground attendants were reportedly attacked by West Ham fans.

On 13 December, a Hearts fan was arrested for committing a breach of the peace during the game at Tannadice against Dundee United and Stewart Markland, a Montrose player, was grabbed by a Kilmarnock fan whilst trying to take a throw-in at Rugby Park.

On the Saturday prior to Xmas, acts of hooliganism were reported at the Hibs v Celtic and the St Johnstone v Aberdeen games. At the former, a Glaswegian assaulted 2 brothers (also from Glasgow) as they were leaving the ground. He slashed one of them with a razor, the facial wound requiring 60 stitches. Three other fans were arrested inside the ground for breaches, 2 were arrested outside for similar and 4 fans were ejected. At Perth, 30 football supporters, mostly from Aberdeen, were arrested before, during and after the game although the match attendance was only 3,500.

(1) Unlike the organised activity of picking pockets, this form of "theft" probably falls within the category of "hooliganism".
Only about half a dozen of the arrests were reported at the match itself, but 10 were made before the game when a British Rail special train from Aberdeen arrived at Perth station and many of the remainder were apprehended at a Perth hotel after the match "where trouble erupted and fans broke glasses.\(^1\)

We have to wait until Saturday 27 December to find season 75-76’s first arrest-free day in Scottish senior football (though crowd trouble was reported at the Highland League derby match at Inverness that day). Whether this, in fact, means there were no definable hooligan acts perpetrated at any of Scotland's senior league grounds is, of course, open to dispute but certainly, at the game between Dundee United and Rangers which I attended and which looked on paper to be the most likely trouble spot of the day, there was not discernible crowd hostility. Perhaps the fans were in a tolerant festive mood or were just stodgy with a surfeit of Christmas pudding.

With New Year's Day came the traditional football menu of "derby" matches and larger than usual holiday crowds. Attendances in the Premier League soared over the 100,000 mark for the first time apart from the opening day. Another Edinburgh "derby" brought a 33,000 crowd to Easter Road and saw 6 arrests inside the ground and 3 outside. Seven of the arrests were for breaches and 2 for being drunk and incapable. At Dens Park, where Dundee and Aberdeen were playing, there was one arrest made for a breach of the peace.

\(^1\) *Sunday Post*, 21 December, 1975.
Hearts' meeting with Rangers at Tynecastle on January 3 1976 started with a 2 pm kick-off and ended with only 2 arrests for breaches and 7 ejections. Meanwhile, in the Scottish First Division, there was more trouble at Paisley in an embarrassing incident in the game against Clyde where the son of the president of one of St Mirren's supporters' associations was arrested for fighting on the terracing.

On 10 January, there was a potentially "ugly" scene when Dundee played Hearts. An incident occurred during half-time "when a policeman dived into the crowd to stop a fight. This led to hundreds of young Dundee fans moving out of the covered enclosure to face a large group of Hearts supporters... For a few tense moments the 2 armies stood facing each other. Missiles were thrown then the maroon ranks broke and they scurried for shelter ... The Dundee fans streamed after them, but were stopped by the quick action of the police, who had moved quickly to the spot. During the second half police kept the fans apart."(1) Three arrests, on Edinburgh fans, were in fact made during the game - one for assault and 2 for breaches.

In a frantically exciting game of football at Perth on January 17 Celtic beat St Johnstone by the odd goal in 7. There was considerable activity on the Muirton terracings, too, as 10 arrests were made for a variety of incidents, all involving Celtic fans; one assaulted a Perth man by slapping him on the face, another threw a beer can at home supporters, another refused to move when instructed to do so by police officers, another

---

shouted "IRA Rule" and swore at police and yet another, whom I was to engage quite by chance in a long and interesting conversation on a Celtic supporters' bus over a year later \(^{(1)}\) ran on to the field to congratulate the Celtic goalkeeper. Nearer the mouth of the Tay, the same afternoon, Dundee United supporters indulged in "verbal violence\(^{(2)}\) against their manager when they chanted their displeasure after another unfavourable result, this time a heavy home defeat from Motherwell.

Down in London, Man. Utd fans were hitting the headlines once again. In their drawn game with 'Spurs, 22 arrests were made and 110 people were ejected from the ground.

The next Saturday was the first big round of the Scottish Cup - the third round - when all the top teams were introduced to the competition. Crowds swell in numbers, excitement reaches a peak due to the knock-out basis of the tournament and crowd misbehaviour is quite widespread.

Saturday, January 24, proved little exception to these rules. On paper, the game that looked likeliest to provoke most arrests was the Motherwell v Celtic tie. This, too, proved to the case but the match which excited the blackest media response was the Alloa v Aberdeen game.

At Motherwell, where Celtic were defeated, "fighting broke out behind the goals in the second half and at the end despondent Celtic fans hurled beer cans into the stand. An hour after the game a police spokesman ... said that "more than 50 fans"had been arrested. And he added: "The

\(^{(1)}\) See Ch.18.

figure will be in excess of this before the night is out. They are still coming in all the time". True to his words, the final arrest tally was 68 - arrested before, during and after the game. Their breaches of the peace and disorderly behaviour involved throwing cans and bottles, fighting, threatening other fans, behaving drunkenly, using foul language and running on to the pitch.

At Recreation Park, Alloa, 32 arrests were made, one being on a female. Of the 32, 15 came from Aberdeen and 17 from the Alloa area. "The Scotsman" match reporter wrote:

"Well before the game started it was obvious that there was going to be trouble. In the pubs in the town centre, young Aberdeen supporters, many obviously under-age, seemed hell-bent on getting as drunk as possible.

On the way to, and inside, the ground, they yelled provocative taunts at Alloa supporters, who unfortunately did not have the sense to ignore them. The police should have sensed the dangers.

Twenty minutes before the kick-off, not one police officer was patrolling the perimeter of the pitch. Drunken supporters were free to run on to the park and cavort in the midst of the Alloa players who were warming up.

Shortly before half-time, the missiles began to fly. Even then, there was no effective police presence on the terraces. And supporters could spill on to the track around the pitch at will. Skirmishes became battles, and eventually a riot developed.

This was too much for the majority of decent supporters, many of whom began to leave. Scores clambered out of the ground beyond the north goal on to the railway lines.

An amazing amount of drink was carried into the ground. There were no police checks at the main turnstiles."


The police were widely criticised in the press for their lack of numbers and their insufficient response to a growing situation. When a Central Scotland Police Chief Inspector was reported to say: "The fans behaved terribly. We've never seen anything like this here before" he was making an important statement. The official attendance for Aberdeen's Cup visit was 6,312 whereas Alloa Athletic's average gate is around 600. The club has never tasted football's "big time" and the town itself only has a population of 17,000 - "an obscure haven of tranquility".

Elsewhere, in the Scottish Cup, at Dumfries 3 arrests were made when Queen of the South defeated Premier League St Johnstone, 4 arrests were made when Premier League Dunlee were beaten at home by Falkirk and one Hibs supporter was arrested at Waverley Station where he had gone after the home game against Dunfermline specifically to fight rival supporters. All were for breaches of the peace.

In England, it was F.A. Cup day. At Chelsea v Crystal Palace, where there was a 53,000 crowd, there was a considerable number of fights and arrests and, at Bradford, where City were entertaining little Tooting and Mitcham, the visiting southern fans were subjected to a brick and bottle assault.

(2) In a private conversation with me a Central Police constable attached much of the blame to "Rangers supporters from Tullibody".
The last day of January brought the return of league football and relative calm. Three arrests were made at the Dundee v Rangers game and, at Motherwell, where segregation was being tried for the visit of Hearts, no trouble was reported.

On the first Saturday of February no "trouble" was reported at any of Scotland's senior grounds (though crowd incidents took place at a Junior Cup-tie) and the following Saturday we were back to the Cup once more - for the Fourth Round - and very little reported hooliganism this time. At Hibs v Dundee United game, 3 arrests were made - 2 breaches (with one offender from Edinburgh and the other from Dundee) and the third for the possession of an offensive weapon - but that was the only game afflicted with recorded misbehaviour.

The 21st February brought one breach of the peace arrest at the Aberdeen v Celtic match and at Tynecastle, where Hearts played Dundee United, a fan, who shouted "United!" during a minute's pre-match silence in respect of a Hearts director who had died, was merely ejected from the ground. At Brighton, however, the referee threatened to abandon the game after the crowd at one end of the ground had thrown missiles on the field in the game against Crystal Palace the following mid-week.

The next Saturday saw 3 arrests during the Dundee "derby" at Tannadice and, at Fir Park, Motherwell, bottles and cans were thrown on to the pitch when Rangers had a "goal" disallowed "and the support only settled once Rangers took the lead. (1)

After another series of week day matches, it was back again to Scottish Cup football and, more predictably this time, substantial arrests at all 4 Quarter Final matches. In fact, no fewer than 125 fans appeared in court following incidents during the Cup games. At Dumbarton v Kilmarnock there were 10 arrested, at Montrose v Hearts 19 (15 inside the ground) and at Motherwell v Hibs 14 arrests were made when fighting broke out after Motherwell’s first goal, there were a further 5 arrests inside the ground and one fan was hospitalised when a dart was stuck into his head. Six more supporters were arrested outside the ground.

But even these statistics paled into relative insignificance when compared to the arrest figures and goings-on at Dumfries the same day where the town’s police cells were "bursting at the seams(1) after Rangers five goal defeat of Queen of the South. The "Scotsman" match reporter at Palmerston observed the "play" thus:

"Much of the action took place off the field. The segregation of the supporters failed largely because it was possible to walk from one end of the ground to the other with little or no obstruction. For most of the game there was trouble at the Kilmarnock Road end of the stadium.

Even while the Dumfries chairman ... was appealing for good behaviour, the police were removing troublemakers at that spot and then at the interval, with a major influx of supporters from the other end, there was an exchange of bottles and cans thrown over the heads of 30 or 40 uniformed policemen on the terracing stationed there to prevent such a thing happening.

There was, too, a fire in the stand ...

The fire brigade were called in and it was like a scene from a Laurel and Hardy comedy film in the corridors under the stand after the game. Managers and players

(1) The Scotsman, 8 March, 1976.
were being interviewed with firemen dashing in between with hoses and axes ...

Meanwhile, police were active in the streets of Dumfries countering fights between rival supporters on their way home.

Then came the mad jinking race up the notorious A74 by hundreds of buses, cars and vans in the half light of dusk. The day's outing was not for the faint-hearted.

Thirty-nine arrests were made at the match and 31 in the town later in the day.

The very same afternoon in England, at the Bristol City v Luton game an 18 year old fan was stabbed near the heart.

During the next mid-week in Edinburgh, 2 Cup replays were played after drawn first games. Three arrests were made at Tynecastle and 2 further fans were ejected at the replay with Montrose and, at Easter Road where Hibs and Motherwell played once more, police reported one arrest for the possession of an offensive weapon.

Saturday, March 13, was the date of the next Hearts v Hibs meeting. There were 24 arrests made, mostly for breaches of the peace including one on a 16 year old who threw a marshmallow into the crowd, while 18 supporters were ejected. At Pittodrie, 2 arrests were made for breaches of the peace during the game against Dundee.

The Hearts v Montrose replay had ended in another draw and so a third

(1) Ibid.
game between the clubs was played at neutral Muirton Park in Perth on Monday the 15th resulting in an eventual win for Hearts and a further score of 6 arrests. Over £100 was believed to have been stolen from supporters by a group of pick-pockets operating at the match.

The following Saturday, in Scotland 2 arrests were made at the Dunbee v Celtic game and in England over 40 supporters were injured and 82 were ejected from the ground when Manchester United visited Newcastle.

On Wednesday, March 24, 2 arrests were made for breaches and one for being drunk and incapable at Easter Road where Scotland were playing the Netherlands in an under-23 international before 32,000.

The next Saturday brought no "apparent" acts of hooliganism in Scotland although a linesman was bitten by an over-zealous police dog at the St Johnstone v Rangers game.

On April 3rd, the Ayr goalkeeper was hit by a stone after he had brought off a save in the dying seconds of the match against Dundee at Dens Park with the home side 2-1 down. At the Hibs v Rangers game, 9 arrests were made inside the ground and one outside and at neutral Hillsbrough in Sheffield during an F.A. Cup semi-final between Manchester United and Derby an incident on the field provoked a field invasion by spectators.

There was one arrest before the game for breaking a wine-shop window, one arrest during the game for throwing an empty whisky bottle at the home 'keeper and 5 arrests after the game when a brick was thrown through
a window of the home dressing room with the flying glass slightly cutting a player at the Dundee United v Celtic game where the Tannadice side triumphed by 3 goals to 2 on the 10th of April. One Dundee United player, who was later to become a member of the Scottish Working Party on football crowd behaviour, also collected 62p in coins which had been thrown at him during the game. At the Hearts v Motherwell game the same afternoon one fan was ejected.

The Aberdeen v Rangers game the next Wednesday evening involved one arrest for a breach, one for an assault and one for malicious mischief.

The English Good Friday card included the Second Division "derby" between Bristol Rovers and Bristol City where, after the final whistle and a no-scoring draw, rival supporters faced each other in the centre of the pitch.

On April 17th, a Hearts supporter was arrested when he kicked a Dundee United supporter "in pure anger" when United scored one of their goals in a meeting between the clubs at Tannadice. While in the cell at police H.Q. the youth maliciously broke a window pane. A Dundee United supporter was arrested, too, at the end of the same match when he threw a half-brick over a wall at a group of Hearts supporters. The same afternoon in Perth, 3 arrests were made as Dundee fans smashed car windscreens and shop windows on their way back to the railway station after the match with St Johnstone.

(1) Dundee Courier, 19 April, 1976.
At another "derby" match in Dundee on Wednesday 21st April, several fights broke out on the pitch at the end of the game and in the city centre afterwards one fan was arrested for shouting "United!" at the top of his voice when asked by police to "desist"; as was his friend when he went to his aid to prevent arrest. At Easter Road, where Hibs played Celtic, there were 6 arrests for breaches outside the ground while inside there was one arrest for an assault and another for a breach.

On the Saturday, there was one arrest for malicious mischief and one for a breach at the Dundee United v Rangers match.

The next Monday evening 7 people were arrested, later to appear in court after a Celtic v Rangers game, one admitting challenging people to fight and a breach of the peace.

Saturday, May 1, was Cup Final Day, the show game of the season. Over 85,000 watched Rangers beat Hearts with 32 arrests made inside the ground and a further 17 outside.

The following mid-week the few loose ends of the league season were tidied up with the completion of the outstanding fixtures. Hearts played Celtic and there were 9 arrests and 7 ejections. Eight of the arrests were for breaches while the other was for stealing the match ball. At Ibrox, where 45,000 turned up to celebrate Rangers' League and Cup

(1) Dundee Courier, 21 April, 1976.
double and Dundee United took a point to save them from relegation, one arrest was made at the Copland Road "end" of the ground for breach of the peace.

The 1975-76 football league season was over, but there were still a few extremely important matches to be played with British involvement. On the 5th May, Anderlecht of Belgium beat West Ham United 4-2 in Brussels in the European Cup Winners Cup Final. As the jubilant Belgian side undertook a lap of honour, a stone thrown by a West Ham fan hit the Anderlecht reserve 'keeper in the face. Doubtless, memories of Ostend were evoked.

One week later, the European Cup Final between Bayern Munich and St Etienne was played in Glasgow. There were no arrests and never was the behaviour of any squad of football fans so eulogised (indeed romanticised) by the Scottish press as it was in the treatment of the visiting German and, more especially, the French supporters.\(^{(1)}\)

A few days later came Hampden's second big game of the week - for many inevitably the game of the season - Scotland's meeting with England. In spite of the fact there was a crowd limit of 85,000, the official attendance was 85,165. The police were generally happy with the fans' behaviour - Scotland won 2-1 - and "only" 30 arrests were made.

