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Abstract

At football’s 1992 European Championship Finals in Sweden, the 5,000 Scottish fans (‘The Tartan Army’) attending, won the UEFA ‘Fair Play’ award for their friendly and sporting conduct. The award appears to be the culmination of a major ‘change’ in the international identity of the Scottish supporter over the last two decades. However, as this paper seeks to demonstrate, the nature of Scottish support’s behaviour and cultural identity is the subject of strong contestation among the Scottish football and policing authorities, the media and the supporters themselves. In the first part of the paper, the socio-historical and logistical background to the tournament is outlined. Key issues her relate to whether the fans accept the ‘official’ position that their behaviour and outlook has changed significantly, and what significance may be ascribed to ‘anti-hooligan’ legislation. The conflict may partly be explained by the authorities’ and fans’ differing definitions of the supporters’ social ‘carnival’ at matches, and whether this is considered to be ritualised (safe) or excessive (potentially disorderly). The second half of the paper chronicles, through participant observation and interview research, the social performances and discourses of the Scottish supporters during the Swedish tournament. Internal divisions are noted, relating to region, domestic club affiliation, age, and social class/wealth; these are gradually overcome through collectivisation, around shared attitudes of sociable drinking, anti-Englishness, masculine identity and gregarious fandom. Also highlighted is the symbolic battle for control over the representation of the fans’ identity and behaviour, between media, fans and the authorities. The paper concludes by noting that this conflict has continued beyond the tournament, through the authorities’ recolonising of the fans’ victorious identity, and the media’s challenge to their sportsmanship in defeat.

Introduction

This paper is based on extended fieldwork with Scottish fans in Sweden, and to a lesser extent in Romania and Italy. An earlier paper undertaken in identical circumstances collated findings from a statistical survey of Scottish supporters (Giulianotti 1994a). The conclusion gave three findings germane to what follows:
i) Cultural and historical rather than social structural differences appear to underlie the differential fan identities of the 'friendly' Scottish and the 'hooligan' English fans.

ii) A distinctive group of 'hard core' or long-standing, much-travelled away fans are contained in the overall Scottish support. The socio-economic profile of Scottish fans in Sweden suggests the 'hard core' will become increasingly whitecollar.

iii) Scottish fans greatly prefer to exercise personal or group autonomy over travel and accommodation arrangements at away fixtures.

Here, I seek to provide an ethnographic study of Scottish football fans in Sweden, and the socio-historical context from which their behaviour and culture arises. The paper itself should be located in the context of recent international debate, at the academic and popular levels, about sport, spectating, symbolic experience and the carnivalesque (Armstrong & Hobbs 1994; Bale 1993; Bromberger 1993; Dal Lago & De Biasi 1994; Dunning 1994; Giulianotti 1991, 1994b; Hobbs & Robins 1991; Redhead 1991 & 1993; Silva-Costa 1989; Taylor 1991). These researches explore the scope for interpreting football fan cultures, particularly youth sub-cultures, as promoting expressive, participatory displays of club allegiance, nationality and identity, in conjunction with non- or anti-hooligan discourses and symbols.

The arguments may be split into two general positions. The first maintains that a new 'moment' in British fan culture has obtained, with a subsequent decline in hooliganism. Apart from the weak evidence upon which this thesis is based, it also lacks a precise socio-historical setting and sociological cause. Furthermore, this position tends to curtail discussions of the new football 'carnival' to its peaceable (rather than disorderly) potential. The second perspective argues that only limited or no change in participatory fan behaviour has occurred with regard to hooliganism within the last thirty years. This argument tends to pay little attention to socio-cultural variations and ethnographic study. In respect of Scottish international fans solely, I present the case for the second position, but with two major caveats. Firstly, the social agency of Scottish national fans must be recognized: their fan culture, like any other, must be regarded as relatively specious and autonomous to other fan identities. Secondly, the various characteristics of this fan culture must be recognized as emerging from a unique ensemble of historically fluid, political, juridical and cultural inter-relations.

