

# The Spatial Development of the Modern Stadium

JOHN BALE

School of Human Development, Keele University, Staffordshire, ST5 5BG, United Kingdom

## *Abstract*

The British football stadium is an example of highly territorialized space. In the past one hundred years the environment of football has changed from one of unenclosed, multi-functional space with considerable spatial interaction among players and spectators (weak rules of exclusion) to enclosed, segmented and monofunctional space with impermeable boundaries and efficient surveillance of crowds (strong rules of exclusion). The analogy is drawn between the spatial changes in football space and Foucault's description of the growth of the prison. There has been considerable resistance to the confining of football space and in the early 1990s there are some indications that intra-stadium boundaries are "softening" and that "post-modern" tendencies might be emerging in the landscape of British football.

## **Introduction**

This paper seeks to explore and interpret the territorialization of the British football stadium.<sup>1</sup> The period of modernization, associated with the growth of capitalism, has witnessed the spatial rationalization of many aspects of society. In both rural and urban areas, open space has been replaced by confined spaces, parcels of land replacing common land and multipurpose land uses being followed by enclosure and land use zoning. Sports have been no exception to the increasing spatial rationality and confinement of society; indeed, they can be interpreted as paradigm examples of demarcated spaces since "by its very nature a spatial activity, sport naturally lends itself to geometric quantification" (McClelland 1990), although it could also be argued that nothing in sport is simply "natural" but is, rather, cultural or social. But spatial parameters are certainly found in the rules of all sports and, being struggles over space and the defense of territory, sport has been interpreted as standing out clearly "from all other recreational activity, and even from work, by virtue of an essentially geographic attribute, its time-space specificity" (Wagner 1981).

The seeds of this paper have grown from ideas on space, environment and territory authored by scholars from a variety of disciplines. The concept of the "civilizing process", within which control or restraint have become more subtle and the use of direct force less obvious than previously (Elias and Dunning 1989) is clearly relevant to the changing nature of intra-stadium space. So too is Eichberg's (1988) notion of "achievement space" ("Leistungsräume"), the increasingly artificial and spatially bounded settings within which serious sports take place. The basic ideas informing the present paper, however, come from the work of Robert Sack (1983, 1986) and Michel Foucault (1979, 1980). Although

coming from different disciplinary backgrounds, the work of each of these scholars has considerable relevance to studies of space and territory in sport. Sack, a cultural geographer, sees territoriality, not as some innate defense of space but as a *process* – “the attempt by an individual or group to affect, influence, or control people, phenomena and relationships, by delimiting and asserting control over a geographic area”. In other words, it is a “primary geographical expression of social power” (Sack 1986) creating the idea of a space to be filled and emptied at particular times. Simply stated, Sack’s “theory of territoriality” is that “territories are socially constructed forms of spatial relations and their effects depend on who is controlling whom and for what purpose” (Sack 1986). If territoriality is used as a means of social control but results in an increase in social tension, there are strong arguments for its abandonment and its replacement by nonterritorial alternatives. In a sense, therefore, territoriality may contain the seeds of its own destruction (Johnston 1991). Sport is not mentioned in Sack’s work though he does note, in passing, that the idea of territoriality can be applied at a wide variety of scales and that the internal architectural layout of buildings (i.e. in the present context, stadiums) can be explored in terms of their use of territoriality to establish control over the building’s occupants (Sack 1983).

Sack’s definition of territoriality comes close to Michel Foucault’s view of the idea of territory being “first of all a juridico-political one: the area controlled by a certain kind of power” (Foucault 1980). Central to Foucault’s work is the notion that in order to save political and economic costs a series of basic changes, *relating to the use of space*, has taken place in the exercise of power. Foucault’s (1979) work on the micro-spaces of various “institutions” of internment describes the major focal points (i.e. hospitals, prisons, asylums) of the application of spatial power but he concludes that the penitentiary technique has been taken into the broader social body – or “carceral archipelago” – in which I will include the sporting environment of the football stadium. The stadium is therefore but one part of a “carceral continuum” (Driver 1985). Indeed, many leisure environments might be described as focal points for the application of Foucault’s “great confinement”, consisting of the application of numerous small but significant forms of “biopower” rendering, as they do, a form of docility in the population.