One week later came the European Nations Cup meeting between Wales and Yugoslavia at Cardiff. The East German referee disallowed a Welsh "goal" and play was stopped for 5 minutes as Welsh fans hurled cans on

\(^{(1)}\) See also Ch.6.
to the field. A small number of Welshmen also negotiated the surrounding walls and fences and reached the field of play where "scuffles" broke out with the Yugoslav players. During the invasion, a fan aimed a metal flagpole, apparently at the referee, but it stuck in a policeman's back causing minor injury. After the match, which ended Wales' European ambitions the referee was escorted from the field by 20 policemen.
Newspaper Reaction to an Edinburgh Derby Match

There was typical press reaction and comment to follow a Hearts v Hibs game at Tynecastle Park, Edinburgh that I attended on Wednesday evening, 26 January, 1977. This match, an all-ticket affair, had been thrice postponed from New Year’s Day because of adverse weather conditions. As has already been pointed out, both on and off the field, 'derby' games are generally more passionate than others. That morning 'The Scotsman' had written in anticipation of the game:

'It is a fact of life that some matches are more important than others. Not for any monetary consideration or because they can decide a championship or settle a relegation issue. They have extra meaning for those involved - managers, directors, players and public .. because the outcome can mean the difference between days of cowled misery or time spent in a mood of upright, proud, benevolence .. Local rivalries, prejudices, desires and fears will be in play this evening when no greater hurt can be imagined than that of the loser who throws away the scarf he had earlier flaunted so brazenly. He is finished with his team, or at least until the next time ..' (1)

With such sentiments in mind, a crowd of just over 24,000 turned up for the match which was scheduled to have a 7.30 p.m. kick-off. Allowing for the fact that every continent has its Swiss, there were perhaps a thousand spectators present who might be termed 'neutrals'. Of the rest, perhaps 15,000 were Hearts fans and the remainder Hibs supporters. I arrived inside the ground about ten minutes before the official match start to find that the young supporters of both teams had claimed their usual territorial rights - the Hearts 'vocal choir' (in the majority by far) under the main enclosure opposite the stand, with Hibs' chanting fans behind the goal at the 'school end' and in a small section of the 'Hearts enclosure' which (unusually) has a 90° angle to it. The rival groups were already well-established and faced each other in song, chant and gesticulation; a broken column of policemen was making a half-hearted attempt at maintaining a segregation line between the groups. The game eventually kicked off seven minutes late, by which time I had seen 8 young people removed by police from the crowd and marched ceremoniously round the track towards the stand and there had been one 'surge' of the rival groups towards each other which petered out at the police line and came to nothing. I couldn't help thinking that if a couple of hundred young fans on each side really wanted a 'pitched battle' there would be very little a dozen or so policemen could do to prevent/
prevent them - the terraces would indeed be 'running with blood'. (1) This, therefore, raises the presumption that even these noisy young fans for the most part do not really want a direct confrontation; rather it may be enough that they are seen to want one with their actions stopping just short of collision. Most of the 8 'removals' followed this 'charge' which occurred a few minutes after the game should have kicked off. It makes little sense to stagger a kick-off several minutes to let the late fans queuing outside in on time and (presumably) to prevent them from manifesting annoyance when the fans inside the ground (who left their homes in good time) are becoming increasingly frustrated when the scheduled starting-time is not being met. Here it might be argued that the tension was building up gradually towards the kick-off but that the ritual broke down with the unexpected delay.

During a goal-less and extremely boring first half of football, I counted a further 17 young fans being taken from the terracing by police. Two cans were also thrown by Hearts supporters into the Hibs crowd. The singing and the chanting had mainly come from the young Hearts fans, their usual mixture of pro-Hearts and anti-Hibs, pro-Protestant and anti-Catholic. However, in spite of the considerable religious/

(1) Peter Marsh, Understanding Aggro, B.B.C./Open Univ. Videocassette.
religious content in the Hearts fans' repertoire, their utterings contained, in pro rata terms, much less religious venom than their Glasgow Rangers counterparts and the Hearts fans sang much more proportionately in specific exhortation of their team. (1)

During the half-time interval, a schoolboys' penalty kick competition took place between Tynecastle High (wearing Hearts strips) and Forrester's High, who were clad in green and white. Naturally, the respective fans knew which side to cheer, and this perhaps took some of the 'sting' out of a period of the match that is often extremely difficult from the point of view of crowd control. It also served as a continuation of the ritual of baiting and taunting the opposition.

As the schoolboy footballers left the field, two cans were thrown by Hibs supporters into the Hearts group. The Hearts support retaliated with a can and a bottle (the latter smashing against the enclosure roof and showering the fans below with glass splinters).

(1) During a Rangers v Celtic game at Ibrox two months previously, I had counted only one chant that was blatantly in support of the Rangers team, while as many as 14 different songs and chants were delivered to intimidate the Celtic fans at the other end of the stadium.
During the second half, a further 17 fans were removed from the crowd, the occasional lit cigarette end was flicked into the rival group and I counted 19 cans being thrown in one direction or the other. The cans were either beer cans or coke cans and some were filled, thus making them heavier and more dangerous. Obviously the police would find it impossible to prevent everyone taking cans into the ground, but the only check that was being carried out on approach to the turnstiles was on those fans obviously carrying fat carrier bags. The remarkable thing was that surprisingly little damage was being done to people in spite of the number of 'missiles', though three fans were seen to be hurt and attended by ambulance men and a fourth was stretchered away.

There were a further five 'surges' of the young fans towards their rivals during the second half and these, above all else, prompted the most 'removals' by police - especially the 'surge' that originated with the Hearts fans in 69 minutes when Hibs scored the only goal of a poor game. The 'barks' of these 'charges' are certainly worse than their 'bites'; fans rush forward as if they have completely lost control of their senses and are intent, overcoming any obstacles, to get at their opponents. But, in fact, the 'direct' physical confrontation comes to nothing; the few sturdy constables easily manage to prevent contact between/
between the rivals and both groups return, amidst great fluster, without a blow being struck, to their original station. It is as if the entire set-to is a demonstration of ritual bravado on both sides and that, even without a police presence, the toothless charge might dissipate at the crucial moment. Of course, the policemen help the fans in their belief that they would surely have 'booted that Hibee bastard's heid in if it wisnae for the polis'. Thus, the police may have a very important role to play in the enactment of the drama, though any overacting on their part may precipitate 'real violence'. Apart from this (or a similar) breakdown in ritual, there seems little chance of anyone being seriously hurt in such a 'stampede', unless one is 'unwittingly caught up in it and swept off one's feet - as I nearly was during the first one; I quickly learned to grab hold of a crush barrier for support. (1)

The Hibs fans, sensing that victory on the field had been clinched, started to drift for the exit with ten minutes still to play. The Hearts fans, seeing this, were obliged to make after them and a few score managed easily to break the police line before it became more taut. I suspect that those Hearts fans who were restrained by the police were probably:

(1) Five years later and standing in the 'notorious' Chelsea 'shed' I was actually knocked over when the exuberant home crowd celebrated the first goal. I was helped back to my feet and asked if I was alright.
probably the most satisfied, especially those whose mates saw them being restrained.

The evening had witnessed a fairly typical Edinburgh 'derby' match, both on and off the field. Hibs had won 1-0; 45 fans in all had been led away with a policeman holding either arm; 24 cans, 1 bottle and several cigarettes had been thrown and a few people had been injured. The official police tally in fact turned out to be that 17 fans had been arrested (2 outside the ground), and 30 had merely been ejected. Most of the arrests had presumably been made for can throwing, using foul and/or abusive language or for looking as if you were about to hit someone - instances of conduct 'likely to lead to breaches of the peace'. Everything was largely as expected; the 'trouble' had been almost entirely confined to the young, chanting rival bands of fans in their clearly defined parts of the terracing; even the official returns were par for the course - the last Hearts v Hibs game at Tynecastle had yielded 24 arrests and 18 ejections from a 19,000 crowd and the 'derby' before that 22 arrests and 29 ejections from an attendance of 25,000.

The following day, the press had its comments to make on terracing events. The 'Daily Record',(1) beneath the headline/

headline '15 Arrests during Big Match Clash', wrote that 'teenage gang violence flared' at the match and police had to 'wade' into the covered section of the ground, that 'one person was trampled – and several others knocked unconscious'.

The 'Record' went on to report that about 50 'struggling' youngsters were 'dragged' from the ground. 'Young' they most certainly were, but not one of the fans I had seen 'removed' (there were 45 in this category) could be considered to have put up a struggle and certainly none had to be 'dragged' to the pavilion. Again, as with Queens Park Rangers, we find this easy usage of the linkage with 'violence' when there is not necessarily any direct connection between the numbers 'removed' and the amount of violence.

On the same day, the new tabloid 'Scottish Daily Express' made another frequent and convenient media error, by confusing ejections with arrests. In its match report, the 'Express' wrote '..an estimated 30 supporters were arrested'.

Glenn Gibbons, in his match report in the 'Daily Mail', expressed a poor opinion of the punter on the terracing:

'The match was seen by fewer than the anticipated 30,000 for two reasons. First, during the 25 days sandwiched between the original and the actual date of the match, many paid up fans lost their tickets. Second, a fair proportion of those who/

who did pass through the turnstiles were so overcome by exuberance that they were removed by the police even before the teams took the field'. (1) The 'fair proportion' who were in fact removed turned out to be 47 out of 24,068, which is 0.2% (2) or one in every five hundred, a figure which stands comparison in a 'derby' game with the one in every thousand average for London grounds over a season already mentioned.

And the local evening newspaper reported on its front page that during the Edinburgh derby 'fighting broke out periodically between rival factions as they waited for the game to start and also during the match. But the worst trouble came shortly after Hibs scored the only goal midway through the second half'. (3) However, the newspaper also reported that the police had been relatively happy with the situation. The police spokesman, as if echoing the sentiments expressed at West Ham and Queens Park Rangers, was reported to have pointed out that 'The fans were ejected in an effort to prevent trouble, and we feel that this action was fairly successful. There was a crowd of just more than 24,000 at the match, and although there was some trouble it was not as serious as many reports have suggested'. (3) He added


(2) Even this percentage can be 'reduced'; only 45 fans were removed from the ground (0.19%) and only 8 were in fact removed before the kick-off (0.03%).

that there had also been a minor incident in Edinburgh's West End as the fans made for home after the match but that this was quickly dealt with: 'It is the same as usual, with most of the offenders in the 16 - 18 age group. They have been charged mainly with breach of the peace offences'.

The same newspaper, however, under the headline 'Terror on the Terracing' the following day, (1) exhorted readers to buy the Evening News' sports edition that Saturday evening where 'terror on the terracing' would be investigated and one of their reporters would give an 'on-the-spot description' of what went on among rival teenagers at Wednesday's Hearts v Hibs game. Reporter Ian MacNiven, who had somehow got back from Tynecastle to his desk unscathed, wrote:

'. . . the arrests don't tell the whole story. I was standing in the enclosure 50 minutes before kick-off time and during that period at least 25 offenders were removed from the terracing by the police. Indeed when only a few hundreds were inside the ground scores of youngsters dived for cover behind the McLeod Street goal after missiles had been thrown by rival sets of supporters. You can safely say that a big proportion of teenagers now go to football matches just for the thrill and excitement of clashing with rival fans. Forget about the football, let's get on with the aggro seems to be the motto of so many at the moment. For that's the only explanation for troublemakers being removed long before the action on the field begins.

The police spokesman added that many of those removed from the terracing are not charged because the evidence against them is not strong enough to prosecute. In many cases they are led out and there is nothing the police can do to stop them coming back in again at some other part of the ground'.

This latter problem of those ejected seeking and obtaining re-admission to the football ground during the same game is a common one but is hardly applicable to an all-ticket game where the ticket or a significant part thereof can be taken up and a strict 'no re-admission' rule enforced until the last fifteen minutes or so when the gates are thrown open.

J. White, Esq.,
Department of Law,
Napier College,
Sighthill Court,
EDINBURGH.

Dear Mr. White,

Thank you for your letter of 9th December.

I am sorry that I was unable to accede to your request to be present in the Police Detention Rooms at Easter Road and Tynecastle Parks during the recent football matches when Rangers and Celtic were the visiting teams. This decision, I may say, was taken solely in the interests of those persons who were arrested and who are entitled, as you will no doubt appreciate, to a degree of privacy when being formally dealt with within a temporary Police Station. It is not the practice to allow any person to be present on such an occasion unless the accused has made a specific request, ie for a legal representative.

I am, however, not averse to affording you some assistance with your research into football hooliganism and I am sure that there is much to be learned from discussing the subject with those of my Senior Officers who are most experienced in this field. If you wish to pursue this particular approach then I shall leave it to you to contact the Divisional Chief Superintendents concerned at the West End Police Station or at Leith Police Station so that mutually suitable times for such discussions can be arranged.

I trust you will appreciate my position.

Yours sincerely,

(R. Sim)
Assistant Chief Constable
APPENDIX D

Questionnaire Administered to Police Officers

NAPIER COLLEGE OF COMMERCE AND TECHNOLOGY

DEPARTMENT OF LAW

1. How long have you been in the police force?
   What is your rank?
   In what forces have you served?

2. Have you ever been on duty at a football match?
   How often? (please indicate as best you can and where)

3. Describe the function and role of a police officer at a football match.

4. a) Describe a typical day you have spent working at a football match
       (before, during and after the match)

       b) Any unusual incidents you can recall?

5. Assess the facilities offered to the police by the football club. Do
   the clubs, from your experience, provide adequate stewarding?
   How do you see the role of the steward?

6. At football games, what use is and should be made of a) women officers;
   b) mounted policemen; c) special constables?
7. How many arrests have you made before, during and after a match? Please describe.

8. How many ejections of spectators have you made from football matches? Please describe. Do you keep a written record of those ejected?

9. What criteria do you use in deciding whether to arrest or eject an offender? What guidance or instruction have you been given or are you given in the use of this discretion? Does the way in which you think the later stages of the criminal justice system will deal with the football offender influence your decision on how to deal with him?

10. Apart from arrest or ejection, how else have you dealt with football offenders?

11. Do you find the other spectators to be helpful or obstructive to police work? Please explain. Do spectators report misbehaviour to you? Do they isolate or indicate offenders?
12. From your experience, what are the most frequent types of misbehaviour at football grounds?

13. Do any fixtures pose special problems for the police?

14. How does the football ground's situation, layout and other physical features affect policing?
   How might football grounds be improved?

15. What do you think of crowd segregation at football grounds?

16. Do you see policing football games as any different from other police work?
   If so, in what way?

17. Do you find policing at football games to be:-
   a) difficult/easy;  b) unenjoyable/boring/enjoyable;  c) dangerous/safe?
   Please explain.
   Any other way you would describe football policing?
18. Do the police have sufficient powers at football grounds?

19. What causes 'football hooliganism'?

20. Do you think the media (T.V., newspapers etc) fairly represent what goes on at football matches?

Please add any other remarks you wish to make on the topic of policing football matches.

Thank you for your help.
Court Study No. 1

The "moderate sheriff" interviewed in Chapter 19 was on the bench the Monday morning after the very Hearts v Celtic match he feared. A 16 year old Glaswegian pleaded guilty to a breach of the peace at the match. He had pushed through the crowd waving a Celtic banner, had been warned by police to stop, but had continued pushing and was arrested. His "crime" seemed to me to be one of "bad manners" but he was fined £30 payable by instalments of £4 per week after the court had established the following information: he was an apprentice mechanic earning £15 per week; he was single and lived with his parents; and he had no previous convictions. The sheriff declared he would take a lenient view because the defendant was a first offender and it was "not a very serious matter of football vandalism".

Court Study No. 2

At the same court, an 18 year old from Livingstone pleaded guilty to having an offensive weapon, a knife, in his possession "without lawful authority or reasonable excuse" outside Tynecastle. At the turnstiles before the match police told him he could not take drink into the ground. (1)

(1) This was prior to the Criminal Justice (Scotland) Act 1980.
so he produced a knife and proceeded to open his bottle with it. The sheriff was annoyed that the knife was not produced in court, expressed the view that the dimensions of the knife were relevant and recalled the case 25 minutes later. The knife was then produced, the sheriff decided it was a "serious" one, heard that the accused had 3 previous convictions and remanded him in custody for a fortnight for social inquiry and borstal reports. When he returned to court he was fined £100.

