FOOTBALL FEVER: AN ANALYSIS OF 'SPECTATOR VIOLENCE', 'NATION-NESS', AND THE MAY 13TH DINAMO - RED STAR RIOT

by

Nicholas Van Woert
A Thesis
Submitted to the
Graduate Faculty
of
George Mason University
in Partial Fulfillment of
The Requirements for the Degree
of
Master of Science
Conflict Analysis and Resolution
Master of Arts
Conflict Resolution and Mediterranean Security

Committee:

Quite Steckl for Monika Wohlfeld   Chair of Committee

Quite Stockl for Derek Lutterbeck

Quite Stockl for Anthoni Eliadamby

_____   Graduate Program Director

_____   Dean, School for Conflict
Analysis and Resolution

Date: __12 / 6 / 13_____   Fall Semester 2013
George Mason University
Fairfax, VA
University of Malta
Valletta, Malta

Football Fever: An Analysis of 'Spectator Violence', 'Nation-ness', and the May 13th
Dinamo - Red Star Riot

A Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of
Science at George Mason University, and the degree of Master of Arts at the University
of Malta

by

Nicholas Van Woert
Bachelor of Arts
Winthrop University, 2011

Director: Richard Rubenstein
The School for Conflict Analysis and Resolution

Fall Semester 2013
George Mason University
Fairfax, Virginia
University of Malta
Valletta, Malta

DEDICATION

This is dedicated to all the pens, pencils, and laptops that have extinguished throughout my educational career. I will never forget all the ink, lead, and data you wasted for me to have a better life. Without your sacrifice, I would have had to finger paint throughout the duration of my education. This would indeed have been very difficult and perhaps never been considered acceptable. Your resources have meant a lot to me and I will forever strive for success in my life under your name. Thank you for all you have done.

I will also like to dedicate this work to my family: my father, mother, brothers; Patrick and Robert, lovely sister Heather, cats; Oseda and Sadie, dog Maggie, and my beta fish Poseidon. Without your support to embark on such a challenging opportunity, I would have never made it. I love you guys for always being by my side throughout my life decisions and hope you will continue to be there as I move forward in life.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Bad Blue Boys ....BBB
Elaborated Social Identity Model ....ESIM
Football Association .... FA
La Federation Internationale de Football Association ....FIFA
Oromo Liberation Front.. OLF
The School for Conflict Analysis and Resolution ....S-CAR
Union of European Football Association..UEFA
Yugoslav Football League .... YLF

ABSTRACT

FOOTBALL FEVER: AN ANALYSIS OF 'SPECTATOR VIOLENCE', 'NATION-NESS', AND THE MAY 13TH DINAMO - RED STAR RIOT

Nicholas Van Woert, M.S., M.A.

George Mason University, 2013

Thesis Director: Dr. Monika Wohlfeld

This thesis explores the triggers for 'spectator violence' at football matches. Reviewing two approaches, the social problem approach and the 'moral panic' approach, this research concludes violence lies within nationalism as an ideology in defense of the football 'nation'. It explores multiple terms associated with sports violence and operationalizes the complex terms associated with 'nation-ness' (nationalism, 'nation', and nationality). The final evidence is given through the violent football riot between Dinamo Zagreb and Red Star Belgrade on the 13th of May, 1990. This bloody football event became the starting point for the Croatian War for Independence. Within this case study is undeniable evidence for nationalism as *the* trigger for violence. While discussing other factors for violence, this paper concludes with questions for future research and what analysts should consider in future football violence.

INTRODUCTION

"At the international level sport is frankly mimic warfare. But the significant thing is not the behaviour of the players but the attitude of the spectators: and, behind the spectators, of the nations who work themselves into furies over these absurd contests, and seriously believe at any rate for short periods that running, jumping and kicking a ball are tests of national virtue. "[1]

On May 13th in the year 1990, supporters from both GNK Dinamo Zagreb and FK Crvena Zvzeda (better known as Red Star Belgrade) came to Maksimir Stadium in Zagreb, Croatia for what was foretold to be a great football[2] match between two of the leading teams within the Yugoslav Football League (YFL). Of Maksimir's 46,000 seats, approximately 3,000 were taken by hardcore Red Star supporters, the *Delije*, while on the opposite end of the pitch stood the supporters of Dinamo, known as the Bad Blue Boys (BBB). Before the match even had a chance to begin, stones were thrown and Maksimir's terraces were ravaged; as seats were torn up and hurled at opponents. A riot would break out this day, going down in history as one of the most violent sporting events in the 20th century. At the end of this day, sixty people were wounded, Zvonimir Boban became a hero for many Croatians, the inevitable war between Croatia and Serbia became real, and

---

[1] George Orwell, "The Sporting Spirit," in *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell* (Secker & Warburg,, 1968), 165.

[2] When the term football is used throughout this research, it refers to the same sport Americans call soccer. Any reference to American football will be clearly stated as American football.

the world saw football supporters motivated by a nationalist ideology; collectivize and use violence.

In 1945 English novelist and journalist George Orwell wrote the above quote in his essay *The Sporting Spirit,* a reactionary piece to the Dynamos of the USSR visiting Britain for a football match[3]. Thirty-five years later the behavior of fans at international sporting events had not faltered. What has become known as the Dinamo Zagreb - Red Star Belgrade Riot is an exemplary illustration of these un-faltering spectator attitudes. At the root of these attitudes and behaviors lies unconditional nationalism. The idea of joining a 'cause' for the purpose of lifting one's nation in reputation and standard, does not only serve the purpose of displaying one's sacrifice for the nation, but also boosts an individual's self-esteem, satisfying romantic desires for heroism and purpose within one's life. The violence at Maksimir Stadium was not about the numbers on the scoreboard, it was about defending one's 'nation' from the cultural and ethnic traumas the participating nations had committed against each other. The Yugoslavian harmonious state under Josip Tito was dead. However, the rise of the 'nation' in the Balkans, was just about to commence.

Football, better known as soccer in different corners of the globe, is a drastically different game from what it was ten years ago. The game played today is termed 'modern football', commerce and mass media have affected ticket prices; limiting who can attend, while increased security protocols are cracking down on those who break the rules; or

[3] Orwell, "The Sporting Spirit.", 165.

rather transcend the constructed boundaries of society. Football has slowly been evolving over the years, as the game changes, the behavior of fans change in order to adopt to the developments of the game. In previous years, the 'ends' of a stadium use to be marked as a sacred space for supporters, a holy ground for waving flags and chanting taunts; with the ritualistic activity of 'taking the ends', where supporters from one club would leave their terrace and charge another groups terrace in order to make claim upon it[4]. Protocols were increased to fight the ritual, but the ritual still remained by other means. 'Modern' football has begun to threaten the violent football culture so prevalent in the 20th century, but it has not eliminated it, supporters of football clubs continue to become violent and the question is why? What makes a supporter persistent in employing violence?

Deriving from the English society in the 1960's, hardcore football supporters became labeled as 'hooligans' and their whole pattern of behavior as the 'hooligan phenomenon'. The essential question is, what makes the 'hooligan' violent? Is it drunken rage that brings our common 'hooligan' to violence? Are there frustrations from socio-economic issues outside stadiums looking to be released in an acceptable way? How about high unemployment with a bored uneducated minority looking to achieve 'masculinity' through violence? Are there cultural, political, ethnic, or racial undertones for the fights? Or, what this paper hopes to achieve, are 'hooligans' driven by nationalism?

---

[4] Anthony King, "The Postmodernity of Football Hooliganism," *The British Journal of Sociology* 48, no. 4 (December 1, 1997), 579. doi: 10.2307/591597.

To start, we must first ask ourselves, what is nationalism? Unfortunately for us this is no easy task. Nationalism is a complex and multi-faceted theory that can be used or manipulated for tackling separate approaches to issues such as culture, state policy, movements, and others.[5] Its origins and emergence remain heavily debated and the debates have become cyclical, resulting in no definition as absolute or perfect. Some academics have chosen to avoid solid definitions and instead have opted for elements necessary for nationalism to be present. Anthony D. Smith's national unity, national identity, and national autonomy are three fundamental values derived from what he believes to be the core doctrine.[6] His values are just one of many examples for how philosophers academics have attempted to master the term nationalism. It becomes further complicated when looking beyond a definition, when one considers the implementation of nationalism, because how can it be fashioned into practice? Can we consider nationalism only as an ideology? Is it a movement? How does discourse affect its relation to terms like 'nation', 'national', 'nationality, 'nation-state'. and 'national interest'[?]"[7] It is a head-spinning argument requiring much patience and time to properly operationalize the word.

To be understood as an ideology, nationalism needs to be represented by a social identity. A cumulative social identity has the power to mobilize individuals towards the ideology of nationalism, which is undergone through collective action. Within this collective action, the average football supporter may transform into the classic football

---

[5] Craig J. Calhoun, *Nationalism* (University of Minnesota Press, 1997), 8.
[6] Anthony D. Smith, *Nationalism*, 2nd ed. (Bodmin, Cornwall: Polity Press, 2010), 28.
[7] Calhoun, *Nationalism*. 21. Words in brackets are my own.

'hooligan', inciting violence. Specifically for the average football supporter, there are two identities malleable enough for mobilization; a supporter can either share a collective identity for their local/regional team or their international state team. For example a fan of FC Barcelona is typically[8] a fan of Spain. Comparing these identities to other supporter's identities enhances the levels of nationalism within the 'hooligan' culture, it becomes a competition for whom has a bigger symbolic display. This can be better represented by Benedict Anderson's 'imagined communities', where the community is simply constructed by how it is imagined.[9] The hooligan community is in existence only by the limits in which it is imagined. It uses discourse for constructing 'fanhood' for a football team, or in this example, a 'nation'. The community is imagined around the socially constructed 'fanhood', through discourse and rhetoric. Thus the imagined community of 'fandom' becomes a real existing community.

The construction of the football supporter's social identity came underway in the 1960's, as anxiety arose for the many unemployed youth subcultures; including football 'hooligans'.[10] The media took the role of offering the public a view into who these 'football hooligans' were, but their investigative journalism brought biases. For the media, 'hooligan' violence was driven by gang warfare, animal nature, bad socio-economic conditions, or a lack of authority.[11] Their conclusions came without a lot of consultation with the professionals. Overtime, this paradigm continued to be a central theme for the

---

[8] It can only be assumed all fans of a local/regional team are supporters of their state team.
[9] Calhoun, *Nationalism*. 4.
[10] Anastassia Tsoukala, "Boundary-creating Processes and the Social Construction of Threat," *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 33, no. 2 (January 4, 2008), 144. doi: 10.1177/030437540803300202
[11] Geoffrey Lawrence, "'The Gladiatorial Lust for Blood': The Media and Soccer Violence," *The Australian Quarterly* 57, no. 3 (October 1, 1985). 196. doi: 10.2307/20635326.

media when reporting on football violence. The media was responsible for establishing the 'hooligan's social identity; they were adolescents who did nothing better, but provoke others and clash with the police. The message was, 'hooligans' are degenerates in society and security should be increased to suppress their behavior. The media began labeling the 'hooligan' without valid information, giving false pretenses, and then becoming a voice for society on how to cure the 'hooligan' plague. The affects of media intervention on the 'hooligan' phenomenon is an interesting case study, which will be examined later in this paper. Yet, the social identity constructed by the media on 'hooligan' violence were just a series of hypotheses, the real 'hooligan' community is created from nationalism.

When attending a football game, there are ample amounts of evidence suggesting the fans behavior is dictated by nationalism; present at most matches are a plethora of flags and chants showing dedication to a 'nation'. The opponent becomes more than an opponent, they are an enemy seeking the destruction of your team. If, as Orwell said, sports are "...war minus the shooting[12]," than the 'hooligans' enter each game believing they have entered a metaphorical war. The impact of these elements represents the 'hooligans' deeper consciousness for the game, as opposed to behaving on behalf of their violent animal nature or poor socio-economic conditions. With the construction of symbols and chants, there is an attachment to the 'hooligans' football team through their imagined communities. The violence at games is therefore not for the state, but for this product of nationalism called the 'nation'.

---

[12] Orwell, "The Sporting Spirit." 166.

Similar to the complexities of nationalism, the 'nation' is a multifaceted term difficult for reaching agreements between academics. Some prefer to look through a subjective lens while others a more objective lens, still other academics prefer to throw 'nation' out of nationalism and focus more on the state. Charles Tilly would agree to the latter, it is "one of the most complex puzzling and tendentious items in the political lexicon,"[13]therefore he preferred to focus on the state. However, the complexity of the term should not divert a discussion for the importance of 'nation' in nationalism, for it is the 'nation', nationalism is utilized within. With a blend of subjective and objective elements the 'nation' can be constructed into a simple malleable definition. The football 'hooligan' is acting in the interests of the 'nation'. It is more than just the territory, it is the subjective connections that bring supporters to support the teams they do. A football community is more than the physical ties, they are also emotional connections. Through the emotions, attachments to a football team and its successes become a greater phenomenon, the 'nation'.

Calhoun finds the 'nation' constructed in discourse, but would agree the 'nation' exists outside a state's border. At its bare bones the 'nation' has a minimum requirement of social solidarity and collective identity, any level of integration between these two forms a recognized 'nation'.[14] Every team within the football community holds with it a different collective identity, from the symbols, the colors, and solidarity amongst fans. Under Calhoun's bare bone requirements and Smith's official working definition for the

---

[13] Smith, *Nationalism*. 10.
[14] Calhoun, *Nationalism*. 4.

'nation', "a named human community residing in a perceived homeland, and having common myths and a shared history, a distinct public culture, and common laws and customs for all members,"[15] the football supporter community; encompassing a team at the local and international level, and the average die hard football 'hooligan', is a 'nation'.

Even with trying to grasp the 'nation' and its role with the 'hooligan' phenomenon in a bare bones format, the term is challenging and head spinning. Further explanations of these complex terms must first be initiated for comprehension of the model. To establish belief in nationalism as *the* trigger for violence from the 'hooligan', it is first essential to learn more about the phenomenon of 'hooliganism' and what is perceived as the causes for violence. Before even establishing the causes for violence, it is even more important to discuss, what is violence?

The central question of this paper is, what is *the* trigger for causing violence at football matches? Using the Dinamo Zagreb - Red Star Belgrade Riot as a case-study, a new approach to the topic will be analyzed through an inter-disciplinary discussion of elements contributing to a supporter's behavior at matches. Through discourse analysis *the* trigger for violence will be concluded as nationalism. Taking the topic from a holistic approach, nationalism and its connections to football can be clearly linked, opening up a series of questions for future studies to be conducted.

---

[15] Smith, *Nationalism*. 13.

Research Limitations

In conducting my research there are several biases that need to be discussed. To begin, why football? The interest spawned while researching a personal interest on the Balkans, which led me to stumble upon the May 13th football riot. I asked myself how could something like this happen? A football match that several weeks later turned into an all out war, became the starting point for my research. In the process of this research several areas had to be explored, for starters what was this term nationalism and where did it come from? To call the violence at Maksimir Stadium the result of nationalism, I had to also conduct research on what other actors believed 'spectator violence' stemmed from.

The analysis of fan violence and researching the 'hooligan' phenomenon was limited primarily to English supporters and the surrounding area. Most literature was written on the English 'hooligan', because the media has heavily hyped the English 'hooligan' pushing social scientists to become fascinated with these particular people. Another limitation comes from my restrictions in language. My ability to only speak English has restricted me from sources in any other language, including what would have been a very useful literature coming from any of the Balkan countries. To not become completely dependent on articles and books written in English, I expanded my research to articles from all over the world, but filtered them through my original conclusions of fan violence from the sovereignty of the 'nation' and not their conclusions of alcohol, politics, gang warfare, primal nature, etc., as incorrect.

My biggest enemy for this research was time. The original question for this project was very ambitious looking to incorporate several more sports and states within the Balkans, but the realization of how complex the project was with the amount of time given, operationalized the original question to a specific focus on spectator's behavior and their motivations. Time has also extremely reduced the amount of sources I was able to read through and created bias in my argument. Focusing on research to strengthen my argument, my research lacked a proper number of critiques. Although I do contain critiques while providing negation of particular elements within my working definitions and causes for spectator behavior, this researcher would have liked to uncover more. In exchange, I would also have liked to strengthen my argument further, bring in more examples from other Balkan states and make comparisons to other states in the world, besides Great Britain's notorious actors.

A final limitation is that these results may not hold a universal truth. Everything in this research is only at the tip of exploring the iceberg. There is still a series of research that should be conducted to make any of the conclusions below considered to be a universal ideology. Although this paper conducts an in depth analysis on several topics, all conclusions are bias from the language of sources and the agenda for exploring nationalism. A universal application of these findings is therefore cautioned.

Structure

In Chapter 1, this author looks at the establishment of football and where the 'hooligan' first made its appearance. In the process, the limitations of the 'hooligan' and

other words associated with football attendees, such as fans and spectators, will be compared and defined. Bringing attention to the correct use of labels when discussing this subject matter will bring more concise conclusions when a discussion for *the* trigger begins. In Chapter 2, the question, what is violence, will be answered. An analysis on three theorists, whom contributed immensely to the conflict field of study, will be conducted. Through their theories, the concept of violence becomes clear. With a clear concept of violence, the following chapter becomes easier to understand.

Chapter 3 will focus on the behavior of fans and how they become motivated towards violence. This chapter will look at two approaches for violence, either through the 'social problem approach' or the 'moral panic' approach. Both approaches shed light on what is believed to be *the* trigger for violence. In presenting the perceived causes for violence, they will simultaneously be disproven as *the* trigger, thus leaving room at the end of the chapter for nationalism to be identified *the* trigger.

Chapter 4 will be an analysis of 'nation-ness' and its umbrella terms like nationalism, 'nation', and nationality. The research brings together theorists from different paradigms who view nationalism as an ideology. Through their thought processes and analyses, their definitions will be used to create a working definition pliable for this thesis and project. It is not intended to create a definition ignorant of other aspects in the nationalism ideology, but rather to mold out the complex multi-faceted nationalism term into a device applicable for nationalism and football. Nationalism can be easily manipulated, because it is such a complex word to grasp. This research intends on carefully developing the definition in order to avoid a large bias. Challenging terms like

11

'nation', state, *ethnie,* identity, patriotism, and sovereignty will be analyzed to create further working definitions.

Chapter 5 will tie all of the above elements together. Taking the working definitions of nationalism and the analysis of spectator behavior, connections will be made for the elements of violence, nationalism, and spectators. In effect, a discussion of football as a religion will strengthen these conclusions. At the end of this chapter, the Dinamo Zagreb - Red Star Belgrade Riot will be examined, looking at the importance of identity in Yugoslavia and the events building up to the riot. This particular case study will demonstrate nationalism as *the* trigger.

The concluding chapter will briefly look at the power of football as a sport in the rest of the world and demonstrate the element of nationalism elsewhere. With the above conclusion, I will pose future research questions and the importance of a continued inter-disciplinary study on football violence.

'HOOLIGANS', SPECTATORS, AND FANS

Sports are found in every niche of the planet, in every environment imaginable, and every corner of the earth. They are spectacles drawing men and women from different racial, ethnic, cultural, and nationalities to cheer, chant, celebrate, and mourn. They are the popular topic of discussions throughout an average day and even have their own sections in media literature and their own channels on television. Sports have become a commonly discussed phenomenon whose origins convince us they have always been intertwined with human life. Sports in the earlier days may not be as recognizable as our modern sports,[16] because they were more focused on ritual for pleasing the gods, but today many of us still perform rituals with sports; granted it has much less of a deistic element than it previously held.

On the first weekend leading into September, the American football season begins. Whether at the university level or the professional level, fans work their week around the opportunity to watch the game, or with great luck, attend the game. Saturday and Sunday become sacred days for the games. The ritual is to grab your friends, grab your food and beverage, and go to watch or attend the game. The group you form in order

---

[16] Even before the Roman Gladiatorial games, sports were spectacles of blood and violence. The Mesoamericans used to play an early ballgame known as *ōllamaliztli,* where the losing team was sacrificed, sometimes along with the spectators. The object was to hit a 4kg rubber ball with your hips and, sometimes if allowed, your forearms along with bats and clubs. The object was to get the ball through a sideways hoop on a hanging from a stone wall.

to perform the ritual becomes an integral part to the ritual, especially if your group

attends the game. As spectators, the duty becomes yours to create noise and bring morale

to the players on your team. Without the presence of spectators, a game loses its

environment, the players on the field feel deserted, and fans watching the game on

television will find the particular match to be boring.[17] Therefore the emotions of a

spectator through voice or physicality (like clapping hands or stomping one's feet) are a

necessity for any performance. [18] Although this example is from my personal

involvement as being an American football fan, the fundamentals are applicable

everywhere, sports need spectators, otherwise they lose significant intensity and, from the

consumerism approach, lose monetary value.

Modern sports have developed into global enterprises.[19] In the modern sporting

environment, teams, stadiums, merchandise, beverages, food, and equipment are all

advertised into a global market. In football, teams wear the name of their sponsors

directly on the front of their jerseys; an image larger than a team's crest on their chest. FC

Barcelona's central sponsor for the 2013 - 2014 football season is Qatar Airways, giving

evidence to the financial opportunities available for businesses all over the world in the

sports market; a company from Qatar can be the central sponsor for a team in Spain. In

American football, jerseys may not have sponsors advertised in the same place, but the

makers of the jerseys get away with putting their logo somewhere on the uniform (most

---

[17] My personal emotion when watching games without any spectators present, I feel embarrassed for the home team.
[18] Dennis Kennedy, "Sports and Shows: Spectators in Contemporary Culture," *Theatre Research International* 26, no. 03 (October 2001). 277. doi: 10.1017/S0307883301000359.
[19] Ibid., 283.

cases Reebok). In both versions of football, and many other sports at the professional level, competitions are held in facilities named by corporations; which may or may not change over time.[20]

The merchandise generated from these sports and others is also a big money business. Street vendors in Europe have found merchandise in such demand that they have forged false replicas to sell.[21] In Malta, it is easier to find football jerseys and scarves for teams from England or Italy, than it is for Maltese teams. The same can be said about the New York Yankees baseball team. The famous NY logo hat has been found all over the world in a variety of shops.[22] Sports are a business thriving on spectators to promulgate its success. Whether this has always been the case or not is not the central focus of this study, but it is important to note, modern sports are a business and businesses need to protect their interests. Sports violence, a spontaneous incident with the potential of damaging said interests, needs further examination for trying to erode the spontaneity element in sports violence. What causes spectators to become violent?

Football has dominated the late 20th century as being the sport most associated with violence. As social scientists, we have to ask ourselves why? The question has been raised before many times, but to no avail has there been a general consensus on the issue. Perhaps this is due to most studies focusing on the phenomenon of the English 'hooligan',

---

[20] The best example for this is the Miami Dolphins (American Football) and the Miami Marlins (Baseball) stadium. Since 1987, the stadium has changed its name 7 times, currently it is Sun Life Stadium.
[21] Personal observation while living in Italy and Malta, and while backpacking through France and Spain.
[22] I question whether most people realize it stands for the New York Yankees baseball team. I think most assume it is a symbol for the city of New York.

a media hyped case study which had previously worsened the situation, rather than answering questions. The English 'hooligan' drew a good deal of attention from the rest of the world. Fascination grew with whom the English 'hooligan' was and why they behaved the way they did. The media took it upon themselves to answer these questions in their own conclusions, without consulting social scientists for a better analysis. The media's conclusions ended up increasing 'hooligan' membership. I will touch on the media and 'hooliganism' later, but their role at the peak of 'hooliganism' in the 1980's enticed others to join the 'hooligan' movement. Membership further increased when the 'hooligans' went across the channel to international games.

Internationally, the English 'hooligan'' became a media spectacle wherever they went, generally in a negative context. Countries feared the English 'hooligan' and their capabilities, while others took it upon themselves to fight back against the English 'hooligan' and start their own 'firms'. The problem with most 'hooligan' literature is that it focuses on the English 'hooligan' and the places the English 'hooligan' travelled, which is essentially only Europe; one of the tournaments fans travelled to was the UEFA (Union of European Football Associations) Championship[23]. At such tournaments the media were always ready to report any misbehavior and label it as 'hooliganism'. Due to the media's impact, England became *the* central case study for sports violence, but sports violence was in no way limited to England or where the English 'hooligan' went. Furthermore, it was not only a concept notable in the 20th century.

---

[23] A tournament for the top teams in each state's premier league within Europe.

Arguably the worst incident in football history was the 1964 Peru vs. Argentina match where 287-328 people were killed and over 500 injured.[24] Violence erupted in the final two minutes after Peru scored a goal to tie up the match and the goal was declared annulled. Still, even this violence is miniscule compared to the worst documented sports violence in history.

In 532 B.C. Constantinople, the first written record on sports violence was discovered. The details are vague, but it was estimated 30,000 people were killed during a chariot race when Roman Guards intervened due to riots.[25] Allen Guttman, a sports historian nails it on the head when stating, modern sports violence pales in comparison to the ancient and medieval days, as he says, they are, "innocuous."[26] Sports violence has dwindled dramatically from what it used to be, therefore I can conclude it is not an abnormality to see violence in the modern era. Violence from spectators and sports has been around since written records were first discovered. This conclusion arises a few questions, what elements prevalent centuries ago differ from those elements found in the modern sporting environment? A comparison on what has changed may continue to decrease the incidence of violence notable today. Are there only elements within the stadium that has changed? Or were they elements in society, carried into the sports arena as a venue for expressing grievances? Did 'hooligan' behavior exist back then, as it does today?

---

[24] Eric Dunning, *Sport Matters: Sociological Studies of Sport, Violence, and Civilization* (London; New York: Routledge, 1999) 132.

[25] Russell E Ward Jr., "Fan Violence: Social Problem or Moral Panic?," *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 7, no. 5 (September 2002). 454. doi: 10.1016/S1359-1789(01)00075-1.

[26] Gordon W Russell, "Sport Riots: A Social–psychological Review," *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 9, no. 4 (July 2004). 354. doi: 10.1016/S1359-1789(03)00031-4.

Developing a Spectator in Football

Football is believed to have countless origins and was most likely played uniquely in different parts of the world. [27] It is believed the original idea for the emergence of football stems from the shape of the ball, the shape is suggestive in representing the sun. The ball can therefore be seen as a symbol, representing the objective element in existence reliable for life. This symbolic representation can also conclude football is originally a ritual. However, evidence is currently only suggestive with no direct link or any state being able to claim it as their own.

As football became more popular, the ball maintained its roundness and was copied from sport to sport. The different groups adopting a version of football[28] are all attempting to gain recognition of the sport as their own, due to the language derivative in what they used to call the games, but there are no direct links for any group to gain recognition for this claim. The only country with evidence to make the earliest claim through records, although others continue to argue it, is fourteenth century England.

Folk football made its first appearance under King Edward II of England during the Medieval Ages. He made a decree for football to be prohibited from England. His predecessors are also documented to call for the same prohibition, a cumulative total of

---

[27] Dunning, *Sport Matters: Sociological Studies of Sport, Violence, and Civilization*. 83.
[28] Ibid., 82. Chinese(*Tsu chu*) , Japanese (*kemari*), Greek (*episkyros*), Romans (*harpastum*), and Italians (*gioco del calcio*). Italy's football is still called *calcio,* but it is only a partial link to claim the origins as its own.

six-teen kings, along with local and regional powers.[29] From the amount of prohibitive orders sent down from the hierarchy, it can be assumed the sport was counter-productive for society. The prohibitive action was implemented under, 'The bill for maintaining artillery and the debarring of unlawful games', which forbid the game under pain of imprisonment. The game was considered a waste of time, young men should spend their time training for war, not kicking a ball.[30] The games were seen as an account of public disorder and there was no room for it in traditional Medieval societies. Learning how to handle a circular ball was not going to help an individual shoot an arrow in battle nor would it teach you how parry an opponent's blade.

