Stadium, Theatre, Prison: Ways of Seeing »Sports Space«

Af John Bale

The cultural landscape consists of segmented territories ranging from the scale of the nation-state to that of the house. The world is divided into states; the nation is split up into counties; in the theatre players are separated from audience; the house is divided into rooms. Our segmented world is the outcome of territorialization – a means of achieving control by the enclosure of space. In this chapter I consider the place of enclosure, segmentation and surveillance in the case of a common urban phenomenon, the sports stadium. The stadium's increasing rationalisation reveals sport as not only conquering the physical environment by artificializing it in various ways but also by enclosure and division. The formal design exhibited in sports places celebrates the control of nature in the same way as such formality displays power in »improved« landscape gardens (Daniels, 1988: 63-4). Likewise, the straight lines, rectangles, right angles and semi-circles, all subjected to precise and accurate measurement, indicate the way sport has overcome space. The geometrication of sport, like the rectangularization of much of the modern settlement pattern, reflects the imposition of order on the landscape. Berman (1983: 177) quotes from a Russian poem about such »new order«:

geometry has appeared,
land surveying encompasses everything.
Nothing on earth lies beyond measurement.

This is nowhere more apparent than in sports. Indeed, it has been suggested that »the reduction of space to geometry, the abstraction of what is concrete, real and tangible in nature, is carried to the ultimate extreme in sport« (Brohm, 1978: 74). Segmentation and segregation are not reserved for the players who have their own positions on the field of »play« and their separation from the audience. Segregation is often most rigidly enforced among spectators. Such a rational landscape has, not surprisingly, led neo-marxist observers to view the sports place as a metaphorical »prison of measured time« (Brohm, 1978) or, speaking as a geographer I might add, a prison of measured space. It is the prison-like qualities of the sports landscape, taking specifically the milieu of the stadium, that I want to explore – but not to fully accept. I try to show how the various boundaries in sports are not as unambiguous, and certainly not as impenetrable, as the straight lines on a plan or map may imply. I conclude by using another metaphor, the theatre, in order to read the stadium in another way.

Order on the land and spatial fixations

Sports are eminently spatial phenomena; they are struggles over space, possessing »elaborate spatial strictures« where »the detection and restraint of spatial infractions and the measurement of spatial progress in play are of great importance« (Wagner, 1981: 95). Sports are »dramas acted out within minutely prescribed spatial frames« (ibid: 85), requiring »exactly specified and formalized environments, for in most cases the contest explicitly concerns dominance of territory or mastery of distance« (ibid: 92). Sports possess a long-established fixation with space. The spatiality of sport has led the various governing bureaucracies to prescribe standardised spatial environments where exact measurements define a rationalized »field of play«. Such a desire to achieve exactitude in measurement is most apparent in sports involving the conquest of distance, that is by various forms of racing and in events involving throwing and jumping. Constant refinements in measuring techniques have been matched by refinements in timing.

For children, »life is joyous in its vitality, and vitality is motion during which time is forgotten, space becomes freedom« (Tuan, 1986: 15). For sports participants, however, time is of central significance and space is an obstacle and a constraint. Walking is an example. In its recreational form, there are relatively few spatial limits that prescribe where walking must take place. In its sportised form, however, it takes place either on a prescribed and measured route along a road or on a standardised, synthetic 400 metre track. Parallels could be drawn with say, swimming and ball kicking. »Sports events cannot take place just anywhere; they only take place

under standardized circumstances. Anyone who insists on using his own irregular equipment or unmeasured stretches and places simply excludes himself [sic] from the system of comparable measures of achievement« (Rigauer, 1981: 59).

In most other areas of our lives time and space limitations are rather opaque whereas in sport they are made thematic and integral (Hyland, 1991: 132). In our daily lives we often try to avoid finitude – especially, of course, temporal finitude (that is, death) – but in sports we bring to the forefront those modes of finitude which we usually try to avoid. In sports, temporal and spatial rules limit us in more arbitrary ways than in everyday life (ibid: 129). While much of people's lives is governed by rules, sport is different in so far as »the rule-governed element and the finitude it entails is made an explicit theme of the activity itself« (ibid: 130).