**Court Study No.3**

On a different occasion, the same sheriff sat in judgment over supporters arrested at a Hearts v Rangers match. One of the accused was a 19 year old from Lanarkshire who admitted he was one of a group of Rangers fans who threw a bottle into a group of rival supporters thus committing a breach of the peace. The bottle did not hit anyone. He was a labourer, single and had no previous convictions. The sheriff appreciated the latter fact but held the offence to be "serious". After some verbal confusion where the sheriff understood the accused to say he earned £10 from which he gave his father £15! (the accused, expecting to be fined was in fact "volunteering" to pay instalments of £10), it was eventually established that his weekly wage was £30. He was fined £75 at £10 per week.

---

(1) Nine fans were stabbed at a Notts. Forest v Chelsea game the same weekend, events that were highly publicised.
After another Hearts v Celtic game and before a different sheriff, the accused was asked, "Do you plead guilty or not guilty?" (to a breach of the peace). The accused clearly did not hear properly or understand and the sheriff, losing his temper, shouted the same question once more. He pleaded guilty and the fiscal eventually revealed that he had no record (the setting though a familiar one to the sheriff was therefore new to the accused). According to the fiscal the accused was one of a crowd told by the police to enter the ground by a certain gate. The accused refused, broke through a police cordon and was "insolent to the police." The sheriff asked the accused what he had to say for himself ("Nothing"), his age ("Nearly 18"), whether he was working (he was) and what he did for himself ("Apprentice"). The sheriff then asked (expecting an answer): "You look a proper idiot standing there, don't you?" When the accused made no reply, the sheriff repeated: "I said

It is suggested that on occasion football supporters are charged with and convicted of indiscretions that have a dubious legal basis. This is especially true of vague common law concepts like breach of the peace. Defence solicitors (where they exist) do not always question the competency of charges either at the court of first instance or on appeal when such would seem justified. The recent English cases of Brudzinski and Arscott demonstrate what can be achieved by meticulous lawyers; in the former case, the English Court of Appeal agreed that a citizen has a right to assault a police officer who unlawfully attempts to stop and detain him (thus dismissing a charge of assault under the Police Act 1964); in the latter case, the same court agreed that a citizen could not incite a breach of the peace where only police officers were present since policemen are duty bound to keep the peace (thus dismissing a common law charge of using abusive words and behaviour likely to incite a breach of the peace). See the Sunday Times, 7 March 1982.
you look a proper idiot standing there". The accused eventually agreed, showing suitable degradation. He was then asked whether he had lost a day's pay coming to court and was told that he had not as he was on holiday. He was nevertheless admonished.

Court Study No. 5

After a Hearts v Celtic game, a 22 year old from Barrhead admitted shouting and swearing at rival fans and committing a breach of the peace. He had been warned by the police to "desist" to which he replied, "I can take any of these bastards any time". He was drunk and made no reply when cautioned. His solicitor said he was a labourer, single, earned £40 per week of which he gave £8 to his folks. The sheriff, on being told that this was the sixth time he had been in court for "some sort of breach of the peace" and that £15 of a previous fine was outstanding\(^1\), remarked that this would be the last time he would be fined and imposed sentence of £120 fine, payable at £10 per week, with the alternative of 90 days prison.

Court Study No. 6

A 17 year old Glasgow youth pleaded guilty to brandishing a bottle and challenging others to fight (i.e. a breach of the peace) before a Hearts

\(^1\) Not "overdue".
v Celtic game and to attempting to escape from police custody. According to the fiscal, it appeared to the police that a fight was about to take place but on their approach the group ran away. Police arrested the accused in a shop doorway where he was "very unco-operative" with them. He was found to have a laceration at the back of his head (cause unknown) and had been drinking but was not drunk. His solicitor said he was an apprentice boilermaker, lived with his father and sister, earned £15 per week and paid £7 board and £2 in fares; his client (in spite of his guilty plea) did not try to escape from the police station, "he just moved to talk to a friend". The sheriff fined him £45 on the first charge and £15 on the second, payable at £3 per week, under supervision.

Court Study No. 7

The accused, a 19 year old Hibs fan, pleaded guilty to causing a breach of the peace by throwing an object into a crowd of rival Hearts fans. The police at the time did not see exactly what the object was but the accused told them it was a bottle-top. When the sheriff asked the accused what type of bottle-top was thrown, he replied: "The top off a Pomagne bottle". The sheriff, perhaps displaying culture-clash, was none the wiser and relied on the sheriff-clerk's information that this meant it was made of plastic. He was fined £25 (at £5 per week), the sheriff having recovered confidence sufficiently to declare that it would have been more had it been a "more serious object".
This last court study is reported in greater detail. I had attended a Stirling Albion v Celtic Cup match on 5 October 1977 and stood amongst the young Celtic fans behind one of the goals. During the course of the game, the Celtic fans had occasion to sing, "If you hate the Stirling polis, clap your hands". At the end of the chant a member of the crowd shouted clearly, "They're a' a bunch o' poofs" and the crowd laughed. Two constables at the back of the enclosure arrested a young man from a group of four a few yards away from me - it could just as easily have been me. The arrestee, in whose general direction I had been looking, had been neither singing, clapping nor shouting. The shout came from behind him and to his left. It was a clear case of the police officers resenting the song and comment and making an indiscriminate arrest in retaliation. His friends looked as shocked as I was, and protested to one police officer on the track. This was the sole arrest made at the match and my efforts to follow the arrestee as he was processed through the system left me wearied and disillusioned. I despaired for the effect the ordeal had for the innocent young supporter if this was how I felt. And I despaired for the character of the 2 arresting officers. If it is the proud boast of the Canadian Mounties that they always get their man, it was tempting to conclude that some Scottish officers will settle for any man. I wrote first to Central Scotland Police, then to the Sheriff Clerk's Office, to find out more about the charge and the date of trial. Their replies follow:
John White Esq., LL.B. Dip.Crim.(Cantab)
Department of Law
Napier College
Sighthill Court
EDINBURGH

Dear Sir

I refer to your letter of 15 October 1977, when you sought details of the number of persons arrested at the recent football match between Stirling Albion and Glasgow Celtic Football Clubs, and would advise that spectators on that occasion were well behaved. Only one youth, aged 16 years, was arrested on a charge of breach of the peace and this despite an estimated attendance of approximately 9,000.

The Central Scotland Police do have disorder at football matches from time to time but I would emphasise that this is not confined to spectators from any particular part of Scotland nor yet to any particular age group.

Yours faithfully

[Signature]
Deputy Chief Constable

all communications to be addressed to the Chief Constable
Dear Sir

I am in receipt of your letter of 24 November regarding your research project into football hooliganism and in particular the 16 year old youth arrested at the Stirling Albion v Glasgow Celtic football match on 5 October last.

The youth concerned, whose date of birth is 20/12/60, was charged that "you did, on 5 October 1977 within Annfield Park Football Ground, Stirling, conduct yourself in a disorderly manner and commit a breach of the peace". In court on 6 October he pled not guilty, trial was fixed for 11 January 1978 and the youth was ordained to appear for trial without requiring to find bail but under penalty of £10 in case of failure to appear at the trial diet.

The papers available to me provide no information as to time of arrest nor of details of the alleged breach of the peace.

Yours faithfully

[Signature]

Sheriff Clerk
D Waddell
Having just ascertained that the Stirling football "offender" would be brought to trial on Wednesday, 11 January 1978, I phoned the sheriff-clerk to try to find out roughly what time the trial might be - he told me there were 5/6 trials arranged for that (the next) day but he didn't know when that particular trial would take place. I cancelled my 10 am tutorial, cut my 9 am lecture short and drove to Stirling where the court sat from 10 am ("10.15 if the roads are bad because the sheriff has to come from Edinburgh"). I arrived in the sheriff courthouse at Stirling (a large one-tiered hall with raftered ceiling and 5 wall partitions) at 10.40 am. One or two preliminary pleas were made and discussed before the court settled down to consider 2 main cases. The first was where 2 neighbours got themselves in a tangle and one ended up on an assault charge when the other went to stop him allegedly beating his drum - "not proven" was the verdict of the woman sheriff.

The second case started before noon and involved a whole procession of housewife witnesses in a case about an allegedly fraudulent milkman. There were so many witnesses, including 2 giving complicated bookkeeping evidence, that the trial went on for ages. It was interrupted by the lunch recess at 1 pm.

Sitting behind me in court in the morning were a youth with a well-dressed bearded man alongside him (his father). This was the youth who had been arrested at the match. At least I hadn't missed him. He was extremely anxious looking, nursed a heavy cold and left the courtroom about once every quarter of an hour. He lunched at a nearby Chinese restaurant with his father and 3 friends he had been with at the match. They were in court
to act as witnesses on his behalf.

The courtroom door was opened to me in the afternoon by the court usher whom I asked

J W: Is it possible to find out when a particular case will be tried?

Usher: What case is it?

J W: One involving a football hooligan.

Usher: It's coming up now.

Unfortunately the milkman case took longer than was anticipated and continued throughout the afternoon. The youth and his father, now sitting in front of me, were clearly getting tired of waiting. At around quarter to four, the sheriff, after consulting the fiscal and the milkman's solicitor decided there would be no time for the football hooligan case. His solicitor was summoned and she told him she didn't want to start his case if it wouldn't be finished. The milkman's trial was stopped awhile and the youth brought to the dock where the sheriff apologised for keeping him there all day, told him he'd have to come back and was given a new date by the sheriff-keeper - 6TH MARCH at 10 AM!

I left with youth, father and his 3 friends clustered in discussion outside the courtroom, presumably in agreement that it had been a wasted day.

Having been informed by the procurator-fiscal's office (following a chance phone call) that the trial was to be on the 2nd of March - not the 6th -
I arrived at Stirling once more at 9.55 am, hoping for better luck this time. The same bar officer as before was in evidence: he stood half-way up the entrance staircase, approached would-be passers by and sent them to their proper places.

I told him I'd been here before and that I had come back today as the case had been put off last time - perhaps he remembered me - I was interested in the case involving the football fan. I mentioned the accused's name - given to me by the procurator fiscal's office - and he ushered me into the same court as before, telling me it was O.K. to take notes.

Stanley and his father were already sitting there. Stanley was wearing the same green suit and his father was dressed in the same leather jacket.

I sat down a couple of rows behind them. There were a few others in the public benches - other accused and their friends and relatives.

A young solicitor (not the same one as last time) came over to Stanley and his father and discussed a few things with them - from what I could hear, it shouldn't take long before their case was heard and he explained a few points of court procedure. He then went to the dock of the court where he talked and joked with the fiscal, sheriff-clerk, other young solicitors (what does the accused think of such social interactions?)

Stanley was up to his tricks again. He couldn't seem to sit still in the court for any length of time. Having obtained a bunch of keys (car?) from his father he left the court yet again, returning after a few minutes.
At 10.20 am, the court rose and a male sheriff appeared. He heard 3 cases (guilty pleas and passing judgment on previously deferred sentences) before Stanley's name was called. He was down at the front of the court in a flash only to be told by the sheriff to "have a seat just now". Stanley made his way back to his seat alongside his father.

Another 3 cases were heard before the sheriff adjourned at 11 am. His solicitor came back to inform Stanley and his Dad that the trial would commence soon and he shouldn't have long to wait. A female journalist left the courtroom (the whim of a journalist therefore determines whether a particular case might be reported in a newspaper, an event of enormous consequence for the accused).

The public benches filled up with a fresh batch of interested parties and another usher asked people (including me) what they were there for: I just shook my head.

The court was reconvened at 11.20 and Stanley's case was the third case called.

His name was called, he went forward, the clerk asked him the usual questions - name etc. The sheriff asked; "You're still pleading Not Guilty, Mr Smith .. is that right?" He said he was (how many might have changed to guilty pleas in the 2 month interim?) The clerk said: "Sit down, please".

The procurator-fiscal called the first witness for the Crown: Police Constable Barron (who had been the more eager of the 2 arresting constables) Both constables had, of course, to sit through the 11 January court session.
P C Barron took the oath, declared he was 25 years old and had 5 years' police service.

The procurator-fiscal asked him if on October 5 (5 months previously) he had been on duty at Annfield Park for the Stirling Albion v Celtic game and whether the game had kicked off at 7.30 pm. He replied affirmatively and that he had been on duty on the North terracing with P C Carswell amongst the crowd. Shortly after the kick-off one person that he couldn't see, was shouting and swearing at them - "Let's get the fuckin' polis", "Black and white shite" and "Kill the cunts". Since they couldn't see who it was he and P C Carswell "took observations". At c. 7.45 they heard the same voice shout, "The Stirling police are a set of poofs" after an "If you hate the Stirling polis, clap your hands" chant, while at the same time gesticulating with his arms - it was the accused's voice. He was 10-15 ft away in a group of several youths. P C Barron pointed Stanley out (an easy task as he alone was in the dock) as that lad and said that it was definitely him that was shouting.

According to P C Barron, Stanley was then apprehended, cautioned and charged with a breach of the peace, the process taking c. 5 minutes. When arrested, the P C claimed Stanley said, "Oh, come on, I didn't mean that".

P C Barron was then examined by the defence solicitor. He was asked if the match kick-off was delayed. The constable agreed it might have been 7.35 pm it started (correct).

Sol: You couldn't at first see the person who was shouting. Was it only one person?
P C Barron:  One voice stuck out though other people were shouting other things.

The P C reiterated that before he was arrested, the accused had his arms in the air, was half-turned towards the P Cs and was diagonally turned away from the field of play.

Sol:  Was the accused the only person in the area with fair hair?

P C:  No, there were others.

Sol:  Didn't he form part of a group of 3 or 4 apart from the main group?

P C:  Yes, the crowd was thinner there.

Sol:  Are you not mistaken that it was the accused who shouted the remark?

P C:  No.

Sol:  Did you speak to any of his friends?

P C:  I was not approached, nor was my colleague, but his friends did go to the police station.

Sol:  Are you certain of his reply?

P C:  Yes, I noted it in my book.

The sheriff interrupted to ask the P C what was the actual charge. He replied that on the terracing the accused had "conducted himself in a disorderly manner and committed a breach of the peace".

Sol:  Could it have been that the shouting was coming from behind the accused?

P C:  No, he was near the back.

Sol:  What was the accused's reaction when arrested?

P C:  He said, "What's this for?"

Sol:  He expressed surprise?

P C:  Yes.

Sol:  Did you get the impression he was nervous about being arrested?
P C : No. (J W - At the time he looked red-faced and nervous to me).

The sheriff again interrupted to ask whether anyone else was shouting abuse.
The P C answered that he could hear other shouts further away.

Sher : Was the abuse being given to the police generally?
P C : Yes.

The solicitor finally asked the police officer whether he went back to the
terracing after the arrest. He replied he was instructed to do so. On
returning there was similar shouting from further into the crowd.

The procurator-fiscal then re-examined the police constable:

P F : The accused, when arrested, said to you, "What's this for?"
P C : Yes.
P F : What did you reply to him?
P C : I told him it was for shouting and swearing.
P F : Did you mention that he had called you a "shower of poofs?"
P C : That is possible.
P F : Is such a chant as "If you hate the Stirling polis, clap
your hands" heard often at football matches?
P C : Yes, it is common.
P F : Do they clap their hands?
P C : Yes.

The police constable left the witness box to be replaced by his shorter,
less experienced colleague, P C Carswell. P C Carswell was aged 19 and
had 14 months police service under his belt.

P C Carswell said he was on duty in the terracing with P C Barron on the evening in question. There was an incident soon after the start of the match.

P C : I heard shouts of "Let's get the fuckin' police", "Black and white shites" and "Kill the cunts".

The constable couldn't see who was shouting these remarks, but he "took observations" in the crowd and heard the accused shout that the police were a "shower of poofs" and also "Let's get the bastards". He knew it was the same person as before because the voice was similar and came from the same place. When asked by the fiscal how he could differentiate this voice from the others, he replied that the voice in question was "louder and sharper": "The accused had his arms raised as if inciting the crowd towards us". The P C then pointed to Stanley as that person.

The accused, he said, was standing about 10-15 feet away from them. He was cautioned and charged at the clubhouse. He replied, "Oh, come on, I didn't mean that". The accused had asked what he was being arrested for and was told that it was for calling the police a "shower of poofs".

The defence solicitor then cross-examined P C Carswell.

Sol : Who charged the accused?