As researchers, we have to be careful in generalizing folk football as the same game played in the modern era, because folk football was a very different game. For centuries it was not even clear how the game was played, for example the name football did not mean the ball was only allowed to be propelled by foot.[31] There was also a level of physicality permitted within the game and women were allowed to be involved.[32]

Eric Dunning describes one of these older versions in seventeenth century Florence, where two teams of twenty-seven met in the same Piazza every night to play football.[33] The ritual of playing every night was a valuable venue for players to let out their aggression, it was a healthier environment to fight publically with fists, than to take to the streets with daggers. He does however go on to explain that the presence of pike-

---

[29] Ibid., 84.
[30] Ibid., 85.
[31] Ibid., 88.
[32] Ibid., 89.
[33] Ibid., 89.

carrying soldiers at the matches. Dunning writes, Boccalini concluded the guards were likely related to the matches becoming extremely rough, requiring exterior intervention; this is not limited to the violent behavior from the players, but extends to the spectators present in the piazza.[34] Whether we could classify these early spectator's as 'hooligans' can't be certain, but armed guards present for a match, parallels the police modern football employs. It can be assumed their presence is to fulfill one main goal, maintain order.

Football saw its greatest development during the nineteenth century, through the English school systems. Developing simultaneously with rugby, football became a sport of hierarchy within the schools, seniority and strength ruled the fields. In this very regimented system the young, better known as 'fags', were tossed around, given the position of goalie, became the markers for the field and goal, and had no respect in comparison to the prefects, they were essentially slaves; which is where the word 'fagging' originates from.[35] They were playing when the rules of football were essentially non-existent and anything short of murder was legal.

Industrialization began to change the shape of the game, it was desired to have a more civilized game appropriate for an Industrialized society. The rules of the game were first written down at the beginning of the 1830's, creating official boundaries, a time limit, and tolerable levels of physicality.[36] One prestigious school, Eton, was the first to implement a no hand/arms rule in the second half of the nineteenth century, they believed

---

[34] Ibid., 89.
[35] Ibid., 89.
[36] Ibid., 93.

such a rule would make their students show restraint, to be able to control urges; 'a system of self-control' .[37] In doing so football and rugby began to diverge as two separate games, before this time, the two sports were considered similar. It was not until 1863 before the games were considered as separate, this became official with the creation of the national leagues.[38] Entering the twentieth century, football took its modern form, a sport similar to what is played today.

As the game developed into the twentieth century, a few things need to be considered. Modern football primarily developed in England, as a game for the hierarchy, the elites, and the prefects. In the twentieth century, England also happened to have the largest empire with colonies all over the world. With its international colonies, the game was quickly spread by the travelling elites and picked up by different social strata, earning the game the name, 'the' people's game'. For the elites it was seen as *the* civilized game. Rules prevented the bashing of a skull, which were in place to limit risk, and ultimately, any serious injury. Instead the game was a cooperative dance between two teams which needed to be played with a level of skill in a fast-paced environment whose physicality brought the spectators to keep a level of intensity, "In turn its world-wide popularity and the degree to which fans identify with their teams help to explain why it is the sport most frequently associated with spectator disorder."[39]

The high level of intensity involved in the game increased the popularity and the number of spectators who came out to watch . Dunning states other football leagues

---

[37] Ibid., 96.
[38] Ibid., 98.
[39] Ibid.,105.

21

developed in Europe beginning with Germany's first club in 1878 and followed by the

Netherlands (1879-18880), Italy (1890), and France (1892). [40] France would further

develop the game with the international organization FIFA (La Federation Internationale

de Football Associations), in 1904, "...by delegates from Belgium, Denmark, France, The

Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, and Switzerland. "[41]Britain preferred to not join FIFA, they

chose not to see 'their' game being manipulated to something out of their control. They

therefore kept their distance, but after joining and dropping several times, they finally

became a permanent member after World War II in 1945.[42] Fifteen years later the rise of

the term 'hooligan' began to emerge in the English leagues.

  The 1960's were the beginning of the media hyped 'hooligan', as the world saw

the tough fan demeanor emerge. Although the English 'hooligans' were not involved in

levels of sports violence with a comparable fatality rate like the Constantine chariot race,

their presence at two crucial events in history gave them a negative reputation, whether it

was their fault or not. The Heysel stadium incident in 1985 was a European Cup match

final between England's Liverpool and Italy's Juventus. English spectators charged

Juventus' spectators, where the latter's majority preferred to flee than fight; running

further up the terraces. The mass movement of panicked fans caused the retaining wall to

collapse under their weight. The game was still played that day, but 39 Juventus fans

were killed and over 200 were injured.[43] As punishment for the English spectator's

---

[40] Ibid.,103.
[41] Ibid.,103.
[42] Ibid.,103.
[43] Jo Thomas, "British Soccer Fan: Why So Warlike?," *The New York Times*, May 31, 1985,
http://www.nytimes.com/1985/05/31/world/british-soccer-fan-why-so-warlike.html.

actions, all English clubs were banned from UEFA tournaments for five years. Another

noteworthy incident takes place in Sheffield, England at the Hillsborough stadium.

Liverpool was playing Nottingham Forrest at an FA (Football Association) Cup semi-

final. The game was played at a neutral stadium in Hillsborough. Liverpool was allocated

one side for its spectators while Nottingham had the other. The side Liverpool was

allocated consisted of only two entrances to the terraces, with limited entrances, the

exterior of the stadium was over-crowded with Liverpool fans waiting for a chance to get

into the match. For fear of the Liverpool fans becoming rowdy, because they were getting

impatient at such a slow queue, the police opened up an extra gate allowing more fans

into the already crowded stadium. This resulted in the terraces collapsing, killing 95

spectators and injuring over 700. [44] Even though there was no physical confrontation

between spectators, the perception of what a Liverpool spectator was capable of, made

police shove all the Liverpool fans into the stadium to reduce, what they believed to be,

eventual sports violence. The negative reputation of the English spectator may have been

the ultimate cause for this event.[45] Within the years preceding Hillsborough, the

'hooligans' were blamed for doing this to themselves, however recently in 2010, the

police took responsibility for the incident and apologies were given to the Liverpool

families; after it was discovered 160 police statements were altered into blaming the

Liverpool spectators for crushing their own. [46] Going into the 1990's the Liverpool

---

[44] Kennedy, "Sports and Shows." 281.
[45] The police believed they were taking defensive measures against the English spectators
[46] "Hillsborough Disaster and Its Aftermath," *BBC*, December 19, 2012, sec. England,
http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-19545126

23

spectators and victims were wrongfully being accused of 'hooliganism' by the media, with Margaret Thatcher on their side; they were passing blame away from institutions and towards the football phenomenon of the 'hooligan'.[47]

A spectator's spontaneity is difficult to predict, but evidence suggests the measures used to prevent the violent spectator actually causes more damage than harm.[48] In Peru, the police used tear gas to disperse crowds, but the crowds were stuck in the terraces because of doors being locked; many were killed by asphyxiation. In Heysel and Hillsborough, the retaining walls put up to the keep spectators off the pitch, were the obstacles causing fatalities. It crushed people in Heysel and it prevented others from escaping in Hillsborough. So whom exactly were the police creating these intense security measures for? A simple answer would be to say the 'hooligan', but what does the 'hooligan' mean? What about 'fan'? Or other terms associated with football, like ultras? It is best to begin the analysis by looking at the 'hooligan'.

The 'hooligan', according to Eric Dunning *et al*, is a constructed word defined by politicians and the media, it is a concept used to more or less give clarity to particular behavior which is more or less associated with football.[49] The 'hooligan' becomes a set of people whom are identified as such, after an incident. Prior to the incident, they are

[47] John F. Burns, "British Government Apologizes for Blaming Victims in 1989 Hillsborough Disaster," *The New York Times*, September 12, 2012, sec. Sports / Soccer, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/09/13/sports/soccer/britain-apologizes-for-blaming-victims-in-hillsborough-disaster.html.
[48] Clifford Stott et al., "Tackling Football Hooliganism: A Quantitative Study of Public Order, Policing and Crowd Psychology," *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law* 14, no. 2 (May 2008), 115–141. doi: 10.1037/a0013419
[49] Eric Dunning, Patrick Murphy, and Ivan Waddington, "Towards a Sociological Understanding of Football Hooliganism as a World Phenomenon," in *Fighting Fans: Football Hooliganism as a World Social Problem*, ed. Eric Dunning et al. (Dublin: University College Dublin Press, 2002), 1.

generalized as being such, because of their appearance or if they approach in big groups. An individual may not have a violent bone in their body, but get caught up in a scuffle for self-defense and become labeled as a 'hooligan'.

Joel Rookwood and Geoff Pearson offer a more direct definition for 'hooligan', "...defined as an individual who attended matches with the intention of becoming involved in violence with rival supporters or a fan who became involved in physical violence even if this was not his/her aim."[50] They give us a general definition with the elements of football, violence, and behavior, but I feel it limits what the 'hooligan' is. In their defense, they tell the researcher there is no universally accepted 'hooligan' definition,[51] but I feel the one they utilize for their research is restrained to sports, particularly football. In the fall of 2012 an all female Russian punk band, by the name Pussy Riot, was found guilty for "hooliganism motivated by religious hatred."[52] The media utilizes the term outside the boundaries of sports, where it is primarily associated. This example strengthens Dunning *et al* claim on definition as a complicated term to understand. The use of 'hooliganism' in the media, places my own definition of 'hooligan', as, an individual whose behavior is contradictory to the norms of society with the intent of breaking constructed boundaries of the state. It is an actor whom willingly acts against the traditional functions of society. Here 'hooligan' is applicable to events outside of

---

[50] Joel Rookwood and Geoff Pearson, "The Hoolifan: Positive Fan Attitudes to Football 'hooliganism'," *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 47, no. 2 (January 4, 2012). 151. 10.1177/1012690210388455
[51] Ibid., 151.
[52] Mariam Elder, "Pussy Riot Sentenced to Two Years in Prison Colony over anti-Putin Protest," *The Guardian*, August 17, 2012, http://www.theguardian.com/music/2012/aug/17/pussy-riot-sentenced-prison-putin.

sport, but the casualness of the term opens up possibilities all over the world and complicates its usage when it is generally associated only to sports violence. It is preferable to therefore do away with the term 'hooligan'. Another difficulty with the term is the line between what is considered a 'hooligan' and what is considered a 'fan'.

'Fan' defined by Russell Ward Jr. is simply a crowd of onlookers.[53] Ward limits 'fans' to the onlookers at games, but for our research, we will expand the definition of 'fans' to include those people watching sports by television or listening to them by radio. Both definitions provide a simple generalized explanation of the 'fan', for in these definitions, there is room for an individual to not be passionate for either team at the match, but purely just an observer.[54] The 'fan' is complicated, because it is just the visual act of watching. What separates the passionate 'fan' from the 'fan' who enjoys watching matches of football? Does it matter? Taking it one step further, if the line between 'fans' who are emotionally invested in a match and 'fans' who are just observing is difficult, consider the line between 'fan' and 'hooligan'.

Pearson and Rookwood suggest the barrier defining 'fan' and 'hooligan' is blurred[55]. Every 'fan' has the ability to become a 'hooligan', just as 'hooligans' can retire from 'hooliganism' and become fans. A generalization of similar elements between the 'fan' and the 'hooligan' include: both watch/ attend games, both support their team, those

---

[53] Ward Jr., "Fan Violence." 455.
[54] I could attend a match between Italy's AC Milan and Intermilan and not be passionate for either team. Going to the game would make me just a football fan, but does that make me a fan of football? Or a fan of sports?
[55] Rookwood and Pearson, "The Hoolifan." 151.

that attend may partake in choreography[56] and sing in the chants, they may wear an article of clothing to associate with a team, and both hold an emotional element for the game. From a distance it is difficult to decipher between 'fan' and 'hooligan'. The only time the line becomes clear is when a spectator moves from acceptable behavior to inappropriate behavior exercised by the 'hooligan', which means the 'hooligan' did not exist until the boundaries of behavior were breached. Any 'fan' can potentially transform into the 'hooligan'. Another defining line is to be aware of a spectators obvious association with a 'firm'; which are fan clubs associated with a team in football that have considerably been associated with sports violence in the past. [57] In fact, Rookwood and Pearson discovered most 'hooliganism' violence was inter-team, a conflict between two firms.[58] Although it can't be assumed this is everywhere, because their study focused primarily on England.

To create a more complicated boundary between 'fan' and' hooligan', Pearson and Rookwood did a study on the 'hoolifan'. Their definition of the 'hoolifan' strays away from Martin King and Martin Knight's definition, as the individual between a hooligan and fan, rather they say the 'hoolifan' is not the in-between, but simply the fan of the 'hooligan'.[59] Their data was collected in England, but they learned a majority of fans

[56] This is the artistic performance put on the spectators. It includes draping big banners over crowds, lighting flares, or holding up colored squares to form a large picture when looked on from across the stadium.
[57] Most football teams at the premier level have at least one firm, but there are cases where a team will have more than one. Aston Villa, an English team, has four notable firms: Villa Youth, Steamers, Villa Hardcore, C-Crew.
[58] Rookwood and Pearson, "The Hoolifan." 155.
[59] Ibid., 153.

dislike the practicality of the 'hooligans', because of all the security measures implemented to constrain their behavior, but at the same time, the 'hoolifan' enjoys the 'hooligan' on the moral level. Fans enjoy having a firm, especially one that holds a good reputation against other firms. Their data through interviews suggests the firm served as a defensive mechanism for away games, it was something you desired and even needed to have at an away game, especially for spectators who chose not to engage in sports violence.[60] The fan was able to enjoy an away match with the protection of their firms attendance. Opposing firms would target the away team's firm, because they both are willing to transcend the boundaries of the law and fight. Therefore, the opposing firm would be more attracted to another firm for the fight, than the generic away team spectator.

Morally, the firm was able to bring legitimacy to your city if your football team was not very good. A bad football team with a good firm prevented the opposing team to take particular liberties from your city; it is thus a source of pride.[61] The 'hoolifan' further complicates the diversity between 'fan' and 'hooligan' because the fan supports the 'hooligan'. When there is sports violence, the 'fan' may interact in two ways. First, if the violence is direct, the 'fan' may get close to watch the event, occasionally being generalized as a 'hooligan' in the process.[62] Or secondly, in the case of structural violence, the 'fan' may join in with the chants, becoming labeled as a 'hooligan' for chanting. The

---

[60] Ibid., 161.
[61] Ibid., 158.
[62] Stott et al., "Tackling Football Hooliganism." 117. A similar case can be found at the Euro2000 Cup, when the police generalized all English 'fans' as 'hooligans' therefore treating them with the same coercive force, resulting in over 965 arrests.

identities become difficult to separate, making the terminology a thorny conundrum. Pearson and Rookwood identifying the blurred line between the two groups of people, suggests their whole findings are at jeopardy, because how did Pearson and Rookwood classify who they were studying?

Throughout the rest of the paper, I will look towards minimizing the amount of times I use 'hooligan' and 'hooligan violence', because the terms can be misleading and the wrong assumptions may be constructed. In substitution, spectators and 'spectator violence' will be utilized, because they offer the reader a definition with barriers. Henceforth, the spectator will consist of, all groups of people attending a sports event, those who are in the proximity of a stadium and those entering the event. 'Spectator violence', is the act of direct, structural, and cultural violence at an event related to sports or which is carried out in the name of a sports team. This limits the violence to a sporting event, but includes any Diaspora violence resulting from the games. Due to the increased crowd control measures and the greater difficulties in direct violence happening at games, 'spectator violence' also pertains to those individuals whom have left the proximity of a match to engage in direct violence several blocks or more away. Limiting the terms gives clarification in order to explain the roots of violence.

VIOLENCE: THREE MODELS FOR UNDERSTANDING

Every action needs a trigger, something to ignite the fire. Conflict is universal to human society, "It takes its origins in economic differentiation, social change, cultural formation, psychological development and political organization - all of which are inherently conflictual."[63] When looking at 'spectator violence' and what brings spectators to transcend boundaries of norms, the roots need to be analyzed. What are the primary reasons for individual groups of people to act out and misbehave? What is violence? How is it defined? What shapes can it emerge in? This chapter will focus on three primary theorists discussing 'violence' and how it emerges, including Johann Galtung's models of violence, conflict, and peace, John Burton's basic human needs, and Ted Gurr's frustration-aggression theory.

Johan Galtung, Models of Conflict

Galtung is one of the most influential writers in the conflict resolution field and has contributed immensely to its development. At the end of the 1960's he had developed

---

[63] Oliver Ramsbotham, Hugh Miall, and Tom Woodhouse, *Contemporary Conflict Resolution: The Prevention, Management and Transformation of Deadly Conflicts* (Cambridge, UK; Malden, MA: Polity, 2011). 7.

a model of conflict applicable to all forms of conflict. The idea was to create a model

with the ability to explain where conflict originated from, discover solutions by locating

the type of conflict, and transform societies into what he terms, 'positive peace'[64]

Conflict, for Johann Galtung, is a dynamic evolving concept with the potential to spread

if not treated properly. He takes a deep analytical understanding of the word violence and

how it plays in to the different dimensions of conflict; violence is no longer the generic

man stabbing man sequence. He uses an equilateral triangle to model violence. The

symbolic representation of a triangle depicts the value each corner holds is equal and just

as important as the other. It is together as one, the vertices form the greater triangle better

known as 'violence'. These three forms of violence are described as, direct(personal)

violence, structural violence, and cultural violence.

Direct violence for Gatlung, is to actually go out and commit the physical act of

inflicting damage, such as the bashing of heads. It is the physical contact of one entity on

to another. Galtung's direct violence is the universal definition most people associate

violence as. The lesser known structural violence, refers to avoidable outcomes, such as

damage (on the physical or emotional level) and death, that still happen. It's definition

can be used in a series of scenarios and case studies. For example when individuals or

groups are discriminated against because of who they are, whether its intentional or not,

or when groups don't have an availability to a certain resource crucial for their health, but

the resource is accessible to other individuals elsewhere in the world; that is structural

---

[64] Ibid., 11. 'Positive peace' is the overcoming of structural and cultural violence. It is the end all goal for conflict resolution practitioners. Before it can be obtained, first 'negative peace' must be achieved, which is the 'cessation of direct violence'.

violence. They are suffering violence because of who they are, where they were born, and because no one did anything to stop it. Also included are particular spectator chants at sporting events. If the chants call for the suffering of their opponents, this is a form of structural violence. For example, at a recent English derby between Millwall and Derby County, fans from Millwall were calling Derby County fans 'murderers' and that they burn their children alive, a reference to a recent court case in Derby County where children from the family of Philpott were burned alive. [65]

The final corner is Gatlung's cultural violence, referring to a group's belief and value system convincing groups the way others should be treated, it allows them to commit structural violence because of a strict built in cognitive system.[66] The American Civil Rights Movement is a great example of this. Many white Americans saw blacks as animals, thus creating an image of non-humans, allowing whites to not treat blacks as they would each other; opening the door to discrimination. In the minds of the whites it was ok to look down on the blacks, to not treat them as equals, to create structural violence, and in some cases direct violence.

Galtung gives us a conflict structure. In his structure, the three violent vertices parallel solutions and origins. Direct violence is a result of behavior, it determines the next move. Structural violence is committed from contradictions, a clash of an

[65] "Milwall Fans Slammed after Vile Chants at Derby County About Mick and Mairead Philpott," *SWNS, http://swns.com/news/milwall-fans-slammed-vile-chants-derby-county-mick-mairead-philpott-35042/*
[66] Johan Galtung, "Cultural Violence," in *Violence and Its Alternatives: An Interdisciplinary Reader*, ed. Manfred B. Steger and Nancy S. Lind (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999). 7.

individual's or group's interests[67]. Finally, cultural violence is from attitude, how one

perceives the situation as well as the emotions invested in the conflict. "Galtung sees

conflict as a dynamic process in which structure, attitudes, and behavior are constantly

changing and influencing one another."[68] In order for there to be conflict there needs to

be all three elements present. Identifying if the conflict stems from behavior,

contradictions, or attitude, allows for the proper course of action, whether that is

Peacebuilding for structural violence by changing contradictions and injustices,

Peacemaking for cultural violence by changing attitudes, or Peacekeeping for direct

violence by changing conflict behavior.[69] Galtung gives us the structure to analyze the

conflict, whether the conflict is symmetrical (groups have similar resources and

ideologies) to asymmetrical (groups are very different, typically one has more resources

then the other) conflicts.

John Burton and Basic Human Needs

John Burton, one of the first members for George Mason's S-CAR (School for

Conflict Analysis and Resolution), looks at interests vs. needs. Simply put, a need is an

interest that is non-negotiable, cannot be bargained away; it is necessary for our survival

as humans. If our individual needs are not met, then there is deviance. When human

needs lie unfulfilled, there is a drive for conflict.[70] Burton also explains individuals form

---

[67] Ramsbotham, Miall, and Woodhouse, *Contemporary Conflict Resolution*. 10.
[68] Ibid., 10.
[69] Ibid., 11.
[70] Celia Cook-Huffman, "The Role of Identity in Conflict," in *Handbook of Conflict Analysis and Resolution*, ed. Dennis J.D. Sandole et al. (London: Routledge, 2010), 22.

a group when their needs become social needs, but societal needs do not outweigh an individual's need.

Burton has three needs he considers as the most essential, although other scientists may argue there are more. For Burton, the primary three are security; not necessarily just the security of force and armies but in terms of food and water(a safe space), identity; ones culture and the need to be allowed to be an individual, and finally recognition; to be allowed to be viewed as a person, if one is not incorporated into a community there are repercussions. Burton goes on to explain that needs are at the root of all problems, when one of these issues are being threatened then an individual is most likely to take action to secure the need. When an individual is in a group that shares similar needs, and the needs of the group are threatened, then the group does what they must to secure their needs; including the engagement of a conflict. A need base conflict will stem other conflicts.

Burton says when a conflict is analyzed, the human need at the root of the conflict will have stemmed so many other issues, that analyzers begin to focus their time on what has stemmed and not the threatened human need at the root. For as long as there is a conflict where a need is at the root, there will never be a resolution, anything settled will be short term; the conflict will just deescalate then escalate in a cycle. However, to get to the bottom of the bucket, negotiators and mediators must scrape at the issues on top to get the involved groups to find common ground before tackling the bottom of the bucket head on. It is necessary to find solutions for the conflicts stemming from the needs, but

there needs to be the desire to find the need being threatened. When the need has been secured, conflict transformation, a move towards positive peace, will be successful.

Ted Gurr and Frustration Aggression Theory

To best understand Ted Gurr's common interpretation of the Frustration Aggression Theory, it is best to look at his interpretation of the Relative Deprivation theory. Relative Deprivation is a term used to suggest the difference between an individual's value expectations and value capabilities. It stems from the absence of what an individual has; value capabilities, and what the individual believes they should have, value expectations. According to Gurr, there are three distinct types of Relative Deprivation; decremental, aspirational and progressive.[71] Decremental refers to when there is a decline in an individual's capabilities, but their expectations remain the same, such as if there is an expectation for your student to go to college, but because of an economic downturn, the expectation can no longer be fulfilled. Aspirational is when there is an increase in expectations, but the individual's capabilities do not change. An example would be if the individual wants to switch from renting a house to purchasing a home. Their expectations are enlarged for moving into a permanent residence, but they received no job raise, no outside income, and therefore their capabilities remained the same. Finally, progressive refers to when there is an increase in both expectations and capabilities, but because of certain elements outside of the individual's control, the

---

[71] Ted Robert Gurr, *Why Men Rebel* (Boulder, Colo.: Paradigm Pub., 2011), 46.

capabilities are no longer able to keep up with the expectations. An example for the

progressive form, is an individual losing their job because of company job cuts, they no

longer are able to afford their expectations. The difference between the two values

potentially leads the individual to a feeling of frustration.

Emotions resulting from the inability to meet an individual's expectation become

fueled into frustration. When there is a feeling of frustration there will ultimately be

aggression. This is the Frustration-Aggression theory Gurr proposes; frustration left

unfulfilled is fueled into aggression.[72] Conflict analysts[73] agree aggression, transformed

from frustration, is the cause for direct violence. Neil Miller, author of *The Frustration-*

Aggression Hypothesis[74], and one of the father's for the original theory, would also

defend this statement. Gurr explains, "...frustration produces instigations to various

responses, one of which is aggression. If the non-aggressive responses does not relieve

the frustration," he quotes Miller, "'the greater is the probability that the instigation to

aggression eventually will become dominant so that some response of the aggression will

occur'".[75] Aggression is the reaction to uncontained frustration. When multiple

individuals come together with aggression, there is collective action with the possibility

for the manifestation of violence; either it being direct, structural, or cultural.[76]

---

[72] Ibid., 33.
[73] Joan Neff Gurney and Kathleen J. Tierney, "Relative Deprivation and Social Movements: A Critical Look at Twenty Years of Theory and Research*," *Sociological Quarterly* 23, no. 1 (1982), 35. doi: 10.1111/j.1533-8525.1982.tb02218.x.
[74] Neal E. Miller, "The Frustration-aggression Hypothesis," *Psychological Review* 48, no. 4 (1941): 337–342. doi: 10.1037/h0055861.
[75] Ibid., quoted in Gurr, *Why Men Rebel*. 33.
[76] Gurr, *Why Men Rebel*. 31.

Relative Deprivation is one possible cause for conflict, because it devises the perfect setting for frustration. Frustration creates the violence, the motivation, the action, but Relative Deprivation creates the setting for the behavior to erupt. The preference for looking at Frustration Aggression theory as opposed to focusing primarily on Relative Deprivation is done because the Relative Deprivation theory is just an idea Gurr gives us for the manufacturing of frustration. The Frustration- Aggression theory is the utilization of frustration into aggression ultimately into violence; where' spectator violence' can be discussed as residing. Relative Deprivation is just a theory for the origins of frustration applicable to civil society.

Although Gurr is criticized for his emphasis on the individual and objective criteria in his view of the Relative Deprivation theory,[77] the bi-product is frustration. A discussion of its origins or other interpretations is not the purpose of this paper, however, let it be known his view on Relative Deprivation holds critiques.

The void between value expectation and capabilities is a powerful source for the formulation of emotions. We as analysts and practitioners need to study this void and be more cautious of its power in creating collective actions, especially in a world were globalization is putting someone face to face with opposing ideologies, values, beliefs, expectations, and capabilities. As a probable cause for frustration and eventual violence, it is important to learn more about the void in Relative Deprivation and study other ways frustration can originate. It is important to broaden this search while keeping in mind

---

[77] Gurney and Tierney, "Relative Deprivation and Social Movements." 35.

subjective and objective elements of frustration at the group or individual level while

looking at the psychological, political, sociological, environmental, and economical

factors at all levels of society.

There are many models and theories employed in the world today for why conflict

exists and what it is derived from. Galtung, Burton, and Gurr are some of the founding

fathers in their field and although all their original work has been criticized heavily, their

work has still not been completely disproven, which makes them great models in

introducing what others, the media and social scientists, believe 'spectator violence' to

stem from. Their approach looks at the broad use of violence from world wars to

domestic conflicts.