The relative neglect of Foucault’s work in sports studies is somewhat paradoxical in view of his central concern with the *human body*, which, in Harvey’s (1989) words, is “the ‘site’ at which all forms of repression are ultimately registered”. Foucault’s ideas have certainly been alluded to in a sports context but usually *en passant* (e.g. Brohm 1978, Eichberg 1988, Penz 1990). More recently, however, Harvey and Sparks (1991) have noted how in modernity the body is subject to numerous social controls and powers and, invoking Foucault, they note that the power over the body develops around two complementary poles. The first of these is discipline which comprises techniques of power providing various means of training and coercing bodies. Physical education and sport (including, of course, football) are examples of such disciplines. But so too is architecture, including, of course, the design and layout of the football stadium. The second pole for providing power is made up of regulatory controls, including a large number of repressive measures to regulate the population. These include containment and surveillance, as found, for example in prisons, and, as this paper seeks to demonstrate, in analogous situations in the modern football stadium.

Having outlined some of the theoretical bases of territoriality I will now proceed to trace the evolution of the British football stadium as an example of highly territorialized space where an activity which was initially undertaken in open spaces with “permeable” boundaries and where control was openly and sometimes brutally enforced has, in little over a century, become contained within highly segmented and specialized spaces and with increasingly invisible forms of control. The main sections of the paper are made up of first, an interpretation of the stages of immurement through which the British football landscape has passed and secondly, some of the ways in which those who use the stadium have reacted to, indeed resisted, such changes.

## **The Enclosure and Territorialization of Football Space**

### *Folk Football*

A major feature of pre-industrial football was its lack of spatial regulation and an absence of geographic confinement. The antecedent of the modern stadium was therefore the multifunctional landscape of pre-industrial Britain. In folk-games no standardized rules of play existed and games took place between villages and towns – not simply in the sense that these places competed against each other but also literally, *between* each other – in a spatial sense (Dunning and Sheard 1978). Pre-modern football took place on existing landscapes – roads, commons, fields and squares, public spaces holding spectacular but haphazard and imprecise events analogous to the outdoor “spectacle” of punishment prior to its removal from public space and the development of prisons. There were few places specially set aside solely for “sports” for the masses and in many ways football played in the medieval street and the eighteenth century common was similar to carnival where the weak rules of exclusion meant that there was a tendency to “not acknowledge any distinction between actors and spectators” (Bakhtin 1968). Hogarth’s “Night” showed the street to be an untidy place, work and play (street football) being inter-mixed.

Football was a rough and tumble affair with laughter and fun being central features of such games. But like carnival it was often a somewhat subversive event which was subject to public and often spectacular, but brutal, control. For example, opposition to street football in Derby in the late 1840s reached its climax when the Riot Act was read and the cavalry called in (Marples 1954) – a dramatic case of a non-territorial form of control. Such control was undoubtedly costly, in both economic and political terms, and contrasts with other examples where a territorial approach was used, as in the banning of street football in Alnwick where, in 1827, the inability of nonterritorial measures led to the provision of a special site for the game at the edge of the town (Marples 1954). At the intraurban level, therefore, the *segregation* of football space had commenced in the early nineteenth century but the spatial *segmentation* of football space was to start later, following the standardization of the sports’ rules, the subject to which I now turn.

### *Rule-boundedness*

As noted above, the growth of commerce in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries led to restrictions on public access to places like the commons and the

streets. Rudimentary concepts of town planning emerged where spaces would be allocated to particular uses. An increasing division of labor in society was accompanied with an increasing division of space and time. There was a time for work and a time for play; there were to be specific places where various activities, formerly undertaken on streets, squares and commons, could be accommodated.

These general societal changes, which were to lead to the development of the specialized football stadium, were paralleled by developments in sport itself. Activities became codified and various forms of movement culture like folk-football became "sportified". The nineteenth century witnessed the progressive refinement of the rules, football space becoming delimited by the application of arithmetic and geometry. A crucial feature of all sports rules is the spatial delimitation of the field of "play" and the unspecified spaces in which folk-football was played were replaced by straight lines defining where play could, and could not, take place. Such development was incremental. For the best part of twenty years following the formulation of the 1863 rules (Dunning and Sheard 1979), the boundaries between players and spectators remained relatively permeable. With the absence of touchlines crowds often encroached on to the pitch to the extent that only about 30 metres of playing space was left. As a result players mingled with spectators for the ball, often dodging and fighting with those who had come to watch (Marples 1954). This inexact division of space was clearly a residual of the folk-game tradition and was formally brought to an end in 1882 when the touchline was introduced into the rules.

The spatial confinement of football, initially a response to the standardization of rules and a rational response to the unstandardized nature of early-modern football, also had the effect of making the game more achievement-oriented. This was achieved by isolating the experts (i.e. players) from the spectators, a characteristic of modernity, further reflecting the rationalizing tendencies present in broader aspects of nineteenth century society.