Accordingly, I begin with a detailed outline of the historical and social structural forces underlying Scottish fan behaviour and identity. Three background topics arise here: the collective biography of Scottish supporters; their collective self-perceptions; and, the issues arising from
the build-up to the Swedish tournament, as initiated by the football authorities, police, press and fans themselves.

Scottish Fans’ Background to the Swedish Tournament

1) Collective Biography: Legislating for a Change in Violent Identity

Since at least the inter-war period, it has been more than easy to construct a narrative of Scottish football fan identity that emphasizes rowdy and drunken behaviour at both club and international levels. Primary referents have included religious sectarianism at club matches, involving the Glasgow Old Firm of Rangers (Protestant) and Celtic (Catholic) (Finn 1994a; Murray 1984; Taylor 1992, 162); and violent anti-Englishness during ‘Wembley Weekends’ (Holt 1990, 258-61; Moorhouse 1989). By the mid-1970s, Scottish ‘football hooliganism’ had attained such an unprecedented notoriety that a parliamentary working party was set up in November 1976 under the chairmanship of Frank McElhone MP. Its findings were enacted with alacrity as the Criminal Justice (Scotland) Act 1980, following pitch invasions and fighting at the 1980 Scottish Cup Final (Crampsey 1990, 207-9).

The new legislation’s major clauses prioritized the role of alcohol consumption in causing disorderly fan behaviour. Possession of alcohol in, around and en route to football stadia was prohibited. Ironically, in the 1980s, Scottish football’s financial reliance upon the alcohol industry intensified, with multi-million pound sponsorships unveiled separately by the Scottish League, Scottish Football Association and Britain’s biggest club, Glasgow Rangers (Giulianotti 1994c). Nevertheless, the efficacy of the new legislation has been presented as virtually complete: “The Act is seen by many people experienced in football matters as the primary reason for spectators being better behaved, particularly in the grounds.” (HAC 1990, 78)

Statistically, this conclusion is impossible to confirm. Fan disorder inside soccer stadia is less likely to occur than in the mid-1970s due to other measures, such as the introduction of fan segregation at all domestic club matches, and the ubiquity of closed circuit television. Additionally, police criteria for enforcing the legislation by arrest or ejection from grounds varies with each regional police force. Fan disorder outside soccer stadia can also evade being recorded, as it was not until 1991 that Scottish police forces introduced the new category of ‘Football Related Incidents’ (FRIs). Moreover, there would appear to be good political (rather than empirical) reasons for upholding the legislative change thesis. Scottish civil society is overseen by a number of institutions which seek to preserve and demonstrate their autonomy from English
control: these include the law, education, health, political bureaucracy, police service, popular media and governing sports bodies, including football. Especially since the 1980 legislation, Scottish media, politicians and football authorities have tended to construct selfvalorizing contrasts between the on-going football hooliganism in England and its perceivedly effective control in Scotland (Giulianotti, 1991, 1994b). Nor can it be denied that a new generation of football hooligans, the 'soccer casuals', did emerge in Scotland during the 1980s. Scottish casuals have been most prominent at the league clubs of Aberdeen, Hibernian, Dundee/Dundee United, and Rangers and Celtic. Their continuing activities represent a symbolic challenge to the 'official' position, on the sharp decline of football hooliganism in Scotland. Scottish casuals also convey a further cultural split with the 'reformed hooligans' of Scotland, in that unlike previous club subcultures, the 'casual' fashion style is strongly tied in with youth cultural trends in England (Giulianotti 1993). Its most conspicuous characteristic is the avoidance of wearing of club colours in favour of ‘casual’ leisure wear, in particular designer clothing by Armani, Fila, Lacoste, Chevignon, Katherine Hamnett, Paul Smith, etc.