After exploring probable causes for violent triggers, a focus is brought to what

sociologists consider to be those triggers involved in 'spectator violence'. The above

models of violence are considered to be the roots of any violent action, the misbehavior

of spectators are the flowers from the roots. The latter models of violence set the stage for

discussing emergent violent elements related to 'spectator violence', they are the flowers

of violence from the planted seeds of violence theory. They are what is believed to be the

direct cause of violence, whether through speculation or real analysis, the following

chapter will focus explicitly on 'spectator violence' and where it is believed to blossom in

the realm of sports.

THE SEEDS OF 'SPECTATOR VIOLENCE'

There are many concepts and theories explaining the seeds of 'spectator violence', particularly at football events. They have surfaced over the years from what Russell Ward Jr. calls the social problem approach and the 'moral panic' approach. The social problem approach looks at the violence of spectators from a societal lens, how does spectator violence emerge and what can be done to reduce it? It is paired with the positivist approach on 'spectator violence', there is not a random set of events or spontaneity in which violence emerges, there are instead a code of unwritten rules which bring about the violent nature of spectators.[78] The 'moral panic' approach is more associated with the media and how they construct a news story presentable for the rest of a community, it therefore emphasizes an analysis of public discourse and what their reasons are for 'spectator violence'.[79] As opposed to the positivist and their rational deduction of violence by spectators, the constructivist is interested in the use of labels, how are they constructed and who is responsible for fashioning them for the rest of

---

[78] Ward Jr., "Fan Violence." 460.
[79] Ibid., 454.

society?[80]   This chapter is a broad discussion of the concepts and theories for 'spectator

violence' within the two paradigms identified by Ward Jr.

Through the lens of the Social Problem Approach

There are a series of theories out there approaching 'spectator violence' from a

societal lens. This approach believes the reason for fan behavior stems from social

conditions, they are not limited to an individual's interaction within society, but rather

other processes, such as biological, psychological, individual desires, participation in the

masses, emotional responses, and factors outside ones control; such as political and

economical. This analysis of behavior can be called the academic approach, a discussion

on why humans behave the way they do and how institutional structures may impede or

frustrate our biological programmed processes. Ward Jr. breaks down the social problem

approach into three different categories, the first focuses on an individual's behavior; how

one may behave under unique extreme circumstances, second how an individual acts

within a group; people behave differently when massed together, and finally a look at

violence stemming from political, social, and economical contexts; the pressures of

institutional structures requiring individuals to release frustration.[81] The overview begins

with an individual's behavior and their internal responses for becoming violent. Ward Jr.

---

[80] Ibid., 466.
[81] Ibid., 461- 63.

writes three theories under this category of the individual and their violent behavior, they are instinct theory, frustration-aggression theory, and hooligan addiction theory. [82]

Instinct theory has its origins with Sigmund Freud. He says there are primitive forces of self-destructive energy within each human. As humans we behave rationally to not let this self-destructive energy consume us, one way in doing so is to release it through exercise or attending a sporting event. Yet, if attending a sporting event and you become frustrated in a crowd of people, the moral rationality used on a daily basis to succeed in the modern era will be replaced by primitive and irrational ideas which can lead to violence. [83]Instinct theory goes back to our animalistic nature, we can't control primal surges from time to time, however the instinct theory by Freud poses multiple questions? Why does not every sporting event have similar levels of violence? If it were a consistent factor at sporting events, why are some fans able to control their primal urges, while others can't?

The second theory discussing the individual's behavior is the previously mentioned frustration-aggression theory. In the unusual circumstance of a sports atmosphere, there are some spectators who take on the identity of their team. They have close affiliation and therefore their emotions are invested into the team's performance. Dunning tells us these identities can be very strong, "The probability of spectator violence in soccer contexts is also likely to be exacerbated by the degree to which spectators identify with the contending teams and strength of their emotional investment

---

[82] Ibid., 460.
[83] Ibid., 460.

41

in and commitment to the victory of the teams they support."[84] In the chance of a defeat,

the fans will feel they have not truly proven themselves, a loss on the pitch is a loss in

real life, they become judged by the opposing team for the way their team performed.

Not wishing to be seen as losers by the other team, their frustration for the loss makes

them aggressive and ultimately violent.[85] A strong identity to a team makes the

individual connected, when their team loses, frustration has to be dealt with. The theory

holds a solid idea, but in this case, the frustration aggression theory is presupposing one

thing, violence erupts after a match has finished and there is a winner and a loser.

However, It is a widely known fact violence erupts between spectators before a match

may begin, thus not making this identity based frustration-aggression theory valid for all

spectator violence.

　　　The final theory focusing on the individual is labeled as the hooligan addiction

theory. Simply put, there are extreme spectators who have become addicted to violent

behavior.[86] Their violence is not triggered by some culmination of events, rather they

desire the fight; they seek-out the fight. This addiction is no different than an addiction to

drugs, alcohol, or gambling. There is pleasure from the doses of fighting against another

person. Anthony King uses a quote from an interview Paul Harrison conducted with a

respected leader from Manchester United in 1974, in his paper *Soccer's Tribal Wars*, the

spectator says, "I get so much pleasure when I'm having aggro [violence], I nearly wet

---

[84] Dunning, *Sport Matters: Sociological Studies of Sport, Violence, and Civilization*. 155.
[85] Ward Jr., "Fan Violence." 460.
[86] Ibid., 460.

my pants - it's true."[87] Spectators have a strong addiction to live in the adrenaline of the moment with the opportunity to face a challenger. There is no particular environment that makes these particular people fight, the stars do not need to align, there is no complex sociological theory at play, simply they fight because they enjoy it. Sometimes analysts need to heed the words of the individuals they are studying and not look for a deeper meaning, they told you already it is just for fun. The hooligan addiction theory holds validity in this sense, but what makes the spectators whom have never been violent, turn violent? They had never before tasted the lust for an opponent's blood, what makes them flip the switch from fan to violent spectator? Violence is not just the direct physical contact between two people, it is also the structural violence of insults. Is there the same pleasure in shouting chants as there is in landing a fist to an opponent? The theory may explain the continuance of behavior, but it is not at *the* trigger, it is just one of the blossoming flowers from the violent roots haunting sports violence.

Outside of the individual's mind and their behavior, comes a series of theories analyzing how an individual in a group setting switches from observer to participant. Ward Jr. presents the crowd theories as, the emergent norm theory, contagion theory, convergence theory, collective mind theory, and value-added theory.[88] These are what are known as the 'crowd dynamic' theories. When surrounded by a group of people, the individual may become swayed by the actions of the group. Depending on the circumstances the spectator may become a conformist and join the crowd, whether they

---

[87] King, "The Postmodernity of Football Hooliganism." 588.
[88] Ward Jr., "Fan Violence." 461.

had originally intended to or not, 'crowd dynamics' are strong in manipulating a passive person to become extreme.

The emergent norm theory was originally proposed by Ralph Turner and Lewis Killian.[89] Acknowledging 'group dynamics' adjusted an individual's judgment, Turner and Killian looked for ways the individual's judgment became altered, their conclusion was the acceptance of a norm.[90] For spectators at football games violence became a norm, it was normal to see a fight break out and hear the violent chants. The level of normality was so apparent, moral judgment was altered and spectators participating in the violence didn't see themselves as doing anything wrong, because it was normal. It was seen as everyone else is doing it, why not me? There is no deeper meaning in terms of fighting for reputation or violence in the name of trying to humiliate the opposing team, it was just seen as normal. The emergent norm theory is strong until one goes back to examine its use in 'spectator violence', who started the norm? What reasons brought about 'spectator violence' as acceptable? When over 30,000 were killed in Constantine during the chariot race, did violence commence because one person decided it was normal to throw a punch at the Roman Guard? The emergent norm theory fails to explain the beginning, the roots, in other words it is just another blossomed flower of violence.

The second theory Ward Jr. proposes in 'crowd dynamics' is contagion theory. This theory holds that when people in a group are aroused with a certain emotion (such as in the case of football; a bad call by the referee), individuals within a group feed off each

---

[89] Ibid., 461.
[90] Ibid., 461.

other's emotions. The spreading of emotions may arouse the leader, who in turn gets the crowd motivated. [91] It is an emotional virus spreading from person to person ultimately affecting the whole crowd once the leader has become aware of the emotion. If the emotion is aggression and it spreads from person to person, the crowd may become violent. Similar to emergent norm theory, rational thought is disbanded and violence may set in. The difference between the two is the spectator's determine their own code of conduct in the emergent norm theory, while in the contagion theory they become vacuumed into irrationality and motivated to do harm. The question is, what triggers them to do such harm? It may be able to explain how structural violence originates, but it can't explain the causes for a direct violent confrontation. Contagion theory explains the 'crowd dynamics' of going from happy to sad or sad to happy, but it does not explain what motivates the first individual to throw a punch, whom in turn would convince the rest of the crowd to fight.

Convergence theory is the third idea proposed by Ward Jr. He explains it as, "The major assumption of convergence theory is that inhibitions are lowered in a crowd because like-minded people are gathered together."[92] In a crowd, people realize they are surrounded by others who share similar qualities. In this environment people are more willing to be freer in their decisions and potentially become violent. In this setting, if one man is to become violent others in the crowd will do the same. If there are especially two or three individuals with an aggressive nature in the crowd, they may take advantage of

---

[91] Ibid., 461.
[92] Ibid., 462.

the lowered converged senses and arouse the group into violence. A recent news article from Cyprus points to the acceptance of this theory as they are now introducing measures for any fan with a record of 'spectator violence' at regional football matches to be banned from future matches.[93] These individuals most likely have the capacity to be aggressive enough for bringing the rest of the crowd towards aggression, therefore a ban on particular fans is a strategy to combat this theory. Again however, for the sake of looking at the actual roots of violence, convergence theory, similar to contagion theory, does not explain why the banned spectators in Cyprus acted out in the first place. What triggers an individual whether in a group or by themselves to throw the first violent fist?

The collective mind theory is debated between two individuals, Emile Durkheim and Gustav Le Bon. The argument is over the interpretation of the 'conscious collective' and the two minds each human contains, the individual and the collective. Durkheim believes the 'conscious collective' is a moral imperative for society collaborating a groups ideas and sentiments.[94] Without the 'conscious collective' the society's needs are not considered and the individual mind focuses only on its own personal interests.[95] Le Bon, in contradiction to Durkheim, believes it is not the collective mind holding more rational thought in society, but the individual who is more rationally superior with their decisions.[96] In the collective context at sporting events, the collective mind is degraded

---

[93] Peter Stevenson, "Football Hooligans with a Record to Be Banned from Matches," *Cyprus Mail*, August 1, 2013, http://cyprus-mail.com/2013/08/01/football-hooligans-with-a-record-to-be-banned-from-matches/.
[94] Ward Jr., "Fan Violence." 462.
[95] Ibid., 462.
[96] Ibid., 462.

to a primitive level, where people are "impulsive and lose judgment."[97] The 'crowd dynamics' of a primitive mind are the right environment for violence, because inhibitions and common sense are no longer present. Therefore, according to the collective mind theory, under Le Bon's ideas, violence happens because individuals come together and lose rational thought. There are no triggers in the theory for why violence would be enacted or what sets people off, just that people are more prone to a primitive state of mind, creating an environment for violence to commence.

The final theory Ward Jr. proposes under 'crowd dynamics' is Neil Smelser 's value-added theory, which holds six determinants for why crowds become violent. [98] The theory is constructed as a level necessity system. Stage one of the value-added theory must take place in order for stage two to occur. The only thing triggering stage three is if stage one and two have already happened. These six stages are: *structural conduciveness*; an environment from the structural proceedings of society making it probable for violence to occur (the away teams spectators are eligible to come to your stadium and have arrived), *structural strain;* the system has changed to either subtract or add unexpected new norms (the opposing fans are placed in the same proximity of the home team spectators and shout vocally at each other), *growth and spread of generalized belief*; the belief that the opposing group may have an unfair advantage over another group which creates tension (such as the referee only calling fouls on their team), *precipitating factor*; an event triggering violent activity (the referee calling a goal no good),

---

[97] Ibid., 462.
[98] Ibid., 462.

mobilization; the spectators collectively coming together with similar emotions to take action against the *precipitating factor* (spectators charge the other teams spectators), and finally *operation of social control;* the stadium's forces come together to prevent the violent mobilization, in turn becoming targets themselves (particularly riot police).[99] The theory is viewed as rational to the individuals, because they believe they are rightfully fixing a wrong that was done to them. Compared to the other 'crowd dynamic' theories presented by Ward Jr. this theory has room for violence to emerge before, after, and during the match in addition there is room to insert different triggers into the six determinants. The failure of this model resides in it being only conducive to the proximity of a stadium. The theory calls for forces of social control to intervene, which may not be found in particular fighting grounds, and is formulated with *structural strain*, which also may not be present in particular violent areas. In other words, there are cases where violence erupts without all six determinants present. It fails to explain why violence erupts blocks away from the stadium in the local park, nor does it explain why some fans from opposing teams begin swinging at each other once they have a visual on the opponent. There are grievances at the roots, which the theory fails to recognize.

The final topic within the social problem approach Ward Jr. categorizes are those theories associated with the social, economic, and political contexts. Away from the individual behavior and 'crowd dynamics' bringing people to violence, are elements constructed outside of the stadiums, turning sports as a venue for releasing their

---

[99] Ibid., 462 - 63.

dissatisfaction with institutional factors. Within this final topic Ward Jr. brings up functionalist theory, figurational theory, conflict theory, and post modern theory.[100]

The first theory, functionalist theory, considers the sports venue as serving a purpose for the rest of society. Every institution plays a role for bettering the greater social system. In the modern era where there is a lot of repetition in life, wake up, work, pay bills, sleep, and repeat, there are not a lot of opportunities for changing up the rhythm of one's lifestyle. The functionalists consider sports an opportunity to maintain a healthy lifestyle for the economic prosperity of a capitalist system, while sports venues break away from the disciplined routine of life to enjoy a visually stimulating spectacle whose result is unknown until the game is finished. [101] Since it is seen as more appropriate to physically act out at a sporting event than it would be to do so at work or at one's house, violence at sports is seen as the most acceptable place for such behavior. Functionalists, consider the allowance for a particular level of violence at sporting events helps to sustain violence in other sectors of society.[102] The theory describes why sport becomes the venue for aggression, because it is not appropriate to happen elsewhere. However this means the functionalist theory is suggesting a Freudian foundation, all men are violent by nature and need to let out their aggression in some way. The release of aggression is done in order to create a better economic system. Since sports are considered to be the most appropriate place for violence, it is most notable here, however, if it is a universal theory applicable to sports, why is spectator violence miniscule in the United States in

---

[100] Ibid., 463.
[101] Ibid., 463.
[102] Ibid., 463.

comparison to Europe? Why does football become the venue for the most violence? Is

suggesting a primal nature as the cause for direct violence between spectators enough to

conclude the primal nature of man is the main cause for conflict? There lies too many

unanswered questions within this paradigm and it does not come across as strong as other

theories within the category.

The second theory under this topic is the figurational theory, originally proposed

by Norbert Elias, it culminates a series of disciplines into one violent fan theory; they

include, biological, psychological, sociological, and historical approaches.[103] The

Leicester school for football 'hooliganism', one of the best football 'hooligan' research

centers, set up its framework analysis around this theory.[104]Using their idea of the

'hooligan', they discovered: 'hooliganism' was noticeable outside of Britain, in other

sports besides football, its behavior began before the 1960's created such a phenomenon,

and that violence was most noticeable in the rougher sections of the working class.[105] The

initial framework stems from Elias' belief that our civilization is progressing slowly

towards a more civilized group of people, in this world there is no room for behavior that

is seen as uncivilized or aggressive.[106] Within this growing civilized world the

expectations for public behavior have changed and through external constraints, people

are to act a certain way. The difference between everyone acting within the civilized

manner was the amount of income they generated. Within a society, those with money

---

[103] Ibid., 463.
[104] Dunning, *Sport Matters: Sociological Studies of Sport, Violence, and Civilization*. 142.
[105] Ibid.,143.
[106] Ward Jr., "Fan Violence." 464.

will inevitably come into contact with those who do not hold any money, sports are one of these areas social classes meet. The differences in social classes are noticeable by the lifestyles on display at sporting events (The upper class get the best seats and flaunt their money). Patrick Murphy, according to Ward Jr., explains, "[the]...lifestyle of the working class and recognition of their inequality become factors in fan violence. In particular, violence can be traced to unruly fans who come from the rough or exploited working class."[107] How the working class deals with these interactions, whether it is through resentment of the rich or their disregard for consequences by acting out violently; because they are living in a survival mode, still puts the working class primarily as the culprits for violence.[108] Yet, not all the violence is committed by the working class, there are rich individuals partaking in violence just as there are poorer individuals. The theory also emphasizes a territorial component, spectators are defending what they believe to be their own property, the game is theirs.[109] This territorial component is too intertwined with social classes for it to be seen as a complete separate concept, but this theory is ultimately arguing sports are the location of violence because civilization does not allow violence in other parts of society. Since most of the culprits are agreed upon to be from the working class the theory holds legitimacy, but because there are other classes partaking in the violence[110], there still must be a deeper concept manipulating the violent spectator.

---

[107] Ibid., 464. Words in brackets are my own.
[108] Ibid., 464.
[109] Ibid., 464.
[110] Tim Vickery, "River Plate v Boca Juniors - Where Has the Magic Gone?," BBC, *Tim Vickery's Blog* (blog), October 29, 2012, http://www.bbc.co.uk/blogs/timvickery/2012/10/river_plate_v_boca_juniors_-

The conflict theory goes back to the writings of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, whom described how conditions in a society are prone to create conflict, because they contain opposing interests, such as a worker wishing to work less for more money and the owner wanting more work for less money.[111] The theory seeks to explain how society's structure outside the stadium is carried into the stadium. The spectators walk into the terraces with grievances from the world outside, with these social strains, violence becomes a high probability at these venues. As Ward Jr. says, "Conflict theory suggests that the political maneuvers and economic interests of sport may create the conditions for fan violence."[112] When applying the conflict theory to sports, the element of commercialization is introduced. While the spectators enter the stadium, so do their grievances. A sports venue fails to fulfill a spectator's grievance, while looking for satisfaction, they are instead struck with advertisements for spending more money while realizing they don't have any money to spend. The world of sports is now a product of capitalism. Violence is the bi-product of a spectator's frustration, because the venue which once served the purpose of relieving stress from outside forces, is now an enforcer of the structure many used to try and escape from.

When adding Marx and Engels to any theory it instantly becomes a theory of social classes, violence based on the rich versus the poor, the proletariat fighting a capitalist system. Yet, 'spectator violence' today holds more than a social class battle

---

_w.html. Had a personal conversation with a friend about the Argentinean derby and found an article to back up her point. In Argentina, Boca and River Plate is a fierce derby between those with money and those who work hard to barely make a living.
[111] Ward Jr., "Fan Violence." 463.
[112] Ibid., 463.

between the working class and a capitalist structure (sports venue). 'Spectator violence' is more spontaneous, it can't be limited to a particular grouping of people. How could grievances against a structure push the traditional working class spectator to travel for international away games in order be violent towards an international opponent? Unable to answer this question, a deeper meaning still exists in the realm of 'spectator violence'.

The final theory Ward Jr. assigns to the social problem approach is the complex postmodern theory. Here there is an emphasis on capitalism and class conflict, but shaped differently, not in the same reigns as Marx and Engels had imagined. The focus of the post modern, is the transcendence of boundaries and whom is responsible for creating the boundaries to be transcended. The youth according to Anthony King, need rules because they need to have something to transcend in order to gain excitement.[113]Applying this theme to football, these particular boundaries in the postmodern are boundaries of masculinity and nationalism, constructed and deconstructed by the spectator, because they are regarded as liminal (extremely dangerous, a transgression of boundaries). [114] There is a cycle in the construction and deconstruction of the boundaries in which transcendence is the ultimate goal, without any sort of boundaries to transcend there would never had been a 'hooligan' phenomenon. The creation of boundaries exists only to be breached, in doing so individuals gain the identity of someone whom has accomplished the task of transcending the boundaries. Aggression is not the reason for violence, but the challenge and excitement of transcending what should not be jumped,

---

[113] King, "The Postmodernity of Football Hooliganism." 573.
[114] Ibid., 582.

pushes the spectator to do so.[115]Upon completion of their task they are rewarded with

labels from the media calling them particular degrading names, but to the violent

spectator these are trophies. Dunning adds to the defense of the postmodern theory while

summing up a series of interviews with football spectators, "...football hooligan fighting

is basically about masculinity, territorial struggle and excitement. For them, fighting is a

central source of meaning, status or 'reputation' and pleasurable arousal."[116] Boundaries

are goals to achieve and defend, so opposing fans are not able to transcend and gain

identity. King brings up another interesting argument on the cause for creating

boundaries of masculinity and identity.

In the 1960's hooliganism first emerged. During this time the English male was

facing an obstacle it had previously not struggled with in the preceding decades, no world

wars. The soldier was a symbol of masculinity, going out and fighting for his country, he

embodied what a male was. The 60's did not have as much of an opportunity as the

previous generations to gain the status of masculine. King echoes George Mosse, by

stating, "...during the nineteenth century it was believed only a strong (normal) manhood

could protect the nation from external threat. Manhood and the nation are isomorphic

concepts."[117] After the world wars, the opportunities were gone for most men to fight,

boundaries of nation and masculinity were thus created to gain this recognition by other

means.

---

[115] Ward Jr., "Fan Violence." 463.
[116] Dunning, *Sport Matters: Sociological Studies of Sport, Violence, and Civilization*. 147.
[117] King, "The Postmodernity of Football Hooliganism." 581.

The postmodern theory is a good sociological approach to fan violence. I believe it holds a great deal of validity in the triggering of what is considered as aggressive behavior, but I deem it to be predominantly orientated to English spectator violence, King states early on in his research that a transcendent application of his study may not be the best application of his research, local sociologists should make their own decisions on the matter.[118] In Scotland, the 'old firm' derby between Glasgow Celtic and Glasgow Rangers appears to be a match with more nationalistic elements of Great Britain versus Ireland, than males creating boundaries to transcend into masculinity.[119] A similar study can be found in Israel between Beitar Jerusalem FC and Bnei Skhnin, where males are not combating for masculinity, but rather violence in the derby appears to have its roots in Israel and Palestinian affairs.[120] Whether or not it can be considered the predominant reason for aggression in England, the theory remains as an unacceptable universal phenomenon; which this paper is seeking to explore.

'Moral Panic': Claiming Before Consulting

The other approach for looking at the causes of 'spectator violence' is known as the 'moral panic' approach. Here, the concern is with the construction of labels, whom is labeling behavior as it is and what reasons do they have for doing so. As opposed to the positivists who were interested in the social problem approach and how 'spectator

---

[118] Ibid., 577.

[119] Alex Hoffman, *Rivals: Rangers and Celtic* (Glasgow, Scotland: Vice, 2012), http://www.vice.com/rivals/rangers-celtic-part-1.

[120] P.T. Karolyi, "Way More Than a Game: Football in Israel," Wordpress, *Arab Association for Human Rights* (blog), November 8, 2012,   http://arabhra.wordpress.com/2012/11/08/way-more-than-a-game-football-in-israel/.

violence' mobilized to occur, the constructionists believe the 'moral panic' approach is a tool used by governments to create and maintain social order.[121] The media is the tool most utilized in spreading the 'moral panic'. As Ward Jr. says, "Moral panics are characterized by rapid and intense emotional fervor toward an issue that the media and other social control agents call to public attention." [122] This section will look at what is being said by the media and other social control agents on 'spectator violence', from calling it a disease to legitimizing force against the phenomenon.

The term 'moral panic' originally started with Stanley Cohen, while he was developing the concept into stages to learn more about whose hand was behind the construction of the panic. In the original model, Cohen describes the role of the media in constructing whom the deviant groups are within society, in doing so the media orchestrates a movement to tackle the social issue by creating public responses against whom they have propagated towards, initiating action to the problem.[123] The model becomes criticized over time, because it emphasized too much of the media's construction and not the security dimension; the role of the security professionals in constructing social problems. Stuart Hall, expanding the model, incorporates the security dimension, "Hall emphasizes the relations of reciprocity between various social actors involved in mutually reinforcing representations of deviance."[124] He believed there was a link between political institutions using the media to tackle social problems in order to

---

[121] Ward Jr., "Fan Violence." 466.
[122] Ibid., 466.
[123] Tsoukala, "Boundary-creating Processes and the Social Construction of Threat." 139.
[124] Ibid., 139 - 40.

preserve a form of their hegemony. Hall would eventually be criticized for not considering the generic business model of journalism and how it is their job to create hypes.[125]

The pioneering works of Cohen and Hall continued to be worked on throughout the following years. Chas Crichter broke the theory into noticeable linear levels, he studied how a social problem began with the media, but would be taken on by other professionals such as security forces and political entrepreneurs over time.[126] Erich Goode and Nachman Ben-Yehuda emerged in the 1980's looking to differentiate 'moral panics' from moral crusades, in doing so they looked at the manifestations of what the media was claiming and the interests of social movements, but they were criticized for not considering the impact of the media in the interest group dynamics.[127] The persistent models continued to focus on too much of one element or lacking too much of another. Jef Huysman saw 'moral panics' as a creation of cohesion in society. He declared, communities feel closest to one another when there is a common enemy, an 'us' versus a 'them'. The creation of the enemy creates cohesion, regular problems between community members are forgotten and the community comes together to tackle the social problem. In doing so, political and other sectors of society look to marginalize on the social enemy, Anastassia Tsoukala puts it as,

---

[125] Ibid., 140.
[126] Ibid., 140.
[127] Ibid., 140.

"While politicians may seek to strengthen their position in the political and security realms by opposing themselves to the social enemies of the day, security professionals may associate their preventative and coercive policies with budget claims and/or the ongoing repositioning of their agencies in the security field, and sensationalist media campaigns guarantee an economically quantifiable rise in their audience."[128]

Groups capitalize on the social enemy to enhance their image within society, politicians look to gain favor, security forces look to build a better reputation with the communities, and the media takes home a profit for continuing to make the enemy look bad. In order for the social enemy to come into existence, there first needs to be a boundary recognizable by the whole society which has been crossed. The violence that became very apparent in the 1960's creating the phenomenon of 'hooliganism', crossed those boundaries. However, as Dunning previously mentioned, the Leicester school for soccer hooliganism, proved the 'hooliganism' phenomenon existed prior to the 1960's. Therefore 'moral panic' capitalized by creating a social enemy already present in society, but the process of targeting spectator's behavior as illegitimate and unacceptable, enticed more spectators to join the ranks of the 'hooligans'.[129] As more media hyped 'hooliganism', more 'hooligans' joined accompanied by a series of ideas speculated by the media for why the traditional spectator became violent.

There are a series of ideas out there coming from the media often used to explain 'spectator violence'. Just because the media propagates with these particular ideas does not mean they are wrong by any means, they are just as valid as any other theory from the social problem approach, but most tend to be limited and less complex in explaining the

---

[128] Ibid., 141.
[129] King, "The Postmodernity of Football Hooliganism." 584.

social behavior of spectators. Geoffrey Lawrence, has taken a series of media

publications across Western countries and created four categories the media uses to

explain 'spectator violence'; these are: gang warfare, animal nature, social conditions, and

a lack of security.[130]

Gang warfare takes 'firms' and considers them as gangs, in doing so the media

turns the spectators affiliated to the 'firms' as violent individuals not afraid of

anyone.[131]There is a battle for territory, the need to defend what is theirs against the

others. Lawrence quotes Dr. Fernando Cesarman, whom was quoted in a *Newsweek*

article suggesting it can be seen as a primitive level of tribal warfare, "Sport is like war

that opens up aggressions and feelings...its wholesome male aggression.... a sort of tribal

warfare." [132] The argument is reinforced by Leicester's scientists Dunning and Murphy

who tie the territorial element of tribal defense with the need for social identity status.