### *Commodification and segregation*

It has been argued that a major characteristic of the development of capitalism was the increased commodification of space (Lefebvre 1991) or the idea that space should be made to pay. Football space was no exception in this respect and following its enclosure, someone, somewhere felt that it would be worth charging for admission to watch games. The next stage in the confinement of football was therefore a response to economic imperatives. The sport became "paying consumption rather than participating recreation and could be more easily confined in particular locations and particular time slots" (Thrift 1981). Charging for admission seems to have developed rapidly from the mid 1870s (Mason 1980).

Initially a roped or fenced off field sufficed but soon clubs began to segregate their spectators, already segregated from the players by the white chalk line, by providing superior forms of accommodation. Pavilions, often leased from cricket clubs, could be used by those who wanted additional comfort or space to entertain business acquaintances (Inglis 1989). As the popularity of the sport increased, other forms of segregation could be adopted; grandstands with sections to accommodate directors were built and standing on the terraces was supplemented by seats. The social geographies of the new stadiums came to mirror those of the

cities in which they were found. Into the mid-twentieth century, therefore, segregation – and hence power and control – was based on economic criteria rather than on team affiliation and movement between terraces was widely practiced as supporters changed “ends” at half-time. Boundaries between particular parts of the terraces were still permeable into the late 1950s and the pitch itself, long separated from spectators by the straight white lines, was far from impermeable; crowds often spilled on to the pitch after the game to congratulate players or, on occasions, to remonstrate with the referee, but the term “pitch invasion” would carry all the wrong connotations.

A tangential point might be made at this stage. Although crowds did occasionally venture on to pitches, the grass on which the sport was played was essentially a form of monoculture; it was designed for the cultivation of football and nothing else, in contrast to the land use of folk-football which was intended primarily for agricultural and other commercial usage. Because the grass surface was carefully tended and manicured it was of little value for alternative uses and even football matches could be played on it with relative infrequency. In other words, football space was colonizing existing land uses, multifunctional landscapes giving way to monofunctional sportscares.

### *Containment and panopticism*

Economic (and by implication, class-based) criteria had formed the basis of power and control (i.e. segregation) from the turn of the century but since the early 1960s British football has witnessed a series of measures to further segment intra-stadium space – this time on the basis of team affiliation – or placebased criteria. But such segmentation was itself a response to two basic and inter-related factors; first, from the increased need to “control” the perceived problem of crowd misbehaviour and secondly, from the worsening economic situation in British football. Attendances at British football matches fell steadily from a short-lived post-war boom as the sport faced competition from competing leisure activities and changing family life-styles. Declining attendances were also blamed, in part at least, on the “hooligan problem”.

As a result, the parcelling of stadium space assumed a number of new dimensions, including spatial demarcation by team allegiance, the sub-division of terrace space on grounds of safety, the hardening of the boundary between players and spectators by the erection of perimeter fences, the accommodation of more exclusive accommodation for an economic elite; and the move towards all seater stadiums.

I noted earlier the tendency during the 1950s for fans to change ends at half time. In the mid 1960s crowds became more assertive and the popular press identified gangs who staked out territorial claims behind each goal. Home gangs increasingly watched matches from fixed locations but the absence of any barriers to movement meant that some gangs were able to “take” the opposing “end”. Such interterritorial rivalries and their associated exchanges did undoubtedly take place but tended to be over-reported in the mass media with a resulting “moral panic”. By this I mean the construction by the popular media of “folkdevils” which served to initiate, through a self-fulfilling prophecy, the very things that polite society was seeking to eradicate (Cohen 1972). The result was a new phase of spatial control.

The “thin, blue line” of the police increasingly gave way to much stronger exclusionary measures with the enforced segregation of home and away supporters by the erection of physical barriers and “pens”. In the mid 1980s an electrified fence was installed at one London ground but following protests was dismantled before it could be used. The enforcement of power and control by segregation on the basis of socio-economic status also continued to intensify and, while the more *lumpen* of football’s fandom was being herded into insanitary pens, the more socially and economically acceptable were increasingly distanced from grassroot support by more expensive forms of segregated accommodation – the special, glass-fronted “executive boxes”. Such developments were often accompanied by the destruction of the more popular parts of the ground.