The 1980 Criminal Justice (Scotland) Act was also interpreted by Scottish police and politicians as serving a long-term, educative strategy in reconstructing the behaviour and image of Scottish football fans. Objectives included:

- the promotion of healthier drinking habits in a nation notorious for alcohol-related illnesses (Giulianotti 1994c).
- a subsequent improvement in public behaviour and minimizing of disorder and arrests.
- the self-policing of errant supporters by fellow fans.

Most famously, the supporters of Scotland’s national football side have been venerated for their adoption of the final two practices (Forsyth 1990, 207; HAC 1990, 24). However, the simple etiological link between alcohol consumption and fan violence that is suggested by the 1980 Act tends to see both football authorities and the media ignore the real drinking culture of the 'Tartan Army'. For example, at the 1990 World Cup Finals, one Scottish television commentator argued the good behaviour between Scottish and Swedish fans was due to the fact that not one fan would have failed the police breathalyser test, when fieldwork indicated the direct opposite conclusion (Giulianotti 1991, 526n). Recently, the SFA’s Chief Executive Jim Farry suggested continuing fan violence in Scotland could be counteracted by banning alcohol sales and public drinking on match days, as this measure had worked in Italy (Daily Express, 8 February 1994). Yet such a policy had been the most direct source of conflict between Scottish
fans and local Italians and the police during the 1990 tournament (Giulianotti 1991, 522-3; Williams, 1991, 46-48). And as the 'roligan' football fans from Denmark and 'Jack’s Army’ of Republic of Ireland supporters also demonstrate, copious alcohol consumption can produce biosterous, raucous but trouble-free behaviour (cf. Peitersen 1991; O’Kelly & Blair 1992).

An appropriate way of depicting the culture of these international fans overseas is through the metaphor of 'carnival'. Behaviourally, carnivals are characterized by an abandonment to hedonistic excesses, and the psycho-social jouissance of eating, drinking, singing, joking, swearing, wearing of stylized attire and costumes, engaging in elaborate social interplay, enjoying sexual activity, etc. For these indulgences to occur, carnival can only function as 'authorized transgression': 'the modern mass-carnival is limited in space: it is reserved for certain places, certain streets, or framed by the television screen’ (Eco 1984, 6). Carnivals, like football tournaments, are shaped by modernity and the perceived need to organize: the football authorities identify particular spaces for fans, or the media seek to capture mobile 'moments' of carnival. A further 'rule' of carnivals is that they operate through the collapse or inversion of social boundaries and hierarchies (Ivanov 1984). Social class or authority only exist in the carnivalesque to be mocked or ridiculed. Cohen (1993, 129) notes that, 'Carnival can be an integrative institution, helping to bring together in amity people from different classes and ethnic and religious groupings'. For a group of supporters internally divided by economic, football club, regional or religious differences and confronted by foreign hosts and fans, carnival can thus serve a functionally integrative need in the strongest Parsonian sense. Once achieved, it can also facilitate internal monitoring of behaviour and self-policing.

However, the carnivalesque always threatens to transgress the authorized boundaries granted to it. The inversion of bipolar opposites may be too often repeated or heartfelt for a return to prior political arrangements: for example, intense mocking of the powerful and dominant social norms may redefine the social group’s form and destabilize personal or moral hierarchies. Or the politics of carnival themselves become apparent, through contestations of where the pleasures of excess may be allowed, and to what extent.²

To ensure that the behaviour of Scottish fans does not exceed these boundaries, the Scottish Football Association founded the Scotland Travel Club. Technically, the STC’s primary function is the organized distribution of tickets for prestige fixtures to Scottish supporters (which provokes some fans to rename it the ‘Scotland Ticket Club’). Its ‘Rules of Membership’, however, focus inordinately upon the actions and demeanour of supporters: members must ‘behave in a
responsible manner en route to and from matches'; their dress must be 'moderate' (e.g. no Highland dress); and, the ban on alcohol consumption in a soccer context is taken to apply overseas, even where the host nation's criminal law is more liberal than that in Scotland. Anyone circumventing these edicts is liable to expulsion.