P C : P C Barron.

Sol : What was he charged with?
P C: He was charged with a breach of the peace.
Sol: When did the match start?
P C: 7.30.
Sol: Could it have been later – at 7.35?
P C: It could have been.
Sol: Was the shouting from one person or the whole crowd?
P C: One person was shouting as if to get the others to join in.
Sol: Fifteen minutes later you heard the same voice?
P C: Yes.
Sol: And the second time you saw him waving his arms and shouting?
P C: Yes.
Sol: How do you know he was shouting?
P C: I saw him shouting.
Sol: Was anyone standing behind him?
P C: There were some people behind him and beyond him.
Sol: Did the accused say anything when you went over to him?
P C: I can't recall.
Sol: Was he surprised?
P C: Yes.
Sol: Did his friends contact you at any stage?
P C: I didn't see any.
Sol: Did you note the accused's reply?
P C: Yes.
Sol: Are you certain of it?
P C: Yes.
Sol: Did he not make no reply?
P C: No, he did not make no reply.
Sol: Did you return to the terracings?

P C: Yes.

Sol: Was there still shouting going on?

P C: Yes, there was shouting, but it was quieter.

Sol: Whose idea was it to make the arrest?

P C: Constable Barron's.

Stanley Smith himself was then called to the stand as the first witness for the defence. He said he was 17 years old and went to the match from Bathgate with friends on a supporters' bus. They arrived at the ground at 7.25 pm but there was a big crowd outside and the match didn't kick-off till 7.35. He stood on the terracing with his 4 friends from Bathgate - they stood in a group of their own. He said, in response to his solicitor's questions, that he wasn't shouting during the match. Other supporters to his left sang, "If you hate the Stirling police clap your hands". The whole crowd was singing and someone to the back of him and to the left shouted, "They're poofs anyway!" Two policemen came over to him and one said, "Right, sunshine, you come with me". Stanley's reaction was one of "shock" because he hadn't been clapping or shouting and he didn't have his hands in the air - he had his arms folded. He had never been in trouble before.

It was the first match at Stirling that Stanley had attended though he often went to matches with his friends on the supporters' bus. He didn't understand what the fans were singing so he asked his friend, Thomas Clark, what it was. He replied to his solicitor that he had no grouse against the police.
Stanley said he asked the police at the bottom of the terracing why he had been arrested. The reply was, "You'll see". He asked again in the pavilion and he was charged with a breach of the peace. He went on to say that he hadn't said, "Oh, come on, I didn't mean that".

At this point the sheriff intervened to clear matters up.

Sher : Are you saying that the police were mistaken about your conduct and that the police were mistaken about what you said? Do you realise that's what you're saying?

Stan : Yes.

Under cross-examination by the procurator-fiscal, Stanley said that he was given a slip of paper by the police when he received his belongings from them on Thursday morning. The paper contained a list of 5 names and addresses and Stanley knew 3 of the names - his friends, Thomas Clark, Thomas Baxter and Peter Coulter, but not the other two.

The sheriff interrupted to opine that this seemed to indicate that his friends were expressing interest. In response to his question, Stanley replied that the addresses of the 3 he knew were correct.

The fiscal continued:

P F : Were the Celtic supporters singing "If you hate the Stirling police, clap your hands"?

Stan : Yes, but I couldn't understand it.

P F : What were you wearing at the match?

Stan : Blue denim jeans and a blue denim jacket and a green and white scarf knotted round my neck.

P F : So you'd be distinctive?
Stan: Yes. (J W - bad reply; this was the uniform of half the enclosure)

P F: So the police are making your reply up?

Stan: Possibly. (J W - another reply that would do the accused no favours)

The sheriff again took part; adopting something of an inquisitorial stance:

Sher: The situation seems to be that the police were getting a lot of abuse. Are you quite sure that you just didn't join in and were sorry when arrested?

Stan: Quite sure.

Sher: Quite sure you weren't waving your hands at the police?

Stan: Yes.

Sher: Quite sure you didn't make a comment about the police being poofs?

Stan: Yes.

Sher: Quite sure that you didn't say, "I didn't mean that?"

Stan: Yes.

Sher: Why is it that you thought your friends might know what was being sung and you didn't?

Stan: I just did.

The sheriff clearly wasn't happy with the reply as Stanley had heard the chant umpteen times before and, as the sheriff pointed out, it was a "recognisable chant with a bit of rhythm to it". (J W - However it could have been the word "Stirling" that Stanley was inquiring about - I thought at first that they were chanting "Central" and the sheriff himself pointed out that sometimes the epithet "ef'ing" - which sounds not unlike Stirling - is used of the police).
The fiscal resumed:

P F :  Do you clap at matches?
Stan :  Only for Celtic.
P F :  Do you always watch a football match with your arms folded?
Stan :  Yes.
P F :  Why do you think the police said you had your arms raised?
Stan :  They must have made it up. (J W - another bad reply as sheriffs don't like "their" police officers to be called liars).

Stanley's solicitor then questioned him again:

Sol :  Did you hear any particular swearing at the match?
Stan :  I heard somebody shout, "They're all poofs".
Sol :  Did you hear anybody shout, "Let's get the fucking police", "Black and white shites" and "Kill the cunts"?
Stan :  No.

Stanley left the witness box and his friend, Thomas Clark, also 17 and dressed in a green suit, arrived and took the oath. He said he was an apprentice welder. I was very interested to note that Thomas stood, quite naturally I thought throughout his 20 minute examination with his arms folded! - just like Stanley had so incredibly done throughout the match.

Thomas said he heard the singing of "If you hate the Stirling police, clap your hands" and he also heard someone shout, "The police are a bunch of poofs". (J W : the exact wording) It was not Stanley. He didn't hear anyone shout, "Let's get the fuckin' police", "Black and white shites" or
"Kill the cunts". The singing and shouting that he did hear was from the left and further into the crowd. Two policemen came across and took Stanley away and he didn't know why -

"Stanley was doing nothing - not shouting, swearing or waving his arms".

When the solicitor asked Thomas what his reaction was to Stanley being taken away, he said he was "surprised". Thomas said he tried to tell the police. He and one of the other friends went to the police station in the ground after telling the committee members of the bus. They came back to the terracing and 2 people from the crowd volunteered their names and addresses. Thomas didn't know them - they were from Paisley.

The solicitor asked him what they said but Thomas was prevented from answering as the procurator-fiscal objected that any such evidence was hearsay.

They then handed the 5 names (Thomas, Thomas Baxter, Coulter and the 2 from Paisley) into the police station.

Thomas was asked by the sheriff where his 2 friends were today and the reply was that they were working (they had been in court when the case was originally called).

In response to the fiscal's questioning, it came out that Thomas had missed most of the game in his efforts to help Stanley. He repeated that Stanley didn't shout, didn't swear nor wave his arms about and that he felt Stanley had been mistaken for someone else.
It was the solicitor's turn again and Thomas revealed that he'd in fact been to the police office 3 times - the first with Thomas Baxter (and not Peter Coulter) when they were told that Stanley had been locked up for the night, the second after he'd told the committee members and they and the Thomases went to the police, and a third time when the 2 Thomases went back with the list. At the end of the evening neither Thomas nor the committee members knew why Stanley had been arrested. Thomas said that he'd never been in trouble with the police before either. Thomas didn't remember a conversation with Stanley about the words of the song. (J W : this means to me that they hadn't "rigged" what they were going to say - unlike the police). In an earlier case, 2 witnesses had both used the simile - supposedly independent of one another - "cry like a banshee"!

The solicitor pointed out to the sheriff that there had been more witnesses present on January 11 when the trial was first scheduled but unheard because of lack of time, but one of the witnesses (Coulter) was now working away from home.

The procurator-fiscal, in his summing up, said the case was one of credibility - of the police on the one hand v Smith and Clark on the other. The sheriff interrupted that it was also a question of reliability. He felt that Stanley's reply ("Oh, come on, I didn't mean that") was strange if he hadn't done anything. Equally, his other reply ("What's this for?") was strange if he had done something.

The solicitor, in his summing up, agreed that the case turned on credibility and reliability. He went to great length to point out that
he was not saying that the police had made the story up but that they might be "mistaken". The sheriff thought this was fair enough but it didn't explain Stanley's "Oh, come on..." reply. (J W - unless, of course, the police were "mistaken" here too).

The solicitor suggested that the police might have arrested the wrong person:

Sher : Are you saying this was a "frame-up"?

Sol : No, but his friends gave up the match to find out what had happened and they were astounded. All the other witnesses were in court on January 11 until 4 pm but the system doesn't allow us to take written evidence.

Sher : It may just be that Stanley and his friends thought that he wasn't the worst offender there.

Sol : Stanley is taking a strong line - he is saying there is no grey area. I ask that the charge be found not proven.

Sher : According to Stanley and Thomas there was no noise coming from them. So I can't understand why the police picked him up. I wonder how reliable Thomas is when he says he didn't discuss the chant with Stanley. (J W - confused logic - sheriff seems to be saying that he can't believe their stories because they were not identical in detail but, because the police stories were, he'll believe them!)

The sheriff was clearly confused and a long period of silence followed. (J W - if he was confused, surely there should have been at least a "not proven" verdict - onus is on the Crown).

After a few minutes, the sheriff-clerk said to Stanley, "Stand up, please".

Sher : To find in your favour, I have got to find reasonable doubt. It would have been better if I had heard more of the witnesses. I
accept that you did make the reply ("Oh, come on, I didn't mean that")
to the police. The question is what you "didn't mean". You did associate
yourself with the remarks made. I find the charge proven.

On finding out he was an apprentice coachbuilder:

Sher: This sort of behaviour isn't to be condoned at all. Mr Smith has
no record at all. But I won't have people obstructing the police going
about their duty. I fine you £75.

After brief consultation with Stanley, the solicitor asked for and was
granted £5 per week payments. However, his father came down and wrote
out a cheque there and then. The 2 policemen left the court as it was
cleared. Time: 12.55 pm.

I went downstairs after the fiscal (whom I knew) and said:

J W: Well, Joe, how's life? You did well there - he didn't do it.
I was there at the match right beside him and it wasn't him.

P F: No, I didn't think he looked the type.

J W: And as for the police - that was just a pack of lies. They were
just taking their revenge.

P F: Just making it all up were they? "Might is right".

Justice! The police should have been up on contempt charges. How many
other cases reach conviction like this? (1) I felt like speaking up throughout the trial but my research ethics were against it. The verdict might well have been different if he'd been heard on January 11.

(1) I was told by several police officers that a completely deaf and dumb spectator at a football ground had once been arrested for swearing! Another officer told me that he kept 2 notebooks - one for recording what was actually said at the time and the other for reading out in court, suitably embellished to guarantee conviction!
Dear Mr ______,

I'm a student at Edinburgh University and am doing some research on football crowd behaviour. I wonder if you'd be kind enough to meet me in some pub for a few pints and a chat on the subject. I want to find out what views you have on football. I'll be happy to buy you a few pints.

I'll be up in (name of town) on (date) and if you give me a ring at the above number as soon as possible (reverse charges if you like) we could arrange a place and a time.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN WHITE
A. FAMILY TREE

---

NOTES:

1. Tree carved by hand. Add names.
2. Add children.
3. Add grandchildren.
4. Add great-grandchildren.
5. Adjust branches and leaves as needed.
6. Add details such as dates and locations.
PERSONAL HISTORY

WHERE LIVED & WITH WHOM?

BIRTHS | DEATHS | HEALTH | MARR | SEP. | DIV. (relevant to subject includes self)

SCHOOLS

OCCUPATIONS (WAGE, WHERE, WHAT & WHY LEFT?)

CONVICTIONS
## Girl Friends and Peers

### Girl Friends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>HOW LONG</th>
<th>WHERE MET</th>
<th>ATTITUDE</th>
<th>WHEN SEEN</th>
<th>WHY BROKE UP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Friends (Inc. Relatives)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>HOW LONG</th>
<th>HOW MET</th>
<th>SHARED INTEREST</th>
<th>TOWN</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<p>| REASON |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTEREST</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>HPW(GROU)</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
<th>WHO WITH</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPORTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse Racing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Racing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racing Acts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poker/Bingo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motoring/Braking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt/Shoot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrestling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billiards/Pool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table Tennis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinema</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Concerts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sing/Concert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pub (How much)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cafe Club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dancing/Disc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scout/D.B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.U.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OTHERS:
## HOBBIES / INTERESTS (cont)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTEREST</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>H.P.W (GROS)</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
<th>WHO WITH</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIDGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMINOES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHESS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POKER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOOT, POOKS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARDENING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLOTMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAINTING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARVING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECORATING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODEL RAIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODEL MAKING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAM RADIO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLECTING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>READING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RADIO TV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECORDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSIC (FUNKY)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTERTAINING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOKING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHING UP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEANING HOUSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUT IN TO BED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLAN WITH KIDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAYING HUSBAND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### REGULAR PAY

- PART-TIME
- OVERTIME
- OTHERS:

### INSTRUCTIONS

1. Any news reader classifieds via TV. Also be used e.g. "T.V."
2. Where possible, add context.
3. Of 2 minority done together (e.g. pub/dance) join them.
## Possessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Own</th>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Rent</th>
<th>Share</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car/Bike</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Machine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Problem Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature</th>
<th>Who Turn To</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Money (keep alive)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money (fine, debts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job (get, keep)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommod.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Do you attend football matches?
   How often do you go to a football match? Home? Away?

2. Do you support a team?
   What team do you support? What do you think of them? What's wrong with them? Are you a member of a supporters' club? Who controls your football club? How do you feel about them?

3. Why do you support 'x'? Have you always supported 'x'? (Why don't you support your local team?) How long have you supported 'x' for?

4. How long have you been attending football for? What was your first game? Who did you go with?

5. How much does it cost you to support 'x'? (break down this figure).

6. What does it mean to you to see 'x' win/lose?
   What teams do you like to beat most of all? Do you support and watch Scotland as well as 'x'? How do you feel about seeing Scotland win/lose? What does football mean to you?

7. Describe a typical day at the (home) match (if relevant). Do you stand/sit? Where exactly? What do you wear - scarves, tammies, badges, flags etc? Have you ever seen a weapon (e.g. a knife) at the match? Do you carry a weapon? Do you join in the singing and chanting? What are your favourite songs/chants and what ones do you not like/join in? What is your attitude towards the police at matches? How do you feel about those you see getting ejected or arrested? Do you drink before, during or after football matches? How much do you drink before, during and/or after the match? What do you think about stewards and stewarding at football matches?
(How) does winning/losing affect the mood of the supporters? (How) do incidents on the field affect the mood of the supporters? What grounds do you like/dislike and why? What players do you like/dislike and why? How do you get to away matches? Describe a typical day at an away match. Do you recognise certain people in the crowds as regular 'troublemakers'?


9. What is the cause of 'football hooliganism'? How can it be stopped? Should it be stopped?

10. Have you ever been in trouble with the police - at a football match or elsewhere? Have you ever been ejected from a football match? Have you ever been hurt or been a victim at a football match? Have you ever been involved in any incident at a football match and not been caught?

11. Describe the above incidents (if any) in all their stages e.g. before match, match, arrest, detention, court, publicity, after-effects (what has conviction/publicity meant) to you and others (family, friends?), ability to pay fine.

12. Are you aware of the (new) Criminal Justice (Scotland) Act? (later interviewees only).

13. What do you think of leisure/recreational facilities in the community?

14. Anything else you want to add?
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The newspaper cutting said Pete had been fined £35 at the sheriff court of a county town for fighting with a rival fan during an away match involving his team, Hibernian. The paragraph also gave his age (17), occupation (apprentice plumber) and address.

I phoned him and he sounded very keen to meet me. He pointed out over the phone that he was only seventeen but we nevertheless agreed to meet a few evenings later in the public bar ('it's cheaper') of a hotel near the Edinburgh housing scheme where he lived. He even suggested over the phone that he had a lot of mates at his youth club who might speak to me as many of them were football supporters. We traded descriptions - he had 'black hair' and would be wearing 'jeans'.

I arrived at the public bar at the arranged time (9p.m.) to find a person answering that rough description sitting alone at a table beside the bar. I made for the bar, ordered a pint, asked the bloke if he was Pete and doubled the order.