As football increasingly came to lack commercial viability it therefore experienced a specific kind of “crowd practice” – not the mixing of people as in the cases of the earlier grounds which reflected too much the *lumpen* behaviour of folk-football, but a more territorialized approach more reminiscent of the bourgeois audience of the theatre. There were two important implications of such physical changes in the stadium’s environment:

First, the image of the spectator as someone who can only be tempted to watch a game if it offers standards of physical comfort which he would expect to find elsewhere. Second, it implies a particular way of watching the game. Seated, dispassionately critical, the new spectator waits to be entertained. The show is something out there, not something of which he is part. In the gaps in the entertainment, he expects to be provided with food and drink, music and spectacular demonstrations (Clarke 1978).

The luxury boxes identified a new kind of spectator; “no impassioned trouble maker he – no physical involvement, chanting or swearing in these new stands”. With “whisky in hand” he is the recipient of “instant entertainment” (Cricher 1979). Meanwhile, the community of local fans were relegated to insanitary, alcohol-free pens.

The compartmentalization of space into socially homogeneous areas serves to reinforce boundaries between such groups and people come to literally know their place, with a stake in a particular territory, encouraging docility and a status quo view of the world (Sibley 1981). But despite these measures considerable concern about the behaviour of fans inside stadiums continued into the 1980s. The response was for all clubs to install closed circuit television in order to identify trouble makers. This modern form of panopticism encourages comparison with Foucault’s description of the prison; the spectator, like “the inmate must never know whether he is being looked at at any moment; but he must be sure that he may always be so” (Foucault 1979). Where people with a media-amplified reputation for roughness had to be contained, efficient surveillance was a necessity; surveillance provided knowledge while knowledge provided power and control.

A further tendency in the territorialization of the British stadium, accelerated following the Taylor report (Taylor 1991) into the Hillsborough disaster, was the recommendation that British football should be watched in all-seater stadiums. Seating was a response, not simply to the view (which is contestable) that it would provide greater comfort and hence claw back those who had been lost to the game or attract a new breed of spectators, but also to the view (which is equally contestable) that seats would restrain the violent tendencies of the 1970s and lead

to safer stadiums. By doing so, however, the stadium would approximate to an “enclosed, segmented space... in which the individuals are inserted in a fixed space” (Foucault 1979). “Anchorage in a space is an economic-political form”, noted Foucault (1980) and a numbered seat meant that “each individual has his own place; and each place its own individual” (Foucault 1980). The all-seater stadium therefore represents “a compact model of the disciplinary mechanism” (Foucault 1979), achieving power through individualization, rather than the more random approach used in putting down the folk games. The security system in such stadiums is likened by some observers as being “more suitable to a prison” (Arens 1980) or a fortress, given its need and ability to repel invading hoards (Ehrenberg 1980) – reinforcing the Foucaultian analogy used earlier and the Sackian notion that territoriality can serve as an exclusionary as well as an inclusionary strategy. With computerized ticketing, the physical evidence of spatial separation (i.e. barriers and “pens”) might be reduced as an electronic means of surveillance that would extend beyond the video camera to data banks derived from computerized information. Accompanying this would be a common characteristic of modernity – people being treated less like people and more like things (or numbers).

Some British clubs experimented with another form of spatial segregation, i.e. “family sections”, but this move can also be viewed as an analogy of Foucault’s description of the growth of the prison. As with the hierarchical “family” of supervisors in progressive nineteenth century prisons, the nuclear family, seated together as “docile bodies” replaces the fear of continual visual inspection with the anti-institutional and natural weapon of the family – perhaps the ultimate in the art of power relations (Foucault 1979). The modernist stadium, argues Eduardo Archetti (1992), would be “full of spectators silently watching the performance and not taking part in the drama, who consequently cannot change the result (and is) the ideal image of modern sport... built on the clear separation between players and spectators, between activity and passivity”.<sup>2</sup> Football will then have achieved the “critical distance” between performers and audience, a situation already found in the modern theatre.

## Reaction

In *Rational Landscapes and Humanistic Geography*, Edward Relph notes that “it is paradoxical that while analytic and rational methods of... planning have been demonstrably beneficial, for they have helped to improve living standards and to increase material well-being, they have also resulted in the creation of landscapes which are frequently judged to be inhumane or dehumanizing”, noting also that the rational landscape is paradoxical because it is the result of “too much rationalism and an excess of humanism” (Relph 1981). Such landscapes are often described as “inauthentic” or “placeless” (Relph 1976) and will be typified by some future stadiums – anonymous concrete bowls or bland forms of container architecture. “Traditional” football grounds, however, generating as they do, intense identification among fans, can be regarded as examples of authentic places given the unselfconscious sense of place, sentiment, *genius loci* and attachment generated by them (Bale 1991).