The extent to which these codifications are enforced, or expected to be observed, is a matter of supreme conjecture. Even with a professed monopoly on tickets for major fixtures, the STC does not command majority support. Less than 10,000 people have been STC members at one time or another over more than a decade, while over double that figure of Scots attended the 1990 World Cup Finals in Italy alone. The projected clamour for tickets was undoubtedly a key reason for 80% 'hard core' Scottish fans in Sweden being affiliated. But a minority remain deliberately unorganized:

I don’t believe in the travel club, I detest it. I detest the whole idea of it. It’s just a fucking rip-off and totally unnecessary. Why should we follow Scotland all over the world and then be told that we’re not getting any tickets unless we pay £15 plus the price of tickets, just to join. I’ve been going to Scotland games abroad for years and I’ve got into every game. You don’t need to be a member of that fucking organization. (Brian, self-employed tradesman, Edinburgh)

Additionally, and partially to maintain a positive international image, there is a tendency amongst the Scottish media, police and football authorities to deamplify any incidents involving supporters abroad. Ethnographic research suggests that Scottish fans have been involved in disorderly incidents on several occasions in the recent past; one of the most serious (and unreported) incidents involved Scottish casuals fighting and being arrested in Paris in 1989. Given this rather constrictive structural presentation of the Scots, and conflicting evidence of their actual behaviour, how do the fans themselves perceive their collective identity?

2) Collective Self Cognition: Art Act to Alter Performances?

Via Becker’s theory of the 'hierarchy of credibility’, Armstrong and Hobbs (1994) have argued that those with power are able to influence significantly the self-perception of English football supporters. Similarly, some Scottish fans are readily reported to be persuaded by the efficacy of the 1980 Criminal Justice (Scotland) Act. A middle-aged Scottish fan in Sweden is quoted:

‘We’ve also got very good at self-policing over the years. There’s more older guys who go, and they can take the young boys aside and have a wee word to quieten them down.’ (The Guardian, 16 June 1992)
There is little conclusive, statistical evidence to sustain the purported demographic change in the support which this argument suggests (Giulianotti 1993). One fan, who has missed three Scotland fixtures abroad in fifteen years, argues that the ‘older guys’ have always tended to disappear, leaving another generation of fans to come through:

I think we’ve got our third set of fans now. I only know as far back as ’81, but a lot of the faces on the go then have dropped away, probably gotten married. And it was the same after Spain with the lot who went there, a new lot came in between then and Italy [1990 World Cup Finals]. (Ronnie, storeman, Fife)

More popular arguments with hard core fans about self-policing within the support emphasize the potentially aggressive manner in which a positive international identity is maintained. One fan (Jock) who has been instrumental in organizing away trips for supporters over the last ten years, states simply: ‘If a Scottish fan causes any trouble, there’ll be ten other fans down on top of him right away’. The paradox of this potentially violent enforcement of peace provides a ready caption for cartoonists. One caricature in the leading Scottish tabloid depicted a tartan-clad Scot gripping a compatriot by the throat and asserting, ‘Behave - or else!’ (Daily Record, 20 June 1992). This more machismo explanation for enforcing order on European terraces has a lengthy socio-cultural pedigree within the ‘hard man’ mores of Scottish working-class masculinity.³ Interactionally, it is also sustained by the fact that whatever the intensity of ‘carnival’ attained at any one time, there are always some individual fans who are comparatively less intoxicated and more emotionally detached from proceedings.