Territoriality

The American geographer Robert Sack (1986: 5) defines territoriality as »a primary geographical expression of social power«. It is »the device through which people construct and maintain spatial organisations .... a complex strategy to affect, influence, and control access to people, things and relationships« (ibid: 216); it views »territory as emptiable space« (ibid: 88). Sack's interpretation, which has clear political overtones, is similar to that of Michel Foucault (1980: 68) who notes that »territory is no doubt a geographical notion, but it's first of all a juridico-political one: the area controlled by a certain kind of power«. Territoriality and segmentation are so pervasive that we barely notice them; they are something with which we grow up, literally from cradle to grave.

Sack's »theory of territoriality« has three bases, each of which is clearly evident in the sports landscape. »The first is classification which refers to the categorisation of people in space, and in sports is typified by the spatial separation of players-spectators or home fans-away fans. The second is communication, namely the means of transmitting the classification which »requires only one kind of marker or sign – the boundary« (Sack, 1986: 32) which is invariably displayed with considerable clarity in sports landscapes, both on the field, court or course, and in the spectators« areas. The third basic element of his theory is enforcement which refers to the efficiency of using location, rather than alternative strategies, as a criterion for the exercise of power over people. Resistance to territorial solutions of »street football« in eighteenth and nineteenth century Britain, for example, were common and in recent years, in Britain, there has been resistance to all-seat football stadiums. But as a general rule, territorialisation in sports has prevailed with the help of the referee on the field and of surveillance in the stands. Resistance, while persistent, tends to be muted and arguments for the abandonment of territorialisation in sports have not been persuasive.

The term »territoriality« as used by Sack is not quite synonymous with the term »segmentation« used by Yi-Fu Tuan in Segmented Worlds and Self (1982). Whereas Sack clearly recognises the territorialisation of space as a manifestation of power relationships, Tuan sees an increasingly segmented world resulting from people's growing awareness of, and confidence in, self-detachment and their growing self-perception of greater individuality and need for privacy. Tuan plays down the political dimensions, implying almost, that

as society becomes more complex, segmentation results from psychology as much as from politics. In the context of sport, territoriality seems to have assumed three broad forms or stages following a pre-sportive stage of integrated use of space with permeable barriers between players and spectators and the existence of mixed land use.

In sports, the first stage of territorialisation was when playing space was separated from spectating space so that a segmented but monocultural sport-place was established. A second stage was characterised by segmentation within the crowd, though the sport place itself was still sited within mixed land use, often residential or at the edge of the existing urban area. The third stage occurred with not only the further individualisation of spectators within the sports place but also the separation of sport from non-sportive space by the establishment of »sport estates« or specialised sport zones in particular parts of the city. Britain has hardly reached this third stage but it is commonly found in many other European countries. In this way the landscape of sport came to mirror many other forms of separation in the broader society in which places are reserved for exclusive functions.

Enclosing the field of play

The crucial importance of the straight lines separating the »playing« space from that of the spectators was that they provided the final break with pre-modern traditions and can therefore be seen as marking (literally) the emergence of sporting modernity. The straight line and the large, powerful and solid stadium frequently enclosing them have been symbolically identified with masculinity and the curved line with femininity

(Bondi, 1992: 159; Eichberg, 1993b) and it was men who formed the organisations which drew up the spatial rules of sports. But the straightness, angularity and hardness of the lines further symbolise modem sport's self-image and landscape – the streamlined body speeding in a straight line in a universe of right angles (Eichberg, 1993b). Contrast this environment with the softer, curved, rounded and ornamented shapes of the more natural pre-modern spaces of movement culture (the run along the winding paths through the forest contrasted with the career along the 100 metre straight).

Segmentation and space on the field of play.

On the field of play itself a number of spatial subdivisions exist, many of a visible nature but also a number which are invisible. Many lines drawn in sport-space delimit boundaries between participants (for example, lanes on a running track or in a swimming pool, the half-way line in team games). Such boundaries are further indications of modernising tendencies and have increased in number over time; witness, for example, the incremental increase in the number of spatial divisions on the football field and those on the running track. Sport space also possesses a series of vertical limits. The cross bar, introduced to football in 1875, limited the vertical goal. Baskets, diving boards, hurdles, wickets, and gymnastic equipment all add a vertical dimension to what is sometimes perceived as two-dimensional space.