Fighting in the terraces is a social ritual for giving an individual tribal rites.[133] However,

this interpretation of 'gang warfare' as tribal like warfare precludes all males have the

primal urge for fighting, posing the question why is it that not all spectators engage in

violence?

The second category Lawrence identifies, is the animal nature of humans. The

media argues we are genetically created with the urge to fight. Anthony Burgess claims it

is the young who are triggered by something in society, making them the majority for

---

[130] Lawrence, "The Gladiatorial Lust for Blood." 193.
[131] Ibid., 193.
[132] Ibid., 193.
[133] Ibid., 194.

possessing uncontrolled animal behavior.[134] His conclusions are drawn from the youth

fulfilling the role of the lowest social position, where he blames the violent spectator to

be. His argument is accompanied by Bill Mellor, whom stated in the *Sun-Herald,* "the

English soccer hooligan is quite possibly the lowest, least sensitive form of life."[135] In

referencing the football 'hooligan' as the lowest position of society, the media began to

label them as villains to society. Australian news agencies used terms such as lice, rotten

meat, disease, and virus, to describe the lowest social class position.[136] Categorizing the

group as animals and other non- human objects made them not likely to interact with the

rest of the society as humans. Deciding they were decrepit to society made them

unapproachable by socio-economic policies, the result was legitimizing a level of

violence against these perpetrators, because they did not resemble anything like humans;

animals don't have rights.[137]

     For all the negativity the media sent the 'hooligan', the spectators responded with

excitement for all the labels generated. They enjoyed the liminal status within society,

fans from Manchester United in the 1970's were called animals by the media and

responded with, 'we hate humans'.[138] This led David Robins to title his book, *We Hate*

Humans, a piece looking at the 'hooligan phenomenon and the role the youth played

within it.[139] In refuting the claim of our genetic animal nature as the main cause for

---

[134] Ibid., 195.
[135] Ibid., 195.
[136] Ibid., 196.
[137] Tsoukala, "Boundary-creating Processes and the Social Construction of Threat." 145.
[138] King, "The Postmodernity of Football Hooliganism." 584.
[139] David Robins, *We Hate Humans* (Milo Books Ltd, 2011).

violence, Lawrence states, we are not prisoners to our DNA, unless pertaining to

particular survival needs like water and shelter, otherwise, "...the belief that we are

naturally aggressive is both fallacious and misleading."[140] Our genes do not control our

behavior and can't be used as a scapegoat for violent actions. Arguing animal nature for

'spectator violence' is the same argument as trying to say an individual raping another is

violent animal tendencies in all of us; the argument doesn't hold.

Social conditions in society is the third popular theory Lawrence categorizes the

media into targeting. This approach targets high levels of unemployment with a large

population of youth , results in violence. *Time* magazine was recorded with saying over

80% of those arrested in association to 'spectator violence' are either manual laborers or

unemployed youths. [141] It is to no shock high unemployment with a large population of

youth is considered a problem, the youth have nothing productive to do, they get bored

and cause trouble. They do not have money to fall back on, so instead they prefer to look

for recognition in other means, to gain identity. France is no stranger to what levels of

high unemployment and a large youth population can do; they recently faced several

violent riots in 2005 demonstrated by the youth.[142] Germany identified their 'hooligans'

---

[140] Lawrence, "The Gladiatorial Lust for Blood." 196.
[141] Ibid., 197.
[142] Susan J Terrio, *Judging Mohammed: Juvenile Delinquency, Immigration, and Exclusion at the Paris Palace of Justice* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2009). 11.Although there was a large immigration element involved, the protests were held by majorly youth over the social conditions.

between the ages of 16-22, in doing so they constructed Fan-Projekts[143] for learning more about the skin-headed youth causing violence.[144]

With a strong belief as the youth at the core of the problem, the media attempted to diagnose its own solutions, calling for an increase in security. Robins, quoted in *The Sydney Morning Herald*, explains the youth problem should not be solved with an increase in military forces, "...rather, it is how to give young people a stake in society as productive workers and responsible citizens."[145] Repressing the youth would have the opposite solution of solving the issue. Security feeds the youth with more challenges, they have to be craftier to attack the security forces, more security equals more liminal behavior by the violent youth spectator. However, the best strategy for prevention is to find the cause and according to *The Australian,* "If unemployment is the cause, why is it that British crowds were noted for their orderly behavior in the 1930's when the unemployment figure was much higher than now?"[146] Unemployment may play some role or hold some element for creating the right environment for violence, but it is not *the* factor. Margaret Thatcher , although assumedly bias because of her interests in representing a strong British nation, declined unemployment as any kind of cause in the 'hooligan' phenomenon.[147] It can't be denied that a majority of those involved with

---

[143] Teams of social scientists who would interact with the hooligans as much as possible, be around in their lives for as much time as possible, the plan was to get to know who this social class was made up of.
[144] Chris Gehrz, "Soccer and Nationalism," *The Pietist Schoolman* (blog), July 2, 2012, http://pietistschoolman.com/2012/07/02/soccer-and-nationalism/
[145] Lawrence, "The Gladiatorial Lust for Blood." 197.
[146] Ibid., 197.
[147] Ibid., 198.

violence tend to be from the working class and young, but social deprivation is not *the* trigger in making it all happen.

The final category proposed by Lawrence is what he considers to be the most important, a lack of security. In most mob violence, the security forces tend to be overwhelmed unable to control the crowds mobilizing towards them. Articles from *Newsweek, The Sydney Morning Herald, The Australian,* and *Sunday Telegraph,* are examples of media agencies calling for greater security at football matches, some calling for measures to be incorporated. *The Australian* in particular, called the future of football to be played within fortified amphitheaters using iron cages.[148] Ironically, for the amount of increase in security called for, a study at the European Cup in 2004, proved the opposite.

In Portugal at the European Cup Tournament, the Portuguese police were instructed on how to approach their security tactics during the several days of the tournament. The approach was based on the ESIM (Elaborated Social Identity Model), which theorized normal group behavior was dependent on salience between members, but there could be disruption with a group's identity if they noticed a police presence.[149] This was a noticeable problem at European Cup 2000 in Italy. The police generalized English spectators as violent individuals and treated the group negatively before they had done anything wrong, this treatment made the English spectators frustrated whom in turn acted out against the Italian police, ultimately giving the Italian police the kind of behavior they

---

[148] Ibid., 199.
[149] Stott et al., "Tackling Football Hooliganism." 119.

expected from the English spectator in the first place.[150] There was activity based on a perceived social identity, resulting in hundreds of arrests and more international negativity for the English 'hooligan'. In Portugal, security was told to stand around until a disturbance occurred, told to make personal connections with fans, dress in partial gear (as opposed to the full riot gear Italian police in Euro2000), and maintain a covert presence amongst the crowds. With the police not collectively attacking the English spectators, because of where they came from, fans from other countries were able to make connections with the English fans, making it harder for those several aggressive English spectators to mobilize the rest of the Englishmen.[151] This study concluded that more of a police presence equated to more violence which in turn meant a more negative relationship between police and spectator over the long term. [152]The severe penalties and the call for more armed guards will only worsen the situation. The European Cup 2006 went back to a more serious police presence and the result was hundreds of arrests. Therefore, it can be concluded that an increase in security may have the opposite of positive effects.

The four categories proposed by Lawrence are a great overview of how the media perceives the way 'spectator violence' is created. It can be seen how other forces outside the media, such as political professionals, will utilize the media in their favor. All of the above factors, gang warfare, animal nature, socio-economic factors, and lack of security creates a social enemy and depending on the agenda, helps fulfill a desire. However,

---

[150] Ibid., 119.
[151] Ibid., 122.
[152] Ibid., 137.

spectator violence is complex and is not limited to any of the above factors. In fact there are many other categorizations for 'moral panic', Dunning states there are five, excessive alcohol, biased or incompetent refereeing, unemployment, permissiveness, and affluence.[153] Although these are directly linked to 'hooliganism' in England, it shows more diversity for causes of violence the media targets.

One of the more common categories Dunning mentioned, which Lawrence didn't, is alcohol. The consumption of alcohol is continuously blamed as the premier cause for violence, because it is accessible at games and has had a history of making humans violent. An article from *Time* in 2004 said football violence, "...seems to continue, fueled by little more than alcohol and malice."[154] There was a pamphlet handed out to Japanese businesses during World Cup 2002 by the British embassy in preparation for the arrival of thousands of Englishmen. The pamphlet gave appropriate ways to serve alcohol to the Englishmen and what behavior the businesses should look for before it would be appropriate to cut them off from the alcohol if necessary.[155] The main purpose of the pamphlet was to prepare the Japanese for a culture that enjoys drinking, but also to limit the amount of alcohol consumption preventing, what the embassy believed, to be a main cause of violence.

---

[153] Dunning, *Sport Matters: Sociological Studies of Sport, Violence, and Civilization*. 139.
[154] Stott et al., "Tackling Football Hooliganism."
[155] Ken Belson, "Word for Word/Japanese Etiquette Tips; English 101: How to Handle A Thirsty, Big-Bodied Soccer Fan," *New York Times*, June 2, 2002, http://www.nytimes.com/2002/06/02/weekinreview/word-for-word-japanese-etiquette-tips-english-101-handle-thirsty-big-bodied.html.

Although alcohol is a recurring trend as a violent trigger, according to Dunning, it is not consumed by all spectators who turn violent.[156] There are two reasons for not all spectators drinking, the first is that some simply don't drink, because of factors such as lifestyle, religion, ethics or cost. Dave Fowler, a reporter for the *Observer*, was surprised while interviewing a distinguished leader from Red Star Belgrade's firm, *Deljie,* Zoran Timic. While at the clubhouse he mocked Fowler's desire for a beer and ordered himself an iced Cappuccino. Fowler later learned he chose not to drink in order to concentrate on the choreography he is conducting.[157] The Serbian violent spectators consider themselves to be the most violent in the world, whether that can actually be measured is a myth, but to hear some refuse alcohol, puts the alcohol argument for inciting violence, as dismissible.

Another reason spectators choose not to drink is in preparation of a pre-meditated violent act. For the latter non-consumers, violence is already on the agenda before they arrive to the stadium. The violent act is conscious and the spectator undergoes a ritual in preparation for this action. Keeping their mind focused and not letting it become affected by booze, is part of this ritual. Understanding the reasons for this pre-determination will help academics get closer to the actual trigger for spectator violence. Nonetheless, alcohol consumption as *the* trigger is easily disproven as the cause. Granted, for those that do choose to drink it, it may play a factor in lowering one's senses making

---

[156] Dunning, *Sport Matters: Sociological Studies of Sport, Violence, and Civilization*. 155.
[157] Dave Fowler, "Football, Blood and War," *The Observer*, January 18, 2004, http://observer.theguardian.com/osm/story/0,,1123137,00.html.

participation in a violent act more accessible, but other elements should be considered for *the* cause.

The 'moral panic' approach tends to create labels and assumptions before an analysis is complete. The media has a strong voice in any society, their construction of these labels is pushed on the rest of the community as the truth. The community will slowly begin to show prejudice towards any spectator who appears like those the media has considered dangerous. Differentiating between the constructions of 'hooligan' and fanatic[158] creates misjudgment on the community's behalf. Ward Jr. considers two ways this negativity is brought about by the media. His first negative remark claims the media brings public awareness to 'spectator violence', in doing so they are constructing an identity of the violent spectator, which in turn leads to more violence from the violent spectators whom are looking to reaffirm the constructed identity.[159] They are propagating a social enemy and arguments could be made to say they created the phenomenon through attempting to demonize the original behavior, which actually fueled the identity. The second argument from Ward Jr., takes the negative identity originally constructed by the media, claiming it represents an 'unjust' or 'unequal' system.[160] In constructing the fan deviant behavior, the media classifies the system as damaged needing restructuring, which in effect pushes their main idea of violence in the social system and the treatment of youth. The literature on causes and triggers of 'spectator violence' is broad and deep with a lot of diversity. By no means are models of violence entertained only in the 'moral

---

[158] A Fanatic is a hardcore fan.
[159] Ward Jr., "Fan Violence." 469.
[160] Ibid., 469.

panic' or the social problem approaches, but Ward sets up two well established categories

for discussing some of the more popular theories in 'spectator violence', giving a well

balanced leap into 'spectator violence' literature.

Other factors outside the 'moral panic' and social problem approaches are

throughout the 'spectator violence' literature. Dunning entertains approaches from the

anthropological, Marxist, 'ethological', and the psychological 'reversal theory'. [161] He only

considers them as possible causes, but shortly afterwards gives evidence for disproving

any of the factors as *the* main cause. Ward Jr. believes 'spectator violence' can also stem

from school administrators, stadium designs[162], and the culture of competition.[163] Gordon

Russell adds to this list of other factors for 'spectator violence' by looking at a unique

approach from the environment. He considers interpersonal aggression may stem from

the temperature; warmer heat creates more aggression, darkness, noise; loud sounds

create hostile outbursts, and second hand smoke.[164] These are just a few of the many

factors considered to be *the* trigger in 'spectator violence'.

For all the hypothesized factors for 'spectator violence', there is still no general

agreement on *the* trigger, the igniter, why violence occurs, which is the ultimate end all

goal for this field of research. Identifying this trigger allows for the development of

---

[161] Dunning, *Sport Matters: Sociological Studies of Sport, Violence, and Civilization*. 141.
[162] Russell, "Sport Riots." 369. There was a study conducted between the US and British stadium designs seeking to explain the higher level of violence in Britain. Conducted by Alan Roadburg, he discovered the structural differences of the game may have played some sort of a factor in 'casual violence', these factors include: Britons walk to the stadium and hang out before and after the match while most Americans drive. Britons (before their stadiums changed designs) used to stand in crowded sections, while Americans were seated down and had their own space to move around. Finally, because of cheap travel in Britain, fans there would be a large number of away fans at home games, while in America there would be very few away fans for a home game.
[163] Ward Jr., "Fan Violence." 468.
[164] Russell, "Sport Riots." 461- 62.

solutions. Although the International Football Associations continue to increase security and new measures[165] to crack down on unruly spectator behavior, *the* trigger would allow structures in society to join in the battle and take whatever measures necessary to satisfy whatever the grievance may be.

The intention of this paper, is to explore those options present in the 'spectator violence' literature for drawing some personal conclusions backed with case study evidence. Yet, any conclusion for determining *the* trigger will only ever be assumed. For example, put yourself in a room with a spectator whom has had a serious record for violence. Your job is to find out what makes the individual want to fight, this particular gentleman is from England. As the interviewer, you may just be blunt and ask the central question, "Why do you become violent?" The response may include something along the lines of pleasure, enjoyment, excitement, reputation, or status. A response encompassing either the self-interest of the individual or, if associated with a firm, in the interests of the group. Assumedly, you would not hear, "I fight because of the figurational theory."

After you complete your interview with the English 'hooligan', a violent spectator from Myanmar is next. Again you blatantly ask why they are violent and they respond with a factor of self interests. The self-interests between the two spectators may be completely different from one another, which puts pressure on social scientists to think there are structural factors affecting their behavior . Yet if the two spectators are telling

---

[165] Lyudmila Alexandrova, "Stadium Violence: New Law on Fans Should Put End to Disorders," *Russia & India Report*, July 29, 2013.
http://indrus.in/society/2013/07/29/stadium_violence_new_law_on_fans_should_put_end_to_disorders_27717.html. Russia released new measures against their fans for the 2013-2014 season with serious consequences for any violent offences, which has stirred up emotions from the spectators.

us conscious reasons for why they are fighting, shouldn't we just accept a non-universal theory as *the* trigger, and consider different parts of the world use different factors for 'spectator violence' ?

The question I am posing is, if we are told what makes spectators violent, by the spectators, is there a need to look further? If pleasure is the reason they do it, then pleasure should be the reason they are fighting and no more research should be conducted. However, can individuals be aware of structural elements from society affecting their behavior? Is it ok to believe there are unconscious elements manipulating what a spectator considers are their conscious factors for fighting? This question is essentially the whole argument within the 'spectator violence' literature. At what point in the discussion should it be accepted that their behavior is what they say it is and at what point should scientists continue to look at outside factors making spectators frustrated, but using sports venues, particularly football as a place to let out this frustration?

It is difficult to answer these questions, because answers will never be unanimous, but instead result in cyclical debate. In my particular view, I believe the postmodern theory holds the most credibility to answer this question. The spectators are aware of why they are fighting; reputation. pride, identity, but subconsciously there is social theory with borders of masculinity and nationalism being transcended. It is through the postmodern, I explore more of the nationalism element the boundaries look to transcend. In doing so, nationalism needs to be explored deeper. In order to do this, all of 'nation-ness' needs to be defined, this includes elements like the 'nation', nationality, and nationalism.

Nationalism is a word thrown out a lot, but the word is rather complex. When the postmodern theory for 'spectator violence' talks of transcending these boundaries, what does that mean? The nationalism literature is dense with many concepts on what is contained within it. The next chapter will focus on creating working definitions of 'nation-ness' for application to 'spectator violence'.

DEFINING 'NATION-NESS'

For as long as humans have existed on this planet, groups have simultaneously existed. As humans, we are born to find others and create groups of different shapes and sizes. Ernest Gellner tells us there are two catalysts for group formation and maintenance: "will, voluntary adherence and identification, loyalty, solidarity, on the one hand; and fear, coercion, compulsion, on the other."[166] Individuals since the beginning of time have teamed up to with others to collectivize their skills for security, for favor of boosting survival odds. History tells us these first groups were hunter and gatherer parties from the pre-agrarian age, voluntarily willing themselves together to form beneficial groups/ communities. Groups are therefore comprised of individuals willing themselves to be placed into a formation of collectivity. If we are to construct the 'nation' along the simple definition of being a group, our results would be a disproportionate amount of people identified with what they are not. Are we academically eligible to classify a hunter and gatherer party as the hypothetical 'nation' of Ruritania? Does the 'nation' have to be a consciously consumed label by the individual or may it just be constructed onto groups?

Posing these questions make the 'nation', nationality, and nationalism difficult terms to explain or even analyze. These three words create the components for the greater

---

[166] Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2008). 53.

term of 'nation-ness'. While the term exists as a broad category, most literature focuses on

the individual components, bringing arguments comparable to, 'what came first the

chicken or the egg'? Today, the components have evaded a unanimous definition. Hugh

Seton- Watson, author for one of the most comprehensive texts on nationalism, is

convinced no definitions can be conceived, yet the phenomenon has existed.[167] Seton-

Watson's belief crosses over into one of the more challenging aspects of 'nation' and

nationalism, its origins. The origins of 'nation-ness' have created several paradigms

offering explanations and definitions. The following is a broad overview on three of these

paradigms, prennialism. primordialism, and modernism'. A fourth paradigm, 'ethno-

symbolist', will be introduced in a later section.

'Nation-ness' origins and paradigms

The paradigms of 'nation-ness' have swung into existence over time and are

heavily debated between philosophers and academics . Seton- Watson argues on

empirical observation that the 'nation' has existed for a long time, unsure as to why or

how, but there is a measurable history[168]. This puts Seton- Watson in the prennialism

paradigm, the belief in the nation as long established; not to be confused with the

Romanic paradigm of primordialism, which will be discussed shortly. Seton- Watson

approaches the 'nation' from the 'continuous prennialism' perspective, national origins for

a community may have extended prior to the Renaissance, isolating them from recent

---

[167] Benedict R. Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London; New York: Verso, 2006). 3.
[168] Smith, *Nationalism*. 54.

nations deliberately created. Ernest Renan joins Seton- Watson in prennialism, but he

approaches it from the second perspective within the paradigm, 'recurrent prennialism'.

Here a nations existence is cyclical, it may have changed shape over time from falling

under one name, but it arises under another in different periods of history making it

applicable to many cultural or political communities. As Renan says, "They had their

beginnings, and they will end."[169] Prennialism is similar to another paradigm

primordialism, because they both see the nation's existence as an artifact, however

primordialism's nation is natural.

Our Ruritanian hunter and gatherers naturally formed together for survival and,

from the biological view, for reproduction. Pierre Van den Berghe tells us groups and

'nations' are formed to increase our individual genetic pools beyond kinsman to

incorporate other ethnic kin.[170] The 'nation' was a coercion of ethnic peoples that came

about from our organic processes for establishing a greater bond between one's own

ethnicity. Anthony Smith believes Van den Berghe's belief as rational, because most

ethnic myths have biological origins and it would explain why Van den Berghe believes

co-ethics treat each other as kin. [171] There was a desire to expand our genetic pools,

calling for people to be brought together for a more permanent solution. This analysis

places the 'nation' as a grouping of people looking to enhance their reproductive options.

The emotional connection between peoples of a 'nation' is replaced by survival instincts.

---

[169] Ibid., 54 - 55.
[170] Ibid., 56.
[171] Ibid., 56.

Lacking the emotional component makes the biological view of the 'nation' a weak definition, but it may remain a factor for consideration.

Abbé Sieyès, another primordialist, would consider the hunter and gatherer Ruritanians a 'nation', because they are a group of people associating together and forming their own government[172]; assumedly in this case a chiefdom society. Sieyès definition goes back to the original problem of calling the hunter and gatherers a 'nation', it is too broad allowing too many groups to be considered a 'nation', de-legitimizing the term. Primordialism with a more natural element came from Jean - Jacques Rousseau. He called for the people to return to the nature of their lost innocence, his paradgim of primoridialism found itself in conjunction with words like, fixity, essentialism, and naturalism; it is an organic nationalism.[173] It is a normal free flowing idea bringing people together, it is all part of human nature. The primordialist approach is most concerned with the flow of time and the always existent idea of 'nation-ness'. The more contemporary paradigm, modernism, is in disagreement to these claims.

Craig Calhoun argues primordial's greatest claim for ancient origins is loyalty, but loyalty has limits in its explanation. It can be associated with the loyalty to a family or group, but that loyalty comes in many forms and does not necessarily mean loyalty to nationalism. [174] As a modernist, Calhoun rejects prennialism and primordialism, because the existence of loyalty in history does not equate to the existence of the 'nation'. The paradigm of modernism places a nation's origin in recent times; most philosophers argue

---

[172] Elie Kedourie, *Nationalism* (Oxford, UK; Cambridge, Mass., USA: Blackwell, 1993). 15.
[173] Smith, *Nationalism*. 57.
[174] Calhoun, *Nationalism*. 6.

at the end of the French Revolution. Up until 1789, the world hadn't experienced any

desire for collective action to change a political unit (government) for the sake of a group.

Changes in the past were done in the name of the ruler or high lord, it was for their elitist

sake events took place and reform was implemented. In modernity, change was for the

group. It is in this paradigm Gellner argues, "Nationalism is not the awakening of nations

to self-consciousness: it invents nations where they do not exist."[175] Nations are the bi-

product of nationalism. This statement would be considered correct by most modernists,

but some modernists still believe the 'nation' created nationalism. Adrian Hastings

believes there were elements of the 'nation' present in Medieval times without any sort of

nationalism theory, he considers nationalism as a 'particularistic movement'.[176] In this

approach, self-determination does not play a predominant role like most modernists

consider necessary for the creation of the 'nation', instead, the 'nation' brought about the

movement of nationalism. Still, those against Hastings define the modern 'nation',

responsible for creating nationalism, to have the factor of citizenship, which was only

present after the French Revolution. [177]

In Gellner's view, nations and nationality were not pre-determined or required, but

because of modernity's force to create nations, nationalism appears natural.[178] The

modern nation is seen as one, with one culture, one language, and one community; it is

homogenized. This homogenization for Gellner, is manifested prior to the nation, "The

---

[175] Anderson, *Imagined Communities*. 6.
[176] Smith, *Nationalism*. 103.
[177] Ibid., 102.
[178] Ibid., 71.

culture which more or less contingently, is chosen as the medium of that homogeneity,

comes to define the political 'pool' in question, and thus becomes the object and symbol

of loyalty, rhetoric, and devotion."[179]In other words, it is a political tool imagined to unite

a similar people based on myth, ritual, or symbol, for a community of peoples to feel

relief from a variety of social and economic problems. This belief is similar to another

modernist Elie Kedourie, whom writes(nationalism), "It pretends to supply a criterion for

the determination of the unit of population proper to enjoy a government exclusively of

its own, for the legitimate exercise of power in the state, and for the right organization of

a society of states."[180] The importance of the modernist perspective is to view the 'nation',

nationalism, and nationality as a contemporary modern idea that has grown intertwined

with other worldly events, developing the ideology of nationalism and what a 'nation' is

considered. It is in the modernist perspective I find myself within, because although

'prennialism' and 'primordialism' offer strong arguments for the origins of words

associated with 'nation', developments like the modern map[181] and developed languages

with literature[182]are key factors in delivering the kind of 'nation-ness' (nation, nationality,

and nationalism) we find in the modern era.

A map is the established political boundaries of a state, with the creation of the

map, came the realization of one government having power within every niche of those

drawn borders. Running outside a state's borders, put an individual under another state's

---

[179] Ernest Gellner, "Nationalism," *Theory and Society* 10, no. 6 (November 1, 1981), 768. doi: 10.2307/657332.
[180] Kedourie, *Nationalism*. 9.
[181] Calhoun, *Nationalism*. 13.
[182] Hans Kohn, *Nationalism, Its Meaning and History* (Malabar, FL: Krieger, 1982), 66.

political influence. In other words, maps showed the world there was not a single corner that had not been claimed by a political entity. If there was repression of a particular group under one political entity, there was no way to flee with a group of people to create a utopia, because the repressed group would flee into another verified political influence. 'Nation-ness' were the efforts of minorities whom felt unrepresented in a state, to group up with others around them and form an agenda for achievement. Literature was important, because as time had progressed, people of the same cultures, race, and ethnicity are able to connect all over the world and not only communicate with their own community, but comprehend what the majority was saying about their group. The literary advances have brought communities together, forming collective action into 'nation-ness'. The 'nation-ness' is a tool for discovering what common elements of the repressed group can be utilized for seeking a higher advancement.

There were maps and printed literature before the French Revolution, but 'nation-ness' should be examined post-French Revolution, because its developments were more crucial. The French Revolution opened an opportunity, it was a torch in the dark, the first bullet fired from the chamber, the capstone of an arch; it was necessary for this event to happen to make maps and literature relevant for future 'nation-ness' movements. Anything others claim was 'nation' or nationalism before the French Revolution, should not be considered as the same ideas or concepts we use in the modern. The French Revolution was the first movement in the name of the people and gave every individual in its borders the blessing of citizenship, this is where an analysis on the components of 'nation-ness' is necessary to begin.

'Nation' and the state

The emergence of nationalism and the 'nation' became highly relevant at the fall of the Soviet Union. Within the proceeding years, attempts were made to establish states around a population of the same ethnicity and culture. The years that followed in the ninth decade of the 20th century were a time when the map of the world changed dramatically. New political entities emerged in the Balkans; Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Slovenia, and Macedonia. Czechoslovakia was split into Slovakia and the Czech Republic. The Soviet's iron curtain was dismantled with peoples of common history and territory re-establishing a total of 15 old states. Elsewhere in the world Eritrea broke from Ethiopia, Namibia from South Africa, and Palau became independent from being a U.S territory. This was also a time of re-unification, as East and West Germany joined together and North and South Yemen created a unified Yemen. Even more recently new states have emerged in the 21st century, starting with East Timor in 2002, on to Montenegro, Serbia, Kosovo (depending on recognition), and the recent South Sudan. Nationalism and the formation of the 'nation' are considered to be the driving spike into the establishment of the new political entities.