Pete was tall, though aided by high-heeled shoes, and extremely heavily built. He wore a white polo neck under his jacket and had fashionably lengthed, well-groomed hair, though his nails were bitten and grimy.

His father, he said, was aged forty and a plumber; his mother, two years younger, worked as a linenmaid in a local hospital. Pete got on well with his father, 'alright most of the time' but 'not so good' with his mother. He also got on 'alright' with his fifteen year old sister and thirteen year old brother. He doesn't see his maternal grandparents but sees his widowed paternal grandmother about twice a month mainly because she lives nearby. No less than five uncles and their wives also stay in the same housing scheme. Pete gets on alright with them too.

Pete's parents both hail from Leith where Pete lived until he was two or three years old. The family then moved to Granton for a year before moving to their present
housing scheme where they have occupied two successive houses. They have lived in
the second house, a semi-detached council house with front and back garden, for the
last eight years.

Pete attended the local primary school, then the local secondary school where he
gained three 'O' grade passes in physics, woodwork and engineering drawing. Clearly
a job of a technical nature was in order and mainly through his Dad's influence he
took up plumbing. He had worked with his Dad during his summer holidays while still
at school and had 'quite liked it'. He was now undertaking a four year apprenticeship
with a big plumbing firm and hoped, after gaining experience, to join his Dad's
firm. His Dad's suffering from the effects of a slipped disc just now - so Pete's
doing all the heavy work about the house, not that he minds.

Apart from his football conviction (he knew this was why I had 'phoned) Pete is at
present awaiting a summons for housebreaking - which he denies. He intends to plead
not guilty.

He's had two girl friends of note so far. He saw Julie, whom he met at school,
nearly every night for six months and 'really liked her'. Things broke up, Pete says,
when he started going to the pub too much. He also went out with Linda, a friend
of Julie's, for a few weeks. She was a 'nice lassie' but she moved to Perth. He
goes most lunchtimes with his workmates to a pub with go-go dancers.

He regards none of his workmates as close friends but said I'd still need a whole
page to list his friends, most of whom are Hibs supporters and go to the match with
him:

'You couldn't meet a nicer bunch of guys than my mates.'

Two of his cousins, though two years younger, come into this category. In all, he
mentioned ten 'good friends' whom he claimed to like equally, eight of whom were
very interested in football. One of the two not interested in football is Mick who is 'mental'. Pete talked with awe of the fact that Mick will fight anybody and gave as an example the time when Mick had confronted and challenged an entire gang in the housing scheme. However, it seems that even Mick has calmed down a bit due to enforced circumstances:

'He's getting married - he's got to!'

Pete hangs about with most of his friends most nights at the local chip shop ('Sergio doesn't like us') and goes with a few of them to the local youth club on Thursdays. He, in fact, met most of his friends through such local networks, though he met Ally through more paradoxical channels:

'I was gonna fight him one night but we became friends.'

Of the non-Hibs supporters, one of his friends supports Hearts and another supports Celtic. A third used to support Hibs but has recently transferred allegiance to Hearts because he has moved to a housing scheme (Drylaw) where most blokes support Hearts. He still goes to Hibs games though.

Pete himself used to go to the football every week - until his arrest. Since that occasion four weeks ago he has only been twice - to an Edinburgh 'derby' match and a Berwick Rangers v Stirling Albion match which he attended as he was spending a weekend with a friend's uncle in that area. He hardly ever watches football on television on Saturday evenings though, since he's usually out.

He plays football too at the youth club where they play five-a-sides in the hall and on Sundays when he has a kick-about on a patch of grass with his mates. They haven't formed an eleven-strong team to play against other teams because their lads couldn't be depended on to turn up:

'I just want to play fitba' with my mates anyway.'
Pete is less enthusiastic and less unfortunate when it comes to other sports:

'I played golf twice with my old man but I didn't see the point in it - hitting a ball into a hole';

he used to like cycling - in fact he pieced his own bike together - but lost interest when he broke down in Linlithgow and had to get his father to rescue him in his van; he's very keen on boating - his uncle's got his own yacht which he built himself; he loves cars and wants his own as soon as possible. He used to 'joyride' (take cars and drive them away) with his mates when he had nothing better to do but hasn't done this for a couple of months. In fact his Dad's car was stolen quite recently and the first thing Pete did was to ask his mates if they had pinched it - alas they hadn't. On the other hand, he 'hates' motor bikes, as he was 'jumped' by the local bike boys four months ago.

Pete is saving up for a 'gun' of his own. At the moment he goes 'shooting' with mates in a local wood with rabbits, squirrels, birds and tin cans as the unfortunate prey. He even shot a guy in the head once with a pellet - but he wasn't badly cut. Quite a lot happens in the woods as he and his mates 'toy wrestle' there too with the more the merrier being the guiding principle.

Pete likes going to fairgrounds but, when he goes with his mates, he always gets 'jumped' so if he wants to enjoy himself he goes with his folks. Juvenile gangs, he says, are still widespread in Edinburgh and he is a member of the YCD (Young Clerry Derry) which, in spite of the name, has no religious basis - it contains, he assures me, 'Protestants, Catholics and Jehovah's Witnesses'.

He goes to Murrayfield occasionally because he likes the rugby crowd atmosphere and the fact there's no 'trouble':

'Everybody's pally.'
He goes to the cinema about once every three weeks, sometimes with a 'bird' though more often with his mates, though he doesn't usually pay to get in: he 'scives' in through the exit doors, a practice he insists is really easy, especially at the ABC. Their 'ploy' is to use a 'wee skinny guy' who squeezes his arm through the gap at the bottom of the exit door.

Musically he likes Rod Stewart and 'soul' and doesn't think the Bay City Rollers' offer to play a concert for Hearts and Hibs will be accepted by 'that cunt Hart' (the Hibs chairman). This was the first time that Pete used a swear word though he was to employ them regularly after this.

He goes to the pub as much as he can - which is when he has the money. In practice this means every weekend and every lunchtime, though sometimes on evenings during the week as well. He drinks mainly lager (over 6 pints on a Friday night) though he has the occasional vodka and orange as well. He's been drinking regularly and underage for two years and never once been questioned about his age.

Pete used to go to church 'all the time' but now goes only to Midnight Mass at Xmas. He was brought up in a Catholic household, but when the family moved to the present housing scheme they found there was no Catholic school handy so Pete was sent to a 'Protestant' school. This didn't bother him at all though none of his friends are Protestants. He reckons the 'Protestant versus Catholic thing' causes too much trouble. He likes neither the Queen nor the Pope. He says he believes in Scotland and will certainly vote SNP when he's old enough.

Pete has a few other interests too. He plays chess with his wee brother who is the only other person he knows who plays. He likes walking his dog ('It's a Heinz-57 varieties'); reading sci-fi; and listening to records. When he's doing a plumbing job in someone's house he always asks if he can put the customer's radio on.
Whenever he gets the chance he works overtime because this helps to pay his football fine which he's been paying off at £6 per week. Thus far, he had paid £24 of it leaving two weeks of £6 and £5 payments respectively still to go. He pays by sending a postal order to the court where he was convicted.

Pete used to follow Hibs everywhere. He's been to Leeds, Liverpool and Newcastle to support them. However, his post-arrest experience has put him off. It's not the fine itself that's discouraged him from going to so many football matches - it's the fact that he spent the Saturday and Sunday nights in gaol. He doesn't want to get into trouble again.

He used to go and watch Hearts at times too when they were playing a 'decent' team and he actually likes to see them winning when they're not playing against Hibs.

He thinks Hibs have some brilliant players though he would like to see the departure of both chairman Hart and manager Turnbull. His last wish has been granted and the first soon will be .. Hart, he feels, 'owns' the team but can't get good relations with his players. He is undoubtedly the 'worst thing that's happened to Hibs in years'. Pete claims he has only ever met one Hibs fan who liked Hart. Pete thinks that the only thing the chairman's money has done for the club has been to buy Joe Harper from Everton but then it was because of the chairman's disenchantment with the player's beard and other things that he left the club. Pete feels that chairman Hart makes the decisions to sell players and that the manager just does what he's told:

'That annoys me.'

The club has sold players it never should have - Stanton, O'Rourke, Cropley among them.

He's never been a member of a Hibs supporters' club because he 'couldn't be bothered'. He prefers instead to travel by normal train or bus services with his friends.
He first started supporting Hibs because they were a 'good fitba'-minded attacking team' in spite of the fact his older cousin used to take him up to Tynecastle in the early days. He attended his first match at the age of 7 and has been going practically every week (until recently) since the age of 13.

For a typical evening game at Easter Road, Pete will leave home at 6p.m., take a bus into town and have '1 or 2 pints' in a pub near the ground. He usually buys a programme when he notices a vendor and tries to collect as many as possible. In the ground, he usually stands on the main terracing. After the match, he heads straight home, though there's usually 'a bit of trouble' on the way. A typical Saturday at the match would involve a similar routine except that he'd probably drink 4 or 5 pints before the match.

When he's at an away game, he'll usually have a couple of pints at some pub if it's handily placed for getting into the ground for the kick-off. He usually buys a carry-out to take to the away match - which ran to 12 cans at the game where he was arrested, though then he gave a couple of cans to his mates. Pete gives the impression of being extremely gregarious and protective to most of his friends, many of whom are apparently smaller than he is. On the day of the arrest they had been thrown out of a pub as 'some cunt had started throwing tumblers'. Again after the away match, it's usually straight home.

When Hibs win, it gives Pete a 'good feeling'; it also gives him the opportunity to 'slag' his mates who support Hearts. He gets the best feeling of all in beating either Rangers or Celtic. Pete 'hates' Rangers, though he feels Celtic are a great team. When Hibs lose, he's disappointed but he doesn't bother too much. He now sees the football ground as a place where you go along to watch a game of football. Before he used to go 'mental' but not now.

When he goes to a match, Pete wears a Hibs scarf. He used to carry an Irish flag as well but he lost it when he was arrested. He used to buy rosettes but he kept
losing them too. Up until two years ago, Pete carried a 'blade' to the match 'for protection' when Hibs played Rangers or Hearts. At the Hibs v Hearts game only a week previously, a Hearts supporter apparently brandished a knife before his cousin and a friend outside the St. James Centre after the match. Pete had been on the other side of the street at first but managed to intervene and scare the Hearts fan off.

Pete used to join in the IRA songs at the match but he's stopped that now. He rationalises this as follows:

'We're nowhere near Ireland. Scotland's better than Ireland anyway so why should we sing their songs?'

He still, however, joins in the pro-Hibs chants.

Sometimes Pete really hates the police at football matches. At Liverpool, for instance, he claims the police carried three foot long canes with metal tips which they used on the Hibs fans but not on the Liverpool fans. In spite of such alleged weapons, Pete nonetheless was pleased to report that the hundreds of Hibs fans who made the journey managed to chase the Liverpool fans and the police out of the ground at the end of the match. The Hibs supporters, who identify with the YLT (Young Leith Team) according to Pete, had hatchets, knives and 'anything you could imagine' at the match because there had been a lot of trouble when Liverpool had visited Easter Road for the first leg. After the game at Liverpool there were lots of fights and Pete got 'jumped' by six Liverpool supporters in a car park though, he claimed, his assailants came off worse than he did - he thought he broke one's leg. Pete had made the journey down on a 'pub bus' and one of the guys on the bus had had his head put through a car windsreen. Just before they reached Liverpool, some Hibs supporters had apparently managed to steal a till from a pub.

Pete felt that the police in Scotland were generally not so brutal - they were 'OK' for instance at the respective towns where he was arrested and convicted. However,
he reckoned that if you were 'done' in an Edinburgh street and were known to the police they could be brutal - his 'mental' friend Mick had apparently been dealt with in such a way.

Pete believes that most supporters who get arrested are the victims of police bias - the police are not willing, he thinks, to arrest their 'own' supporters. This was, he claimed, admitted to him by the police at the town where he was arrested and was confirmed by his Liverpool experience.

Some supporters, he felt, were 'lifted' for doing wrong things, but others were lifted for 'doing nothing'. For example, he said, at a Motherwell v Hibs game a guy he knew was arrested and fined £25 for singing 'Tom Hart's a bastard'. The police, according to Pete's account, tried to pin 'everything' on his friend including a charge that he had been fighting (which he hadn't, said Pete). It was really nothing to do with the Motherwell police, Pete felt, nor was it fair that one guy should have been picked on when 'everybody' was singing. This last point would, of course, be given no respect in legal circles.

Pete felt that violence on the field of play might cause some spectators to be violent. A lot of opposing players, he claimed, pick on Hibs' Alec Edwards (a skilful but volatile player). This could lead to Hibs supporters taking it out on the opposition's supporters.

It was time for the hotel bar to close. Pete had drunk three pints of lager in one and a half hours. He asked me if I wanted to come back to his place and we could continue talking. On the ten-minute journey he pointed out to me such notable sites as the woods, the place where Mick challenged the gang and the chip shop. At his house, he offered me a cup of tea and a can of export.

He claimed that there weren't so many fights when Hibs played Celtic because Hibs are supposed to be a Catholic team too (this opinion is not supported by the
statistics or by my observations). Obviously, when Rangers and Hearts were at Easter Road, he said, there would be most trouble as they bring the biggest support.

He doesn't like Easter Road as a ground because there's no 'shed' in which to stand and sing. This is the very reason he likes Tynecastle, though he thinks Celtic Park is the best ground in the country. He considers that Hampden Park is a 'disgrace' as a national stadium.

The only professional footballer Pete really dislikes is John Greig of Rangers because 'he thinks he's it and he's crap'.

Pete thinks 'aggression' depends on a lot of things. He felt that he could usually control himself but it would be more difficult if the following factors were present - if he had 'had a couple', if Hibs were playing well but getting beaten and if someone was arguing with him.

He describes football ground facilities in Scotland as 'very poor'. He likes the idea of having a social club at the football ground itself (as in England) where you can 'share a drink' before the match. He feels that Scotland's football grounds generally provide far too little and the little that they offer is far too highly priced. If he could afford it he would rather sit under cover - a facility that's been extended to the fans for standing prices at Easter Road for all games except cup-ties and those involving Rangers, Celtic and Hearts. However, Pete feels that this concession has not been granted out of any care for the fans but is rather the result of a commercial enterprise backfiring.

Hibs are the only club whose origins Pete knows anything about - he read, he thinks, in the 'One Hundred Years of Hibs' book which he got for a Xmas present that they started off as an Irish Catholic church team with Irish players.
perry thinks 'football hooliganism' comes about when you have people coming from different places and one person starts trouble. Most of the trouble comes from the juvenile gangs who, says Perry, still attend football matches. For example, gangs from Niddrie and Drylaw go along to Tynecastle, while the YLT and a 'big squad' of his own gang frequent Easter Road. The YLT apparently resent the presence of this other gang (YCD) in such large numbers.

He considers the best way to reduce incidents of football hooliganism is to split the rival supporters up - not just at the match but also, as they have tried to do at Rangers v Celtic matches, on trains, buses and pavements before and after the match. He reckons we should have total police control at big football matches.

Apart from his one arrest at a match, Perry has been ejected from the ground by police on several occasions - when Hibs have played at Tannadice, Motherwell and East End Park - and on each occasion he has paid at the turnstile to get back in. Each time the police had given him instructions to the effect of: 'You get out, dinna' come back - if you do you'll be booked' though they were 'no' usually so polite!' The only problem Perry sees in going back in is that you've got to pay twice.

Away from the football ground, Perry has been involved in countless scrapes with the police. At an early age, he had his name taken for playing in the Leith docks; he's been in trouble 'hundreds of times' for playing football in the streets; and, years ago, he was playing on the site where a college was being built and, as the police gave chase, a sheath knife fell out of his pocket. Perry claims the police at first tried to suggest that he was carrying it in order to stab someone but nothing came of this.

As to the outstanding 'charge' of 'housebreaking', Perry came out the youth club with his friends one evening and went to the chip shop as usual. Nearby the shop he and his friends engaged in their customary 'toy fighting' with the result that one combatant fell through a house window. This was all that happened, Perry assured me.
After this he had gone to see some 'birds' before going home. Later, however, the police came round to his house and charged him saying he had been seen taking stuff out of the window even though he had 'never done nowt'. Pete has no idea how they came to have his name though he made unsuccessful inquiries to try and find out.