Other limits that, for most of the time, separate some players from others (for example, the goalkeeper from the striker or the bowler from the fielder) are not physically enforced; they are invisible boundaries, enforced by »procedural« rather than »constitutive« rules (Shore, 1993: 2). Yet unwritten insistence on such invisible boundaries is a further indication of modernity in sport's spatial organisation. In the case of many ball games the early stages of their »development« were typified by the notion of football's »kick and rush« – a lack of any clearly defined division of labour among the players. As various forms of the »passing game« developed, players assumed positions (or procedures) on the field, each position being separated by an invisible boundary but at the same time being linked by an invisible bond. In this sense, the space of the game, while at one level the »legal« space of the field with its »distinctive geometry« could also be interpreted as the team's space. As the philosopher, Paul Weiss (1969: 159) further notes:

> *the space of a team is the space which the members together constitute by their attitudes, expectations, actions, and reactions. The members of a basketball team are inter-related in a continuously modified space which relates them intimately to one another, even when they are at different parts of the court. They constitute a spatiotemporal group in which the members are more closely together than they are to members of the other team, who may in fact be physically closer to them.*

From time to time these invisible boundaries disappear as modernist assumptions about strict positioning in space are questioned. The »total football« of the Dutch teams of the 1970s, in which every attacker was also a defender and every defender also an attacker, might be cited as a case in point.

Segmentation and Spectating.

In modern sport, it is not only players who have been separated from spectators. Indeed, the strongest and most visible barriers in many modern sports landscapes are those separating one kind of fan from another. Having isolated the field of play from spectators, why should further segmentation have occurred among the spectators? Broadly speaking, the reasons have been economic, social and political. Although fences were erected around some nineteenth century sports grounds to keep undesirables out, it was much more common for enclosure to be undertaken in order to charge admission for spectators to be allowed in. Throughout the twentieth century there has been an increasing territorialization of the spectating areas of sports grounds with individuals being gradually separated from each other and also confined individually in particular spaces. Such segregation of fans are an example of one of Foucault's »substantive geographies«, that is, the geometries of Foucault's texts are not depersonalised »spatial laws« but are best understood as fully-peopled geographies (Philo, 1992a: 156-7). Hence, all-seat stadiums are not simply »plans« but containers of the frustrations, resentment and sometimes resistance of human beings reacting to control, in a small but important part of modern life. Opposition to the »containment« of fans has often been voiced in the pages of numerous football fanzines (Bale, 1992: 48-9) and in Britain has become of question for public policy. Hence, while it is possible to find allusions to stadiums as »prisons« (Eichberg, 1988) it is also possible to see them as sites for resistance and »carnival« (Giulianotti, 1991). And to state, as the British judge, Lord Justice Taylor (1989: 12) did,

that »sitting for the duration of the match is more comfortable than standing« is far from »obvious« (as he also put it); what is known is that what may be more comfortable (some prisons, for example), may not always be enjoyable – a paradox shared by many over-humanised landscapes (Relph, 1981).

If »it is common knowledge that the seventeenth century created enormous houses of [medical] confinement« in the form of »lunatic asylums« (Foucault, 1965: 38), it should also be common knowledge that the twentieth created equally large »houses of confinement« in the shape of urban sports stadiums – arguably the major foci of confinement of modern urban crowds. Reading Foucault's history of the prison, *Discipline and Punish* (1969), I was struck by the great similarity between the transition of punishment on the one hand, and of sport on the other, each being transformed from activities undertaken in corporal/public space to those found in carceral/private space. In pre-modern times punishment, madness and sickness were, like the antecedents of sports, public events found in public spaces. They were subsequently confined in spaces that became increasingly segmented. For example, spectating space in the stadium was initially unsegmented and fans, having paid for admission, were able to wander around the ground at will. In Britain it subsequently became segmented on the basis of rich and poor, seating and standing, and later on the basis of home and away »ends«, though this latter place-based segmentation was not found in many sports nor in all countries. Later still, the stadium space was fully segmented by placing each individual in a seat. It was also subjected to sophisticated methods of surveillance with closed circuit television