Presentation of behavioural and cultural ‘change’ within the support, by the support, is most perspicuously illustrated through the stances adopted by contemporary hooligan sub-cultures to following Scotland abroad. Those Scottish soccer casuals travelling with the national side tend to eschew the hooligan habitus for the duration of the tournament. In doing so, they can easily join in with the festivities, while some others may, on an individual level, retain club-level animosities or oppose foreign supporters (Giulianotti 1991). Alternatively, there are hooligan formations such as the Hibs casuals which are alienated by the Scottish support’s persona. A handful have marked out their fundamental antipathy towards the reputation of Scottish fans by following English supporters to fixtures abroad, in the hope of either witnessing or getting caught up in football-related violence. Meanwhile, they challenge the ‘ambassadorial’ fans’ claim to embody the genuine identity of Scottish fandom, by pointing to the perceived hypocrisy in the image of the gregarious ‘hard man’:
They say we’re giving Scottish fans a bad name, you know, spoiling our reputation abroad. Okay, they’re getting pissed and being friendly with everyone and in the papers for it, but when they’re back in Possilpark or wherever, they’re back to stabbing each other, and battering the wife and that. (Brian, storeman, Edinburgh, returning from Anderlecht v Hibs)

The fact hardly needs reiterating that public responses to Scottish fan disorder over the years, from press, politicians and football authorities, have been almost spontaneously negative. However, an alternative perspective is forwarded by a leading Scottish hard core supporter, on the utility of Scottish casuals at matches played in England:

But throughout the 1980s frankly I was glad that there were hooligans amongst our ranks going to Wembley simply because we needed them in London. From my point of view it would hardly be an ideal situation if no troublemakers crossed from north of the border leaving what may be termed as ‘ordinary fans’ at the mercy of English thugs. (McDevitt 1994, 171)

Undercutting these competing discourses on Scottish fan identity and its cognition of violence, there is the issue of whether there actually has been a change in Scottish fan behaviour and subsequently what value may be placed on the social effects of the Criminal Justice (Scotland) Act. Long-standing, hard core fans provide the most interesting (and conflicting) views here. Jock argues, while amongst long-time associates, that the ageing process has played the greatest role in dampening the aggressive behaviour of supporters:

If you look at the people here, you’ll probably find more than half of them have got some sort of previous [conviction] that’s down to football. We just got older.

Similarly, another fan argues that the perceived early 1980s ‘change’ within the support’s behaviour has little to do with legislation, occurring abroad at a particularly raucous fixture in 1981 (cf. McDevitt 1994):

I’ve been going since ’74 [World Cup Finals in West Germany]. I witnessed the change. You could say the main time for it was in Spain in ’82 when we got dubbed ‘Ernie’s Angels’ after the party with the Brazilians and that. That was something else, I’ve never seen anything like it since. But I remember when we played in Israel in a qualifier [in 1981] and won 1-0. The Jerusalem Post carried a set of stories on the Scottish fans every day for about three days, on the front page, praising our behaviour and support for the team. I think a lot of guys really got a kick out of that. (Graeme, white-collar worker from Lothian)
In contradistinction, other hard core fans argue that the culture of the support has not changed, nor has it needed to. The prohibition on alcohol consumption is criticized, at club level as well as national:

> It’s really no different to what it was in the 1960s and 70s. It’s always been like this, you know, just fans together, having a drink and talking. They should never have banned drink from football. I know, I’ve seen Scottish fans having a great time with a drink at a football match, although I’ve seen them, you know, going right over the top as well. It’s like they say, ‘When the drinks in, the brains out’. But, they should never have banned it. I used to take a wee bottle into matches. I’d maybe take, say, a half-bottle into a match between three or four of us at a match at Firhill; that’s not much at all, is it? I’ll tell you, you needed it on a cold winter night, say on a Wednesday. (Robbie, retired publican, Glasgow)

Also, the argument that ‘self-policing’ is newly-fangled within the support receives a similarly critical treatment:

> The worst thing they ever did at Scottish football was introducing segregation. It’s created an atmosphere of animosity and rivalry between the supporters that wasn’t there in the first place. All this shouting at each other between the fencing, goading each other on. You never had that before. If there was any trouble in your own end, the supporters would take care of themselves, stop it, or get the police in, you know ‘Get this nutter out of here.’ (Bill, white-collar worker, Strathclyde)

Clearly, therefore, the inter-relations between different groups of Scottish fans, and their variable views on the nature of the support, are complex. Some hard core fans subscribe to the ‘change’ thesis promoted by Scottish football legislation; others do not. Some ‘hooligans’ feel comfortable within the support as ‘ambassadors’, others flit between the two identities at international matches; while others still reject entirely the gregarious social ethics of the Tartan Army. These social ambiguities are further reflected in the strong ambivalence with which the Scottish police and football authorities approached the 1992 European Championship Finals.

