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Abstract

This thesis uses football as a case study to examine the identities of working-class boys and men in post-war Britain. As the most popular spectator sport in England for over a century, with a widely recognised status as a site for the expression, and tool in the construction, of collective loyalties and identities, football and the discourses around it provide a valuable window into working-class culture. Through the examples of Merseyside and North East football fans, this thesis re-evaluates the extent of cultural change in the post-war era, by demonstrating the persistence of long-standing traditions and bases of identification in relation to class, gender, age and place. It also, however, challenges popular and academic understandings of such traditional culture by presenting a complex narrative of coexisting and conflicting identities that differ from stereotypical images of the ‘working man’s game’.

Drawing on a combination of retrospective personal testimonies from football fans and post-war public and press discourses, this thesis contributes to a number of debates that have emerged in existing historiographical literature of this period. Firstly, it builds on attempts to dispute the findings and predictions of contemporary social commentators over the impact of affluence on traditional working-class lifestyles, values and identities, by revealing the continuation of older community attachments and practices among football fans. Additionally, it intervenes in discussions of the emergence of ‘youth’ as a distinctive basis of identification capable of overriding identities associated with class, masculinity and place, or else as the subject of adult moral panic and a source of generational rupture and conflict. This thesis, in contrast, argues that football provided a means of inter-generational cooperation. The transmission of cultural values and identities across age groups, which football enabled, further emphasises the idea of cultural continuity presented throughout. This builds on growing historiographical reappraisals of the mythologised ‘swinging sixties’ as a decade of revolution.
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Introduction

The significance of class, masculinity, nation and generation to identities are widely debated topics within modern British historiography, and this thesis uses football to explore these themes. As a pastime primarily enjoyed by large numbers of working-class men across their life course, at least until the late-twentieth-century commercialisation of the game, football spectatorship is a useful case study to examine the ways in which class, gender, age and place informed men’s identities in post-war Britain, and therefore to bring together the disparate historiographical debates surrounding them. Underlying this study is an attempt to reassess the nature and extent of working-class cultural change in this era.

The issue of class in post-war Britain has largely centred on the contested impact of affluence and improved living standards on ‘traditional’ working-class culture and identities, as defined by contemporary social commentators such as Richard Hoggart, John Goldthorpe and Mark Abrams. Part of the landscape of ‘traditional’ working-class culture, Hoggart contrasted professional football support with the ‘candyfloss world’ of post-war consumerism and youth culture, characterised by newer leisure activities that were less indicative of collective loyalties and an ‘authentic’ culture. Although the extent to which football was separate from such consumerism is questionable, as an example of an older leisure habit that was viewed as intrinsic to working-class life, it is able to contribute to historiographical revision of the extent to which working-class lifestyles and cultural values altered substantially.

---

2 Hoggart, Uses of Literacy, p. 157.
in post-war Britain as a result of high employment levels, improved welfare provision and the increased accessibility of consumer goods. However, by interrogating this association and deconstructing the various meanings of football to working-class fans – including the appeal of football-related consumption and commercialising processes – football can also contribute to an interrogation of the ‘cultural stereotypes about “working-classness”’ and the ‘hypermasculine culture centred around the trade union, working men’s club, allotment, and football field’ upon which Hoggart and his contemporaries relied in order to stress the novelty of post-war developments.

Equally, as a cross-generational leisure activity, to which boys were introduced at a young age and remained engaged in throughout their lives, football support counters popular images of post-war cultural revolution and generational rupture, epitomised by the ‘swinging sixties’ of popular music, student protest, fashion and permissiveness, with origins in a 1950s ‘affluent society’. Dominic Sandbrook attributes this imagery to ‘extremely close attention to the affairs of a minority of well-educated, relatively affluent young people, precisely those people

---


most likely to become writers, publishers, historians and so on’, and David Fowler similarly challenges the version of the 1960s according to ‘middle-class “with it” journalists and academics’, thus questioning its relevance to the experiences of the majority of people.

Alternatively, historiographical interest has focused on moral panics surrounding minorities of ‘deviant’ young people and youth subcultures to emphasise generational conflict. A study of football supporters, in contrast, provides insight into a longer-term masculine working-class culture, shared by younger and older community members, and including the ‘silent majority’ of non-deviant post-war British youth, rather than a site for the expression of new or distinctively youth cultures.

This focus on ‘highly visible’ or exceptional incarnations has also dominated studies of masculinity in post-war Britain, whereby attention to the gender ideologies discernible in the youthful subcultures most likely to be the subject of moral panic has obscured the experiences of ordinary working-class men. Furthermore, as recognised by Michael Roper in 2005, there has been an unequal focus on ‘external codes and

---


structures’ and predominant ‘representations’ of masculinity at the expense of ‘masculine subjectivity’ and men’s experience and performance of gender identities, which has further encouraged this interest in the well-publicised and arguably exceptional versions of masculinity typified by, for example, the ‘Angry Young Men’ literature of the late 1950s and early 1960s. This thesis, in contrast, aims to follow the approach advocated by Roper, Celia Hughes and others in capturing ‘the lived experience of masculinity’ and the ways in which ‘men understand and use the “scripts” that prescribe and describe manliness’. Hughes, for example, relied on oral history interviews with former political activists to explore the relationship between ‘masculine codes of Trotskyism’ and young men’s ‘felt experiences’ and ‘social behaviour’, whilst Roper has demonstrated how the psychological and emotional impact of the First World War ‘challenged traditional ideals of the “soldier hero”’. By similarly recognising ‘the sometimes ragged fit between experience and representation’, this thesis presents a more complex image of working-class masculinity than that based on rebellion, aggression and physical toughness as has been propagated in studies of male youth subcultures and readings of the Angry Young Men genre.

---


In attempting to elucidate the masculine identities of ordinary boys and men, the use of a traditionally male-dominated leisure site such as the football stadium enables this thesis to depart from dominant historiographical narratives of male domesticity in post-war Britain. Although the home-centred versions of working-class masculinity analysed by historians such as Laura King, Claire Langhamer and Martin Francis would have informed the identities of football fans, as Alexander Jackson has argued in his study of the consumption of football memorabilia, this thesis largely focuses on the matchday experiences that emerge as significant in fans’ memories, and the stadium as important site for the learning and performance of masculine identities through male sociability.¹⁴

Langhamer and Collins have argued that traditionally male dominated leisure sites became less strictly gender-demarcated in post-war Britain, and that socialising between men and women was an increasingly important rite of passage and was influential in negotiating gender identities.¹⁵ The extent to which football offered a comparable opportunity for male-female socialising is contested by the differing views on the scale and significance of a female presence at football grounds, and female voices do not feature prominently in this thesis, as they are underrepresented in the source material drawn upon, which is potentially indicative of the relatively small number of women who attended football matches in this era.


small proportion of the post-war crowd that was made up of women.\textsuperscript{16} However, it is not an intention of this thesis to contribute to the popular and academic ‘invisibilization’ of women identified by Stacey Pope, who argues that some women were ‘active’ football fans in the post-war era and that football had comparable significance to their identities as well as to men’s.\textsuperscript{17} Indeed, there are occasions when women emerge as key facilitators of male football support, as opposed to the accounts of post-war domestication wherein women drew men away from the stadium, as more men ‘took heed of their womenfolk’s interests’ and women had greater ‘say in the way their menfolk spent their free time’.\textsuperscript{18} Therefore, whilst the focus of this thesis is on football’s role in the process of becoming a man, and its opportunities for male sociability meant it was an important site for men to construct and perform their masculine identities in relation to other men, it attempts to move beyond stereotypical images of sex segregation and female exclusion as principal components of football’s traditional meaning to working-class masculinities. It does so primarily by deconstructing the masculine discourses in football journalism and fans’ memories, and by analysing male fans’ subjective responses to such doctrines, but also by acknowledging a potential role for women beyond that of absentees, restrictors of men’s attendance, or part of football’s late-twentieth-century ‘feminisation’.\textsuperscript{19}


Nevertheless, the substantial proportion of the working-class male population attending football matches in this era make it a valuable opportunity to analyse the discursive construction and negotiation of their masculine working-class identities, as opposed to more marginal activities, or activities that have not tended to incite the kind of public and vociferous discussion by participants and contemporary commentators that has accompanied football support. Furthermore, as this thesis argues, it is through football that many working-class men learned to identify with and express loyalty towards broader collectives such as the nation or locality, which is important in understanding popular responses to and participation in the construction of ‘the people’ and definitions of English national character.  

**British Football and Identity**

Despite such potential significance, football rarely features in the key historiographical treatments of and debates surrounding post-war Britain, and sports history is often perceived as a sub-discipline for specialist historians and journals or an area of greater interest to sociological and cultural studies departments. For example, Selina Todd’s recent work on *The People* makes scarce mention of ‘the people’s game’, whilst Paul Ward suggests that sport’s significance to cultural life in Britain has been exaggerated, and that sports history’s exclusion from the

---


historiographical mainstream has been ‘self-imposed through too often publishing in specialist sports journals’, a tendency towards ‘indulgence’ at the expense of ‘quality’, and a reluctance to ‘address the needs of other historians’.

Equally, sports historians have asked whether their topic constitutes “another discrete historical ghetto where fans with typewriters practice their esoteric craft with little contact with the historical mainstream”. Ross McKibbin explains a lack of mainstream historiographical engagement with sport as a symptom of the difficulties inherent in conceptualising its meanings, with ‘little agreement as to what exactly is “sport” and what precisely are the emotions, satisfactions and disappointments that are involved in it.’ He also cites the rise of cultural history, with its ‘emphasis on linguistic and discursive analysis’, as an academic trend that ‘does not readily lend itself to the study of sport’.

Cultural history approaches have, however, been influential in a shift in focus away from the social histories of football emerging in the 1970s and 1980s, which treated sport as a reflection of society and sought to examine the influence of broader political, social and economic contexts on popular spectator sports such as football.

Increasingly, there has been an emphasis on sports as ‘cultural agencies with a power to work on their participants and consumers ideologically’, or as ‘texts’ with

---


empirically discernable cultural meanings to spectators. Consequently, the study of football history in Britain has paralleled a more general historiographical concern with identities since the 1990s, but this trend has risked undermining the earlier attention to football’s broader contextual relevance, prompting calls for a shift away from ‘thinking about “sports history” to talking of sports “in history”’. 

Martin Johnes’ work on football’s relationship to the wider social, cultural and political context of inter-war Wales is particularly effective in presenting an image of the physical and emotional experiences of football fans, whilst demonstrating their reliance on historically specific values and ideologies. For example, he examines the relationship between sport and unemployment in the 1930s, the efforts of the labour movement in Wales to harness sport, the impact of transport improvements in encouraging the expression of national identity through club football, and the influence of changing working-class social norms on crowd behaviour. Elsewhere, however, an emphasis on football’s legitimacy as a topic or historical agent in its own right, with its own associated micro-identities, has limited football history’s intervention into wider debates about class, masculinity, place and age.

Although important as a site for the learning and expression of identities, studying football supporters’ identities in isolation raises the question of whether fans

---


constitute, for example, “ninety minute patriots”, or whether, as historian Dave Russell argues, their football-related identities are relevant to other aspects of their lives and more general historical contexts. Recent scholarship on football and identity in England has endeavoured to affirm Russell’s contention, treating the game as an example of Eric Hobsbawm’s ‘invented traditions’, wherein occasions such as the FA Cup final and its ceremonial aspects become imbued with national significance that encourage a sense of nationhood. Football has also been treated as a vehicle for what Michael Billig terms ‘banal nationalism’, which is particularly applicable to press coverage of international football and its tendency to ‘flag’ markers of national distinctiveness, whilst the experience of shared hopes and disappointments through watching the English national team also serve to reinforce an English ‘imagined community’.


In such work, football emerges as both an agent in constructing and expressing identities, and as a reflection of broader cultural understandings of such identities. This approach, however, is limited by its focus on the ideological content of football and football-related ‘texts’, which risks ‘ascribing’ to the audience certain responses’, such as the imagining of the nation through its personification by the national football team, and thus neglecting ‘the different cultural perspectives brought to the spectacle by the members of the audience’.  

Although scholars have been sensitive towards such different perspectives, notably with respect to the interplay of local and regional identities with ideologies of nationhood, or women’s relationship to or exclusion from male-dominated sports such as football, this work often seeks to provide exceptions to conventional wisdom about the identities football constructs and expresses. In contrast, this thesis aims to historicise such wisdom with reference to ‘the average fan’ to whom historians ascribe these identities, rather than drawing on minorities of exceptional groups. In doing so, it challenges stereotypical images of football as the ‘working man’s game’ and its meaning to working-class men’s identities, which largely centre on late-twentieth and early-twenty-first century nostalgia for a mythologised ‘golden age’ in response to English football’s 1990s commercialisation and related fears over its

embourgeoisement and feminisation, a relationship that is interrogated in greater detail in Chapter One.

Historiographical treatments of this ‘golden age’ have generally focused on establishing or contesting the chronological parameters of the ‘highpoint’ of football’s status as ‘the people’s game’, whereas this thesis questions the extent to which its supposed attributes corresponded with or informed broader cultures of working-class masculinity. By avoiding ascribing the meaning of football-related practices and developments to working-class boys and men, as well as demonstrating their diversity and complexity, the case study of football fans enables interrogation of more general popular and academic understandings of ‘traditional’ working-class culture.

To a large extent, historiography on the relationship between professional football and class-based identity has centred on its late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century context, in which the issue of working-class agency versus middle-class ownership of football clubs has been of principal concern. Stephen Tischler argued

---


37 Research carried out by Wray Vamplew and Tony Mason established this socio-economic characterisation of early professional football club shareholding and governance. See Vamplew, *Pay
in the 1980s that football was never a working-class game ‘in anything other than a superficial sense’, and instead served the middle-class purpose of preserving ‘the basic relationships of society’ by providing an outlet for potentially disorderly or revolutionary working-class frustrations with industrial capitalism, which corresponded with a more general historiographical association between commercial leisure and social control in the 1970s and 1980s.  

In contrast, historians such as Stephen Jones and John Hargreaves could discern working-class agency and creativity in the adaptation and investment of middle-class controlled leisure activities with particular working-class meanings, such as football fans’ rejection of ‘the bourgeois athleticist tradition’ and creation of a ‘popular theatre’ out of the ostensibly passive activity of buying a ticket and watching a match. In this way, football support could be understood as encouraging and personifying a ‘wider sense of difference between “us” and “them”’ for working-class men. However, as Patrick Joyce argues, ‘because manual workers chose to wear cloth caps and support football teams it does not follow that they saw the social order

---


in terms of class’.\textsuperscript{41} Equally, such an approach neglects the sense of difference between members of a working-class ‘us’ based on age, locality and income, as well as a potential overlap in terms of working-class and lower-middle-class leisure patterns.\textsuperscript{42}

Given such difficulties in assessing football’s impact on class-related identities and the significance of internal distinctions and divisions, class has become less central to British football historiography, but it predominates in anthropological and sociological discussions of the English Premier League context. The impact of recent commercialisation and stadium redevelopment on older forms of working-class ‘terrace culture’, which Chapter One discusses in further detail, have raised the older issues of fans’ agency, but with ‘social exclusion’ replacing ‘social control’ as the centre of debate.\textsuperscript{43} Anthony King’s research into 1990s Manchester United fans suggests that their masculine identities hinged on imagined notions of being a ‘traditional’ working-class fan, appealing to ‘the caricatured figure of the Woodbine-smoking, flat-cap wearing spectator’ to distinguish themselves from more affluent, modern ‘consumers’ of football, and to defend a style of support that did not correspond with such caricatures historically.\textsuperscript{44} Rex Nash similarly implied the imagined nature of appeals to working-class tradition in highlighting the middle-class

\textsuperscript{42} For this argument against a generalised ‘traditional working-class culture’, see Andrew Davies and Stephen Fielding (eds.), \textit{Workers’ Worlds: Cultures and Communities in Manchester and Salford, 1880-1939}, (Manchester, 1992).
socio-economic positions of fans opposing the game’s modernisation.\textsuperscript{45} This work indicates the necessity of interrogating such appeals to traditional working-class values, which sports historians have hitherto been reluctant to do, instead seeking to demonstrate football’s historical ‘working-classness’ with examples of its ability to reflect similarly stereotypical values.\textsuperscript{46}

Football historiography related to the pre-1950s era has established a strong correlation between manual labour, local industrial heritage, and working-class masculinities, in which football support was integral to the identities of, for example, ‘the horny-handed in the shipyards’.\textsuperscript{47} However, such a correlation has thus far received considerably less attention in light of post-war socio-economic and cultural developments, particularly the changing association between class categories and occupation, and the emergence of youth as a key basis of identification. Indeed, although there are several popular histories of football since 1945, notably that of John Williams and Andrew Ward, academic literature covering football between the end of the Second World War and the emergence of hooliganism as a social problem of widespread concern in the late 1960s and 1970s is relatively sparse.\textsuperscript{48} Long-term accounts of British football sketch a period of national and cross-class ‘respectability’ in the 1950s, followed by the game’s decline in terms of reputation and ‘traditional’ characteristics.\textsuperscript{49} Martin Johnes and Gavin Mellor have more thoroughly interrogated

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{46} For example, Holt, ‘Heroes of the North’; Phelps, ‘The Southern Football Hero’.
\bibitem{48} Andrew Ward and John Williams, \textit{Football Nation: Sixty Years of the Beautiful Game}, (London, 2009).
\end{thebibliography}
notions of football’s respectability in their study of the 1953 FA Cup Final, arguing that the ‘consensus and unity’ it represented were mitigated by persistent class divisions and distinctions.  

Mellor has also questioned the socio-economic homogeneity of north-western football crowds in the 1940s and 1950s, but there is no consensus as to whether grounds became more diverse than before the Second World War, only that newspapers increasingly represented them as ‘places to be seen’ for more affluent social groups. The potential reasons why they did so, and the impact of such representations on working-class fans, require further investigation in relation to the broader issues of debate about the extent of changes in working-class culture and identities in post-war Britain. Furthermore, other changes within the game during the period such as the abolition of the maximum wage for footballers in 1961, the growth in support for ‘big’ clubs, the emergence of regular European club football competition, and the increasing significance of hooliganism, also have ramifications for such debates in terms of their media representation and internalisation by fans.

Nicholas Fishwick’s influential account of football’s role in English society, although ending in 1950, introduces many of the post-war themes covered in this thesis, such as the role of the press in encouraging supporters’ identification with clubs, and the effects of long-term commercialising processes, wherein ‘spectators

---

were in a sense the consumers of a product’ with an interest in ‘value for money’. Reference to this work enables this thesis to argue for continuity in terms of football’s relationship to working-class men’s identities, as well as its understanding of commercialisation as a more gradual process than late-twentieth-century discourses and popular memory have suggested. Equally, Johnes’ study of football in inter-war Wales highlights the long-term nature of the identities with which this thesis is concerned, which supports this thesis’ attempt to revise the extent to which the post-war years, and the 1960s in particular, witnessed extensive changes in working-class cultures. In the post-war context, Williams’ *Passing Rhythms* has demonstrated the ‘processual manifestations’ of some of the spectator cultures highlighted in this thesis, and relates them to the specific historical and cultural life of Liverpool, but it is necessary to build on this work in establishing clearer connections between football and broader historical and national developments through such local studies.

**Sources and Methodology**

Through the use of two northern cities as case studies, this thesis counters London-centric notions of the 1960s as ‘swinging’, and builds on growing historiographical reassessments of this period that have also largely focused on the capital. As well as contrasting with London-based versions of the ‘swinging sixties’, as two northern port city-regions associated with traditional male-dominated manual

---

occupations, Liverpool and Newcastle also provide appropriate case studies to interrogate the stereotypical masculinities of ‘the archetypal proletarian’ associated with heavy industry and occupational communities.\textsuperscript{55} Furthermore, both areas have traditionally been associated with distinctive regional and civic identities, which is an important aspect of this study.\textsuperscript{56}

Although the chronological parameters of this thesis encompass the 1950s and 1970s, the predominant focus is on the 1960s, in order to interrogate the aforementioned myths associated with this decade in popular memory and academic representations, as well as to examine more mainstream cultures of working-class masculinity than historians of this era have tended to focus on. Furthermore, the 1960s witnessed several football-related developments such as the abolition of the maximum wage and the staging of World Cup matches in England, which emerge as important in the memories and identities of football fans during the course of this thesis. Nevertheless, in order to challenge the image of the 1960s as revolutionary and representing a sharp break with the past, it is necessary to refer to the preceding and subsequent decades, rather than drawing clear distinctions between, for example, ‘1950s affluence, tradition and stability on the one hand, and 1960s rebellion, sexual revolution and social upheaval on the other’.\textsuperscript{57} As David Kynaston argues, ‘many of the issues for which the 1960s have been praised or blamed were already the subject


\textsuperscript{57} Wills, ‘Delinquency, Masculinity and Citizenship’, p. 159.
of public debate in the late 1940s and early 1950s.\textsuperscript{58} Equally, the focus on the 1960s in this thesis demonstrates the continuation of the ‘shared values, respect for authority, social cohesion, community, consensus, meat and two veg suburbanism and, above all, happy families’ associated with the 1950s.\textsuperscript{59}

As well as the 1950s, this thesis also deviates from its main preoccupation with the 1960s in order to examine the extent to which subsequent decades have influenced popular and individual accounts of the 1960s. Mark Donnelly has criticised ‘the “sixties never mattered that much” revisionism’ of recent historiography, arguing that it is necessary to ‘ask how and why contending readings of the sixties gained authority at particular times.’\textsuperscript{60} Consequently, this thesis draws on 1970s and 1980s discourses around the issue of football hooliganism in order to examine one such lens through which the 1960s are remembered and contrasted with more positively, primarily in Chapter Three. Also, the evocation of the 1960s in the post-1990s context of Premier League football, which is the basis of discussion in Chapter One, provides a further examination of the nostalgia with which this decade has been recalled.

The issue of nostalgia and the influence of subsequent periods and present concerns are significant to the use of personal testimonies, which this thesis relies upon. Historians have thoroughly discussed the problems associated with relying on retrospective and oral accounts, such as the unreliability of memory, the influence of public and collective memory on individual accounts, and the significance of the context in which the testimonies are produced in influencing their accounts of the

\textsuperscript{60} Mark Donnelley, \textit{Sixties Britain: Culture, Society, Politics}, (London, 2005), pp. xii.
The influence of public and contextual considerations is particularly pertinent in relation to football fans’ retrospective evidence, given the substantially altered state of the game after 1992 and the discursive construction of such shifts in terms of a lost terrace culture, as Chapter One demonstrates. Furthermore, the demonisation of football fans from the 1970s and 1980s, as typified by the media coverage of disasters such as Hillsborough and Heysel, also impacts upon supporters’ retrospective accounts and potentially heightens their sense of nostalgia for the 1960s.

Penny Summerfield argues that personal testimonies’ disparities with historical ‘facts’ form an important subject in their own right, and recalling and reconstructing past experiences is an integral component of identification. The ways in which ‘prevailing discursive constructions of the past “contaminate” memory, in the sense that they overlay it with later accounts and interpretations’, are of particular pertinence with respect to football, which is and has long been the subject of intense public discussion. However, such public accounts and the attempts by individuals to relate their stories to them enable the construction of a ‘contemporary consciousness’ within which social and cultural identities can be constituted, and in which remembering the past is a central component, and this thesis takes a similar view of football fans’ memories.

---

62 Chapter One discusses these issues in greater detail.
64 Summerfield, ‘Culture and Composure’.
Rather than conducting new interviews, the personal testimonies upon which this thesis is based are taken from published oral history collections including *The Kop: Liverpool’s Twelfth Man*, which was originally published in 1992 when the stand in Liverpool’s Anfield stadium after which it is named was about to be demolished, and *Three Sides of the Mersey*, based on interviews conducted between 1992 and 1993. Both of these collections initially drew on the authors’ contacts among supporters associations who then recommended others for interviewing, which arguably limits their samples to the kind of ‘active’ supporters likely to join such associations. However, it also enabled a reduction in the kind of formality that hampers some oral history interviews, given that some respondents knew the interviewers personally, and that some of Stephen Kelly’s sources for *The Kop* were drawn from acquaintances in the unofficial Liverpool Supporters’ Club bar on match days. Encouraging interviewees to feel relaxed was also an aim of the authors’ decision to conduct the majority of their interviews in the respondents’ home or office, which oral history practitioners have cited as preferable locations for interviewing.

The interviews contained in *Three Sides of the Mersey* were broadcast on Liverpool’s Radio City station before the book was published and funding for the project was provided by the radio channel, which potentially incorporated the interests of commercial entertainment into the selection of stories, as well as encouraging

---


interviewees to select the memories they deemed to be of greatest public interest. Equally, *The Kop* was edited so as to include accounts that had ‘a relevance to issues being raised’ and an ability ‘to describe specific aspects’ chosen by the author.\(^7^0\)

Despite such influences, these works are valuable for their capturing of memories deemed to be of importance to other fans. Other collections used in this thesis include *Tales from the Gwladys Street*, which contains stories from Everton fans compiled by other fans, and *Newcastle United: Magpie Memories*, which was similarly produced by fans of the club in the late 1990s.\(^7^1\) The Everton Collection oral history project contains interviews conducted by volunteers in 2010, as part of a wider project to advance ‘the education of the public in the history and social impact of Everton Football Club’ through the collection and display of club-related artefacts at Liverpool Records office, much of which has been digitised and is available online.\(^7^2\)

The interviews were largely conducted at Liverpool Central Library, and several of the interviewers were also interviewees, which, although narrowing the sample group, facilitates the kind of social interaction that is recognised as one of the strengths of using personal testimonies as source material, when storytelling is viewed as a performance contingent on audience.\(^7^3\) This thesis also makes use of collections of interviews by and with former football hooligans in Chapter Three, namely Cass Pennant’s *Top Boys* and *Terrace Legends*, which, although heavily stylised and prone
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\(^7^1\) Jonathan Mumford and David Cregeen (eds.), *Tales from the Gwladys Street: Stories from Players and Fans Chronicling more than 50 Years of Everton FC*, (Cheltenham, 2009); John Edminson and Andrew Clarke (eds.), *Newcastle United: Magpie Memories*, (Seaham, 1998). Unfortunately, relevant contextual information on the conducting and compilation of the interviews for these works is not provided by the authors, and due to their relative obscurity, it has not been possible to contact them for such information. Consequently, these works must be treated with greater caution, although it has been necessary to include them in order to balance the extent to which the case studies in this thesis are covered.

\(^7^2\) http://www.evertoncollection.org.uk/home/about.

to exaggeration and romanticisation, provide one of the few means of gauging the perspectives of such men.

Inevitably, using pre-existing personal testimonies necessitates relying on other people’s selection of interview subjects, editing of testimonies and choosing the questions asked, and in some cases such contextual information is unavailable. Nevertheless, as American proponent of oral history Ronald Grele argues, although ‘the interviewer did not ask exactly the right question at the moment and in the form demanded by any one researcher’, a historian can ‘find questions he or she would never have asked’, some of which ‘will open new ways to view the events and experiences under investigation or will offer a new insight.’

Moreover, some of these sources reveal a masculine, working-class ‘conversational narrative’ between football fans as interviewers and interviewees that would have been subverted by my role as a middle-class female student, and one of the strengths of this material is the sense that fans feel themselves to be speaking to other fans, both in terms of the interviewer and the wider audience of the collections. As Pennant claims in relation to his ‘exclusive’ access to the stories of other former hooligans, he was able to ‘go where no outsider can go’.

Another benefit of books such as *The Kop* and *Three Sides of the Mersey* is the passage of time since their publication, which enables an examination of the early 1990s context and its impact on narratives of the 1960s, rather than focusing only on present-day reconstructions of the decade.

As well as collections of personal testimonies, this thesis also attempts to recover fans’ voices through internet fan forum discussions in Chapter Two, adopting
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a ‘participant observation’ methodology whereby forum users initiate the topics under
discussion, which enables identification of the issues of interest to fans.\textsuperscript{76} whereas
sociologists have begun to examine the potential significance of internet forums to
members’ identities and view them as ‘communities’, historians have hitherto
neglected this potential. There are substantial methodological issues with the use of
such websites in academic research, particularly the anonymity of participants, which
has initiated debates about confirming the validity of their statements.\textsuperscript{77} for the
purposes of this thesis, ascertaining the validity of demographic data such as age and
gender, as well as the legitimacy of fans’ accounts of their experiences, has been
problematic. Additionally, the potential ‘digital divide’ must be considered, in which
access to the internet is unequally distributed according to gender, age and income.\textsuperscript{78}
There have also been debates about the potential dichotomy between ‘real’ and
‘virtual’ life, and amongst football sociologists, such debates have centred on the
relative ‘authenticity’ of online, mediated fandom, which can be viewed as part of
football’s modern commercialisation and globalisation, rather than windows into a
historical or ‘traditional’ working-class football culture.\textsuperscript{79}

Despite these problems, this thesis posits fan forums as an important site for
the reconstruction of club histories and the sharing of memories, in a similar way to

\textsuperscript{76}This methodology is advocated and developed by Tom Gibbons and Kevin Dixon. Tom Gibbons and
Kevin Dixon, “Surf’s up!”: A Call to Take English Soccer Fan Interactions on the Internet more

\textsuperscript{77}Annette Markham, ‘The Methods, Politics, and Ethics of Representation in Online Ethnography’, in
Norman Denzin and Yvonna Lincoln (eds.), The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research, Third

\textsuperscript{78}J.E. Katz, R.E. Rice and P. Aspden, ‘The Internet, 1995–2000: Access, Civic Involvement and Social

\textsuperscript{79}Richard Giulianotti described football fan forum users as likely to be ‘detached’ or ‘passive’. Richard
Giulianotti, ‘Supporters, Followers, Fans, and Flâneurs: A Taxonomy of Spectator Identities in
the collection of oral history interviews. Whether or not participants are who they claim to be or experienced the events they discuss matters less for the findings of this thesis than the choice of topics for public sharing, particularly in Chapter Two, which explores the significance of football storytelling. The forums used were selected based on their independence from the football clubs to which they relate, and the presence of a ‘history thread’ for the explicit purpose of sharing memories.

In addition to the retrospective fans’ voices represented by internet forums and personal testimonies, this thesis also makes extensive use of historical newspaper sources in order to explore some of the competing discourses of football fans’ identities from the 1960s. The principal publications relied upon include the Journal and Evening Chronicle, as well as the Liverpool Echo and Liverpool Daily Post, selected for their long-established status as the most widely read local newspapers in Tyneside and Merseyside respectively, and as voices of authority on their respective local football clubs. The potential problems in using newspaper sources as evidence have been widely discussed by historians, and also highlighted from within the field of media studies. Richard Ericson, for example, argued for recognition of the literary character of news, in which it is necessary to view journalists as creators of ‘fact’ rather than presenters of it.⁸⁰ Moreover, the popular press in Britain has been viewed as part of Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer’s ‘culture industry’, obscuring capitalist exploitation from working-class readers and driven by market forces and economic interests, or else as ‘politically and socially conservative’.⁸¹
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Adrian Bingham, in contrast, argues that the heterogeneous and often unpredictable content of popular newspapers in Britain mitigates their potential role as an agent of social control or capitalist exploitation. Bingham also notes their role in setting agendas for public debate and in circulating a variety of ‘representations and narratives’ amongst readers, rather than the stereotypically reactionary and sensationalist tropes with which they have become associated. Additionally, although local newspapers in Britain have been treated with caution for their ‘partisan slant on national and international events’ and role in the ‘political “machine”’, historians have argued that such political leanings were less clearly and frequently expressed by the Second World War, following commercial developments that necessitated a more ‘socially consensual and civically reinforcing’ tone, and increased attention to ‘the positive enjoyments of urban culture’ in order to attract and maintain readers.

Similarly, this thesis argues that the political interests and allegiances of journalists and newspapers did not impact significantly on their football coverage, which is evidenced by similarities in the masculine football discourses circulated by traditionally politically disparate publications, as well as by the heterogeneous ways in which football issues were discussed. Nevertheless, it is necessary to maintain an awareness of the limitations of such sources in terms of reflecting readers’ views or a factual reality. As well as newspaper sources, parts of this thesis also use the club minute books available in the Everton Collection, which, although containing relatively sparse evidence pertaining to supporters’ identities, are useful in providing

---

82 Bingham, ‘Ignoring the First Draft of History?’, pp. 311-326.
background information to some of the developments discussed, particularly commercialisation in Chapter One.

**Structure and Arguments**

This thesis reconsiders the ‘working-classness’ of some of the values associated with football, in order to build on recent scholarship that seeks to recover the richness of working-class cultural life in twentieth-century Britain. Despite drawing on notions of the ‘traditional’ to emphasise post-war cultural continuity and inter-generational cooperation, it questions the extent to which this traditional masculine culture was represented by ‘hard’ football heroes, disorderly crowd behaviour, and a less money-oriented game. Furthermore, it argues for the significance of identities and interpretive frameworks other than class in understanding football’s relationship to working-class culture, whilst recognising the classed nature of these identities.

Chapter One deals most explicitly with the working-class values traditionally associated with football spectators in England, arguing that capitalist interests and commercialising and modernising trends in the 1960s were not incompatible with fans’ wishes. This implies that recent media and popular concerns over the impact of post-1990s developments on ‘the people’s game’ are not based on a historically accurate understanding of ‘the people’. The first two sections draw on local newspaper discussions of stadium redevelopment, club profits and players’ wages to demonstrate their parallels with current discourses on similar issues. This approach
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85 Todd stresses this intention and criticises the historiographical preoccupation with an ‘ideal’ or ‘traditional’ working class’. Todd, *The People*, p. 7.
serves to challenge nostalgic reconstructions of pre-1990s football, and highlights how such topics were not framed in terms of their negative impact on traditional working-class culture. The final section provides evidence of fans’ involvement in such discussions in the form of letters to newspapers and retrospective personal testimonies, which reveals their encouragement of and receptiveness to the changes that are commonly understood as detrimental to their ‘traditional’ working-class values.

In contrast, Chapter Two emphasises the significance of appeals to tradition in cross-generational cultural exchange and the maintenance of older forms of community attachments and identities, particularly in the context of the 1960s ‘cultural revolution’ and ‘generation gap’, but also in terms of recent threats to such attachments. The first section uses evidence from older fans that expresses their concern that the football-related rites of passage they experienced in their post-war childhood and adolescence are no longer available to and will be forgotten by younger generations in the Premier League era. The second section describes retrospective reconstructions of these rites of passage in order to argue that football was an important tool in the socialisation of boys and is remembered in terms of its significance in the process of becoming a man, but was also imposed by adults and involved the endurance of frightening and unpleasant experiences that contradict romanticised images of football terrace culture. In the final section, the potentially divisive age-specific cultures associated with the ‘swinging sixties’ are examined in the context of the football stadium to argue that such practices as the singing of pop songs at football matches were more likely to form the basis of a cross-generational sense of local pride and unity than enforce distinctions based on young and old.
Chapter Three, on the other hand, illustrates the significance of age in 1960s and 1970s discussions of football hooliganism, which suggests that generational conflict did permeate this aspect of supporters’ sense of identity. In the first section, evidence of how national newspapers, members of the public and the F.A. framed the issue of hooliganism at the time also indicates that class was not as significant to their understanding and articulation of the problem as it has been to academic interpretations. The second section outlines how former hooligans, whose voices were obscured at the time of their activities by an overwhelmingly negative press depiction of football fans, have reconstructed their behaviour in terms of masculine codes of honour since the 1980s. This section again argues that class should not necessarily be the principal analytical framework in understanding how hooliganism relates to football supporters’ identities.

Chapter Four also prioritises identities other than class in its consideration of civic, regional and national identities as expressed and constructed through football, but it also recognises the distinctively working-class or ‘popular’ nature of such identities. The first section argues that civic and regional identities contributed to expressions of patriotic sentiments and coexisted with national identities in certain circumstances, particularly when non-English football opponents provided a focus for the construction of difference. The second section, on the other hand, illustrates football’s role in the expression of distinctiveness from and disenchantment with the nation and the South during a period in which national government became increasingly centralised and immigration from outside of Britain provided a new potential focus for a sense of difference. The third section argues that football rivalries
produced opportunities for intra-regional fragmentation and the assertion of micro-identities to be encouraged or expressed, but that this had been and continues to be a long-standing feature of working-class football support and one of the bases of the game’s appeal.
Chapter One: Capitalism and the ‘People’s Game’

The English Premier League was formed in 1992, when clubs from the old First Division resigned from the Football League in order to negotiate separate and more lucrative television broadcasting contracts, and British Sky Broadcasting bought exclusive television rights for five years for around £300 million. These developments initiated an era of unprecedented increases in transfer fees, players’ wages and ticket prices, as well as growing revenues from sponsorship deals and club merchandise. Chelsea currently hold the record for the highest transfer fee paid by a British club with their 2011 signing of Fernando Torres for £50 million, whilst Wayne Rooney will reportedly earn £300,000 a week in his next five years at Manchester United. In the 2012-2013 season, the cost of a season ticket at Arsenal ranged from £985 to £1,995, and several news outlets have reported that average ticket prices have increased by up to 1000% in the 20 years since advent of the Premier League, compared with a 77% cumulative rate of inflation.

---

86 In today’s money this price tag is equivalent to approximately £542 million, but given that Sky and BT Sport paid three billion pounds each in 2012 to share the rights to televise Premier League matches for three years demonstrates that English football’s monetary value has increased beyond the rate of inflation.

87 In 1992, the record transfer fee paid by an English club was Tottenham Hotspur’s 1988 signing of Paul Gascoigne for £2 million (approximately £4.7 million in today’s money), although several European clubs had paid higher fees to sign players from English clubs. Manchester United broke this record in 1995 with the £7 million (£12 million) signing of Andy Cole, and Newcastle United doubled this record fee the following year when they paid £15 million (£24.5 million) for Alan Shearer. For comparisons with Rooney’s salary, Blackburn Rovers’ Chris Sutton made headlines in 1994 as the first player to earn £10,000 a week (equivalent to around £16,000), whilst the average weekly wage for top division players in 1992 was £1,755 (around £3,500 in today’s money).

Such economic developments have prompted a popular, media and sociological preoccupation with a perceived dichotomy between football’s commercial aspects and its traditionally working-class fan base. For example, a recent article in the *Daily Telegraph* described the possibility of Red Bull buying a Premier League team as the latest example of how ‘football sold its soul’ and how ‘a price tag is being attached to everything’.  

Malcolm Clarke, chairman of the Football Supporters’ Federation, told the *Guardian* in 2011, “there is a great danger that an increasing section of the community will be priced out.” Out of 23 Everton fans interviewed in 2010 for the Everton Collection oral history project, only two did not answer a definitive ‘yes’ when asked if football had become too commercial.

A dominant narrative among sociologists is that of football’s late-twentieth-century transformation from ‘sport of the masses’ into a mediated, globalised, financial enterprise, characterised by ‘sanitised’ stadiums, overpaid celebrity players, and dispassionate, disloyal or disillusioned fans and consumers. For example, John Williams claimed that football had become ‘suddenly a lot more middle class’ after the BSkyB deal, suggesting that commercialisation had undermined its previously unquestioned working-class characteristics. Anthony King and Rex Nash similarly present fans’ nostalgia for a pre-1990s ‘golden age’ of football as ‘the people’s game’
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90 Conn, ‘The Premier League has Priced Out Fans’.
91 These interviews are available online at: http://www.evertoncollection.org.uk/article?id=ART94107 [Accessed on 25/7/2014].
as evidence of an inherent incompatibility between commercialising trends and working-class culture and identities. This chapter challenges this idea of incompatibility and undermines this overly stereotypical narrative that dominates sociological scholarship, by arguing that the ‘working-class’ aspects of football have largely been defined and applied retrospectively, and that post-war commercialising trends in the game did not produce the type of class-based discussions that have accompanied similar developments since the 1990s.

As sports historian Tony Collins noted in 2007, football’s late-twentieth-century commercialisation should not be considered as ‘the acme of the corporate subversion of “the peoples’ game”’, given that its rise in popularity as a mass spectator sport in the late-nineteenth century corresponded with its professionalisation and sponsorship by capitalist interests. Equally, as Fishwick demonstrates, popular and media interest in football’s commercial aspects were also apparent before the 1950s, marked by discussions of players’ wages, club profits and expenses, transfer fees, ticket prices and the game’s overall ‘value for money’. This chapter, in focusing on the 1960s, further extends this image of football’s commercialisation as a longer-term process, encompassing the abolition of the maximum wage in 1961 and colouring discussions of English stadiums’ suitability to stage World Cup matches and welcome foreign visitors in 1966. As well as countering popular nostalgia for a pre-1990s non-commercial ‘golden age’ of football, this chapter argues that mid-twentieth-century commercialism in football did not necessarily conflict with the
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96 Fishwick, English Football and Society, p. 65.
interests and wishes of working-class supporters, and was, at least ostensibly, encouraged by supporters’ demands as consumers.

Evidence from local newspapers in Merseyside and the North East reveals that, although club directors and board members had to avoid accusations of profiteering and exploitation of fans, they were expected to compete with other clubs and other forms of entertainment for fans’ custom, primarily through increasing their expenditure on players and stadiums, which could justify any increases in ticket prices. Again, as Johnes demonstrates, this was not a new development specific to the 1960s, but it is relevant to the late-twentieth-century tendency to mythologise this decade more generally, and it is also necessary to consider such discourses in the context of the alleged post-war emergence of the ‘affluent consumer’.  

Similarly, whilst the abolition of the maximum wage and the increasing celebrity status of footballers in the 1960s potentially signalled the decline of ‘traditional-located players’ as ‘working-class heroes’, local media and fans also deemed it necessary in improving the quality and success of a team, which corresponded with a tendency to discuss the merits of particular players in terms of their monetary value. The idea that football clubs must be seen to be providing an attractive product to fans was central to local newspaper discussions of the game’s mid-twentieth-century commercial aspects, discussions that positioned working-class fans as discerning consumers with an awareness of and agency in these developments. By drawing parallels between these developments and discussions of post-1990s
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98 Fishwick has demonstrated the inter-war antecedents of such discussions and emphasised the disparity between footballers’ wages and those of ‘most working-class people’ in order to challenge the idea of the pre-1961 player as an ‘obedient servant’. Fishwick, *English Football and Society*, pp. 74-75.
commercialising trends, this chapter aims to challenge popular and media nostalgia for the 1960s and for an imagined ‘working man’s game’.

Working-class football fans’ consciousness of and role in the game’s post-war commercialisation challenges historiographical characterisations of the relationship between commercial leisure the British working classes as either intrinsically exploitative or oppositional, where ‘one person’s pleasure was another’s profit.’ 99 Academic treatments of the subject have interpreted the late-nineteenth-century emergence of commercial leisure industries as the capitalist financial exploitation of workers’ increasing leisure time, a means of inculcating middle-class values among workers, or as a primarily escapist or ‘consolatory’ form of popular culture. 100 Where working-class agency was evident, it entailed either a rejection of commercial leisure activities or the middle-class values associated with ‘rational recreation’, or else such activities were adapted to suit distinctively working-class ends, allowing the survival of more ‘genuine’ forms of popular culture in the face of ‘bourgeois hegemony’ or cultural ‘massification’. 101 The idea that commercialisation in football contradicts an imagined ‘traditional’ or ‘genuine’ working-class culture is revised in this chapter, firstly by arguing that this traditional culture was more ambiguous in post-war Britain than supposed in discussions of 1990s developments, and secondly by challenging the extent to which the relationship between capitalist interests and working-class consumers was inherently exploitative or oppositional.