But as Hargreaves (1987) has observed, "the rationalization of spectator sports has had counter-productive effects in relation to audience satisfaction". The paradox of the modern football landscape can be explored by applying the ideas of Relph (1981) who argues that "progress", as reflected in the urban landscape, is often associated with a "manifestation of rationalism pushed to its limits and already turning against itself, becoming restricting rather than enlightening". Relph feels that little exists in the modern landscape of concrete and glass

that has not been conceived in terms of efficiency or improved material conditions. but there is almost nothing in them that can happen spontaneously, autonomously or accidentally, or which expresses human emotions and feeling. If this absence diminishes the quality of our lives it does so sadly, quietly and unobtrusively, rather than with some overt, brutal denial.

Several aspects of the modern stadium, while demonstrating technical progress, engender dissatisfaction by players and spectators alike and can be interpreted in the terms applied above by Relph. The most obvious, in the present context, are those of spatial confinement, surveillance and seating. These newer developments contribute, therefore, towards the stadium becoming a site for resistance to forms of rational progress which have led to dissatisfaction, even active opposition, from those for whom the proposals were intended.

Reactions and resistance to the present state of confinement found in the British football stadium come from various groups associated with the sport and many have articulated strongly negative responses. For example, the Taylor report itself noted that "the spectacle of these cage-like fences is inconsistent with a sports ground being for pleasure and recreation... Having to stand in a cage for your Saturday afternoon recreation inevitably causes resentment" (Taylor 1991). The stadium is therefore all too often the antithesis of play and freedom and more often a symbol of control and restraint. But dissatisfaction and resentment to changes in the football landscape are not new and go back to the folk-game days of the eighteenth century and earlier. There has, in other words, been a long tradition of resistance to the enclosure of football space and I noted some examples of defiance to the abolition of street football in the early part of this paper.

The enclosure of common land and the appropriation of streets had great implications for peoples' leisure as well as for their work. The fact that folk-football was often banned does not mean that there was no resistance, or that it was inevitably useless. Among many examples, it is recorded, that a football riot was associated with the successful defiance of an eighteenth century attempt to enclose Holland Fen, a folk-football site in Lincolnshire (Malcolmson 1979), though law and order did eventually prevail. In other cases resistance to the banning of folk-football appeared more successful, as in the case at Ashbourne in Derbyshire where the game continues to the present day, albeit in a museumized form. But it is impossible to tell the extent to which apparently successful resistance to the banning of folk-football and its accommodation at particular sites or in particular forms represent examples of ritualization, hence allowing the consolidation of power more effectively than by violent means.

Over two hundred years later Coventry City fans resisted the introduction of seats to their Highfield Road stadium by simply tearing them out. More recently, fans have begun to stand on the very seats which were intended to "contain" them



– arguably a more dangerous way of watching football than standing on the terraces (Foster 1992).

But perhaps the problematic and conjunctural articulation of opposition to more recent developments in the confinement of football space can be found in the literature of the somewhat anarchic fanzine movement (made up of “unofficial” football magazines produced by and for fans themselves) which has been a feature of the British football scene in the past decade. Such publications, totaling around 400 and read by more than one million people, are fugitive and ephemeral but almost certainly reflect the “insider’s” view of football better than any other printed source. They can be interpreted as a form of cultural contestation; they also constitute a valuable research resource. A letter to the 1970s fanzine, *Foul*, attacked the vision of society’s dominant groups by noting that “Utopia is a spotless concrete bowl lined with thousands of little blue plastic seats, lots of clean toilets, a restaurant, a sports complex, piped muzak, and 22 cleancut goal hungry zombies... on a plasti-grass pitch”. But for the blue collar masculine fan it was from “those cold, forbidding terraces that you find the central nervous system of football from which the adrenalin rises and the lifeblood flows” (quoted in Redhead 1986). A decade later, fanzine editors were echoing these sentiments. In *Of the Ball* it was noted that embourgeoisified football “is reduced to ritzyglitzy hype, heavily commercialized with forced and ordered excitement. This sanitized soccer becomes, to the hamburger culture society, just another thing to do – last week the cinema, this week football, next week the theme park” (Beauchampe 1986). Among the consistent features of British football fanzines has been their opposition to the introduction of territorialized means of control – the “executive boxes”, crowd segregation, fencing and penning, as well as other forms of rationalisation such as ground sharing by clubs and the escalation of policing (Jary et al. 1991).