His football arrest had come about during a Hibs away meeting with a small, provincial club in a cup-tie. After arrival in the ground, Pete left his friends and most of the Hibs fans in the main 'shed' and made his way round to the other side of the ground in order to purchase a pie. On his return journey he had to walk past the young rival supporters gathered in another 'shed' behind a goal. Pete thought he heard someone make a remark to him as he passed so he turned round and said to the rival fan behind him -

"What did you say, pal?"

"Fuck off", was the unsubtle reply.

Pete then (honourably) asked the other if he wanted to go round the back of the shed (for a fight). He replied that he would see him later.

It seems that by this time several Hibs supporters, including Pete's cousins, had come round to see what was happening. Pete moved beside them and started to converse when 'something or somebody hit me' and fighting broke out all around him. Some of the other supporters went for his cousins. Pete jumped into the middle of the affray, shouting 'Who's going to fight me?' It turned out that his offer was accepted by the guy with whom he'd just had the disagreement. As the two of them were fighting more of the Hibs supporters rushed round from the main enclosure. Pete and his opponent stopped fighting and Pete bent down to pick up his flag which had been dropped in the scuffle. As he was doing so he got kicked. He grabbed hold of two of the rival fans nearest him. He still had a hold of one of them when he was 'lifted' by a policeman who pulled him on to the pitch by the scarf and nearly choked him in the process. Pete told the constable that he wasn't going to run
away. Another policeman joined them and he was taken to a 'wee police box' behind the stand where he was 'booked' and where he waited with other Hibs supporters for a police van. On his way to the police box Pete threw the only can of beer he had left 'through a hole in the stand' as he didn't want to be caught with a drink underage. Pete admits he was in the wrong but feels that the other guy who started all the trouble should have been 'done' too.

The arrested were taken to the local police station and then transferred by 7 p.m. the ten miles to the police station at the county town where they would stand trial the following Monday. That Saturday evening the police went round to Pete's Edinburgh home to inform his parents of his arrest. His little sister answered the door as his parents were out at a dance. On the Sunday Pete's parents phoned the police station to be told that Pete had enough money to get home after his court appearance.

Pete was treated alright by the police though he complained that he couldn't sleep on the Saturday as they'd frequency open his cell door during the night in a loud manner to shout: 'Are you alright?' in order to 'see that you werenae dead or something'. There were two people to a cell and it was 'dead warm'.

The occupants just sat about all day Sunday though there was a box of books for them to read and they were allowed to have a walk round the police station. Somebody's 'old dear' arrived at the police station and she bought newspapers which they all shared.

They were given cornflakes, a roll and a cup of tea from a 'wifie' for breakfast; bread, mince and two carrots for lunch; and a boiled egg, margarine 'piece', jam 'piece' and a cup of tea in the evening. Pete thought the food was 'O.K.'

On their way to court on the Monday morning, they were handcuffed, which again Pete thought was fair enough because there were 'twelve o' us to two o' them'. At the
court they sat in an ante-room. Those that wanted to see a lawyer were taken out; Pete didn't as he was going to plead 'guilty':

'You've just got to come up again if you don't plead guilty.'

They were seated in the room in a certain order and called one by one in that sequence.

In front of the court, Pete was informed of the charge; the police report was read out; and the sheriff asked Pete about himself. Pete replied that he was a plumber. He was then told by the sheriff that his offence was more serious than the others, was fined £35 and asked how much he could pay a week. He volunteered £5 but it was decided he should pay £6 per week. Pete argued that he paid £7 board to his mother; that he had his bus fares, his dinners, etc. He was of the opinion that the court doesn't go into the offender's background sufficiently which isn't helped by the fact that you're 'dead nervous'.

Pete had £3 in his pocket for the journey home but, since one of his co-accused had only 47p and would have to hitch, Pete offered to travel with him. The pair of them 'hitched' as far as Kirkcaldy (walking about ten miles on the way) where they pooled their money and bought bus tickets for Edinburgh.

As for parental reaction, his 'old dear' seemed upset at first but joked about it later and his 'old man' asked him to recount what had happened after which Pete vowed never to go back to another match. He recalled that it 'wisnae too bad' meeting his mates on the Monday evening as a lot of them had been 'done' at football matches.

Pete was conscious of the role that alcohol may have played in his breach and subsequent arrest:
'In my case if I hadnae been drinking I might have controlled
myself..... but maybe not. You can't tell.'

And he added, unwittingly paraphrasing Shakespeare, that if you're absolutely
paralytic, you can't see straight far less punch straight.

I left his house just after midnight.
CASE STUDY NO 2: GEORGE

Travelling home on an Edinburgh 'corporation bus' one evening I chanced to overhear a boisterous and one-sided 'conversation' about football several rows behind me in the back seat of the upper deck. The main participant was loudly singing the praises of Glasgow Rangers and their fans and talking with especial knowledge of the infamous Aston Villa v Rangers game. The listener was a young coloured guy who didn't appear to have much to say on the football front but nevertheless displayed an enthusiasm to hear about the Rangers exploits.

I stayed on the bus several stops past my house until they finally got off the bus. I approached the Rangers fan and he agreed to meet me that Friday evening in his local pub.

George arrived at the public bar a few minutes after I did and I bought him a pint of 'Special' in spite of the fact he insisted on buying me one first. George was of average height and build and wore a close fitting leather jacket and jeans. His finger nails were black and bitten and throughout the evening he was unable to look me in the eyes for any length of time.

His mother and father are both aged around forty, his father working as a security guard and his mother as a canteen assistant. He feels he gets on well with them both as he does with his two brothers (one older and married) and his three younger sisters. George himself has just turned eighteen. He has no living grandparents and no aunts or uncles that he regards as being in any way significant to him.

George has lived all his life in the one home in the Edinburgh housing scheme near the pub where we now sat - except for a period of one to two years which he spent working in fields on a farm near Dunoon. He attended the local primary school in Edinburgh and the local secondary school before taking up his farm job, then returning home and becoming a coal merchant, a job he has now been doing for
sixteen months:

'You've got to take a bath every day.'

George has never been convicted of any offence in a court of law though he reckons he came quite near to it three years ago when he was caught by police in the act of smashing windows. The only action taken was that he had to find £7 to pay for the damage. His mother in fact paid it for him.

George said no girlfriend had ever meant anything to him and he doesn't really go out with girls though he does in fact go to discos regularly. He mentioned four male friends, of equal status, whom he regarded as his best friends, three of whom he met at school and he sees practically every day, the other he met at the pub two years ago and sees about twice a week. All of them live near him.

Football is his number one interest in life and he travels by supporters' bus every Saturday to see Rangers play. He used to play as a goalkeeper in a team himself but now he just 'kicks about' with his mates especially in the light evenings. He goes to the 'bookies' every lunchtime with his workmates and goes to the 'bingo' with his mother one evening a week during the winter - he has not had conspicuous success at either activity.

George goes to the cinema now and then to see 'good films' only ('The Exorcist' and 'Carrie') but he's in the pub whenever he's got the money - every Friday and Saturday evenings, with the supporters before the match and some evenings during the week. He attends the local youth club two evenings a week where he plays table tennis and goes to the discos. Sometimes on a Sunday evening he goes with his Mum to her social club. He claims to have been to church once in his life - when his big brother got married.
He is a keen collector of football match programmes and has over 500 in his collection (mostly Rangers though he collects others as well). He reads only Rangers books and only watches T.V. when there's football or a 'good film' on. He listens to eight hours of Radio One at work every day, buys two pop singles every week and, not surprisingly for a Rangers fanatic, has taught himself to play the flute though he doesn't think he's much good at it. However important music may be to George it is nevertheless relegated to a poor second to football:

'I got offered a Billy Connolly ticket a night Meadowbank Thistle (my second team) were at home. I went to the football.'

George's job affords him enough money to keep him going in the essentials of life - to pay his disco, for football and for beer. When he's short of a few quid for the football his Mum, who seems to play a considerable financial role, will 'lend' him some money, though he doesn't usually pay her back. He doesn't enjoy his job though - he'd rather be back at school, mainly because he's got to get up at 6.30a.m. in order to start work at eight on five days of the week.

George would 'even go to Ireland to see the Rangers' though he doesn't think he'd travel any further afield (in geographical terms) than this. In the words of the song: 'If they go to Dublin, we will follow on'. He doesn't like Celtic or Hibs because they're Catholic teams but he likes Hearts a bit more than them and doesn't mind getting beaten by them so much. (This put me in mind of one time in a queue before kick-off at Tynecastle when I saw Rangers and Hearts supporters shaking hands with one another and declaring they didn't really mind who won that afternoon.... 'as long as we beat the Tims'.)

George is blind to the faults of Rangers as a team:

'I can't see anything wrong with them.'
He 'quite likes' the current manager (Jock Wallace) though he knows nothing about who actually runs the club. He's been supporting Rangers since he was five years old, simply at first because he liked the name 'Rangers'. It was nothing to do with religion in the early days. None of his pals - except those he's met on the supporters' bus - are Rangers supporters; most of them support either Hearts or Hibs. He attended his first game when he was nine - Hearts v Rangers at Tynecastle.

At an outing to an average match George reckons he spends about £6. On the Friday night, he and his mate buy two cans of beer each that they drink on the 'corporation bus' that takes them to Haymarket the next morning; at Haymarket they buy three cans each for the coach journey; they will drink three pints each when the coach pulls into the 'Union Jack' club at Baillieston. It costs him £1.50 for the fare, 70p. for ticket or cash admission and 10p. for a programme. They buy three cans each for the return journey and then drink two pints at the end of the day in this very pub where we were sitting before going home to watch (hopefully the Rangers) match on T.V. He drinks about eleven pints in all, with food not playing a great part in the proceedings.

'To beat Celtic means more than anything else', announces George. It's only at Rangers away matches that he ever has any doubt about their winning - he always expects them to win at Ibrox. It is the worst thing imaginable to get beaten by Celtic and when it happens:

'You feel as if you want to take it out on somebody.'

George goes to the match itself in a bunch of about ten or eleven from the bus and they frequency get involved in 'punch-ups' with Celtic supporters. At the last 'Old Firm' game, only a week before, George and his group 'got hold of those Celtic boys and everybody gave them a punch' though they weren't badly hurt. However, George reckons it's a mutual process because out of the seven Rangers v Celtic games he's been at, he's been 'jumped' by Celtic supporters at two of them.
The return fare of £1.50 on the supporters' bus is charged no matter where in Scotland Rangers are playing, making the value 'really good for Aberdeen'. On top of this there is a pound membership fee. All the drinking on the bus goes on ostensibly behind the driver's back:

'He gets more in the hat if he lets us drink.'

There is no stewarding on board the bus as such:

'The boy in charge of the bus drinks too.'

When their bus arrived back in Edinburgh after Celtic had defeated them 1-0, some of the members threw bricks and smashed a Celtic bus's windows. George reckons the same thing would have happened even if Rangers had won, as drink has a lot to do with it. It's usually cans of beer that are drunk on the bus and the occasional bottle of wine. There's a lot of underage drinking too which nobody tries to stop.

When George is at Ibrox he always stands at the back of the 'shed' where he meets the whole bus. They all meet under the 'shed' at the various away matches too. When Rangers are playing at Tynecastle the club members meet at Haymarket and walk to the ground, buying their carry-outs on the way; they do the same starting at the St. James' Centre when Rangers are at Easter Road. George himself doesn't often take 'booze' to a match, though he has been caught once trying to smuggle a can in - at the boys' gate which he still uses.

George always wears a scarf round his neck to the match, a further two scarves round his wrists, a tammy and carries a 'Union Jack' banner. He has occasionally seen knives being carried by Rangers supporters though he's never seen anyone being stabbed at a match. He has, however, seen plenty of people get a 'helluva doin'. A friend of a friend got a broken bottle 'rubbed' in his face.
George offered an 'explanation' as to why Rangers fans sometimes fight amongst themselves. He reckons that at Ibrox somebody throws a bottle from the back of the 'shed' and some guy at the front throws it back, and so on. Only two weeks previously in a match against Aberdeen, two men at the front of the 'shed' started fighting - 'so everybody started fighting'. George doesn't really understand why this sort of thing happens but thinks that it's probably due to drink. He's seen such things occur when Rangers have been winning too.

As for the chants and songs, George 'kens them a' and sings them a''. He happily narrated to me the lyrics of some of his favourite songs:

'I married a Fenian called Bridget Maguire,
She ordered my flute to be thrown in the fire,
And as it was burning I heard a strange noise,
'Twas the old Orange flute playing 'The Protestant Boys'.

George has actually made up a further verse of this song himself. He wrote it at work, but is disappointed that 'nobody bothers about it' though he'll sing it himself if he's on the bus and he's drunk:

'I burned down the chapel two Sundays ago,
Some Fenians were in but were too fuckin' slow,
They got to the door and they opened it wide,
So I shot them all down - that's an Orangeman's pride.'

The 'Sash', an old favourite with the Rangers legions, it apparently not sung as often these days. Instead it's being largely replaced by a strangely tuneless effort:
'There's a wee spot in Europe
It's a place of great fame.
It lies to the north land
And Ulster's its name.
Sure it's only six counties
Through all that renown
And its emblem is the Red Hand
Tor'by the Queen's crown.'

'Sure the Germans came over
In the year forty one.
And they tried to destroy us
By bomb and by gun.
But our history will tell you
Of others who tried
And the sons who fought for Ulster
And all those that died.'

George has been 'quite happy' with the fact that Rangers have been a 'Protestant only' club and doesn't in fact think that they will ever sign a Catholic player in spite of their stated intentions. Indeed he hopes that they won't but maintains stoically that he'll still support them even if they do. George puts Rangers' falling crowds down to the team's poor performances and the fact they've promised to sign a Catholic. However, he was confident that the Rangers fans would turn out in large numbers for the cup semi-final with Hearts the following Wednesday. (As it turned out, he was wrong).

George thinks the right thing to do at a football match is to segregate the crowd - he feels this is successfully done at Tannadice - though he objects to this himself when he's drunk. He's been thrown out of the ground by police three times in his career as a supporter - at Tynecastle, Easter Road and Somerset Park, Ayr - either for swearing or for being drunk. On each occasion George claims he was so drunk he
wasn't bothered. He was aged sixteen or seventeen on all three occasions, and has recently had his eighteenth birthday. At Tynecastle, George was ejected before the kick-off but he didn't want to go back in again 'though you can do this quite easily'. At just about every away match, someone in his bus gets arrested - 'I must be one of the lucky ones' - mostly for 'swearing and fighting'.

If supporters are arrested and convicted, George feels they should be fined but he is vehemently opposed to convicted supporters being prohibited future match entry or travel on the supporters' buses as well - this would hurt too much. He thinks that generally in the football arena the police are doing the right thing in spite of the fact that:

'Nine out of ten cases get arrested for nothing. I don't feel it's right for people to get thrown out for something they dinnae do.'

When he does take a couple of cans to the match with him, he stands on the empty cans to crush them and leaves them at his feet. Nobody has ever picked them up, he says.

He thinks it makes 'nae difference' to the amount of violence if Rangers win or if they lose and he considers that violence on the field of play has no effect on the terracing behaviour either.

Of the Scottish football grounds, he likes Ibrox, Tynecastle and Celtic Park ('I shouldn't but I do') the best because each one gives you a 'good roof over your head'. An absence of the latter makes him dislike Easter Road whose terracing he also feels is 'chipped and too steep'.

George likes all the Rangers players but especially Tom Forsyth. He admires Johann Cruyff - 'but you don't talk about him though'. He hates all the Celtic players, especially Alfie Conn who has committed the ultimate sin of going over to the
'enemy' having once been a Rangers player. George reckons that if he was drunk and provoked, he would 'lay one on any piss-taking Celtic supporter'. As an afterthought, he adds he probably would if provoked when sober too.

As for his beloved Ibrox, George had two complaints about its facilities. Firstly, the nearest refreshment hut is too far away from his usual stance and further, there's 'nae chance of a pie at half-time'. His second point of complaint also concerns distance:

'You've too far to go for a pish - away down the 'disaster steps'.