becoming the stadium analogue of Foucault's panopticon – »this enclosed, segmented space, observed at every point, in which the individuals are inserted in a fixed place, in which the slightest movements are supervised, in which all events are recorded« (Foucault, 1979: 197) – to such an extent that the stadium might be viewed as »the new »ideal type« of good socio-spatial engineering« (Philo, 1992b) and sport as »perhaps the social practice which best exemplifies the »disciplinary society«, analysed by M. Foucault« (Brohm, 1978: 18n). Indeed, the stadium is regarded as such a secure form of containment that it is, in fact, actually used as a prison in times of national security or repression. It was the Paris cycling stadium, the Vé1odrome d'Hiver, which was used to incarcerate the 13,000 Jews who were rounded up by the Paris police in 1942 (Webster, 1993: 15). In the Chilean fascist revolution in 1973 internees were held by armed guards in the stadium in Santiago (Eichberg, 1988: 35). In the 1980s there were moves by the Metropolitan Police in London to »relocate« the famous Notting Hill street carnival, which the organizers want to be a quasi-Rabelaisian form of »organised chaos«, to »a variety of sports stadia«, these being seen by the police as being »more controlled conditions« (Jackson, 1988: 221). The sports place, therefore, can be argued to have changed from being one of open, public space to one of segmented and panopticised confinement.

The word »enclosure« has traditionally been used to define particular spaces within stadiums and, like the house, the school, the prison, the hospital and the theatre, the story of the sports landscape has been »one of enlargement and of progressive partitioning« (Tuan, 1982: 52; see also Eichberg, 1986). Such transition can be summarised by contrasting the crowd scenes at an early twentieth century football match with the equivalent in the modern, all seat stadium. In the former, the spectators would have been scattered around the ground, not segregated and mingling freely with each other. In the modern stadium spectators have been individualised in numbered seats, each being fully identifiable through their computerised ticketing and from knowledge gained from the pervasive forms of surveillance which characterise the modern sports environment.

All seat stadiums, clinically and scientifically organised, are now common throughout the world of sport. Most, but not all, spectators have come to fully accept them and no longer seriously question the desirability or otherwise of spaces for those who might wish to stand and mix with friends and colleagues.

A change of metaphor

An alternative way to read the stadium is to employ the »softer« metaphor of the theatre (Bale, 1995) and it is to this that I now want to turn. In doing so I also suggest that spatial segregation in sport may be not as rigid as it might first seem. The map of the modem stadium with spectators today confined to seats, increasingly appears to look like a plan of the theatre and perhaps sport is becoming more theatrical (if, for the moment, this is interpreted as an increasing physical and emotional »distance« between players and spectators).

The rationalisation of the body in civilised society has traditionally involved the careful deployment of passions and can be argued to include the »ordered, mediated,

cerebral and relatively passive pleasures of spectating« (Shilling, 1993: 165), while sports »as theatrical representations, with a clear differentiation in space between different types of players (the ground, the seating and stand) are undoubtedly a creation of modernity« (Archetti, 1992: 214, emphasis added). With modernity the discriminating spectator represents a move from ritual to theatre, the participating audience fragmenting »into a collection of people who attend because the show is advertised, who pay admission, who evaluate what they are going to see before, during and after seeing it« (Schechner, 1988: 142).

Individual sports vary considerably in the hardness of their boundaries. But the spatial relationships between players and audience are always of significance. Modernisation implies the clear definition and spatial separation between players and spectators and this might logically lead to a situation where the fan becomes totally passive – even »eliminated« from the stadium (Baudrillard, 1993; Bale, 2003). In the orthodox ('modern') theatre, which I view as analogous to the modern sports environment, spectators have an »almost private experience«, sitting in the dark in their separate chairs, contemplating scenes »out there« and putting an increasing stress on the eye, rather than on other senses (Tuan 1982: 189); in other words, reflection rather than corporeal participation (Bourdieu, 1984) where the spectator's contribution becomes that of an outsider's gaze.