Such qualitative statements as these can be supplemented with quantitative data resulting from a number of attitude surveys into fans’ reactions to the recommendation of the Taylor Report (1991) that all supporters in British football grounds should be seated. Such surveys reveal that the percentages of respondents who prefer to stand to watch a match range from 44 % (Canter et al. 1989) to 80 %.<sup>3</sup> Of respondents to a survey undertaken by Millwall Football Club, 93 % believed that they should have the “right to stand”<sup>4</sup> while a survey of members of the Football Supporters’ Association showed that 69.3 % would oppose seating in their own clubs’ grounds while 15.6 % stated that they would not watch their club in an all seater ground (Sir Norman Chester Centre for Football Research 1989).

In the early 1990s several events have suggested that resistance was not entirely useless. The Football League is reconsidering its views on all-seater stadiums; the perimeter fences around many grounds have come down; observers are talking about “celebration” rather than “aggravation” among football fans (Taylor 1991) and zany dress styles, face paints and a MUSIC-football nexus are bringing fun back to the terraces (Redhead 1991). The Football Supporters’ Association and the fanzines have become mouthpieces through which the voices of many of the sport’s supporters can be heard, combining to create a form of cultural resistance. In the case of the British football stadium, therefore, the confining tendencies which I have described above have been resisted – with varying degrees of success – at both the start and at the current stage of the “great confinement”. Such

resistance, indicating social tension, suggests that territoriality may not have been a wholly appropriate way of solving football's problems. This view is confirmed, to an extent at least, by the apparent trend towards what might be loosely called "post-modern" trends in the micro-spaces of British football.

Although it is difficult to talk about "post-modernism" in relation to British football space – simply because the sport has barely started being modernized – the softening of the boundaries and the weakening of the rules of exclusion within grounds invite analogies with post modern movements in other spheres. In architecture it is widely regarded that the symbolic end of modernism was in 1972 when the Pruitt-Igoe apartment blocks in St. Louis (constructed in the mid 1950s) were dynamited and demolished; they had become uninhabitable. In British football, 1990 might be flagged as the beginning of the postmodern stadium when the metal fences surrounding many grounds were taken down and scrapped. As Hillsborough had demonstrated, the terraces (like Pruitt Igoe) had become uninhabitable. The old suddenly seemed to be new again. And the ambiguity of modernization itself was revealed in the short-lived presence in English League football of the plastic pitches (subsequently replaced by grass) in a small number of grounds. While disliked by players and fans, plastic pitches showed how modern technology could be double-edged in its applications by temporarily signaling a return to the multifunctional use of space – a return to mixed land use where football could take place along side a range of other activities, many of which were less "serious" and involved greater community use than was possible on the monocultural "sacred turf" of sportscape. Whether technology produces further innovations in playing surfaces, satisfactory to all participants in football remains to be seen.

## **Conclusion**

In this paper I have tried to show not simply how the environment in which sport is played has changed over time but how some of these changes might be interpreted. I have attempted to illustrate the fact that since the eighteenth century football has been regularly subjected to forms of territorialization or spatial confinement. The game has moved from being a form of corporal to one of carceral participation. Initially, a limitation on playing space, then an exact spatial definition of the pitch and, today, enforced segregation of spectators both from players and other spectators, the story of the stadium has indeed been one of "great confinement". Whereas the intra-stadium space of the early twentieth century included a number of "permeable boundaries", in the modern stadium the boundaries between various groups (players/spectators, home/away fans, rich/poor fans) tend to be "impermeable". In this sense, the stadium is an archetype of modernity (Archetti 1992). In addition, I have illustrated how surveillance is central to a major sporting activity. The paper has also shown how the sites of football have assumed some of the characteristics of spaces of resistance and contestation in which "marginalized" groups (in this case, football fans) have shown themselves to be far from passive. Finally, the paper has indicated the centrality of the spatial dimension in the environment of sport and how a politics of territory, a geographical humanism and an awareness of sociospatial interactions are crucial to an understanding of that environment.