The ideology of nationalism used in creating a new 'nation' varied in violence across the world. For example Slovenia broke away peacefully from Yugoslavia while Bosnia and Herzegovina broke out into war; whose disaster still haunts the International Community today. Other 'nations' experienced violence for failure to successfully gain their own 'nation', this would include the protracted conflict of Israel/Palestine, the Chechens in Russia, and the battle of Nagorno-Karabakh between Armenia and

Azerbaijan. There are many other examples out there, but some we will never hear of, because the peoples efforts at a 'nation' are repressed before they find a voice in the international community. Nonetheless the emergence of so many new 'nations' in a period just over twenty years, tells the world we are experiencing a global phenomenon. Before comprehending this new philosophy, the bi-product should first be examined. The global community has become spectator to a movement being utilized, while in the process creating nations, so what exactly is a 'nation'?

If we consider Gellner's belief in 'nations' are a product of nationalism, understanding the 'nation' transparently , is a step towards understanding the complex concept of nationalism. It is in the assumed simplistic form a 'nation' is considered as a homogenous entity structured by one culture, one ethnicity, one language, and etc. Consolidating and clarifying the properties of a group or community, is what Calhoun labels, 'essentialism'.[183] Cultural categories within 'essentialism' use simple identifiers to catalog the groups; Spanish from Italian, black from white, man from women and so on. In this thought, the 'nation' is a simple form with no overlapping. However, it is clear the modern world's 'nation' is not homogenized. Each individual living today possesses many identities capable of emerging at different stages in life. To make things slightly more complicated there are different interpretations of the same categories spread across the world, a Christian from Thailand will have a different constructed reality from a Christian in Canada. Identities within a modern 'nation' are diverse and complex, yet still, a 'nation' is formed.

---

[183] Calhoun, *Nationalism*. 18.

Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels misunderstood identities back in the 1848 revolutions, when they believed the identity of the proletariat worker would be easier to mobilize over cultural, ethnic, religious, and individual nation identities.[184] Although they were wrong about the worker identity being a greater force for mobilization over the others, 1848 can be considered as a wave of nationalist revolutions across Europe. A variety of identities were mobilized throughout this year, which means no single identity held all the power for collective action. It is only appropriate to ask, if it is not one single identity bringing together the 'nation', is there a stronger element the 'nation' can be defined with, or has each 'nation' previously constructed, been unique in the way it was formed? Was the identity of culture the dominant identity in forming one 'nation' while elsewhere the racial identity was the most dominant for 'nation' building. ?

Benedict Anderson gives his readers three paradoxes for struggling with a definition of the 'nation', they can be summarized as the objective modernity seen by historians versus the subjective antiquity viewed by nationalists, the universality of nationality as a socio - cultural concept (everyone has a nationality) versus the concrete manifestations of nationality, and finally the 'political' power of nationalists versus the impoverished philosophers; "In other words, unlike most other isms, nationalism has never produced its own grand thinkers".[185] The paradoxes identified by Anderson are largely debated in the modern today. For the sake of this research, discussing the first paradox thoroughly will fashion a working definition of the 'nation' applicable to this

---

[184] Ibid., 23.
[185] Anderson, *Imagined Communities*. 5.

research. The other two paradox's do not prevent or regulate criterion of the 'nation', so they will be left out of this discussion.

So, what is a nation? The best way to define the nation is to decide what it can be and what it can't be, put another way, what criteria is needed to consider communities a 'nation'. The criteria is Anderson's first paradox, a balance between subjective and objective elements. A subjective definition of the 'nation' consists of a national consciousness unifying people from all over the world. One can relate to complete strangers if they share this similar consciousness. Subjective criteria relates back to the will of volunteerism, as Eric Hobsbawm says, the consciousness of belonging, "... can lead the incautious into extremes of volunteerism which suggests that all that is needed to be or to create or recreate a nation is the will to be one."[186]Under this criterion, the idea is that if there is a will there is a way, if Quebec wanted to be their own nation, than subjectively they can have one. However, the subjective is not enough to construct a solid definition of the 'nation'. Objective criteria is needed in order to attach the consciousness to a more defined existence. Even two of the main philosophers favoring a subjective definition, Otto Baur and Renan, agree the criterion of a 'nation' has objective elements in common.[187]

Likewise, it is agreed upon that a full objective definition would neither be sufficient enough to describe the 'nation'. Examples of these objective elements include

[186] E. J Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality* (Cambridge [England]; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992). 8.
[187] Ibid., 8.

language, territory, a common history, and cultural traits.[188] With this criterion communities of similar attributes constitute a 'nation'. Still, if there is no desire for the 'nation', than how can it exist? With a full objective definition, the 'nation' is formed into existence where it was not imagined. This goes back to Gellner's argument on nationalism creating 'nations' where they don't exist. This also puts Anderson's 'imagined communities' into a new perspective. Many nations could be constructed if a researcher were to thoroughly scan the world for communities living in states whom do not share the 'majority's' characteristics. Identifying these communities as 'nations' is creating 'nations' where they don't exist. The objective criteria is thus too blurred to describe the 'nation'. Furthermore, any of the above criteria could be interpreted differently among those recognized communities. If the Creoles of Louisiana hold a similar culture and well-being, are they therefore their own 'nation'? I would not describe them as a 'nation' because they lack the volunteerism to form a 'nation'. What about the people of Texas, whom hold a variety of ethnic and cultural elements in their state? Can we describe their dialogue for secession[189] an attempt at creating a Texas 'nation'? Some of the population holds the will, but the objective elements are very diverse, a blend between American and Hispanic communities, which means two languages, multiple cultures, and a common history in the sense of conflict towards each other.

---

[188] Ibid., 5.
[189]Manny Fernandez, "Texas Secession Movement Unbowed by White House Rejection," *The New York Times*, January 15, 2013, sec. U.S. / Politics, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/16/us/politics/texas-secession-movement-unbowed-by-white-house-rejection.html.

We are told by Smith, that Max Weber would agree upon the complex dimension of an objective - subjective definition.

> "...showed, purely 'objective' criteria of the nation - language, religion, territory and so on - always fail to include some nations. Conversely, 'subjective' definitions generally take in too large a catch of cases. Emphasizing sentiment, will, imaginations and perception as criteria of the nation and national belonging makes it difficult to separate out nations from other kinds of collectivity such as regions, tribes, city-states and empires, which attract similar objective attachments."*[190]*

Our definition of a 'nation' therefore needs to be created with criteria from both the subjective and objective. An established definition needs to be conscious of all it includes, it can't be too simple, but it can't be too strict in its criteria.

In the consideration of this criteria, the modern era and its role on the 'nation' needs to be measured. Hans Kohn reminds us the 'nation' is modern, "Only in nineteenth century Europe and America and in the twentieth century Asia and Africa have the people identified themselves with the nation, civilization with national civilization, their life and survival with the life and survival of the nationality."[191] Looking earlier than the nineteenth century for elements between people in communities steers the definition of a 'nation' down the wrong road. Yet the 'state', originating from the ancient Greeks, stems from when the ancient Greeks extended the concept of loyalty to a political community.[192] The city- state, *polis,* can pull on centuries of evidence to produce a sound definition of the state. A 'nation' has the lesser timeline and fewer examples to create a

---

[190] Smith, *Nationalism*. 12.
[191] Kohn, *Nationalism, Its Meaning and History*. 11.
[192] Ibid., 12.

solid definition. Differentiating between state and 'nation' gives clearer recognition to what the 'nation' is not, therefore defining state has to be emphasized.

Smith places the concept of the 'state', "as a set of autonomous institutions, differentiated from other institutions, possessing a legitimate monopoly of coercion and extraction in a given territory."[193] Here, there is a political entity within the drawn borders of a map. One of the key elements of a state for Michel Foucault, is discipline introduced by the state, "Thus discipline produces subjected and practised bodies, 'docile' bodies. Discipline increases the forces of the body (in economic terms of utility) and diminishes these same forces (in political terms of obedience)."[194] The state sets up institutions in the name of society for the purpose of creating children to grow up into regimented adults whom do what they are told, pay taxes, and do not question or rise up against their own sovereign state. This is very similar to Weber's definition of a 'state', which is essentially a society with a monopoly of violence held by a central political authority empowering other individuals to use violence when needed. [195] The ability to use violence brings in power dynamics, which is the allocation of power to use violent measures on its own subjects and is central in defining the state.

With the series of above definitions, a working definition of the state can be formulated, which will be used for the remainder of this research. A 'state' is, a territory with boundaries claimed by a sovereign central political operation, consisting of

---

[193] Smith, *Nationalism*. 12.
[194] Michel Foucault, "Docile Bodies," in *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (New York: Random House, 1977), 138.
[195] Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism*. 3.

institutions whose purpose are to maintain economic interests and order, through a monopoly of violence. Limiting the 'state' to a defined territory gives the 'state' restrictions on boundaries but also limitless capabilities for what it can do within those boundaries. This is very different from the limitless 'nation'. A few examples better put this into perspective. Examples of states include, The United States, Peoples Republic of China, and Madagascar. A 'nation', depending on one's definition can incorporate Kurds, Assyrians, Tibetans, and Abkhazians. With the construction of a definition for the state, the 'nation' will be easier to understand.

As previously discussed the nation' must hold criteria from within the objective - subjective spectrum. My construction of a working 'nation' definition will start with Anderson's 'imagined communities'. The 'nation' is imagined as limited, sovereign, and as a community.[196] Limited because no 'nation ' wishes to have its 'nation' encompass all humans. There are metaphysical barriers between diverse nations, in other words there is not a single 'nation' meant to rule them all. A 'nation' as limited acknowledges there are other people out there whom do not belong within their own 'nation'. It creates the 'us' and 'them', limitations to who can be a part of the 'nation'. A 'nation' is sovereign because it does not falter, empires may fall and monarchs killed, but the 'nation' is a subjective idea that can't be destroyed.[197] The 'nation' does not have to be recognized as sovereign by others, but it holds a sense of autonomy from its own members. Finally, the 'nation' is imagined as a community, because the 'nation' has no hierarchy. It is a brotherhood

---

[196] Anderson, *Imagined Communities*. 7.
[197] Ibid., 7.

whose members share the same status. All of its members have common elements tying them together; members may not know every individual in the 'nation', but there is an unspoken bond through these elements; these are the same elements members of a 'nation' are willing to sacrifice themselves for. From Anderson, we begin to shape the 'nation' as a group of people considering themselves to be limited, sovereign, and a community. Before structuring 'nation' further, community has to be clearly defined for preventing confusion between the similar term of 'nation'.

The modern idea of community stems from Ferdinand Tonnies, a German sociologist from the late 19th early 20th century. He was writing during a time when German sociological literature was considered metaphysical and impractical; an analysis or idea was not to be published until all angles were considered and the theory was referenced heavily by other sources.[198] Tonnies presented a sociological system with two concepts, one of them 'community' and the other, 'society'. The 'community' in his terms is natural and organic, composing of life-forces in instinct, emotion, and habit.[199] A very similar relation to Rousseau's romantic idea of the 'nation', but lacks credible objective factors to call it a 'nation'. In comparison, 'society' was an artificial conscious creation, deliberately constructed through mechanics and rationality.[200] The 'community' is the unconscious grouping, like the hunters and gatherers, while 'society' provides a role manufactured for a purpose. This dichotomy is persistent throughout Tonnies

---

[198] Louis Wirth, "The Sociology of Ferdinand Tonnies," *American Journal of Sociology* 32, no. 3 (November 1, 1926), 414. doi: 10.2307/2765542.
[199] Ibid., 416- 19.
[200] Ibid., 416- 19.

sociological system.[201] In offering a modern view of community, a line is drawn between 'community' and 'nation'. The 'community' is thus seen as the unconscious component of 'nation' which brings with it a horizontal structure. Another term needing more decisive boundaries is *ethnies.*

Smith's criteria for a 'nation' calls for greater objective factors, but Smith cautions his readers to not mistake a 'nation' with ethnic communities; or as he calls them *ethnies*. Smith compares the two concepts in his book *Nationalism,* with a small table identifying the difference between the two. An *ethnie* holds: a proper name, common myths of ancestry, shared memories, cultural differentia, a link to the homeland, and some solidarity among elites.[202] The 'nation' is comprised of a proper name, common myths, shared history, distinct public culture, residence in perceived homeland, and common laws and customs.[203] The largest difference resides in the reality versus the belief. The shared memories and link to the homeland are imaginary bonds to the past. The 'nation', has written history explaining the past for a community and is established in association to a perceived homeland. The difference in culture also needs to be considered. The 'nation' holds a public culture, the whole world is able to view and experience this culture, it is also a culture that may adopt to new changes in global society. The *ethnie* embodies a distinct culture, which may or may not be known by the public. They are separated by means of limitation. Culture of the 'nation' is more accessible and can be discovered, the *ethnie* holds more restrictions and therefore more particular in what it is

---

[201] Ibid., 419.
[202] Smith, *Nationalism*. 14.
[203] Ibid., 14.

88

constituted as. The two terms hold very similar criterion, which needs to be further regarded in the development of a working definition for 'nation'.

Using Smith's objective elements and Anderson's subjective elements we will establish the 'nation' along the objective - subjective scale. For the remainder of this research a 'nation' will be, a group of people whom have voluntarily come together from a common history, shared culture, an attachment to territory of high value whom perceive themselves as a legitimate, sovereign, horizontal community; whose boundaries potentially overstretch the borders of states. I am excluding language from my definition, because language has changed dramatically over time, it is too malleable for consistency, which is unlike the common history of people, because it can't change, it has been written. Language should be associated with culture and not an essential criteria for the 'nation'.

I can only assume my definition of such a complex term will have its protagonists, but my definition does achieve a place on the objective - subjective scale. Constructed any other way and the 'nation' would be too common or too strict; not incorporating those territories that should be nations. With the understanding of 'nation', it becomes slightly easier to tackle another complex term, nationalism.

Nationalism: The Ideology

Applying Gellner's perspective for believing the 'nation' as a bi-product of nationalism, the definition of a 'nation' displays the objective criteria a nationalist ideology looks to preserve. In simple terms, nationalism is a persuasive ideology used

ultimately for the creation of the 'nation' or in most cases, the nation-state[204]. It conserves the identity of a 'nation' and mobilizes people uniformly towards action for the preservation of a sovereign 'nation' using symbols, flags, and language; like national anthems.

In the era of nation-state creation, nationalism is on the front lines for being the most utilized and applied theory. With the ability to mobilize and the desired result for autonomy on a community of people, nationalism is powerful. In the modern era, nationalism can, according to Peri Pamir, play three big roles. First, it permits communities to seek self-determination and preserve their nationality within a state, secondly it validates peoples to maintain the sovereign 'nation', and finally it is capable of mobilizing unsatisfied minorities and ethnic groups within a state by choosing to adopt a nationalist ideology and challenge a state's authority.[205] With the capacity of motivating people to go against a political central entity whom monopolizes violence, for the preservation of the 'nation', tells us nationalism is a very powerful concept. This realization makes nationalism further complicated to define.

One way for further comprehension is to look at self-determination, a term that is regularly discussed with nationalism. Put broadly, self-determination is a given right for groups to choose their own future. The most common groups seeking self -determination are traditionally the minorities in a state with ethnic or cultural ties. Self-determination is

---

[204] Nation-state- a 'nation' constructed in the criteria of the state. A political entity representing the interests of the 'nation' in a defined territory.
[205] Peri Pamir, "Nationalism, Ethnicity and Democracy: Contemporary Manifestations," *The International Journal of Peace Studies* 2, no. 2 (July 1997).

traditionally associated with secession being the ultimate goal of a group within a state, but that is not always true. Some groups, for example the Oromo of Ethiopia whom are more or less 31 million people, do not desire their own state, but rather the right for equality, respect, and recognition of their existence by the Ethiopian government.[206] They desire representation and acknowledgment of their presence. Another example of a group who searched for partial autonomy are the Catalans of Spain, whom obtained an internal 'self-rule' including religious and cultural rule, which means a source of legal autonomy.[207] Through the Catalans and Oromo, nationalism is viewed as tied to self-determination, because the nationalist ideology pulls on the characteristics of the repressed groups to mobilize against those whom impede on their rights for recognition and equality. The community may be satisfied residing in a state not dominated by a majority, but self-determination may be rightfully deployed where there is inequality.

For Kedourie, "The idea of self-determination as the highest moral and political good inevitably produced a deep change in the tone of political speculation."[208] The principle of self-determination is utilized by political parties in which they create platforms in order to gain a voice in democratic systems; to speak out for rights and equality. Within the nationalist movement of the Oromo, it is pursued by the OLF (Oromo Liberation Front), whom consider themselves a nationalist party.[209] The desire for equality and rights is a desire for political 'self-rule' autonomy, or in the case of the

[206] "Oromo," *Unrepresented Nations and Peoples Organization*, March 25, 2008, http://www.unpo.org/members/7917.
[207] Smith, *Nationalism*. 28.
[208] Kedourie, *Nationalism*. 32
[209] "Oromo."

Catalans, partial 'self- rule'. Self-determination is thus a political movement. It is used for changing the political rule of a state for gaining legal tenders.

Since the principal of self-determination is so tied to nationalism, it enables us to view nationalism with a political lens. Applying the political lens to nationalism gives us visualizations of a political movement, because nationalism is an ideology that clamors for change, whether creating a new nation-state with the 'will' to be recognized by the international community or to change the system of a state; politics is a central theme in nationalism. Jaqueline Nolan-Haley confirms these suspicions by stating, "International law limits the legal privilege of self-determination to nations and peoples, referring to "national" rather than "party" or "group" self-determination."[210] Self-determination's legality is constructed in the existence of a nation, which doesn't exist without nationalism. Hence, nationalism is a political movement employing principles of self-determination, asking the state to give power to minorities, in order for them to make their own decisions and have room to construct their own destiny.

Nationalism first began its academic career at the end of World War One with writer Hans Kohn and Carleton B. Hayes. [211] This was a very relevant time period for nationalism to first appear in writing, because nation- states were forming along lines of nationality. It was during this time the words nation, nationality, nationalism, nationalist, and others associated with 'nation-ness first' appeared. Kohn was at the forefront of this discussion, when he defined nationalism, "[It] is a state of mind, in which the supreme

[210] Jaqueline Nolan-Haley, "Self-Determination in International Mediation: Some Preliminary Reflections," *Benjamen N. Cardozo School of Law: Journal of Conflict Resolution* 7, no. 2 (Spring 2006), 277- 78.
[211] Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780*. 3.

loyalty of the individual is felt to be due the nation-state. A deep attachment to one's native soil, to local traditions and to established territorial authority has existed in varying strength throughout history."[212]Kohn places emphasis on nationalism stemming from nationality. It is his view that after WWI nationality changed dramatically in the early 20th century from loyalty to a social authority or empire towards loyalty to the nation-state. Kohn adds, nationalities are established by important objective factors, such as language, but they are not the most important criteria. Kohn focuses on the subjective, the 'will' of the people to come together and form nationalities. Nationalism is the 'will' of the nationality existing beyond objective factors and the belief of the nation-state as the only legitimate political authority for the established nationality.[213] Kohn's nationalism is therefore heavily reliant on the subjective 'will' for accomplishment, a very relevant idea considering the number of new nation-states drawn after the war.

Hobsbawm considers the second major explosion of nationalism and the formation of nation-states at the fall of the Soviet Union, as unfinished business from the first explosion of nation-states from 1918-1921.[214] Nation-states were formed along nationalities, but there were still factors limiting groups to have full autonomy. At the end of WWI, the Ottoman Empire and the Austro-Hungarian Empire collapsed, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia merged several competing nationalities together, Romania gained territory encompassing nationalities they experienced tensions with, the Caucuses were re-drawn, and the USSR still included non-Russian nationalities.

---

[212] Kohn, *Nationalism, Its Meaning and History*. 9. Words in brackets are my own.
[213] Ibid., 10.
[214] Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780*. 164.

Nationalities without a nation-state were stuck under another nationality's political authority for over sixty years. Even before the USSR fell, the seed for a second explosion was planted in the Soviet's social reform.

Mikhail Gorbachev set in motion the gears for nationalism when he first introduced social policy in the late 20th century. *Glasnost,* a term referring to 'openness', was introduced as a part of the social policy *perestroika.* For Hobsbawm, the openness brought about freedom of debate and anxiety against the state, deteriorating the Soviet's authority. It was, "the failure of *perestroika,* i.e. the growing deterioration of living conditions for ordinary citizens, undermined faith in the all-Union government... [which essentially] encouraged or even imposed regional and local solutions to problems". [215] The second explosion of nationalism was a result of domestic policies. Nationalities away from the Soviet's provincial capitals began to believe regional/local action needed to happen. With the collapse of the USSR, it became possible for new nation-states to form. Explaining this history is important for understanding how Hobsbawm uses the term nationalism. Borrowing from Gellner, Hobsbawm writes, nationalism is, "primarily a principle which holds that the political and national unit should be congruent."[216] In the second explosion of nation-states, he doesn't see nationalism as the driving force, but rather it was the beneficiary.

Hobsbawm, like Gellner, favors a political definition of nationalism. This definition is very different from the train of thought emergent in the Kohn-Hayes era. The

[215] Ibid., 168. Words in brackets are my own
[216] Ibid., 9.

view shifted from the idea of a nationality having its own political legitimacy to nationalism as a political rouse, mobilized through nationalities. In this version, I feel the romantic passion of being a nationalist is lost into a political agenda. Nonetheless, examining the fall of the USSR and the impact of *Glasnost* supporting the collapse of it, nationalism as an ideology begins to be seen as strictly political.

This ideology is considered by Nenad Miscevic while describing ethno-nationalism in relation to the proximity of other nationalities. It is traditionally considered that we have the duty to help our closest neighbor; known as the Distance Principle. What Miscevic says, is that ethno-nationalism goes against the Distance Principle, instead, ethno-nationalists hate their neighbors; he calls this the Hated Neighbor Truism. Defined, Miscevic writes the Hated Neighbor Truism is that, "ethno-nationalist claims are usually directed to neighboring peoples with which the claimant people have close ties and interacts quite intensively."[217]Nationalist claims are directed at neighbors. Instead of looking after each other in a community, they are instead separated by tensions, because of ethnic-nationalism. Still, what is important is that Miscevic applies a political claim to ethnic-nationalism, understanding that any form of nationalism needs to hold similarities to politics. In this case, political ethnic-nationalism is, "...that every people has *a right and an obligation* to form its own state."[218] The emphasis of ethnic-nationalism is the hunt for political autonomy.

---

[217] Nenad Miscevic, "Close Strangers: Nationalism, Proximity and Cosmopolitanism," *Studies in East European Thought* 51, no. 2 (June 1, 1999), 111. doi: 10.2307/20099699.
[218] Ibid., 111.

In *Imagined Communities*, Anderson relates 'nation-ness' and nationality to the preservation of cultural artifacts.[219] He argues the creation of such artifacts emerged at the end of the eighteenth century originating from historical forces. Once materialized within the self-conscious, the historical forces became applied to society merging with 'political and ideological constellations.[220] Much of this emergence is related to the level of literature available and the increase in European education throughout the centuries. Unconsciously, the languages changed and became stronger if they were in the proximity of a big printer, known as print-capitalism; changes in language stemmed from "...interaction between capitalism, technology, and human linguistic diversity."[221] The stronger languages, or print languages, were volatile, opening dialogue between peoples and recording histories for cultures to become attracted to.   It is within culture that Anderson's 'imagined communities' are generated into belief. Culture is then seen as the tool to gather people together, the roots of nationalism. If culture is at the roots, then the soil in which they are planted, is political.

Gellner, whom stated nationalism is a political principle, further describes nationalism as a *sentiment* and *movement*. As a *sentiment*, nationalism is the feeling of anger involved in the violation of the political principle or a feeling of achievement from the political principle; nationalism as a *movement*, is nationalism validated by emotions from the *sentiment*. [222] Therefore, national sentiment and movements are tied back to the

---

[219] Anderson, *Imagined Communities*. 4.
[220] Ibid., 4.
[221] Ibid., 45.
[222] Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism*. 1.

principle of nationalism as a political movement. Anderson, who saw culture as more of a driving force, would disagree with Gellner, because Gellner considers culture as a historical device manufactured for the delivery of nationalism. Yet, the culture nationalism promotes to defend, is so manipulated, it goes beyond recognition of the original culture.[223] Hence, culture is a tool for the political agenda. This is relevant to a case-study between Indonesia and Malaysia. Malaysia has developed efficiently over the past few years, especially in tourism. They have promoted their indigenous cultures and have attracted people from all over the world to view the spectacles. However, Indonesia claims the culture Malaysia promotes is their own; Malaysia has stolen and manipulated it.[224] Whether or not this is true, the discussion on culture has brought citizens from both nation-states to engage in the debate, whether accusing or defending the Malaysian culture.

Gellner continues to explain the manifestation of culture while explaining the hypothetical 'nation' of Ruritania, which consisted primarily of farmers. Once the Ruritanians migrated to other nation-state cities for work, due to a shift from Pre-Agrarian to Industrialized societies, culture began to become important.[225] In the city where a majority of the people were a different culture, the Ruritanians clung to their traditions i.e. their culture, primarily because it was familiar to them, it was something all Ruritanian immigrants could relate to. Back in Ruritania, a stable community, "...culture

---

[223] Ibid., 56.
[224] "A Never-ending Story of Cultural Disputes Between Indonesia and Malaysia," *The Jakarta Post*, June 18, 2012, sec. National, http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2012/06/18/a-never-ending-story-cultural-disputes-between-indonesia-and-malaysia.html.
[225] Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism*. 61.

97

is often quite invisible, but when mobility and context-free communication come to be

the essence of social life, the culture in which one has been taught to communicate with,

becomes the core of one's identity."[226] Culture appears to only be relevant when there is a

desire for it to become relevant. When a minority is living in a majority, culture becomes

the divide, the identifier between groups. It is a device used to connect to other people

who share the same common history. As strong of an element as culture was, through

generations, it became assimilated; it transitioned from an invisible relevance, to a

plurality from migration, ending with a homogenous one culture per state.

The Industrial society is primarily responsible for the shift towards a homogenous

culture. The need was to create an affluent mobile society where citizens could

communicate and be effective in working together.[227] It developed a new 'high' culture

with the creation of a division of labor. The Pre-Agrairian society was a traditional

generational system, where your occupation was dictated by what your parent's careers

were. With a division of labor, new generations grasped new jobs. In the modern state

culture developed dramatically. It had solidified the blurred, fuzzy boarders of what

nationalism in the Pre-Agrarian used to be. This 'high' culture, based on a communicative

educational model, is how Gellner defines nationality, it is the homogenous units of

people characterized by a common culture.[228] Since nationality needs a 'nation' for

association and the 'nation' is created by nationalism, then a 'high' culture is dependent on

a people's pride in nationalism.

---

[226] Ibid., 61.
[227] Ibid., 140.
[228] Ibid., 56.

Another stab at nationalism came from Kedourie. He was writing about nationalism around the same years as Gellner. Kedourie declared nationalism as a, "doctrine invented in Europe at the beginning of the nineteenth century."[229] Kedourie comes to conclusions on this matter by citing Immanual Kant and a student of his, Johann Gottlib Fichte. Their focus is on the 'will' and the consciousness, the reality that things became real once they are believed to be real.[230] For Fichte, "Only reality can be known; and the only realty is the whole."[231] Believing something into existence makes it exist, nationalism, according to Kedourie, holds this existence. The doctrine came into existence because German intellectuals were unhappy with the autonomy they possessed, so they pushed nationalism out there to gain membership and fulfill their own agendas.[232]Gellner opposes Kedourie's view of nationalism as a doctrine, because he argues it is the result of a modernizing state. These ideas do not hold the power Kedourie believes them to. Modernizing in the Industrial society, nationalism was an inevitable consequence that reshaped society; it was a necessary change[233] Here nationalism is viewed as a social theory, necessary for mankind to advance. The cultural plurality pervasive in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries could not exist in the modern, nationalism brought common peoples together for a 'high' culture to take precedence over plurality. As a social theory, we can re-connect nationalism as being an ideological political tool having influence on culture. The tool was devised for an affluent society

---

[229] Kedourie, *Nationalism*. 9.
[230] Ibid., 35.
[231] Ibid., 37.
[232] Smith, *Nationalism*. 67.
[233] Ibid., 67-68.

necessary for change. The arguments in the modernist paradigm are another example of how complex nationalism can be. Debates are cross-paradigms and inter-paradigm.