Consider for a moment the case of British football. Many would agree that the ideal stadium would be one that was »full of spectators silently watching the performance and not taking part in the drama, who consequently cannot change the result« (Archetti, 1992: 214). This ideal type can be seen increasingly in some sports, but has existed for many years in the theatre, cinema, and in its extreme form, in television. The notion of a »critical distance«, imposed by a bourgeois economy of the body (Bourdieu, 1984) and applied to players and spectators is helpful here. It can be interpreted as the emotional or physical distance that is reached between players and spectators when the latter become so passive as to no longer influence the outcome of play, i.e, becoming merely »imaginary participants« (Archetti, 1992: 215), as in middle class theatre and in total contrast to, say, working class football or boxing. Such separation would not only produce crowd control but would also prevent them »taking part« in the game. By doing so, they affect the result and hence contravening the logic of equality of advantage (Bale, 2003).

It is clear, however, that the extent of fundamental distancing and separation of the various participants varies considerably between sports, and between different periods of time in particular sports. For an example, let me return to professional wrestling which is virtually a theatrical performance masquerading as sport or, more accurately, perhaps, a pre-modern theatrical performance where the audience is regularly engaged in the action while the wrestlers themselves often engage one another outside the ring. The spatial boundaries are constantly and deliberately violated while the referee's »authority« is always being upstaged by wrestlers and spectators (Shore, 1993: 7). Less dramatic examples of the liminal nature of sport's boundaries may be found in, for example, football, where players interact with the crowd by gesturing, and by performing dances and acrobatic tricks. In return, the

crowd shout, sing and applaud their heroes and verbally abuse their villains. Such liminality was not always favoured. For example, in a football programme for a Sheffield United game in 1907, polite, non-dialogical behaviour was encouraged among spectators, when it was noted that »continued bellowing at the top of your voice ... gets on people's nerves and takes away a lot of the enjoyment of the game« (quoted in Mason, 1980: 232). Such advocacy of polite behaviour in early modern football can be compared with the traditional attitude in tennis, for example, where the umpire often calls for silence. In such situations the (middle class) tennis audience concurs and applause is polite and at specific times, as in the theatre. The audience and the players engage in »turn-taking«. Traditionally, tennis spectators have not shouted or urged on a player; they do not engage in singing or beating drums or in rhythmic chanting or clapping. Such behaviour could be regarded as assisting the competitors in some cases or putting them off or interrupting the performance in others. While acceptable in many sports – and indeed, contributing to the enjoyment of the game, rather than detracting from it as the 1907 football programme suggested – it is clearly unacceptable in others.

The involved attitude and behaviour of spectators at football or boxing matches contrasts with the more polite ('theatrical') applause traditionally (and I stress, traditionally) displayed at cricket and tennis matches. In football there are strong aural and visual links between spectators and players, including banners, flags, music, drums, chants and insults. If the same crowd involvement occurred in tennis as happens in football it would have exceeded the critical distance demarcating modern from pre-/post-modern spectating beha-

viour. The distinction between the different kinds of »distance« between fans and performers in sports is graphically illustrated by Zurcher and Meadow (1970: 190) in a chapter on bullfights and baseball:

Unlike the matador who constantly communicates with the crowd, the baseball players are seen to remain distinctly aloof from them. The player's allegiance is to the team, and he who performs ostentatiously for the crowd is ostracised as a »grand-stander«. Contrast, for example, the baseball player's downcast eye and turf-kicking toe after an outstanding move with the matador's haughty glance and proud posture following a good series of passes.... It might be said that in baseball the crowd is expected to observe, in a relatively detached way, the spectacle being performed for them on the field. At the bullfight, however, the crowd is expected to be one with the matador, to participate, fully, in the emotions of the fight.

In recent years there does appear to have been a tendency towards the imposition of a critical distance as the modernist project would wish. All seat stadiums and greater constraints on crowd behaviour reflect this trend and create milieux where loitering and aimless strolling are discouraged. The restrictions on where people can and cannot go in sports environments, when fans should and should not chant, as in the musically orchestrated singing in north American ice hockey, what they can, and cannot bring with them to a game as in the example of police confiscation of flags and banners at some English football matches, or when they can or cannot talk as in tennis, are further exemplifications of control over socio-spatial interaction.