99 Chas Critcher, quoted in Jones, Workers at Play, p. 2.
The first section focuses on the media interest in football finances from the 1950s onwards, following a post-war ‘boom’ of high attendances and anticipated profits, which was no longer secure by the early 1960s. The contrasting cases of John Moores at Everton and William McKeag at Newcastle reveal how football club directors and chairmen were subject to media praise or criticism depending on their financial management of the clubs, and were obliged to publicise and justify their clubs’ economic affairs. Local sports journalists presented club directors and chairmen as responsible for ensuring a level of customer satisfaction commensurate with ticket prices, expressing a concern with the interests of supporters.102 The second section discusses media attitudes towards players and their wages, and the extent to which conflict existed between their increasingly affluent and celebrity lifestyles, and their traditional status as masculine working-class heroes. In contrast with more recent images of ‘over-paid, over-pampered and over-hyped English prima donnas’, whose lifestyles are deemed detrimental to their toughness and work ethic, mid-twentieth-century concerns centred on the extent to which financial incentives encouraged ‘rough play’, and the impact this could have on entertainment, suggesting the possibility that fans would be deterred by such playing styles.103

Departing from the mediated framing of commercialisation presented in the first two sections, the third section discusses evidence from fans in the form of letters to newspapers and retrospective personal testimonies. This evidence reveals a belief

---


in players’ entitlement to improved wages and employment conditions, and a pragmatic attitude to football’s commercial aspects more generally, demonstrating an awareness of their rights as consumers. Demands for stadium improvement and the acquisition of expensive players indicates that, whilst continuing to patronise this traditionally working-class form of commercial leisure, fans expected to be rewarded for their support and satisfied for their expenditure through clubs’ commercial endeavours.

**Football Club Directors and Chairmen**

Whereas Chapter Four of this thesis will describe the local and civic significance of football clubs in post-war Britain, this section outlines how this civic role conflicted with football’s profit-making potential in local media discussions of the responsibilities and duties of club directors and chairmen. In the early days of professional football in the late-nineteenth century, the F.A. introduced measures to prevent football club directors and chairmen from making substantial profits. Boardrooms were likely to consist of prominent local businessmen with broader civic roles, whose prestige and influence was of greater significance than their personal fortunes as motivating factors in their association with local football clubs.104 Historian Peter Bailey describes pre-1914 spectator sports as ‘commercial but not capitalist’, suggesting that economic exploitation was largely absent, regardless of the increasingly business-like nature of professional sports clubs and competitions.105
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104 Kennedy, ‘Class, Ethnicity and Civic Governance’; Garnham and Jackson, ‘Who Invested in Victorian Football Clubs?’. Football historians generally agree that directors and chairmen rarely made significant profits from clubs in the late nineteenth century despite their organisation as businesses catering to large audiences. See Tischler, *Footballers and Businessmen*.

Mid-twentieth-century football club directors had similar socio-economic characteristics to their nineteenth-century counterparts, and made similar claims as to the civic and collective significance of football clubs, but with a post-war boom in attendances and increasing possibilities for sponsorship and television deals, the ‘business’ of football accompanied its significance to civic pride and governance in media discussions. Again, this was not necessarily a new development of post-war football and its media coverage, but journalists often presented it as such, and drew links between football and other, newer branches of the ‘entertainment industry’.

As outlined in the Introduction to this thesis, media narratives do not necessarily reflect wider opinions or realities, but in this chapter they provide an appropriate means of interrogating present-day discourses about commercialisation and the decline of the game’s ‘working-class’ characteristics.  

This section demonstrates how local newspapers in Merseyside and the North East circulated varied narratives of football’s commercialisation and debated the extent of capitalist exploitation of ‘the people’s game’. It argues that, contrary to contemporary discussions of football’s commercialisation, the press positioned fans themselves as the force behind and beneficiaries of such developments. It is possible to interpret this narrative as evidence of the media’s alignment with capitalist interests, obscuring a reality whereby ‘the supply side dictates providing for the people, rather than accommodating to the whole needs of the people’. However, media criticism of football club chairmen for what they were not providing for fans complicates an easy correspondence of ‘stereotyped class interests’, as does the press’
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regular tendency to draw attention to football finances, rather than attempt to obscure
them from an exploited customer base.\textsuperscript{108} It is also difficult to discern clear or
consistent political leanings from such material, with journalists tending to position
themselves as agents of the ‘common good’ and voices of the football ‘community at
large’ rather than partisan observers.\textsuperscript{109}

One issue that the Liverpool and Newcastle press both raised in the 1960s was
that of stadium improvement and the extent to which this benefited clubs and their
shareholders financially to a greater or lesser degree than it would benefit the cities as
a whole. This issue revolved around how the proposed improvements should be paid
for and by whom, which was framed by the media in both cities as a club versus
council dispute. The dispute was thus represented as being between two sets of
economic interests within the urban middle classes, from which the press separated
and distinguished themselves. The Liverpool press largely presented themselves as a
neutral forum in which both sides could articulate their standpoints without editorial
or journalistic judgement, whilst the \textit{Evening Chronicle} and \textit{Journal} in Newcastle
were highly critical of both sides for their failure to act in what they described as fans’
interests, but tended to side with the City Council over the ‘caucus’ of Newcastle
United’s board of directors.\textsuperscript{110}

On Merseyside, Liverpool City Council and its Health Committee instigated
stadium improvements at both Liverpool and Everton football clubs through regular

\textsuperscript{108} Bailey, ‘Politics and Poetics’, p. 141. Gareth Stedman Jones warned against the oversimplification
of class interests in leisure historiography. Gareth Stedman Jones, ‘Class Expression versus Social
pp. 162-170.

\textsuperscript{109} Bromley and Hayes, ‘Campaigner, Watchdog or Municipal Lackey’, p. 198.

inspections to ensure satisfactory safety and sanitary conditions, but were reluctant to assist in the financing of such projects on the grounds that the clubs themselves stood to gain financially from such investment.\footnote{As reported in \textit{Liverpool Echo}, 14 July 1961, p. 17.} A debate emerged in the \textit{Liverpool Echo} and \textit{Daily Post} in 1965 about the cost of re-housing several families whose homes would be demolished to accommodate a new stand at Goodison Park, which Everton deemed necessary in order to meet the requirements of staging World Cup matches the following year. At a meeting in 1962, the Everton board discussed the possibility of FIFA funding the stadium improvements it required for the tournament, which also included new seating at an estimated cost of £25,000, but this prospect does not seem to have progressed further.\footnote{Minutes of a Meeting of Everton Football Club, 17 December 1962, Liverpool Records Office – Minutes 1959-1964 – 796 EFC/1/1/29.}

The club asked the Housing Committee for assistance in meeting the cost of re-housing the families to be displaced, arguing that the ‘enormous prestige value’ of the World Cup matches would benefit the city and its Council, as councillor Frank Keating reportedly recognised: “If we are city councillors of the second city of the empire, as I believe, we should think big and act big.”\footnote{Frank Keating quoted in, ‘Split Over Everton F.C. Expansion’, \textit{Liverpool Daily Post}, 19 February 1965, p. 34.} Despite recognising a relationship between Everton and the promotion of Liverpool as “the second city of the Empire”, several councillors expressed the opinion that ‘the club had adequate resources of their own’ to ‘set their own house in order’, and that the Council should not be ‘pressurised in the interests of a big club’.\footnote{‘Split Over Everton F.C. Expansion’.} Newspapers framed the position of the local council in terms of a view that improving the stadium would be of greater long-term financial benefit to the club and its directors than to the city as a whole, and
thus they should be responsible for funding the project. In opposition, the press framed the club’s position as a ‘problem’ that required the Council’s cooperation and financial assistance in order to maximise the World Cup’s ‘enormous prestige value for the city.’

The local press adopted an objective tone in representing these debates, providing a platform for representatives of both sides of the dispute without explicitly articulating its own position. For instance, on one occasion it highlighted the more widespread benefits of staging World Cup matches in marketing the city of Liverpool, such as promoting its image as a vast industrial conurbation and a great business centre’ at ‘a time when we can sell the city’. Elsewhere, in contrast, Everton’s proposed new stand and its facilities were ‘theirs’, and ‘would eventually rebound to the club’s benefit’, suggesting that the use of public money would be inappropriate. It is likely that this ambivalent position reflected a reluctance to alienate readers whose support for Goodison’s redevelopment and its financing would have been difficult to gauge.

As well as Liverpool fans, whose enthusiasm for their rival’s stadium becoming ‘one of the best, not only in this country, but possibly internationally’ would have been questionable, the press expressed sensitivity to the people whose homes would be demolished to accommodate the new stand. Thus, a 1965 article

115 ‘One Vote Decides Against Aid for Everton F.C.’, Liverpool Echo, 19 February 1965, p. 25.
represented the views of the Everton Tenants Association, who described the proposed demolition of 46 houses on Walton Lane as an “unhappy story”. Seemingly, the Liverpool press did not have a unified view on how beneficial Goodison Park’s improvements would be and to whom, and therefore refrained from asserting its own views on who should pay for them, instead presenting the views of Everton directors and city councillors for readers to assess.

The Newcastle press, in contrast, were far more opinionated on the redevelopment of St. James’ Park to meet similar demands for the staging of World Cup matches. They adopted the stance that stadium improvements were in the interests of the city as a whole – particularly ‘long-suffering Newcastle fans’ – and represented any obstructions to this project in a negative way. The row had begun in 1959, when the Council, as owners of the land upon which St. James’s Park was built, introduced conditions for the renewal of the club’s long-term lease, which was due to expire in 1965. The board of directors were required to provide assurances that the ground would be adequately improved by this time, whilst the club sought guarantees that the tenure of their lease would be sufficiently long to make such improvements and expense worthwhile. With the announcement that St. James’ had been selected as a possible venue for World Cup matches, the urgency and publicity of this issue were considerably heightened.

As reported in the *Evening Chronicle and Journal*, Newcastle United club directors frequently accused the Council of rejecting their proposed ground improvements, whilst councillors denied having received adequate plans. Councillor
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Dan Smith in particular was heavily critical of the club via the Newcastle press:

“What degree of comfort is there at St. James’s Park at present for the vast majority of spectators?…None – and this has been so for the past 50 years.”\textsuperscript{120} He accused the directors of “arrogance” for boycotting a public meeting to discuss the disputes, and described them as “a football empire opposed to the liberation of its spectators”.\textsuperscript{121} Smith and the Council favoured more extensive development work than the club proposed, but Newcastle United’s ‘new “stately home”’ would belong to the club and its investors, and therefore be of greater benefit to them.\textsuperscript{122} According to the media’s representation of Smith’s arguments, he and his fellow councillors claimed to be acting on behalf of a “majority” of fans against a powerful “empire” that did not adequately provide for their needs and interests.

In response, Newcastle chairman William McKeag claimed the club had spent “approximately £200,000 on improvements during the present tenancy”, and that “it would be absolute folly to expend further vast sums of money until United are given security of tenure.”\textsuperscript{123} Answering Smith’s suggestion that St. James’ Park might be developed so as to provide other leisure facilities such as bowling, cinema and restaurants, McKeag was scornful of the councillor’s preoccupation with other sports and attempted to position himself and his fellow directors in accordance with the interests of football fans amongst the \textit{Chronicle}’s readers: “we apologise but trust we

\textsuperscript{121} Dan Smith, quoted in, ‘The Storm at St. James’s’, \textit{Evening Chronicle}, 28 April 1964, p. 1; ‘Club Run by Caucus’.
\textsuperscript{122} Dan Smith, quoted in, ‘Club Must Have Fresh Money’, \textit{Evening Chronicle}, 5 October 1963, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{123} William McKeag, quoted in, ‘United Need Security First, Says McKeag’, \textit{Evening Chronicle}, 7 October 1963, p. 1. The £200,000 quoted by McKeag would be worth approximately £3.6 million in today’s money, but given that this figure represents the total expenditure on ground improvements throughout a long-term tenancy accurate estimates of its present equivalent value are not possible.
may be forgiven for trying to concentrate on soccer”.  

These interests had apparently been “thwarted and frustrated almost all along the line by the City council. Now they have the impertinence to complain that the club does not possess the facilities which they themselves have prevented us from providing.”

The statements of McKeag and Smith to the Newcastle press thus demonstrate their respective efforts to associate themselves with local football fans in calling for the improvement of conditions at St. James’ Park, suggesting their belief that fans themselves favoured modernisation. Although improved stadium conditions could be used to justify increased ticket prices and potentially attract new social demographics to football, it should not be assumed that existing working-class fans were satisfied with the stadium as it was or that improvements conflicted with what has retrospectively been defined as ‘traditional’ working-class culture. The Newcastle press largely framed the club versus council dispute in terms of who should pay for the developments required by or for supporters, rather than in terms of their role in football’s commercialisation and its resultant impact on working-class fans.

One solution to the problem of funding the redevelopment proposals was to bring in “fresh men with fresh money”, potentially including some members of the Council. McKeag dismissed this as councillors’ desire to make a profit, and “they
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125 ‘McKeag – “United Entitled to Help, Not Hindrance”’.


127 ‘The Storm at St. James’s’.
might as well disabuse their minds of this idea right away”.128 Earlier, a mysterious ‘Tyneside millionaire’ had apparently offered to invest in the club, but McKeag claimed that, “we did not rely on millionaires when we were winning the English Cup”. He argued that the club should be self-sufficient: “if Tyneside cannot pay for its own football it’s a sad state of affairs.”129 According to McKeag, wealthy investors motivated by financial gain were unnecessary and unwelcome, as club revenues and public money should finance the stadium improvements. In contrast, the Evening Chronicle had reported that ‘the club’s capital is only £1,000 – a fantastic state of affairs in a club capable of drawing gates in excess of 50,000 people’, that ‘paid paltry transfer fees for inadequate footballers’, and that ‘provides medieval facilities in the atomic age’.130

According to this view, the club’s gate receipts were expected to directly pay for the signing of players and the improvement of the stadium, and their failure to do so was because, ‘for too long a handful of men owning a handful of shares have lorded it over the Tyneside sporting public.’131 Without accusing Newcastle United’s directors of profiteering, the Chronicle implied that financial mismanagement was responsible for the club’s lack of improvement and reinvestment of fans’ money. Whereas McKeag was critical of “this obsession with the money angle”, the Chronicle stressed the centrality of this angle to the ways in which Newcastle United was being and should be run. In this instance, the press represented football as a commercial product, which should be striving to appeal to fans, who it described as
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128 ‘The Storm at St. James’s’.
131 ‘United: Let’s Have New Blood At The Top!’
customers entitled to expect a certain standard of comfort and entertainment for the cost of their tickets.132

The Merseyside football clubs provide further evidence of such expectations. In 1961, Everton chairman John Moores felt compelled to apologise for a crush during a Goodison Park match attended by 75,600 fans, indicating that the club would prioritise fans’ safety and comfort over gate receipts in future: “We don’t want near-capacity or capacity crowds to see matches in discomfort…if there is a possibility of overcrowding, we shall limit the big attendances”.133 At a meeting in 1960, the Everton board also explored the possibility of measuring the capacity of Goodison’s standing areas so as to avoid overcrowding.134 Liverpool chairman Tom Williams expressed similar sentiments in 1963: “I must emphasise, again, the club’s desire not to break crowd records, but to make watching at Anfield as safe and comfortable as possible.”135 Public statements such as these served to defend the clubs and their directors from accusations of prioritising profit over crowd safety and comfort, and the Liverpool press provided an outlet through which their voices could reach a large local audience.

It could be speculated that the press provided such an outlet in order to protect the shared capitalist interests involved in maintaining fans’ custom, by highlighting the clubs’ prioritisation of crowd comfort and safety over the potential profits of excessive ticket sales, thereby obscuring any possible exploitation of fans by club

132 ‘United Need Security First, Says McKeag’.
135 Tom Williams, quoted in, ‘Welcomed By Watch Committee Chairman’, Liverpool Echo, 27 February 1963, p. 15.
directors. The club’s efforts to ensure the adequacy of its stadium earned the praise of the local media by 1964: ‘An indication of how costly it is to maintain Goodison Park in its wonderful condition is provided by the spending of £85,618 on improvements and maintenance.’ However, Everton did introduce material improvements to conditions at Goodison Park, including the installation of a crowd counting system to prevent overcrowding in 1961, and an extra cover to shelter spectators in the Bullens Road End in 1963. Such measures, whilst potentially rewarding to the club in terms of attracting and maintaining support, did not necessarily diverge from the interests and wishes of supporters in the form of class-based differences.

Moores implied that improved stadiums and crowd comfort were related to increased club revenues in 1963 via the Liverpool Echo: ‘He thought fans today were prepared to pay a little more for comfort’. His statement implies that the additional cost to supporters would be minimal, and worth paying. This relationship was particularly apparent in the increase in seated accommodation at Goodison Park, which was more expensive and more likely to be sold on a season-ticket basis than standing room, hence Everton’s ‘more than double’ revenue from season ticket sales in 1964 compared with the previous season. Additionally, the threat of fans being deterred by unsafe and uncomfortable stadium conditions would have encouraged increased expenditure on ground improvements due to the potential loss of revenue,
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136 ‘Goodison Park Improvements’, Liverpool Daily Post, 10 June 1964, p. 4. This figure is equivalent to around £1.5 million in today’s money.
138 Eileen and Stephen Yeo typify the class-based interpretation of leisure as oppositional or exploitative. Yeo and Yeo, Popular Culture and Class Conflict.
139 Untitled Newspaper Cutting, Liverpool Echo, 23 July 1963, LRO – Newspaper Liverpool Echo - 796 EFC/19/9/11.
140 Untitled Newspaper Cutting, Liverpool Echo, 14 June 1964, LRO – Newspaper Liverpool Echo - 796 EFC/19/9/20.
as suggested by the *Liverpool Echo*’s reference to letters received indicating that ‘many fans would not attend capacity crowd games in the future unless better arrangements were made’. The real or imagined threat of losing gate money due to the deterrent effects of overcrowding balances Moores’ and Williams’ assurances about limiting crowd sizes at the expense of gate receipts. Nevertheless, the media and directors’ attention to such a threat suggests that they recognised a degree of agency amongst fans who would not tolerate inadequate stadium conditions.

The North-East press also drew attention to the ‘prime importance’ of crowd comfort and stadium improvement to club revenue, praising Sunderland in 1964 for being ‘determined to provide seats for as many supporters as possible’, and realising that ‘seats raise the season ticket potential – and season tickets mean cash in the bank before the start of a season.’ The significance of generating income before the start of the season rather than on a game-by-game basis revolved around the acquisition of new players and the improvement of the stadium, which would further attract supporters and increase revenues, but was also presented as an incentive for fans to buy season tickets. This particular article followed concern in the previous season over ‘the moderate interest of supporters’, demonstrated by a drop in average attendances despite Sunderland’s ‘excellent progress’ in league results. This concern was part of a local media narrative about the precariousness of football finances, which hinged on supporters’ agency as customers, whereas nowadays

---

football’s financial instabilities tend to be associated with capitalist influences by the modern media.144

According to one journalist in 1963, ‘football as a game will never pull back the customers it has lost until the amenities at nearly all the grounds are given a big “face lift”’, as fans would ‘no longer tolerate the discomforts’ or ‘stand on bleak exposed terraces’.145 Articles such as this represent an idea that fans who had previously tolerated such conditions would no longer do so, exemplifying their acquisition of a new status as discerning consumers according to the press. These fans were allegedly willing and able to withdraw their custom from a club that failed to meet their growing expectations. Such characterisations are reminiscent of contemporary depictions of fan fickleness, which contemporary media discourses tend to associate with less ‘traditional’ and ‘middle-class’ fans.146 In the 1960s though, they were applied to the still largely working-class football fans in Merseyside and the North East. Rather than representing this as a negative result of football fans’ ‘embourgeoisement’, the press instead focused on the failures of clubs to adapt and improve according to what it presented as fans’ wishes.

The emphasis on football’s improvement for the benefit of fans could be interpreted as a novel way of marketing the game, either to increasingly affluent existing working-class supporters, or to potential new middle-class support bases. In

this case, the extent of fans’ agency in encouraging modernisation and
commercialising projects was countered by the role of capitalist interests in presenting
such projects as necessary and forthcoming, justifying any increases in ticket prices
and representing fans’ financial input as an essential and valued aspect of the game’s
improvement. Local and national newspapers had vested interests in ensuring
football’s popularity, given their coverage of the game and its importance in selling
newspapers. However, at least in Newcastle, the local press was more likely to
publicise and be critical of the club’s failure to meet such expectations than to
promote football as an increasingly attractive leisure pursuit, expressing fears that
previously loyal fans were being deterred and that other activities were more
attractive to fans. According to one journalist in 1963, ‘gone are the days when if
there was no football match to go to there was just about nowhere to go to all on a
Saturday afternoon’, and clubs had to provide better ‘amenities’, ‘pre-match
attractions’ and ‘a winning team’ in order to boost their ‘box office figures’. The
local press presented the significance of football’s ‘box office figures’ as a new
development corresponding with the rise of a competitive entertainment industry,
within which football was only one of many options for people to spend their time
and money.

Whilst this competition for custom was applicable to all clubs, the local media
also drew attention to how ‘glamour teams’ were emerging to the detriment of less
successful clubs, whose ability to buy the best players enabled them to draw the
biggest crowds: ‘the poor are getting poorer and the rich are getting richer’. Evidently, this narrative has persisted in the British media, as demonstrated by recent

\[147\] ‘You Must Keep Customers Happy’.
discussions of the economic inequality between teams in the Premier League and the rest of the Football League, as well as inequality between Premier League clubs, with a dominant ‘big four’ or ‘big six’ clubs. In 2013, the Daily Mail highlighted the significance of television revenues in perpetuating this situation, drawing a direct link between the 1992 BSkyB deal and a growing economic gulf between clubs.\textsuperscript{149} Differing proportions of television revenues are currently awarded to Premier League clubs based on league position, whilst clubs that finish in the top four and qualify for the Champions League receive substantially more money from the television coverage of this competition.\textsuperscript{150} Such disproportionate allocation of broadcasting revenues enables the most successful clubs to maintain their prominent positions through their ability to buy a greater number and a superior category of player, as well as to attract such players with the offer of higher wages. These players then attract new fans and new sponsorship revenues, adding to the financial and footballing dominance of these clubs. UEFA’s recently adopted Financial Fair Play Rules – which dictate that a club cannot spend more than its income – further perpetuate this inequality by preventing smaller clubs from taking financial risks to achieve football success and the related increases in revenues.\textsuperscript{151} A similar cycle was part of a media narrative of football’s commercial aspects as early as the 1950s though, predating the unprecedented broadcasting and sponsorship revenues initiated in 1992, and also predating the


\textsuperscript{151} UEFA also stipulate that clubs may spend beyond their means if this money is ‘entirely covered by a direct contribution/payment from the club owner(s) or a related party’, enabling the clubs with the wealthiest owners to circumvent these rules. For an overview of the Financial Fair Play Rules, see ‘Financial Fair Play: Everything you Need to Know’, 28 February 2014, www.uefa.com/community/news/newsid=2064391.html [Accessed on 12/03/2014].
abolition of the maximum wage, when there were ‘other ways for a club to monopolise star players’.152

Even two comparatively ‘big’ clubs were deemed to be in financial competition with each other, as demonstrated by concerns over the impact of Sunderland’s potential promotion on the city of Newcastle in 1963: ‘they will be entertaining soccer’s aristocrats…All Newcastle will have to offer to the North-East’s football loving public in competition will be Grimsby, Scunthorpe, Rotherham and Co…and this means money is being lost’.153 Second Division status for a football club translated into ‘a vicious and inevitable circle’ due to the pervasiveness of financial implications in the game, as a club ‘needed money in order to establish seniority again. But money could come only from the fans, who would not pay until they were assured of a dividend in entertainment and success’.154 Only in recent years have the football authorities attempted to ameliorate this cycle through ‘parachute payments’, allocating a proportion of television broadcasting revenues to relegated clubs. Prior to this, relegated clubs relied on the continued financial support of their fans through match attendance, and local newspapers argued that this was no longer guaranteed by the 1960s, therefore representing fans as the agents of football’s precarious finances.

Whereas in the early 1950s ‘dropping gates’ and the subsequent financial impact on ‘the smaller league clubs’ was attributed to fans’ ‘shortage of money’, by the early 1960s this was more likely to be rationalised in terms of spectators’ increasingly discerning attitude towards football clubs and entertainment in general,

152 Fishwick, English Football and Society, p. 74.
154 ‘First Division Town?’, Evening Chronicle, 17 May 1963, p. 52.
and the failure of football clubs to adapt to fans’ changing expectations. For example, when Gateshead Football Club were denied re-election to the Football League in 1960, director Hilton Laing explained how “the Gateshead people have shown that they do not care whether they have League football or not”, presumably because they had alternative entertainments and football clubs to choose from.

The Liverpool press presented a similar view of how ‘success on the pitch means bigger gates for the club’, and praised Everton’s ‘staggering’ revenue from the advance sale of season tickets in 1966: ‘Success - the winning of the Football Association Cup - and enterprise - the spectacular £110,000 signing of Alan Ball - have combined to give Everton a record financial start to the season.’ The North-East press also recognised the importance of players to a club’s ticket sales, attributing Sunderland’s declining attendances to a lack of signings: ‘supporters love to see a new face in the team – especially if he is a big name – and I think it will take a big buy or the return of Clough, before Sunderland get the gates their League position merits.’ The signing of ‘big name’ players was therefore comparable to the improvement of stadiums in terms of media representations of its significance to football’s ‘box-office appeal’, and it was fans’ priorities that influenced such trends at this stage in the media narrative which football clubs and their directors must adapt to and provide for through commercial endeavours. In this evidence then, commercialisation was not as incompatible with supporters’ interests as the present-day media presents it.

155 ‘Soccer Boom Over, Sale Time Ahead’, Sunday Sun, 7 January 1951.
158 ‘Roker Park Gates Still A Mystery’.
Other evidence, however, indicates that fans’ expectations of improved stadiums and teams reflected a concern over their exploitation by clubs and directors for profit. For instance, in 1961, in response to what he described as the misconceptions of ‘the average fan’, a Newcastle *Evening Chronicle* journalist denied that ‘the directors line their pockets at the expense of everyone else in the game, and that the shareholders get the crumbs – fat, nourishing crumbs’. In contrast, he argued, ‘the return on football shares just isn’t worth picking up’, and ‘the majority of directors are forever pouring more money into it (football)’.159 As the view of just one journalist, and potentially not a reflection of his own views given the possible input of his editors and their shared agenda of selling newspapers rather than defending football club directors, this article is not evidence of a reality of football’s ‘golden age’ when club directors and owners did not make profits. Nor is it definitive evidence that negative popular opinion surrounded certain football club directors, despite its claims to be a response to the views of ‘the average fan’, since it is difficult to ascertain the extent to which a media agenda reflected or dictated the issues readers and football fans were concerned with. Rather, the article shows that discourses about the relative agency of football fans versus their exploitation by capitalist interests were in public circulation much earlier than existing football scholarship and contemporary media discourses acknowledge. Although this particular article denied the capitalist exploitation of football fans, another author in the same newspaper two years later accused Newcastle United’s directors of ‘lording it over the Tyneside public’, reflecting the varied nature of such discourses.160

---


160 ‘Club Run by Caucus, say Councillors’.
A further example is provided by Everton chairman John Moores, who claimed that he and his fellow Everton directors recognised themselves as answerable to the club’s fans in 1963, noting how “the difference between getting a pat on the back and a kick in the pants is only a matter of inches.”161 At least according to his own protestations, Moores was more concerned with his reputation and popularity than with profit-making in his role at Everton, situating himself in a longer-term traditional image of football club directors as civic servants, and claiming that fans’ wishes were of paramount importance to his activities. The Liverpool press joined in this representation of Moores, who had made his fortune with the Littlewoods pools company, was chairman of Everton from 1961 to 1965, and again from 1968 to 1973, and was praised for improving the club ‘at his own expense’ and for his modesty: ‘he disliked being called ‘Mr Everton’ and hearing the club called ‘The Millionaire Club’. ’162 The club’s minute books also reveal how Moores loaned money to Everton, reinforcing his image as a benefactor.163

Tom Williams, who ran a cotton-broking business, became Liverpool chairman in 1956, and upon his resignation in 1964, a Liverpool Echo reporter detailed how he had ‘devoted a great deal of his time during his chairmanship to the club and leaves a record of service which will be difficult to equal.’164 These sources depict Moores and Williams as philanthropic benefactors of their respective clubs, whose personal expenditure and tenure as chairmen provided a ‘service’ to supporters and the local community. The Daily Mail’s obituary for Moores in 1993 also stressed

161 John Moores, quoted in, ‘Everton Veterans Led the Celebrations’, Liverpool Echo, 6 September 1963, p. 3.
163 For example, Minutes of a Meeting of Everton Football Club, 1 February 1960, LRO – Minutes 1959-1964 – 796 EFC/1/1/29.
his ‘surprising modesty’ and outlined his generosity in ‘giving millions to charities, community projects and the arts’, suggesting that the Liverpool media’s representation of him was echoed in some sections of the national popular press.\textsuperscript{165}

Interestingly though, the Mail’s obituary makes only a brief reference to Moores’ chairmanship of Everton, instead focusing on his successful career at Littlewoods, which counterbalances the Liverpool newspapers’ prioritising of his ‘services’ by drawing attention to his commercial enterprises.

Moores’ interests in football gambling through Littlewoods and the broader economic stakes in enhancing the prestige of Liverpool as a city through football meant that, irrespective of whether or not he profited directly from Everton, the club was run according to capitalist interests. This pattern of football club governance was a continuation of late-nineteenth-century trends whereby local civic dignitaries and business magnates were the principal investors in football clubs, rather than a new development of the post-war era. What was new about this period was the circulation of local media discourses about fans’ power as consumers, capable of rejecting or supporting football financially and necessitating the provision of an attractive product, which converged with their role as stakeholders, with a perceived influence on how club profits were utilised. The media simultaneously presented the purchase of a match ticket as an investment as well as a purchase. The press’s increasing focus on and demands for club directors to reinvest any club revenues represents a narrative in which they were not entitled to profit personally from supporters’ input, which distinguished football clubs from other commercial leisure industries at the same time as the media was assessing football’s ability to compete with these other activities.

It is possible that media discourses about fans’ actual or ideal level of input in the running of football clubs served the capitalist interests of directors and shareholders, primarily by emphasising the desirability of modernising and commercialising projects to working-class fans who might otherwise be resistant, or by ensuring the loyalty of supporters as paying customers through declarations of their influential status. Such an interpretation would support characterisations of the relationship between working-class interests and commercial leisure as intrinsically exploitative or oppositional, as well as situating the popular press in Britain as complicit in this exploitation.\textsuperscript{166} However, such a reading would presume that commercialisation was antithetical to post-war working-class culture and interests, as contemporary media discourses present it nowadays.

**Star Players and Working-Class Heroes**

As noted in the introduction to this chapter, players’ high wages have become synonymous in popular and media discussions of football’s post-1990s commercialisation and detachment from its working-class fan bases. The *Daily Telegraph* recently estimated the total annual earnings of a top footballer in 1957 at £1,677, which it adjusted to £75,000 in today’s money, and compared this to the salary of ‘a GP or senior manager’ rather than the average Premier League footballer, whose weekly salary often exceeds this figure.\textsuperscript{167} As well as emphasising the


\textsuperscript{167} ‘How Footballers’ Wages have Changed over the Years: In Numbers’, *The Telegraph*, 18 January 2011, available online at, [http://www.telegraph.co.uk/sport/football/competitions/premier-league/8265851/How-footballers-wages-have-changed-over-the-years-in-numbers.html](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/sport/football/competitions/premier-league/8265851/How-footballers-wages-have-changed-over-the-years-in-numbers.html) [Accessed on
excessiveness of Premier League wages and their disparity with average salaries in Britain, the press also increasingly associates such soaring wages with a decline in traditional masculine working-class attributes such as hard work and physical toughness, with players more likely to be characterised as ‘over-paid, over-pampered and over-hyped English prima donnas’ than ‘working-class heroes’.  

In 1961, Johnny Haynes of Fulham became newsworthy as the first player to earn £100 a week, and George Best’s £1,000 a week deal at Manchester United was another milestone in 1968, but even adjusted for inflation, such figures do not compare with today’s Premiership wages. Despite the differing scales of the problem, it is nonetheless possible to compare discussions of the potential negative impact of the abolition of a £20 a week maximum wage for footballers in 1961 with present-day concerns over footballers’ attitudes and attributes. Rather than ‘prima donnas’, 1960s footballers were more likely to be criticised in the press for their ‘rough play’, which was directly correlated to their increased financial incentives. The idea that more money from the 1960s was damaging the ‘spirit’ of football is reminiscent of late-nineteenth-century debates over professionalisation and its effect on the ‘amateur spirit’, which is associated with football’s public school origins. Both late-nineteenth-century and mid-twentieth-century media framings of the impact

---

13/03/2013]. The website measuringworth.com estimates that the average annual salary in Britain in 1957 was £488, about a third of the average footballer’s salary. In 2014, the average British annual salary is estimated to be £26,500, whilst the average Premier League footballer reportedly earns £25,000 to £30,000 a week, so roughly 50 times the national average. See http://www.measuringworth.com/ukearnep/ and Alistair McGowan, ‘Revealed: What’s Inside a Footballer's Contract?’, BBC Sport, 28 September 2013, http://www.bbc.co.uk/sport/0/football/23923904 [Accessed on 04/04/2014].

^168 Godisff on ‘England’s Failure to Qualify for the European Championships’.

^169 Equivalent to around £2,000 and £16,000 respectively.

of financial incentives on players differed substantially from the present-day nostalgia for ‘a tough competitor with a strong work ethic’. 171

Sports historian Richard Holt has been influential in presenting an image of the mid-twentieth-century footballer as an embodiment of characteristics that corresponded with and appealed primarily to working-class men: ‘there was a side of northern masculinity that admired anyone who could “do the business”’. 172 Nicholas Phelps has challenged the ‘northern-ness’ of this figure with reference to the appeal of similar characteristics to football fans in the south of England, establishing the footballer as a geographically broader working-class hero. 173 Such heroes contrast with recent sociological characterisations of the ‘mediated meaninglessness’ of the ‘post hero’ or ‘celebrity’ that they associate with footballers since the late 1980s, whose fame and media personifications have overridden their potential significance to working-class identities. 174

In the 1960s though, media discussions of increasing wages were accompanied by scorn for Holt’s heroes’ subsequently romanticised qualities of ‘grit…hardness, stamina, courage’. 175 Unease that higher wages would lead to excessive competitiveness and ‘rough play’ at the expense of skilful, entertaining football – and that this would deter audiences – reveals an alternative response to the characteristics that have been retrospectively defined as ‘heroic’ and ‘working-class’.

---

171 Holt, ‘Heroes of the North’, p. 139.
175 Holt, Sport and the British, p. 173.
Consequently, this section argues that such qualities were not unanimously valued or appealing, challenging an unambiguous association between working-class masculinity and notions of ‘hardness’ or ‘toughness’.\footnote{For examples of historiographical preoccupation with this association, see Andrew Davies, ‘Youth Gangs, Masculinity and Violence in late Victorian Manchester and Salford’, \textit{Journal of Social History}, 32:2, (1998), pp. 349-369; Joanna Bourke, \textit{Working Class Cultures in Britain, 1890-1960: Gender, Class and Ethnicity}, (London, 1994); Ronnie Johnston and Arthur McIvor, ‘Dangerous Work, Hard Men and Broken Bodies: Masculinity in the Clydeside Heavy Industries, c. 1930-1970s’, \textit{Labour History Review}, 69:2, (2004), pp. 135-151.} In other work, Holt has also challenged this association, particularly in relation to Newcastle United’s Jackie Milburn, celebrated for his ‘modesty’ and ‘gentlemanly’ characteristics.\footnote{Holt, ‘The Lives of Jackie Milburn: “Footballer and Gentleman”’, in Wagg and Russell, \textit{Sporting Heroes of the North}, pp. 149 and 152.} Still though, he argues that ‘Geordies were presented as more “real” than other people’, and the ‘unspoken assumption of authenticity’ he identifies as intrinsic to working-class masculinity corresponds with Brook’s reading of the Angry Young Men genre of literature, in which she highlights ‘the authentic, free male individual whose emotional honesty contrasts with the dominant culture, and whose masculinity dominates over inauthentic femininity.’\footnote{Holt, ‘The Lives of Jackie Milburn’, p. 146; Brook, ‘Engendering Rebellion’, p. 24.} Although this thesis must necessarily rely on such secondary readings, which are prone to variation and disagreement, the literature of, for example, Alan Sillitoe and John Osborne is relevant for its exploration of the impact of affluence and domesticity on working-class masculinity.\footnote{Alan Sillitoe, \textit{Saturday Night and Sunday Morning}, (1958) ; John Osborne, \textit{Look Back in Anger}, (1956).} In contrast to the protagonists of such work, this section argues that characteristics such as aggression, rebellion and ‘authenticity’ were not particularly valued qualities of the 1960s footballer.

A 1962 article in the \textit{Liverpool Echo}, which reported criticism of Everton’s style of play, exemplifies local newspapers’ tendency to initiate debates over the
impact of ‘rough play’ on the game’s image and audiences following the abolition of the maximum wage: ‘there have been criticisms of over-forthright play in some positions. This brilliant Everton side does not need anything more than its own high talent to bring rewards. Its reputation should be that of providing nothing but the best’. Without directly aligning himself with such criticisms, the author’s attention to what Everton’s reputation ‘should be’, rather than what it was, suggests his insinuation that the team was failing to meet expectations of proper conduct. The article also portrayed threats to Everton’s reputation as worrying for the club’s directors and shareholders, who raised the issue of the way the team was ‘being talked about elsewhere’ during a 1964 board meeting that discussed ‘matches which had been reported as ending in near brawls’. As reported in the *Echo*, Moores reassured those present at the meeting that “it was the policy of the board for members of the team to always play attractive football”, and later that year he blamed a media “vendetta” against the club for the team’s negative public image. It is uncertain whether he was referring to the local or national media in describing this “vendetta”, but the *Echo*’s publication of Moores’ reassurances over the club’s policies suggests a shared interest in defending Everton’s reputation.

The Liverpool press also printed Moores’ warnings to players about their role in constructing this image: “If you play clean attractive football then the reports will be good…We don’t want bad press notices; we do want good strong play, fair but vigorous. We don’t want rough play.” His association of “rough play” with “bad press notices” implies an anxiety over attracting fans, and his assumption that fans
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183 ‘Everton Made Own Enquiries’.
would be deterred by negative publicity regarding the team’s ability to provide an “attractive” or entertaining spectacle. Equally though, Moores recognised that ‘it was little use to a club if a team played attractive football which only succeeded in landing them in the Third Division.’ Manager Harry Catterick agreed according to the Echo’s version of his statements: ‘Every manager would like to produce a team which played purely delightful football, but it was doubtful if such a team could be successful.’ Catterick’s defence of Everton’s style was in reply to a shareholder’s request for the manager ‘to encourage the ball-playing type of man rather than those who relished in physical contact’. The press coverage of this discussion is evidence of a mediated contestation of the ideal type of player, based around the relative merits of skill versus physicality. It is possible that the views of this particular shareholder reflect his own personal or even class-based tastes, and an attempt to impose them on the team and spectators. On the other hand, it is equally likely that, as a shareholder, he was concerned with ensuring the continued attraction of fans to Goodison Park, and felt that ‘ball-playing’ footballers would be more useful to that end.

During the 1966 World Cup, a medical officer for the Brazilian team echoed such sentiments in a statement to the press:

There is a new style of play coming into favour in Europe. I do not think it will give as much pleasure to the public…It seems inevitable now that we shall have to put more emphasis on the physical side of the game and concentrate rather less on technique.

In recent media framings of national styles of play, ‘physical’ football is represented as a positive and traditional characteristic of the English game, to which foreign players in the Premier League either struggle to adapt due to their ‘softness’, or
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attempt to subvert through dishonesty and diving.\textsuperscript{188} In the 1960s however, physicality was less widely lauded by the media. For example, the Liverpool press reflected on the comparatively small Goodison crowd of 39,840 at the World Cup semi-final between West Germany and the Soviet Union. The crowd were apparently ‘bored’ and ‘entitled to expect far more passes to reach their target and far more scoring efforts…There was no outstanding personality…No ball magicians to whet the appetite.’\textsuperscript{189} This article represented ‘technique’ and ‘ball magicians’ as superior to more ‘physical’ styles of play, and explained the small attendance figure in terms of the absence of this superior style.\textsuperscript{190} Such evidence demonstrates that the merits and entertainment value of ‘physical’ football and ‘hard’ players were challenged in local media discourses that circulated amongst football fans. This narrative also warned that, as financial incentives increased, ‘rough’ football would take precedence, which would not be entertaining or appealing.

As well as wage increases following the abolition of the maximum wage, local sports journalists also highlighted the system of paying match bonuses to players as ‘one of the reasons why so many European ties are played in the wrong spirit’.\textsuperscript{191} English clubs in 1963 were limited to paying a £50 match bonus to each player, whereas other national football associations did not impose similar constraints.

resulting in ‘bitter’ matches, according to the *Evening Chronicle* in Newcastle. Of a match between Tottenham Hotspur and Atlético Madrid in 1963, a *Chronicle* article framed defeat for either team as ‘financial disaster’ and ‘a matter of life and death’, which, it argued, was ‘distorting the issues of the match and making European F.A. officials apprehensive about the manner in which it will be played.’ Although providing a dramatic and suspenseful story to entertain readers, this representation of the match also warned readers of the potential dangers of financial incentives.

The *Chronicle* did not limit its discussions of such dangers to European matches, but also depicted a ‘grasping attitude’ amongst footballers resultant from bonuses for League performances and results. These incentives encouraged an attitude whereby ‘players will go almost to any lengths on the field to gain the money’, and were often ‘intent on kicking an opponent…just for the money!’ The extent to which such descriptions of violent and cynical playing styles represent a realistic image of football matches in the period is difficult to ascertain. Potentially, they confirm the historical reality of contemporary nostalgic images of footballers ‘who could “do the business”’. However, more important for the purposes of this chapter is the negativity with which the 1960s press represented such real or exaggerated scenarios, in contrast to the present-day media’s condemnation of apparently antithetical masculinities, such as those identified during ‘the snood epidemic’ of recent years. According to this evidence, rather than the ‘feminization (that)’
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192 ‘Spurs’ Rivals on £365 A Man Bonus’. This figure is equivalent to around £900 in 2014.
194 ‘Danger To Football in Bonus System’, *Evening Chronicle*, 1 April 1964, p. 56.
195 Holt, ‘Heroes of the North’, p. 161;
196 The ‘snood epidemic’ refers to the recent trend for footballers to wear neck scarves in cold weather, which was generally derided in the press as evidence of the ‘weakness’ of modern footballers. For example, Rory Smith, ‘Premier League falls Victim to the Snood Epidemic, Football’s Latest Fashion Faux Pas’, *The Telegraph*, 29 November 2010, available online at,
accompanied glamorization’ in 1990s football, the increased financial rewards available to footballers in the 1960s were deemed more likely to encourage the behaviour attributed to the ‘Northern hero’ by Holt, and such behaviour was less likely to be unambiguously posited as that of a ‘hero’ by the press. 197 Without arguing that this narrative represented the views of the average football fan at the time, it provides a contrast to the prevailing present-day media narrative that increased financial stakes result in ‘whining’, ‘vanity’ and ‘softness’. 198

Potentially, the heroism of more physical styles of play had earlier been contingent on its lack of association with financial motivations, and the idea that more money from the 1960s was damaging the ‘spirit’ of football echoes longer-term trends in discourses surrounding the impact of professionalisation on the game’s historical ‘amateur spirit’. 199 Holt and his followers argue however, that ‘the values associated with playing for money – competitiveness, seriousness of purpose, determination and so forth’, were intrinsic to footballers’ hero status among working-class fans. 200 That these values aroused concern in the 1960s about their impact on football’s entertainment value and appeal to fans, suggests a perception that supporters’ attitudes

198 James Lawton, ‘To cast Wayne Rooney as a Victim is to Insult the Real Professionals’, The Independent, 10 August 2013, available online at,
199 Taylor, The Association Game.
200 Wagg and Russell, Sporting Heroes of the North, p. xiii.
towards them had changed, and that the style associated with ‘playing for money’ was now less favourable, although the media often articulated this concern in terms of a deterioration of the style itself due to increased financial stakes rather than a shift in attitudes towards it.