Pish-houses at other grounds are nearer than at Ibrox.'

Certainly, with George's substantial beer intake, one can understand his pressing desire for more proximate facilities.

One of the greatest attractions for George of standing in the 'shed' is that 'you get the heat off other people's bodies'. He went to sit in the Centenary Stand at Ibrox once but didn't fancy it, leaving at half-time and spending the second half standing in the 'shed'.

As for club origins, Celtic started, according to what George has heard on supporters' buses, 'when a bunch of Catholics from Ireland came over to Scotland and had nothing to do, so they started a football team'. Surprisingly perhaps, he knows nothing about Rangers' origins. All the boys on his supporters' bus, he says, support Liverpool a bit too - "cos they're a Protestant team". George had also heard several times the totally erroneous comment that 'all teams called 'United' are Catholic'.

He thinks that the main cause of 'football hooliganism' is 'people being drunk' and, as to preventative action or a cure, is pessimistic:

'You cannae stop people drinking at football matches.'
Apart from his football ejections, George was in trouble with the police when he was caught smashing the windows and when he was spotted playing football in the streets (several times).

When Rangers beat Celtic 3-1 in a Glasgow Cup match at Celtic Park, George and a few friends travelled by train for the first time. When they left the ground they mistakenly took the Celtic exit route and, half-way down the road,

'about a dozen Celtic blokes jumped out an alleyway and we got a hiding. They punched and kicked us and we were bruised all over our bodies.'

George came off worst of all since his friends were all bigger than he was.

More recently, on the way to Ibrox for another 'Old Firm' game which was to end in a 1-0 victory for Celtic, George's supporters' bus mistakenly arrived at the 'Celtic end' and 'we spat out o' the windows'. George felt that they had been lucky the Celtic supporters hadn't retaliated with bricks.

George has been the recipient of several bricks and punches collected over the years - even from Rangers supporters:

'Somebody just walked up to me at Ibrox and put the heid on me - he was just drunk.'

George had been at the notorious Aston Villa v Rangers 'friendly' down in Birmingham and had a long version of the events to tell as seen from a variety of vantage points but by no means concurring with the media's presentation.

He travelled down to Birmingham not by his usual bus but by the bus I was on for the Rangers v Celtic game (described elsewhere). This was, he said, a 'good bus'
by which he meant a well-organised and well-behaved bus. The supporters had been given the choice of leaving Edinburgh at midnight on the Friday night or 7 a.m. on the Saturday morning. They chose midnight as they thought they would have slept in for the morning rise. George had a personal store of half a dozen cans of 'Special' with him since it was an extra long journey.

The bus stopped at a service area near Carlisle for 20 minutes to use the facilities and to give the driver a rest. There, other Rangers supporters from other buses that had stopped were 'kicking in the machines' just for the hell of it. George's bus left quietly and stopped next, at around 6 a.m., for breakfast at a service area. They stayed there for an hour and 'nothing much happened'.

When the bus arrived in Birmingham about 8.30 a.m. (with 6½ hours to go till kick-off) there were already hundreds of Rangers supporters in the city. This was the first time George had ever been to England for a Rangers match and he thought he would 'get a doin'. He joined the Rangers mob in the Birmingham city centre and their numbers got 'bigger and bigger' - 'a few hundred of us ran riot in the 'barrows' [market] throwing clothes about'. By 10 o'clock they had a police escort and 'half of them [the Rangers supporters] were paralytic' by the time the pubs opened at 11 a.m. The pubs immediately filled up with Rangers supporters. George went to a pub called the 'Locomotive' till noon. It was quiet in that pub and there was no trouble. He and his friends then caught a bus (which George reported with delight only cost 2p) and found a pub nearer the Villa ground which was 'mobbed with Rangers supporters dancing on table tops and bar tops.' He later read in a newspaper that 'hundreds' of glasses had been broken in this pub but George claims that only a few were in fact broken. Twenty or thirty police entered the pub and several arrests were made. One guy from George's bus, according to George, got punched by a policeman whom he then told to 'Fuck off'. He was promptly 'lifted'. He was held in custody thereby missing the match but was released at 10 p.m. - in time to catch the bus back to Scotland. George stayed in the pub for half-an-hour before heading for the ground, five minutes away.
On arrival at the ground George entered the traditional 'Villa end' where the Rangers supporters had arrived so early (c. 2p.m.) that they were able to 'take it over'. The police took the few Aston Villa supporters already in the 'Villa end' out and led them to positions elsewhere in the ground in an attempt to prevent trouble. According to George, there was no trouble in the ground before the kick-off and there were no 'incidents' that he saw throughout the first half.

It is in their reports of what allegedly happened during the interval and what there was of the second half that George reckons the newspapers were badly wrong:

'The newspaper reports were rubbish.'

During the interval, by which time Villa was a goal up, George from his vantage point at the back of the 'shed' watched some Rangers supporters break into a closed beer hut inside the ground. Beer bottles were stolen, their tops ripped off by teeth or by smashing the necks against the crush barriers, their contents swallowed and then the empty bottles themselves were crushed under foot at the back of the 'shed'. The Rangers fans in other sections of the 'shed' (mistakenly) thought the sound of breaking glass was the result of bottles being thrown and under this misapprehension, 'some other Rangers fans threw a bottle back' and the trouble escalated from there. Bottle-throwing took place amongst the various parts of the 'shed' with the Rangers fans split into about ten different 'gangs' before the police moved in. The fighting got worse and spilled over onto the pitch.

George had moved to the front of the 'end', having been separated from his friends. When you thought the fighting and the bottle throwing had stopped in one section, he said, it would start up again in some other part of the 'shed'.

George moved on to the roof of a programme stall as the second half of the match began. Villa soon went two goals into the lead as the fighting went on and again spilled onto the field of play. The referee halted the game before it was eventually
announced over the loudspeaker that the game had been abandoned. However, the
gate nearest George was still locked so he determined to climb out over the wall.
As he was doing so, he watched a couple of hundred Villa supporters come round from
the other end to confront Rangers supporters. The Rangers fans started throwing
bottles down the terracing slope at the Villa fans who tried to retaliate but failed
because of the distance and height. George saw one Rangers supporter throw a bottle
just as another Rangers supporter was tripping on the terracing. The bottle hit him
full in the face. Someone pointed the offender out and friends of the victim went
to 'kick him in':

"He was in a helluva state - much worse than the guy he'd hit
with the bottle."

By this stage, George had abandoned his plans to leave the ground by climbing a wall
and was now perched on a toilet roof surveying the scene.

People gradually began to leave the ground. George clambered down from his position
and made for the exit by walking along the track. The police were by now joined arm
in arm across the breadth of the field in front of the Rangers fans to stop them
encroaching on the pitch once more.

George went back to the city centre where there was the 'odd bit of trouble'. He
stayed in a pub with a tartan carpet until just before 10 o'clock when someone
pushed over a cash register. Somebody summoned the 'polis' so George and his friends
left and walked round the city centre until their bus (one of the last ones to leave)
departed at midnight. By this time there were only a few hundred Rangers supporters
left in Birmingham and George's bus pulled out of the city to the sound of windows
being broken.

Since he'd had no sleep on the journey down to Birmingham George slept throughout
most of the return journey. He woke up when the bus stopped at a service area but
it was quickly moved on by police as other Rangers supporters from earlier buses were already 'running riot' in the service area. George fell asleep again and woke up finally at about 9 a.m., just as the bus was arriving in Edinburgh.

In summation, George described the visit to Birmingham as 'the best day in my life' because it was the first time he'd been to England for a football match and there were so many Rangers supporters there (George estimated 10,000 out of a crowd of 17,000 at the match were 'Gers supporters):

'If you were wearing a Rangers scarf that day you were alright.'

He says he wasn't drunk at any stage of the trip as he'd only had six cans on the journey down (and there was plenty time for the effects to wear off) plus 'one or two pints' in the pubs.

He'd enjoyed the visit so much that he intended to go to Wales and Wembley to support Scotland - especially since he won't be able to go to see Rangers again in England as they've been 'banned' since the 'Villa affair'.

George himself has no doubt as to what 'caused' the Birmingham trouble - 'all night drinking and the fact we hate the English'. He adds that you can't help but feel sorry for the Rangers team because it's not their fault - it's their supporters' fault.

When he arrived home on the Sunday morning, his folks 'weren't bothered'. His Dad said to him:

'There was a lot of trouble down there - did you enjoy yourself?'

George left me at 9.30 p.m. to have his bath. Then to bed in order to get up in time to enjoy his trip to see Rangers playing at Kilmarnock the next day.
The newspaper cutting declared that Tam had been fined £50 for shouting and swearing at an Edinburgh 'derby' match. When I phoned him his immediate response was to ascertain how I had got hold of his name and address. I told him I saw it in a newspaper. He agreed to meet me after telling me that he was a university student. We arranged to meet in a convenient pub at noon a few days later, just after one of his lectures finished.

I arrived at the pub just a few minutes before Tam. He was tall and slim with longish, frizzy hair and was trying to grow a beard. He wore jeans and a crew-neck jersey with shirt collar outside and sleeves rolled up to his elbows. He had a slight stutter and nervously and frequently uttered 'Pardon?' even before I had completed asking him the question.

Tam was 19 and got on 'alright' with his mother (a housewife) and three wee brothers. He admitted, however, that there was a 'certain friction' between his father (a headmaster) and him. He had lived all his life in the same family home in one of Edinburgh's most pleasant residential areas.

He had gained four SCE 'Higher' passes at one of the city's fee-paying schools and was now in his second year of reading for a B.Sc. at university.

He said he had no girl friends of any significance though further conversation, which revealed a near-total involvement in the all-male ethos, led me to doubt whether in fact he had much interest in females.

Tam reckoned he had four close male friends, three of whom he met through the pub and the fourth, Angus, his best friend, who was later to join us, he'd known since school.
He used to play football every Sunday in a Sunday league side but he's now given that up because he didn't like training. Before his arrest and conviction (his only conviction), Tam went to all the 'good' home games at both Easter Road and Tynecastle but he hadn't been to any game since then (four months previously). He was now reduced to watching the game on television.

He goes to the bookies 'now and then' to put money on a horse - 'I sometimes win and sometimes lose'. However his friend Angus later described him as a 'compulsive gambler'.

Instead of going to the football on a Saturday afternoon, he now stays at home to watch the wrestling on T.V. As a result of his trying to imitate a 'Boston Crab' submission hold on his 16 year old younger brother, the hapless lad ended up in hospital with a twisted testicle. Friend Angus was also a recent and unfortunate victim of Tam's newly found love of wrestling - in a pub Tam's attempt at a mock stranglehold ('a touch of the Kendo Nagasaki's', laughed Tam) ended with Angus passing out.

Many of his other activities are pub-based - he plays snooker and pool in pubs and students' unions and darts in the pub. He used to play rugby but gave it up when he lost his front teeth. He's keen on heavy rock music - Genesis, the Stones, the Floyd and Yes - and conservatively underestimates that he spends c. 12 hours per week in the pub. He goes to a golf club on Sundays 'for the cheap pint of lager'.

He describes his background as 'typically middle class' (the family have a 'superior' Persian cat) though he stresses that class means nothing to him - 'it doesn't bother me what the neighbours think'. In spite of this (or perhaps because of this) he finds life 'extremely tough' on his student grant and frequently borrows money from his best friend. At that moment, he was actually owing Angus £10. His fine was paid out of money left to him by his grandfather. If he hadn't had that legacy, Tam thinks
his parents would have paid it for him even though he has his own money (which he
doesn't want to touch). If he had the means, he would rather live away from home,
mainly because of the personality clash with his father:

'He conforms, I rebel.'

Since the fine Tam no longer thinks it's worth the risk to go to a football match -
at least not until he's earning some money.

Tam first started supporting Hibs at early secondary school for no other reason than
that his mates supported Hearts. He therefore dislikes Hearts 'in a friendly sort
of a way' because of his mates. He feels that the current Hibs team is 'very mediocre'
having foolishly sold O'Rourke, Stanton and Gordon. They were a good team, he thinks,
when they won the League Cup. Their defence is still 'quite sound' but their attack
is 'pathetic'.

He reckons it's 'blatantly obvious' who runs the show at Easter Road - 'that guy
Hart'. His idea has been to challenge Rangers and Celtic with his financial backing
but 'they'll never do that even with money'. Both the board of directors and those
who sign the players at Easter Road, Tam reckons, must take the blame for recent
unimpressive results. There has never been a 'big man' behind the club at Tynecastle
and this is why Hearts have never been able to splash out on massive transfer fees
in the way Hibs have. The Hearts team, Tam feels, are 'totally unpredictable' but if
they were more consistent they would be better than Hibs.

Tam estimates his trips to see Hibs and Hearts at home cost him £5 a time. Before
the match, he would set off to the pub at opening time (11 a.m.) where he'd drink
10 pints of lager. After the match, he would go straight home to eat the evening
meal before going out for the Saturday evening.
Tam saw football, more than anything else, as 'good conversation fodder' - it didn't matter to him overmuch whether Hibs or Hearts won or lost. It was a nice Saturday afternoon out plus the main topic of discussion over the evening's beer.

When Tam went to the match he would stand on the main terracing at Easter Road or under the 'shed' at Tynecastle. He didn't often wear a scarf except at Edinburgh 'derbies' and he was wearing a Hibs scarf when he was arrested at such a game. He used to enjoy joining in the chants - especially the sarcastic ones - even from his stance on the Easter Road terracing.

Before his arrest, Tam just regarded the police as 'being there'. He held a certain sympathy for those who were arrested 'as you realised that you were just doing yourself what they got charged for'. Since arrest, he regards the police as 'agents provocateurs' because of the way they segregate the fans. At that match, Tam got segregated on the terracing along with his mates who support Hearts. The police interpreted the fact that he was wearing a Hibs scarf in a Hearts crowd as meaning that he was a trouble-maker. The police told him that he was 'causing trouble' and he got 'lifted':

'Segregation may have to be done, but it's unfortunate that people like me slip through the net.'

At first, Tam claims he wasn't exactly arrested. He was taken to the Easter Road detention room where the police asked him for his name. He replied that he had no intention of telling them unless they charged him. They charged him! Tam says he started 'being arrogant and treating them with contempt and disparaging their intelligence'. This, he now readily concedes was stupid and was due to the amount of drink he'd had. It had been an exceptional lunchtime session - even for Tam - and he'd knocked back 15 pints of lager:

'I'm not normally aggressive but I was in the detention room.' (his emphasis)
One of his friends on the terracing had been wearing a Hibs scarf too but he had noticed the police coming and ran. Tam, however, had been grabbed by the arm and hauled out:

'That was fair enough.' (This is a reference to the force used).

They put Tam down for a 'breach of the peace' on the charge sheet - 'the only charge they could get me with'. Tam then, to the best of his memory, called them 'fascist pigs' but didn't swear:

'I don't believe they are but I was in 'some state' of drink .'

He is convinced he would have acted more humbly if he'd had less to drink and therefore the incident might not have gone as far as it did.

Tam had been to the stand twice in his life and he hated it both times because there was no atmosphere. The Tynecastle covering, he feels, is good and there's a great atmosphere in the 'shed' there. For him, Easter Road lost much of its atmosphere when seating was put behind the goal.

His favourite players in the game are Danny McGrain ('the ultimate professional and one of the best full backs ever'), Pele, Eusebio and Cruyff. He says he hates John Greig (as a player) because he 'breaks legs' - what he did to Lennox at Ibrox was 'terrible'. He detests Alan Ball too and describes him as an 'arrogant little "B"'.

Tam doesn't bother with food when he's at the match:

'I prefer lager.'
He reckons he would still drink in the pub before the match even if you could buy drink inside the football ground - though he thinks the police will never agree to that in Scotland. He feels that alcohol is the major factor in incidents of football hooliganism though the fanatical support that some sober supporters exhibit may be another element.

Of the fans gathered together in the Easter Road detention room Tam was the most drunk by far. The other 'offenders', he says, had different ideas from him - they seemed to be keen on collecting charges at every ground in Scotland. One said things like: 'The cell at Perth is a lot better than the cell at Tynecastle.'