Paradoxically, however, there are also signs that the critical distance between players and spectators is actually being

reduced in the very sports that have traditionally been more »theatrical« in this respect. The noise and excitement now found in English cricket has created a more carnivalesque atmosphere at some of the »stately homes« of the game. In tennis and badminton crowd involvement is also much more evident now than ever before while in track and field the triple jumper, Willie Banks, started the idea of rhythmically orchestrating the chanting and clapping of the crowd in unison with the rhythm of his athletic performance. Traditionally, the crowd had been hushed while athletes in jumping events took their approach run with applause being restricted to the completion of the jump. Today some high jump competitions find the silence of yesteryear replaced by the rhythms of rock music.

In football and other sports, »gesturing« or »display« has become common among »clown-like« characters such as the footballer Paul Gascoigne or the tennis player John McEnroe. Indeed, in such relatively bourgeois sports as tennis, badminton and cricket, the growing liminality of boundaries suggests that they are merging with – or being appropriated by – the more working class sporting behaviours associated with football and boxing. Attempts to bourgeiosify football (all-seat stadiums, family enclosures, executive suites) have therefore been paralleled by the proletarianisation of tennis (crowds shouting, players gesturing) revealing, perhaps, a polarisation of sporting environments.

In football, an increasing number of dialogical antics directed at spectators rather than other players include various acrobatic feats, somersaults and brief spells of dancing, the taking off and waving of shirts, following the scoring of a goal. In sports, more unrestricted kinds of body movements can be interpreted as forms of resistance to the »modern« traditions of self-discipline, lack of ostentation, and the suppression of emotional display. In these ways the »clown« or »fool«, far from »inhabiting the edges of staged and »real life ... as normally occurs, is able to assume a centre-stage position – an inversion of modern hierarchicl society« (Mangham and Overington, 1987: 121). In post-modern sport fools can and do assume a centrality denied them in other areas of life.

Such boundary violations, therefore, appear more frequently than the apparently neat and tidy, prison-like world of modern sport might lead us to believe. They exemplify the liminal nature of its boundaries, often appearing to be worlds of betwixt and between, or marginal play (Shore, 1993):

In liminal or marginal play sport overflows the normal boundaries of the game. For instance play may spill over from the official players to encompass pseudo-players like spectators, managers, players on the bench or technical support teams. Play can become spatially marginal when the playing field's boundaries are temporarily breached to include the spectator stands or other peripheral areas as part of the play. In relation to time, play becomes marginal when it flows into periods before or after official play. Or when »time out« periods become an important part of the play itself (ibid, 3-4).

In some of the most apparently »theatrical« of sports the effects of the audience clearly spill over on to the field of play and appear to be crucial in influencing the outcome of sporting contests, clearly transcending the boundary between spectators and players. Basketball and ice-hockey, for example, may appear »the-

atrical« in the sense that they take place indoors, »in the round«, on more or less identical plane surfaces in brightly lit environments with the seated and individualised audience in relative darkness. Yet it is in these sports, in their »theatrical« milieux, in contrast to those played outdoors in more varied environments, that the »home field advantage« is found to be greatest. In the absence of physical variables with which the home team might be more familiar, this has been attributed to the presence of the audience whose participation is regarded as crucial in contributing to the home advantage (Edwards, 1979). In such cases as these the audience is returning/ going to pre-/post-modern traditions, becoming (or, perhaps, having always been) much »closer« than the »theatricalisation thesis« might suggest.

Liminality is important in sports because, as elsewhere, it »represents a liberation from the regimes of normative practices and performance codes« (Shields, 1991: 84). That is, the strictly ordered world of rigidly defined geometrical and ordered cells which sport ought to be according to its spatial rules and regulations, is often found to be a shifting interstice, widening and narrowing over time and between sports. Sports, therefore, are like theatre; but more accurately some forms of sport are like some sorts of theatre.