Contrary to the view that football had become more ‘rough’, a 1963 article in the Evening Chronicle criticised the excessive media distortion of incidents of violence between players as ‘typical’ and as ‘a disgrace to football, there are cries of “shame on Spurs” and a promise of an F.A. probe. What nonsense!’\(^{201}\) The author challenged what he described as the misconception that ‘football is rougher and dirtier today than it has ever been’, and ‘played almost exclusively by thugs and hoodlums.’\(^{202}\) Those with a more direct involvement in the game such as players and managers were also generally less critical of ‘rough play’ and asserted its longevity. Writing for the Chronicle, footballer Jimmy Armfield was sympathetic towards his fellow professionals, although he did acknowledge that ‘the stakes are big…and there is a certain desperation in a lot of today’s football which encourages even if it cannot condone conduct which is not all it should be.’ Nevertheless, Armfield argued, ‘football is a man’s game. I never want it to be anything else and it would not be worth either playing or watching if it ever were anything else.’\(^{203}\) Expressing similar sentiments through the Liverpool Echo, Harry Catterick claimed that ‘football was a hard game and as manager he had always demanded 100 per cent effort from his players’, each of whom ‘needed three attributes – skill, courage and the ability to withstand physical contact.’\(^{204}\) These statements echo recent clichés that make up the

\(^{202}\) ‘Soccer Not As Bad As It’s Painted’, Evening Chronicle Pink, 7 December 1963, p. 3.
\(^{203}\) ‘Soccer Not As Bad As It’s Painted’.
\(^{204}\) ‘Shareholder Attacks Everton Style’; ‘End Of Big Fees By Everton’. 
language of former players and managers when speaking to or through the media. For example, former Scotland international and Premier League manager Gordon Strachan described football as ‘hard but fair’ in his 2005 article for The Guardian, which argued in favour of lesser teams trying to stop more skilful teams playing through ‘strong challenges.’

Aston Villa manager Paul Lambert also defended his team as “hard and fair” after they collected 12 yellow cards in the first three matches of the 2013-2014 season. The long-term usage of such phrases potentially indicates continuity in British players’ and managers’ attitudes towards ideal playing styles and their relation to a persistent model of masculinity. More likely however, these clichéd expressions constitute a shared vocabulary of stock phrases that have become standardised by their frequent mediated usage, limiting their relationship to broader codes and representations of masculinity.

Other evidence presents players’ ‘grasping attitude’ as a greater source of anxiety than their playing style. The view that players’ effort could be induced more by financial incentives than by ‘the honour and glory of championships, cups and medals’, raised questions regarding their loyalty to particular clubs and the extent to which a team could be successful if players were insufficiently rewarded economically.

Catterick acknowledged this trend, highlighting Everton’s wage structure as “likely to attract the right kind of player” in 1961, discussing the Everton team’s collective earnings through wages and bonuses in 1962, and acknowledging
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their continued desire to increase these the following year: “I’ve yet to manage a club where players have been satisfied with what they are getting. They all want better terms if they can get them.”209 Players’ demands for higher wages and improved contracts were in spite of frequent reporting that footballers were being paid ‘handsomely’ following the abolition of the maximum wage, and had become ‘£100-A-Week Soccer Kings’.210

According to these media narratives, the abolition of the maximum wage had raised the likelihood of greediness amongst players, and transformed the ‘modest’ player of the 1950s into the post-‘new deal’ “show-off” or “bighead”.211 In similar fashion, contemporary media narratives lament how the 1992 BSkyB deal transformed the ‘working-class hero’ or ‘tough competitor’ of the post-war period into the ‘pampered, greedy, mutinous’ modern player, with the ‘self-indulgent narcissism of spoilt adolescents’.212 The tendency of both to reflect backwards onto idealised pasts to draw negative contrasts with inadequate presents is evidence of a persistent nostalgic trope within the British popular press and its football reporting. More importantly, though, is the ability of the 1960s media to contradict the chronology of the contemporary media’s idealised ‘golden age’ of close connections between football and working-class identities.

209 ‘Much Remains To Be Done At Goodison’; ‘Merseyside’s £100-A-Week Soccer Kings’, Liverpool Echo, 22 September 1962, p. 4; ‘Everton Players Are To Share £1,100 In Talent Money’.
210 ‘Danger To Football in Bonus System’; ‘Merseyside’s £100-A-Week Soccer Kings’.
In relation to more explicit discussions of players’ ‘greed’, the *Liverpool Echo* also drew attention to the possibility of more affluent and extravagant lifestyles for footballers in 1962. Although arguing that Merseyside footballers had changed ‘very little’ since the abolition of the maximum wage, one *Echo* journalist contrasted this situation with the players’ cars at Tottenham, where ‘not one of them cost less than £1,000 new. Several were in the £2,000 category.’ These sums are equivalent to approximately £18,000 and £36,000 in today’s money, when stereotypical images of footballers in the national press associate them with £200,000 Bentleys. Still, given that the average annual overall income of First Division footballers in 1957 is estimated to have been £1,677, the contrast over a five-year period is substantial, presupposing that the author of this article did not exaggerate the cost of the cars he claimed to observe.

According to the author, some players in Liverpool had ‘plusher’ cars than others, and their families all enjoyed ‘the comforts of dress, food, leisure and entertainment that a salary in the thousands can bring.’ This attention to the lifestyles and status symbols of footballers’ wives and families is echoed in contemporary media preoccupation with ‘Wags’ – a commonly used acronym for footballers’ ‘wives and girlfriends’ – some of whom have acquired celebrity status in their own right. However, the lifestyle that ‘a salary in the thousands can bring’ was insufficient in creating sustained media interest in the wives and families of footballers.
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footballers in the 1960s, as opposed to the lifestyle that contemporary football Wags enjoy, such as then Manchester City player Stephen Ireland’s girlfriend, who the player gifted a customised pink Bentley in 2009.\(^{218}\) Acknowledging that ‘all Everton and Liverpool players have not sought these sort of status symbols yet’, the 1962 *Echo* article predicted that ‘the way they are going, they will be able to afford to.’\(^{219}\) Generally, though, the Liverpool press did not seem to begrudge players this more affluent lifestyle.

Indeed, occasionally the Merseyside newspapers reported favourably on footballers’ extra money-making activities beyond football-related wages and bonuses. For example, Everton players were purportedly ‘making financial hay out of their League Championship’ in 1963, having been ‘robbed of any chance of the highly lucrative ‘perks’ that come the way of the Cup Finalists.’ Led by Roy Vernon, the team were planning to ‘amass the largest money pool they can arrange’, by publishing an illustrated team brochure, selling a signed match ball and shirts, and organising a dance with 1,400 tickets for sale, and the press was not critical of these endeavours.\(^{220}\) The following year, the Everton players recorded a single that was played during a match at Goodison Park the day it went on sale, and ‘the players get the usual percentage royalty, like other show business performers.’\(^{221}\) This media approval in Merseyside contrasted with the scornful tone in the Newcastle *Evening Chronicle*’s reporting of ‘players (who) asked for money before they would allow their


\(^{219}\) ‘Merseyside’s £100-A-Week Soccer Kings’.

\(^{220}\) ‘Everton Players Cash In On Their Title’, *Liverpool Echo*, 7 June 1963, p. 5.

\(^{221}\) ‘Recording Stars From Goodison’, *Liverpool Echo*, 3 October 1964, p. 10.
photographs to be taken,’ which intimated that some Tyneside footballers were separating themselves from working-class fans.\textsuperscript{222} Contemporary media discussions of footballers’ ‘image rights’ are similarly scathing in describing deals whereby clubs pay players for the use of their name and image for sponsorship and advertising purposes, a practice the \textit{Daily Mail} characterised as ‘super-rich footballers dodging tax.’\textsuperscript{223}

A 1964 study defined the minimum gross weekly wage of British dock workers in 1960 as £8 9d., which it estimated was the actual wage for a ‘substantial group’ of Liverpool workers, due to the frequency of workers on daily rates, although several earned up to £20 a week, then the maximum wage for footballers.\textsuperscript{224} According to popular legend, at a 1961 meeting of northern representatives of the Professional Footballers’ association to discuss the abolition of the maximum wage, the Bury delegate argued that, since his father earned less than £20 a week as a coal miner, players should not go on strike to demand higher wages. In response, Bolton Wanderers player Tommy Banks, who had also worked as a miner, challenged the comparison:

\begin{quote}
I know how difficult it is but just let me tell you one thing, you ask your Dad to come up out of that pit next Saturday afternoon and mark ‘Brother’ Stanley Matthews and see what he has to say.\textsuperscript{225}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{222}`Danger To Football in Bonus System'.
\textsuperscript{225} Tommy Banks, quoted in Ian Seddon, \textit{Ah’m Tellin’ Thee – A Biography of Tommy Banks}, (Bath, 2012), p. 6. This story is repeated in contemporary news outlets but I have been unable to find sources from the time to verify it. See for example, ‘Today's Soccer Stars Owe a lot to Bolton Wanderers Idol Tommy Banks’, \textit{The Bolton News}, 29 October 2012, available online at, http://www.theboltonnews.co.uk/news/northwest/10012194.Coal_face_worker_and_England_footballer_earned__20_a_match_playing_for_Wanderers/ [Accessed on 05/03/2014]. Joe Bernstein, `SPECIAL REPORT: Too many Average Footballers are Millionaires... They Drive Ferraris but they Deserve a Reliant Robin’, \textit{The Daily Mail}, 9 January 2011, available online at,
Such evidence illustrates that, prior to 1961, footballers’ wages were comparable to those of workers employed in manual occupations traditionally associated with Tyneside and Merseyside, and that the abolition of the maximum wage was partially framed in terms of whether footballers deserved to earn more than the fans that paid to watch them. Rather than centring on the extent to which disparate earnings would lead to players’ detachment from working-class audiences and erode the game’s ‘rootedness in local working-class communities’, however, the local press in the 1960s was more concerned with footballers’ ability to entertain these audiences than their socio-economic relation to them.226

Generally, in the early 1960s the Liverpool press approved of footballers’ ascendancy to ‘the top executive class financially’.227 In contrast, nowadays the Echo can be critical of Everton and Liverpool for being among ‘the worst offenders’ in paying excessive wages.228 Players’ increased wages in 1962 were portrayed in Liverpool as ‘monetary reward for their skills in keeping with the money taken at the gates’, allowing footballers to chase ‘the financial heights of the other stars who entertain the public.’229 The North-East press, conversely, were disdainful of players’ ‘petty demands’.230 It is possible that this contrast reflects distinctive local cultures. At a time when Liverpool natives were excelling in other branches of the entertainment industry, particularly popular music with internationally successful bands such as The

227 ‘Merseyside’s £100-A-Week Soccer Kings’.
229 ‘Merseyside’s £100-A-Week Soccer Kings’.
230 ‘Danger To Football in Bonus System’.
Beatles, the Liverpool press was elevating footballers to stardom status, and praising clubs for remunerating them sufficiently.\textsuperscript{231} Equally though, this disparity hinged on the relative success of the respective region’s teams. Everton were First Division champions in 1963 and FA Cup winners in 1966, whilst Liverpool won the First Division in 1964 and 1966, and the FA Cup in 1965. Newcastle United, in contrast, had last won the First Division in 1927 and the FA Cup in 1955, and played in the Second Division between 1961 and 1965, so the players were not necessarily demonstrating their ‘value’ through match results and performances.

In 1961, an \textit{Evening Chronicle} journalist debated the dilemma of evaluating the relative ‘financial merits’ of players, and whether the ‘spectacular’ should be paid more than the ‘hard-working’ footballer. His worth would be relative to his ‘box-office appeal’ and demonstration of a playing style which ‘draws the crowds’, he wrote: ‘the argument is that goals win matches and that, more than anything else, the spectators love to see goals.’\textsuperscript{232} As well as needing goalscorers to ‘capture the imagination of the press and public’, the journalist suggested clubs should employ figures with ‘that indefinable something called personality’, who ‘the crowds will roll up to watch’.\textsuperscript{233} This journalist therefore calculated players’ ‘value’ in terms of their relationship to gate money, and the Liverpool press presented a similar situation at Everton, where players received bonuses relative to attendance figures: ‘Success brings crowds…crowds bring cash to footballers, and the Everton and Liverpool players are “cashing in”.’\textsuperscript{234} In these sources, the ability to entertain and draw crowds had very little to do with the extent to which players could still be categorised as

\textsuperscript{231} ‘Enterprise, Success Pay Off’.
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‘working-class’ and thus represent relatable heroes for fans following the abolition of the maximum wage.

As reported in the Liverpool Echo, Everton chairman John Moores reminded players that their financial rewards depended on their playing style and successes in 1965: “We want to see you earn more and more. But we don’t want it to be one-way traffic. We want something from you.”

A comparable scenario accompanied post-1990s commercialisation, wherein ‘the broadcasters want ever higher competitive standards’ in return for their economic investment in football. However, rather than being a deserved reward for attracting large television audiences and providing skilful, entertaining football, contemporary media outlets are more likely to present Premier League wages and their source in a negative light: ‘Sky has also pumped billions of pounds into the national game…most of it went into players’ pockets.’

The money currently in ‘players’ pockets’ is now objectionable because footballers are ‘uncaring, pampered and overpaid…having lost touch with fans that part with hard-earned money to watch them every week.’ In the 1960s, by contrast, higher wages were objectionable insofar as they were seen to encourage ‘over-forthright’ or ‘rough play’, a style which, according to more recent media and academic arguments, was what had kept footballers and their working-class audiences in touch in their imagined ‘golden age’, when ‘footballers didn’t earn £100,000 a week, matches all
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kicked off at 3pm on a Saturday – and there wasn’t a WAG in sight’, and when ‘nobody made excuses for cheating, faint-hearted footballers.’239

If, as Ross McKibbin has noted, footballers ‘always thought of themselves as film stars rather than artisans’ irrespective of their wages, the extent to which representations of the ‘traditional located’ player or ‘working-class hero’ hinged on their historical closeness and similarities to working-class incomes and lifestyles is problematic.240 Media discourses in the 1960s evaluated players according to skill and ‘box-office appeal’, and challenged the archetypal ‘tough competitor’ who ‘could “do the business”’ that is retrospectively constructed as an ideal representation of working-class masculinity.241 Nevertheless, competing media narratives on footballers’ wages, lifestyles and playing styles – as well as commercialism in football more generally – did not necessarily reflect or influence the views of readers and football fans. Equally though, present media discourses about the decline of football’s ‘working-class’ characteristics should not be presumed indicative of contemporary popular opinion, nor of the historical reality of such characteristics. As Max Jones argues, it is necessary to consider popular responses to hero figures such as footballers rather than rely solely on their discursive representation as evidence of their cultural meaning.242 Consequently, the following section examines evidence from football supporters regarding their attitudes towards increasingly wealthy footballers and broader trends of commercialisation in football.

‘The People’ and Commercialisation

In the 1960s, newspaper letters sections provided one of the very few forums for public debate for football fans. Adrian Bingham, Jon Steel and Martin Conboy have described how the *Daily Mirror* used readers’ letters in the ‘construction of a working-class voice’ and created a ‘rhetoric of inclusivity’ in its commercial endeavour to appeal to working-class audiences, but this dialogue ‘returns the reader once again to the editorial preference’ by criticising or disagreeing with readers’ opinions.\(^{243}\) Additionally, the selection, editing or invention of readers’ letters could maintain ‘editorial preference’, but as other evidence of fans’ views from the time is not available, it is necessary to use such material, albeit with caution. In more recent years, oral history projects and internet fan forums have emerged to articulate fans’ interpretation of their clubs’ history, and this section also relies upon such evidence.

The principal issue with retrospective source material is the extent to which nostalgia and public or media discourses influence individual accounts. As Penny Summerfield notes, ‘prevailing discursive constructions of the past “contaminate” memory, in the sense that they overlay it with later accounts and interpretations’, which is particularly pertinent in the case of football support, where collective and media discourses about the game’s detachment from working-class fans are pervasive.\(^{244}\) On the problem of nostalgia, David Lowenthal argues that ‘obfuscation’ occurs as negative past experiences such as poverty and hardship are presented as ‘something wholesome, warm and welcoming’, and such obfuscation is apparent in
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nostalgia for antiquated stadiums or ‘roug"}, which were not necessarily experienced as positively as they are remembered. On the other hand, nostalgia can be interpreted as the creation of ‘competitive imageries of present life (rather) than faithfully regenerating an idealised past,’ and fans’ positive recollections of the ‘working-class’ aspects of football’s past could signify an attempt to counter the contemporary image of the game as ‘a commercial event’ or ‘a lot more middle class.’ Additionally, as Summerfield argues, the influence of ‘generalised, public versions’ of the past in the reconstruction of individual and personal accounts is a necessary part of the process of ‘reproducing the self as a social identity’, and these personal accounts also contribute to the public and collective ‘contemporary consciousness’.

Consequently, this section treats fans’ personal testimonies on football’s commercialisation as part of a collaborative and creative process in the construction of both individual identity and collective public consciousness. It argues that, whilst some accounts indicate the internalization of contemporary media discourses about football’s ‘golden age’ in the construction of a working-class identity – particularly on the issue of ticket prices – past and retrospective fans’ views also complicate the representation of commercialisation as inherently incompatible with working-class interests and culture, notably in relation to players and stadium conditions.

In the 1960s, attendance figures at successful clubs such as Everton indicate that the ‘rough play’ highlighted by the press and club directors and framed in terms of increased financial rewards had not significantly deterred fans. In fact, in the 1962-

63 season, Everton’s average attendance was 24% higher than the previous season, in which the maximum wage had been abolished.\footnote{http://www.european-football-statistics.co.uk/attn/archive/aveeng60.htm [Accessed on 14/03/2014].} As the \textit{Echo} reported, Everton and Liverpool players were still “cashing in” through crowd bonuses, which suggests either that they responded to criticism of ‘rough play’ and adapted their style, or that fans were still attracted to and entertained by the teams despite or because of any ‘rough play’, or else that the press inaccurately exaggerated this ‘roughness’.\footnote{‘Merseyside’s £100-A-Week Soccer Kings’.} In popular memory, the Everton teams of the 1960s are known as ‘The School of Science’, denoting the prioritisation of skill over physicality or ‘kick-and-rush’ football, which fan George Orr describes as the reason he chose Everton over ‘less graceful’ Liverpool.\footnote{Interview with George Orr by Ben McGrae, (2010), http://www.evertoncollection.org.uk/article?id=ART94072 [Accessed on 16/11/2012]; Tim Byrne also cites ‘The School of Science’ as the reason for his initial attraction to Everton. Interview with Tim Byrne by Shaun McCoy, (2010), http://www.evertoncollection.org.uk/article?id=ART94027 [Accessed on 14/11/2012]. Brian Burrows similarly refers to Liverpool as the ‘kick-and-rush’ team in explaining his choice of Everton. Interview with Brian Burrows by Ray Robinson, (2010), http://www.evertoncollection.org.uk/article?id=ART94026 [Accessed on 30/10/2012].} In interviews conducted in 2010 for the Everton Collection website, 8 out of 23 discuss Alex Young – who played for Everton between 1960 and 1968 – when asked about memorable or favourite players of the past, because ‘he played \textit{football} – he played it right’, and was like a ‘graceful’ ‘ballerina’ who could outplay the ‘gangsters with studs’ on opposing teams.\footnote{Interview with Dave Webb by Ray Redfern, (2010), http://www.evertoncollection.org.uk/article?id=ART94062 [Accessed on 29/10/2012]; Interview with George Orr.} Positive recollections of this ‘graceful ballerina’, as well as indicating that press fears over ‘rough play’ at Everton were exaggerated at the time, also contrast substantially with the masculine working-class hero defined by Holt and with contemporary media discourses lamenting footballers’ ‘feminization’.\footnote{Holt, ‘Heroes of the North’; John Drayton, ‘I'm not as Vain as Metrosexual Beckham! Neymar takes Cheeky Swipe... Then Admits he Shaves his Legs’, \textit{The Daily Mail}, 23 July 2013, available online at, http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sport/football/article-2375240/Neymar-says-hes-metrosexual-like-David-Beckham.html [Accessed on 14/03/2014].} These contrasts demonstrate that contemporary football
fans do not unanimously share nostalgia for ‘that classic football breed, the “hard
man”’, which casts doubt on the significance of such ‘heroes’ to a working-class
identity.253

Another aspect of the ‘working-class hero’ that retrospective fans’ views
counter is his ‘strong work ethic’, which ‘cavalier’ Newcastle player Malcolm
MacDonald, who ‘wouldn’t chase the ball’ and ‘would stand with his hands on his
hips’, did not require to become a ‘folk hero’ for fans in their nostalgic
reollections.254 Evidence from the 1960s though, indicates that some fans were
concerned about the impact the abolition of the maximum wage would have on
footballers’ work ethic. In a letter to the Evening Chronicle in 1961, A. McKintosh
complained about the ‘slackness’ of Newcastle United players: ‘Only on three
occasions this season have I seen them put in 90 minutes hard work.’255 Another fan
feared that players’ greed would influence their choice of club and hence be
detrimental to League competition: ‘money will talk BIG and the smaller clubs will
suffer’, as players ‘couldn’t resist the temptation of so very much higher pay’ offered
by wealthier clubs.256 In 1963, T. Robson echoed media discourses about the impact
of increased wages on playing style, protesting that ‘football in general has declined
to a marked degree since the players were overpaid’, and players frequently ‘resort to
the rough stuff in their bid to keep a place in a winning team and, incidentally, draw
the rewards for present day success.’257 Although it is problematic to separate these
letters from the press agenda in framing the issue of players’ wages and their impact
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on football, their parallels with present-day criticisms suggest that contemporary nostalgia for a more ‘working-class’ ‘golden age’ of football does not correspond with the way football was represented during this era.

In response to a rumour that a Newcastle player was ‘unsettled on Tyneside’, S. Nichols complained to the *Chronicle* about:

> Temperamental soccer players who ask for a move when they are dropped, blow off steam because they think they should be given a better house or have a private gardener, yell their heads off when a cold wind blows, say they can’t settle down when they have not really tried, are all tending to make the paying customer fed up with their tantrums. 258

The idea of the footballer as ‘temperamental’ and prone to ‘tantrums’ is reminiscent of more recent complaints about ‘overpaid prima donnas’. For instance, in 2009, then Newcastle manager Joe Kinnear reportedly insisted that player Charles N’Zogbia “needs bringing down to earth” for demanding a transfer after Kinnear had mispronounced his name as “Charles Insomnia” in a television interview, and if N’Zogbia had played in an earlier era “he would have got sorted out.” 259 The idea that modern footballers are less “down to earth” and implicitly more detached from working-class audiences is challenged by letters such as Nichols’, which identified similar problems in the 1960s.

> Everton fans remembering football in the 1960s are generally more positive in describing players, and are more likely to reflect on present-day ‘obscene’ wages and
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consequent ‘players diving’. In addition, they tend to recall a closeness between players and fans within communities and often contrast this with current players who reside in ‘gated mansions’, as John Summerfield reflects. For example, George Orr remembers how, ‘when the match was over they went to the same pubs as you’. Only one out of the 23 fans interviewed recognised the abolition of the maximum wage as the beginning of a ‘free reign’ for players in terms of their wages, with a majority failing to recognise this as a significant turning point in players’ attachments to their working-class fans. Equally, in the 1960s, fans’ concern over players’ wages had more to do with the impact they could have on the quality of football, rather than players’ positions in working-class communities.

An anonymous 1963 letter to the Chronicle criticised Newcastle United’s directors for failing to ‘ensure a player’s happiness’ rather than the player’s own demands when Dave Hollins was reluctant to sign a new contract: ‘United waved the big fist rather than the generous hand, though how they can afford to do this amazes me.’ This letter implied that losing such players meant losing fans and subsequent income from ticket sales, and if a particular player was of sufficient quality, he should be rewarded accordingly. T. Robson’s letter also associated higher wages with fans’ increased entitlement to ‘pleasurable entertainment’ from footballers, suggesting that such developments could improve football. A further correspondent, W. Rogan, blamed Newcastle’s inadequate performances on the club directors’ reluctance to spend money rather than players’ demands for more money or their ‘rough play’
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resultant from increased financial incentives. He wrote: ‘the obvious answer is to buy the best players in Britain’ and spend ‘hundreds of thousands’ on the team like other clubs were doing, while ‘Newcastle barter with Workington whether their goalkeeper is worth £7,000 or £7,500’, unable to ‘find the heart to spend a paltry few thousands’.

As another letter put it, ‘once it was a team to be reckoned with. The directors have a lot to do with the fact that it no longer is.’ In this evidence, the club’s lack of commercial enterprise conflicted with fans’ wishes, as opposed to the contemporary view that “money has poisoned English football”.

Fans seemingly approved of high expenditure on players, and the Liverpool press identified a direct correlation between the £100,000 signing of Alan Ball and the record sale of Everton season tickets in 1966, attempting to illustrate the appeal of ‘big’ signings to fans. The Newcastle press, in contrast, invited fans to discuss their grievances with the way the club was being run, quoting one fan who complained that “the team is playing badly and there is no incentive to go and watch them”, while another explained why “I don’t go to see the matches any more because they are not worth watching.”

An earlier letter to the newspaper threatened to ‘divert my interests to more appealing sports’ after an ‘appalling debacle at St. James’s Park.’ The press presented these fans as aware of and willing to exercise their agency as consumers, who could reject the inferior product offered by the Newcastle board. The Evening Chronicle and its sister publications continue to present themselves as a
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voice for ‘frustrated fans’, and recently criticised current Newcastle owner Mike Ashley’s failure ‘to bring in the promised big signings during the summer transfer window’. Newcastle United’s lack of signings was the subject of a 2013 public demonstration, and the paper’s coverage of it resulted in the club denying them access to press conferences.\textsuperscript{271} Seemingly then, for the Newcastle press and its representation of fans’ views in the form of letters, ‘trophy signings’ have never been a problematic aspect of football’s commercialisation insofar as it affects fans’ interests. In national media discourse though, such transfers mean that ‘the league title not only can be bought but can only be bought’, that ‘super-agents’ make substantial personal profit, and that clubs risk debt and bankruptcy in order to acquire better players, all of which conflicts with fans’ interests in such representations.\textsuperscript{272} Nevertheless, transfer fees and increased wages for players were not as objectionable to fans in the 1960s as they are now.

The \textit{Evening Chronicle} also used its letters section to articulate fans’ grievances over having to ‘tolerate’ poor stadium conditions in the 1960s, with ‘Mr. Spectator’ apparently entitled to ‘some measure of comfort at St. James’s Park, improved toilet


facilities, larger and better refreshment points’, for example.273 Another supporter’s letter urged the directors to ‘think of the fans and improve the amenities as well as the team’, whilst ‘Fed Up Fan’ suggested that ‘Mr. McKeag enters St. James’s by the turnstiles of the popular end and sees for himself the shortage of toilets…Give us seats and cover, a canny team and we’ll pay’.274 R. W. Robson condemned the City Council and Dan Smith for ‘publicity-seeking’ and ‘bouts of hot air’ during the dispute over the modernisation of St. James’ Park, which distracted attention from fans’ rights as ‘paying clientele’.275 This evidence suggests that some fans repeated or shared the media view that ‘money talks in football’, and recognised themselves as the providers of a substantial proportion of this money, entitling them to a degree of agency in its spending by the club. Rather than rejecting football’s commercialisation for its potential disparities with traditional working-class culture, this evidence demonstrates fans’ awareness of football’s commercial potential and attempted to use their role as customers in encouraging the game’s material improvement.

Nowadays, the ‘sanitised stadia’ of the Premier League are seen as being detrimental to ‘atmosphere’ and enjoyment, and a symptom and cause of football’s commercial and ‘corporate’ aspects, according to narratives circulated in the press.276 For several Everton fans, in contrast, Goodison Park is not ‘sanitised’ enough. According to current match-goer Brian Burrows,

If you’re going to pay 30-odd quid, or 40 50 quid, you want to be able to go to the toilet. You want to get a decent somewhere to sit with a pint…It’s not moved on, hospitality for the fans.\textsuperscript{277}

Likewise, fellow match-goer Dave Webb describes Goodison as ‘terrible’, complaining that the Bullens Road stand is ‘still the original stand from 1927’ and ‘the whole ground needs modernising’.\textsuperscript{278} For Gordon Dale, the ground ‘is looking a bit tired’ and ‘not up to modern day standards.’\textsuperscript{279} Rather than preserving Everton’s traditions, Ken Turner would prefer to rebuild the ground, whilst Tony Heslop would not object to moving elsewhere, and Tony Tighe views a ground share with Liverpool as the ‘only solution’ that ‘makes financial sense’\textsuperscript{280}. These fans’ views contrast with the contemporary media nostalgia for the ‘grand old venues’ that ‘we have lost’, demonstrating that such discourses do not always reflect or influence popular opinion, and fans do not necessarily view ‘sanitised stadia’ as a negative aspect of football’s transformation from ‘sport of the masses’ into sport of ‘the prawn sandwich brigade’.\textsuperscript{281}

In 2000, then Manchester United player Roy Keane criticised the type of fan likely to eat “prawn sandwiches” at matches, distinguishing them from the “hardcore”

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{277} Interview with Brian Burrows.
\textsuperscript{278} Interview with Dave Webb. Tim Byrne also protests that Goodison has not changed in ‘50 years’ in, Interview with Tim Byrne.
\textsuperscript{279} Interview with Gordon Dale by John Dale, (2010), \url{http://www.evertoncollection.org.uk/article?id=ART94068} [Accessed on 7/9/2012].
\textsuperscript{281} Nick Metcalfe, ‘Football's Golden Years: From Hampden to Anfield, Old Trafford to Highbury, Wembley to Maine Road… the Famous British Grounds we have Loved (and some we've Lost)”, \textit{Daily Mail}, 6 March 2013, available online at, \url{http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sport/football/article-2288458/Footballs-golden-years-From-Hampden-The-Dell--.html} [Accessed on 05/05/2014]; Adrian Lee, ‘The Great Football Exodus’, \textit{Daily Express}, 12 July 2008, available online at, \url{http://www.express.co.uk/expressyourself/52191/The-Great-Football-Exodus} [Accessed on 04/05/2014].
\end{footnotesize}
fan who travelled to away matches: “I don’t think some of the people who come to
Old Trafford can spell football, never mind understand it.”282 In the 1960s, FIFA
president Stanley Rous drew a similar distinction between different types of fan based
on socio-economic position, warning to Everton officials to expect “businessmen,
doctors, lawyers, executives – important and intelligent people…used to grounds
which offer a hundred amenities during the 1966 World Cup.”283 The Liverpool Daily
Post echoed his views:

Football is more an art than a sport, the hobby of millionaires and film
stars, the passion of psychologists and university professors…the people
who are attracted here next summer will not be the blood brother of the
Kop or the teenaged fans of The Beatles, but wealthy, well-educated
people of taste and discrimination.284

As the first section of this chapter demonstrated, club directors and local newspapers
were increasingly preoccupied with the satisfaction of their ‘customers’ in terms
of entertainment, comfort and safety, and it could be argued that this demonstrates a
recognition of football’s potential appeal to ‘wealthy, well-educated people of taste
and discrimination’. Although working-class fans were not yet ‘priced out’ of
football, attempts to modernise stadiums and discourage ‘rough play’ can
alternatively be interpreted as an attempt to appeal to new audiences from more
affluent social sectors, rather than an effort to satisfy existing fans.

Equally though, it is possible that existing working-class fans were more
affluent and discerning themselves, with increased opportunities to pursue other
leisure activities than football. Consequently, the game’s adaptation was necessary in
order to maintain their custom, which is how the press usually framed the issue, as

282 ‘Angry Keane Slates Man Utd Fans’, BBC Sport, 9 November 2000, available online at:
284 ‘Up For The World Cup’, Liverpool Daily Post, 8 December 1965, p. 16.
discussed in the previous sections. Academic considerations of hooliganism have advanced the theory of football’s ‘embourgeoisement’, which provoked the assertion of more ‘authentic’ working-class styles of support. However, as we see in Chapter Three, football fans argued that non-violence was the more ‘genuine’ expression of their traditional values. Also, the idea that fans’ ‘embourgeoisement’ instigated the redevelopment of stadiums and clubs’ implies that previously poor stadium conditions were a valued or acceptable part of the game’s association with working-class culture, which seems unlikely.

Of greater significance in fans’ complaints about football no longer being ‘the people’s game’ is ticket prices. For example, out of the 23 interviewees of the Everton Collection’s oral history project, 17 objected to the prices demanded by Premiership clubs. Brian Burrows remembers paying the equivalent of ‘about a pint and a half’ to watch Everton in the 1960s, whereas now a match ticket would cost the equivalent of at least ten pints of beer.285 Gordon Dale agrees when asked how football had changed:

it’s a lot more expensive now…I used to be an order boy when I was 13 getting 30 shillings, and I think Everton was four and six to go in the stand, so you could afford to go 6 times. But today young boys would never have the opportunity of doing that because of the cost.286

Ken Turner remembers paying two shillings in the 1960s, and how ‘when you went to the cinema and the football you paid the same price, but now one’s totally away from the other.’287 For George Orr, such prices are the principal reason why football can no longer be described as ‘the people’s game’ and why ‘there’s a lot of ex-football

---

285 Interview with Brian Burrows by Ray Robinson.
286 Interview with Gordon Dale. Equivalent to around £8 in today’s money.
287 Interview with Ken Turner. Equivalent to about £4 in today’s money.
Although average annual wages have increased from £705 in 1964 (equivalent to £11,157 in 2010) to £24,753 in 2013, representing a 55% increase, an increase in ticket prices from two or four shillings to £30 represents an 86 or 73% increase, clearly exceeding the differential in relative earnings. Still though, the demographic composition of football crowds has not necessarily shifted completely in terms of socio-economic class, as former Football Supporters’ Association chairman Rogan Taylor observed in 2011: “I don't mostly see a bourgeois, middle-class crowd, but ordinary people who must be stretching to afford it”. According to this view, the current ‘struggle’ to afford football rather than fans’ exclusion from it represents the significant issue in the game’s decline as ‘sport of the masses’.

In the 1960s, whilst recognising themselves as key components in the commercial success of football, working-class fans had fewer concerns over football’s expense, as it was still relatively affordable. Indeed, one journalist at the Evening Chronicle claimed in 1961 that ‘soccer has sold itself cheaply – too cheaply’. This was especially the case compared with ‘continental’ football, and ‘only in London do the patrons of the best stand seats have to hand over ten shillings’. However, his claims were in response to what he described as ‘the old argument about increasing the charges’, suggesting, in his words, that ‘the average football fan’ was dissatisfied with ticket prices. Retrospective accounts do not recollect having such grievances, presumably because the present cost of football is substantially more expensive.

Alternatively, reflecting on evidence from fans in this section suggests that the disjuncture between football’s commercial aspects and its working-class fans has

---

288 Interview with George Orr.
289 Conn, ‘The Premier League has Priced Out Fans’.
290 ‘Stop Wanting Your Game On The Cheap’.
largely been a product of post-1990s developments and imposed retrospectively. As football fans and the media currently object to overpaid players, ‘sanitised’ stadiums and profiteering directors, lamenting the loss of ‘the people’s game’, it is assumed that such trends have always been incompatible with working-class wishes and identities, which was not necessarily the case in the 1950s and 1960s, as this chapter has argued.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has demonstrated an increasing focus on football as an entertainment business in the early 1960s, in terms of its money-making potential, the rewards and responsibilities of directors and players, and the rights and satisfaction of its customers. Additionally, the juxtaposition of 1960s and 1990s developments in this chapter has enabled an interrogation of popular and media nostalgia for a lost ‘golden age’ of football’s ‘working-classness’. Whilst some of these developments had antecedents in preceding decades and are comparable with late-nineteenth-century commercialisation as well as that of the late twentieth century, the abolition of the maximum wage in 1961 and the need to improve stadiums following the allocation of World Cup matches were discussed in terms of their relationship to new developments, and to the changing priorities of supporters.

Mike Savage and Selina Todd argue that post-war affluence had minimal impact on working-class identities, as material improvements in terms of salaries and disposable incomes were not always felt to be secure. Nick Tiratsoo suggests that,
rather than undergoing a process of ‘enbourgeoisement’, the period of affluence ‘had most to do with evolving different ways of being working class’, rather than becoming more ‘middle class’.292 Hence, football supporters’ demands for better stadiums and players did not necessarily conflict with their working-class identities, and the game’s overall commercial aspects did not clash with its status as ‘the people’s game’, irrespective of affluence. This has implications for broader considerations of working-class culture, particularly for defining such cultures retrospectively. The case of football suggests that its historical definition as ‘the people’s game’ in terms of its connections to working-class fans and identities has become narrowly focused on present-day concerns and complaints, which differ from those of ‘the people’ to whom the phrase refers.

Chapter 2: Becoming a Man in Post-War Britain

In 1959, the Labour Party established its Youth Commission with the stated aim of addressing and resolving ‘youth problems’, which typified post-war media, medical and sociological attitudes towards ‘youth’ as a distinctive and problematic social category. Although public concerns about working-class youth and juvenile delinquency were apparent from at least the late-nineteenth century, the post-war ‘baby boom’ and relative affluence seemingly created an unprecedented number of young people with unprecedented levels of disposable income and leisure time. For example, contemporary social scientist Mark Abrams identified ‘distinctive teenage spending for distinctive teenage ends in a distinctive teenage world’, and in 1958 Richard Hoggart’s seminal *Uses of Literacy* lamented young people’s ‘diet of sensation without commitment’ as characteristic of an emergent youth culture, which resulted from affluence and a consequent rise in commercial industries aimed at young people. For media and government commentators, young people’s ‘empty hours faced with empty heads, full pockets and high spirits’ underlay their deviant or delinquent behaviour. Since then, this rising youth culture and adults’ reaction against it have become inextricably linked in popular culture with an image of the

---

‘swinging sixties’ as a decade of cultural revolution and generational ruptures and divisions.\textsuperscript{297}

In contrast, this chapter argues that for many boys and young men in the 1950s and 1960s, distinctively youth cultures, cultural revolution and inter-generational conflict were not all-pervasive in their everyday lives and leisure activities. Retrospective personal testimonies from football fans recall their childhood and adolescent aspirations to engage in what they now articulate as a traditional working-class pastime, and to learn what they remember as having been an adult culture of older fans. This learning process entailed significant rites of passage that marked an individual’s progression through his life course, and which were constructed and regulated by older members of their local working-class community. The recollection and publication of these stories in later life has enabled these men to participate in the construction of a collective memory regarding the history of their club and football generally, continuing the tradition of cross-generational cultural transmission that they entered into in their post-war adolescence.

Historians have begun to re-evaluate the extent of generational rupture and conflict in post-war leisure. For example, Selina Todd and Hillary Young argue that parental co-operation, support and encouragement were essential to working-class young people’s leisure activities in the 1950s and 1960s.\textsuperscript{298} Studies of popular music have also countered the image of adult disapproval of post-war youth cultures,

\textsuperscript{297} For an example of this popular imagery, see Marwick, \textit{The Sixties}.
highlighting the favourable reception of certain musicians across generations. Marcus Collins describes how The Beatles were considered ‘family entertainment’ and a potentially positive influence on British youth by Members of Parliament, whilst Keith Gildart interprets the music of The Kinks as an expression of traditional forms of class consciousness, given their lyrics’ tendency to criticise popular perceptions of ‘swinging London’, ‘affluence’ and ‘consensus’. This chapter builds on this work in questioning ‘the generation gap’, but focuses on young people’s engagement with and learning of adult culture, rather than adults’ attitudes towards youth culture. It also contributes to a growing body of literature that seeks to historicise the ‘swinging sixties’ and challenge popular images of cultural revolution and generational rupture, by stressing cross-generational cultural exchange and continuity in terms of young people’s socialisation into and identification with local community values through football.

Despite this chapter’s emphasis on continuity and generational co-operation, it also recognises the significance of age and generation both in terms of the historical identities of football fans, and in terms of the reconstruction of such identities in retrospective personal testimonies. Memories of childhood and adolescent experiences of football reveal age-specific practices and identities, as well as

---


revealing the significance of the life course in the learning of local, masculine and working-class identities. Such memories are in turn informed by the passage of time and the ‘elder’ status of fans, enabling the construction of an age-specific identity for these fans as knowledgeable storytellers and historians of their clubs. Nevertheless, this chapter argues that such age-specific practices and identities did and do not override, but instead formed part of, a more general sense of community and identity, in a way that historians of post-war Britain and youth cultures have hitherto neglected.

This chapter is structured so as to emphasise inter-generational co-operation and cultural transmission at various stages of fans’ life course. The first section focuses on older fans in the post-1990s era, arguing that their memories and stories of post-war football constitute a valued means through which to ensure the continuation or remembrance of community traditions and identities, and an attempt to impart knowledge to younger generations. Although this departs from the thesis’s overall focus on the 1960s, it does so in order to examine one of the ways in which ‘narratives of the sixties have been mobilised and reworked’ in subsequent decades.\(^2\)

The topics and themes of these stories are largely determined by communities of fans themselves, influenced by what they think is important to other fans, which is one of the benefits of using personal testimonies collected by and for other football fans, and internet fan forum discussions.

The second section examines these fans’ reconstructions of their childhood and youthful experiences of football, revealing their recollections of the rites of passage that marked their transitions between age groups. Rather than marking

\(^{2}\) Donnelly, *Sixties Britain*, p. xii.
distinctive age-based cultures, this section argues that these transitions signified the learning of a local, working-class masculine culture that predated the post-war period and was encouraged and enforced by older generations of football fans. The final section considers the extent and significance of distinctively ‘youth’ cultures at football matches in the ‘swinging sixties’, such as the singing of pop songs at football matches, and argues that such practices enabled inter-generational communication and togetherness, rather than reinforcing divisions.

**Telling Football Stories in the Twenty First Century**

This section addresses the significance of memory and storytelling in later life to football fans’ construction of a sense of self, as well as to the informal education of younger fans, in a process of cross-generational cultural exchange. It focuses on the motivations and impact of older fans’ football stories in order to argue that recent developments in British football have raised concerns over the maintenance of communitarian identities, which fans have responded and adapted to by utilising novel forms of communication. One such response entails the sharing of stories about the 1960s and football traditions, providing an example of this decade’s role in constructing fans’ sense of identity through memory in later life, as well as in defining a collective consciousness among both younger and older fans, irrespective of whether one experienced football in this decade or not.