An emergent critique to nationalism in the 1960 - 1970s, unlike previous critiques, called for a focus on ethnicity and away from the 'nation' and nationalism ideology; this became known as the 'instrumentalist critique'. Nathan Glazer and Daniel Moynihan used New York City as a case-study for applying the 'instrumentalist critique', because of the plurality of ethnic groups present. They discovered, even within the plurality of ethnic groups, there still materialized an American culture.[234] Approaching the ethnic differed from 'nation' and nationality, because its concern was how mobilization between common ethnic groups remained strong. In New York, "...ethnic leaders and elites used their cultural groups as sites of mass mobilization and as constituencies in their competition for power and resources, because they found them more effective than social classes. "[235] The identity of cultural groups has been diminishing into the 'high' culture, but ethnicity remained a strong independent element for consideration. John Breuilly disagrees with cultural identity being associated with nationalism, because it goes back to the primordialist paradigm and the need for a feeling of belonging, which doesn't exist in the modern.[236] Thus, for Breuilly, according to Smith, "Nationalism is simply an instrument for achieving political goals, and as such it can only emerge under modern conditions."[237] The culture aspect is once again seen as

---

[234] Ibid., 59.
[235] Ibid., 59.
[236] Ibid., 59.
[237] Ibid., 60.

irrelevant for nationalism as an ideology. In the development of a 'high' culture and the division of labor, traditional culture dies. It was therefore not present during the two big explosions of nationalism in the twentieth century. Culture therefore remains a factor for consideration in the development of a working definition. Introducing the 'instrumentalist critique' permits a greater comprehension of the fourth paradigm on nationalism.

The 'ethno-symbolic' paradigm holds a different view on nationalism, but primarily maintains a modernist perspective. Holding similar qualities to the 'instrumentalist critique', the 'ethno-symbolist' looks at the *ethnie,* but gears it more towards nations and nationalism.[238] The focus is on the subjective elements of myths, memories, and symbols and how they are used in constructing the 'nation'. Smith considers himself a 'ethno-symbolist' and explains their paradigm of thought, "...arose out of dissatisfaction with the claims of the rival modernist and prennialist paradigms, and the explanatory failure of primordialism."[239] This does not mean the other paradigms have become irrelevant, rather 'ethno-symbolists' are revamping the way in which the previous paradigms have been considered. Smith would constitute more as a modernist, although he doesn't completely agree in no 'nation' before the French Revolution. John Armstrong, another 'ethno-symbolist' stems from the prennialist viewpoint. Differing from the other paradigms, 'ethno-symbolists" focused majorly on the role of ethnicity and its role in nationalism. Armstrong's analysis focuses on the 'myth-symbol' complexes in ethnicity, while Smith looks more for the symbols and memories tied to ethnicity and

---

[238] Ibid., 61.
[239] Ibid., 63.

their role for constructing and maintaining national autonomy, national unity, and national identity.[240] Challenging the original three paradigms in a fourth paradigm, has brought theory into a final paradigm.

The new considerations in nationalism ideology are beginning to bring the discussion of nationalism outside paradigms and into what Smith calls the 'post-modern', a pre-mature fifth and final paradigm; where nationalism is seen more as a movement.[241] Nationalism as a movement existing in the post-modern is far too complex, because it is a relatively new phenomenon that is lacking substantial evidence. Nonetheless nationalism and the 'nation' continue to evolve. What began with Kohn, nationalism as transparently a subjective idea, has become a political ideology focusing on the *ethnie.* Calhoun, would argue these two conclusions are still not enough to learn of nationalism discourse. Similar to what Foucault calls 'discursive formation', [242] Calhoun sees nationalism as a manipulated discourse by the elites, which even with all the literature in existence, is still not sufficient enough in understanding nationalism in the modern world.[243] In the 'nation-ness' literature, there is a range of factors responsible for bringing nationalism in to existence, focusing on aspects of political, ethnic, uneven development , cultural, doctrine, and ideological references.[244] However there is still not enough to comprehend what nationalism is, if anything, these factors are forms of different grievances, which

---

[240] Ibid., 9, 62.
[241] Ibid., 61.
[242] Calhoun, *Nationalism*. 3. The way we speak and how it manipulates our consciousness.
[243] Ibid., 21.
[244] Ibid., 20. Several authors previously mentioned whom are associated with these ideas are as follows, political (Gellner), ethnic (Armstrong, Smith), uneven development (Hechter), cultural (Smith, Anderson), doctrine (Kedourie), and ideological references (Hobsbawm).

become manipulated by discourse for achievement. Nationalism discourse is thus a vehicle for other grievances.[245]

This brings us to the million dollar question, what is nationalism? From analyzing the literature we find conclusions across the subjective - objective spectrum, a variety of explanations for why some factors should be considered over others, and a cyclical debate on origin. Approaching nationalism as a platform constructed by a set of criteria, like that of a 'nation', would be futile because it would either be too vague or too strict. Therefore, for this research nationalism will be considered as an ideology developed in the modernist era, fueling grievances into collective action with the ultimate desire of achievement. This definition appears odd, for there is no connection to 'nation-ness', which is usually dominant in most definitions. This is because I have left the definition as an empty shell, a theoretical equation leading to nationalism:

$$\text{Fuel} * \text{Grievance} + \text{Action} +/- \text{Achievement} = \text{Nationalism}[246]$$

Fuel is used as a representation of the spark; what gets the collective action to occur? Appropriate answers to suggest are what tools are used to gain collective action for satisfying a grievance. In nationalism, the fuel is symbols, myths, rituals, territory (fatherland), culture, nationality, patriotism, self-determination, ethnicity, and others

---

[245]Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism*. 25.
[246] Fuel multiplied by a grievance creates collective action for fulfilling an achievement equating to nationalism

related to the 'nation-ness' of a community. The fuel does not have to consist of all the factors, but at least one needs to be present in association with 'nation-ness'.

The fuel is to ignite the grievance into collective action. It could be a conscious or unconscious grievance[247] such as a repression of identity, security, lack of economic opportunity, division of labor, immigration, and many others. The importance is on collective action, essentially a community needs to embark on a mission together, this mission is achievement. The achievement is what a group of people want to change. The change could be the desire for secession, create a new 'nation-state', a change in particular policy bringing equality, an overthrow of the current political system, or even to gain recognition as a minority by the state. With this shell of nationalism, everything becomes imaginable and limited. Achievement may not always be achieved, but there needs to be an attempt made at achieving change. Like Gellner tells us, for the amount of successful cases of nationalism identified, there are *n* number of cases not identified or barely sparked.[248] In this definition, the failure of such movements amount to either no fuel, no collective action, or no desire for achievement; granted it would be rather difficult to mobilize people without an end all goal to accomplish, but for those reasons, a failure to fill one of the shells, is a failure of nationalism.

One of the first critiques I expect my working definition to receive is that it is too vague. There is no limit for the criteria that goes into the shells and anything could be

[88] Unconscious grievances are grievances rooted at the at the bottom of other grievances (conscious grievances), they may be layered by so many other grievances, that they are not discussed. It is believed their *anxiety* is related to a conscious grievance and not consider the agenda of an unconscious grievance.
[248] Gellner, "Nationalism." 767.

implanted. For this reason, I stress the importance of 'nation-ness' being tied to the fuel.

This is where I will find most arguments within my definition, what criteria is constituted

as related to 'nation-ness'? An inclusion of ethnicity and culture, shows the flexibility of

words in relation to 'nation-ness', but I believe the criteria should not be a concrete list. I

believe it has developed over time and will continue to change over time. For example,

the first implosion of nationalism after World War One had very different elements from

those after the fall of the USSR. I would argue World War One nationalism was more

about the subjective factors, groups looking to 'will' themselves together by community

similarities, and after the fall of the Soviet Union, it was more about the objective, the

desire to obtain one's own nation-state. New elements were in play. Had philosophers

been writing on nationalism after World War One and constructed a concrete definition

after the war, then nationalism after the Soviet's demise would have to be considered as

something else, because the explosion was based on different criteria, therefore why limit

an ideology whose factors continue to change?

While looking at the discussion on literature, the belief of nationalism as a

political ideology was raised by several philosophers. Within my definition, this can still

be the case. The political aspect discussed would go into the achievement 'shell'. The two

nationalism implosions of the twentieth century wanted new nation-states for better

representation. Culture, ethnicity, and tradition were the fuel to gain collective action for

the grievance of communities not being represented. The new 'nation-state' is a political

move, thus the ideology still has room to maintain its political aspect. It also has room for

the acknowledgement of the 'nation' as a bi-product of nationalism. The 'nation' is part of

the process nationalism encompasses. The working definition is malleable, but limited; filling in the equation with incorrect information makes it irrelevant to nationalism, it snaps and becomes disposable.

From reading the literature on nationalism and observing how it has been discussed as being so complex, it has entered into the realm of the sacred. A word that has been heavily used throughout time with no concrete definition to accompany it, yet it continues to be viewed as having high relevance in the development of the modern world. It becomes 'sacred' because there is fear in concreting a definition, but there is also fear of limiting its capability, restricting its mobility. The above equation gives nationalism plenty of room to fit into the modern world. It is a simple lens showing the processes of what can be considered nationalism.

Setting up the 'nation-ness' working definitions of 'nation' and nationalism opens opportunities for a discussion of nationalism and 'spectator violence'. The following chapter explains the direct connection between the behavior of spectators and how they act in the interests of nationalism. This connection becomes very clear with the Serbian and Croatian international teams.

NATIONALISM AND 'SPECTATOR VIOLENCE'

One of the more noticeable observations at any team sporting event, is identifying which spectators are associated to which team; they display their loyalty dressed in team colors, they wave flags expressing this identity, and they mingle with other supporters. These spectators have taken to the characteristics of their team. They hold elements of nationalism, because they become linked to their team through symbols. For as long has there has been sports, there has been devices utilized by the spectator to prove association to a team. These nationalist elements taken on by the spectator do not represent affiliation to the nationalist political party movement, but show the 'nation-ness' a spectator willingly takes upon themselves to present to the rest of the sports arena which team they prefer. When the fan or 'spectator' is putting on these colors they are representing their 'nation'. Before diving deeper into 'nation' and its role in 'spectator violence', it is first appropriate to ask, why football? What does football offer other sports do not? Metaphysically, the simple answer is, football is a religion.

Football: A religious ritual

Football is a game known across the world with a universal set of rules. No one debates this doctrine, because it has long been established. The referees are interpreters of the doctrine and their word is final. The players are seen as deities to many supporters,

whom give them their prayers. For 90 minutes, mostly on Sundays, football becomes a ritual event. At game time, fans across the world unite in belief and faith, for their team to succeed in battle over the opponent. The game is a tradition passed down throughout the ages. If your father was a fan of a particular team, you will most likely become a fan of the same team. When you throw in a few religious key words to describe football, it begins to sound like a religion. The question is, can we really call a sport, a religion?

In the year 2002 over 2.88 billion people turned on their TV or radio in their personal home, a local bar, or the only building with a TV in the village, to watch the World Cup.[249] This event has the opportunity for every country, no matter their size, to make it all the way and become champion. Although small countries will always be at a disadvantage, because they have less of a population to choose their players from, there is always a possibility for their country to strive to the top and win the World Cup. The next World Cup will be held in Brazil 2014. The qualifying games have already begun for the event and teams have already been eliminated. This means the World Cup does not take place every four years, but instead it is a yearly activity, reminding fans of the awaiting tournament. Besides the World Cup, there are other international tournaments with participation based on region/continent or by invitation. The national teams are a bonus for supporters, because they also have their divisional teams to follow throughout the year. In other words, there is always some team to support under football. A supporter may be a part of two football 'nations'.

---

[249] Tom Hundley, "More Than a Game, Soccer Is a Religion," *Chicago Tribune*, June 4, 2006, http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2006-06-04/news/0606040375_1_world-cup-soccer-top-two-teams.

With so many football events throughout the year, supporters may have to drop previous activities in order to make room for their devotion to soccer. Depending on a fan's ritual for game day, an entire day may be spent in perpetration for the match. Since most football games are played on Sunday, traditional religions like Christianity, may suffer participation. R. Scott Appleby suggests this decline has come from the larger result of developed secularized societies, but the decline in numbers is actually a shift of numbers. He writes, " Seldom does "the secular" eliminate "the religious" in society; rather, secularization shifts the social location of religion, influences the structures it assumes and the way people perform their religious functions, or forces religion to redefine the nature, grounds, and scope of its authority."[250] I don't believe Appleby meant this shift could be brought into an activity like football, but a declining population in religion and an increasing number of football fans, is certainly a social shift. Can football be the replacement? Appleby further tells us, "Even in secularized or secularizing societies where people come to interpret the world without constant reference to religious symbols , some theorists argue, religion is displaced rather than destroyed, as believers transfer religious loyalties to the nation, "the people," or other objects of unconditional devotion."[251] The shift of loyalty to the 'nation' in football terms, is a shift of loyalty to a fan's football team, the 'people' represent the players, and the object of devotion is the game. Within his description of a shifting religion, football fits the criteria and after analyzing Appleby's definition of religion, football fits his definition.

---

[250] R. Scott Appleby, "Introduction:Powerful Medicine," in *The Ambivalence of the Sacred: Religion, Violence, and Reconciliation* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2000), 4.
[251] Ibid., 4.

Appleby says religion, " discloses and celebrates the transcendent source and significance of human existence. So ambitious an enterprise requires a formidable array of symbolic, moral, and organizational resources."[252] He concludes that religion is made up of four C's, creed, cult, code of conduct, and a confessional community, which football contains. Creed, for Appleby, "...defines the standard of beliefs and values concerning the ultimate origin, meaning, and purpose of life. It develops from myths-symbol-laden narratives of sacred encounters-and finds official expression in doctrines and dogmas."[253] In football these are the universal set of rules for how the game is played, every supporter knows the rules and no one debates them. Symbols and rituals vary by team, but every team has some element of a symbol; a football team's patch is an example of the simplest of these symbols. The difficulty of the football rules is that it struggles to answer the question of transcendence and the reason for life and death, an essential component to religion, but I will tackle this issue later on.

It can be hard to think of something as a religion when it is not one of the big 5 (Christianity, Judaism, Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism). In order to grasp football as a religion, one must therefore let go of what they know, so no unconscious comparisons can be made obstructing a rational thought of analysis. It is hard to idealize a pitch over a temple or synagogue, because our whole lives have associated religion with an enclosed sanctuary, not a 100-130 meter field surrounded by stands, yet it is observable that society has shifted here in the Modern.

---

[252] Ibid., 8.
[253] Ibid., 8.

Monica Toft declines the "secularization theory" suggested by Appleby, arguing that religion has increased its numbers, it hasn't been losing members. She does argue that it may not hold the shape it traditionally held, but has become more malleable to join public society, noticeable in sports by the participation of players and coaches, "Once private, religion has gone public. Once passive religion is now assertive and engaged. Once local, it is now global. Once subservient to the powers that be, religion has become "prophetic" and resistant to politicians at every level."[254] Football is something Toft would allow for consideration as a form of religion. Applying her usage of William P. Alston's definition on religion, football would fit Toft's definition.

William P. Alston's definition of religion consists of seven elements. For Toft, a religion does not need to consist of all of these elements, but it does need to be a majority".[255] For this researcher, this means a religion has to have a minimum of five of the seven elements from Alston's definition. The first element is a belief in the supernatural; the football players who become deified[256] fulfill this requirement. Secondly, prayer or communication with those gods; the chants from supporters are to be heard by the deities on the pitch. Thirdly, a transcendent reality must be present. Again, the transcendent question is the most conflictual part of the religious definition and football, but I will tackle this issue later on. The fourth element is a separation of the

---

[254] Monica D. Toft, Daniel Philpott, and Timothy S. Shah, *God's Century: Resurgent Religion and Global Politics* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2011). 3.
[255] Ibid., 21.
[256] Rupert Howland-Jackson, "La Iglesia Maradoniana – Argentina's Real Religion?," *The Argentina Independent*, December 1, 2008, http://www.argentinaindependent.com/life-style/undergroundba/la-iglesia-maradoniana-argentinas-real-religion/.There are churches currently dedicated to skilled football players, there is a very well known one in Argentina dedicated to Diego Maradona.

sacred and the profane with ritual acts and sacred objects. The pitch is the holiest of

holies for the realm of football, it is the turf where the deities perform their spectacles.

Above the pitch the supporters wear and wave symbols representing their football sect

and showing their belief in the team below. The fifth element is to explain the worldview

as a whole and our role within it. This would be one of the two elements football can't

really answer, but I believe if the reader considers the levels of nationalism involved in

the supporters behavior, it molds its way for fitting into this element. The religion of

football does not mean there is secularization from the state. The nation-state's worldview

easily carries over into the realm of football, these are elements of nationalism projected

from the nation-state answering questions in society and elsewhere.

The sixth element is a code of conduct tied to the worldview established by the

religion, a simple answer would be the football rulebook. This worldview is constructed

from the universal rules, but it may vary depending on location. For example the

worldview of football in Argentina may have a different worldview than that of South

Korea. Finally, the last element of football is the existence of a community bounded by

the other six elements.[257] This represents the spectators, the ultras, the 'hooligans', the

fans. It doesn't matter the level of their commitment, they are all bound to the community

in some fashion, all playing their role in devotion. Religion thus, "... involves a

combination of beliefs, behavior, and belonging in a community."[258] Football

---

[257] Ibid., 21.
[258] Ibid., 21.

comfortably fits 5 of the above elements and partially fits the fifth element, but the

important element of transcendence in religion is a key quality.

The question of transcendence is what stands in the way of calling football an

official religion. After describing Alston's definition of religion, Toft goes into what she

believes to be the most important element separating religion from ideology.

> "...All religions by definition seek understanding of, and harmony with, the widest reaches of transcendent reality- the quality that distinguishes them from political ideologies such as Marxism or secular nationalism that are sometimes thought to be functionally equivalent to religion. Religions offer answers to universal questions about the origins of existence, the afterlife, and realities that transcend humanity; nations generally do not."[259]

A religion is meant to answer the questions of the transcendent, a set of instructions for

what we have to do in life to achieve certain things in the afterlife. In a nutshell, football

can't answer these questions. However, in arguing football is a religion, I am arguing it is

unique. In neither Toft or Appleby's definitions does it say that a religion must remain

independent from others. Why could supporters not borrow the idea of a heaven from

Christianity? How about a life of cyclical rebirth from Hinduism? Or perhaps adopt the

notion of nothing after death from Atheism? In borrowing another religion's

transcendence, football would be complete in being classified a religion. Let me expand.

If you went to a football game and found a group of fans that were Christian, but

retired their Christian rituals to put more faith into football, and asked them what happens

---

[259] Ibid., 21.

after death; I believe you would get three answers, heaven, hell, or nothing. The only way to learn of football's transcendent value is to ask those supporters whom have become fully converted footballinigans[260]. I do not believe these answers are universal, I think the context of the answer comes from the area of the world one grows up in. However, I think it is perfectly fine for footballinigans to adopt their religious transcendence from elsewhere. Have religions not pulled from each other throughout the years? Christianity has come from Judaism, why can't football come from mixed elements of the big 5? As our globalized world moves forward, religion can take new molds. Whether one argues secularization or a strengthening of religious ties with the state. Religion, like other things in our modern world, will have to adopt to current trends. I think more devotion into football is one of these adoptions.

A strengthening of this devotion is being funneled into the 'nation'. Football holds a lot of religious elements and ritual, but so does nationalism in the 'nation'. The relationship of football as a religion explains the numbers of people attached to the game and the sacredness of the sport. In considering the football religion, the 'spectators' participating are involved in something more than just a match of football. The game is a ritual with larger constructed consequences by the spectators. This does not mean the game is heavily induced with religious elements, because even the biggest religious based rivalry, Glasgow Rangers and Celtic, is more based on national identity than actual

---

[260] A term I constructed myself to reference religious football spectators.

religion.[261] Rather, I am pointing out the game's other dimensions. The 'nation' is at the center of these dimensions and should be seen as the source for all 'spectator violence' in football.

The Football 'Nation'

Remembering the previously defined 'nation', a group of people whom have voluntarily come together from a common history, shared culture, an attachment to territory of high value whom perceive themselves as a legitimate, sovereign, horizontal community; whose boundaries potentially overstretch the borders of states; analysis shows how easily a football team, at the regional or international level can be considered a 'nation'. The players, the spectators, the fans, the community; they are all united as one 'nation'. They come together voluntarily; to watch the game and cheer for their team, they have a history of winning and defeat; activating emotional responses within the 'nation', they share the football culture and make claims to their stadium; the territory, and they view themselves as a legitimate grouping of people in a horizontal structure, whose sovereignty is comparable to their reputation. The boundaries of the 'nation' may be outside of a team's territory, because of the Diaspora fan.[262] This is the football 'nation'.

One of the arguments against this phenomenon of the football 'nation', is that it should be considered more as a football community, but I disagree. With Tonnies

---

[261] Alan Bairner, *Sport, Nationalism, and Globalization: European and North American Perspectives* (New York: SUNY Press, 2001). xiii.
[262] An example of the Diaspora fans are those outside the distinguished territory of the 'nation', but still claim association with a particular team. Back in the United States I have friends who cheer for English Premier League teams like Manchester United or Liverpool.

community, there was a noticeable lack of objective elements in making connections between groups. His community was unconscious and natural. The modern football 'nation', is the conscious 'will' of an individual calling for recognition in association to the team. In terms of Tonnies, the football 'nation' holds more characteristics of his 'society' rather than 'community'. Yet, unlike Tonnies' 'society', the football 'nation' does not hold a constructed purpose. The 'nation' is conscious, because there is a realization and desire for joining collective action in support of a team, but its construction came from the 'will' of the people, not erected in reaction to state infrastructure. Although, there is room to argue commercialization heavily developed the football 'nation'; commercialization came in the late 20th century developing football into the global game it is today. The football 'nation's origins began when there were spectators and fans available to watch a game.

The football 'nation' is similar to the community; Dunning discusses this in relation to the Leicester theory. He describes the working class as being their own communities in affiliation to a territory, they are 'gangs' challenging one another, but during a game-day match, they all unite under their football team to combat the 'invasion' of foreigners in their community.[263] Dunning creates a link of community and territory comparable to the football 'nation' and stadium phenomenon I have proposed. Both are alike, but I put emphasis on the elements of nationalism leading to the creation of the 'nation', while using community as a component. It is important to note Dunning's argument has influenced my own, but the use of 'community' is perceived differently. In

---

[263] Dunning, *Sport Matters: Sociological Studies of Sport, Violence, and Civilization*. 150.

both arguments, territory is a strong component. Konrad Lorenz, one of the founders of ethology,[264] switched to studying human behavior as the English 'hooligan' became a media spectacle. He considered intra-specific conflict between fans as 'tournaments' predominantly expressed by males as a show of strength in maintaining ownership of territory and for dominance over females.[265] This view of aggression is similar to the disproven primal urges Freud previously mentions, but the territorial component Lorenz discusses is important. Defense of the territory in the football 'nation' is more than defending the land; it is defending the metaphysical reputation of the team. In enacting violence, spectators are protecting their sovereignty, a football 'nation' taken advantage by another football 'nations' holds no sovereignty, the reputation is shattered and everyone under that 'nation' is seen as useless/scum. Therefore defense of the 'nation', is defending a sovereign reputation necessary for other nations to not believe they own your 'nation'. In becoming directly violent, the objective is to not to kill, combat is for proving a spectators football 'nation' is strong. Lorenz observes, there is restraint in 'spectator violence' for decreasing physical damage; the objective is not to become harbingers of death.[266] This is observable through most weapons used in fights, although any weapon is capable of killing another person, most direct 'spectator violence' does not utilize guns. There is an unmentioned agreed upon limit to knives and other blunt objects.

---

[264] Objective study of animal behavior, subfield of zoology.
[265] Dunning, *Sport Matters: Sociological Studies of Sport, Violence, and Civilization*. 160.
[266] Ibid., 160.

Recently I watched a video where firms from Moscow and St. Petersburg met in a large open green field to fight for their 'nation's sovereignty.[267] Both groups had anywhere between twenty-five to thirty members and identifiable only because one side took their shirts off, but it was unclear to this observer which firm was Moscow and which one was St. Petersburg. It began with each firm standing at one end of the open field and slowly walking towards each other while chanting, once within ten meters of the other group, they charged. From the video it appears fists were the only allowed weapon in this fight, because both groups had wrapped their fists. Within a few minutes there was an evident winner. In defense of Lorenz's observation, I noticed the victors claimed themselves as winners, picked up their guys who were knocked down, and walked off. The other team slowly came back to consciousness gathered all their guys and headed off the other direction. The object was not to kill, but only to knock out the other opponent. The message was sent, 'we are more powerful than you'.

The 'spectator violence' from this example of Russian firms fighting has four outcomes, displayed in the following table.

---

[267] The video came from a Facebook fan group of 'hooligans', but Facebook considered the video too violent and it was taken down.

Table 1 Football 'nation' direct violence outcomes

Outcome	Home Team	Winner	Draw
1	A	A	-
2	B	A	-
3	A	A	0
4	B	B	0

In this engagement the firm without shirts won, they will therefore be A. B will represent

the firm wearing black shirts, those whom were defeated. It was evident who won the

match, but what was unclear was whose territory was being defended, whose reputation

was at stake. Therefore, four hypothetical situations are drafted up. In outcome one, firm

A was defending their sovereignty and they succeeded in doing so. They have media

footage to prove their victory and word will slowly spread of this defeat. In outcome 2,

firm B is the home team, in which case they failed to defend their sovereignty. A defeat

on this field has meant a defeat in their representation, the victors will see firm B weak

and walk all over their territory (city, stadium, region, province, etc...it is the area they

have claimed as theirs) doing as they please; they may even consider creating songs

about this defeat. Firm B has little options, but to rest up and wait for another opportunity

to fight again for redeeming the reputation they lost'; this is the gang warfare aspect of

'spectator violence'. In outcomes 3 and 4, I have added an extra element for explanation

outside the example of Russian firms, a draw. A draw may only occur if the fight is

broken up by security forces before it is finished, otherwise most fights are fought until

the winner is decided. In a draw, the football 'nation' home team takes a victory. The old

ritual of 'taking the ends' during a football match was important, because even if security had broken up the mad dash to the opponents end, the invaders were able to judge a victory if they took the end before security forces engaged.[268] The increased security measures, such as barricades, began to prevent the ritual of 'taking the ends' to judge who had sovereignty. It became harder for violent spectators to gain a reputation, because security forces kept getting in the way, therefore they are beginning to leave the pitch.

Adopting to a new arena for direct violence outside of the pitch is a move by violent spectators to get away from security forces for the probability of finishing the fight. There had been too many previous obstacles constructed by security forces preventing the completion of a fight, likewise the punishment for fighting in a football arena got more severe. Therefore, there was a need to move the location elsewhere which, according to a 2006 article in *Newsweek*, was easy to organize, because of the internet and text messaging technology available.[269] It gave way for fights between different football 'nations' within states, to commence off-site battles. A clear winner could be identified and the football 'nation's sovereignty was established. This explains how the Russian firms ended up in the middle of a green field with nothing nearby.