Sport landscapes as urban zones

I have been looking at the increased spatialisation of sport at the level of the playing field to that of the stadium. But how should the segmentation of sports space be viewed at the scale of the city? The modern city,

just like the modern stadium, is characterised by »fragmentation, break-up and separation« resulting from the application of »technological and technocratic rationality« (Lefebvre, 1991: 317) with its carefully zoned land uses, either resulting from the »forces« of social ecology or, these days, from the edicts of land use planning systems. Sport has long featured in this homogenisation of urban land uses.

The essence of a detailed study by the Swedish sports geographer, Olof Moen (1991; 1992), was that during the twentieth century sporting land use has not only become more suburban but has also become much more segmented with distinct agglomerations or zones of specialised sporting land use characterising each city. Such zonation reflects, of course, the neat and tidy world of the planner, a replication at a different level of scale of the increasingly neat and tidy world of the football field (from kick and rush to well-defined »positions'), the running track (from unstandardised sizes and absence of lanes to the regular 400 metre track with regulation lanes), and the stadium itself (segmentation in the stands). The first such urban sports zones were developing in mainland Europe in the 1920s and 1930s (Lyngsgård, 1990). The typical sports park would contain a stadium, velodrome, football fields, training areas, indoor badminton and ice hockey facilities, and tennis courts, and would be geographically isolated from the rest of the city, contributing to the »planned obliteration of variety in the urban arena« (Philo, 1986: 26) – and mirroring at a different scale the planned obliteration of variety in the sports arena.

Putting sports together in zones makes a certain amount of sense, just like putting people together in seats in segregated sections of the stadium may seem to make sen-

se. It may make urban life, like stadium life, more comfortable but it is contestable whether it makes it more »enjoyable'; there are such things as comfortable prisons. It certainly improves the well-being of those local residents who often view the sports stadium in the same way as they view any other »noxious facilities« but at the same time it removes that facility from its community and places it in a placeless »zone«. In such a place it is easier for it to become a space to enter and leave – to fill and empty – rather than a place to relate to. And the possibility of residents sorting conflict out for themselves is denied by the simple expedient of territorialisation – »a "consensual" embrace of the rational« (Lefebvre, 1991: 317) or »suspending the body in an ever more passive relation to its environment« (Sennett, 1994: 375). In a segmented world of sport, the mixing of differences at various levels of scale, from the stadium to the city, disappears; hence the landscape becomes predictable. In the stadium, at least, we have seen that the impermeable boundary is an illusion. Further research is needed in order to consider the hardness of the boundaries between areas of sports and other zones of the modern city. In Britain, at least, many of the major football grounds remain rooted in the communities in which they were founded, even though the extent to which they »represent« those communities may have decreased.

Conclusion

The paradigm of the landscape of modern sport is one of straight lines and land use specialisation. Such characteristics apply to both the »field« of »play« (note the increasing inappropriateness of conventional language to describe what I am talking about – reality seems to become a set of metaphors) and to the areas for spectators. A crucial point to bear in mind, however, is that within such modernisation, ambiguities remain. The world of sport is not yet as neat and tidy as might be expected, given the huge number of guidelines (literally) and statistics, rules and regulations, by which the spaces of sport are governed. Boundaries are rarely as impermeable as they appear on maps and plans; resistance to sporting confinement has assumed many forms and zombie-like passivity and predictability, on the part of players and spectators, is not yet with us. Nor is it likely to be in the immediate future. At the same time, however, resistance and confinement imply power that, in turn, cannot be divorced from politics. The stadium is arguably the most secure building in the modern city. Power and security are terms often associated with the prison and the concentration camp. The postmodern stadium, with its multiple uses, can also be readily converted to the most sinister of uses – given political will.

Bibliography

Archetti, E., 1992, »Argentinian football; a ritual in violence?«, The International Journal of the History of Sport, 9 (2), 209-35.

Bale, J., 1994, Landscapes of Modern Sports, Leicester University Press, London.

Bale, J., 1994, »The stadium as theatre: A metaphor for our times«, in J. Bales and O. Moen (eds.), The Stadium and the City, Keele University Press, Keele, 311-322.

Bale, J., 2001, Sport, Space and the City, The Blackburn Press, Caldwell, NJ.