As we saw in Chapter One, the changes in British football signalled by the Taylor Report in 1990, the British Sky Broadcasting deal and the advent of the Premier League in 1992, have encouraged a popular tendency to reflect nostalgically
on football’s past prior to the introduction of all-seater stadiums and substantial increases in ticket prices.\(^{303}\) Although partially media constructed, the present-day popular attention to football’s post-war history also involves the active participation of fans themselves, who perform a role as historians of their football club, imparting knowledge to younger generations through internet fan forums and oral history interviews.\(^{304}\) The passage of time and the attainment of ‘elder’ status enable such fans to perform this role, and arguably represent the adoption of an age-specific identity. However, as this section argues, it also enables their participation in the continued construction of other identities based on class, masculinity, and locality as they relate to football support, despite the potential ruptures brought about by football’s early 1990s transformation.

Historians of modern Britain have rarely considered the significance of aging or old age in forging distinct identities, with the primary focus being on youth cultures and identities, and their incompatibility with older generations.\(^{305}\) In contrast, sociologists and anthropologists have examined the ways in which the physical and temporal experience of aging can be internalised and impact upon a sense of self, as


\(^{305}\) Pat Thane has sought to redress this imbalance by examining the ways in which the experience of aging has changed over time. Pat Thane, Old Age in English History: Past Experiences, Present Issues, (Oxford, 2002).
well as impact upon other identities as they are constructed retrospectively.\textsuperscript{306} Memory and storytelling are integral to such processes of identity construction, in terms of their ability to encourage consciousness and appreciation of the passage of time, whereby ‘our present knowledge of our “selves” as aged beings is, in part, a function of our memory of ourselves at previous ages’.\textsuperscript{307} Similarly, our present knowledge of our past selves as classed and gendered beings relies on memory and the search for composure, in which the aging process is influential, as Carolyn Steedman noted when reconstructing the ‘oddness’ of her childhood from an adult perspective.\textsuperscript{308} As opposed to earlier criticisms of oral history and personal testimony as unreliable sources of information about the past, historians now generally recognise the value of such material as a window into the internal creative process of remembering and the significance of this process to an individual sense of self.\textsuperscript{309}

As Sally Alexander argues, this process is not always individual and age-exclusive, but can be collaborative and cross-generational, whereby older storytellers shape the identities of their younger listeners or readers, who in turn guide the recollections and composure of their elders.\textsuperscript{310} A comparable interaction is discernable amongst football fans, with the memories of older fans aimed at informing and instructing younger generations, whilst this aim and young fans’ reception of such memories informs and shapes the identities of the storytellers, both

\textsuperscript{307} Hockey and James, \textit{Social Identities across the Life Course}, p. 208.
\textsuperscript{308} Carolyn Steedman, \textit{Landscape for a Good Woman}, (London, 1986), p. 44.
\textsuperscript{309} Thompson discusses such scepticism. Thompson, \textit{The Voice of the Past}. Summerfield exemplifies this historiographical interest in subjectivities over the recollection of objective ‘facts’. Summerfield, ‘Culture and Composure’, p. 65.
\textsuperscript{310} Sally Alexander, “‘Do Grandmas have Husbands?’ Generational Memory and Twentieth-Century Women’s Lives”, \textit{The Oral History Review}, 36:2, (2009), pp. 159-176.
as age-specific and authoritative ‘elders’, and as members of the same local masculine community of football fans as their target audience.

Dave Russell has noted the public and performative nature of football’s 1990s ‘turn to history’, in which fans’ commemoration of dead players and managers ‘formed a part of the process through which they recast an image tarnished by hooliganism’, casting themselves as respectful and respectable.\(^{311}\) In contrast, this section argues that the public telling of football stories has more to do with the perceived decline of older forms of cross-generational cultural exchange due to the material changes in football since the early 1990s.\(^{312}\) As the second section of this chapter details, young football fans in the 1950s and 1960s were socialised into their local masculine parent culture through widely accepted rites of passage related to football, particularly the spatial transitions within stadiums that marked various stages in the process of becoming a man. The eradication of standing terraces following the Taylor Report in 1990 removed such spatial demarcations of age, whilst it has also become substantially more expensive for young fans to attend football matches or for their parents to fund their socialisation through this pastime.\(^{313}\) The ways in which fans have adapted to such changes, in order to maintain the cross-generational bonds that they remember having discerned in the 1950s and 1960s, represents an important continuity in the tradition of constructing and expressing a sense of community through football, one which survived the generational ruptures popularly associated

\(^{311}\) Dave Russell, “‘We All Agree, Name the Stand after Shankly’: Cultures of Commemoration in Late Twentieth-Century English Football Culture’, *Sport in History*, 26:1, (2006), p. 12.

\(^{312}\) For a more detailed discussion of such changes, see Chapter 1.

\(^{313}\) A 2011 Premier League survey indicated that the proportion of younger fans attending Premier League matches had declined more markedly than other demographics since 1992, as reported in Conn, ‘The Premier League has Priced Out Fans’. 
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with the 1960s, and which has adjusted to the commercialised, mediated and
globalised nature of contemporary British football.

Evidence of such adjustment is provided by the discussion of clubs’ history on
internet fan forums. As discussed in the introduction to this thesis, there are
substantial methodological issues with the use of such websites in academic research,
particularly the anonymity of participants, the legitimacy of fans’ accounts of their
experiences, a potential ‘digital divide’, and the relative ‘authenticity’ of online
fandom.\(^{314}\) However, it is necessary to consider the possibility that fans engage in
both ‘traditional’ or ‘authentic’ forms of support such as attending matches, as well as
participating in online discussion forums.\(^{315}\) Equally, there is a potential for such
forums to be used as sites of protest or resistance against football’s commercialisation
and globalisation, either through explicit discussion of such topical issues, or through
the dissemination of traditional notions of fandom as they relate to local, gendered
and classed identities.

In other areas of popular culture such as television viewing, sociologists view
online fan forums as ‘self-defined and ongoing interpretive communities’ that
‘transcend the time-space barrier at an unprecedented scale and scope’.\(^{316}\) In the case
of football, fan forums also constitute ‘self-defined’ communities that transcend time
and space, but equally, participants demonstrate a concern with older community
attachments and values, as well as a strong sense of history and place. Part of this
concern hinges on the extent to which future generations will continue to participate

\(^{314}\) Markham, ‘The Methods, Politics, and Ethics’; Sapsford, ‘Research and Information on the Net’.
\(^{316}\) Hangwoo Lee, ‘Implosion, Virtuality, and Interaction in an Internet Discussion Group’,
in this process of cultural exchange and share the community identities that older fans reconstruct via the internet.

A Liverpool fan known as ‘kriss’ initiated a discussion of the Anfield Boys’ Pen on the Redandwhitekop fan forum in February 2013, and ‘Big Red Ritchie’ asked, ‘is there a point to this?’ In response, ‘kriss’ expressed the fear that such stories would be forgotten by future generations and consequently should be recorded by fans of his age: ‘I feel it is important that people know because in another generation’s time a lot of supporters won’t even remember the Boys’ Pen in the Kop’. The Boys’ Pen was an area of the stadium designated for under-16-year-olds, and offered cheaper admission prices than other parts of the ground. It is unclear exactly when it was eradicated from Anfield, with fans on the Onthekop forum unable to agree, and other fans not always specifying their age and the dates they recall having experienced the Boys’ Pen. The last match before the demolition of the main Kop, which the Boys’ Pen was part of, was in 1993, so at least 20 years elapsed before ‘kriss’ instigated this discussion. For him, the primary reason for telling stories about football’s pre-1990s history was the possibility that such memories would be lost if they were not shared with younger fans:

the number of people who can give those testimonies/personal memories is decreasing all the time. I just think it is important to get some sort of record down now so that supporters of today can realise what it was like in a different era…I just want it recorded and here is as good a place as any other.\(^{319}\)


\(^{318}\) Premier League clubs generally still offer concessionary rates for under 16s, but without restricting their location within stadiums. There has been a recent trend for designated ‘family enclosures’ at football grounds, but these are not age-exclusive, and therefore do not replicate the experience of attending matches unsupervised by adults that the Boys’ Pens did previously.

\(^{319}\) Kriss, The History of the Boys’ Pen at Anfield.
Another fan using the forum agreed with ‘kriss’: ‘posts like this that show a very interesting part of our past that you would not otherwise know too much about is just great.’ One of the forum’s moderators also concurred: ‘spot on Kriss, that’s exactly why we started the history thread’. These fans’ sense of responsibility for recording their stories for future generations, now that such experiences are no longer available to younger supporters, potentially indicates a lack of interest in football’s post-war history among present-day younger fans, and a consequent need to encourage interest. This encouragement is comparable to evidence discussed in the second section of this chapter, which describes how parents or other elders influenced children’s interest and participation in football in the 1950s and 1960s, and represents a similar cross-generational cultural exchange.

Given that much of this chapter relies on evidence from fans who were young in the 1950s and 1960s, the extent to which older fans in post-war Britain feared that their community values and identities as expressed through football would be forgotten by younger generations is difficult to estimate. However, the stories of these younger fans suggest that parents and other adult fans ensured the continuation of tradition and the transition from childhood to adulthood by guiding young football fans through rites of passage such as the Boys’ Pen, and relied on informal oral traditions in maintaining this process of cultural transmission. According to these fans’ adult perspective, 1990s developments associated with commercialisation and stadium redevelopment are the main threat to such processes and the construction of community identities, rather than internal generational divisions within such communities. Consequently, present-day older fans depict their storytelling as a
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valuable service to younger fans unable to share the experiences of post-war football and its role in becoming a man, rather than as a response to their lack of interest.

The Everton Collection’s 2010 oral history project, which contains several interviews with fans of the club and is available to listen to online, is one manifestation of such concerns. Some of the interviewees, whose stories form the basis of discussion in the second part of this chapter, also volunteered to conduct the interviews. One fan, George Orr, decided to write two books and start his own fanzine about the club’s history, having felt that too many fanzines were only concerned with contemporary football, and that not enough of Everton’s history had been recorded:

Everton were the team of the sixties - it’s forgotten…So I thought, I’ll do this book…There was tonnes of Evertonians like me who loved Alex Young. They were still telling their kids about him, telling their grandkids, but there wasn’t a book about him. There was nothing. So I just sold out. That paid for my daughter’s wedding.\(^{322}\)

George thus presents himself as responding to a demand for information about Everton’s history. In another exchange between fans participating in the project, John Churchill, who was conducting the interview, complained, ‘Sky think football started in 1992 don’t they…there’s no football before then. Premier League, and that’s it.’ According to his view, it was Sky and the Premier League’s marketing of more recent football that threatened the remembrance of earlier eras and players, and since these bodies represent the commercial aspects of present-day football, their accounts are implicitly less valuable. Ken Turner replied, ‘you only have to look at the Everton Collection to realise where football started and how long ago it was.’\(^{323}\) This evidence indicates the importance of participating in the maintenance of Everton’s history for
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\(^{322}\) Interview with George Orr.

\(^{323}\) Interview with Ken Turner.
these supporters, whose stories are primarily for the benefit of fans too young to have shared their experiences.

Younger Liverpool fans participating in online discussions of Anfield’s Boys’ Pen concur with this idea of storytelling as a valuable service performed by their elders, and similarly lament the impact of 1990s developments on the availability of such rites of passage to them and their children. A commentator known as ‘Only5times’ exemplifies this sense of having been deprived of an important formative experience: ‘I missed out on that shenanigans (too young)...I wish my little fella could see what it was like (sic.)’.324 ‘Lloydiethe1st’ agreed that the Boys’ Pen ‘sounds a million miles away from the sanitised footballdome we reside in today (sic)’, explicitly articulating commercialisation and stadium redevelopment as a disadvantage to his generation. ‘Beinmar Col’ also regretted that the Boys’ Pen was ‘unfortunately just before my time’, as did ‘Andy82lfc’.325 As well as considering themselves unfortunate to have missed out, these younger fans also expressed the value of such stories from older fans:

Only born in the 80’s I’m far too young to remember any of this but the whole story about it and escaping into the kop etc is brilliant, as brutal as it sounds I wish I could of experienced that myself. What a difference a few decades make.

Similarly, ‘Only5times’ was grateful to older fans using the Onthekop forum to share an important aspect of their past: ‘Great stuff boys, like me granddads war

stories’. Internet fan forums such as these have thus become important places for the type of cross-generational communication and cultural transmission that older fans remember having taken place in their post-war childhood and adolescence, but which is no longer guaranteed by attending matches and speaking to older relatives, who might also be too young to have experienced the Boys’ Pen. However, the construction of pre-1990s football stories and storytellers as valuable to younger generations is also pertinent in assessing the validity of fans’ accounts in internet forum discussions - given that we cannot be sure how old participants are, there must also be uncertainty as to whether their ‘experiences’ are actually fantasies or inventions.

As well as commercialisation and the sanitising of football grounds, a minority of older fans depict present-day political correctness as incompatible with the role of Boys’ Pens in a broader masculine culture of football fans. In discussing the Boys’ Pen at Goodison Park, Everton fan Ray Redfern complained,

There’s no such thing any more. They wouldn’t even be allowed to call it the Boys’ Pen any more. Some bureaucrat would be down on them wouldn’t they, like a ton of bricks. “You’ve got to call it the Young People’s Enclosure”, or something.

Ray’s evidence, without necessarily objecting to the increasingly less gender-exclusive nature of football support in Britain, hints at his concern with football’s emasculation resultant from political correctness, and detrimental to traditional aspects of terrace culture such as Boys’ Pens and their associated identities. In

328 Sports sociologists Tom Gibbons and Kevin Dixon attempt to challenge ‘the Internet’s reputation for fraud and fantasy’. Gibbons and Lusted, ““Surf’s Up!””, p. 607.
contrast, a Liverpool fan using the name ‘Xabier Alonso Olan’ on the Redandwhitekop forum was less opposed to the idea of adapting such rites of passage to be more gender-inclusive and reflective of current crowd compositions:

Be lovely if the club truly embraced our vast history and traditions, would love the idea of a specifically named kids section in the ground, a boys and girls Pen so to speak. Nostalgic possibly but it would continue the legacy of the auld boys pen.  

This ‘legacy’, according to ‘Xabier Alonso Olan’, did not necessarily hinge on gender, but instead centred on the spatial segregation of age groups. Despite the often negative and frightening memories of the Boys’ Pen as the second part of this chapter describes, retrospective testimonies construct it as an important feature of the clubs’ history, and a necessary experience in the growing up of younger fans. Whereas ‘Mottman’ was ‘thankful’ his children would not have to undertake this rite of passage, ‘Kal’ was ‘glad that I did my time in the Boys’ Pen…just like my dad did before me.’

‘Kal’ thus implicitly relates the emulation of his father’s football-related rites of passage to his appreciation of his own experiences of becoming a man, suggesting that the Boys’ Pen’s significance in retrospective accounts derived from its long-term and cross-generational nature, and its relation to familial and communitarian bonds.

It is possible that older fans’ reconstruction of the Boys’ Pen as a significant aspect of the process of growing up and in the maintenance of communitarian identities across generations represents their search for composure. Their narratives of

their post-war experiences construct their present-day identities as ‘traditional’ fans, who experienced an era of football that they reconstruct as firmly rooted in working-class, masculine local cultures that transcended generations, as opposed to the less certain identities of younger generations. In this sense, older-fans’ football stories represent the construction of positively-defined age and generation-based identities, whereby the passage of time enables football fans to adopt an authoritative voice on the game’s history as elders, and discussions of the ruptures brought about by 1990s developments allow for the construction of boundaries between generations. However, if, as Summerfield argues, narratives of selfhood in personal testimonies are constructed ‘in the hope of eliciting recognition and affirmation from his or her audience’, and assuming that older fans’ audience is not exclusively composed of members of the same age group, then younger fans’ input into the construction of generationally-distinct narratives must be recognised.\(^{332}\) This collaboration indicates that old and young fans endeavour to continue the traditions of cross-generational exchange that the stories about pre-1990s football reconstruct, even as they emphasise the loss of such traditions.

Although this exchange process entails the construction of age and generation-based identities, fans tend to stress the external factors that they perceive as having imposed these distinctions, expressing a sense of regret that such generational breaks have accompanied 1990s commercialising processes. Rather than simply representing an attempt to find composure and assert the positive features of a ‘traditional’ pre-1990s generational identity, fans’ stories of post-war football also represent an attempt to counteract generational divisions by stressing the impact of

\(^{332}\) Summerfield, ‘Culture and Composure’, p. 70.
commercialisation on a retrospectively constructed, more unified, working-class and masculine identity.

Older fans’ attempt to forge links with a current generation of younger fans, through the reconstruction of a more cohesive community identity of football fans, is evidenced by their concern that the practices of such a community ‘shouldn’t just be confined to history but be revived with a view to the future.’ Several storytellers identify current Premier League ticket prices as a major obstacle to the revival of such traditions as Boys’ Pens, as a Liverpool supporter known as ‘The LeftSide’ claimed on the redandwhitekop forum: ‘If the pen was still here today we would be charging kids a tenner to get in.’ Although some fans express an awareness of inflation, their personal testimonies tend to recall other things that could be bought for the cost of a match ticket previously, or the proportion of one’s childhood or adolescent ‘spends’ it represented. Everton fan Brian Burrows, born in 1947, remembered paying three shillings in his childhood, which ‘didn’t seem very much. Me mum used to give me spends, and that was the same all over the country…It was affordable, for a young lad to go.’ It is worth considering the potential significance of the fact that it was Brian’s mother who regulated and facilitated his football support, given women’s general ‘invisibilization’ in football history, or their alleged role in drawing boys and men away from post-war football. Although he does not reflect in detail on this female influence on his football support, Brian’s evidence demonstrates that such

335 Interview with Brian Burrows by Ray Robinson.
336 Pope and Williams, “‘White Shoes to a Football Match!’”, p. 1; Walvin, The People’s Game, pp. 165-166.
influence was important in enabling boys such as him to learn and perform his
masculine role through football.

As well as parents, part-time employment could also facilitate boys’ football
support. Gordon Dale describes how his job as a 13-year-old delivery boy in 1960
would easily pay for his football support:

It was more reasonably priced for the working man…I used to do an order
round which got me 30 shillings, which would have got me six tickets for
the best seats at Everton. Nowadays somebody doing a paper round
wouldn’t be able to get a seat.337

It is significant that Gordon likens himself to the ‘working man’ in his account of his
childhood earnings and expenditure on football, demonstrating his internalisation of
closeness between age groups in terms of their identification with a working-class
culture of masculinity through football.

Although these fans and other interviewees were still attending matches in
2010 despite the admission costs, their disapproval of the prices reflected their
concern that younger fans would no longer be able to watch football as they had done
in their childhoods, and that fathers would not be able to share this pastime with their
sons, as Gordon noted: ‘now it can cost a family up to a hundred pounds to go to a
game.’338

Brian Burrows recalled attending a recent Everton match with special prices
for families:

They said £10 for dads, £5 for kids…There was a lad in front of me, he
was about five or six and he was really excited, and I said to his dad,

337 Interview with Gordon Dale by John Dale.
338 Interview with Gordon Dale by John Dale.
‘Why’s he so excited?’ ‘It’s his first game,’ he said, ‘I can’t afford to go to a game, let alone bring him.’…That lad’ll be committed now.\footnote{Interview with Brian Burrows. Simon Churchill discusses the expense of club merchandise for parents. Interview with Simon Churchill by John Churchill, (2010), \url{http://www.evertoncollection.org.uk/article?id=ART94029} [Accessed on 17/11/2012].}

In this account, children’s match attendance is considered crucial in ensuring the continued future of Everton’s ‘committed’ support base, and consequently the collective identities of its fans. Later in his interview, Brian described working in a school whose pupils’ parents could not afford to take them to matches: ‘I taught kids, who were 14, 15, 16, who said they were Evertonians, but they’d never been to Goodison.’\footnote{Interview with Brian Burrows.} This further indicates older fans’ concern with subsequent generations’ inclusion. Brian also expressed this imperative in his praise for the club’s efforts to include younger fans through an Everton in the Community scheme, which offered schools £10 tickets for groups of pupils: ‘you’ve got to get the kids in because they’re the future generation.’\footnote{Interview with Ray Redfern, who also worked in a school at the time of his interview, likewise praised this scheme: \begin{quote} To get a seat for £10 is marvellous… we go about 25 of us together to the game… gets an extra gang of young Blues going to the game who might grow up and want to go every week.\footnote{Interview with Ray Redfern.} \end{quote} }

The importance of ensuring the continuation of support for Everton through younger generations is part of a broader concern with ensuring that the club’s history and traditions – as well as their associations with the learning of local working-class identities – are remembered and continued, which reflects new forms of inter-generational co-operation and exchange necessitated by 1990s changes.
Among these changes, the idea that football support is no longer a cross-generational working-class pastime troubles older fans, such as Phil Parker, who expressed disappointment at economically disadvantaged fans being ‘priced out’, to the detriment of the sport:

they play hard, they play the game at the lower level in the Sunday league and during the week and in the schools and they know what they’re talking about and what they’re watching. I think there was far more knowledge in football crowds years ago than there is now.343

Fan John Summerfield also described how his experience of Goodison Park had become less enjoyable because of such changes: ‘we kept shouting and screaming, and you were meant to just sit there and eat your funny sandwiches’, alluding to Manchester United player Roy Keane’s famous criticism of Old Trafford fans for eating prawn sandwiches and having little interest in football, which resulted in such fans being labelled ‘the prawn sandwich brigade’.344 This preoccupation with the perceived decline of football’s working-class characteristics will be deconstructed in greater detail in Chapter 3 of this thesis, but for now it is important to note its role in articulating a sense of generational rupture. According to retrospective accounts of post-war football, not only was the game an important pastime for working-class men, it was also affordable and educational for their sons, and consequently a shared source of pride and identification across generations. 1990s developments are presented as a threat to this situation.

344 Interview with John Summerfield. ‘Angry Keane Slams United Fans’.
Older fans do not unanimously view all aspects of contemporary football negatively, and several interviewees from The Everton Collection expressed a preference for seated accommodation in Goodison Park.\textsuperscript{345} Nevertheless, they usually attribute this preference to old age, reflecting a longer-term trend for older fans to ‘retire’ from the terraces to seated parts of the ground. Terracing is still generally considered to have been safe and appropriate for younger men, although this view has been coloured by the 1989 Hillsborough disaster, in which 96 Liverpool fans died as a result of overcrowding and a subsequent crush.\textsuperscript{346} Everton fan Ray Redfern, born in 1945, articulated the impact of Hillsborough on how terracing has been remembered:

Looking back on it now it was fearsome, absolutely fearsome. It wouldn’t be tolerated now, all the post-Hillsborough, and quite rightly too, it shouldn’t be, but we never thought much of it, fit young men. It was a crowd, and you were in it, and, tough.\textsuperscript{347}

Ray’s testimony implies the ordinariness of uncomfortable or unsafe crowd conditions pre-Hillsborough, and associates this ordinariness with the ability of ‘fit young men’ to withstand such conditions. His characterisation of his youthful terrace experiences as ‘fearsome’ derives from his retrospective and older position, as opposed to from his memories of being afraid at the time, when he ‘never thought much of it’.

A Liverpool fan known as ‘The 92A’ on the Redandwhitekop forum also described previously crowded and uncomfortable terraces as ‘normality’, and Hillsborough as ‘totally different’ due to ‘gross neglect forcing in too many at semi-

\textsuperscript{345} For example, Interview with Brian Burrows, Interview with Dave Webb, Interview with Phil Parker, Interview with Simon Churchill, and Interview with Tim Byrne by Shaun McCoy.  
\textsuperscript{347} Interview with Ray Redfern.
According to him, young fans ‘soon became proficient in the crowd’ following their apprenticeship in the Boys’ Pen or adult terraces:

you knew where the barriers where how to sidestep so you didn’t go flying down the steps…by the time I was thirteen or fourteen I was a veteran who could handle myself in any crowd, knowing when to give and when to resist, it was rammed in there but football fans were used to it.349

He also recalled a friend who had ‘grown up on the (Gwladys) Street End’ at Everton, making him equally ‘proficient in the crowd’, but who had struggled at another Hillsborough semi-final in the late 1970s due to overcrowding.350 The testimony of ‘The 92A’ suggests that football crowds were not considered inherently dangerous by fans who had served an apprenticeship and ‘grown up’ on the terraces, and that disasters such as Hillsborough should be viewed as the result of outside influences, and therefore separated from the historical ‘normality’ of football fans.

The following section further examines the centrality of crowd ‘proficiency’ as an indicator of adulthood in fans’ memories of post-war football. Firstly though, it is necessary to speculate as to why older fans in the present context engage in such reconstructions of football as a tool of socialisation. In part, such stories reveal a desire to dissociate pre-1990s football from crowd disorder and disasters in collective memory and public discourse. Rather than merely attributing this dissociation to nostalgia or denial however, the evidence in this section has demonstrated fans’ expression of concern with the potential generational ruptures resultant from younger fans’ being ‘priced out’ and being denied the socialising experiences provided by terrace culture, despite the arguably negative characteristics of the ‘fearsome’ terraces. Older fans’ concern with the ‘future’ or ‘younger’ generation, whilst it

348 The 92A, Re: The History of the Boys’ Pen at Anfield.
349 The 92A, Re: The History of the Boys’ Pen at Anfield.
350 The 92A, Re: The History of the Boys’ Pen at Anfield.
distinguishes themselves as elders or ‘traditional’ fans with the knowledge and experience required of them as storytellers, also indicates their effort to perpetuate and adapt football’s traditions of cross-generational communication and exchange that have been endangered by developments since the 1990s.

**Post-War Rites of Passage at Football Matches**

If the beginning of the apprenticeship marked the end of childhood then to finish ‘serving your time’ was to enter into manhood.\(^{351}\)

The above quote, taken from Alan McKinlay and John Hampton’s 1991 oral history of interwar Clydebank shipbuilders, illustrates a distinctively working-class culture of becoming a man through rites of passage associated with the workplace. This section outlines how memories of post-war football in the north of England reconstruct comparable transitions, and use similar work-related language, in oral history interviews, published collections of personal testimonies, and internet fan forum discussions. These rites of passage included the first match attended, followed by attending matches without an adult chaperone, before ‘graduating’ from adolescence to adulthood through a move to a different area of the stadium. Taken as a whole, a theme that emerges from these sources is the idea of growing up through football, and learning to become a man through the achievement of independence from adults. Although a longer-term trend, football’s use in the socialisation of young men is especially significant in discussing the 1960s context, when, as Claire Langhamer argues, ‘youth’ became a ‘period of legitimate leisure, characterised by

freedom and independence’, as opposed to a period marked by entry into full-time employment. 352 This chapter argues that reaching independence as a football fan signified full adult membership of a community of football fans, and attainment of a traditional shared culture and identity, rather than a new and generationally distinct identity centred on post-war ideas of ‘youth’ and its subcultural manifestations. Furthermore, it argues that evidence of adult involvement in these rites of passage casts doubt on the extent of generational conflict in post-war Britain, at least in the arena of football support.

Early anthropological interest in rites of passage identified their necessity in protecting society from the potential disorder associated with transitions between age groups, whereas later work emphasises their role in indicating and constituting such transitions, whereby ‘the body is…made to have life-changing experiences, rather than being regarded as itself a source of change’. 353 The experience of such ritual practices also contributes to the construction of societies and communities, and therefore to their associated identities. This section similarly considers football-related rites of passage as integral to the construction of local, working-class cultures of masculinity, drawing on anthropologist Anthony Cohen’s conceptualisation of the construction of community as the learning of a ‘language’ from a vocabulary of


353 Hockey and James associate the shift in theoretical positions towards rites of passage as constitutive, rather than reflective or protective, of age transitions and society. Hockey and James, *Social Identities across the Life Course*, p. 26. For an early but influential anthropological interpretation of rites of passage, see Arnold Van Gennep, *The Rites of Passage*, (London, 1960 [1908]).
shared symbols, whose shared meaning must be learned and recognised, enabling the inclusion and exclusion of community members. In mid-twentieth-century Britain, a local football club was one such shared symbol, whilst the various practices and styles of support that were differentiated according to age represented the learning of the ‘language’ required in the formulation of a local working-class masculine identity. Equally, in late-twentieth and early-twenty-first-century reconstructions, football clubs provide ‘cultural anchors’ and ‘symbols of the ‘past’, mythically infused with timelessness’, to continue the construction of collective identities threatened by the game’s commercialisation and globalisation. Adult involvement, both in guiding and instructing boys’ early experiences of football in the post-war context, and in remembering and disseminating these experiences in the present context, as outlined in the previous section, indicate the significance of football as a tool of socialisation.

Whilst there is a sizeable historiographical and sociological literature on young men’s socialisation into work and its relationship to the learning of masculine and working-class identities, historians interested in the parallel processes evident in the realm of young men’s leisure have tended to focus on middle-class or institutional interventions, such as persistent ideas of ‘rational recreation’ or uniformed movements such as the Boy Scouts, in which ‘the dissemination of the culturally dominant gender ideology was an integral and unquestioned feature of their work.’

355 Cohen, The Symbolic Construction of Community, p. 102. For an example of a recent application of Cohen’s theories to contemporary British football fans, see Ed Mainwaring and Tom Clark, “‘We’re Shit and We Know We Are’: Identity, Place and Ontological Security in Lower League Football in England’, Soccer & Society, 13:1, (2012), pp. 107-123.
Comparatively minimal historiographical work has recognised the educational and socialising potential of commercial leisure for young working-class men, whereas historians generally accept its significance in girls’ learning and internalisation of ideas about femininity, and widely acknowledge the creativity and agency with which working-class consumers or participants engage with commercial forms of leisure.\(^{357}\)

Although Hall and Jefferson’s influential *Resistance Through Rituals* identified commercial leisure and consumer activity as integral to the identity construction of young men in post-war Britain, its focus on distinctively youth cultures – autonomous from both the literal ‘parent culture’ of local working-class adults, and from the more abstract ‘parent culture’ of the national, middle-class mainstream – has deflected attention from cross-generational leisure activities, and from the role of parents and broader community values in constructing young people’s identities.\(^{358}\)

Brad Beaven, in contrast, argues that not only was commercial leisure – including football spectatorship – capable of socialising boys and young men into ‘citizens’, but this was a key feature of its appeal in male working-class communities


\(^{358}\) Hall and Jefferson, *Resistance Through Rituals*. Historiographical examples of this focus on distinctive youth cultures and young people’s autonomous construction of their identities as separate from or resistant to those of adults include Osgerby, “Well it’s Saturday Night an’ I just got Paid”; August, ‘Gender and 1960s Youth Culture’. Recent sociological applications of Hall and Jefferson’s conceptualisation of youth subcultures have included a large body of literature on nightclub culture and its role in young people’s creation of their own rites of passage. See for example, Jeremy Northcote, ‘Nightclubbing and the Search for Identity: Making the Transition from Childhood to Adulthood in an Urban Milieu’, *Journal of Youth Studies*, 9:1, (2006), pp. 1-16.
in the late-nineteenth century, rather than the aim of ‘a manipulative ruling class’.\textsuperscript{359} This section argues that this situation continued in the post-war era and survived the generational ruptures associated with the 1960s, providing an example of inter-generational cultural cohesion that was organised by and within working-class communities. Andrew Davies’ studies of gang violence in nineteenth- and twentieth-century Manchester and Salford also illustrate a distinctively working-class culture of young men’s negotiation of their masculine identities outside of the workplace and school, and locate this ‘youth culture’ within a broader adult ‘parent’ culture.\textsuperscript{360} Building on Davies’ work, this section instead examines a non-violent culture of working-class masculinity and, equally as important, male emotional responses to and fears of violence. It also contributes to an increasing historiographical focus on boys’ and men’s ‘subjective understandings of everyday worlds’, as exemplified by Melanie Tebbutt’s use of inter-war leisure to argue that ‘being a boy and becoming a man encompassed more than collectivity, resistance and challenge and could also involve ambivalence, diffidence and loneliness’.\textsuperscript{361}

In retrospective personal testimonies, a majority of fans’ reflections on their initial interest in football or choice of a particular team recall adult influence. For example, of the 23 interviews on the Everton Collection website, only five fans cite reasons other than familial influence as to why they have grown up supporting Everton, and only two of these five recall their fathers having had little interest in football.\textsuperscript{362} Among the remainder of these five, Ken Turner and Ray Redfern recall

\textsuperscript{360} Davies, ‘Youth Gangs’.
\textsuperscript{361} Tebbutt,\textit{ Being Boys}, p. 270.
\textsuperscript{362} Brian Burrows’ father preferred cricket, and George Orr’s father ‘was not interested in football at all’. Interview with Brian Burrows; Interview with George Orr.
how the extent of differentiation between themselves and their families hinged on the choice between Liverpool and Everton, whereas Tim Byrne does not discuss familial influence.\textsuperscript{363} The rest of the interviews describe support for Everton as ‘a natural progression, it was in the family’ and ‘inherent’, or else one was ‘brought up that way’.\textsuperscript{364} A similar scenario emerges from Liverpool fans’ childhood memories in \textit{The Kop} and those of Newcastle fans in \textit{Maggie Memories}, such as Ian Swan, whose interest in football came from his grandfather.\textsuperscript{365} Adults introducing children to football was not a new development in post-war Britain, nor has it ceased in subsequent years, but it is important to historiographical discussions of this period in balancing a disproportionate focus on newer, more age-exclusive and generationally-distinct pastimes, which contribute to an image of the 1950s and 1960s as an era of youthful autonomy.

Newcastle fan Evan Martin remembers a comparable situation at the age of 10 in the late 1940s:

\begin{quote}
My next door neighbour, Tommy, was a Sunderland fan and when I was a boy he took me to Roker Park…Tommy wanted me to become a Sunderland supporter but my father was determined I would be a Newcastle fan.\textsuperscript{366}
\end{quote}

These disagreements between adults, as well as further demonstrating their intervention into younger relatives’ leisure habits, also indicate the significance of supporting the same team in creating and maintaining familial bonds. It must be noted, however, that evidence of such bonds and the association of football support with family history is provided by retrospective reconstructions, which may have as

\textsuperscript{363} For example, Interview with Ray Redfern; Interview with Ken Turner; Interview with Tim Byrne.
\textsuperscript{364} Interview with Stephen Todd; Interview with Simon Churchill; Interview with Phil Parker.
\textsuperscript{365} Ian Swan, in \textit{Maggie Memories}, p. 14.
much to do with individual nostalgia as with more general social and cultural trends. Nevertheless, the frequency with which fans’ stories evoke parental involvement as the principal reason for their future football allegiances suggests that parents in post-war Britain attached value to such allegiances, a value which, this chapter argues, derived from football’s role in the learning and expression of local, masculine and working-class identities.

In a minority of stories, fans recall being forced to take an interest in football, which further demonstrates their parents’ use of football in their socialisation into adulthood. For instance, Everton fan Simon Churchill remembers having football ‘shoved down my throat from an (unspecified) early age’. Evan Martin had to be ‘dragged’ by his father aged ten ‘just after the Second World War’ to watch Newcastle United:

I didn’t want to go to the game, I wanted to go to with my mother because I would get sweets for walking around. But I was forced to go to the game.

Evan’s case is potentially comparable to the earlier evidence of Brian Burrows pertaining to his mother’s involvement in encouraging his football support, in that there is a possibility that Evan’s mother was involved in the ‘forcing’ he remembers, thereby demonstrating the inclusion of women in such narratives of ‘becoming a man’.

Everton supporter Mike Everett, born in 1949, similarly recalls an initial lack of enthusiasm for football: ‘the best part about the day was a comic and a bag of

---

367 Interview with Simon Churchill.
crisps, rather than watching the football." In Evan’s case, a clear connection is evident between his first experiences of football and his parents’ ideas of appropriate gender roles, as well as the appropriate age at which these roles should be learned and performed. Having previously been allowed to accompany his mother on shopping trips while his father went to St. James’ Park, Evan was ‘dragged’ reluctantly into the realm of men, rather than deciding for himself which leisure activities were appropriately masculine, which supports Todd and Young’s efforts to challenge images of autonomous or rebellious post-war youth.

More commonly though, fans remember not understanding football during their early experiences, which is likely more consistent with their present-day construction of their identities as long-term passionate supporters than the idea of being forced. For instance, when Brian Burrows went to his first Everton game at the age of 13 in 1960, he ‘didn’t even know the names of the Everton players’, whilst Dave Webb describes missing the Everton team being presented with the First Division Championship trophy in 1963 as he left the ground immediately after the match, not realising the magnitude of the occasion: ‘I was only 14…It seems silly now, thinking back to it, but I didn’t know what was going on.’ Gary Hart does not remember his first match because he was taken to Goodison Park as an eight or 18-month-old baby. Again though, that these fans attended matches without knowing ‘what was going on’ implies their indoctrination by adults. It also highlights the necessity of learning more about football in the process of becoming a man, since fans

---

370 Todd and Young, ‘Baby-Boomers to ‘Beanstalkers’.
371 Interview with Brian Burrows; Interview with Dave Webb.
associate their lack of knowledge with their immaturity and exclusion from adulthood in their reconstructions.

Several fans’ accounts reconstruct their early experiences of football as a learning process, wherein an ability to talk about football was essential to their masculine roles. Part of this learning process, following parental introduction to football, revolved around socialising with other boys. For Newcastle supporter Ian Swan in 1969, football was ‘all me and my friends talked about’ at the age of 16, and Liverpool fan Andrew Thomas remembers witnessing two small boys ‘asking each other the most detailed and testing questions about the club’s history and players’, in an effort to publicly demonstrate that they had ‘learnt the entire history’ on his first visit to Anfield in the 1960s.373 Everton fan Brian Burrows remembers feeling embarrassed when his school friends had to explain to him who Everton player Alex Young was in the early 1960s:

I went to school on the Monday and said, ‘there was a player for Everton, number nine’, and my mate said, ‘Young?’…and I said, ‘I don’t know how old he was’.374

Brian and Andrew’s testimonies reveal the importance football knowledge to peer group affirmation and status, which was a specifically childhood and adolescent culture in which boys asserted their maturity over that of others with inferior ability to discuss football. However, it was also important as practice for future social interaction with older men, since parents had taught boys that understanding and talking about football was part of their future adult identities by taking or ‘dragging’ them to matches.

373 Ian Swan, in *Magpie Memories*, p. 88; Andrew Thomas, in *The Kop*, p. 47.
374 Interview with Brian Burrows.
Boys’ efforts to improve their understanding of football and its relation to their aspirations of being included in adult conversations, coupled with parents’ initiation of their children into football, counteract contemporary media images of a ‘war on parents’ signified by teenage runaways and the ‘lure’ of ‘coffee bars’. According to the *Daily Mirror* in 1957, parents should worry that ‘teenagers are fighting against authority’ and ‘hate to be bossed around’, whilst the general public was threatened with ‘panic in the streets’ caused by ‘the wild ones’ in 1964. The views and actions of football-supporting parents and their children challenge the relevance of these images to everyday experience in post-war Britain, since football’s socialising capacity enabled closer cross-generational links than distinctively ‘youth’ cultures, and what children learned from this socialisation enabled their adoption of the more traditional or longer-term community identities that contemporary social commentators such as Hoggart feared would be lost.

A central feature of what post-war boys and young men learned from football was the importance of physical strength and prowess, not necessarily in relation to violence, but in relation to withstanding the threat of such, and ‘standing your ground’. Fans remember becoming aware of their physical immaturity at their earliest football matches, either in comparison to larger adult fans or in relation to the ‘massive’ stadium. At Ray Redfern’s first Everton match as ‘a little lad’, he ‘couldn’t see very much’ due to his small size, and remembers ‘dodging between the

---

378 Interview with Dave Webb.
men’ or relying on them moving out of his way. Dave Morgan was nine or ten at his first Newcastle match in 1964, but ‘couldn’t see much and I was a bit squashed... I didn’t really see the goals.’ Football terraces in post-war Britain were often overcrowded, and as there was no formal allocation of space in standing areas, fans negotiated their positions amongst themselves, occasionally contesting the most desirable vantage points. At the age of ‘11 or 12’ in 1960, Liverpool fan Jeff Scott remembers arriving at Anfield several hours before kick-off to reserve a good position, only to be ‘pushed out of the way’ and ‘ barged’ by adult fans at the last minute. Jeff’s story casts doubt on the extent of cross-generational co-operation and friendliness at football matches, by providing an example of older and presumably bigger fans using their size and strength to gain a more advantageous viewing position. Nevertheless, it also illustrates how such differences in size and strength have been internalised by fans as significant components of their process of becoming a man.

More commonly, though, the practical problems associated with being small at football matches are remembered in terms of inter-generational co-operation, with children relying on older fans for assistance and protection. According to Liverpool supporter Johnny Kennedy, recalling his first match at Anfield aged four at an unspecified date, ‘everybody was very nice to me and very friendly, like they always are to a kid.’ Such friendliness and helpfulness form part of fans’ nostalgic reconstruction of their childhoods and the pre-1990s age of the terraces, but it also contrasts with their reconstructions of adolescence as a less communitarian and more

---

379 Interview with Ray Redfern.
380 Dave Morgan, in Magpie Memories, p. 16. See also Interview with Simon Churchill.
381 Jeff Scott in The Kop, p. 46.
382 Johnny Kennedy, in The Kop, p. 37.
dangerous experience, suggesting that fans’ seek composure from the separation of these life stages in their narratives. As this section discusses later, being a teenager meant ‘facing your fears’ and ‘looking after yourself’, whereas being a child meant being ‘looked after’.383 Newcastle fan Alan Gleghorn remembers of his first match in 1948, ‘if you were a little lad and couldn’t see the game, you were passed over the tops of the heads of the crowd to the front of the terraces.’384 Bill Saunders remembers this as a majority trend in the mid-1950s: ‘all the kids were passed down the terraces – over the heads of the crowd – so they could sit on the wall at the front.’385 Liverpool fan David Johnson remembers being ‘passed over down to the front, every single game’ in his early experiences of Anfield, suggesting this was a frequent and widespread occurrence.386

Once children were considered old enough to attend matches without an adult chaperone, the assistance of older fans was relinquished, and in some cases a spatial segregation between fans of different age groups was enforced. For Liverpool fans who had first experienced Anfield in the Spion Kop with an adult relative, the beginning of their adolescence is remembered as coinciding with their move to the Boys’ Pen, which by the 1950s was situated in the top right-hand corner of the Kop.387 Although the exact age at which young fans were allowed to attend matches without an adult varies between accounts and is not consistently specified, it is generally remembered as corresponding with the time when ‘all my pals’ were being
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383 Anonymous, in Tales from the Gwladys Street, p. 40.
384 Alan Gleghorn, in Magpie Memories, p. 12.
386 Three Sides of the Mersey, 126.
387 Official records of the development of Anfield contain minimal information on the Boys’ Pen, but according to the website liverpoolpictorial.com, it ‘was around for 70 years before being demolished in the early ‘80s’. See, http://www.liverpoolpictorial.co.uk/blog/liverpool-fc-boys-pen/ [Accessed on 14/07/2014].
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allowed, and involved a process of ‘going on’ at one’s parents until they relented.\textsuperscript{388} Liverpool fan Steve Anderson remembers being nine when this occurred, whereas Everton fan Mike Lyons was 14 when he started going ‘with just my mates’ in 1966, having previously been taken by his father from the age of eight.\textsuperscript{389} Whilst being able to attend matches unaccompanied by an adult marked the achievement of a degree of independence, for many Merseyside fans the attainment of full adult status was delayed by an ‘apprenticeship’ in the Boys’ Pen.\textsuperscript{390}

Younger fans were not formally prevented from entering other parts of the stadium, but the Boy’s Pens at Anfield and Goodison Park provided cheaper admittance and were restricted to under-16s, enforcing generational segregation. In some cases, fans remember the cheapness of this part of the ground as its most significant aspect, such as Everton supporter John Summerfield: ‘I went into the Boys’ Pen…that was the cheapest part’.\textsuperscript{391} Ray Redfern used to frequent the Boys’ Pen at both Liverpool and Everton until the early 1960s because, ‘It was sixpence to go in, which is two and a half pence…you can’t believe it can you’.\textsuperscript{392} A Liverpool fan describes the low cost of the Boys’ Pen as the main reason he supported the club: ‘I watched every home game from the pen. It cost nine shillings to get in. That’s less than four pence. At the time the Kop was three and six (Just under 18 pence). It was affordable football for kids and it was a major contribution in making me a match going red for life.’\textsuperscript{393}

Whilst cheaper admission costs made the Boys’ Pen more appealing for young fans themselves, it also appealed to working-class parents who wanted their children to

\textsuperscript{388} Steve Anderson, in \textit{The Kop}, pp. 39-40. 
\textsuperscript{389} Mike Lyons, \textit{Tales from the Gwladys Street}, p. 5. 
\textsuperscript{390} Jeff Scott, in \textit{The Kop}, p. 46. 
\textsuperscript{391} Interview with John Summerfield. 
\textsuperscript{392} Interview with Ray Redfern. 
\textsuperscript{393} The LeftSide, Re: The History of the Boys’ Pen at Anfield.
watch football as cheaply as possible, as Dave Webb recalls of his fifteenth birthday in 1964:

I thought, ‘right. I’m 15 here, I’m not going in any Boys’ Pen, so I went in the ground, paid three shillings…When I got home I told my mum. I said, ‘I went in the gound! I’m 15, I went in the ground.’ ‘You stupid boy, you could’ve paid one and six!’