## References

- ARCHETTI, E., 1992: "Il calcio: un rituale della violenza?" In: P. Lanfranchi (ed.): *Il Calcio e suo Pubblico*. Naples: Edizione Scientifiche Italiane.
- ARENS, W., 1980: "Playing with aggression". In: J. Chermas and R. Lewin (eds.): *Not Work Alone*. London: Temple Smith, 71-83.
- BAKHTIN, M., 1968: *Rabalais and his World*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- BALE, J., 1991: "Playing at home: British football and a sense of place". In: J. Williams and S. Wagg (eds.): *British Football and Social Change*. Leicester: Leicester University Press, 130-144.
- BEAUCHAMPE, S., 1986: "Family fodder". *Off the Ball*, November.
- BROHM, J.-M., 1978: *Sport: a Prison of Measured Time*. London: Ink Links.
- CANTER, D., COOMBER, M., and UZZELL, D., 1989: *Football in its Place*. London: Routledge.
- CLARKE, J., 1978: "Football and working class fans; tradition and change". In: R. Ingham, et al. (eds.): *Football Hooliganism; the Wider Context*. London: Inter-Action Inprint.
- COHEN, S., 1972: *Folk Devils and Moral Panics*. London: McGibbon and Kee.
- CRITCHER, C., 1979: "Football since the war". In: J. Clarke, C. Critcher and R. Johnson (eds.): *Working Class Culture*. London: Hutchinson, 161-184.
- DRIVER, F., 1985: "Power, space and the body: a critical assessment of Foucault's Discipline and Punish". *Society and Space*, 3, 4, 425-446.
- DUNNING, E., and SHEARD, K., 1978: *Gentlemen, Barbarians and Players*. Oxford: Martin Robertson.
- EHRENBERG, A., 1988: "Aimez vous les stades? Architecture du mass et mobilization". *Recherches*, 43, 25-54.
- EICHBERG, H., 1988: *Leistungsräume: Sport als Umweltproblem*. Münster: Lit Verlag.
- ELIAS, N., and DUNNING, E., 1989: *Quest for Excitement*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- FOSTER, J., 1992: "All-seater football stadiums 'dangerous'". *The Independent*, 26th January, 2.
- FOUCAULT, M., 1979: *Discipline and Punish*. Harmondsworth: Penguin
- FOUCAULT, M., 1980: *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings*. Brighton: Harvester.
- HARGREAVES, J., 1987: "The body, sport and power relations". In: J. Horne, D. Jary and A. Tomlinson (eds.): *Sport, Leisure and Social Relations, Sociological Review Monograph*, 33. London: Routledge, 139-159.
- HARVEY, D., 1989: *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- HARVEY, J., and SPARKS, R., 1991: "The politics of the body in the context of modernity". *Quest*, 43, 2, 164-189.
- INGLIS, S., 1989: *The Football Grounds of Great Britain*. London: Collins.
- JARY, D., HORNE, J., and BUCKE, T., 1991: "Football 'fanzines' and football culture: a case of successful 'cultural contestation'". *The Sociological Review*, 39, 3, 582-597.
- JOHNSTON, R., 1991: *A Question of Place: Exploring the Practice of Human Geography*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- LEFEBVRE, H., 1991: *The Production of Space*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- MALCOLMSON, R., 1979: *Popular Recreations in English Society, 1700-1850*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MARPLES, M., 1954: *A History of Football*. London: Secker and Warburg.
- MASON, T., 1980: *Association Football and English Society, 1863-1915*. Brighton; Harvester Press.
- MCCLELLAND, J., 1990: "The numbers of reason; luck, logic and art in Renaissance conceptions of sport". In: J. Carter and A. Krüger (eds.): *Ritual and Record*. New York: Greenwood Press, 53-64.
- PENZ, O., 1990: "Sport and speed". *International Review for Sport Sociology*, 25, 2, 158-167.

- REDHEAD, S., 1986: *Sing When You're Winning*. London: Pluto.
- REDHEAD, S., 1991: *Football with Attitude*. Manchester: Wordsmith.
- RELPH, E., 1976: *Place and Placelessness*. London: Pion.
- RELPH, E., 1981: *Rational Landscapes and Humanistic Geography*. London: Croom Helm
- SACK, R., 1983: "Human territoriality: a theory". *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 73, 1, 55-74.
- SACK, R., 1986: *Human Territoriality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- SIBLEY, D., 1981: *Outsiders in Urban Societies*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- SIR NORMAN CHESTER CENTRE FOR FOOTBALL RESEARCH, 1989: *Football and Football Spectators after Hillsborough: a National Survey of Members of the Football Supporters Association*. Leicester: Department of Sociology, Leicester University.
- TAYLOR, I., 1991: "From aggravation to celebation". *The Independent*, 21 April, 31.
- TAYLOR, Lord Justice, 1990: *The Hillsborough Stadium Disaster; Final Report*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- THRIFT, N., 1981: "Owners' time and own time". In: A. Pred (ed.): *Space and Time in Geography*. Lund: Gleerup, 56-70.
- WAGNER, P., 1981: "Sport: culture and geography". In: A. Pred (ed.): *Space and Time in Geography*. Lund: Gleerup, 85-108.