Bale, J., 2003, »A geographical theory of sport«, in

Verner Møller and John Nauright (eds.), The Essence of Sport, University Press of Southern Denmark, Odense, 93-106.

Baudrillard, J., 1993, The Transparency of Evil, Verso, London.

Berman, M., 1983, All that is Solid Melts into Air, Verso, London.

Bondi, L., 1992, »Gender symbols and urban landscapes«, Progress in Human Geography, 16 (2), 157-70.

Bourdieu, P., 1984, Distinction, Routledge, London.

Brohm, J-M., 1978, Sport: a Prison of Measured Time (I. Fraser, trans.), Ink Links, London.

Daniels, S., 1988, »The political iconography of woodland in later Georgian England«, in D. Cosgrove and S. Daniels (eds.), The Iconography of landscape, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 43-82.

Edwards, B., 1979, »The home advantage in sports«, in G. Goldstein (ed.), Sports, Games and Play: Psychological Viewpoints, Erlbaum, Hillside, NJ., 409-38.

Eichberg, H., 1986, »The enclosure of the body«, Journal of Contemporary History, 21, 99-121.

Eichberg, H., 1988, Leistungsräume: Sport als umwelt Problem, Lit, Münster.

Eichberg, H., 1993, »New spatial configurations of sport?, Experiences from Danish alternative planning, International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 28 (2/3), 245-63.

Foucault, M., 1980, Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, Harvester Press, Brighton.

Hyland, D., 1991, Philosophy of Sport, Paragon House, New York.

Jackson, P., 1988, »Street life: the problems of carnival«, Society and Space, 6, 213-27.

Lefebvre, H., 1991, The Production of Space, Blackwell, Oxford.

Lyngsgård, H, 1990, ldrættens Rum, Borgen, Copenhagen.

Manghan, I. and Overington, M., 1987, Organizations as Theatre, Wiley, Chichester.

Mason, C., 1980, Association Football and English Society, 1863-1915, Harvester, Brighton.

Moen, O., 1992, Från Bolldplan till Sportcentrum, Byggforskningsrådet, Stockholm.

Moen, O., 1990, Idroltsanldggingar och idrottens Rumsliga Ulveckling i Svenkst Sladsbyggande under 1900 talet, Handelhogskölen, Gothenburg.

Philo, C., 1986, »"The same and the other"; on geographies, madness and outsiders«, Occasional Chapter, 11, Loughborough University, Department of Geography, Loughborough.

Philo, C., 1992a, »Foucault's geography«, Society and, 5pace, 10, 137-61.

Philo, C., 1992b, personal communication.

Relph, E., 1981, Rational Landscapes and Humanistic Geography, Croom Helm, London.

Rigauer, B., 1981, Sport and Work (A. Guttmann, trans.), Columbia University Press, New York.

Sack, R., 1986, Human Territoriality, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Sennett, R., 1994, Flesh and Stone: the Body and the City in Western Civilization, Faber, London.

Schnechner, R., 1988, Performance Theory, Routledge, New York.

Shields, R., 1991, Places at the Margin, Routledge, London.

Shilling, C., 1993, The Body and Social Theory, Sage, London.

Shore, B., 1995, »Marginal play: sport at the borderlands of time and space«, in O. Weiss and Wolfgang Schultz (eds.), Sport in Space and Time, Vienna, University of Vienna Press, 111-125.

Taylor, Lord Justice, 1989, Hillsborough Stadium Disaster: Final Report, HMSO, London.

Tuan, Y-F., 1982, Segmented Worlds and Self, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

Tuan, Y-F., 1986, The Good Life, University of Wisconsin Press, Madison.

Wagner, P., 1981, »Sport: culture and geography«, in A. Pred (ed.), Space, Time and Geography, Gleerup, Lund, 85-108.

Webster, P., 1993, »Vé1odrome survivors look back on French treachery«, The Guardian, July 17, 15.

Weiss, P., 1969, The Philosophy of Sport, University of Southern Illinois Press, Carbondale, Ill.

Zurcher, L. and Meadow, A., 1970, »On bullfights and baseball: an example of interaction of social institutions«, in E. Dunning (ed.), The Sociology of Sport, Frank Cass, London, 175-197.