Whereas Dave had decided he was old enough to leave the Boys’ Pen, his mother clearly wanted him to stay there until he was officially too old, due to the money he would save. Again, this evidence demonstrates women’s involvement in ensuring their sons underwent the masculine rites of passage deemed appropriate within the wider community. Other sources also indicate this parental stipulation that fans under the age of 16 had to go in the Boys’ Pen once they had started going to matches without adult chaperones, but few allude to the possible financial reasons for this, which suggests that parents valued the Pen in their children’s socialisation into football for reasons other than economic constraints.

There were also alternative methods of gaining cheaper admission, such as bribing turnstile operators. Newcastle fan Terry Mann used to get into St. James’ Park ‘for nothing by squeezing through the turnstiles when someone else was going through’. ‘Big Red Ritchie’ describes himself as ‘a three quarter time urchin’, which alludes to the practice of entering the ground towards the end of the match, when gates were opened to allow people to leave, enabling those waiting outside to enter for free for the remainder of the game. Everton fan Phil Parker recalls how he

394 Interview with Dave Webb.
395 For example, Steve Anderson, in The Kop, p. 41.
396 The 92A, Re: The History of the Boys’ Pen at Anfield.
397 Terry Mann, in Magpie Memories, p. 19.
398 Big Red Ritchie, Re: The History of the Boys’ Pen at Anfield.
did not pay to enter Goodison Park until 1967, aged nine.\textsuperscript{399} It is not clear whether these fans were entering the Boys’ Pen or other areas of the ground, but their stories reveal the possibility of gaining free admission, which suggests that some fans or their parents rejected this possibility and chose to pay for admittance to the Boys’ Pen for reasons other than financial necessity. This evidence limits the extent to which the cheapness of the Boys’ Pen was a central factor in its appeal to working-class parents and children, which suggests that socio-cultural factors such as the socialisation of boys into men were of equal significance.

Former Liverpool player John Aldridge suggests that safety concerns influenced his parents’ decision that he should go in the Boys’ Pen at Anfield in the late 1960s, having previously attended matches with his father from the age of ten:

\begin{quote}
I started going by myself and I went in the Boys’ Pen. My dad wouldn’t let me go on the Kop proper. Eventually, he relented but told me to stay at the sides.\textsuperscript{400}
\end{quote}

The sides of the Kop would have been less crowded and easier to escape from than the middle, which was safer for ‘fit young men’ who were ‘proficient in the crowd’, so presumably John’s father did not yet consider him ‘proficient’ or old enough.\textsuperscript{401} Johnny Kennedy recalls how it became ‘difficult’ to go on the Kop as he aged and grew physically, after having been looked after by older fans on the Kop at a younger age: ‘you had to go in the Boys’ Pen, you couldn’t actually roam free in the Kop’.\textsuperscript{402} Another Liverpool fan, using the name ‘Macca007’ on the Redandwhitekop forum, relays a cautionary story his father told him about accepting the Boys’ Pen as the appropriate area of the stadium for someone of his age:

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{399} Interview with Phil Parker
\textsuperscript{400} John Aldridge, in \textit{The Kop}, p. 35.
\textsuperscript{401} Interview with Ray Redfern; The 92A, Re: The History of the Boys’ Pen at Anfield.
\textsuperscript{402} Johnny Kennedy, in \textit{The Kop}, p. 37.
When he was really young he was just small enough to sneak through a gap in the pen and used to go into the kop. One time he ended up in the middle of a crush and ended up having to be crowd surfed to the front and resuscitated. He then watched the rest of the match at the front but never left the pen until the time was right again!\textsuperscript{403}

It can be speculated that ‘Macca007’’s father told him this story in order to encourage him to respect and adhere to accepted notions of when ‘the time was right’ to graduate from the Boy’s Pen, which did not necessarily correspond to a particular age, but rather to physical maturation and having learned how to cope with such crowds.

This evidence demonstrates that the Boys’ Pen marked a transitional stage between childhood and adulthood for Liverpool fans, who were too old to be protected and assisted by older fans, but too young to watch football comfortably and safely on the Kop. Although parents enforced this transitional stage, as did football clubs’ differentiated admission costs, several fans reconstruct it as an important learning experience in their memories of growing up.

Liverpool fan Jeff Scott describes his two years in the Boys’ Pen between 1958 and 1960 as an ‘apprenticeship’, while several other supporters refer to leaving the Boys’ Pen and entering the Kop as a ‘graduation’.\textsuperscript{404} In a 2013 discussion of Anfield Boys’ Pen on the Redandwhitekop forum, a user known as ‘kriss’ described it as,

\ldots a dangerous place. It was a place where you had to grow up fast, a place you entered as a boy and then, when your apprenticeship had been served, you left it as a man.\textsuperscript{405}


\textsuperscript{405} Kriss, Re: The History of the Boys’ Pen at Anfield.
This reconstruction introduces the notion of the Boys’ Pen and its role in the process of becoming a man as a forced and involuntary experience, in which ‘you had to grow up fast’. ‘Pooley’ also described his apprenticeship there from the mid to late 1960s: ‘I probably had about five years in the pen before graduating on to the Kop when I was about 14.’ This apprenticeship, as well as coinciding with a period of physical development necessary for the transition to adult sections of the stadium, also entailed the learning of certain behaviours and mental qualities deemed necessary for adult football support, particularly the withstanding of physical threat and the overcoming of fear.

The generally negative retrospective descriptions of Anfield’s Boys’ Pen reveal its suitability as a site for the learning of these behaviours. They also, however, illustrate boys’ subjective responses to an atmosphere of bullying, violence, theft and confinement, as commentator ‘The 92A’ exemplifies:

I was on my own and was scared because the minute you got in it was (as) if you had a big sign on your head because there where always little groups in there a few years older who’d start ‘who you looking at’, ‘Where do you come from, Have you got any money?’ And you couldn’t get away from them.

‘81a’ likewise described the Boys’ Pen as ‘the UFC of the 1960s. Nothing good about children’s caged fights.’ ‘The 92A’ also likened Everton’s Boys’ Pen to ‘a cage in an old Zoo, the type animal rights protesters would kick up murder over today.’ These testimonies raise the issue of being ‘caged’ and unable to ‘get away’ from the
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407 ‘UFC’ refers to the Ultimate Fighting Championship, an international mixed martial arts competition fought in cages.
408 The 92A, Re: The History of the Boys’ Pen at Anfield.
threats posed by older or more violent young fans, and reveal how frightening this experience was. Since the Boys’ Pen was cheaper than other parts of the ground, it was enclosed and guarded by stewards to prevent boys from moving to more expensive areas once they had paid a reduced fee. As well as an unflattering portrait of other fans in the Pen who ‘81a’ and ‘The 92A’ wanted to escape from, rather than identify with as fellow community members, the cage in a zoo analogy implies a view that such conditions were inhumane, or at least would be considered as such by 2013 standards. Although fans using internet forums to share their memories are often unclear about precisely which context they are remembering, their contrasts between past and present standards of acceptable conditions suggest a degree of resentment at adults’ previous toleration or imposition of the Boys’ Pen as a rite of passage that they were forced to endure. This resentment and the frightening experiences it arose from contradict nostalgic reconstructions of a pre-1990s football ‘golden age’ characterised by close connections and shared identities between fans of all ages.410

Another Liverpool fan, using the name ‘SirKennyDaggers’, first entered the Anfield Boys’ Pen in 1963, and remembers how, ‘(a) lad stood by me was about 6 feet and had a moustache, one scary lad remember him to this day.’411 Whilst this description may be exaggerated, it corresponds with other fans’ abiding memories of the Boys’ Pen’s ‘scary’ elements, which centred on a sense of being the youngest or smallest compared to other fans in the Pen. For example ‘kal’, who served his time between 1971 and 1976, describes it thus: ‘Right of passage indeed, fucking scary SCARY place’ (sic.).412 As opposed to earlier memories of being small and being

410. This ‘golden age’ is interrogated more thoroughly in Chapter One of this thesis.
cared for by adult fans at a younger age, in the Boys’ Pen being small or ‘weedy’ meant becoming the target of other boys’ aggression, as ‘kal’ recalls: ‘I was pretty weedy looking too, this didn’t help, because…any perceived weakness was always pounced upon’. Similarly, ‘theoldkopite’ recollects:

I was a skinny little runt with NHS specs and I will never understand how I didn’t get beaten up every week cos I must have been a bully’s dream.

Rather than simply denigrating other fans as bullies though, and thus undermining notions of football as a site of unequivocally communitarian values, this attention to their perceived physical shortcomings indicates that broader ideals of masculine physical attributes have been internalised, and that bullying in the Boys’ Pen both reflected and constructed these ideals.

In addition to physical characteristics, some fans’ accounts recall altering their demeanour to avoid being targeted. ‘Rednose54’ describes the Boys’ Pen as ‘a rough gaff if you were on your own and timid,’ with the implication that boys should learn to conceal their timidity. In 2008, commentator ‘kal’ reflected on the changes he underwent during his time in the Boys’ Pen between 1971 and 1976: ‘not being a local lad made it even more intimidating for me, remember thinking that I had to learn to speak like them and fast.’ Evidently, he felt compelled to perform the local Merseyside identity that his potential attackers embodied through their speech, in order to be less identifiable as an outsider, and in the process potentially became more local. Another fan remembers learning to fight to defend his property against theft:
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The worst time for me was queuing to get in. The big threat was your money going just before you got to the gate and that happened to me once or twice. It was the worst feeling in the world. I collared one lad in the queue who I’d seen on the dip and fucking battered him. He couldn’t half fucking fight and it was a real battle. One snarly bastard that. I think I was 9.  

As opposed to the bullying of smaller boys, commentator ‘Barnieslad’ in this account reconstructs his own involvement in violent activity as justifiable as a response to theft, and as a ‘real battle’ between equals. He recalls being incited by ‘the worst feeling in the world’ of being stolen from, which provides an example of how he learned and internalised his ideas about acceptable contexts for fighting. Although this could be reflective of more widely-held ideas from the time to which this story pertains, it could also indicate his internalisation of subsequent discourses and values and his use of these in constructing a more ‘composed’ narrative and identity.

The extent to which fans retrospectively value their experiences of the Boys’ Pen is challenged by their tendency to contrast it unfavourably with the Kop at Anfield, which was ‘like heaven in comparism’ (sic).  

‘As ‘Mottman’ remembers, ‘The Kop was warm and friendly - the Boys’ Pen was angry, aggressive and mean.’

These sources liken the Boys’ Pen to a prison term to be endured prior to being able to enter the Kop, as typified by ‘kal’ who ‘did my time’ and ‘The Sheriff’ who ‘did my stint’. Whereas ‘kal’ is ‘glad’ he endured this, ‘theoldkopite’ ‘can’t say I am a better person for having spent time in the Boy’s Pen – I’m just fortunate that I
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survived the experience. Mottman’ seemingly shares this view, speaking of his own children: ‘It is a rite of passage that thankfully they will never have to go through. ‘Rednose54’ remembers a friend of his who was deterred from being a Liverpool supporter: ‘I know a lad who only ever went in the boys pen once, he became an Evertonian after his experience.’ Such negative memories demonstrate fans’ perception that this rite of passage, rather than being an important educational stage of their childhood and adolescence, was a frightening and dangerous experience imposed on them by adults.

In a similar recollection to that of Dave Webb, whose mother was unhappy that he had decided he was old enough to leave the Goodison Boys’ Pen, ‘The 92A’ recalls parental input: ‘it took a few times before I plucked up the courage to tell my Dad I didn’t like the pen because there were too many older kids in there who picked on you.’ It is possible to speculate that his fear of telling his father that he was afraid of older bullies stemmed from his fear of disappointing his father’s expectations of his masculine behaviour. Relatedly, other fans recalling the reason why they were not forced or were discouraged from entering the Boys’ Pen construct this in terms of their failure to meet adult notions of masculine strength and toughness, but they largely seem thankful for this adult sympathy, rather than regretful about having been ‘weedy’. For example, commentator ‘tonyfatface’ contributed to the 2008 Onthekop discussion by describing how, ‘Me auld fella would never let me go in it he said I would have been eaten alive as I was a bit weedy as a

421 Theoldkopite, Re: The History of the Boys’ Pen at Anfield.
422 Mottman, The Boys’ Pen.
423 The 92A, Re: The History of the Boys’ Pen at Anfield.
kid’. Additionally, ‘Hampsy’ remembers being warned against going in the Boys’ Pen at a young age:

> I said to someone that I thought I’d go in the Boys’ Pen next time. What he then told me made me shit me pants just hearing about it! Being small for my age and unlike Kal, only average at fisticuffs, he did me a big favour really!

In contrast, other fans identify their own fears as reasons why they did not experience the Boys’ Pen, as opposed to adult fears about their safety. For instance, ‘Dynamo Dresden’ ‘was shit-scared of the boys pen, like a mini borstal!’ Everton supporter Ken Turner ‘stayed clear of the Boys’ Pen, because sometimes it was a little bit of a battle ground’. For these fans, their parents seemingly did not interfere in their choice of where to watch matches, suggesting a degree of independence in the negotiation of their own masculine identities. Everton fan Brian Burrows describes being able to decide for himself whether the cheaper admittance outweighed the risks:

> It was one shilling or five p to go in there, rather than three shillings or 15p to go into the ground. But I always paid 15p, that Boys’ Pen was nuts.

Likewise, Liverpool fan ‘andrewd3’ recalls, ‘the boys pen was far too scary to go into! The slightly cheaper admission price was a false economy!’ Cheaper admission could have been a ‘false economy’ in literal terms, given the aforementioned stories of theft and extortion, as well as in metaphorical terms, whereby it did not make up for the unpleasantness of the experience.
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Although there were stewards in the vicinity of the Boys’ Pen at Anfield, retrospective evidence suggests that their primary role was to prevent boys ‘escaping’ to more expensive areas, rather than to regulate their behaviour.\(^{429}\) The fact that many young fans wanted to escape the Boys’ Pen illustrates the comparative ‘heaven’ of the adult-dominated Kop in their imaginings, both in terms of its relative safety from the dangers of other young fans in the Boys’ Pen, and its recognised status as an adult realm among young fans eager to become men.\(^{430}\)

The exact age at which fans ‘graduated’ from the Boys’ Pen varies between accounts, with Dave Webb deciding 15 was old enough and his mother disagreeing, whereas ‘The 92A’ felt at the age of 12 that ‘the pen was for kids, I was a Kopite and wouldn’t have been seen dead in the pen with all the bin lids.’\(^{431}\) Everton fan Ray Redfern could not remember the exact age limit for the Goodison Park Boys’ Pen, but assumed it corresponded with the age at which the rest of the ground became affordable: ‘I suppose it would be 15, 16 wouldn’t it, because by then, people were starting to go to work weren’t they.’\(^{432}\) For these fans, physical maturity and financial independence marked the attainment of adult status and the corresponding move away from the Boys’ Pen. As mentioned in the previous section, at the age of 13 or 14, ‘The 92A’ considered himself ‘a veteran who could handle myself in any crowd, knowing when to give and when to resist’.\(^{433}\) John Aldridge also remembers how, having previously been instructed by his father to stay at the edges of the Kop or go in the

\(^{429}\) For example, Phil Thompson in *The Kop*, p. 33; The Sherriff, *The Boys’ Pen*.

\(^{430}\) On attempts to escape the Boys’ Pen at Anfield, see Pooley, *The Boys’ Pen*; Theoldkopite, *The Boys’ Pen*; Barnieslad, *The Boys’ Pen*.

\(^{431}\) The 92A, Re: The History of the Boys’ Pen at Anfield.

\(^{432}\) Interview with Ray Redfern.

\(^{433}\) The 92A, Re: The History of the Boys’ Pen at Anfield.
Boys’ Pen, ‘as I got older I was there in the middle with the true Kopites’. Being able to ‘handle’ oneself in a crowd and in the middle of the Kop thus signified becoming a ‘true’ Liverpool fan, which was synonymous with becoming a man.

As this section has argued, older fans and parents were significantly involved in a majority of these rites of passage, primarily through determining the age at which they were undertaken by younger fans, but also through ensuring that such practices continued throughout the post-war period, which many of them predated. Such shared memories and traditions across generations suggests that older fans considered the socialisation of their children and other young fans into a local, adult masculine culture a priority, and that football was a useful tool in this process. Potentially, this priority reflected the broader adult concerns about ‘youth as trouble’ that have occupied historiographical attention, but its pre-war antecedents cast doubt on this possibility, as do the stories of youthful fears of other members of their own age group. The following casts further doubt on the extent of generational rupture in post-war Britain, with respect to the ‘swinging sixties’ and the emergence of distinctively ‘youth’ cultures in the realm of football spectatorship.

**Youth Cultures and the ‘Swinging Sixties’**

This section examines how football fans have remembered the 1960s as a distinctive decade in personal testimonies, assessing the extent to which wider cultural

434 John Aldridge, in *The Kop*, p. 35.
developments impacted on this pastime. Having argued in the previous section that longer-term practices continued in the post-war years through cross-generational co-operation and cultural transmission, this section argues that relatively new cultural practices, such as the singing of pop songs at football matches, did not represent exclusively youth phenomena, and involved older generations of supporters. Also, such practices drew on older traditions and sources of local pride, suggesting that new youth cultural phenomena, related to metropolitan ‘taste leaders’, were mediated through traditional values and provincial identities for young people in northern cities. Building on the work of Todd and Young, who argue that parents supported and encouraged their children’s participation in youth-centred activities and cultures, this section demonstrates that mainstream symbols of youth culture such as The Beatles could be enjoyed and appropriated as cross-generational sources of pride and distinctiveness in the traditional working-class football arena.

Everton fan George Orr, born in 1948, remembers having been more interested in football than popular music in the 1960s:

It was a strange time in Liverpool at the time, the Beatles were taking off...It never affected me at all, I had no interest whatsoever. It was just Alex Young, he was my idol, Everton Football Club.

Of the 1960s being a ‘revolutionary’ time, George also remembers this in relation to football, in that he had enough money to follow Everton home and away:
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438 Interview with George Orr.
I know it’s all cliché to say it was a revolutionary time, but it was…You had the money to go, there was coaches on…and it was an experience. I wasn’t interested in The Beatles or anything like that, it was just purely Everton.439

Similarly, John Bailey recalls,

It seemed happy then. Maybe everybody had a job. The men would look forward to going to the pub before the match, and going to the game. Everyone had smiles on their faces. It was a great time to grow up. All you wanted to do was play (football) on the streets.440

These sources suggest that for some young fans, the ‘cliché’ of the 1960s as ‘revolutionary’ and ‘happy’ is verified because of the money and time that older and younger generations could spend on football, rather than what young people could spend on popular music, fashion and the cinema.

Ken Turner also remembers how, ‘when you went to the cinema, and the football you paid the same price’ in the 1960s, enabling football clubs to compete with other leisure activities for young people’s custom.441 Likewise, Ray Redfern, born in 1945, recalls being able to go to the cinema before a football match due to the regularity of three o’clock kick-offs, and being able to watch full replays of the 1966 World Cup matches at the cinema.442 Brian Burrows similarly remembers his experiences of the cinema in relation to football:

I was enjoying watching football, because there was not much on the television, if any. There was nothing. The only things you could see was Pathe news on the cinema, and we used to go there and watch Pathé News for the one game that Pathé News…you know, there was no football that you could see except live. Dead cheap though.443

439 Interview with George Orr.
441 Interview with Ken Turner.
442 Interview with Ray Redfern.
443 Interview with Brian Burrows.
The dearth of televised football and the affordability of attending matches thus ensured that young working-class boys and men continued being football supporters as previous generations had been since the late nineteenth century, despite media concerns that ‘affluent’ teenagers would be attracted to newer and more ‘glamorous’ forms of entertainment at football’s expense.

Popular music was also incorporated into football support, particularly at Liverpool matches, and as an inter-generational arena, the ‘generation gap’ could be bridged in this way. George Orr’s memories of being disinterested in The Beatles seem to be exceptional among Merseyside football fans, many of whom remember the group and other local acts as integral to a sense of local pride and identity that emerged in the 1960s. Liverpool fan Alan Smithies, who was young enough to still be attending matches with his father in the 1960s, recalls how ‘they’d sing Beatles songs – for two or three hours before kick off’, whilst Ian St. John, who played for Liverpool from 1961 to 1971 in his twenties, has similar recollections of this decade:

Before that the fans would just roar and cheer and clap and whatever, but now we’d got fan involvement where they were singing. They’d picked up on the Beatles thing. ‘We love you, yeah, yeah, yeah,’ they used to sing, and ‘God Save Our Gracious Team’ and all that.\(^{444}\)

Ian’s testimony reveals how pop songs were adapted by fans in support of the team, whilst Smithies’ suggests that this was not an exclusively youthful practice. Similarly, Eddie Garrett recalls how *Jesus Christ, Superstar* was the top musical in London and the Kop were singing, “Roger Hunt, Superstar”, and Tony Ensor describes an incident in 1967 when the Leeds United goalkeeper fumbled the ball across the goal line for a Liverpool own goal:

\(^{444}\) Alan Smithies and Ian St. John, in *Three Sides of the Mersey*, p. 127.
There’s the well-chronicled one of *Careless Hands* when Gary Sprake threw the ball into the back of the net. That was a popular song at the time, *Careless Hands*, and immediately the Kop began to sing.\(^445\)

According to Derek Hodgson, ‘pop music, blasted through giant amplifiers, is mostly ignored unless the Kop’s Lennon can hastily improvise a new verse to a current hit’, suggesting that such music was only significant to fans if it could be adapted for football purposes, not because it corresponded with a newly affluent and self-confident youth.\(^446\) Stan Kelly likewise explained the popularity of ‘Ee-aye-addio’, which was adapted from a traditional nursery rhyme, in terms of its ‘straightforward framework on which the crowd could improvise at will’.\(^447\) Similarly, another Liverpool fan claims that the first instance of *You’ll Never Walk Alone* being sung in support of Liverpool was in 1963, when Liverpool had lost a match and it was raining heavily, making the lyrics ‘when you walk through the storm’ seem appropriate.\(^448\)

Memories of such improvisation and originality largely revolve around a distinctive Merseyside identity rather than a youth-specific one. As Tony Ensor recalled, ‘it wasn’t copying songs that one hears all over the country. It was sheer, spontaneous humour.’\(^449\) Ian Sergeant described the music and humour of Anfield’s Kop as ‘a reflection of the city of Liverpool’, whilst Stan Kelly attributed the ‘Anfield chorus’ to ‘the long tradition of Merseyside comedians’, the area’s ‘natural treasury of
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shanties, fo’c’se songs, music-hall ditties’ and ‘the traditional scouse idiom’. The Beatles and other 1960s pop musicians from Merseyside ‘put Liverpool on the international pop scene’ and are remembered by football fans as ‘a local group’, explaining their appropriation by football fans. Alan Smithies describes the general, rather than age-exclusive, pride with which successful local musicians and comedians are remembered:

Wherever you went, people wanted to know Scousers, and Liverpudlians had belief in the city. We couldn’t go wrong. We succeeded at whatever we put our hand to…Comedians, singers, football…the excitement was right across the city.

Alan’s memory of a positively-defined cross-generational local identity is evidently influenced by nostalgia for a community of successful, popular Liverpudlians, which contrasts with the more negative national constructions of Liverpool and its residents in the 1980s. Still though, it is significant that he does not draw upon images of the 1960s as revolutionary in terms of distinctively ‘youthful’ cultures and Liverpool’s role in this respect, in a way that personal testimonies of British popular music tend to.

Although it is difficult to ascertain the extent to which older fans appreciated the ‘Merseybeat’ music of the 1960s, which was primarily marketed at young consumers, those attending football matches would at least have become familiar with it, and potentially participated in its adaptation in support of Liverpool. Furthermore, whilst such music was new to the 1960s, as was its singing at football matches
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encouraged by recently installed tannoy systems, younger fans attending matches continued to be exposed to more traditional songs and chants such as ‘Scouser in Gay Paree’, adapted from *Under the Bridges of Paris*, originally written in 1914. Additionally, the pop songs most commonly remembered by Merseyside football fans were of the more respectable ‘family entertainment’ variety, as opposed to the more ‘deviant’ manifestations of youth culture that were apparently more likely to attract disapproval from older generations. Without suggesting that young football fans did not participate in any manifestations of youth culture or deviant behaviour that older fans either objected to or were excluded from, the football stadium does not appear to have been a site for such generational cultural divisions for a mainstream majority of Liverpool fans remembering the 1960s.

The same can be said of Newcastle United fans, whose retrospective personal testimonies make no mention of popular music, and instead recall singing *The Blaydon Races*, which was a nineteenth-century local folk song and has been sung by Newcastle supporters throughout the twentieth century. This disparity reflects Liverpool’s role in 1960s popular culture and subsequent collective memory of this decade, but it also indicates the varying extent to which the ‘swinging sixties’ were experienced in different parts of Britain, with Newcastle being more remote from London and Merseyside’s ‘taste leaders’.

Even in Liverpool however, memories of generational change generally focus on the 1990s as a more significant turning point in terms of generational rupture than

---

457 *Magpie Memories*.
458 Hoggart, ‘Proper Ferdinands’.
the 1960s. The recollections of fans whose youth predated the post-war period best exemplify this tendency, given that they also witnessed the 1950s and 1960s, and identified minimal difference between these years and their own childhood and adolescence. As noted in the previous section, Billy O’Donnell, Harry Wilson, Jack Payne and James McCudden shared similar memories of their 1920s experiences with fans born in the 1940s and 1950s. For Everton fan James McCudden, born in 1909, the 1960s signified the era of his favourite player and manager, Alan Ball and Harry Catterick respectively, who were also highlighted by several younger Everton supporters. Another shared feature of the testimonies of different generations of fans is the idea of the early 1990s and the introduction of all-seater stadia as marking ‘the end of an era’, as Billy O’Donnell, born in 1910, described: ‘all those generations, fathers and sons reared on the Kop, standing behind the barriers, cheering Liverpool on. It won’t be the same.’ Substantial increases in ticket prices and televised football matches from the early 1990s are also generally discussed as heralding ‘the end of an era’ and threatening the tradition of cross-generational cultural exchange between working-class football fans as described in this chapter.

**Conclusion**

Football fans’ retrospective personal testimonies suggest that the 1950s and 1960s ‘generation gap’ has been overstated, as Todd and Young also argue. Studies of newspaper articles, crime statistics and early academic considerations of youth provide a very different but equally significant image of post-war youth than such
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testimonies, as does Chapter Three of this thesis in its consideration of hooliganism. Young football fans were not immune to the type of ‘moral panic’ that other scholars have focused on, but this chapter has shown how a substantial proportion of them did not aspire to separate themselves from adult fans through ‘deviant’ subcultures, and instead aimed at attaining a traditionally understood working-class male identity, in a process that was assisted and enforced by older fans.

The findings of this chapter are, however, limited by their reliance on retrospective reconstructions of this era, some of which are provided by anonymous and ‘ageless’ fans via the internet, and therefore difficult to verify and relate to precise chronological contexts. Nevertheless, in the absence of other historical evidence of childhood and adolescent subjectivities, retrospective accounts are invaluable windows into the internalisation or lack thereof of dominant ideas about age and generation, as well as about class, masculinity and place. They are also important in providing qualifications to public representations of these identities, which is particularly valuable in the case of ‘youth’ in post-war Britain, given its association with deviance in such representations.
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Chapter Three: Constructing the Football Hooligan

Football crowd disorder and violence have been recurrent features of the game in Britain since the early days of professionalism in the late nineteenth century, but a general belief persists that the 1960s witnessed a rise in this sort of behaviour, culminating in a 1980s peak during which a widespread sense of fear among non-hooligan fans led to heavily reduced attendances.\footnote{464 For a debate on the differences between nineteenth-century hooliganism and its post-war incarnations, see Eric Dunning, Patrick Murphy, John Williams and Joseph Maguire, ‘Football Hooliganism in Britain before the First World War’, \textit{International Review for the Sociology of Sport}, 19 (1984), pp. 215-240; R.W. Lewis, ‘Football Hooliganism in England before 1914: A Critique of the Dunning Thesis’, \textit{The International Journal of the History of Sport}, 13:3 (1996), pp. 310-339; Patrick Murphy, Eric Dunning and Joseph Maguire, ‘Football Spectator Violence and Disorder before the First World War: A Reply to R.W. Lewis’, \textit{The International Journal of the History of Sport}, 15:1 (1998), pp. 141-162.} According to a 2012 article in \textit{The Guardian}, seasonal aggregate attendances in the ‘bad old days’ of the mid-1980s fell below 16.5 million due to hooliganism’s deterring effects, compared with recent figures approaching 30 million, despite the reduced capacities of today’s football grounds.\footnote{465 David Lacey, ‘Terracing Deserves Another Trial to see if Times Really have Changed’, \textit{The Guardian}, 14 December 2012, available online at, \url{http://www.theguardian.com/football/blog/2012/dec/14/terracing-deserves-another-chance} [Accessed on 14/02/2013].} It is common for the media to describe the 1970s and 1980s as ‘the dark old days’, which serves as a warning that ‘the game shouldn’t be complacent’ whenever trouble recurs.\footnote{466 For example, David Bond, ‘Millwall and Newcastle Violence: Who is to Blame for Football Chaos?’, \textit{BBC Sport}, 15 April 2013. Available online at: \url{http://www.bbc.co.uk/sport/0/football/22158585} [Accessed on 13/02/2014]; David Lacey, ‘Compared with the 80s, Football is Top Dog for Entertainment and Skill’, \textit{The Guardian}, 1 February 2013, available online at, \url{http://www.theguardian.com/football/blog/2013/feb/01/football-entertainment-overhaul-arsenal} [Accessed on 13/02/2014].} Additionally, the anti-hooligan measures introduced by the football authorities, such as perimeter fencing and crash barriers, and the negative portrayal of football fans in the press also form part of this image of English football’s ‘dark days’, particularly following the recent independent inquiry into the Hillsborough disaster and its press coverage, the main aim and result of which was to
show that ‘the fans were not the cause of the disaster’, at which 96 Liverpool fans were killed in a crush.467

The inaccurate presentation of Liverpool fans in some sectors of the media following Hillsborough, which included allegations that some fans had pick pocketed injured and dying victims, and that drunk and disorderly fans had caused the crush, was part of a broader trend to characterise all football fans in the 1980s as hooligans, based on a belief that ‘those who still went to games did so knowing they either had a seat or could be guaranteed a fight.’468 Such demonisation of football fans is explicitly addressed in some supporters’ personal testimonies, but it is also of potential significance in encouraging the more positive recollections of the 1960s that have been addressed in the previous two chapters, wherein fans use a mythical, non-violent ‘swinging sixties’ to recover the image of supporters that has been tarnished by hooliganism, which is constructed as a problem of later decades and younger generations. Hence, it is necessary to examine evidence from the 1970s and 1980s in order to understand the ways in which football became synonymous with hooliganism, and the strategies fans employed to dissociate themselves from such a label, as it is likely to have impacted substantially on the retrospective reconstructions of the 1960s discussed elsewhere in this thesis.

Developing their influential studies of hooliganism throughout the 1980s, Eric Dunning and his associates at the University of Leicester focused on the historically changing acceptability of hooliganism in the football context, in order to show how a long-term ‘civilizing process’, which eluded some ‘rough’ elements of the working

468 For an example of the accusations against Liverpool fans, see James Collins, ‘Police Accuse Drunken Fans’, Daily Express, 19 April 1989, p. 1;Lacey, ‘Compared with the 80s’
class, led to heightened conflict between this group and a newly ‘respectable’
majority of football fans. According to this thesis, any alleged rise in hooligan
behaviour can be interpreted as a result of its decreased acceptability among
‘respectable’ elements, and a reaction against this by ‘rough’ sectors of society. More
general historiography on male violence in Britain, particularly the work of John
Carter Wood, has similarly focused on increasing middle-class intolerance and
criminalisation of what is characterised as ‘traditional’ working-class behaviour, but
in the nineteenth-century context. John Clarke had earlier explained hooliganism as
a reaction against football’s alleged post-war ‘embourgeoisement’, and as an
implicitly more ‘genuine’ expression of ‘traditional’ working-class values than that
represented by non-hooligan fans. Clarke’s explanations echoed the wider work of
the Birmingham Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies of which he was a
member, and which presented ‘deviant’ youth subcultures as a form of resistance
against hegemonic ‘middle-class’ culture and values.

Both of these interpretations posit socio-economic class as the principal
analytical framework for football hooliganism and intolerance of it, an assumption
which sociologists Richard Giulianotti and Gary Armstrong challenged with their
studies of 1990s hooligan groups. Their fieldwork identified many football hooligans
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as affluent, respectable and middle-class, undermining the traditional focus on inter- and intra-class cultural conflict by presenting hooliganism as a cross-class phenomenon.\textsuperscript{473} Equally, recent work by Brett Bebber, which examines the institutional reactions to hooliganism, has endeavoured to detach the causal explanations for the problem from fans themselves.\textsuperscript{474} This chapter builds on this work by arguing that class was less significant in the framing of football hooliganism in the 1960s and 1970s than most existing literature acknowledges, as well as in its retrospective framing from the 1990s. Rather than class, age and gender were equally if not more important categories of identification and interpretation for commentators and participants. By focusing on the ways in which hooliganism has been discussed by observers and participants, rather than seeking to explain it, as a majority of previous studies have done, its meaning to the identities of both hooligans and non-hooligans can be revealed.\textsuperscript{475}

The first half of this chapter compares evidence from the media, members of the public and the Football Association, primarily focusing on the construction of the ‘hooligan’ and the ‘genuine’ fan, and the various solutions to the problem that were offered. As well as revealing a general lack of languages of class, this section also argues for an increased role for non-hooligan football fans and members of the public in constructing the problem than existing literature has recognised. Recognising the agency of these fans provides a more complex understanding of the concept of ‘moral

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}

The second section examines how the problem of hooliganism has been framed retrospectively, largely focusing on the personal testimonies of former hooligans, whose voices were obscured in 1960s and 1970s discussions of the problem. Rather than dismissing this evidence as factually inaccurate glorifications of violence, this section argues that it represents an important attempt to reclaim agency in the construction of hooliganism by participants, and an attempt to define a masculine code of honour that forms a significant component of these men’s self-identities.\footnote{For a discussion of the shortcomings of hooligan personal testimonies, see Jon Dart, ‘Confessional Tales from Former Football Hooligans: A Nostalgic, Narcissistic Wallow in Football Violence’, \textit{Soccer and Society}, 9:1 (2008), pp. 42-55.} Also, it represents a contrast to the majority of personal testimonies in this thesis that focus on constructing the 1960s as a more positive era, and thus provides an example of how competing discourses about fans’ past and identities can emerge in different contexts and for different audiences.

Both sections are premised on the notion that previous scholars have exaggerated the role of class in the framing of hooliganism, and consequently in the construction of the identities of hooligan and non-hooligan football fans. The absence of class in discussions of hooliganism has implications for debates on the significance of class in post-war Britain and the extent of changes in working-class culture resultant from affluence, given the traditional association between football support and the English working class. Selina Todd and Mike Savage have stressed continuity
and stability in their assessments of the impact of affluence on working-class culture and identity, and this chapter potentially supports their findings by demonstrating that changes in class culture were not a key problematic in the framing of hooliganism, but it is also possible to interpret the absence of class as an indication that it had ceased to be an important basis of identification among football fans.478 In arguing the significance of age in constructing the hooligan in the first section, I contribute to a body of literature that stresses ‘youth’ as a primary basis of identification and metaphor for social anxieties in post-war Britain, and as a key analytical framework for this period.479 The second section prioritises gender over class in understanding how self-confessed hooligans have framed their activities retrospectively, challenging historiographical interpretations of the ‘working-class’ aspects of male violence.480

**Framing Hooliganism in the 1960s and 1970s**

When sociologist Stanley Cohen developed his influential ‘moral panic’ concept in the late 1960s, he was responding to what he saw as the British media’s ‘creation’ of the Mods and Rockers as a social problem of national concern, ‘out of all proportion’ to the threat they posed.481 Historians such as Angela Bartie and Louise Jackson recently exemplified how Cohen’s model has been applied to other groups and contexts, namely Glasgow gangs and coffee clubs respectively, demonstrating the impact of moral panics on law enforcement priorities and strategies.482 One aspect of
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this concept that is particularly pertinent with respect to football hooliganism is the notion that the social problems concerned ‘didn’t become news because they were new; they were presented as new to justify their creation as news.’\(^{483}\) Given that, as the Leicester School stressed, football crowd disorder and violence were not new in the 1960s, the media’s increased preoccupation with it at this time arguably makes it an appropriate example of a media-orchestrated moral panic.\(^{484}\)

Stuart Hall, whose work is primarily credited with expanding the field of cultural studies, was among the first to identify a connection between football hooliganism and Cohen’s moral panic concept in the late 1970s. He argued that the press played a decisive role in an actual escalation of the problem through their exaggeration of it, and sociologist Emma Poulton contends that ‘little has changed’ in this respect in subsequent years.\(^{485}\) This research tends to underplay the role of the public in defining and discussing the problem of hooliganism, treating this as secondary to and influenced by the press and football’s governing bodies. Elsewhere, Eileen Yeo and Geoffrey Pearson have been less specific in determining the source of moral panics, describing general shifts in ‘public opinion’ that determine the subject and seriousness of the fears expressed.\(^{486}\) Similarly, Joseph Maguire, an associate of the Leicester School, interpreted the post-war ‘rise’ in hooliganism as a change in the ‘limits of acceptable behaviour’ in the football context, without applying strict definitions of who set these limits and defined hooliganism as a problem.\(^{487}\)
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Nicholas and Tom O’Malley argue for a less ‘straightforward’ interpretation of moral panics than those which depict an alliance of press, state and commercial interests, whilst Julia Laite stresses the significance of ‘conflicts as much as consensus’. 488

This section is divided into three parts, presenting evidence from the tabloid press, non-hooligan football fans and the football authorities respectively, and argues that non-hooligan football fans and members of the public were instrumental in defining the problem of hooliganism, particularly through their letters to the F.A. and newspapers, which previous treatments of the subject have neglected. Although a comparison between this evidence and sources from the national media reveals certain similarities in framing the problem, this should not necessarily be interpreted as a ‘top-down’ process whereby the media ‘created’ the problem and dictated popular responses to it. Alternatively, this chapter argues that football fans’ construction of a dichotomy between themselves as ‘genuine’ fans, as opposed to the ‘hooligan’ other, represented an attempt to counterbalance the media’s focus on hooligans in its presentation of football fans. Also, there is evidence that certain sectors of the tabloid press were sensitive to this dichotomy, and sought to avoid presenting an overwhelmingly negative image of football supporters, which would have alienated football fans amongst their readership.

The distinction between the ‘genuine’ fan and the ‘hooligan’ was also a means for fans to express fears that the F.A. and government’s anti-hooligan measures would

have a negative impact on all football supporters, particularly ground closures and restricting access to the pitch in emergencies. However, this issue is complicated by evidence from the F.A., which suggests that public and media pressure motivated many of their 1970s initiatives. The views outlined in this half of the chapter demonstrate a widely-held perception that hooliganism had changed rather than attitudes towards it, and that these changes hinged on age and generation, rather than hooligans becoming more ‘rough’ or anti-hooligan fans and the game of football becoming more ‘respectable’ or ‘bourgeois’.

The Media

This section largely relies on articles from populist newspapers the *Daily Mirror* and *Daily Express* between 1960 and 1980, which were among the best selling publications in this period and exemplify a burgeoning British tabloid culture. Their availability in the searchable ukpressonline database makes it possible to identify general trends in their presentation of hooliganism over time, which implies a shared media agenda in framing the problem. One of the most common devices employed by the press in the representation of football hooliganism is the metaphor of ‘disease’. Following the deaths of 39 Juventus fans during a match against Liverpool at Heysel in 1985, UEFA banned English clubs from European competition indefinitely. ‘The English disease’ subsequently became a familiar term and its use has continued in press reporting of hooligan activities among followers of the England national team.

---

team. There are also examples of this national framing of football hooliganism prior to Heysel however, such as the *Daily Mirror*’s description of ‘the British blight’ afflicting Glasgow Rangers supporters during a visit to Barcelona in 1972. This article emphasised the ‘Spaniard-in-the-street’ as an ‘outraged’ victim, who ‘neither knows nor understands’ hooliganism, in order to present British fans as shamed outsiders, who would be ‘shunned’ by the rest of Europe if their hooligan activities continued.

A 1977 article in the *Daily Telegraph* similarly reported that UEFA’s threat to ban Manchester United from European competition due to their fans’ behaviour was ‘voicing the disgust of many ordinary folk throughout the Continent’, who were ‘unwilling to tolerate the high degree of hooliganism that British soccer – indeed British society – is prepared to accept from its youth.’