Tam is now of the opinion that the police are 'stupid'. He eventually tossed them his matriculation card and they wrote his name down from there - writing down 'Tony' as his Christian name instead of 'Thomas' which was on the card. ('Tony' in fact is his Dad's name). Tam then gave them his address and age. He was then asked if he had been in trouble with the police before and he said he hadn't been.

Tam was the first man in the ground to be 'lifted', with his arrest taking place before the kick-off. He feels that he would only have been ejected if he hadn't been so 'arrogant' and he most certainly regrets his attitude now.

There were two 'cells' (locked rooms) in the detention room - the 'Hibs cell' had two other inhabitants apart from Tam and there were six Hearts supporters locked up next door. Tam was kept in the room from 2.45 p.m. until 5 p.m. (and the others consequently for lesser periods of time) and he wanted to be sick throughout the time.

By 5.30 p.m. they had all been transferred to the High Street where eight of the nine, including Tam, were put in a communal cell (the ninth, according to Tam, spat on the police and was to appear in court on Monday morning with two black eyes).

One of the others was having 'about five different charges brought against him' and he thought it was great to be arrested. Tam, on the other hand, was not at all
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amused as he was beginning to sober up and with his sobriety came regret.

The police soon phoned his father who made his way down to the police station to bail his son out but, unfortunately for Tam, he couldn't find the High Street police station and his son wasn't bailed out until 10 p.m. by which time he had sobered up completely. Tam was annoyed that most of the others were given £5 bail but his bail was £10. He had in fact started out that morning with £11 in his pocket and he had five left at the time of arrest. According to Tam, his Dad didn't say anything - 'one of the few times he's been decent'.

When they discussed possible court tactics, his father told him to plead guilty as he wanted a minimum of publicity (not for Tam's sake but for his own sake, thinks Tam). Tam concedes that he might well have been 'drunk and incapable' but that was all - 'a breach of the peace was a stick-on charge'. Tam feels it's impossible to define a breach of the peace and is annoyed that people get fined similar amounts as he did for throwing boulders. Pleading not guilty his father reckoned, in simplistic terms, would have involved twice the publicity because Tam would have had to appear at both a pleading diet and a trial diet. If it hadn't been for his Dad's influence Tam says he would have made a not guilty plea and asked for a lawyer on legal aid. His Dad insisted that he was protecting Tam from the university authorities but Tam felt he was only trying to protect his own reputation. In any case, there was publicity - bigger than a three-month security fiddle got, complained Tam. Tam himself took the fact he felt he had been 'wrongly convicted' badly. He felt the financial strain of the fine badly and the publicity that the court case was given also affected him. Even the guilty plea backfired a bit on his father as, after the report appeared in the evening newspaper, 'friends' and neighbours phoned his father ostensibly to talk about something else but inevitably ended the conversation by asking 'by the way, was that your son...?'

Tam arrived at the sheriff court on the Monday morning at 10 a.m., asked 'some guy' what court he would be in, was told where to sit in court and watched about twenty
cases being processed before his. Tam, somewhat cynically, reckons that by the time
his case came round the sheriff was 'so pissed off that he hammered me'. Tam was
eventually brought before the court sometime between noon and 1 p.m.

The sheriff-clerk asked him if his name was 'Tony _____' and he replied that it
wasn't, it was 'Thomas ____'. Tam says dryly that he would have kept it at 'Tony'
had that not been his father's name. Even then, he was tempted! Tam was then asked
how he was pleading to which he replied 'Guilty'. He was asked by the sheriff if he
had anything to say. Tam said he didn't and was fined £50. It was agreed that he
should pay the fine in instalments but Tam later decided to pay it all in one go.

According to Tam, the sheriff had asked the first football offender how much he
earned (£45) and then appeared to assume that everyone else earned the same and he
didn't enquire about his background. Nevertheless, Tam bears no grudges against the
sheriff - 'he was just doing his job.' Tam is amazed though when he reads of some
of the fines imposed on other 'football hooligans':

'Oone guy who was done outside the ground was only fined £10 -
I resent this.'

Tam feels that violence on the field has nothing to do with violence on the terracing
and that there's no way 'football hooliganism' can be 'cured'. He reckons that
there's always some sort of 'trouble' when Hearts, Rangers and Celtic visit Easter
Road - though he feels that against Hearts 'there's never any real fighting'. Celtic
supporters are fine when their team is winning but Rangers supporters are 'naturally
bad' and their IQ can be measured in 'negative points'. The worst crowd
'trouble' that Tam's ever seen at Easter Road was the first time that Liverpool
visited them in the Fairs Cup and the 'Kop' took over what was then the Easter Road
'Cave'. The crowd scenes were also pretty bad when Hibs beat Rangers 3-0 in a
Dryburgh Cup game and Hibs fans were chased on to the pitch by Rangers fans.
Tam claimed he never drunk himself during the match but in any case he left me with the impression that, if he didn't already have one, he was heading for a drink problem. Between 12 noon and our being hustled (last) out of the pub at 2.45 p.m., Tam had easily managed to sink seven pints of lager. When he went up to the bar to buy a round he'd return with half of his pint drunk by the time he came to sit down. 'Reality is an illusion caused by severe lack of alcohol', he said jokingly when I tackled him on the subject. More seriously, he admitted that there were times when he could 'drink and drink' and that sometimes he made an exhibition of himself. He reckons he can handle drink but says:

'There are times when I get so bloody depressed with the house that I think ....'up to the pub'.

Tam doesn't in fact think that there's much 'real violence' at all on the terraces - 'it's mostly like myself'. He says he's been to a hundred matches yet he's never seen anyone 'really fighting'. He's seen heads 'stamped in' at his local pub but never at a football match. About a month before his arrest at the match he was going to charge someone with assault after a pub incident: some guy stole Tam's jacket and then 'hammered' Angus's jaw (which needed stitches) when he gave chase. The police, however, Tam says, decided to drop the charges against the guy because Tam was a 'hooligan' too. This is the sort of thing, Tam declares in disgust, that you would easily get 'done' for at a football match.

Students at his union, too, were found guilty of breach of the peace but merely admonished for throwing bags of flour in opposition to a performance by female strippers. Yet Tam was fined £50!

He had read a few years ago about a breadknife being stuck in a female's head at an Aberdeen v Celtic game but people try to make out that this is a regular thing. It isn't, he says.

Tam left the pub and headed straight for the 'bookies'.
CASE STUDY NO 4: HARRY

Harry's an eighteen year old Rangers supporter who lives with his Mum, Dad and little brother in an Edinburgh housing scheme. An older brother and four sisters are married. His Dad's unemployed and his Mum's a cleaner; both his parents are, he says, 'drunkards'. Harry's hoping to move out soon as he's 'about tae get engaged'.

Harry is small but stockily built. His main interest is playing and watching football though he was 'really keen' on boxing at one time. Harry stopped boxing because he was 'too vicious'. One opponent stood on Harry's toes during a boxing match so afterwards Harry gave him a 'doin'' with his gloves off. In fact, Harry looks a bit like Jim Watt, only Harry's a bit more battle-scarred. He sports a few tattoos on his arm (including his name) and his finger nails are badly bitten.

Harry used to go to the football match a lot. But he's curtailed his attendances because of the violence and the risk of getting into trouble:

'It's getting to the stage that you're scared to go to games.'

He only goes to 'wee gemmes' now - innocuous affairs like Rangers v Morton, where there's less chance of getting into 'trouble'.

He thinks Celtic, Rangers and Aberdeen fans are not particularly well behaved and that the police are not capable of controlling them. He sometimes goes to see Hearts or Hibs if they're playing a reasonable team. He reckons Hearts supporters are the most violent of all though:

'They'll fight with anybody.'

He supports Rangers 'because I like them' and because his father, his Uncle Rab and 'everybody else' supports them. Religion doesn't bother Harry though he doesn't like Celtic - but not because they're Catholic: 'They're a good team,' he admits. He
thinks Rangers are 'no' very good at present and that certain of their players are getting too old. He supports Liverpool too and likes to see both Hearts and Hibs doing well. He's never been a member of a Rangers supporters' club though he uses their buses to get to matches. He attended his first match at the age of nine (at Tynecastle) - he remembers falling asleep during the game - and first went to Ibrox when he was fourteen.

It costs Harry about £2 for the bus fare and £2 admission. He reckons the total cost of the day out is £5 or £6. He says they're 'no' allowed booze on the bus but it's OK as long as you don't throw the cans out the window'. Harry usually drinks four cans of lager on the outward journey. The bus stops at a pub on the way - 'for a couple o' jars and tae listen tae a flute band'. He doesn't go to a pub on arrival at the ground but heads straight for the match. He's never taken a carry-out into the match. On the return journey there's a 'whip-roond' for the driver.

Harry wears a tammy and scarf to the matches and his scarf is covered in Rangers badges. At Ibrox, he goes to the Centenary Stand \[now demolished\], partly because he prefers sitting:

'I try to get to a place where there's no folk so I won't get picked up. I can't afford it 'cos I've been in trouble so often.'

He's never taken a knife to the match - he never uses weapons. Some of his mates do. One carried a knife to the last Scotland v England match. Harry's seen a knife being used at the match once - 'after a boy got clobbered'.

Harry warns you've got to watch going to Ibrox because you have to pass through a Catholic area of Glasgow to get there and in coming back. When the Rangers buses pass nearby the Celtic ground 'they \[Celtic supporters\] throw bricks from bridges'.
When Rangers win, Harry's happy; when they lose he feels bad inside and tries to make up excuses for the opponent's victory e.g. they scored a flukey goal. He likes singing any Rangers song and also 'God Save the Queen'. The only songs he doesn't like are those about the Pope and the IRA:

'The Pope's got nowt tae dae wi' it. That's just askin' for trouble.'

As for crowd control tactics, Harry advocates a greater police presence and more seating (as at Ibrox). He feels all spectators should be compelled to buy a season ticket which would be withdrawn if the holder caused trouble.

He reckons that a 'lot of boys' (aged between 16 and 30) just go to the match for 'trouble' and that you always get at least one person that'll do things for kicks:

'At the match, my mates used to tell me tae 'do' people. I did it because they'd think I was a 'scaredy-cat' if I didn't. I'd go up and hit a boy wi' a can 'cos they told me to. I'd do it in the past but I dinnae do it now.'

Harry thinks drink is the main cause of trouble at football matches. He reckons drink 'brings out the truth' and from personal experience knows that he's been drunk on several occasions he's been arrested. Not only is Harry afraid of getting into trouble at matches but also he refuses to go 'up toon' [Into Central Edinburgh] because there's too much trouble there. He claims the 'Mods v Punks thing' on the streets is just like the Rangers v Celtic conflict at the match.

Harry has amassed over 80 convictions or references to Hearings in all, some 16 of which were collected at football matches. He has also been ejected from football grounds on 10 occasions.
His earliest childhood memory is of his father locking him out on the balcony of the house and of singing the 'Sash' there while clad only in a 'wee vest'. His father had the habit of expelling his children from the house: his four sisters had all been 'kicked out' and Harry had been forced to live in a mate's tent and in abandoned cars (for weeks at a time) on the occasions his father had turned him out. Harry ran away from home as well because his Dad used to hit him with a belt.

Harry first got into trouble when he set a brewery on fire. Bicycle theft, stealing from shops, breaches of the peace, assault and stealing from houses followed. Harry remarked that he fell in with a bad crowd. He also ran into trouble at football matches.

His ejections have followed on a variety of incidents. He's been thrown out several times for fighting, sometimes deservedly, other times not:

'When fighting starts the polis don't know who's causing the trouble and they'll grab anybody. They kick you, give you a black eye and throw you oot. Ye canna dae nowt. Ye canna hit them back or you'll get 'done'. I got thrown oot once for wearing the 'Red Hand o' Ulster'.
I've deserved gettin' kicked oot a few times for shouting and swearing.
I used to try to come back in again - but not now. If I got caught, I'd get done.
You never get chucked oot by plain-clothes men, always by the police.'

On his frequency of ejection, Harry reflected that he just seemed to be unlucky and that he'd been ejected no more often than his mates.

Harry's been arrested at football matches for fighting, assaulting police, swearing, resisting arrest and for singing Rangers songs:
'I've never been charged with anything serious like offensive weapons.'

On being arrested too, Harry claimed, the police give you a 'doin'' then they charge you and 'that's you till Monday'. In Edinburgh they keep you in the High Street cells 'with the drunkies'.

Harry is of the opinion that the 'police'll just grab you if they dinna like your face' and that because of their uniform the police seem to think they can do anything they want. His most recent arrest was at a Hibs v Rangers game:

'There were Hearts fans between the Hibs fans and us. Somebody threw a bottle and two polismen grabbed me even though I never done anything. They dinna give you a chance to explain. They gave me a bit o' a doin' - my eye was way up.'

Harry's lawyer advised him that even if he pleaded not guilty, he probably would be found guilty and, with his record, be put inside; if he pleaded guilty, he'd get a hefty fine. On this recommendation and a belief that his mates wouldn't turn up in court to confirm that he had not thrown the bottle, Harry pleaded guilty. However, he was sentenced to three months detention at Glenochil.

Before then, he'd been expelled from school, lived in various homes, attended numerous List 'D' schools, been admonished and put on probation. Strangely, he's never been fined.

Harry's experiences of incarceration are bitter. At the age of eighteen, he feels he's already been 'away' too long and doesn't want to be locked up again:

'At Glenochil, you've got to say, 'Excuse me Sir' every time you pass an officer - even if he's on the other side of the room.
They're worse than the Nazis. You get battered if you're caught talking. They shouldn't send anybody there. It gives you a 'short, sharp shock' a' right - but in the wrong way.

I was in Saughton for two and a half weeks on remand. You didnae get battered there or that. But being locked up in your cell for that time on your own is enough for anyone. Some people hate prison but say it was easy when they come out. I've told everybody the truth: it's as hard as anything.'

Harry's been in 'trouble' since the age of six and reckons to have spent nine and a half years out of his eighteen 'away' from his father's house. He has a reputation for being a 'hard man' which is difficult to shake off:

'I can just take care o' myself, that's a'.'

However, he thinks that his forthcoming engagement and the consequent responsibility will help him.

He's seen his exploits publicised in the newspapers on a few occasions. At first, he was 'quite chuffed'. Now he considers he's been stupid. He 'nearly collapsed' and was 'greetin'' when the court sentenced him to detention.

He would much rather appear before a Children's Hearing than a court. In court, he claims, the accused isn't given sufficient opportunity to speak and he complains that the lawyer doesn't always say what you want him to. At his last court appearance on a football charge, Harry had asked his solicitor to say that Harry was willing to undertake community service - in fact anything rather than be 'put away'. However, his solicitor made no such plea and, according to Harry, 'made things sound much worse than they really were'. On the other hand, Harry feels that Children's Hearings have given him a chance to speak and have given the same facility to his mother, social worker and teacher.
Harry is unemployed. He feels prospective employers now class him as a 'proper' criminal because of his spell in detention. He's tried lying to employers about his record but they've always found out. He receives a girocheque from the state worth £37 per fortnight. He smokes 25 cigarettes a day, drinks 40 pints of lager a week and is paying £10 a fortnight to a neighbour whose car he damaged in a show of temper. If he doesn't get a job soon, he's thinking about joining his brother and three sisters who now live in Yorkshire. Otherwise, he says,

'I'll end up like my old man. He spends about £30 a week on booze. Yesterday he drank two bottles o' whisky. He buys a bottle of St. Andrews [fortified wine] every morning.'

When he's not looking for work Harry spends his time at the local community centre - playing snooker, table-tennis, badminton and going to the disco there. He's also attending reading and writing night classes 'cos I can't read or write properly'. This, he acknowledges, is a considerable disadvantage in job hunting. He also feels his age is against him - he's too old for an apprenticeship while a lot of jobs (e.g. bus conductor) want over-21's.

Instead of going to the football, a typical Saturday for Harry now consists of getting drunk. He drinks all day - a dozen pints in the pub, or ten cans or a half-bottle of vodka while listening to records alone in his room. His mates who are working help subsidise his drinking. He spent £13 on drink one night and used to drink with his Dad but that cost too much. Harry's been drinking in pubs since he was sixteen without any bother. Before that he used to drink alcohol at home.
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