When there is a discussion on 'spectator violence' the assumption is the direct physical aspect of conflict. Yet, the structural vocal violence spectators use against each other is still heavily prevalent in the stadiums. Language is an element security forces are

---

[268] King, "The Postmodernity of Football Hooliganism." 587.

[269] Malcolm Beith and Stefan Theil, "Football's Big Fear; Chased from Matches, Hooligans Now Tend to Look for 'Off Site' Fights. But the Cup Is a Big Target.," *Newsweek Magazine*, August 5, 2006, http://www.thedailybeast.com/newsweek/2006/05/07/football-s-big-fear.html.

unable to crack down on. Recently racism has become a very noticeable violent act by spectators, commencing a discussion by authorities for measuring punishments on those who employ such violence.[270] Still, primarily the vocal violence is tolerated. Cheers and chants are used to either glorify one's own 'nation' or to traumatize another teams 'nation'. The construction of chants are from nationalist elements, the words have the power of turning spectators against each other, because they are what Vamik Volkan would consider 'chosen traumas'.

Vamik Volkan is a professor of psychiatry at the University of Virginia. In his book *Bloodlines,* he writes about how individuals and groups recover from disasters and the process of mourning that follows these events. He uses the concept 'chosen trauma' to explain the impact a negative event can have on an individual or a group through the collective memory of an idea, "it is a shared mental representation of the event, which includes realistic information, fantasized expectations, intense feelings, and defenses against unacceptable thoughts."[271] The 'chosen trauma' is carried on through generations never to be forgotten. In defending his concept he considers the Navajo Indians, who through interview, discussed how they believe time been stopped since 1864 when their ancestors were forced to take the 'Long Walk' and over 2500 died on the journey.[272] He further observes how history between groups can create 'chosen traumas' and fuel conflict between these groups. The history of conflict and defeat is passed down through

---

[270] "Fifa Approves New Racism Crackdown," *BBC*, May 31, 2013, sec. Sport/Football, http://www.bbc.co.uk/sport/0/football/22728162.
[271] Vamik D Volkan, "Chosen Trauma: Unresolved Mourning," in *Bloodlines: From Ethnic Pride to Ethnic Terrorism* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1998). 48.
[272] Ibid., 41.

the generations in what he calls psychological DNA.[273] The trauma remains fresh in the

minds of the affected.

Spectator's employing violent chants are utilizing Volkan's 'chosen trauma'. Most

chants and taunts used are historical representations of past incidents. Maria Iliycheva

conducted a study on Bulgarian sports forums, monitoring the language fans used and

how it was manipulated by their culture and history. One of her observations included the

particular language used by Bulgarians after Turkey lost a match to Latvia. In a match

where Bulgaria didn't even participate, nationalist discourse exploded on to the forums,

in context of the histories between Bulgaria and Turkey.[274] Bulgarians were occupied by

the Ottoman Empire for approximately 500 years, they take this 'trauma' out on turkey

through negative discourse. These same emotions expressed on the internet are

intensified when the international football 'nations' have a match against one another.

Songs and chants are created to continue the trauma, all of which are violent because of

the hate expressed towards one another.

The chants may begin by a few, but in a crowd setting they are quickly absorbed

by others, because of the common histories and culture. This makes the violent cheers

spread like wildfire. Emotions then become strong and structural violence can quickly

escalate to direct violence. At this point in an escalation, spectators take it upon

themselves to defend their sovereignty from the 'bastards' across the pitch. These are

'chosen traumas' of the football 'nation' and can be applied to both international and

---

[273] Ibid., 44.
[274] Maria Iliycheva, "'Faithful Until Death': Sports Fans and Nationalist Discourse in Bulgarian Internet
Forums," *Polish Sociological Review* no. 151 (January 1, 2005), 260. doi: 10.2307/41274930.

regional levels of football matches. Between one of the bigger rivals in Bulgaria, Levski and CSKA, a generalization exists with Levski being Jews and CSKA, Turks. Fans believe these truths and employ a, "...use of negative stereotypes facilitating the creation and preservation of the ethnocentric images both teams' fans construct for themselves."[275] The songs are insulting and demeaning to a football 'nation', nonetheless the language employed in sports is a powerful weapon for using nationalism and 'framing a national consciousness'.[276] What one team considers as a 'chosen glory'[277] is another 'nations' 'trauma', when being constantly reminded of a negative time in your groups history, hate and frustration form, with these emotions the 'aggro' kicks in and direct violence breaks out.

The structural violence used through 'chosen traumas' directly affecting the football 'nation' is not the only way direct violence becomes activated, after all direct violence is observed before and after matches. Emotions of nationalism are still present in these encounters just as much as they are during a fight that breaks out on the pitch. The example above, gives evidence to nationalist elements being tied to each location violence is employed.

Another aspect of the football 'nation' leading to violence comes from national identity. Association with a football 'nation' embodies representation of that 'nation' in your character and well-being. In sport, national identity is strong, Alan Bairner,

---

[275] Ibid., 264.
[276] Ibid., 253.
[277] An event that goes down in history as a great achievement in a groups history. For example, America will consider the victories of the two World Wars as 'chosen glories'.

observed celebrations in Germany at the same aptitude of those in Turkey, after Turkey

won a football match against Germany in 1998. The national identity of Turkish

immigrants, whom had migrated to Germany, was far greater than the identity of the

Germany they resided in.[278] National identity is preserved within the football 'nation'

individuals grew up in, the football 'nation' becomes a part of the individual and seeks

preservation. When United Kingdom Secretary General Jack Straw proposed merging

Britain's four teams (England, Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland) into one

homogeneous team, he was criticized from all four states.[279] This proposition put the

national identities of each state at risk of dissolution. Although Straw assumedly had

good intentions, the merger never happened. This is similar to Bairner's experience while

growing up in Scotland. He grew up despising those south of the Hadrian Wall in any

sporting opportunity there was. Anytime Scotland played England, the state of Scotland

awoke with eyes glued to the televisions in supporting their team, it was always essential

Scotland won, because it was an outlet for the Scots to hold something over the English.

While living in England, Bariner learned the English were nowhere near intense about the

Scottish/English rivalry like himself and the rest of Scotland. He observed, "As junior

partners in the United Kingdom, Scots needed the sporting contest with England as an

element in a constant struggle to maintain a separate identity", the English embodied a

majority of British-ness and therefore were more concerned with opponents outside of

---

[278] Bairner, *Sport, Nationalism, and Globalization: European and North American Perspectives*. 169.
[279] Antonio Missiroli, "European Football Cultures and Their Integration: The'short' Twentieth Century," *Institute For Security Studies (ISS)*, June 1, 2002, 5.
http://www.iss.europa.eu/publications/detail/article/european-football-cultures-and-their-integration-theshort-twentieth-century/.

their island.[280] The football 'nation' of Scotland depended on the rivalry with England, it helped develop their national identity. National identity is thus able to be classified as strong, resilient, and can be expressed and constructed through sports; since football is the most popular sport, because of its very religious elements, the football 'nation' plays a big role in shaping identities.

During the unification of North and South Yemen, football played a big role in breaking down regional identities and creating national identities. Thomas B. Stevenson and Abdul Karim Alaug studied the function of football in building a national identity in Yemen. They observed national football events were established in Yemen for bringing together a greater national identity from the two regional identities.[281] These strategies included a national Yemeni tournament for the best teams of north and south to play for and establishing a national team comprised of players from both sides. A national team with spectators sharing a national identity essentially eased the difficulty of unifying other institutions between North and South Yemen, because a national sports organization, "...promoted integration, solidarity, and state and consensus building.[282] There is no denial in the role football played for bringing a united Yemen identity, but there are not enough examples to make this a universal concept. Still, Stevenson and Alaug's observation further demonstrate the power football 'nation's established identities have.

---

[280] Bairner, *Sport, Nationalism, and Globalization: European and North American Perspectives*. xiv.
[281] Thomas B. Stevenson and Abdul Karim Alaug, "Football in Newly United Yemen: Rituals of Equity, Identity, and State Formation," *Journal of Anthropological Research* 56, no. 4 (December 1, 2000), 454. doi: 10.2307/3630927.
[282] Ibid., 462.

Tied to the 'nation', the national identity is a large component and held with high value. The emotional ties are very prevalent; for, in attacking a football 'nation', the offender is attacking the identities of all fans tied to the football 'nation', this may cause 'aggro' in the one's being attacked, leading to violence. The national identity is established, once the 'nation' has been established. The 'nation' comes from the ideological movement of nationalism; the final component of 'nation-ness'. Within the realm of 'nation-ness', spectators become violent. The movement of nationalism is *the* trigger in initiating the violence.

Violence and Nationalism

In the previous chapter a working definition for nationalism was established as an equation. This equation was:

Fuel * Grievance + Action +/- Achievement = Nationalism.

In the post-modern concept for 'spectator violence' nationalism was constructed and transcended, but the nationalism the violent spectator transcended was never defined. The above equation gives evidence for the process of this transcendence, whether it is constructed by the spectator or not, its existence comes into reality. By applying elements to the empty shells, the establishment of nationalism forms. For example in relation to football, fans from a team use their symbolic crest as fuel to ignite the grievance of the football match. The grievance is fear of losing the match and the action is to cheer and

126

chant during the match, using as many symbols as possible to bring morale to the team. This simple form of nationalism creates the football 'nation'. The transcendence of nationalism in the post-modern is the behavior taken up by fans and spectators for partaking in the football 'nation'. The football 'nation', the sovereign territorial entity, becomes a real thing, believed by all who join the football 'nation'. The ideology of nationalism creates to the 'nation' where violence spawns in protection of its sovereignty.

This is *the* trigger for conflict, other explanations, provide statistics on particular individuals whom may be more likely to engage, but a group of unemployed individuals is not the trigger, it may be a factor, but the cause is nationalism.[283] 'Moral panic' has given spotlight to different groups they believe are responsible for the violence, but their coverage of the different groups more prone to violence only gives light to those most passionate in preserving the football 'nation'. As mentioned earlier, spectators whom hold no history for violence, may become violent, because there are opposing spectators impeding on the sovereignty of their football 'nation'. While in a foreign territory and with few fans from your football 'nation' present, the individual will take it upon themselves to defend their sovereignty. The spontaneity of becoming violent is not because the individual was unemployed, in a gang, or becoming victim to the animal within them, their only attachment was to the football 'nation'.

---

[283] Lawrence, "The Gladiatorial Lust for Blood." 198.

The use of violence in the name of nationalism is a recent accepted idea in the Modern era. One of the best ways to express this relationship is an application of these concepts on Croatia and Serbia.

Case Study: Serbia and Croatia, 'spectator violence' as nationalism

An analysis of the Croatian and Serbian spectators, a decade after Josip Tito's death, is perhaps the best demonstration of 'spectator violence' through nationalism. It is certainly the most extreme case, where war ended up being the final result. Clearly not all violent spectators will escalate into this level of intensity and surely there were several other factors at play for the war to begin, but the beginning of violence in the Croatian War for Independence, is directly linked back to the football 'nation', which in turn projected images of the greater nation-state Croatia and Serbia call home today.

Prior to the war, Serbia and Croatia had been politically unified underneath Yugoslavia. After Tito's death and the failure to bring about new economic reform to a greater Yugoslavia, Slovenia and Macedonia sought and were granted independence without much conflict. This was followed by the violent breakaway's of Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina, leaving Yugoslavia comprised of Serbia and Montenegro. In 2007 Montenegro would finally become independent of Serbia, creating six new states where one had originally stood; depending on personal recognition of Kosovo breaking away from Serbia, there are seven. Before the movements for independence in the Balkans, there were fragmented national identities all falling under a greater Yugoslavian identity; individuals from Serbia and Croatia would have both considered themselves as

Yugoslavian. Since the break up, six(seven) new national identities have emerged from elements present before the formation of Yugoslavia. The identities were to be constructed independently from their neighbors, each nation-state looked to preserve a version of its own autonomous national identity. All commonalities wanted to be dismantled. After years of war and grief, there was the desire to leave no traces of the unified Yugoslavian identity. It was no easy task, especially when considering the biggest commonality between the Balkans goes back to their Slavic language roots and the fact that many were under the control of the Ottomans at the same time. Differences were therefore constructed as to how far back in history each nation-state could claim their origins, and their proximity to others. For example Croatia and Slovenia's location puts them more towards Central Europe, therefore their identity was more heavily influenced by this region.[284] Serbia and Macedonia chose to recognize their Orthodox roots primarily holding on to these aspects, ousting the remnant Ottoman culture that had previously controlled their territories. Minorities in Bosnia, particularly the Bosniak Muslims, chose to accept the Turkish rulers religion and traditions, making it difficult to integrate into a system with what the Bosniak Serbs and Bosniak Croats wish to preserve as their identities.[285]

Consider for a moment what a national identity needs to have to become an identity. In order for the Balkans to have constructed a Yugoslav identity, there needed to

[284] Boris Skvorc, "The Question of Yugoslav Cultural Identity: An Artificial Problem," Faculty of Arts, *Macquerie University*, 1995,
http://www.mq.edu.au/about_us/faculties_and_departments/faculty_of_arts/department_of_international_st
udies/european_languages_and_cultures/croatian/review/the_question_of_yugoslav_cultural_identity_an_a
rtificial_problem/.
[285] Ibid.

be similar qualities between these states. This region is full of Slavic peoples, evident from their language roots in Bosnia, Croatia, and Serbia. Yet, when borders were eventually drawn around these states, they came to believe they are completely different nations. This fact remained preserved in the pre-Yugoslavian literature.

Before Yugoslavia, each state's literature rarely discussed other areas of the Balkans and only focused on their own.[286] Slovenia wasn't discussing Skopje or Belgrade and Serbia focused more on folklore and the mythological elements it produced; they were all very independent from one another. Yugoslavia literature, a stockpile from the rest of the Balkans, never had a central hub for the other states to partake in; there was never an acceptance for which elements would be allocated into the Yugoslavian identity.[287] Serbia attempted to pressure its own traditions in becoming the "Yugoslav" identity, a process known as "Serbization", similar to Russia's "Russification"[288]. The idea was to spread Serbian traditions and ideas, ultimately choosing to not accept any others. A continued use of this system would, in their mind, transition Serbia's traditions and histories into a greater "Yugoslav identity". The Serbian literary power failed to grasp and Yugoslavia remained without a cultural center, each of these regions held on to different values broken across historic narratives, religious, and ethnic lines. These were the identities collaborated into the football 'nation'. It can be suggested the pressures from "Serbization" tied with the failing economy of Yugoslavia created anxiety, strengthening the football 'nation'.

---

[286] Ibid.
[287] Ibid.
[286] Ibid.

The national identities held many obstacles in their construction, but the nationalism in the football 'nation' helped develop the national identity. In Croatia the embodiment of the Croatian national identity was predominantly within the Dinamo Zagreb football 'nation' and in Serbia, Red Star Belgrade emblazoned their national identity. Simon Kuper, author of *Soccer Against The Enemy*, was interviewing Zvarko Puhovski, a philosophy professor from Croatia. In a discussion on national identity, Puhovski told Kuper a story of two Algerian boys who were in Puhovski's class when he was younger, the schoolteacher asked the children what they were, most replied Croats others Yugoslav, but the two Algerians also said Croat. The school teacher was perplexed by this answer and asked how this was possible, they were Algerian. At this point Puhovski chimed in saying they were Croatian, because they spoke Croat and were fans of Dinamo. [289]

At the beginning of the Croatian War for Independence the Croat identity was not very established, but Croats had discovered it within Dinamo. The largest firm of Dinamo, the Bad Blue Boys (BBB) became a majority of the soldiers when the war finally broke out. They had such an influence on the military the Dinamo crest was sewn on as a patch of their uniforms.[290] While interviewing two men claiming to be leaders of the BBB, Neno and Darko, Kuper was further informed of the BBBs role in the war. Darko commented about the house he lived at in the frontlines had a Dinamo flag on the outside, where convoys honked every time they drove by on their way to fight, he also

[289] Simon Kuper, *Soccer Against the Enemy: How the World's Most Popular Sport Starts and Fuels Revolutions and Keeps Dictators in Power* (Nation Books, 1994). 277.
[290] Ibid., 276.

stated, "Many people died in this war with the Dynamo emblem on their sleeve."[291] The

football 'nation' led the charge for violence in the Balkans. In Croatia, grievances between

regional football 'nations' were put aside for fraternity in a greater Croatian football

'nation', which was pictured largely under Dinamo influence, but there was still a large

Croatian following with Hadjuk Split. During times of war these two 'nations' could be

heard singing,

Dinamo and Hajduk are of the same blood
it doesn't matter which of them is first,
Dinamo and Hajduk are two brother clubs,
the whole of Croatia is proud of them.[292]

Their songs of fraternity promoted a national Croatia. In Serbia, a parallel world of

dependence on the football 'nation' led to the establishment of the national unity.

Serbia's two big teams taking a lot of the attention during the start of the

Yugoslavian independence movements was Partizan with their notorious firm, The

Gravediggers, and the more notable Red Star, with the *delije*. In the course of war,

Serbia's sports newscasters replaced the commentator's becoming the devices for war-

propaganda.[293] Their commentary had glorified the football fan and their aggression

demonstrated at away games. The reporters gave praise to the Serbian spectators,

comparable to the Serbian army at their most glorious moments in time, "Star's

supporters display unparalleled patriotism."[294] Supporting Red Star became equivalent to

supporting Serbia and Serbdom. As quoted in one of the last issues of *Nasa Rječ* (Our

---

[291] Ibid., 286.
[292] Ivan Colovic, "Football, Hooligans, and War," in *The road to war in Serbia: Trauma and Catharsis*, ed. Nebojsa Popov (Budapest; New York: Central European University Press, 2000), 385.
[293] Ibid., 376.
[294] Ibid., 379.

World), "Red Star is more than a football club, it is a symbol of the Serbian being."[295] Red Star had become an embodiment of the football 'nation'. Once Željko Ražnatović Arkan became affiliated with Red Star, The 'Warriors' were born, a group of football spectators whose lifestyles were easily transferrable into soldiers; predominantly Red Star spectators.[296] After the infamous football match between Dinamo and Red Star on March 13th 1990, war was inevitable. Arkan instantaneously began preparing for war, his first step was discipline. He was quoted saying, "From the beginning I insisted on discipline. You know what football fans are like, they're noisy, they like drinking, clowning; I put a stop to that at a stroke, I made them cut their hair, shave regularly, stop drinking and - it all took its own course."[297] Arkan had established an army of Warriors from Red Star. The Warriors went on to join his paramilitary group known as Arkan's Tigers.

Even through the establishment of Red Star's dominant Serbdom, Partizan maintained an active voice during this time. At times they put aside their own rivalry to explain the importance of Red Star's victories and how they reflected all of Serbia.[298] The identity of Red Star as the football 'nation' was projected into the greater Serbian football 'nation', just as Dinamo became the Croatian football 'nation'. Violence was the need to preserve the sovereignty of each 'nation'. In fighting for the 'nation', what it meant to be a part of the 'nation' was discovered. In other words, what it meant to be Croatian or what it meant to be Serbian, was embodied in the football 'nations'.

---

[295] Ibid., 380.
[296] Ibid., 387.
[297] Ibid., 388.
[298] Ibid., 381.

133

During the war for independence, the Croatian President Franjo Tudjman saw the importance of Dinamo as a symbol of Croatian national identity and decided to re-baptize the team as Croatia Zagreb.[299] This would ruin Tudjman's reputation in Zagreb, although his attempt was to accelerate a process for national identity within Croatia, he was deterred. The Dinamo football 'nation' was transcending the Croatian football 'nation', Dinamo was more of an embodiment of Croatia for the people. In a speech in Zagreb, Tudjman noticed a Dinamo banner flying in the crowd, he interrupted his own speech to criticize the banner, where in return the spectators began shouting, "Dinamo not Croatia."[300] Tudjman's name change dramatically decreased the spectators at the matches and further exemplifying how the name itself was important for the Croatian identity.

Balkan spectators are a unique mix, because they have adopted the aggression of the English 'hooligan' and the choreography from the Italian 'ultras'. These two attributes have helped develop the football match into a classification of what Orwell calls, 'sport as war'. Ivan Colovic also classifies it a war, "...but a 'ritualized war', and not only because journalists describe it using military vocabulary but because the supporters' props, flags, drums and uniforms suggest that it is a kind of symbolic warfare."[301] The football spectators who fought in the war of Yugoslavia, 'fighter-fans', were already mentally ready for combat from their experiences at football matches. Through the working definition of nationalism, the above elements in Colovic's description are seen as the fuel

[299] Kuper, *Soccer Against the Enemy*. 279.
[300] Ibid., 281.
[301] Colovic, "Football, Hooligans, and War." 393.

in the grievance of identity. The ultimate achievement is recognition of these separate cultural and ethnic identities that became demanded after the fall of Yugoslavia. In order to achieve the recognition, mobilization had to take place, the mobilization between both Serbia and Croatia came from under the football 'nation'. The desire for recognition of identity was utilized under a pre-existent 'nation', which became projected into the larger national identities. The violence came from the opposing 'nation' failing to recognize the other's sovereignty.

This is a rather extreme case of nationalism inducing violence. It however holds the simplest characteristics for demonstrating violence in the name of nationalism, as well as the influence the football 'nations' held within each state. Arkan and Slobodan Milosevic celebrated the 'fighter-fans' and saw their devotion as something to take advantage of, Colovic believes, "...thanks to war, the state redeems aggression of hooigan-fans by giving them a chance to become socially useful, or, as it would be put today, to contribute to 'positive energy', the foundation of post-war life."[302] Tudjman made similar observations on the Croatian side as the BBB went out to fight for a Croatian identity. Violence became legitimized and glorified, the football 'nation' in Serbia and Croatia was created and mobilized by nationalism in producing a recognizable national identity from all the histories of ethnic and cultural clashes between Balkan states.

---

[302] Ibid., 395.

After the war, the construction of identities had continued and the fierce devotion to Red Star, Dinamo[303], Split, and Partizan remains. The football 'nations' still hold a large precedence over the Balkans today, in 2010, spectators of the Serbian 'nation' went to Italy where they disrupted a match between two teams, eventually to the point of having to call the match off. The media speculated the actions were related to political right-wing orchestrated violence.[304] In reality the Serbian spectators were choosing to declare the sovereignty of Serbia, trying to prove to themselves the Italians were weak. Another example of the Serbian football 'nation' employing violence occurred during a game in Genoa where Serbian spectators began burning Albanian flags, a violent message of nationalism in the name of Kosovo attempting to break off from Serbia.[305] Several Croatian fans were deported from Malta, after becoming directly violent at a UEFA qualifying match in Malta.[306] Fearing the sovereignty of Croatia was at risk because of a loss on the field, the fans became violent tearing up the Ta' Qali stadium and engaging police.

In the most recent qualifying matches for the 2014 World Cup, Croatia and Serbia played each other for the first time since the outbreak of war. There was a match in March 2013 at Zagreb, where Croatia won, and another match will be played in Belgrade later in September. Unlike other FIFA qualifying matches, there was one

---

[303] Croatia Zagreb was changed back to Dynamo Zagreb in the year 2000

[304] Ian Traynor, "Serbian Thugs Are the Toys of Nationalist and Neo-fascist Leaders," *The Guardian*, October 13, 2010, http://www.theguardian.com/football/blog/2010/oct/13/serbia-hooligans-italy-riot.

[305] Ibid.

[306] Matthew Xuereb, "Croatian Hooligans Banned from Entering Malta Again," *Times of Malta*, August 2, 2008, http://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20080802/local/croatian-hooligans-banned-from-entering-malta-again.219154.

stipulation involved at these particular games, no away fans were allowed to be present.[307] This is a security measure enforced by both teams for the safekeeping of spectators. Security forces are not ready to see if the previous passions in the football 'nations' have dwindled or are still prevalent. Although the first match experienced some negative chants directed to the Serbian players, the game was an overall success. Before both spectators are allowed to be in the same stadium, certain measures would have to be introduced to reduce confrontations that may lead to violence. If sports are war without the bullets, two opposing 'nations' whom have fought a war against each other, should heed caution when attempting to reintegrate.

The war that started with a football 'nation' establishing identities for the greater 'nation', became integrated into the greater 'nation' they established. As a result, the football 'nation' has remained a violent actor in the name of the sovereignty for the nation-states.

Impact of football in the modern

The overall impact of what football has done to the Modern is complex and immeasurable. The media tends to focus on the violent aspects of the game, but it offers so much more. Turkey and Armenia are working on strengthening their relationship through football, In 2008 Turkey's President Abdullah Gul was the first political figure to

---

[307] "Serbia's Federation Urges Fans to Behave Responsibly at Match with Croatia," *Dalje*, September 2, 2013, http://dalje.com/en-sports/serbias-federation-urges-fans-to-behave-responsibly-at-match-with-croatia/481442.

visit Armenia for the purpose of attending a World Cup qualifier.[308] Armenia's leaders

were to repay the favor later in the year, making this event the first in their histories since

relations deteriorated over the contested Nagorno-Karabakh in the 20th century. Earlier in

2013, the same concept of diplomacy was used and employed by Turkish spectators, as

'firms' notorious for 'spectator violence' and hate for one another bonded together, taking

to the frontlines in demonstrations against President Erdoğan.[309] The 'firms' have the most

experience in dealing with riot police and therefore take it upon themselves to be at the

front; to shield the inexperienced protesters. To see several football 'nations' unite against

the government, demonstrates the unique dynamics of spectators with football. A similar

stunt can be found in Egypt at Tahrir Square in 2011, as al-Ahly shielded protesters from

the police.[310] In the same country, fans in Egypt are mourning the death of 74 individuals

whom were killed in an al-Masry/al-Ahly match, a year later in Port Said. [311] Fans are

willing to sacrifice themselves for their 'nation', a powerful concept that governments are

learning more about in recent protests and demonstrations. Mexico is also becoming

changed by the game, because their youth have recently affiliated themselves with

Argentinean influenced firms, bringing new dangers to the family environment the

football matches traditionally bring.[312] The game is a developing religion, violence may

---

[308]"Turkish-Armenian Relations: Football Diplomacy," *The Economist*, September 3, 2009,
http://www.economist.com/node/14380297.
[309] Fehim Taştekin, "Ultras: The Surprise Kids Of Turkey's Uprising," *Al-Monitor*, June 4, 2013,
http://www.al-monitor.com/pulse/originals/2013/06/instanbul-football-clubs-help-protesters.html.
[310] Ibid.
[311]Jon Leyne, "Egypt Football Clash Kills Scores," *BBC*, February 2, 2012, sec. Middle East,
http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-middle-east-16845841.
[312] Ioan Grillo, "Hooliganism Blossoms Under Aztec Sun," *Business Mexico* 14, no. 7 (July 2004): 42–44.

continue to be a part of it, but there is more to the game of football than the media hyped violence.

New developments in violence have brought changes in legislation and increased security protocols, but the game is ever-developing and does offer positive opportunities. One of these opportunities is a discussion for the creation of a Balkan football league between post-Yugoslavian states; a chance for bridging the gaps in the devastated societies.[313] One of the major elements for causing the outbreak of violence in the first place, may offer an opportunity for reconstruction.