Sociologists such as Dunning and Giulianotti have countered this misrepresentation of hooliganism as peculiarly British, showing it to be a long-term global phenomenon, and arguing that the media’s national framing of the problem relates to the centrality of football to national pride and identity. Therefore, metaphors such as ‘the English disease’ or ‘the British blight’ represent attempts to express concerns with the way ‘Britishness’ or ‘Englishness’ was being constructed abroad by football fans, and did not necessarily usually point to class in discussions of this construction.
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The ‘disease’ metaphor was also relevant to domestic football, however, with ‘soccer’s sickness’ conflated with and symbolic of ‘the nation’s ills’.\textsuperscript{496} Reporting on a speech made by Football League Secretary Alan Hardaker at the Conservative Party Conference in 1975, the \textit{Daily Express} summarised these ‘ills’ as ‘a lack of discipline – a breakdown of law and order’, of which hooliganism was a symptom.\textsuperscript{497} In 1967, the \textit{Mirror} reported that psychiatrists were planning to interview hooligans to discover ‘who the rowdies are, and what it is about a soccer match that makes them get out of hand’.\textsuperscript{498} The findings of this study were published in 1968 and focussed on ‘individual pathology’, ‘immaturity’ and ‘loss of control’ as explanations for hooliganism.\textsuperscript{499} The same psychiatrist, Dr. John Harrington, was quoted in the \textit{Express} in 1970, reporting on the ‘paranoid’ mental condition of student protesters, suggesting a perceived correlation between the behaviour of young people, irrespective of social milieu or context.\textsuperscript{500}

Tabloid reports on hooligan incidents frequently reiterated the idea that football hooligans were suffering from a mental illness, such as the ‘teenage maniacs’ who engaged in ‘an orgy of destruction’ at Charlton Athletic’s ground in 1977, the ‘lunatic fringe’ that threw missiles onto the pitch at Everton in 1975, the Rangers fans who ‘lost their sanity’ in Barcelona, the ‘pathological lunatics…behaving like madmen’ in 1975, and the ‘teenagers’ who ‘seemed to go mad’ according to an

\textsuperscript{496} ‘I Blame the Louts’, \textit{Daily Express}, 25 September 1972, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{497} David Buchan, ‘Harkader Blows the Whistle on Violent Britain’, \textit{Daily Express}, 8 October 1975, p. 3.
eyewitness after a match between Arsenal and Chelsea in 1969. The presentation of hooligans as insane and out of control young people reflected wider concerns about ‘delinquency’ as an affliction to which ‘youth’ was susceptible, which Abigail Wills interprets as a concern over the transition of young boys and men to adult citizens, which required medical guidance through psychiatric treatment. It also reflects an attempt by the press to present hooliganism as particularly dangerous, by stressing the mental instability and lack of self-control of its perpetrators, which potentially supports Hall’s characterisation of the media’s treatment of football hooliganism as a moral panic, and the press’s use of eyewitnesses served to further stress such danger to ‘innocent bystanders’. This preoccupation with ‘youth’ and the ‘disease’ of delinquency in framing the issue of hooliganism suggests that class or ‘rough’ elements of society were not the media’s primary focus of attention.

As well as being symptomatic of wider problems, the national popular press also presented football hooliganism as a disease in itself, sometimes labelled ‘football thuggery’, ‘rowdyism’ or ‘soccermania’ as alternatives to ‘hooliganism’. In 1988, the Mirror complained of the ‘medical respectability’ that such terms implied, arguing that it was ‘defeatist’ to treat hooliganism as an uncontrollable ‘epidemic’.

502 Wills, ‘Delinquency, Masculinity and Citizenship’.
505 ‘Put the Boot in Now’; Squire, ‘Sin-Bin and a Moat’.
present hooliganism as something that was growing or worsening, and which required urgent action to ‘cure’. Present hooliganism as something that was growing or worsening, and which required urgent action to ‘cure’. Without suggesting that the problem was not growing or worsening, its presentation as such corresponds with Cohen’s criteria for identifying moral panics, but it also reflected an attempt to encourage action to eradicate the problem, rather than being ‘defeatist’.

Criticism of the F.A. similarly reflected the media’s efforts to wage ‘war’ on hooliganism, such as when the Mirror alleged that the F.A. had ‘passed the buck’ and ‘admitted defeat’ after deciding not to charge Everton for the missiles some fans threw onto the pitch in 1975. The press articulated concerns that, unless sufficient action was taken, ‘the weekend recreation of the masses will be made a misery by the few.’ The extent of this ‘misery’ could be exaggerated with sensationalist headlines such as ‘Soccer’s Savage Saturday’ or ‘Soccer Fans on Rampage’, and hyperbolic descriptions of ‘incredible riots’ or ‘battles’ perpetrated by ‘rampaging hordes’. Still, these articles characterised the number of people involved in inflicting it as ‘the few’ rather than ‘the thousands of law-abiding citizens who go to soccer matches every Saturday’. Some reporters were also sensitive to what they described as the ‘innocent victims’ of the ‘thugs disguised as (Chelsea) fans’, suggesting that ‘hooligans’ should not be conflated with ‘fans’.
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fans, who objected to football’s increasingly negative public image. It also represents an attempt by some sections of the media to assuage fans’ fears that a moral panic about hooliganism would impact upon their identities and football experience.

As Adrian Bingham and Martin Conboy argue, newspapers such as the *Mirror* initially adopted a ‘populist tone’ as part of a commercial strategy to increase circulation and ‘attract a working-class readership’ in inter-war Britain.\(^{513}\) The construction of this tone entailed presenting itself as ‘a voice of the people’, which partially explains the press attention to the ‘victims’ of hooliganism and the ‘silent majority’ of peaceful fans’, who it aimed to speak for and appeal to.\(^{514}\) In presenting such fans as superior to and more ‘genuine’ than hooligans, the tabloid press’s framing of the issue can alternatively be interpreted as its involvement in conservative ‘moral regulation’, defining ‘the boundaries of morality and normality’.\(^{515}\) These boundaries though, did not tend to revolve around the ‘rough’ and ‘respectable’ distinction that has characterised some studies of press involvement in moral panics or moral regulation, but instead hinged on ‘youths who terrorised genuine fans’.\(^{516}\) Furthermore, occasional press sympathy towards fans mistreated by instruments of state control such as the police casts doubt on the extent of its alignment with ‘reactionary and conservative’ forces, supporting Bingham’s argument for a less
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One such conflict is discernable in press reports of fans’ accusations of ‘police brutality’, even when the police accused these fans of engaging in hooligan activities. This was the case in 1974 following a Manchester United match in Ostend, when the *Express* quoted two teenage fans, one of whom alleged that they “needed the British Army on our side” for protection. The other, 18 year old Paul, described his fear when “suddenly every police car in the world seemed to be there…we were thrown into police cars and then into a big iron cage”, apparently for no reason. However, the author of this article contradicted their version of events with a quote from a Belgian police spokesman, who claimed that the Manchester fans “went on a drunken rampage of the city.” Again, in 1977, the *Mirror* described how ‘battered, bruised and bewildered, the Red Army of Manchester United fans returned to Britain yesterday after their bashing by French supporters and baton wielding riot police.’ The article interviewed and described the injuries of two young fans targeted by police, as well as quoting a ‘42 year old mother of four’ who ‘never saw a ball kicked because she was ejected from the ground’, having paid £40 for her ticket and travel. The reporter depicted these events as an injustice against British citizens by foreign policemen, and implied that Manchester United fans’ reputation as “the worst in Europe” had unjustly prejudiced the French crowd control measures.
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Such media attitudes towards foreign police were also apparent in articles related to issues other than football, such as the ‘brainless police (who) brutally provoked’ cricket fans in Pakistan in 1977, and the 1967 police ‘thrashing’ of students in Francoist Spain.\footnote{523} Although such evidence demonstrates a nationalistic attempt to frame police brutality as a ‘foreign’ issue, and thus implicitly less problematic in the British context, the willingness to voice the grievances of football fans wrongly treated as hooligans also challenges generalised approaches to the press that focus on its relationship to state agencies and ‘right-wing proprietors and editors.’\footnote{524}

Regarding the policing of domestic football, on the other hand, the press do not seem to have held similar concerns over brutality or injustice, portraying the British police alternatively as heroes or victims. For example, a 1977 \textit{Express} article outlined police anxieties about the start of a new football season, which, according to officer Dave Morgan, presented the threat of “ending up an invalid.”\footnote{525} The authors described a ‘widespread’ problem of ‘lack of volunteers for football duty’ due to ‘fans who put the boot in’, whereas match-day duties for policemen ‘used to bring pleasure as well as profit’.\footnote{526} In 1978, the \textit{Express} reported that 20 policemen were resigning every day as a result of violent crime and the ‘social mumbo-jumbo’ excusing it, of which it listed football hooliganism as an example.\footnote{527} The presentation of policemen as victims of hooliganism served to associate them with the ‘ordinary’ fans and members of the public, whom the press aimed to speak for and to, potentially
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obscuring their role in social control and the forceful ‘civilising’ of football fans. Such an argument, however, neglects the potential interests and wishes of the fans who objected to hooliganism, as later sections of this chapter contend.

In assuring readers that the police would be ready to deal with anticipated incidents of hooliganism, newspapers constructed their own representations of fans’ interests. Examples of such assurances are provided by articles in 1975, when transport services in central London threatened to go on strike to avoid carrying Manchester United supporters, and in 1977, when a Chelsea hooligan ‘firm’ planned to ignore an official ban and travel to away games.528 The media’s presentation of the British police as heroes or victims enabled the construction of hooligans as enemies or folk devils in a conflict over the safety and enjoyment of football grounds and their vicinity, but also connected the police with non-hooligan fans as part of the same side in this war.529 The hooligan, though, was not framed by languages of class, but by the issue of age and generation.

Despite claiming to start a ‘crusade’ in 1966 against ‘savage criticism of youth’, which neglected young people’s ‘guts and energy and compassion’, the *Daily Mirror* also asserted that the actions of ‘a handful…of louts and hooligans’ had caused negative perceptions of youth ‘as a whole’, rather than blaming press and state constructions of youth as problematic and menacing.530 In reports of incidents described as football hooliganism, national tabloid articles habitually described the accused offender as a ‘youth’, ‘boy’, ‘lad’, or ‘young man’, or else provided the
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precise age of any fans arrested. According to the *Daily Mail*, ‘football hooligans are mostly aged between 15 and 22’.

Although the national press largely used age categories in distinguishing the hooligan from the ‘genuine’ fan, this was not a straightforward ‘us and them’ narrative revolving around youths and adults. As well as being the culprits and perpetrators of violence and hooliganism, young people and children could also be labelled the ‘victims’ of hooliganism. For example, an *Express* journalist in 1969 described how ‘there are a million mums in this country who will be worried sick about their young sons’, not because of their role in instigating incidents of hooliganism, but because of their unwilling targeting by other young people. Another reporter described having to refuse his son’s request to attend a football match on the grounds that ‘I don’t want my young son coming home covered in blood, spittle or urine’. In 1976, the *Mirror* reported on a ‘young fan in a coma’ as a result of football’s “bovver boys”. This evidence implies that hooliganism was threatening the safety and enjoyment of football for people who would otherwise be fans, including young people.

Non-hooligan fans and members of the public expressed similar concerns, as outlined below, which suggests a shared agenda in presenting the problem as one that affected ‘genuine’ supporters, rather than one caused by all supporters. This shared
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agenda is important in distinguishing the 1960s and 1970s from ‘the dire treatment of football fans’ in the 1980s, when political, official and media ‘antipathy’ towards supporters in general is seen to have influenced the crowd control measures that made football stadiums less safe, as typified by the media treatment of Liverpool fans after Hillsborough.\textsuperscript{536} It is also important in assessing the extent to which reactions to hooliganism in the 1960s and 1970s can be characterised as a moral panic, as Hall contended.\textsuperscript{537}

If a moral panic can be defined as the presentation of a problem out of all proportion to its actual threat, then the media’s presentation of the physical dangers and ‘diseased’ nature of football hooliganism can perhaps be understood in this way. However, the threat to the public image of football fans was a very real one by the 1970s, and had a significant impact on the way in which fans were treated in the 1980s. As the example of the \textit{Mirror}’s coverage of police brutality in St. Etienne demonstrates, the reputation of football fans could have serious physical consequences, which explains attempts to reclaim this reputation amongst non-hooligan fans. Although the press must be considered partially responsible for constructing a negative image of football fans, this section has illustrated a degree of sensitivity to distinctions between hooligans and non-hooligans, which probably reflected a concern to avoid alienating football fans amongst their readers.

The press’ general reluctance to employ languages of class indicates a comparable priority, in that framing hooliganism as a ‘working-class’ phenomenon

\textsuperscript{537} Hall, ‘The Treatment of Football Hooliganism’.
would have been objectionable to a substantial proportion of the popular press’s readership. Despite these potential ulterior motives, the media’s representation of hooliganism in terms of age rather than class is still significant in challenging the extent to which class is a useful interpretative framework in studying the phenomena, as it illustrates the circulation of an alternative discourse to that of sociologists, and one which had a greater likelihood of being internalised by football fans in their sense of identity due to its broader circulation. Rather than being a ‘top-down’ process, the following section discusses fans’ role in constructing their own identity as non-hooligans.

**The ‘Genuine’ Fans**

Sir Harold Warris Thompson was chairman of the Football Association between 1976 and 1981, and his papers, held at the Royal Society, contain letters from members of the public about hooliganism. Although a small number, the 15 he collected on this issue in the mid-1970s reveal these fans’ collective concern to denigrate the hooligan as a separate and less genuine identity from that of most football supporters. A third of these fans made clear distinctions between themselves as genuine supporters as opposed to hooligans, and three more advocated solutions to hooliganism that would target the minority of perpetrators, rather than all fans. Such concerns represented an attempt to prevent the moral panic with which Stuart Hall, Joel Rookwood and Geoff Pearson associate genuine fans, and an attempt to dissuade the football authorities from introducing anti-hooligan measures that would affect
their safety and enjoyment of football. Also, as shown below, these letters’ framing of hooliganism rarely involved languages of class, and although they articulated the discourse of hooliganism as a ‘youth’ problem less vociferously than the press, instead prioritising the ‘genuineness’ of non-hooligan support, age categories were still a more frequent basis of differentiation than class.

In a letter from 1976, Mr. E.H. Neal described how he and ‘most of the regular supporters’ of Southampton were ‘appalled’ by hooliganism, and Mr. R.R. McLaughlan used the phrase ‘genuine supporter’ three times in his 1977 letter. Another letter stressed the need for action against hooliganism for the ‘benefit of genuine supporters’, whilst Mrs. Z. Price complained how she and other ‘good supporters’ were being driven away from football. Rookwood and Pearson attribute this dichotomy between the ‘genuine’ fan and the hooligan to the discourses circulated by ‘the police, politicians and the football authorities’, arguing that many more recent fans express ambiguous or positive attitudes towards hooliganism. Alternatively, Bev Skeggs argues that individual or personal ‘dis-identification’ with externally-defined categories such as class hinges on the public construction of the ‘respectability’ of these categories. As the previous section showed, public constructions of hooliganism in popular national newspapers were unsurprisingly
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negative, hence fans’ ‘dis-identification’ with the hooligan identity could indicate their internalisation of media notions of respectability. In contrast, this section argues that fans themselves were instrumental in constructing this division between the hooligan and the ‘genuine’ fan, and that they sought to challenge public discourses that threatened football’s respectability.

Supporters’ concern with the image of football supporters reflected their apprehensions about crowd control measures that the F.A. proposed and implemented in response to hooliganism. Among these measures, perimeter fencing and crash barriers were the main target of criticism. For example, Mr. Neal informed the F.A. that ‘the erection of fences inside the grounds is not the answer, because much of the violence and vandalism occurs outside the grounds.’ Mr. Golding went further than this, arguing that fences to segregate rival fans ‘could endanger more lives, as it would encourage rival fans to create more trouble in a effort to get to the home fans.’ The Chairman of the National Union of Football Supporters also expressed concerns about the safety of fencing, asking:

How many fans would get trampled in the rush to avoid a riot or disaster, when they came to get through the narrow breaks in the fencing?…the playing area is possibly the only escape route and safe position inside a football ground, yet clubs fence it in.

The threat to fans’ safety posed by anti-hooligan measures was less apparent in media and F.A. discussions of the problem, and non-hooligan fans’ highlighting of this threat in their framing of hooliganism indicates their differing priorities from the more generalised ‘moral panic’ in other academic accounts. In this evidence, rather
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than an effort to evade the judgement of ‘respectable fears’, fans’ ‘dis-identification’ with hooliganism had more practical aims.\textsuperscript{547}

Fans’ proposed alternatives to perimeter fencing primarily centred on the exclusion of ‘the evil-doers’ from football grounds.\textsuperscript{548} To this end, several fans advocated identity cards to gain access to grounds as ‘a must for all clubs’, which would be confiscated from those involved in trouble, and would be ‘respected by the supporter.’\textsuperscript{549} As Mr. McLaughlan argued:

\begin{quote}
To the GENUINE FOOTBALL SUPPORTER, he would have no hesitation showing his passport, but to the SOCCER HOOLIGAN he would have to produce a passport, and if he lost it due to misconduct in the FOOTBALL GROUND, he would not only lose his passport but his IDENTITY.\textsuperscript{550}
\end{quote}

Mr. Johnson attempted to emphasise widespread support for an identity card system among football fans, referencing ‘five polls carried out in the national press over the last two years, which have shown a minimum of 53% and up to 63% calling for identity cards.’\textsuperscript{551} According to these views, the ‘genuine’ fan would be easily distinguishable from the hooligan by his willingness to produce identification, and by the unlikelihood of him losing it. Identity cards would thus give formal, physical and spatial recognition to the distinction between the hooligan and the genuine fan, which the exclusion of the hooligan from the stadium would reinforce.

The necessity of excluding ‘evil-doers’ from football stadiums also related to a growing tendency for ‘genuine’ fans to feel excluded or deterred themselves, as Mrs.

\begin{flushright}
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Price claimed: ‘I used to attend matches regularly, but now I never go, these savages are sending good supporters away.’ Mr. Golding also typified this trend:

I am a keen football fan, and used to enjoy the pleasures of watching a football match, a few years ago, but now, I am terrified to go to a match, after hearing of all the riots and vandalism.

In his second letter to the F.A., Mr. Neal described being ‘selective’ in his choice of matches, ‘that is to say, when certain visiting teams are playing, I stay away, so as not to become the victim of the violence.’ Another fan, like Mrs. Price, framed the declining attendances of ‘genuine’ fans as an intentional aim of hooligans: ‘the other parts of the ground will gradually empty, as they are doing, leaving the hooligans the final victors.’ In framing themselves as victims of hooliganism, these fans were not only asserting their distinctiveness from the hooligan, but also positioning themselves as the last line of defense against the loss of a more ‘genuine’ non-violent style of support. Evidence such as this challenges John Clarke’s presentation of hooliganism as a more ‘genuine’ expression of ‘traditional’ working-class values, by showing how fans denied the authenticity of hooliganism. Fans’ assertion that hooliganism was not a ‘genuine’ style of support motivated demands for the F.A. to ‘stop treating it as an inevitable part of the football scene’.

The idea that hooliganism was not ‘inevitable’ or ‘traditional’ is also associated with fans’ assertions that hooliganism was worsening. Mr. Jones identified a ‘deteriorating situation’, and Maurice Chalk described his ‘disgust’ at the hooliganism of ‘the present moment’, compared with his ‘28 years’ of football
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experience.\textsuperscript{558} Another letter described hooliganism as a ‘disturbing phenomenon’, whilst Mr. Richardson found the start of the 1976 season ‘distressing’ due to ‘a new outbreak’.\textsuperscript{559} However, out of all of the letters to the F.A. consulted, only three describe first hand experience of hooliganism. Mr. Jones, for example, informed the F.A. how he and his son, on their way to Highbury, ‘were overtaken by a large gang of Villa supporters…suddenly without provocation one of them accosted me and hit me full in the face’.\textsuperscript{560} Mrs. Price complained of Manchester United fans ‘bashing up innocent animals’, including her cat and her sister’s, who ‘had her head nearly bashed off’.\textsuperscript{561}

Other than these examples, fans did not frame the issue in terms of what they had witnessed or experienced directly, suggesting that their impressions of hooliganism were based on what they had heard or read about in the media, along the lines of a classic ‘moral panic’.\textsuperscript{562} Given the press’s habitual reporting of hooligan incidents and insistence that it was an ‘escalating’ or ‘worsening’ problem, supporters’ second-hand or impressionistic accounts of its increase suggest the influence of press discourses rather than an actual rise in its occurrence.\textsuperscript{563}

Nevertheless, attempts to define the differences between themselves and hooligans, and urge the F.A. to take the issue more seriously, also represent an attempt to prevent the negative media generalisation of football fans as hooligans that occurred in the


\textsuperscript{562} Cohen, \textit{Folk Devils}.

1980s. Furthermore, some fans were seemingly sceptical of the media’s treatment of hooliganism. For example, in a letter to the *Mirror* in 1975, Mrs. Osman complained of the ‘fantastic coverage’ given to hooliganism, claiming that ‘TV news dwells too much on violence and sensationalism.’\(^{564}\) Again though, such scepticism was expressed more frequently towards the end of the 1980s, particularly through independent fanzines, which emerged as a direct response to the overwhelmingly negative image of football fans.

Prior to the emergence of fanzines in the 1980s, official supporters’ clubs began to play an important role as spokesmen for their members and their team’s wider fan base in the late 1960s, particularly around the issue of hooliganism. In the absence of a larger number of individual voices from ‘genuine’ fans in historical sources, such spokesmen will be relied upon here as indicative of more generally held views, given that they were drawn from clubs’ fanbases and endorsed by other fans as their representatives. One of the main functions of supporters’ clubs was the organisation and provision of travel and tickets to away matches, which meant that they became increasingly responsible for ensuring the good behaviour of their members on such trips. They were also increasingly responsible for defending the reputation of their club and its fans against those who “are not interested in football” and who “bring the game into disrepute”.\(^{565}\) In 1968, the Chairman of the National Federation of Football Supporters Clubs claimed to “speak for our 750,000 members” in demanding “strong action” to “stamp out” hooliganism, which “appalls every true supporter”.\(^{566}\) Mr. Johnson of the National Union of Football supporters also claimed to speak on behalf


\(^{565}\) Secretary of the National Federation of Football Supporters Clubs, quoted in Hunter, ‘SOS’.

of ‘genuine’ non-hooligan fans in calling for identity cards.\textsuperscript{567} In 1977, Manchester United’s official supporters club was involved in appealing the UEFA ban following the aforementioned incidents in St. Etienne, and argued:

United supporters can not be blamed for the incidents inside the ground and the French authorities should be asked…Why United supporters were searched on entering the ground yet home supporters were not, and thus entered carrying bottles, cans, knives, etc…why the police used undue violence to retrieve the situation, and even stole a wallet containing 100f belonging to a member of the Torbay Branch.\textsuperscript{568}

This account of events challenges Manchester United fans’ reputation as ‘the worst in Europe’ and their consequent prejudicial treatment by authorities, demonstrating an attempt to engage with the press and authorities in the construction of public opinion.\textsuperscript{569} Such spokesmen and their views represent fans’ involvement in the public framing of hooliganism.

Out of all 15 letters to the F.A., Mr. Johnson’s is the only one to refer to a ‘class distinction’ in the issue of hooliganism, and his intention was to deny that it was a ‘rough’ or ‘working-class’ problem. It is unclear whose views he was alluding to, but his assertion that ‘it is the so called stand season ticket holders who should be setting an example to the so called lesser mortals who stand on the terraces,’ implies a perception that hooligan behaviour was associated with cheaper sections of the ground by some observers, which Mr. Johnson refuted.\textsuperscript{570} A \textit{Daily Mirror} reader also indicated this perception in a letter about ‘Leeds fans ripping up seats and hurling them’, and how in seated accommodation, ‘you could be unable to escape…a riotous mob…Let’s keep the terraces for the real fans’.\textsuperscript{571}

\textsuperscript{569} Ricketts, ‘Return from the Hell’. 
of the ‘genuine’ fan as opposed to the hooligan, these fans attempted to reclaim the terraces as the domain of the ‘real’ fan, in the face of an unknown source of criticism. The ‘real’ fan of the terraces refers to the historiographically and sociologically constructed ‘working-class fan’, but differs in excluding hooligan behaviour from its definition, thereby undermining notions that it was primarily ‘embourgeoisified’ fans that objected to or abstained from hooliganism.\(^{572}\)

The Leicester School argued that a ‘rough’/ ‘respectable’ distinction based on socio-economic class categories explained the differences between hooligans and non-hooligan fans.\(^{573}\) However, with the possible exception of Mrs. Price’s description of hooligans as ‘savages’, this section has identified no other examples of fans using ‘rough’ or comparable words to depict hooligans.\(^{574}\) Although terms such as ‘genuine’, ‘bona-fide’, ‘good’, ‘real’ or ‘regular’ supporters could arguably be compatible with ‘respectable’, the evidence suggests that they are more evocative of authenticity and tradition, and it would be problematic to translate them into languages of class without sufficient indication that fans intended them to be understood as such. The fans who used these terms were presenting non-violent support as a more established and appropriate style of support than hooliganism, which was the behaviour of ‘teenagers’, ‘supporters aged from 11 years old to 30 years old’, ‘youngsters’ or ‘young people’.\(^{575}\) Identifying hooliganism as an activity of the young enabled non-hooligan fans to undermine its authenticity and
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appropriateness as a style of support, by presenting it as a new behaviour of a new generation.

Football hooliganism was not a new behaviour in post-war Britain, as Dunning showed, but it had not been so explicitly associated with young people in representations of its earlier incarnations. The press presented hooliganism as a young person’s activity in order to depict it as distinct from older forms of crowd ‘trouble’, and football fans potentially accepted this distinction. Equally, it is possible that ‘genuine’ fans themselves constructed this dichotomy because they feared being associated with hooliganism and thus targeted by preventative or punitive measures. Furthermore, out of 77 arrests made following disturbances between Aston Villa and Glasgow Rangers fans in 1976, 64 of the offenders were aged between 16 and 25, which suggests that the association of hooliganism with ‘young people’ was not entirely invented. According to Joseph Maguire, changes in ‘the limits of acceptable behaviour’ were more significant in the post-war reaction against hooliganism than changes in the behaviour itself. However, the connection between hooliganism and youth, whether real or imagined, represents a belief that the behaviour or its practitioners had changed, rather than a change in ‘genuine’ fans’ level of tolerance for a previously acceptable behaviour. As the following section demonstrates, the football authorities also expressed a belief in hooliganism’s rise, but their framing of it had more to do with their perception of public opinion than their privately-held views on age or class.
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In 1975, the *Mirror* quoted Minister for Sport Denis Howell making a clear correlation between the seriousness of hooliganism and the age of its perpetrators:

We have always had trouble at football matches...but they were stopped from going too far by tolerance and good sense. What is now different is the age group and the magnitude of the hooliganism.\(^{579}\)

The “tolerance and good sense”, according to a minority of non-hooligan fans, could take the form of physical discipline provided by older fans, such as Mr. Monk, a veteran of the First World War, who ‘can deal with thugs’ and ‘would flog them.’\(^{580}\)

Mr. Sougeon recommended stopping matches whenever hooliganism surfaced, during which time ‘the vast majority of fans would start to take matters into their own hands and the louts would be getting what they deserved.’\(^{581}\) Howell seems to have shared with these fans a view of hooliganism as ‘going too far’, unchecked by the ‘majority’ of fans, a view which implies that certain forms and levels of violence were acceptable if justifiable in terms of the controlled exercise of discipline. Football League secretary Alan Hardaker also called for “old-fashioned psychiatry” and “sharp discipline”, alluding to corporal punishment, in an effort to stress the football authorities’ hard-line approach to “young thugs” in response to their perception of public opinion.\(^{582}\)

F.A. chairman Sir Harold Warris Thompson similarly described hooliganism as a ‘youth’ phenomenon in his response to a video of crowd disorder between Derby County and Manchester United: ‘it was not very informative, but general chaos of this
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sort, and youths kicking each other must clearly be stopped. Generally, though, the football authorities did not attempt to define the hooligan in terms of age or social categories, and considered the problem primarily in terms of their own public image, and what they were being seen to do about it. This concern complicates their involvement in a consensus-driven ‘moral panic’ with the media and non-hooligan fans. Indeed, evidence suggests that the F.A. were skeptical of and anxious about the press coverage of hooliganism, rather than in alliance with them as part of a ‘reactionary’ force of ‘moral regulation’ with the same ‘hegemonic aim’.

In 1976, the Mirror reported that ‘the press and TV are to be asked to exercise responsibility in reporting soccer hooliganism.’ The F.A. made similar efforts to control the media’s coverage of hooliganism at a meeting with representatives of the Football League in 1975, during which the importance of ‘carefully worded’ statements were agreed upon, as was the longer term ‘policy of the Working Party to play down the problem of violence in the media.’ Football authorities were therefore aware of media sensationalism as a potential problem, but they also sought to contain it, and thus prevent the ‘moral panic’ with which Hall, Rookwood and Pearson associate them.

Another article from Thompson’s collection of newspaper cuttings objected to the F.A.’s assertions that the media was exaggerating hooliganism:
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Protesting repeatedly that the media exaggerate the difficulty, Parliament, magistrates, the F.A., the League, the clubs and supporters’ clubs have all failed to take this evil seriously enough…The F.A. have a responsibility to fire the first salvo.\textsuperscript{588}

This article indicates a degree of conflict between the press and the forces of ‘state control’, which existing studies of moral panics often underplay.\textsuperscript{589} Being seen to take hooliganism ‘seriously enough’ appears to have been part of official policy. For example, following the F.A.’s decision not to charge either club for crowd disturbances in a 1976 Derby vs. Manchester United game, Howell indicated this preoccupation with public image in correspondence with Thompson:

My main concern is that where clubs have been seen not to have acted on the recommendations of the government, the F.A. and the League, and they find themselves in a situation of public disorder, it is important that their failure to have so acted should be treated as a material part of the event.\textsuperscript{590}

Thompson repeated this idea of emphasising clubs’ culpability over the F.A.’s when explaining the need for an F.A. Committee on hooliganism, because ‘the F.A. must be seen to do all that it can’. The 1975 meeting with the Football League found it ‘vital for the Football Association and the Football League to be seen by the public to be acting in a decisive manner’ since ‘the public believed, quite wrongly, that the football world was doing nothing to combat the problem.’\textsuperscript{591} As well as the press then, F.A. officials were also aware of potential conflict with ‘the public’, and sought to avoid this by raising awareness of their pro-active approach to solving the problem of hooliganism. In this sense, a degree of public pressure influenced the F.A.’s framing of hooliganism and its measures to curb it.

\textsuperscript{588} Newspaper Cuttings collected by Thompson, RS – TP – HWT/48/4/3/12.
\textsuperscript{589} For example, Bradley, ‘Juvenile Delinquency’; Chritcher, Chas. ‘Model Answers: Moral Panics and Media History’, in Nicholas and O’Malley (eds.), \textit{Moral Panics, Social Fears}, pp. 13–27.
Making recommendations to clubs regarding ground modifications was part of the F.A.’s policy of ‘being seen’ to be dealing with hooliganism, as was deflecting blame from themselves where clubs had failed to meet these recommendations. Perimeter fencing and crash barriers were among the measures suggested, contrary to the views of the ‘genuine’ fans, who advocated the identification and exclusion of hooligans from grounds rather than their control and containment within them. On the issue of identity cards, F.A. secretary Ted Croker argued that they were impractical, due to the vast number of people entering grounds simultaneously, and the ease with which hooligans could use a false name after having their card confiscated.

The authorities thus deemed it unfeasible to implement measures that recognised the distinction between the hooligan and the ‘genuine’ fan, even though they presented themselves as acting in the best interests of and in response to pressure from the ‘genuine’ fan. This divergence between fans’ wishes and the F.A.’s actions therefore limits the extent of supporters’ agency in influencing the F.A.’s framing of the problem, insofar as the F.A.’s anti-hooligan measures reflected their views on the topic as opposed to the urgency of their need to take action.

Again, this section has provided an alternative approach to hooliganism than those focused on class, in that the F.A.’s articulation of hooliganism did not mention ‘rough’ or ‘working-class’ fans as part of the problem. It could be argued that the authorities’ concern with ‘public opinion’ indicates their preoccupation with

---

‘respectable fears’, rather than their lack of class-based bias towards hooligan fans, but still, it should not be presumed that these notions of respectability were defined exclusively by external groups rather than by working-class fans themselves. Indeed, the F.A. sources discussed in this section do not indicate that they were concerned with the impact hooliganism had on football’s respectability, only that the F.A. was under pressure from its constituency of football supporters and its more general conception of ‘public opinion’ to take action.

Such ‘public opinion’ was partially constructed by the press, as shown in the first section, but also involved the ‘genuine’ fan who called for the eradication of hooliganism as vociferously as journalists, and challenged the extent to which hooliganism signified a more ‘authentic’ expression of ‘traditional’ working-class values and culture than the ‘embourgeoisified’ non-hooligan.\(^{594}\) In the following section, a more positive framing of hooliganism in retrospective evidence emerges, but which similarly challenges the primacy of class in terms of its relation to the identities of participants and observers of hooligan behaviour.

**Reframing Hooliganism Since the 1990s**

Whereas the previous section focused on the complaints about hooliganism in the 1960s and 1970s, the subjects of these complaints, hooligans themselves, did not have many opportunities to respond publicly at the time. It is therefore necessary to rely on retrospective personal testimonies and autobiographies in order to demonstrate how these men have reframed their activities. Scholars in sociology have related the

genre of ‘confessional’ hooliganism writing to a particular late-1990s culture of ‘new laddism’ as represented by titles such as Loaded, and FHM, and television programmes such as Fantasy League Football.’

Gary Whannel, a sociologist specialising in the subject of football fandom, defined ‘new laddism’ as a reversion to ‘hardness’ and ‘sexism’ among men in response to ‘the imagined threat of emasculation’ exemplified by contrasting attitudes to footballers such as David Beckham as opposed to ‘hard men’ like David Batty or Vinnie Jones.

Anthony King also argues that ‘the lads’ he identified in his ethnography of Manchester United fans in the 1990s were asserting an older form of masculinity in response to ‘emasculating’ trends like consumerism and commercialism in football.

The rise of the hooligan memoir in availability and popularity was preceded by the emergence of fictionalised versions of football fandom in the early to mid 1990s, such as Nick Hornby’s Fever Pitch, and John King’s The Football Factory, the latter of which was heralded as an authentic and definitive depiction of hooligan culture.

The film adaptation of The Football Factory, released in 2004, included ‘real’ hooligans among its cast members, for which some sections of the press criticised it, but which also indicates an audience with an appetite for ‘real’ or ‘authentic’ versions of British football’s hooligan history.

In response, former hooligans themselves have felt qualified to ‘tell it like it was’, a phrase used
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repeatedly in the advertising slogans and introductions of their memoirs. Whilst the public appetite for such stories was part of a wider ‘new laddism’ culture of which styles of football fandom was one aspect, it was also part of a post-1980s tendency among football supporters and sports journalists to reflect nostalgically on the pre-Taylor Report and pre-Hillsborough days of ‘terrace culture’, as described in Chapter 3. Although hooliganism has not become an unequivocally positively defined feature of collective memory among a majority of football fans, it has, at least, become recognised as an ‘authentic’ style of support associated with an important era in the popular history of football, as demonstrated by the popularity of hooligan stories.

The hooligan stories generally attempt to present their behaviour in a positive and rational way, and construct a masculine code of honour based on recollections of violence as consensual, victimless, and an important means of achieving ‘status’ within and between groups. Such storytelling devices indicate the significance of ‘composure’ to these authors, which Penny Summerfield argues is a necessary aspect of the reconstruction of identities through personal testimonies. ‘Composure’ is the selection and presentation of particular memories ‘to produce a version of the self that the teller can live with in relative psychic ease’, drawing on ‘public discourses’ of generalised, collective memories, and on the search for audience ‘affirmation’. Gender complicates this search for ‘composure’ due to the multiple and contradictory discourses on femininity and masculinity, as Michael Roper demonstrates in the case of remembering First World War ‘soldier heroes’, which storytellers must navigate and select from in their reconstructions of their pasts. This section argues that hooligan personal testimonies represent an equivalent search for ‘composure’ and
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‘affirmation’ that draws both on contemporary and past discourses of masculinity, seeking to re-define their past behaviour as a more positive aspect of their identities than past public discourses allowed for.

Several former hooligans stress the importance of their own authority to tell their stories, as opposed to the media, academics or non-hooligans. In the introduction to his collection of interviews *Top Boys*, former hooligan Cass Pennant described hooliganism as ‘a club you can’t buy your way into, not even wearing the right clothes. And if you’re not part of it, you can’t possibly know it.’ Similarly, Andy Nicholls introduced his memoir by denigrating and excluding more recent groups of hooligans from his narrative:

> There is nothing worse – and it makes my blood simmer – than to see a mob of knob-heads from some ten-bob club, dressed head-to-toe in so-called terrace designer gear, acting hard and thinking it was always this easy.

Pennant and Nicholls both reveal here a concern with being imitated by implicitly less genuine hooligans, particularly through the ‘casual’ style of clothing, which was adopted by hooligans in the 1970s as a means of distinguishing themselves from non-hooligans and evading recognition by the authorities. Also, the idea that contemporary hooligans have it ‘easy’ implies the hardships undergone by older generations, who ‘acted hard’ when violence was significantly more widespread, and thus the risks and repercussions would have been greater. Their authority to reconstruct Britain’s hooligan history is therefore presented as exclusive and special, given credence by cinematic and literary depictions of this era as special.
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Nicholas Allt, however, author of The Boys from the Mersey, claimed his motivation for chronicling his memories of hooliganism was to speak on behalf of ‘thousands of lads’: ‘I thought about the people who, like me, were there, you know, really there, but who had never had a voice.’\textsuperscript{604} Martin King, in Terrace Legends, relates the necessity of giving hooligans a voice to the ‘sensationalised’ media characterisation of their activities, and to the misrepresentation perpetuated by ‘boffins from universities around the country…(who) didn’t have a clue and still don’t’.\textsuperscript{605} Whilst Allt and King do not necessarily view themselves as more authoritative than other hooligans from the era, their concern with providing a ‘voice’ for their contemporaries about their participation in behaviour significant enough to be the subject of media and academic discussion suggests a similar elevation of those who ‘were there’ to that of Pennant and Nicholls.

The authors’ attempts to present themselves and their associates as authoritative voices of a ‘genuine’ hooligan culture relates to the construction of certain notorious former hooligans as ‘legends’ or ‘top boys’. Pennant outlined his criteria in selecting the ‘top boys’ for interview as those having ‘answered the call of passion further than most would’,\textsuperscript{606} and King in Terrace Legends, those who ‘had hero status across the nation, with their names heard not only across the terraces but in every pub, club, youth club and school playground.’\textsuperscript{607} Also, Pennant positioned himself as a ‘top boy’, equal in status to his interviewees, and claimed their mutual ‘respect’ facilitated his exclusive access to their stories:
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I feel privileged in some way, for I go where no outsider can go. It’s a secret world that opens up to me, no doubt on the strength of my own CV, some curiosity and, dare I say it, respect.\(^{608}\)

The idea that the history of hooliganism is a ‘secret world’ that only former hooligans themselves – particularly those commanding the most ‘respect’ – can provide insights into, creates a sense that the reader is privileged to be given access to the stories. It also positions the reader as inferior in status to the ‘legendary’ storytellers and interviewers, who, by having ‘been there’ and developed their own ‘CV’ of violent encounters, acquire a superior masculine status to those who were not there. The post-1990s popular nostalgia for football’s lost ‘terrace culture’ and the fictional genre of hooliganism literature and film make possible such assertions of status in hooligan recollections, as the predominant public discourses of the 1960s and 1970s denigrated hooliganism as oppositional to ‘genuine’ fan culture.

The issue of ‘status’ between hooligans also underlies descriptions of ‘hand-to-hand combat’ and the need for ‘top faces’ within one’s ‘mob’, demonstrating the importance of individual demonstrations of fighting prowess. Bill Gardner, in *Terrace Legends*, claimed that ‘no man from another firm has ever faced me one to one’, signifying his concern with stressing his fearsome reputation in his search for composure.\(^{609}\) Other sources prioritise the collective over the individual characteristics of football violence such as camaraderie and pride in being part of ‘a good squad’ of ‘untouchables’.\(^{610}\) Andy Nicholls, for example, describes forming a ‘mob’ of friends in his early teens in the late 1970s, who continued to fight together into middle age.\(^{611}\) Another former hooligan, who later ‘decided to take a back seat’,
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\(^{608}\) Pennant, *Top Boys*, p. xiv.


\(^{611}\) Nicholls, *Scally*. 
expressed few regrets at his retirement, as ‘I still drink with all the lads and have
remained good pals with them all.’\footnote{612} This account suggests that being part of a group
was more important and pleasurable than the actual violence, although it is likely that
the shared experiences and memories of violence were an essential element in the
bonding of such groups.

Sociologist Anthony King notes how football hooligans tend to spend more
time talking about violence than on actual fighting, and argues that this process
involves the negotiation of agreed versions of events, which facilitates the creation of
a ‘collective memory’ that defines a group’s code of conduct and honour.\footnote{613} Klaus
Theweleit has been influential in examining the relationship of narratives and
fantasies about violence to the construction of identity, and his analysis of the
memoirs of Freikorps members in inter-war Germany found that the cognitive
conception of victims as dangerous enemies enabled the perpetrators of violence to
justify and take pride in their actions.\footnote{614} Hooligan memoirs made similar attempts to
justify their violence and define their activities as honourable, reconstructing a
masculine code of conduct that defines their identities and the collective memory of
hooliganism in a way that class does not seem to have done.

An important aspect of the recollection of hooliganism as honourable centres
on its presentation as consensual, and therefore victimless, as Frank Harper
emphasized in Terrace Legends:

At the end of the day, if like-minded people want to fight one another,
then that’s fine. If a phone call’s made and two mobs fight in a field or on

\footnote{612} Alan ‘Monty’ Montgommery, Terrace Legends, p. 238.
\footnote{613} King, ‘Violent Pasts’.
\footnote{614} Klaus Theweleit, Male Fantasies, (Cambridge, 1987), (Originally published in German as
Männerphantasien, Frankfurt am Main, 1977).
waste ground and kick shit out of one another, then who are they hurting?  

Steve Lyons also made this claim to harmlessness, insisting ‘I only ever fought other geezers that were like me and wanted it’. As well as being harmless, King and Pennant also present hooliganism as entertaining for non-hooligans: ‘During the ‘60s and ‘70s if there was a 40,000 gate, well over half would be up for a fight - the rest were there to watch.’ Rather than ruining football for the ‘genuine’ fan, these sources present hooliganism as having improved it, and draw on the fact that such scenes are no longer likely to occur at matches to construct them as a ‘lost’ aspect of football culture.

Some former hooligans recollect protecting non-hooligan fans and local residents from rival supporters, as though this was their duty. Bill Gardner described how ‘they (Millwall fans) jumped on and started slapping a few young West Ham Fans about. I steamed into them thinking that the rest of our boys on the train would back me up’. Mark Chester recalled the necessity of ‘revenge’ when ‘a van load of Geordies had a fight in a pub and a little girl had been glassed.’ As Gilroy Shaw recalled, ‘clubs that bash fans in shirts – that’s not on. Fair play should come into it. Rules of combat apply - only fight like-minded people.’ As well as bestowing honour on themselves for having performed this service, describing attacks on ‘innocent’ victims also represents an opportunity to denigrate the honour and masculinity of rivals, who attacked children and young fans rather than equals.

Similarly, Nicholls recalled a visit to Newcastle in 1977, when ‘women, kids…were

619 Mark ‘Jasper’ Chester, *Terrace Legends*, p. 79.
battered. No Everton fan was ignored in the carnage.621 Such notions of fairness and the protection of ‘innocent’ fans reveal the influence of 1970s press constructions of hooliganism as a threat to these fans’ safety and enjoyment at football matches, and hooligans’ denial of their involvement in victimising ‘innocent’ fans indicates their internalisation of the potential disapproval such behaviour would incur, hence their rejection of it in their search for composure.