## Notes

- <sup>1</sup> Throughout this paper the word "football" is used in its English sense to refer to "soccer".
- <sup>2</sup> From an unpublished English version of Archetti (1992), kindly provided by Pierre Lanfranchi.
- <sup>3</sup> Quoted in *When Saturday Comes*, 51, 1991, 22.
- <sup>4</sup> Quoted in *The Lion Roars*, 18, 1990, 20.

## Le développement spatial du stade moderne

### Résumé

Le stade de football anglais illustre à merveille le concept d'espace hautement "territorialisé". Au cours des cent dernières années, l'environnement du football qui reposait sur un espace non clos, multifonctionnel et dans le cadre duquel on notait d'importantes interactions entre joueurs et spectateurs du fait du peu de règles d'exclusion, s'est aujourd'hui transformé en un espace clos, segmenté et monofonctionnel, aux démarcations imperméables et sur lequel on constate une surveillance intense allant de pair avec l'instauration d'importantes règles d'exclusion. On remarque une certaine analogie entre les changements spatiaux intervenus sur les stades de football et la description de Foucault relative à la taille de la prison. Le resserrement de l'espace du football a dû faire face à une importante résistance et l'on constate en ce tout début des années '90 certains indices qui tendent à démontrer un certain assouplissement des limites internes des stades et la possibilité de voir émerger des tendances "post-modernes" dans le paysage du football anglais.

## Die räumliche Entwicklung des modernen Stadions

### Zusammenfassung

Das britische Fußballstadion ist ein Beispiel für einen extrem ausgegrenzten Raum. In den letzten hundert Jahren hat das Umfeld des Fußballspiels von einem offenen multifunktionalen Raum mit unterschiedlichen räumlichen Interaktionen zwischen Spielern und Zuschauern (schwache Regeln des Ausschlusses) zu einem geschlossenen segmentierten und monofunktionalen Raum mit unüberschreitbaren Grenzen und wirksamen Ausschluß der Masse (strenge Regeln des Ausschlusses) gewandelt. Es wird eine Analogie aufgezeigt zwischen den räumlichen Veränderungen des Fußballplatzes und Foucaults Beschreibung des Wachstums des Gefängnisses. Es gab beachtlichen Widerstand gegenüber den Veränderungen des Fußballplatzes zu Beginn der 90er Jahre und es gibt einige Anzeichen dafür, daß die Grenzen innerhalb des Stadions aufgeweicht werden, und daß „postmoderne“ Tendenzen in die Landschaft des britischen Fußballs eindringen.

## El desarrollo espacial del estadio moderno

### Resumen

El estadio de fútbol británico es un ejemplo de espacio altamente delimitado. Desde hace cien años la base territorial del fútbol ha evolucionado de un espacio abierto y multifuncional – con elevada interacción entre jugadores y espectadores (reglas débiles de exclusión) – a un espacio cerrado, segmentado y monofuncional con fronteras impermeables y una eficaz vigilancia de cualquier aglomeración (reglas fuertes de exclusión). Se plantea una analogía entre los cambios espaciales en el fútbol y los desarrollados por Foucault para el caso de las prisiones. A principios de los noventa ha tenido lugar una resistencia considerable respecto a esta confinación del espacio futbolístico lo cual hace pensar que se está produciendo una debilitación de las fronteras interiores del estadio y que tendencias “post-modernas” podrían estar apareciendo en el paisaje del fútbol británico.

### 現代的スタジアムの空間的発達

#### 〈概要〉

イギリスのフットボールスタジアムは、より高く区画化された空間の一例である。ここ100年間に、フットボールの環境は、選手と観客との間の無視できない空間的相互作用を伴う囲いのない多機能的空間（力のない疎外のルール）から、通り抜けることのできない境界線や群衆の十分な監視（強制的な疎外のルール）を伴う囲まれ、区別され、そして単一機能しかもたない空間へと変化した。フットボールの空間的变化とフーコーの刑務所の発達の記述との間の類似性が論じられる。制限されたフットボールの空間に対する抵抗がなされており、1990年代のはじめにおいてスタジアム内にある境界線を柔和にすることや、“ポスト・モダン”の傾向がイギリスのフットボールの景観に表出しているだろうといういくつかの指摘がある。