Through research, it appears the United States are the only one's losing out on the opportunity for what football can offer. Participation in football is slowly beginning to grow, but the US continues to lack the media hype football gets elsewhere. Seattle and Portland offer two 'nations' slowly bringing fanaticism to football in America, but still the US has too many sports to follow and the big cities have several teams, diversifying interests in the greater American population. It is a unique study compared to the rest of the world who tend to have national and regional football teams and maybe one or two national sports, like England and Sri Lanka have cricket and Ireland, hurling. As Americans begin to become more fascinated with the World Cup, they will slowly begin to turn their attention to football and look at the rest of the world for the appropriate behavior of football spectators. As the Americans begin to adopt football into their

---

[313] "Two Decades after War Ended, Balkan Nations Mull Forming Regional Soccer League," *Fox News*, March 21, 2013, http://www.foxnews.com/world/2013/03/21/two-decades-after-war-ended-balkan-nations-mull-forming-regional-soccer-league/.

society, analysts have to ask if this adoption will take a violent form? Or remain rather peaceful in comparison to the legendary English 'hooligan'?

Using lessons and experiences from the past, politicians and scientists need to focus on utilizing football as a tool for future international developments. It continues to play a major role in the development of the modern today and has proved its durability as a tool in diverse fields such as diplomacy and commercialization. Once one has began to identify the football 'nation' as a legitimate entity, the right steps can be taken to take advantage of the full potential it offers.

CONCLUSION

Football has made a lasting mark on the world today, the pitch has aided in the development of globalization; in connecting the world through sports, international tournaments have brought fans across international borders; bearing their cultures and lifestyles, and a common passion for a universal game has linked people from all over the globe. The World Cup and the Olympics continue to be at the frontier of such opportunities, offering fans to be directly confronted with new ideas and perspectives. Besides bringing the world together through the collaboration of sport, football has also offered opportunities for diplomacy, state-building, identity construction, unification, and global markets. Unfortunately with these same opportunities, football also created an environment for violence, simultaneously playing a unique role in modern societies. The idea of the English 'hooligan' phenomenon has left a negative impact on the most passionate of supporters, creating prejudice of an individual's intensity, because of their emotional investment in the game, not just on those who express violent emotions, but those whose feelings for their team are powerful. Yet, as the Leicester school discovered, this passionate behavior is found all over the world. The English may have been the trendsetters, but 'spectator violence' is now a universal phenomenon. As measures are increased against this type of behavior, interactions between spectator, management, security, and external actors needs to be reinvestigated.

The term 'hooligan' is too vague to apply to violent behavior at football matches or any other sports event for that matter. The term 'spectator violence' is preferred, because it directly links to a sporting event and committed by an individual whom was either at the match or within the proximity of the stadium. There has always been a link with violence and sport. Armed guards on the streets of 16th century Florence present evidence for unruly crowd behavior. 'Hooliganism' is in no way a new phenomenon, it rather provides the role of labeling activity not acceptable to society. Forging a direct link between the phenomenon of 'hooliganism' and football will confuse future historians. It is a flawed movement that should not be considered when trying to study the violent behavior of spectators. The line between fan and 'hooligan' are too blurred, therefore definitions of spectator, fan, and 'spectator violence' were offered for more liable concise research. The investigation therefore becomes, what makes a spectator to become violent?

Johnan Galtung, John Burton, and Ted Gurr are forefathers in the field of conflict analysis. Their three models on violence are good podiums when beginning any sort of analysis on an individual's motif for violence. Galtung constructs a triangle with three vertices of direct, structural, and cultural violence. At the same time he offers ways to cure these three forms of violence and how they are extrapolated from an individual. Burton discusses how the denial of three basic human needs will cause individuals to become violent, these are security, identity, and recognition. Finally, Gurr offers a model on relative deprivation and how one's value expectations and value capabilities can lead to frustration, ultimately fulfilling the original proposed thesis of the Frustration-

142

Aggression hypothesis by Neal Miller; frustration causes aggression leading to violence. These three models for violence are the basic undertones for studying the violent behavior of individuals at sports venues. Many concepts and theories have been proposed on 'spectator violence', but models such as these, offer the potential roots of conflict. Many of the other materials on 'spectator violence' only examine the seeds that have sprung from the roots.

The violence portrayed by spectators has been considered in two lenses, either through the social problem approach or by the 'moral panic' approach. The social problem approach looks at the behavior of individuals from an analytical lens. Within three frameworks this work is examined; through an individual's desire to fight, the group dynamics pushing an individual into conflict, or by the societal factors outside the stadium; forcing the individual to release their stress through aggressive means. The latter framework consists of the post-modern theory, where the idea of violence through nationalism was originally obtained from; a transcendence of nationalism simultaneously constructs and satisfies visions of masculinity. In the 'moral panic' approach, constructivists use labels to achieve means. A tool primarily used by the media, 'moral panic' brings society's attention to a social problem, which may or may not actually be a problem. However, in the process of reporting on 'spectator violence', more 'spectator violence' was created resulting in the public to call for the dispersal of the constructed 'hooligan' social group. To disperse the 'hooligans' they first had to be identified. The attempt by the media and constructivists to label who the 'hooligans' were created the lens of the 'moral panic' approach.

143

Nationalism was talked about in both approaches, but was never analyzed in a deeper context. This paper explored the idea of 'nation-ness', a combination of the 'nation', nationalism, and nationality. In creating working definitions for 'nation'[314] and nationalism[315] and adopting Gellner's definition for nationality[316], a deeper connection could be formed between nationalism and violence. Nationalism was discussed in relation to three well constructed paradigms (modern, prennialism, primordialism) and a fourth rather more contemporary developing idea (ethno-symbolist). Our nationalism stems from the modern paradigm, but merges slightly with the ethno-symbolist idea. The result is the formation of the operationalized nationalism equation, where the *trigger* of violence at football matches can clearly be seen as nationalism.

A conclusion for 'spectator violence' as *the* trigger is drawn from the evidence of filling in the empty shells of the working nationalism equation. Through the application of nation-ness related fuel, the movement of nationalism as an ideology is concrete in its formation. The related fuel is used against a grievance, which in turn requires action towards an achievement. Whether or not the achievement is obtained makes no difference, but the desire to jump it as an obstacle is important for nationalism to exist. Without any such elements, nationalism does not exist, nor the 'nation'. The violence typically fills the empty shell of action, which is done in the defense of the resulting

[314] Our working definition of the 'nation' is: 'a group of people whom have voluntarily come together from a common history, shared culture, an attachment to territory of high value whom perceive themselves as a legitimate, sovereign, horizontal community; whose boundaries potentially overstretch the borders of states'.
[315] Our working definition of nationalism as an equation is: Fuel * Grievance + Action +/- Achievement = Nationalism
[316] Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism*. 56. Adopting Gellner's definition on nationality, it is, ' the homogenous units of people characterized by a common culture'.

144

football 'nation'. The passion invested into the football 'nation' is comparable to the investment devout individuals give to their religions. These elements were clearly noticeable through the Dinamo Zagreb - Red Star Belgrade riot.

In the 1990 case-study of Croatian and Serbian spectators, the phenomenon of 'nation-ness' is very applicable. The 'nation' was a motivator for national identity and became established through nationalism. The football 'nations' of Red Star and Dinamo embodied national identities of their greater nation-state. At the fall of Yugoslavia, Croatia and Serbia did not have many unifying factors for a national identity, therefore the football 'nations' became a beacon for progression. Although it was difficult to describe exactly what it meant to be Yugoslav, besides having Josip Tito as a ruler and living under its political authority, there was neither a solid identity for Croatians or Serbians. In the pursuit of nationalism, the football teams became 'nations' creating the greater 'nations' of Croatia and Serbia. The perseverance of the football 'nation' as the identity over a greater 'nation' was marked by the protests against President Tudjman's attempt to re-name Dinamo Zagreb to Croatia Zagreb. In some views, the identity of the football 'nation' for Croatia had more dominance than the national one. Violence began with the football 'nations' to mark sovereignty of their 'nation' over the other. In this extreme case-study, nationalism ideology was employed into the football 'nation', creating the greater 'nation'. Violence, was the passion invested into the football 'nation' for protecting its sovereignty from the opposing 'nation'.

This particular case-study is an excessive result of war in defense of the football 'nation', but it demonstrates the development of a national homogeneous identity through

145

already established football 'nations'. In this environment football is the big benefactor of such developments. Were this theory applied to the Soccer War of Honduras and El Salvador in 1969, very similar characteristics would be discovered. It is also applicable to regional interstate matches from Argentina to India, the football 'nation' is *the* trigger for 'spectator violence'. Whether violence in the name of a sporting 'nation' can be found in different sports remains unknown. Further research may demonstrate *the* trigger for violence at sports like baseball, boxing, cricket, and hurling is not the same as nationalism in the post-modern context. Comprehending if violence from nationalism is strictly limited to football or a more universal concept applicable to all sports allows for the right measures in security to be taken. In return, sporting events become a safer place for all peoples, but maintain the high passions establishing an exciting sports arena.

Research Perspectives

The above research only just begins to make strides for where future research should be conducted. The conclusion on the 'nation' as the origin for conflict opens up questions like, how does one identify the 'nation'? How can security measures be implemented to not disrupt the sovereignty of the 'nation'? The football 'nation' has a large following, but how does it become tied to the 'nation-state'? How does the football 'nation' help in promoting self-determination? If de facto states like Somaliland and Northern Cyprus were able to establish a greater football 'nation', what kind of impact will that have on the rest of the international community?

This paper offers working definitions for terms related to people at sports venues and the violence related to them, but they are not perfect; they are not complete. Careful analysis of how scientists wish to label actors involved in violence and those present at football matches is important for future research and reducing 'moral panic' from the media. Strategies also need to be developed for not over categorizing attendees, because of their looks, their dress, or their emotional reactions to events taking place on the pitch. Over generalizing attendees has created violence where it may have never existed. These individuals are representing their football 'nation', but when the police intervene during these times, the passion for the 'nation' may become extrapolated on the security forces. Further studies and analysis of these terms should be conducted on a universal scale and not strictly focused to one part of the world.

One of the more important questions from these findings is whether or not to call the football 'nation' a problem. It can't be generalized into a negative entity just due to the violence stemming from its being. There are peaceful members, just as there are the other extreme aggressive members. In this case, what needs to be examined is how a football 'nation' may or may not become manipulated. This desires examination of the football 'nation' in particular parts of the world, relating to racism and the allegations of particular politicians recruiting those football 'nations' for political objectives. How do some nations become more malleable then others? Are there particular factors in the societal environment making it prone to change?

Movements like nationalism remain modern, but the pending question is what was nationalism? What are its origins? How is it being used today in connection with

football and where is it going to be used in the future? In considering the post-modern theory of 'spectator violence', nationalism remains a constructed reality for transcending in the approval of masculinity. It is through the sovereignty of the 'nation' all spectator violence can be observed and implicated. Still, the overall concept of 'nation-ness' remains complex with the connection between the elements of nation, nationalism, and nationality, as generalized assumptions. This paper strengthens the argument for nationalism being the movement established for the 'nation', in turn creating nationality, but this phenomenon needs further examination and application.

This research has primarily been a discourse analysis of secondary sources. For strengthening this argument and had more time been acquired, an in depth quantitative analysis of 'spectator violence' from multiple countries throughout the world should be conducted. Depending on the condition of records and their accuracy, it may be interesting to look at how the violent engagements between fans took place and record all these numbers[317]. In creating sub-categories, particular engagements for being related back to nationalism or other factors, would create statistical proof of football violence from nationalism. Therefore, it would take further research for deciding which sub-categories of behavior could be linked to the football 'nation' and what other factors may stem elsewhere. This paper provides an answer for *the* trigger, the root of the problem. Still, there remain other factors that could contribute to a more violent 'nation', anywhere from alcohol to group dynamics or security protocols.

---

[317] Examples of these number include, the number of incidents in a week, number of arrests, number of injured, number of dead, a categorization of the incidents into sub-categories, and of course the same numbers from multiple countries.

A further analysis of the football 'nation' should also examine the 'moral panic' created by the media for discovering the effects of their narrations. Their voice is directly related to increasing the number of people participating within the 'hooligan' phenomenon and for increasing security crackdown and brutality on spectators. In examining the role of the media across the international community, studies on security measures like Euro2004 should be further conducted to learn more about the effects of a heavy police presence at sporting events, like football matches. These studies will create a safer environment for the spectator and bring stability to the parts of society that the violent spectator disrupts.

REFERENCES

Books

Anderson, Benedict R. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London; New York: Verso, 2006.

Appleby, R. Scott. "Introduction:Powerful Medicine." In *The Ambivalence of the Sacred: Religion, Violence, and Reconciliation*, 1–19. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2000.

Bairner, Alan. *Sport, Nationalism, and Globalization: European and North American Perspectives*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2001.

Calhoun, Craig J. *Nationalism*. University of Minnesota Press, 1997.

Colovic, Ivan. "Football, Hooligans, and War." In *The road to war in Serbia: Trauma and Catharsis*, edited by Nebojsa Popov, 373 – 396. Budapest; New York: Central European University Press, 2000.

Cook-Huffman, Celia. "The Role of Identity in Conflict." In *Handbook of Conflict Analysis and Resolution*, edited by Dennis J.D. Sandole, Sean Byrne, Ingrid Sandole-Staroste, and Jessica Senehi, 19–31. London: Routledge, 2010.

Dunning, Eric. *Sport Matters: Sociological Studies of Sport, Violence, and Civilization*. London; New York: Routledge, 1999.

Dunning, Eric, Patrick Murphy, and Ivan Waddington. "Towards a Sociological Understanding of Football Hooliganism as a World Phenomenon." In *Fighting Fans: Football Hooliganism as a World Social Problem*, edited by Eric Dunning, Patrick Murphy, Ivan Waddington, and Antonios E. Astrinakis. Dublin: University College Dublin Press, 2002.

Foer, Franklin. *How Soccer Explains the World: An Unlikely Theory of Globalization*. New York; Enfield: Harper Perennial, 2010.

Foucault, Michel. "Docile Bodies." In *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Random House, 1977.

Galtung, Johan. "Cultural Violence." In *Violence and Its Alternatives: An Interdisciplinary Reader*, edited by Manfred B. Steger and Nancy S. Lind. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999.

Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2008.

Giulianotti, Richard, Norman Bonney, and Mike Hepworth, eds. *Football, Violence and Social Identity*. London [u.a.: Routledge, 1994.

Gurr, Ted Robert. *Why Men Rebel*. Boulder, Colo.: Paradigm Pub., 2011.

Hobsbawm, E. J. *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. Cambridge [England]; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Kedourie, Elie. *Nationalism*. Oxford, UK; Cambridge, Mass., USA: Blackwell, 1993.

Kohn, Hans. *Nationalism, Its Meaning and History*. Malabar, FL: Krieger, 1982.

Kuper, Simon. *Soccer Against The Enemy: How the World's Most Popular Sport Starts and Stops Wars, Fuels Revolutions, and Keeps Dictators in Power*. New York, N.Y.: Nation Books, 2006.

Orwell, George. "The Sporting Spirit." In *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell*, 165–166. Secker & Warburg,, 1968.

Ramsbotham, Oliver, Hugh Miall, and Tom Woodhouse. *Contemporary Conflict Resolution: The Prevention, Management and Transformation of Deadly Conflicts*. Cambridge, UK; Malden, MA: Polity, 2011.

Robins, David. *We Hate Humans*. Milo Books Ltd, 2011.

Smith, Anthony D. *Nationalism*. 2nd ed. Bodmin, Cornwall: Polity Press, 2010.

Terrio, Susan J. *Judging Mohammed: Juvenile Delinquency, Immigration, and Exclusion at the Paris Palace of Justice*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2009.

Toft, Monica D., Daniel Philpott, and Timothy S. Shah. *God's Century: Resurgent Religion and Global Politics*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2011.

Journal Articles

Gellner, Ernest. "Nationalism." *Theory and Society* 10, no. 6 (November 1, 1981): 753–776. doi:10.2307/657332.

Gellner, Ernest. "Nationalism Reconsidered and E. H. Carr." *Review of International Studies* 18, no. 4 (October 1, 1992): 285–293. doi:10.2307/20097307.

Grillo, Ioan. "Hooliganism Blossoms Under Aztec Sun." *Business Mexico* 14, no. 7 (July 2004): 42–44.

Gurney, Joan Neff, and Kathleen J. Tierney. "Relative Deprivation and Social Movements: A Critical Look at Twenty Years of Theory and Research*." *Sociological Quarterly* 23, no. 1 (1982): 33–47. doi:10.1111/j.1533-8525.1982.tb02218.x.

Iliycheva, Maria. "'Faithful Until Death': Sports Fans and Nationalist Discourse in Bulgarian Internet Forums." *Polish Sociological Review* no. 151 (January 1, 2005): 251–270. doi:10.2307/41274930.

Kennedy, Dennis. "Sports and Shows: Spectators in Contemporary Culture." *Theatre Research International* 26, no. 03 (October 2001): 277–284. doi:10.1017/S0307883301000359.

King, Anthony. "The Postmodernity of Football Hooliganism." *The British Journal of Sociology* 48, no. 4 (December 1, 1997): 576–593. doi:10.2307/591597.

Lawrence, Geoffrey. "'The Gladiatorial Lust for Blood': The Media and Soccer Violence." *The Australian Quarterly* 57, no. 3 (October 1, 1985): 192–202. doi:10.2307/20635326.

Miller, Neal E. "The Frustration-aggression Hypothesis." *Psychological Review* 48, no. 4 (1941): 337–342. doi:10.1037/h0055861.

Miscevic, Nenad. "Close Strangers: Nationalism, Proximity and Cosmopolitanism." *Studies in East European Thought* 51, no. 2 (June 1, 1999): 109–125. doi:10.2307/20099699.

Nandy, Moti, and Shampa Banerjee. "Footaball and Nationalism." *India International Centre Quarterly* 17, no. 3/4 (December 1, 1990): 240–254. doi:10.2307/23002465.

Nolan-Haley, Jaqueline. "Self-Determination in International Mediation: Some Preliminary Reflections." *Benjamen N. Cardozo School of Law: Journal of Conflict Resolution* 7, no. 2 (Spring 2006): 277–288.

Pamir, Peri. "Nationalism, Ethnicity and Democracy: Contemporary Manifestations." *The International Journal of Peace Studies* 2, no. 2 (July 1997). http://www.gmu.edu/programs/icar/ijps/vol2_2/pamir.htm.

Rookwood, Joel, and Geoff Pearson. "The Hoolifan: Positive Fan Attitudes to Football 'hooliganism'." *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 47, no. 2 (January 4, 2012): 149–164. doi:10.1177/1012690210388455.

Russell, Gordon W. "Sport Riots: A Social–psychological Review." *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 9, no. 4 (July 2004): 353–378. doi:10.1016/S1359-1789(03)00031-4.

Stevenson, Thomas B., and Abdul Karim Alaug. "Football in Newly United Yemen: Rituals of Equity, Identity, and State Formation." *Journal of Anthropological Research* 56, no. 4 (December 1, 2000): 453–475. doi:10.2307/3630927.

Stott, Clifford, Otto Adang, Andrew Livingstone, and Martina Schreiber. "Tackling Football Hooliganism: A Quantitative Study of Public Order, Policing and Crowd Psychology." *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law* 14, no. 2 (May 2008): 115–141. doi:10.1037/a0013419.

Tsoukala, Anastassia. "Boundary-creating Processes and the Social Construction of Threat." *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 33, no. 2 (January 4, 2008): 137–152. doi:10.1177/030437540803300202.

Ward Jr., Russell E. "Fan Violence: Social Problem or Moral Panic?" *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 7, no. 5 (September 2002): 453–475. doi:10.1016/S1359-1789(01)00075-1.

Wirth, Louis. "The Sociology of Ferdinand Tonnies." *American Journal of Sociology* 32, no. 3 (November 1, 1926): 412–422. doi:10.2307/2765542.

News Articles

"40 Injured as Mohun Bagan-East Bengal Derby Called Off." *The Times Of India*. September 12, 2012. http://articles.timesofindia.indiatimes.com/2012-12-09/i-league/35704646_1_bagan-players-mohun-bagan-okolie-odafa.

"A Never-ending Story of Cultural Disputes Between Indonesia and Malaysia." *The Jakarta Post*. June 18, 2012, sec. National. http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2012/06/18/a-never-ending-story-cultural-disputes-between-indonesia-and-malaysia.html.

Alexandrova, Lyudmila. "Stadium Violence: New Law on Fans Should Put End to Disorders." *Russia & India Report*, July 29, 2013. http://indrus.in/society/2013/07/29/stadium_violence_new_law_on_fans_should_put _end_to_disorders_27717.html.

Belson, Ken. "Word for Word/Japanese Etiquette Tips; English 101: How to Handle A Thirsty, Big-Bodied Soccer Fan." *New York Times*, June 2, 2002. http://www.nytimes.com/2002/06/02/weekinreview/word-for-word-japanese-etiquette-tips-english-101-handle-thirsty-big-bodied.html.

Burns, John F. "British Government Apologizes for Blaming Victims in 1989 Hillsborough Disaster." *The New York Times*, September 12, 2012, sec. Sports / Soccer. http://www.nytimes.com/2012/09/13/sports/soccer/britain-apologizes-for-blaming-victims-in-hillsborough-disaster.html.

Duncan, John. "Social Change: Give'em a Good Talking To;." *The Guardian Society*, September 27, 1995. Lexis Nexis Academic. http://www.lexisnexis.com.mutex.gmu.edu/hottopics/lnacademic/.

Elder, Mariam. "Pussy Riot Sentenced to Two Years in Prison Colony over anti-Putin Protest." *The Guardian*. August 17, 2012. http://www.theguardian.com/music/2012/aug/17/pussy-riot-sentenced-prison-putin.

Fernandez, Manny. "Texas Secession Movement Unbowed by White House Rejection." *The New York Times*, January 15, 2013, sec. U.S. / Politics. http://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/16/us/politics/texas-secession-movement-unbowed-by-white-house-rejection.html.

"Fifa Approves New Racism Crackdown." *BBC*, May 31, 2013, sec. Sport/Football. http://www.bbc.co.uk/sport/0/football/22728162.

Fowler, Dave. "Football, Blood and War." *The Observer*, January 18, 2004. http://observer.theguardian.com/osm/story/0,,1123137,00.html.

"Hillsborough Disaster and Its Aftermath." *BBC*, December 19, 2012, sec. England. http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-19545126.

Howland-Jackson, Rupert. "La Iglesia Maradoniana – Argentina's Real Religion?" *The Argentina Independent*, December 1, 2008. http://www.argentinaindependent.com/life-style/undergroundba/la-iglesia-maradoniana-argentinas-real-religion/.

Hundley, Tom. "More Than a Game, Soccer Is a Religion." *Chicago Tribune*. June 4, 2006. http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2006-06-04/news/0606040375_1_world-cup-soccer-top-two-teams.

Leyne, Jon. "Egypt Football Clash Kills Scores." *BBC*, February 2, 2012, sec. Middle East. http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-middle-east-16845841.

"Serbia's Federation Urges Fans to Behave Responsibly at Match with Croatia." *Dalje*, September 2, 2013. http://dalje.com/en-sports/serbias-federation-urges-fans-to-behave-responsibly-at-match-with-croatia/481442.

Stevenson, Peter. "Football Hooligans with a Record to Be Banned from Matches." *Cyprus Mail*. August 1, 2013. http://cyprus-mail.com/2013/08/01/football-hooligans-with-a-record-to-be-banned-from-matches/.

Taştekin, Fehim. "Ultras: The Surprise Kids Of Turkey's Uprising." *Al-Monitor*. June 4, 2013. http://www.al-monitor.com/pulse/originals/2013/06/instanbul-football-clubs-help-protesters.html.

Thomas, Jo. "British Soccer Fan: Why So Warlike?" *The New York Times*. May 31, 1985, sec. World. http://www.nytimes.com/1985/05/31/world/british-soccer-fan-why-so-warlike.html.

Traynor, Ian. "Serbian Thugs Are the Toys of Nationalist and Neo-fascist Leaders." *The Guardian*, October 13, 2010. http://www.theguardian.com/football/blog/2010/oct/13/serbia-hooligans-italy-riot.

"Two Decades after War Ended, Balkan Nations Mull Forming Regional Soccer League." *Fox News*, March 21, 2013. http://www.foxnews.com/world/2013/03/21/two-decades-after-war-ended-balkan-nations-mull-forming-regional-soccer-league/.

Xuereb, Matthew. "Croatian Hooligans Banned from Entering Malta Again." *Times of Malta*, August 2, 2008. http://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20080802/local/croatian-hooligans-banned-from-entering-malta-again.219154.

Online Articles

Beith, Malcolm, and Stefan Theil. "Football's Big Fear; Chased from Matches, Hooligans Now Tend to Look for 'Off Site' Fights. But the Cup Is a Big Target." *Newsweek Magazine*, August 5, 2006. http://www.thedailybeast.com/newsweek/2006/05/07/football-s-big-fear.html.

Gehrz, Chris. "Soccer and Nationalism." *The Pietist Schoolman*, July 2, 2012.
    http://pietistschoolman.com/2012/07/02/soccer-and-nationalism/.

Israely, Jeff, Bruce Crumley, and Hugh Porter. "SOCCER FANS: Out of Control In
    Europe." *Time*, December 17, 2004.
    http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1009612,00.html.

Karolyi, P.T. "Way More Than a Game: Football in Israel." Wordpress. *Arab Association
    for Human Rights*, November 8, 2012.
    http://arabhra.wordpress.com/2012/11/08/way-more-than-a-game-football-in-israel/.

"Milwall Fans Slammed after Vile Chants at Derby County About Mick and Mairead
    Philpott." *SWNS*. Accessed August 21, 2013. http://swns.com/news/milwall-fans-
    slammed-vile-chants-derby-county-mick-mairead-philpott-35042/.

Missiroli, Antonio. "European Football Cultures and Their Integration: The'short'
    Twentieth Century." *Institute For Security Studies (ISS)*, June 1, 2002.
    http://www.iss.europa.eu/publications/detail/article/european-football-cultures-and-
    their-integration-theshort-twentieth-century/.

"Oromo." *Unrepresented Nations and Peoples Organization*, March 25, 2008.
    http://www.unpo.org/members/7917.

Skvorc, Boris. "The Question of Yugoslav Cultural Identity: An Artificial Problem."
    Faculty of Arts. *Macquerie University*, 1995.
    http://www.mq.edu.au/about_us/faculties_and_departments/faculty_of_arts/departm
    ent_of_international_studies/european_languages_and_cultures/croatian/review/the_
    question_of_yugoslav_cultural_identity_an_artificial_problem/.

"Turkish-Armenian Relations: Football Diplomacy." *The Economist*, September 3, 2009.
    http://www.economist.com/node/14380297.

Vickery, Tim. "River Plate v Boca Juniors - Where Has the Magic Gone?" BBC. *Tim
    Vickery's Blog*, October 29, 2012.
    http://www.bbc.co.uk/blogs/timvickery/2012/10/river_plate_v_boca_juniors_-
    _w.html.

Video Clips

Hoffman, Alex. *Rivals: Rangers and Celtic*. Glasgow, Scotland: Vice, 2012.
    http://www.vice.com/rivals/rangers-celtic-part-1.

BIOGRAPHY

Nicholas Van Woert graduated from Hilton Head Island High School from Hilton Head Island, South Carolina in 2007. He received his Bachelor of Arts in history from Winthrop University in 2011, with a minor in social sciences. Before taking on his master program within the partnership of George Mason University and The University of Malta, Nicholas spent a year in Charlotte, North Carolina gathering his thoughts together for what his future academic career would consist of. While working at a small town brewery, Nicholas discovered his passions in interdisciplinary study and international human security.