Notions of a ‘fair fight’ also define the honour that could be won or lost through the recollection of hooligan activities. In Terrace Legends, subjects were asked about their ‘worst feeling at a game’ and ‘any serious injuries’ they suffered, and being outnumbered framed most of the answers to these questions. For example, ‘Mac’ recalled how ‘about fifteen of us’ were confronted by ‘a mob of about 200’,622 and Gary Johnson described how ‘me and a mate of mine, Davo, bumped into about fifty Blues fans’.623 Similarly, in Top Boys, Les Muranyi recalled being ejected from a match at West Ham on his own, and how rival fans were ‘everywhere’ outside: ‘that’s the only time I’ve ever been concerned for myself at a football match. West Ham, I think, had that reputation of being knife happy.’624 These sources reflect a tendency for hooligans to treat fear, defeats and injuries as inadmissible unless they occurred as a result of unfairness, which they construct as un-masculine, thus defending their own masculine status.

The use of weapons represents another un-masculine violation of the hooligan code of honour as it has been constructed retrospectively. Steve Cowens, in Terrace

621 Nicholls, Scally, p. 17.
622 Mac, Terrace Legends, p. 148.
624 Les Muranyi, Top Boys, p. 66.
Legends, recalled the case of a man who ‘smashed half a brick in my face from the side’, which he considered ‘snidey’, and asserted that ‘we can all take a beating but to me Muppets carrying blades is the lowest of the low.’

Spenna, in Top Boys, described witnessing an incident at West Brom, where ‘one lad got hit over the head with a pole, split his head virtually clean in two.’ Pennant asked his ‘top boys’ about ‘the worst instance of weapons being used’, leading his subjects to define this negatively. In contrast, Nicholls recalled how at his own club, ‘we would have mobs of over 1,000 at every game and one in ten was a blade merchant. There cannot be a ground in the country that has seen as many cuttings as Goodison.’ He described the city of Liverpool and Goodison Park in particular as ‘one of the most evil places for a travelling football fan’, introducing his memoir as ‘The book they tried to ban!’ His story is thus imbued with a sense of danger, and presented as illicit material, inviting the reader to share an anti-authority attitude.

Former hooligans in Terrace Legends were asked about the ‘fairest’ and ‘worst’ police forces they encountered, framing recollections of police around similar notions of masculine honour and fairness that frame attitudes to rival hooligans, and denigrating the masculinity of the police. Bill Gardner described Manchester police as ‘heavy handed’, and only able to overcome his ‘mob’ because ‘there was more of them than us and they were all dressed like Robocop.’ Alan Montgomery argued that there is ‘no such thing’ as ‘fairest coppers’, and warned ‘don’t mess with the Scouse bizzies with the big sticks - ouch!’ The police are also accused of targeting
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625 Steve Cowens, Terrace Legends, pp. 45 and 40.
626 Spenna, Top Boys, p. 36.
627 Nicholls, Scally, p. 9.
628 Nicholls, Scally, pp. 9 and front cover.
629 Bill Gardner, Terrace Legends, p. 11.
‘innocent’ fans, and Steve Cowens described them as ‘legalised thugs’ who have ‘hidden agendas’ and ‘take great delight in mullering anything that moves, guilty or not’. Nicholls recalled how ‘even the bizzies were evil at Everton’, and were more likely to give fans ‘a crack with a long metal-tipped stick’ than to protect them from hooligans. In another account, Andy Phillips recalled how Bolton police ‘just stood and watched as some of their lot threw bricks and bottles at us’, making them complicit in the unfair tactics of the rival hooligans. Defining the police negatively in this way represents an attempt by hooligans to define themselves and their activities as more honourable, and therefore more masculine, in contrast, which further underlines the significance of masculinity rather than class to the reconstruction of their identities.

Part of the negative construction of the police, as well as attempting to denigrate their masculinity in relation to that of hooligans, is framed around the perception of police culpability for disasters such as Hillsborough and Heysel. For example, Richard Grey alleged that ‘South Yorkshire Police seemed to incite more trouble than they prevented and failed to cope (with the events at Hillsborough)’, and Steve Cowens described how he ‘used to think South Yorkshire Police were pretty fair…but now my opinion has changed.’ In Boys from the Mersey, Allt claimed there would have been ‘1,000 Heysels’ if more policemen had ‘run away when things started to turn ugly’, as he alleged the Belgian police had done. Elsewhere, other former hooligans cited ‘watching Heysel unfold on TV’ as a scene that ‘sickened’
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631 Steve Cowens, Terrace Legends, p. 44.
632 Nicholls, Scally, p. 10.
634 Richard Grey and Steve Cowens, Terrace Legends, pp. 98 and 44.
635 Allt, Boys from the Mersey, p. 298.
them, in an effort to distance themselves from it.\textsuperscript{636} This distancing relates to the reconstruction of hooliganism as a ‘harmless’ and victimless activity, which only becomes serious and objectionable when ‘fans have gone well over the top’ and failed to ‘stop when someone’s had enough,’ or when ‘shirters and scarfers’ were involved.\textsuperscript{637}

‘Shirters’ or ‘scarfers’ are terms used to describe non-hooligan fans, easily identifiable and therefore excluded from hooligan activities by their preference for wearing club colours and replica kits. Nicholls claims that hooligans’ preference for ‘casual’ fashion originated amongst his peer group in Merseyside in the late 1970s, and is proud of the fact that it was emulated by other hooligans around Britain.\textsuperscript{638} ‘Mr. M’ in \textit{Top Boys}, a member of the ‘Aberdeen Soccer Casuals’, described how some Celtic and Rangers ‘scarfers’ would involve themselves in fighting to give the impression that hooligans supporting the opposition team had attacked them, and thus violated the code of honour.\textsuperscript{639} Allt, however, undermines the ‘authenticity’ of contemporary ‘think-they’re-hard’ Burberry contingent who all believe they’re so different to the replica-shirt wearers’, who are too young to have experienced the ‘sweet’ and ‘carefree’ days of hooliganism, and are distinguished from ‘genuine’ earlier hooligans by their fashion choices.\textsuperscript{640} As Jason Marriner claims in \textit{Top Boys}, ‘it will never be the same’, and ‘Mr. M’, ‘it can never be what it was, but the memories will live on.’\textsuperscript{641}

\textsuperscript{636} Andy Phillips and Steve Cowens, \textit{Terrace Legends}, pp. 143 and 45.
\textsuperscript{638} Nicholls, \textit{Scally}, pp. 15-16.
\textsuperscript{639} ‘Mr. M’, \textit{Top Boys}, p. 9.
\textsuperscript{640} Allt, \textit{Boys from the Mersey}, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{641} Jason Marriner, \textit{Top Boys}, p. 83; ‘Mr. M’, \textit{Top Boys}, p. 17.
The importance of ensuring that hooligan memories ‘live on’ is related to a more general nostalgia for an older ‘terrace culture’, which former hooligans have reconstructed themselves as an integral part of. In *Top Boys*, Pennant asks his subjects their opinions on ‘all-seater stadiums, ticket prices and the commercial aspects of today’s football’, enabling them to recall their experiences as more traditional and ‘genuine’ in contrast. ‘Spenna’ exemplifies this contrast, claiming that ‘the stadiums I think took a lot of the atmosphere out of it…I think we’d all have the terracing back tomorrow’, as does ‘Brains’: ‘The state-of-the-art football stadiums, there’s no atmosphere, I don’t think, not like the old days.’ In lamenting contemporary football’s lack of ‘atmosphere’, these stories imply that memories of hooliganism attempt to reconstruct in more positively for having contributed to this lost experience.

Although ‘mainstream’ accounts generally deny a place for hooliganism in their reconstruction of ‘terrace culture’, the popularity of hooligan literature suggests that some fans, perhaps of a younger generation, value these stories of football’s ‘dark old days’. The reframing of hooliganism in a more positive light, based on honour, authenticity and harmlessness, signals an attempt to challenge and seek ‘composure’ from negative representations of the 1970s and 1980s, and to dissociate hooliganism from the stadium disasters and subsequent alterations that eradicated ‘genuine’ terrace culture. It also represents an attempt to define this culture in terms of masculinity, as opposed to class.
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642 Spenna and Brains, *Top Boys*, pp. 40 and 56.
Conclusion

This chapter has attempted to historicise contemporary popular and media conceptions of football’s ‘dark old days’, by outlining the ways hooliganism and reactions to it were framed in the years preceding the 1980s, and how they have been reframed in the recent past. The first half described how the media, the football authorities and non-hooligan fans discussed hooliganism, and primarily identified it as a ‘youth’ phenomenon. This focus on youth is a departure from traditional interpretations of football hooliganism, which have framed the post-war rise of hooliganism and reactions against it in terms of socio-economic class. By focusing on how observers and participants framed it, rather than what caused it, has revealed an overall silence about class amongst those who discussed hooliganism in the 1960s and 1970s. Such silence suggests that class was not necessarily of significance in the distinction between the ‘genuine’ fan and the ‘hooligan’, which was the principal way that non-hooligan fans framed the problem.

Since post-war football in Britain was still a largely ‘working-class’ game in terms of the occupations and incomes of fans, the absence of languages of class amongst supporters in framing the important issue of hooliganism indicates that they did not consider class a key problematic. Potentially, this supports Todd and Savage’s claims that class categories and identities were relatively stable and unchanging in post-war Britain, by showing that the Leicester School’s interpretation of a conflict between ‘rough’ and ‘respectable’ elements, and John Clarke’s ‘embourgeoisement’

643 Lacey, ‘Compared with the 80s’.
644 Dunning, ‘Social Roots of Football Hooligan Violence’; ‘Spectator Violence at Football Matches’; Roots of Football Hooliganism; Clarke, ‘Football and Working Class Fans’.
theory, were not evidenced by football fans themselves. However, fan’s silence about class is also evidence of its questionable significance to their sense of identity and their dis-identification with the hooligan ‘other’, supporting claims that ‘youth’ and generation replaced class as the main points of difference at this time.

The first half of this chapter also demonstrated the importance of treating the views expressed by the press, the F.A. and football fans separately, rather than as a unified ‘moral panic’ over hooliganism. The views of ‘genuine’ fans indicated their fears of becoming indistinguishable from hooligans, and treated by the press and football authorities indiscriminately. The construction of a public image of football fans in the 1970s had important consequences for the way in which fans were treated by the late 1980s. In this way, rather than being viewed as part of a moral panic, the 1970s reaction against hooliganism amongst ‘genuine’ supporters was an attempt to prevent a moral panic and its effects on football fans in the 1980s, which were summarised by the popular fanzine *When Saturday Comes* in the aftermath of Hillsborough:

Fans are treated with the utmost disrespect. We are herded, cajoled, pushed and corralled into cramped spaces, and expected to submit passively to every new indignity. The implication is that ‘normal’ people need to be protected from the football fan. But we are normal people.

The efforts of former hooligans to reconstruct their activities in terms of honour, fun and harmlessness is a comparable attempt to ‘re-humanise’ themselves in popular memory, but it is also an attempt to reconstruct the ‘bad old days’ as part of a less
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commercial and more ‘traditional’ era in football’s history. Although the men telling these stories glorify their activities and distance themselves from some of the more serious consequences of hooliganism, they also assert their authoritative status as voices on the subject. Fanzines in the 1980s and oral histories from football fans in the 1990s represent equivalent attempts to claim agency in the construction and reconstruction of the football fan, indicating a shared agenda among supporters to challenge media-constructed images of them and their pasts.
Chapter 4: Football Support and National, Regional and Local Identities

Sport has traditionally been associated with forging a sense of national unity, which was especially apparent in the English national broadsheet and tabloid press’ celebration of the 2012 London Olympics for encouraging and expressing ‘a sense of belonging to Britain…free of divisive identity politics’. During the Euro 2004 football tournament in Portugal, then Conservative MP for Henley, Boris Johnson, commented on the unprecedented display of the St. George’s Cross as evidence of loyalty to an idea of England, as distinct from Britain. Sports journalist and later scriptwriter Arthur Hopcraft recognised such connections between sport and popular patriotism in one of the first books on football and identity in England, which was written in 1968 and described football as ‘an everyday matter’, with ‘more significance in the national character than the theatre’ and other cultural phenomena. Academic studies of football frequently cite its links to ‘national character’ as a principal justification of its study, while its equivalent role in relation to local and regional identities provides another long-standing motivation for study. However, in the English case, this role is often taken for granted and under-analysed, without attention to the varying circumstances in which particular place-based identities become pertinent among football fans.

This chapter suggests that defining players or clubs as ‘symbols’ or ‘embodiments’ of the nation or locality is insufficient an explanation for the connection between football and identity. In contrast, this chapter focuses on the processes by which such symbols were constructed and received by newspapers and football fans, using the ‘identity talk’ that tends to accompany football support to illustrate the relationship between national, regional and intra-regional identities in mid-twentieth-century England. This approach enables consideration of the ways in which each of these identities became more prominent in different circumstances, as well as the circumstances in which they coexisted, in an effort to answer the question raised by Peter Mandler in 2006: ‘what determines which identity is salient at any given time?’ Merseyside and the North East, areas traditionally associated with a strong sense of distinctiveness from the rest of England and with long-standing local football rivalries, are useful case studies for the examination of the coexistence of national, regional and local identities, and the bases of fragmentation within them.

The political significance of national and regional identities in England has recently come under concerted scrutiny, particularly following the Blair government’s
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devolution policies and the consequent ‘English question’. Numerous public figures, political scientists, and historians have contested the existence and content of ‘Englishness’, centring on what England means or should mean in a diverse, multicultural society following the loss of its historic role within Britain as a whole. Krishnan Kumar argues that Englishness has historically been defined by outsiders and based on England’s relationship with outsiders, primarily in other parts of the Empire and the Union, and by its global ‘mission’. Mandler, on the other hand, defines the English national character as an ideal of liberal citizenship and tolerance, which George Schopflin echoes in his characterisation of an English identity based on acceptance and tolerance of the class system. Julia Stapleton challenges this association between national identity and citizenship in her account of political elites’ distrust of patriotism and nationalist sentiments as incompatible with their ideals of citizenship. Rather than focusing on competing definitions of Englishness, this chapter demonstrates how potentially agreed-upon notions of nationhood were adopted or rejected, and considers levels of identification or disillusionment with the nation in relation to competing local and regional identities, irrespective of the content of Englishness.

In the post-war context, decolonisation and immigration have dominated discussions of national identity in England, with historians such as Wendy Webster, Chris Waters and Bill Schwarz identifying racial ‘others’ as the key feature of
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discursive redefinitions of postcolonial Englishness. Local press coverage of
football in this era, on the other hand, reveals the persistence of a southern ‘other’ to
northern English identities, and a sense of distinctiveness from the idea of a “little
England” (that) was used against a black migrant ‘other” in the national discourses
upon which such historiography relies. Equally though, it reveals a desire for such
distinctiveness to be recognised as part of and representative of the nation, which
challenges academic emphasis on regional exclusion from or rejection of national
identity.

Indeed, other work on post-war Britain has emphasised central or national
recognition and celebration of local and regional diversity. Becky Conekin, for
example, highlights attempts by the organisers of the 1951 Festival of Britain to
represent local and regional distinctiveness as part of the national ‘imagined
community’. Richard Weight has also emphasised the national Art Council’s
efforts to encourage local engagement with cultural initiatives, whilst Nick Tiratsoo
argues that national urban planning initiatives attempted to incorporate local public
opinion and participation. Despite these efforts and the more general centralisation
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Weight and Abigail Beach (eds.), The Right to Belong: Citizenship and National Identity in Britain,
of political and economic policies of post-war governments, this chapter argues that local, civic and regional identities persisted in Merseyside and the North East, and were occasionally articulated in terms of disenchantment with the nation.665

The first section explores evidence of nationalist sentiments in the North East and Liverpool, and argues that civic and regional identities contributed to expressions of patriotic sentiments and coexisted with national identities, a circumstance that tended to coincide with the presence of a foreign ‘other’ against which ‘Geordie’ and ‘Scouse’ football could be contrasted positively by the rest of England. Defeating international opposition in European competition and fulfilling an ambassadorial role on behalf of the nation encouraged a sense of being valued as part of Britain or England. In contrast, the second section describes the construction of a North/South dichotomy and a London-based ‘other’ in these areas, generally articulated in terms of a feeling of being insulted or undervalued by the nation, and provoking defensive assertions of superiority. In the third section, the construction of intra-regional divisions and micro-identities through football rivalries and contested local symbols is examined, demonstrating that broader regional identities were not necessarily static and unified, but also indicating the persistence of smaller-scale local attachments and a tradition of working-class football partisanship in an era of the ‘affluent worker’ and the associated decline of such attachments.666


666 For example, Zweig, The Worker in an Affluent Society; Michael Young, and Peter Willmott, Family and Kinship in East London, (Harmondsworth, 1962). Recent historiography has challenged this association between affluence and a decline in local community attachments. See Simon Gunn, ‘People and the Car: The Expansion of Automobility in Urban Britain, 1955-70’, Social History, 38:2,
National Identities and Local Football

National identities were constructed and expressed at a local and regional level through football support and local press coverage of football in post-war Britain, demonstrating that patriotic sentiments and local loyalties were not necessarily mutually exclusive. Academic considerations of the relationship between football support and national identity in England generally focus on international football and support for the England national team, whilst domestic club football is reserved for examinations of local and regional identities.\textsuperscript{667} The role of the press in constructing these identities has also followed a similar national/local distinction in academic treatments of football and identity.\textsuperscript{668} Conversely, in presenting evidence from the local press in the North East and Merseyside, this section highlights their role in constructing a national ‘imagined community’ and the particular circumstances in which this occurred. Given the traditional association of these areas and their press with a strong sense of regional or civic identity, their involvement in constructing a sense of English or British nationhood among their readers has largely been neglected.
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Generally, with regards to the local media’s construction of national identities through football in Liverpool and Newcastle, the salience of these national identities revolved around international competition. Foreign opponents were juxtaposed with English or British characteristics, whilst local clubs and their fans were presented as performing an ambassadorial role on behalf of the nation. Whilst such journalism occasionally parallels national popular press clichés that have been criticised as jingoistic and xenophobic, and can arguably be deemed equally as unrepresentative of public opinion, the fact that local media outlets circulated comparable discourses of national belonging in areas with a strong sense of local or regional identity indicates their varied and unpredictable agendas, as well as revealing the availability of multiple representations of place-based identities to local communities of readers. 669

The tendency of the Liverpool and Newcastle press to circulate images of Englishness or Britishness in the post-war era largely depended on the availability of a foreign ‘other’ and an international stage, and on the extent to which these circumstances provided an opportunity for local representatives to be included in and valued positively by the broader national community. Increased European competition and travel to away matches from the 1960s, as well as the staging of the World Cup in England in 1966, meant that non-English opponents, and styles of play were made more visible to English fans, and more relevant to club football at a local level and in local press coverage. These developments enabled the local press to construct local teams and their fans as representatives of England or Britain by describing opposing teams and fans in terms of contrasting national stereotypes.

669 On xenophobia and jingoism in national popular press football reporting, see Bishop and Jaworski, “We Beat Em”; Young, ‘Two World Wars and One World Cup’.
For example, during the 1966 World Cup, the *Liverpool Evening Express* described ‘the cast iron curtain of Russia’s defence’, alluding to the country’s political situation. At a national level, *The Guardian* considered Russia’s style to be ‘so well-matched and so alike in temperament’ to their West German semi-final opponents, leading to ‘austere fare’ for the audience. As this semi-final match was played at Everton’s Goodison Park in Liverpool, the response of the local crowd to such ‘austere’ football was recorded locally in nationalistic terms: ‘The crowd, at times, possibly bored with the entire proceedings and seeking to rouse the teams to worthwhile activity chanted “England, England, England”’. The article aimed to imply that the England team would have provided a more entertaining match, and the Merseyside crowd were active in expressing this to the ‘austere’ and defensive Russians and Germans. Although such newspaper sources do not provide evidence of a reality of Merseyside football fans’ response to this match, nor do they reflect actual differences in national styles of play, they show how some local journalists constructed an image of local football fans as patriots who appreciated England’s superior football.

Also during the World Cup, the Liverpool press provided a quote from Otto Gloria, coach of the Portugal team, denigrating the West German style of play: “The West Germans are the one team we want to avoid…They are so physically strong. We prefer to play against artists.” Similarly, *The Guardian* quoted Brazil’s medical advisor Dr. Hilton Gosling complaining about a new ‘physical’ style of football.
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replacing ‘technique’: “I do not think it will give as much pleasure to the public as we have tried to give over the last eight years.”\textsuperscript{674} The \textit{Liverpool Weekly News} described the pleasure provided by Brazil and Portugal to the Goodison Park spectators, who ‘had their money’s worth’ and were left debating whether Brazil’s Pele or Portugal’s Eusebio was “The Greatest” player.\textsuperscript{675} In expressing an admiration for ‘artistic’ and attacking styles of football, the English local and national press associated their nation with successful sides such as Brazil, who had won the last two World Cups, whilst constructing a negative image of other nations for their ‘physical’ or ‘boring’ style of play. Additionally, an appreciation of attacking football by Merseyside fans was presented as a positive characteristic of English football fans in general by the \textit{Liverpool Daily Post}, which cited the President of the Portugal Football Federation, Pinheiro Machado, who ‘joined other international soccer heads in saying that English fans understand and appreciate football.’\textsuperscript{676}

As demonstrated by a 1963 article in the \textit{Evening Chronicle}, the north-eastern press also participated in the construction of an English style of play, which was contrasted with other ‘inferior’ nations, such as Czechoslovakia on this occasion: ‘what took the Czechs by surprise was our modern style. We have thrown off the shackles of tradition and hide-bound habits to play with fluid economy…The Czechs were old-fashioned.’\textsuperscript{677} The emphasis on England’s ‘modern’ style is significant given their disappointing performances in the previous three World Cups, having abstained from the competition between 1928 and 1950 following a dispute with football’s international governing body FIFA. In 1950, England were defeated by the USA, a
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\textsuperscript{675} Steve Mitchell, ‘Goodison has had the Best’, \textit{Liverpool Weekly News}, 21 July 1966, p. 5.
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\textsuperscript{677} Bernard Joy, ‘“A Long Way to go yet” is Ramsey’s Warning’, \textit{Evening Chronicle}, 20 May 1963, p. 27.
relatively new footballing nation, and failed to advance beyond the first round. In 1953, England were defeated heavily at Wembley by Hungary, another team considered by the English press as novices compared to ‘masters’ England, the nation which invented football, and was previously ‘a hallmark of greatness’ internationally.\(^\text{678}\) Having missed over 20 years of international competitive football, the ‘masters’ had ‘forgotten’ how to play whilst their former pupils had improved.\(^\text{679}\) Consequently, the intervening years prior to the 1966 World Cup entailed a ‘modernising’ agenda for the England team, and a preoccupation with foreign styles of play, particularly on the part of the national press.\(^\text{680}\)

By the early 1960s however, evidence suggests that the press had begun to replace its discussion of English football’s decline with the idea that England had improved and modernised sufficiently to compete with and assert superiority over other national styles of play, such as the ‘old-fashioned’ Czechs, the ‘physical’ Germans and the ‘austere’ Russians.\(^\text{681}\) The aforementioned praise for and desire to be associated with the ‘artistry’ of Portuguese and Brazilian football notwithstanding, the British national and local press also constructed a ‘Latin temperament’ with negatively defined characteristics. In his 1966 World Cup coverage for \textit{The Times}, journalist Geoffrey Green highlighted ‘Latin cynicism’ as a feature of South American and southern-European teams, whose tactics involved committing fouls and attempting to deceive referees into awarding free-kicks.\(^\text{682}\) In 1969, an \textit{Evening Chronicle} reporter similarly described the ‘Latin temperament’ as ‘the actor looking
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\(^\text{678}\) Peter Wilson, ‘Now We Must be the New Masters’, \textit{Daily Mirror}, 26 November 1953, p. 15.\(^\text{679}\) Wilson, ‘Now We Must be the New Masters’.

\(^\text{680}\) For a detailed discussion of this process, see Taylor, \textit{The Association Game}, pp. 202-213.

\(^\text{681}\) Joy, ‘A Long Way to go’; ‘Portuguese Will Stick To All Out Attack’; ‘Similarity of Styles’.

for an Oscar- the dying swan every time he is tackled. 683 English footballers, in contrast, were implicitly more ‘honest’, a cliché that has persisted into the Twenty First Century in popular football reporting, and that promotes a positive image of Englishness through football that readers are invited to take a shared sense of pride in.

Such representations of foreign teams and players contributed to the construction of a distinctively ‘British’ or ‘English’ style of play in opposition, based on notions of fair play, hard work and bravery. Whilst it is possible that notions of foreign footballing ‘temperaments’ and styles were more longstanding, England’s return to competitive international football at the 1950 World Cup, and the staging of the tournament in England in 1966 provided increased opportunities for contact with these ‘others’, against which ‘Englishness’ and ‘Britishness’ were defined by the press. Furthermore, the establishment of the European Champions Cup and the Intercities Fairs Cup in 1955 enabled the local and national media in Britain to construct foreign others against local clubs and their fans. 684 Chelsea were the first English team to qualify for the European Cup, having won the league in 1955, but Football League secretary Alan Hardaker ‘bullied’ them into withdrawing due to his ‘disdain’ for European competition, according to a recent Telegraph article. 685 Nevertheless, Manchester United was allowed to represent England the following year, whilst Everton and Liverpool participated in the 1963-64 and 1964-65 seasons respectively.

684 The European Champions Cup is equivalent to the present-day UEFA Champions League, in which the most successful teams from domestic leagues throughout Europe compete against each other, but which previously involved fewer teams and less matches. The Intercities Fairs Cup was the second-tier European club competition, and an antecedent of today’s Europa League.
For Newcastle United, the 1968-69 Fairs Cup was their first experience of European competition, having qualified through a ‘one club one city’ rule that excluded Everton due to Liverpool’s participation, despite Everton having achieved a higher league position than Newcastle. During this campaign, the north-eastern press indulged in national and racial stereotyping in its descriptions of opposition players as ‘dark, swarthy’ with a ‘Latin temperament’, thus constructing their difference from the Newcastle team as representatives of England.  

Also, the Englishness of Newcastle fans was stressed in the *Evening Chronicle*’s guides to the foreign cities in which the club would play. For example, a guide to Lisbon highlighted the Portuguese variation in culinary tastes, whilst reassuring fans that ‘you can have chips with everything- and red sauce too.’ However, ‘people used to a good English pint will be disappointed…In comparison with English beer, the Portuguese brew…leaves much to be desired.’ The guide thus defined the tastes of Newcastle fans as English and distinguished them from those of the Portuguese, although the extent to which fans themselves identified their tastes in similar terms is not apparent.

A further distinguishing feature between the English and the Portuguese was the perceived ability of Newcastle players and their fans to withstand difficult weather conditions. In retrospective personal testimonies, Newcastle supporters recalled how, during a match against Portuguese side Vitória Setubal at St. James’ Park in 1969, opposition players were ‘wearing tights and gloves’ and ‘didn’t want to know’ due to the weather, which enabled an easy victory as it was ‘what we were used to’ and ‘didn’t worry about.’ According to such reminiscences, it was ‘a liberal helping of English mud’ that won the match for Newcastle, and Newcastle’s ability to withstand
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English weather as opposed to players from warmer climates who ‘just couldn’t take it.’ On this occasion, the foreign ‘other’ was defeated by the English weather and an English team’s acclimatisation, enabling Newcastle players’ and fans’ inclusion in a national identity through their contrast with this other.

The establishment of annual European club competition from 1955 increased the opportunities for this ‘othering’ at a local level, but there is evidence to suggest that similar tendencies predated this development. For example, local newspaper references to George Robledo, who played for Newcastle between 1949 and 1953, reveal a comparable distinguishing of his South American characteristics from the rest of the Newcastle team. Although Robledo represented Chile in the 1950 World Cup, he spoke no Spanish, had an English mother and had lived in Yorkshire since the age of five. Nevertheless, the North-East press were not averse to highlighting Robledo’s Chilean nationality and presuming his ‘comfort’ playing in a ‘hot climate’ tours abroad, which would have served to perpetuate an awareness of national difference. However, international players were not prevalent in the English Football League at this time, so press attention to Robledo’s Chilean heritage should not be understood as indicative of more widespread trends. Furthermore, national identities seemed to become more prominent in North East press discourses when the ‘other’ was an opponent of Newcastle United, a circumstance that became more relevant in the late 1960s.

The tendency of the local press to describe foreign ‘invasions’ provides further evidence of their resort to national clichés and stereotypes in their coverage of

689 Arnold Howe and Ian Swan in Edinson and Clarke, *Magpie Memories*, p. 82.
matches against European opposition, such as the labelling of a scout as a ‘Hungarian master spy’ and the likening of Portuguese team Setubal to ‘the notorious jellyfish, the Portuguese Man of War, which occasionally invades Britain’s beaches’ in the Chronicle’s 1969 Fairs Cup coverage. Against such opposition, the local club could thus be constructed as a defender of Britain, echoing broader discourses of national identity based on the notion of being besieged or threatened, as demonstrated by Webster, but not usually in relation to the immigrant ‘other’ she focuses on.

Richard Weight has likened national media coverage of England’s 1966 World Cup victory over West Germany to ‘a peacetime version of the Finest Hour…stamping the Second World War on the national cortex’, which Webster interprets as evidence of ‘anxieties about white British masculinity’ brought about by the declining availability of an imperial setting for the ‘soldier hero’. The local press and their reporting of local club football were also involved in promoting this broader militaristic nationalism, although not necessarily through World War Two nostalgia or exclusively anti-German sentiments.

The Tyneside press defined Newcastle United and its fans’ defensive role more explicitly following the visit of an estimated 22,000 Glasgow Rangers fans to St. James’ Park in 1969, many of whom caused considerable damage and disturbance around Newcastle before and after the match. The incident was reported locally as ‘the rowdiest, wildest Scottish invasion so far’, and described in terms of the ‘riot-prone’ characteristics of Scottish fans displayed on other occasions when they
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‘crossed the Border’, thereby framing Scottish fans as a threat to England, and Newcastle as part of this besieged England.\(^{694}\)

Rather than reflecting on the implications of the Rangers fans’ behaviour for British football, an *Evening Chronicle* journalist stressed the ‘disgrace’ to ‘Scottish football’ it represented and the separateness of England and Scotland: ‘there will be incensed cries today that Scots teams should be given home rule and have their passports withdrawn…there are those calling for Hadrian’s Wall to be rebuilt and the Scots to be banned from European soccer.’\(^{695}\) The match itself was compared to the Battle of Bannockburn of 1314, in which the forces of Robert the Bruce defeated Edward II of England in the Scottish Wars of Independence. Although Rangers did not win this ‘battle’, they succeeded in compelling the referee to abandon the game by repeatedly invading the pitch en masse after Newcastle went ahead by two goals. The first leg of the tie at Rangers’ Ibrox ground had been anticipated as ‘bitter’ Scotland’s opportunity for revenge, following a recent defeat to England and what was perceived as ‘English sneers’.\(^{696}\) Such language could be indicative of a particularly north-eastern form of English nationalism involving anti-Scottish sentiments, reflecting the region’s proximity to the Border and historic role as a defensive territory against Scottish invasion. A perception of distinctively ‘Scottish’ attributes preceded the events of 1969, and the Newcastle press employed it in the discussion of players as well as fans, such as those whose innate ‘warrior spirit’ did not excuse their ‘crime sheets’ according to a 1967 article.\(^{697}\)

\(^{694}\) *The Journal*, 23 May 1969, p. 32.

\(^{695}\) *Evening Chronicle*, 22 May 1969, pp. 31-32.

\(^{696}\) *The Journal*, 22 May 1969, p. 34; *Evening Chronicle*, 14 May 1969, p. 40

\(^{697}\) *Evening Chronicle Pink*, 11 November 1967, p. 3.
Equally, though, the nationalistic framing of this incident reflects an attempt to distance Newcastle supporters and residents from the trouble that occurred. Retrospective eyewitness accounts described the atmosphere as ‘frightening’ or ‘intimidating’, with one fan likening the bottle throwing to ‘Henry V when all the arrows get fired into the air’. Newspaper reports also contributed to this distancing, describing the behaviour of the ‘severely provoked’ Newcastle fans as ‘impeccable, and the sectarianism of Scottish hooliganism as ‘alien’. Rather than attempting to distinguish the North East from the rest of Britain, the local press on this occasion sought to define the hooligan behaviour of other clubs’ supporters as separate from and alien to ‘British’ football, primarily by stressing the Scottish nationality of Glasgow Rangers fans. In this way, the press constructed Newcastle fans as representatives of ‘British football’ and ‘Britishness’, in contrast to the Scottishness Glasgow Rangers fans.

The importance of players and fans being well-behaved and representing Britishness or Englishness abroad was related to the construction of an ambassadorial role for clubs competing in Europe. In 1969, for example, Newcastle manager Joe Harvey expressed his aim of “making friends all over the Continent” during the Fairs Cup campaign, and avoiding being associated with the ‘trouble’ that had surfaced during previous matches involving British teams as a result of “the language barrier”. In 1964, the Liverpool Daily Post concluded that Everton had gained ‘a wonderful reputation for sportsmanship’ on a summer tour of Australia, quoting Australian soccer officials who declared that “Everton are the greatest sporting
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Everton player Roy Vernon claimed that “We have left them with a much more favourable impression of British football than they had when we arrived”, whilst director Fred Mcklesfield agreed that “The behaviour of the boys both on and off the field was impeccable…They were a credit to Everton and to English football. We can justly be proud of them.” The fact that this article and the observers it quoted focused on Everton’s role in promoting British and English football rather than acting as ambassadors for Liverpool and Merseyside indicates the local press’ participation in encouraging a sense of national belonging.

A Liverpool fan also defined this role in a retrospective account of his experiences of European football spectating in Stephen Kelly’s oral history *The Kop*, describing how he and his fellow supporters enjoyed a positive reputation abroad: “we ain’t Leeds…and we ain’t Manchester United…we’ll behave”. Although this quote attempts to distinguish Liverpool, Everton and Newcastle from other English clubs, it could also be interpreted as an effort to compete for the title of ‘Britain’s best behaved’, at home and abroad, both representing the nation positively and gaining admiration within it as ambassadors. In this way, local clubs and fans used European competition as an opportunity to be included in and valued positively by the broader nation, and asserted their distinctiveness from other localities to this end.

One further circumstance in which local identities could claim inclusion in and positive valuation by the nation was through the selection of a club’s players for the England national team. Tom Gibbons and Jim Lusted explore how players can
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represent the nation and the locality simultaneously through national newspaper references to the regional origins of players in the England team. They argue that these references act as “banal flaggings” of the multiple identities that coexist within England’, encouraging regional readers to ‘connect with the players’ through local and regional stereotypes. However, although local newspapers and fans derived pride in their clubs’ players being selected for England, this pride was not necessarily dependent on a sense of shared local characteristics, such as the ‘Geordie accent’. Of greater significance to fans was the club to which a particular player was attached, regardless of their regional origins. For example, Bobby Charlton, who was born in the Northumberland mining town of Ashington and spoke with a strong north-eastern accent, but spent his entire career as a Manchester United player between 1953 and 1973, consequently did not gain the support and affinity of Newcastle fans when representing England between 1958 and 1970, despite his north-eastern origins and local characteristics. In contrast, London-born Malcolm Macdonald, who also represented England, gained ‘folk hero’ status in the area after spending five years at Newcastle United.

The idea that a club’s players deserved national recognition could take the form of complaints when a player is ‘left out in the cold’ despite playing ‘consistently well’, or proud indignation at having ‘the best uncapped centre forward since the war’, as one Newcastle fans describes Len White, who played for the club from 1952
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to 1962. Also, it could take the form of defending the players selected for England from criticism, as Everton did in their match day programme following an unsuccessful World Cup for England in 1970, during which Everton players ‘did no worse than other England men.’ The significance of playing for a local team, over shared local origins or characteristics, suggests limitations to the impact of the national media’s flagging of the ‘Geordie’ or ‘Scouse’ characteristics of England players who play for non-local clubs. As a *Liverpool Echo* journalist put it,

> Supporters and players are bound together by intangible bonds that have nothing to do with common background or birthplace and that make it possible for a Scot from Dundee to become the idol of a Liverpool docker who has never ventured north of Gretna.

According to this reporter, non-local players ‘soon fit the red shirts’ and ‘acquire that distinctive drive and fury’ characteristic of Liverpool players, suggesting that this particular local identity could be learned by, and therefore inclusive of, outsiders. Equally, a local player could be excluded from the local imaginary for his contributions to the successes and reputation of other clubs in other areas, such as Bobby Charlton, ‘the one who got away’ from Newcastle.

Having a player from a local club selected for England could therefore be a source of pride for fans and contribute to their sense of national identity, but this player did not necessarily have to be locally born, and a comparable sense of pride did not usually apply to players from the same locality who played football elsewhere.

The ambivalence of fans towards England players from other clubs suggests that they
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could derive their own symbolic meaning from the team and its representative status regarding their nation and locality, and this meaning could vary in different local contexts.

The FA Cup Final’s ‘interweaving of local, national and British allegiances’ through its representation of local clubs competing on a national stage is also problematic, given its potential for multiple and contested meanings. Eric Hobsbawm cited the Cup Final and the formalisation of rituals such as community singing and the attendance of the reigning monarch as an example of ‘invented traditions’, capable of encouraging a sense of national community. Historians such as Johnes and Mellor have highlighted the 1953 Final as indicative of football’s post-war national respectability, notable as the first televised Final and attended by the new Queen, as well as for the celebration of Blackpool’s Stanley Matthews as ‘a traditional working class hero and icon of Englishness’, but which was reported locally in Blackpool and Bolton as ‘a civic event’. Similarly, the North East press in the 1950s prioritised the importance of the Cup Final to the participating teams’ localities, rather than its significance in terms of national identity. For instance, whilst reports of the joint ovation for Winston Churchill ‘from both Arsenal fans and Tynesiders’ in the 1952 Final imply an attempt to portray national unity, there was a distinctively local element of pride in having ‘put paragraphs with punch into the
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story of football’ in 1954, and scoring a goal that ‘has been nationally acclaimed as the best ever to have been scored on Wembley turf’ in 1951.\(^{715}\)

Jeffrey Hill has argued that a North-South distinction in national press coverage of the FA Cup Final had declined by the late 1920s, when its ‘transformation’ into ‘a new symbol of sporting and national unity’ had largely been completed.\(^{716}\) However, whilst the London-based press may have ceased its late nineteenth-century characterisation of the Cup Final as an ‘invasion’ of the capital by ‘the northern horde’, local and regional newspapers continued to use such imagery in the 1950s, when ‘the Geordies’ ‘invaded’ and their ‘roar…echoed miles over London.\(^{717}\) Although this was not a new development, and represents a common and long-standing cliché in popular press football coverage, whereas ‘invading hordes’ had previously signified the urban working classes in broader national discourses, in the 1950s this demographic was presented as representative of English ‘order’ and ‘the values of the ‘hearth’ against ‘immigrants”.\(^{718}\) The persistence of this older rhetoric in local press representations of northern football fans, and its generally positive characterisation as symbolic of local strength and success, therefore indicates a competing discourse to other post-colonial redefinitions of Englishness.

Local press coverage also provides an important qualification to interpretations of the FA Cup final as ‘a narrative of the English nation’, in demonstrating that the occasion also provided narratives of local, civic and regional

\(^{715}\) Newcastle United Official Programme, 12 August 1954; Newcastle United Official Programme, 1951.
\(^{716}\) Hill, ‘Cocks, Cats, Caps and Cups’, p. 8.
\(^{717}\) The Pall Mall Gazette, (1883), in Tony Mason, ‘Football, Sport of the North?’; in Hill and Williams, Sport and Identity, pp. 41-83, p. 46; Sunday Sun, 8 May 1955, p. 29.
\(^{718}\) Webster, “There’ll Always Be an England”, p. 580.
identities. Football’s continued use in the construction of local and regional identities among working-class fans is significant in the context of post-war Britain, when, as Todd argues, the working classes became synonymous with ‘the people’ and thus ‘the nation’, which was paralleled in the transformation of ‘the sport of the masses’ into a respectable ‘national game’. Nevertheless, as this section has argued, such identities coexisted with imaginings of nationhood and national characteristics in local treatments of football. The following section, in contrast, presents evidence of local opposition to and a sense of distinctiveness from the nation as a whole.

**Local, Civic and Regional Identities**

This section focuses on expressions of disenchantment with and separateness from the nation in the North East and Merseyside, which coincided with the post-war enhancement of central government powers through welfare provision, economic centralisation, and the nationalisation of industries such as coal mining. Barry Doyle argues that centralisation eroded local and municipal government independence, whereas Ken Young and Nirmala Rao stress the expansion of local governments’ role in implementing central state policies. This debate over the impact of increased central government powers at a local level has also been discussed in terms of identity, with Mandler arguing that the failure of post-war
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reconstruction policies to involve local communities and elites was detrimental to a sense of civic pride, whilst Peter Shapely argues that civic pride was actually enhanced as a side-effect of local governments’ efforts to attract private investment and consequent engagement in place promotion practices.  

As this section demonstrates, place-promotion and civic pride were important components of the Merseyside press’s discussions of the staging of World Cup matches at Goodison Park in the 1960s, suggesting that football provided an opportunity for civic boosterism in Liverpool, but also a means of articulating a conflict between local and national interests.

In Newcastle, on the other hand, such an opportunity for place-promotion was denied by the failure to resolve the Club versus Council dispute over the redevelopment of St. James’ Park in time for the FIFA deadline for proposals from potential World Cup match hosts, as Chapter One outlined. Still though, assertions of local and regional distinctiveness from and superiority over other parts of the nation, and particularly a southern ‘other’, were apparent in the Tyneside press’s treatment of football at the time of the Festival of Britain’s celebration of ‘a uniquely harmonious society’ in the early 1950s, and the increasing discussion of a racialised migrant ‘other’ in nationalist discourses in the 1950s and 1960s.

Existing literature on regionalism in England tends to present Merseyside and the North East as innately distinct in terms of cultural, economic and social conditions, in order to explain their historical sense of difference from the rest of the

---


nation and their perceived ‘exclusion’ from English nationalism. In terms of sport, historian Richard Holt has been influential in identifying a ‘northern hero’ as ‘a tough competitor with a strong work ethic, not always a great stylist but highly effective’, whose ‘hard man’ characteristics uniquely appealed to an intrinsic northern, working-class masculine ideal. Without challenging the existence of long-standing distinctive features in these areas, this section instead considers the circumstances in which they were evoked by the local press and residents of Liverpool and Newcastle, and argues that local, civic and regional identities were related to discussions of the areas’ perceived status within the nation.

As suggested in the previous section, the FA Cup Final was open to multiple meanings beyond its national symbolism, and evidence related to Newcastle United’s Cup Finals of the 1950s suggests that local newspapers and fans prioritised its local and regional significance. For example, according to the *Evening Chronicle* in 1951, it was imperative to display north-eastern culture at Wembley:

we will go in one happy crowd…We will sing the grand old songs…all the Geordies’ songs…We will show the Londoners that we are great sports from Tyneside. So good luck the ‘Magpies’, the team of wor town.

In a letter published in the same newspaper 12 days later, one Newcastle supporter connected this visit to London with his memory of the coronation of King George VI.
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in 1937, when he ‘showed London the Gallowgate Roar’, referring to the Gallowgate End of St. James’ Park:

An old ‘Cockney Lidy’ in front of me said: ‘You didn’t ‘arf shout when the King went past. You nearly took my ear orph.’ I said: ‘That’s how we shout when Newcastle United scores a goal.’

Again in 1951 – the year of the Festival of Britain – the Chronicle described the impact of Newcastle fans arriving in London for the Final, and how they ‘enlivened the London scene’ by creating ‘little Tynesides’ at King’s Cross and Marylebone stations. This evidence suggests that on this occasion, the Newcastle press presented the Cup Final as an opportunity to display distinctiveness for Newcastle fans, rather than express a sense of nationhood.

The World Cup matches at Goodison Park were also ambiguous in terms of the press’ interpretation of their meaning to Liverpool residents. Although FIFA President Stanley Rous stressed the need to impress international visitors on behalf of England, warning Everton to expect “businessmen, doctors, lawyers, executives–important and intelligent people…used to grounds which offer a hundred amenities”, Merseyside journalists were generally more preoccupied with the extent to which Liverpool impressed these visitors, rather than the extent to which the World Cup provided an opportunity to advertise the nation. Following the announcement of Goodison as a World Cup venue in 1963, a Liverpool Echo journalist presented this decision as an acknowledgement that the stadium was ‘one of the finest, if not the finest, stadium in the North.’ For another reporter, the announcement was confirmation that Liverpool was ‘a city second to none in Britain for football
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enthusiasm’, which the Daily Post later confirmed further by highlighting the rapid sale of tickets for the Goodison fixtures: ‘Liverpool’s claim to be the soccer capital of Britain is complete…IT HAD BEEN A SELL OUT.’\textsuperscript{732} These sources indicate that the local press framed FIFA’s decision in terms of Liverpool’s distinctiveness and superiority, and as a challenge to any potentially negative views of the City:

> Cynics may have scoffed at our simple enthusiasm for soccer in the past, they may have laughed at the fanatical support given to our two fine sides. Now that enthusiasm has surely come into its own…the nation’s number one soccer city is at last to be rewarded - and recognised internationally - for its loyalty to the game.\textsuperscript{733}

The potential benefits of staging these matches were similarly discussed in local terms. For example, one Merseyside journalist described an opportunity to ‘promote Liverpool’s image as a vast industrial conurbation and a great business centre’, which FA Chairman Joe Mears had earlier promised:

> the influx of foreign visitors should give a tremendous stimulus to overseas trade and Liverpool will have the chance to impress everyone with its vigour and enterprise as a port and commercial centre.\textsuperscript{734}

Following the tournament though, Liverpool Daily Post reporter Ian Hargraves emphasised the importance of Liverpool’s ‘friendliness and hospitality’ over ‘commercial successes’, which ‘wins no huge contracts, but does help to convince even the most sceptical that Liverpool is no longer a concrete jungle dominated by long-haired guitarists and drunken ruffians.’\textsuperscript{735} The notion of convincing the ‘sceptical’ ‘cynics’ of Liverpool’s positive features was therefore integrated into the local press’s World Cup coverage, indicating an element of contestation over the

\textsuperscript{733} ‘Loyalty Rewarded’, Liverpool Daily Post, 8 January 1966, p. 16.
\textsuperscript{734} ‘A Superb Chance to Advertise Liverpool’; ‘20,000 Expected in City Soccer Invasion’, Liverpool Daily Post, 22 January 1965, p. 6.
\textsuperscript{735} Ian Hargraves, ‘What the World Cup has Meant to Liverpool’, Liverpool Daily Post, 29 July 1966, p. 12.
city’s image that was portrayed as contingent on outsiders’ inaccurate perceptions as opposed to the more optimistic ‘reality’ that readers were invited to take pride in and identify with. This articulation of conflict had the potential to construct a sense of ‘us’ and ‘them’ based on community members’ defensive responses to externally-defined negative images of Liverpool.

Related to this defensiveness was an assertion of superiority over other areas. An article in July 1966 reported on the successes of the World Cup Liaison Committee in Liverpool, responsible for assisting foreign and non-local visitors to the city. Sid Rudd, Chairman of the Committee, told the Daily Post of his encounter with a group of American visitors, who “had been to the last three World Cup competitions and had never encountered such friendliness or such efficient organisation as they have found in Liverpool”, thus demonstrating Liverpool’s prestige in relation to cities in other nations. The article also denigrated Manchester, the other north-western host of World Cup matches, which required the assistance of extra interpreters from the Liverpool Committee, to the ‘glee’ of the Liverpool branch. Liverpool’s superiority over Manchester was further emphasised in press reports of the selection of Goodison for Brazil’s first-round matches, ‘a tit-bit denied the Manchester spectators’, who would host the less glamorous Hungary team: ‘Goodison Park came off considerably better than did Old Trafford’.
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The pride in hosting World champions Brazil was nevertheless counterbalanced by local journalists’ expression of indignation at not being able to watch England at Goodison Park. As early as January 1966, when the first-round fixtures and their venues were announced, the *Liverpool Daily Post* denounced the decision to stage England’s games at Wembley, arguing that the national stadium was incapable of producing ‘an atmosphere worthy of the challenge’ and had ‘the funeral air’, in contrast to Merseyside’s ‘incessant barrage of sound...(which) could so easily have been harnessed to England’s advantage in her greatest hour of need’.\(^\text{739}\) This article presented London and its residents inferior to Liverpool in terms of football enthusiasm and an ability to harness this ‘roar’ for the benefit of the England team: ‘Londoners have never experienced vocal support at any Wembley event remotely to compare with that when Liverpool won the FA Cup last season’.\(^\text{740}\) Additionally though, the Merseysiders’ ability to create ‘atmosphere’ was constructed as distinct from and superior to the rest of England, where ‘the placid English regard their sport far less fanatically’.\(^\text{741}\)

The Liverpool press again targeted the ‘placid’ fans of London and England when England’s semi-final match was staged at Wembley instead of Goodison. Everton Chairman E. Holland Hughes was quoted in support of the *Daily Post’s* earlier sentiments regarding the first-round matches:

> In Lancashire and Liverpool in particular we have a football loving public which would have risen to the opportunity in a manner which London certainly will not be able to excel.\(^\text{742}\)

\(^{739}\) Yates, ‘Merseyside Roar’.
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The article also quoted Mr. G.G. Thompson, on behalf of Everton Supporters’ Club, expressing his ‘disgust and dismay’ at the decision, believing it reflected ‘once again the preference of giving the South the opportunity of watching our national team.’

A further article claimed that local football fans shared these views, describing spectators of the semi-final between Russia and West Germany, which was staged at Goodison instead of the England fixture: ‘when two banner bearers had tried to unfurl their message which seemed to be ‘England insults Liverpool’, they were hustled out of the ground’. This narrative of being ‘snubbed’ and ‘insulted’ by England to the benefit of London-based football fans framed Merseyside supporters and residents as a community of victims of such insults, and encouraged them to identify themselves as such, rather than identifying with the nation.

A spokesperson from travel agency Thomas Cook warned the Daily Post prior to the World Cup that Liverpool would be ‘snubbed’ by foreign visitors:

Most foreigners feel Liverpool has relatively little to offer and that it is better for them to stay here…a general holiday is much better in London…Many top writers and broadcasters intend to stay centrally too.

Also in the early months of 1966, The Guardian described the difficulties faced by ‘northern cities’ in accommodating foreign visitors, especially ‘Boro and Sunderland – bleak, workaday industrial towns’, which would be suitable for the Russians and Koreans but not the implicitly more glamorous Italians. The North-East press were equally as attentive to ‘southern bias’ against the region as that of Merseyside, which the Evening Chronicle demonstrated in 1960 when Gateshead were not re-elected to the Football League despite finishing above two other clubs who retained their
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League status. The *Evening Chronicle* framed Gateshead’s replacement with Peterborough as an injustice in the interests of ‘Southerners’, alleging that its attainment of League status was because it was ‘nearer to London’:

> It is the old, old story as far as the North-East is concerned. Whether it be in the world of industry, commerce or sport, we are regarded by Southerners as being ‘up in the wilds’, and the less contact made with us the better.

The *Chronicle* expressed similar views again in 1964, describing a perception that the BBC ignored parts of the North:

> Officials of the BBC in London seem to think that when you are north of Manchester you are in a foreign country…When it comes to sporting events it seems we are nothing more than a backwater.

Irrespective of whether or not southern-based football authorities and media outlets actually regarded the North and North East as a ‘backwater’ to be excluded or ignored, the Newcastle press’ representations of such prejudices are significant as evidence of the limitations of discourses of national unity in this period.

Occasionally, such perceptions of London or southern discrimination against the North East motivated retaliation. For example, in 1958 the *Chronicle* labelled Wembley ‘one of the poorest stadiums among the leading countries’, and challenged the ‘complacency’ of its status as ‘the number one home for big football in this country’. In 1963, journalist Len Hetherington claimed to be ‘sickened’ by London
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747 Until the 1986-1987 season, the lowest placed clubs of what was the Fourth Division in 1960 had to re-apply for their place in the League, whilst non-League clubs could apply for a place in the League, rather than a direct system of promotion and relegation. According to a recent *Evening Chronicle* article, Gateshead’s re-election in 1960 was anticipated as ‘a formality’, with rivals Southport seemingly more likely to lose their League status due to a succession of bottom-four League finishes. David Morton, ‘Can Gateshead FC Finally Right the Wrong of 1960?’, *Evening Chronicle*, 13 May 2014, available online at, http://www.chroniclelive.co.uk/lifestyle/nostalgia/can-gateshead-fc-finally-right-7114139 [Accessed on 13/08/2013].
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club Tottenham Hotspur ‘hogging the limelight’ and enjoying attention from ‘the London-based Press and television’ that was ‘out of all proportion to their ability as a football team.’

Related to these attacks on the standard of football in London were notions of a threatening southern ‘other’, presented as an enemy of football in the North East. In 1951 for example, the Chronicle published several articles addressing the difficulty of acquiring FA Cup Final tickets for Newcastle supporters, and one of these identified ‘ticket spivs, believed to have arrived from London’, as a cause of the shortage and as group seeking to profit from the situation. Another article blamed the London-based Football Association for the disproportionate allocation of tickets:

Newcastle United’s home gates average around 59,000 – all true and ardent supporting ‘Geordies’. Only around 12,000 will be able to travel to London to see the final battle. It seems farcical and unfair.

Such notions of unfairness typified the press’s presentation of ‘southern’ treatment of the North East, and represents an attempt to encourage local readers to identify themselves as victims of this shared southern enemy. Although the extent to which readers were actually affected by and internalised such representations of a southern ‘other’ is difficult to gauge, it is possible to speculate that these discourses at least provided an alternative to those of nationhood.

As described in Chapter One, Newcastle United’s prospects of hosting World Cup matches in 1966 were thwarted by a dispute between the club and the City Council over the redevelopment of St. James’ Park. As owners of the land upon

751 ‘I Won’t Weep in Spurs’ Cup of Woe’.
752 ‘Cup Final Ticket Spivs Are in N.E.’, Evening Chronicle, 26 March 1951, p. 4.
which the stadium was built, the Council threatened not to renew the club’s lease if they failed to improve the ground in accordance with the Council’s vision of ‘A new Newcastle’.\textsuperscript{754} In response to the Council’s demands, Newcastle Chairman William McKeag warned the public of the possibility that the stadium and the club could be bought by ‘London financiers’ who ‘wish to exploit it for as much money as they can get…Very soon the whole of the city will be controlled by one financial syndicate or another.\textsuperscript{755} Councillor T. Dan Smith also raised the spectre of ‘London financiers’ in urging the club to improve on their proposed redevelopment plans, and warned fans that the club was in “real danger of slick wide boys moving in and stripping down the ground.”\textsuperscript{756} In these sources, a vague ‘London’ figure threatened ‘our traditions’, implying that southern ownership of Newcastle United would have negative consequences for the club’s supporters and their way of life.\textsuperscript{757} Both McKeag and Smith were natives of the North East, and were consequently able to emphasise the significance of local control and ownership of Newcastle United and its stadium, contrasting their identities with London outsiders.

In the 1950s, the strength of amateur football in the North East also contributed to the construction of the region’s identity as an opponent of the South. A ‘vigorous rivalry’ with London-based teams enabled the region to mobilise in opposition to a narrowly defined southern ‘other’, and thus claim to represent ‘the North’ as a whole.\textsuperscript{758} Several programmes from Bishop Auckland matches in the 1950s reveal this North/South distinction, particularly one staged at St. James’ Park in

\textsuperscript{755} \textit{Evening Chronicle}, 8 October 1963, p. 28.
\textsuperscript{757} Entwhistle, ‘The United Puzzle’.
1954 in which a Newcastle United official described a ‘tradition of rivalry between south and north’, and how ‘proud’ the broader area was of the amateur club for ‘keeping up the north’s end’. A 1955 Amateur Cup programme described Bishop Auckland as ‘the Number One threat to the South’, providing evidence to support the claim that ‘when the chance to beat London arose, the passions intensified to absorb and unite the whole region.’ Local newspaper articles also hoped for ‘another ‘all-North ‘big day’ in London’ between Amateur Cup semi-finalists Bishop Auckland and close neighbours Crook Town, and described their involvement in the final as ‘the North’s Consolation… whoever wins.’ This ‘consolation’ was in spite of the ‘fierce rivalry’ between Crook and Bishop Auckland, suggesting that triumph over southern opposition was more important than local enmities.

The aforementioned 1954 Amateur Cup match at St. James’ Park was attended by 54,000 fans, and was described as an ‘unexpected plum’ for ‘Tyneside’s football followers’, despite the approximate 30 mile distance between Newcastle and Bishop Auckland. The official programme labelled Bishop Auckland symbols of ‘the prestige of amateur soccer in this far corner of England’, and attributed this prestige to the unique success of north-eastern amateur clubs and an inimitable north-eastern ‘enthusiasm for soccer’. Such enthusiasm and a shared ‘passion for football’ also explained local football authorities’ organisation of the Liverpool Senior Cup from 1882, in which amateur teams from the Merseyside area competed against the reserves of the professional clubs. These occasions were particularly important in the 1950s, when Liverpool and Everton were in different divisions and ‘there was such a
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dearth of derby matches’, explaining their policy of fielding first teams at this time.\textsuperscript{763} The local press described the competition as providing ‘the best games ever seen in Liverpool’.\textsuperscript{764} The press in Merseyside and the North East therefore made similar claims to uniqueness in terms of the regions’ ‘passion for football’.

Such claims could also defend against the areas’ reputations when their teams were unsuccessful. In a letter published in the \textit{Chronicle} in 1963, a Newcastle fan contrasted his and his fellow Newcastle supporters’ loyalty with the fans of other teams:

\textit{the lads aren’t exactly setting the place alight yet there aren’t many better supported teams….I wonder how the likes of Everton, Spurs and Manchester United would fare were they relegated? I should imagine their fans would shrink by half.}\textsuperscript{765}

After Liverpool were defeated by Arsenal in the 1950 FA Cup Final, fans and players recalled how ‘huge crowds’ assembled in the city to welcome home the losing team: ‘Even when they won the Cup it wasn’t as good as that.’\textsuperscript{766} Both Liverpool and Newcastle fans and their local press viewed this level of loyalty and enthusiasm as distinctive to their places, and adapted the potentially negative circumstance of their teams’ defeat into a positive feature of their local identities. As Newcastle’s \textit{Journal} noted, ‘it takes little effort to applaud the victors’, and such applause would be unlikely to occur in ‘a town that takes its football lightly’.\textsuperscript{767}

As well as loyalty to their clubs, local journalists encouraged football fans in the North East and Merseyside to take pride in being seen as friendly and sporting by

\textsuperscript{763} T.E. Jones, in \textit{Three Sides of the Mersey}, p. 178. 
\textsuperscript{764} \textit{Liverpool Echo}, 8 July 1947, p. 20. 
\textsuperscript{766} Ray Lambert and Cyril Sidlow, in \textit{Three Sides of the Mersey}, p. 85. 
\textsuperscript{767} \textit{The Journal}, 7 May 1974, p. 5.
outsiders, in order to earn the title of ‘Most sporting crowd in the country’.\textsuperscript{768} For example, it was important to be considered well-behaved and amicable ‘ambassadors for Liverpool’, or upholders of ‘the reputation of the genial ‘Geordie’ and North-East football’ as a whole.\textsuperscript{769} The local press cited the opinions of outsiders as evidence of fans’ superiority over other parts of the country, such as the referee who ‘expressed the opinion that the North-East football public was the fairest in the country’, and the Bristol Rovers fan whose letter thanking Newcastle fans ‘for their sportsmanship and welcome to us’ in 1951 was published in the \textit{Chronicle}.\textsuperscript{770}

In the 1960s, part of the Merseyside press’s agenda involved defending Everton supporters from a reputation as ‘troublesome trainwreckers’.\textsuperscript{771} According to some of the Everton directors, this reputation resulted from ‘what amounts to a vendetta against the club’, and local newspapers subsequently sought to challenge this vendetta by praising Everton fans’ behaviour.\textsuperscript{772} In 1965, for example, the \textit{Daily Post} claimed that Merseyside had passed a ‘soccer behaviour examination’ after a match between Everton and Nuremberg: ‘The crowd of 39,033 applauded both sides at the end, and gave a particularly generous reception to the German goalkeeper Wabra.’\textsuperscript{773} They were also ‘generally well-behaved - and they stood in silence before the game for the German anthem.’\textsuperscript{774} Another journalist in 1962 described his train journey to an away match with Everton fans as ‘the quietest I have ever known’, and one during which ‘Grannie would have been quite at ease.’\textsuperscript{775} This peaceful excursion was in
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spite of warnings he claimed to have received in advance: “‘Take a crash helmet,”
they said. “Take a friend - a big one.”’ Such articles represent attempts to counter a
‘myth’ that associated Everton with hooliganism, a myth that was presented as the
creation of outsiders, rather than indicative of the regular behaviour of a majority of
Everton fans. A spokesperson from Everton Supporters Club affirmed this view in
1962, after a Burnley Alderman had expressed ‘apprehension’ and requested extra
police for a potential visit by Everton:

We are all very upset about these allegations and consider them unfair to
the majority of Everton supporters…Generally speaking, the Everton
supporter is as well behaved as any in the country."

A desire to dissociate one’s club and locality from hooliganism, and counter its
potential association with trouble by outsiders, reflects a further example of the
assertion of a positive local or regional identity against a wider English or British
hooligan ‘other’, as discussed in Chapter Three in relation to the discourse of the
‘Genuine Fan’. However, this ‘other’ could also be internal to an area, for instance in
the rivalry between Newcastle and Sunderland or Everton and Liverpool. It could also
exist within the ranks of fans of a single club, creating divisions between hooligans
and non-hooligans, or young and old. The following section discusses these potential
divisions and other sources of disunity within the categories of identification that this
section has highlighted.

---
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Football Rivalries and Intra-Regional Fragmentation

In 1952, The Journal reported the wide-ranging locations of Newcastle supporters to be collected by ‘specials’ for the FA Cup Final – ‘from the Shields and the Hartlepools, from the Northumberland farms and the Easington pits’, and ‘From Sunderland, where they forget all the local rivalry’— depicting this wide-ranging support as testament to the fact that ‘no-one harbours any really hard feelings anyway’. In 1969, the same newspaper presumed ‘mixed feelings on Wearside’ during Newcastle’s 1969 Fairs Cup campaign, when ‘the dyed-in-the-wool Sunderland supporter pretends to be indifferent…but deep down he is envious’. Potentially, a change in levels of partisanship occurred during this period, which is corroborated by supporters who recall following both teams in the 1950s, when ‘there was not the bias against Sunderland that there is today’. This change was perhaps related to the increased appeal of ‘big clubs’, as well as increased television coverage, which encouraged attachments to and divisions between individual clubs and their fans. The extent of change in this period, though, is undermined by the long-standing tradition of rivalry between certain clubs.

In 1963, the Chronicle published an article reminding readers of an early twentieth-century match between Newcastle and Sunderland, which resulted in rioting. A Newcastle fan’s memories of this match were subsequently provided as evidence that Sunderland fans were responsible for the incidents:

779 Evening Chronicle, 1 March 1969, p. 25.
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I can see the goal nets being ruthlessly destroyed by fans sporting their red and white rosettes...I saw one Sunderland fan, dressed like a gentleman of means, take out his pocket knife and cut off about two feet of the net.  

According to some sources, the rivalry between Newcastle and Sunderland as places dates as far back as the English Civil War and continued in the Jacobite Rebellions, whereas others emphasise an inter-city competition over the shipbuilding industry from the nineteenth century. The rivalry therefore predated football and any increase in partisanship that occurred in the mid twentieth century, but there is evidence to suggest that football contributed to this enmity.

Although the local press was capable of creating an ‘imagined community’ of local readers, as outlined in the previous section, it also served as a forum for debate over the relative status of conflicting identities, thus threatening the cohesion of this community. As well as the example above of the highlighting of Sunderland fans’ responsibility for the 1901 rioting, another fan quoted in the Chronicle in 1963 criticised the apparent lack of sportsmanship demonstrated at Roker Park: ‘The Wearside crowd must learn to take off its red and white striped glasses and to appreciate the finer arts of the game.’ In this evidence, Newcastle fans’ behaviour is presented as distinct from and superior to their regional neighbours, constructing a separate identity from other residents of the North East.

In 1961, the editor of the letters section of the Evening Chronicle described how the singing of ‘The Blaydon Races’ by Sunderland supporters at a match against
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Liverpool had annoyed Newcastle fans, ‘who claim the famous Tyneside song as their own anthem.’\textsuperscript{784} ‘The Blaydon Races’ is a well-known music hall song written by Geordie Ridley in the mid Nineteenth Century, describing an annual race that was organised in Tyneside until 1916, and containing references to several places in the area such as Scotswood Road and Collingwood Street. Its association with Newcastle United fans was well established by the 1960s, and this edition of readers’ letters presented a conflict over the issue of whether Sunderland fans should also sing it.

Several Newcastle fans’ letters objected to Sunderland fans trying to ‘steal something that belongs to and should stay with Newcastle United,’ and would be ‘known always as Newcastle United’s national anthem’.\textsuperscript{785} One letter from a reader known as ‘PAX’ suggested that ‘Sunderland get another song. Why not ‘The Lambton Worm’ or some other Durham ditty’.\textsuperscript{786} A Sunderland resident challenged this exclusive use of the song, arguing for Sunderland’s inclusion in a broader North-East identity: ‘Here were a crowd from the North, flushed with success, wishing to denote to the Lancastrians that they hailed from the North-East.’\textsuperscript{787} The editor expressed agreement with this latter view, emphasising the significance of a north-eastern identity against an external ‘other’ over internal differences based on a Tyne-Wear rivalry: ‘the happy Sunderland fans just wished to drop the ‘Scouses’ a hint that they hailed from the Northumberland and Durham area.’\textsuperscript{788}

The debate over ‘The Blaydon Races’ resurfaced in 1963, with one Newcastle fan arguing, ‘nobody minds anyone singing ‘Blaydon Races’ at home or anywhere

\textsuperscript{788} “Blaydon Races” is Ours’.
else. That is, of course, if they live on or North of the Tyne.\(^7\) Two Sunderland fans defended their use of the song: ‘Have Newcastle United bought the exclusive rights to ‘The Blaydon Races’?…Sunderland supporters do not need a geography lesson…We all know the whereabouts of Scotswood Road.’\(^8\) A Chronicle journalist sided with the Newcastle fans this time:

> It did shake me a little, the other weekend, to hear Sunderland soccer fans singing ‘Blaydon Races’…it did not seem to belong at Roker, except when Newcastle are there in opposition.\(^9\)

These debates illustrate the possibility for a potentially unifying symbol of a north-eastern community to have the contrary effect of provoking antagonism over issues of authenticity and ownership. According to the Chronicle’s framing of the argument, Newcastle fans did not consider Sunderland fans’ use of ‘The Blaydon Races’ as an authentic expression of their identities as Wearsiders, given the Tyneside-specific nature of the song and given its longer association with Newcastle United. Nevertheless, the significance of such debates is limited by the possibility that the newspaper’s editors initiated them and adapted or fabricated readers’ letters in order to generate controversy. Still though, they provide evidence that micro-identities associated with particular place-attachments and football allegiances continued to inform narratives of broader regional identity.

The applicability of the ‘Geordie’ label to people from particular localities was also contested, and its geographical fluidity varied in different accounts. In 1955, for example, residents of Wearside identified themselves as ‘we Geordies’, and the Sunderland-based press celebrated the Durham Miners’ Gala as an occasion when
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‘Geordie meets Geordie’. Locally known as ‘The Big Meeting’, the Gala is an annual event originally established in 1871 as a gathering of trade union members from the coal mining industry, who march through Durham City carrying banners to represent their associations. With the decline of the coal mining industry in the North East, the Gala has subsequently evolved into a celebration of the region’s mining heritage. According to some accounts, early usage of the term ‘Geordie’ was intrinsically connected to coal mining, and applied to miners throughout County Durham and Northumberland by outsiders. Elsewhere, however, the ‘Geordie’ is defined more narrowly and refers to residents of the Tyneside area and the city of Newcastle, as well as support for Newcastle United as opposed to Sunderland, thereby excluding large areas of the North East.

A further example of debate between Newcastle and Sunderland fans – as represented by the Evening Chronicle in 1963 – surrounded the relative quality of their teams’ players. A Sunderland supporter complained about the ‘rave notices’ Newcastle player Bill Thompson had been getting, and objected to his comparison with Sunderland player Charlie Hurley: ‘are the ‘Black and Whites’ again counting their chickens before they hatch?’ A week earlier, a Newcastle fan had defended Thompson against Sunderland fans’ unfavourable comparison of him with Hurley, and undermined the playing ability of Hurley: ‘I’m glad ‘Big Bill’ isn’t a ‘king’ like Charlie. And as for Sunderland being in the First Division next season, well, not while ‘King Charlie’ takes the penalties.’ Players were thus constructed as
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important to the assertion of superiority over other local clubs and their fans, as were
derby matches in establishing supremacy and inflicting ‘humiliation’.  

According to the Liverpool press, on the other hand, a ‘Liverton derby’ was the ‘most acceptable’ way to celebrate Goodison Park’s new floodlights in 1957. In contrast to the ‘full-blooded, no-holds-barred’ Tyne-Wear derbies, in which ‘the finer points’ of football were often lacking, matches between Merseyside teams were characterised by the local press as ‘the best games ever seen in Liverpool’.  

Furthermore, the proximity of Goodison Park and Anfield, as opposed to St. James’ Park and Roker Park, obstructed any construction of difference based on location. This closeness and the ‘friendliness’ of the Liverpool-Everton rivalry have formed a significant component of a broader Merseyside identity, capable of overriding football partisanship in contrast with other areas. In retrospective personal testimonies collected since the 1990s, supporters of both clubs recalled deriving enjoyment from the rivalry and ‘banter’, particularly during derby matches, when rival fans stood ‘side by side’ with ‘no problem at all’.  

Although some testimonies described the ‘heartache’ or ‘joy’ dependent on derby results, this did not detract from the fact that ‘everybody was a Merseysider’. Additionally, a small number of fans admitted having ‘switched allegiances’ according to relative success, alternating visits to Anfield or Goodison according to ticket prices and dates of home fixtures, and being
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unable to decide which team to support, which suggests that such particularistic football identities were not always rigidly defined.\(^{802}\)

One point of difference that Liverpool fans constructed between themselves and Everton supporters was the practice of singing popular chart songs and composing original chants at matches. Joe Martin in *The Kop* recalled a match in the 1950s when the crowd refused to be ‘organised’ by a conductor attempting to orchestrate community singing, and started singing different songs to those the band was playing.\(^{803}\) Composing new songs in pubs and encouraging other fans to sing them also constituted an important source of cohesion for several fans, who recognised that the same pre-match ritual would be occurring simultaneously in pubs all over Liverpool, and enjoyed hearing ‘thousands of fans’ singing one of their compositions.\(^{804}\) The significance of singing to the identities of Liverpool supporters derived from their claims to spontaneity and originality, as Tony Ensor explained in *Three Sides of the Mersey*: ‘It wasn’t copying songs that one hears all over the country. It was sheer, spontaneous humour.’\(^{805}\) As well as differing from other parts of the country, this practice and its Anfield origins were also contrasted with Everton by some fans. For example, Graham Wilson described the Goodison crowd as ‘a bit more cultured’ and not ‘particularly vociferous’: ‘They just stand back and enjoy it, a bit like ballet.’\(^{806}\) Former Liverpool player Ian St. John concurred with this view, and contrasted Everton negatively with Liverpool:

It’s funny but over the park they didn’t do it. It was only the Liverpool fans. They were first in, sharper, quicker, funnier, and the Everton lads,
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you always felt, were the more serious football fans…and you nutters over there!  

The extent of differentiation between Liverpool and Everton fans differs in retrospective accounts, with some fans ascribing labels to their ‘Blue Nose’ counterparts, and others stressing familial connections and intermingling on match days. Although the absence of violence in this rivalry is unanimously attested to, levels of animosity were variable according to particular circumstances. Whereas one Liverpool fan recalls minimal conflict in the 1950s with his Evertonian schoolmates, whose status as ‘Merseyside’s top dogs’ was secure while his team were in the Second Division, this is the source of another fan’s ‘grudge’ and resentment at being regarded as ‘the second team in Liverpool’. Accusations of bias directed at local newspaper reporters also indicate the importance of this distinction, although Everton supporters’ celebration of Liverpool’s promotion in 1962, and congratulating of their 1950 FA Cup final team, suggest that having two successful teams in the city could be a source of pride for some fans.

Whilst this situation of ‘friendly rivalry’ remained relatively stable throughout the 1950s and 1960s, the Heysel stadium disaster of 1985 marked a significant turning point in Liverpool-Everton relations. The Belgian national stadium was selected as the venue of the European Cup Final between Liverpool and Juventus, despite Liverpool officials’ prior objections to the ground’s inadequate and unsafe condition. Another controversial circumstance was the allocation of a ‘neutral’ area
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close to a Liverpool stand, which was intended for Belgian fans but could be populated by fans of either club who bought tickets unofficially. The issue of which set of supporters instigated the trouble is contentious, but an hour before kick-off both Liverpool and Juventus fans were throwing missiles at each other, some of which included rubble from the stadium. Subsequently, a group of Liverpool fans climbed the fence separating them from Juventus fans, many of whom tried to escape towards the wall opposite, crushing a number of other fans and eventually causing the collapse of the wall. 39 Juventus fans were killed, and 14 Liverpool fans were convicted of involuntary manslaughter in the aftermath.

For Everton, Heysel had the direct consequence of preventing their involvement in the European Cup, for which they would have qualified as champions of the First Division in 1985 and 1987, but UEFA banned all English clubs from taking part almost immediately after the disaster. Some Everton fans and players stressed the injustice of this ban given their record of good behaviour in Europe, such as Jim Greenwood: ‘we didn’t think it was justified, particularly as we’d just returned from Rotterdam with no problems. Everyone was full of compliments and then that one incident.’ Andy Gray described how he and the rest of the team responded:

We felt cheated, and I think rightfully so. We felt we had contributed nothing but good things all through Europe that season. No trouble at all from any of our supporters.

Everton fan Brian Burrows, interviewed for The Everton Collection website in 2010, described an ‘anti-Liverpool’ attitude among ‘younger’ fans in their 40s and 50s:

They say it’s because of Heysel, and that stopped the 1984-5 team getting into Europe, and that team split up’. A 50 year old friend of his would say, ‘We’d have been champions of Europe but for them’…and that’s why he
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just can’t stand them…A lot of people, even a little bit younger, just have no time for them.\textsuperscript{813}

Nevertheless, Burrows is the only interviewee in the Collection to cite Heysel as a cause of conflict between Everton and Liverpool fans, which suggests limits to the extent of its impact in defining Liverpool supporters as an ‘other’ within a broader Merseyside identity.

Liverpool fans were more likely to describe their ‘shame’ at being associated with the incidents in retrospective accounts, such as George Shannon who recalled: ‘Suddenly, it was a disgrace to be a Liverpool supporter; you didn’t want to call yourself a kopite any more.’\textsuperscript{814} Tony Ensor extended this shame to his identity as a Liverpool resident: ‘It was quite a weird experience because so many of us when we used to go abroad, used to throw our chests out and say, ‘We’re from Liverpool’ and it was a matter of great pride.’\textsuperscript{815} The sudden ‘shame’ after Heysel indicates one possible way in which identities could be adopted or rejected by individuals depending on circumstances, with the negative image of Liverpool fans reducing its appeal. Generally though, feelings of being perceived negatively by outsiders tended to encourage a defensive assertion of positive distinctive characteristics, as well as strengthening a sense of distinctiveness from these outsiders. At the 1984 League Cup Final between Liverpool and Everton, both sets of fans chanted ‘Merseyside!’ and Everton fan Tony Heslop interpreted this occurrence in terms of a shared sense of identity and ‘isolation’ from the nation:

that was of its time. And that probably said more about Liverpool as Liverpool city politically, which felt a bit isolated in the 80s…that was not
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only two clubs with people from the same families, but also two clubs from the same city sharing the same difficulties at that time.\textsuperscript{816}

Although Tony’s account is evidence of the ability of community identities to override football rivalries, it is through a footballing occasion that he experienced and remembers this sense of togetherness.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has demonstrated how different place-related identities could alternately co-exist or conflict with each other in varying circumstances within the realm of football support in post-war Britain. The extent of co-existence or conflict depended on the presence of an ‘other’ against which these identities could be contrasted favourably, and on whether this ‘other’ was foreign, English or local. The first section outlined the construction of national characteristics and styles of play and their contrasting with foreign ‘others’, as well as the adoption of a national ambassadorial role by local clubs, players and fans. At a local and regional level, a more easily identifiable non-English ‘other’ could therefore counteract a sense of distinctiveness from other parts of the nation, and there was a desire to have this ‘othering’ defined positively by, and as part of, the nation. The second and third sections demonstrated how local and regional identities could override national ones, and how these identities could also become fragmented based on particularistic allegiances and rivalries, such as the desire to defeat southern opposition or local rivals. Rather than being based simply on a sense of shared characteristics, local and regional identities and distinctiveness hinged on a sense of competition with others and a concern with how these communities were perceived by outsiders.

\textsuperscript{816} Interview with Tony Heslop.
Although this chapter has focused on a relatively narrow set of circumstances in which these identities were expressed, this was intended to demonstrate how multiple meanings could apply to shared symbols such as the FA Cup Finals, the staging of World Cup matches, derby games, and supporters’ reputation for sporting and non-hooligan behaviour. Attention to these circumstances has revealed a degree of stability in terms of how identity operated across time and space for the case studies of Merseyside and the North East. Overall, the relative salience of national, regional and local identities depended on the extent of opportunities to contrast these categories favourably with a constructed ‘other’, thereby establishing a positively defined identity to outsiders. A sense of being perceived negatively by others generally contributed to a strengthening of identity, through attempts to counteract such perceptions and emphasise more admirable features of distinctiveness.
Thesis Conclusion

As the most popular spectator sport in England for over a century, with a widely recognised status as a site for the expression and tool in the construction of collective loyalties and identities, football and the discourses around it provide a valuable window into the culture and identities of working-class men. In addressing the ways in which fans expressed and internalised discursive constructions identities associated with class, masculinity, age and place, this thesis has aimed to challenge some of the stereotypical images of the British football fan that have permeated popular memory and historiographical assumptions. In doing so, it has reassessed dominant narratives about changes in working-class lifestyles and culture in post-war Britain, instead emphasising continuity, but challenging conventional wisdom about the ‘traditional’ aspects of working-class masculine identities that the football fan has historically represented.

One such stereotype is the association of ‘hardness’ and violence with ‘traditional’ working-class masculinities. Although, as Chapter Three argued, former hooligans and their ‘hoolifans’ have framed their activities in terms of positively-defined notions of honour and a lost terrace culture in retrospective personal testimonies, this was not defined as a ‘genuine’ aspect of football culture in the prevailing discussions of hooliganism in the 1970s, nor by non-hooligan working-class fans who contributed to defining the problem. Equally, the threat of violence and physical intimidation recalled by fans in their reconstructions of football-related rites

of passage in Chapter Two negates their characterisation as indicative of working-
class values and traditional behaviour. Likewise, as argued in Chapter One, Holt’s
‘hard men’ footballers were not the unequivocal hero figures they have come to be
remembered as in nostalgic evocations of football’s pre-1990s era. These findings
contribute to a growing body of literature that seeks to draw out ‘the complexities of
working-class masculinity’ and working-class boys’ and men’s subjective
understandings of their identities and the representations available to them.

As well as countering an association between football and the valuation of
‘hardness’, Chapter One also contested understandings of football’s more general
historical ‘working-classness’. Recent complaints about ‘prima donna’ footballers,
‘sanitised’ stadiums and profiteering club owners and shareholders construct post-war
football as a ‘golden age’ when football was ‘the working man’s game’ in contrast to
the Premier League era, but equivalent issues were also apparent in the 1950s and
1960s. Furthermore, commercialising and modernising trends were not understood
as detrimental to football’s status as ‘the people’s game’ and its ‘traditional’ working-
class characteristics, which suggests that such characteristics are largely a post-1990s
imagining. This is important in interrogating the impact of affluence on working-class
identities in the 1950s and 1960s, when, according to Peter Willmott and Michael
Young, men ‘watch the television instead of going to the pub, and weed in the garden
instead of going to a football match’.

---

818 Annmarie Hughes also disputes depictions of violence as part of working-class culture in
‘Representations and Counter-Representations of Domestic Violence on Clydeside between the Two
819 Martin Johnes, ‘Pigeon-Racing and Working-Class Culture in Britain, c. 1870-1950’, Cultural and
Social History, 4:3, (2007). For an example of this literature, see Tebbutt, Being Boys.
820 Godsiff, ‘England’s Failure to Qualify’; Ingle, ‘Fans Lose their Voice’.
Obviously, this thesis has focused on those men that continued to attend football matches, and does not therefore undermine the possibility that increasing home-centredness and privatism were characteristic of many men’s post-war experience. Nevertheless, evidence discussed in Chapter Two indicates the continued importance attached to male socialising rituals such as football by working-class parents, and an explicit concern with maintaining attachments to local communities and working-class traditions across generations through such leisure activities. Arguably, affluence was significant as a cause of this concern, or in enabling more boys and men to participate in this shared culture. Andrew Davies argues that many men were excluded from the working-class culture of football support due to inter-war poverty and unemployment, which suggests that post-war affluence may have had a more positive impact in maintaining older forms of working-class identity than contemporary commentators feared.\footnote{Andrew Davies, ‘Leisure in the 'Classic Slum”, in Andrew Davies and Steven Fielding (eds.), \textit{Workers’ Worlds: Cultures and Communities in Manchester and Salford, 1880-1939}, (Manchester, 1992), p. 111. Simon Gunn has also recently examined the possibility that affluence helped maintain older forms of community attachment with the example of car ownership enabling increased contact with family and friendship networks and visits to former neighbourhoods in, ‘People and the Car: The Expansion of Automobility in Urban Britain, c. 1955-1970’, \textit{Social History}, 38:2, (2013), pp. 220-237.}

Equally though, as Todd and Savage argue, it is possible that the extent and impact of affluence within post-war working-class life has been exaggerated, given that improved living conditions are rarely discussed in the sources this thesis has utilised, and given the more general emphasis on continuity rather than change apparent in the identities of football supporters.\footnote{Todd, ‘Affluence, Class and Crown Street’; Majima and Savage, ‘Contesting Affluence’.} As Chapter Four demonstrated, longstanding place-based identities and attachments did not decline to the extent
anticipated in the affluent worker studies, and withstood the emergence of new definitions of nationhood and distinctively and exclusively ‘youth’ cultures.824

The limited significance of generation as a source of division and conflict demonstrated in Chapter Two further contributes to this thesis’ findings of post-war continuity by challenging narratives of 1960s ‘cultural revolution’ that tend to be based on young people’s opposition to ‘establishment’ or ‘traditional’ values, or on youth culture as classless. Young football fans sought inclusion in or were compelled by parents to participate in this longstanding pastime that enabled the learning of ‘adult’ identities, and older fans came into contact with youth culture through the singing of pop songs at football matches, thus bridging the ‘generation gap’ associated with this period in popular memory. These findings contribute to increasing attempts to historicise the ‘swinging sixties’ and the ‘revolutionary’ nature of this decade by demonstrating how football’s use as a tool in the socialisation of boys and young men facilitated the transmission of traditional values and identities across generations and decades, and thus assisted in the avoidance of potential ruptures with the past.825 This argument, however, is limited to the football context, and consequently does not preclude the possibility that generational fissures and age-based identities were relevant to other aspects of young football fans’ lifestyles.

Additionally, Chapter Three’s focus on the framing of hooliganism in terms of age provides a qualification to the conclusion that generational conflict was limited among cohesive communities of football fans. On the other hand, attempts to stress

---


the ‘minority’ nature of the problem demonstrate the inadequacies of characterising the hooliganism debates as another example of frequent post-war moral panics over young people that involved broad and indistinct groups of adults. Indeed, adult football fans in the 1970s actually tried to prevent a moral panic that would impact on their identities and experiences as football fans, culminating in a situation in the 1980s whereby supporters recall being treated ‘like cattle’, which some fans blame for the Hillsborough and Heysel stadium disasters.826

The 1980s ‘demonization’ of football fans, whilst beyond the chronological parameters of this study, should not be discounted as an influence on the retrospective personal testimonies collected since the 1990s that this thesis has utilised as evidence of identities from the 1950s to the 1970s, and this influence perhaps limits the significance of the conclusions drawn here to post-war British historiography.827 For instance, the reconstruction of cohesive and cross-generational local communities of traditional and respectable working-class boys and men could be indicative of a reaction against 1980s counter-representations of football fans, and also against 1990s celebrations of more ‘middle class’ styles of football support exemplified by Nick Hornby’s Fever Pitch.828 Nevertheless, as Summerfield argues, the influence on personal testimonies of subsequent developments and the prevailing public discourses of the context in which past experiences are recalled is an important and interesting aspect in the construction of selfhood through memory, and is a potential means for

---

826 Interview with George Orr.
historians to reconcile collective and public memory and discourse with individual and personal subjectivities.  

Although this thesis has endeavoured to interpret fans’ personal testimonies as subjective reconstructions rather than accurate representations of the post-war period, further research into the 1990s ‘turn to history’ and commemoration in British football culture and its precise relationship to broader 1980s developments and discourses of class would be beneficial to football historiography.

Equally though, as Todd and Savage argue, it is possible that the extent and impact of affluence within post-war working-class life has been exaggerated, given that improved living conditions are rarely discussed in the sources this thesis has utilised, and given the more general emphasis on continuity rather than change apparent in the identities of football supporters. As Chapter Four demonstrated, longstanding place-based identities and attachments did not decline to the extent anticipated in the affluent worker studies, and withstood the emergence of new definitions of nationhood and distinctively and exclusively ‘youth’ cultures.

829 Summerfield, ‘Culture and Composure’.

830 Although Dave Russell has conducted research into this area, few others have followed his example. See Russell, “We All Agree, Name the Stand after Shankly”.


832 For examples of contemporary fears of the decline of ‘community’, see Zweig, The Worker in an Affluent Society; Goldthorpe, The Affluent Worker in the Class Structure; Josephine Klein, Samples from English Cultures, Volume One, (London, 1965).
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