3) Bad News and Bad Clues: Dissuading the Tartan Army

Prior to the beginning of the tournament, the various football authorities and Scottish media appeared to embark upon a campaign dissuading Scottish fan attendance at Euro ’92. Match tickets, alcohol and other subsistence were publicized as certain to be scarce resources for itinerant fans. A maxima of 6,000 tickets would be available, through official organizations, for each fixture, in contrast to the 25,000 or so Scottish supporters who had attended Italia ’90. ‘Offlicences’ were to open only during office hours, and pub beer to be sold at quadruple the
Scottish prices; restaurant and hotel prices in Sweden were depicted as the most expensive in Europe (Friday Sportscene, BBCTV, 17 January 1992). A fortnight before kick-off, the Swedish organizers warned that failure to prove possession of a minimum £50 per day for food and accommodation would result in refusal of entry (Edinburgh Evening News, 27 May 1992).

Such ‘bad news’ undoubtedly influenced the approach of the Scottish supporters towards Euro ’92. Given that only around 5,000 fans attended these finals, the majority within the potential Scottish support appear to have elected not to attend. For those who did travel to Sweden, the presumed dearth of tickets encouraged a surge in their membership of the official SFA Scotland Travel Club, which again had a monopoly on Scotland’s ticket allocation. And to minimize their costs, a particularly high 42% of these fans at Euro ‘92 were prepared for ‘camping’ (Giulianotti 1994a).

After successfully budgetting for these initial handicaps, Scottish fans were still faced with the unhelpful response of ferry companies and football authorities towards their transport arrangements. Nine years earlier, several thousand Aberdeen fans had sailed from their home city to Göteborg without any trouble. By contrast, the Swedish shipping companies’ resolve hardened against sailing with any football supporters. The Edinburgh Evening News (28 April 1992) reported that the tour operators’ embargo had extended to Scottish ports. One Scottish agent was refused hire of a vessel to ship 500 fans from Edinburgh to Göteborg. Inevitably, the more expensive option of flying to Scandinavia became the most popular mode of travel (Giulianotti 1994a). A minority did endeavour to travel overland, leaving from English ports.

Given the SFA’s failure to develop a positive policy towards transporting these less wealthy supporters to Sweden, uncertainty reigned over how well they would mingle with Dutch, German and English fans also en route to Sweden. The SFA’s security officer could only muse, ‘In relation to the Scots fans, I am not pessimistic - but I cannot speak for the other fans. Whether the Scots would turn the other cheek if they were attacked is difficult to say’ (Edinburgh Evening News, 28 April 1992).

The activities of the Scottish fans who eventually arrived in Sweden were set to be monitored by the authorities. Scottish police and football authorities re-erected the ‘Scottish Liaison Unit’, which had previously followed supporters to the World Cup Finals, to solicit the fans on good behaviour and offer advice on how to get by in the host cities. The Unit’s head, Bill Spence (Deputy Chief Constable of Tayside Police), met with fellow officers from participating nations within a month of the group draw (North Tonight, GTV, 7 February 1992), ostensibly to
publicize the Scots’ gregarious, ‘carnival’ behaviour at prior tournaments (Giulianotti 1991). But, other British police officers and exiled Scots left Swedish police in no doubt about the hooligan potential of Scottish supporters. Representatives of the 4,800 Swedish officers set to police the Finals made use of the state-of-the-art facilities at the Scottish police training school, which test commanding officers’ responses to simulated, football-related disorder depicted on CCTV. Media presentation of this tuition emphasized the necessity of such preventative policing of Scottish supporters (Crime Ltd, BBCTV, 9 June 1992). Meanwhile, in a publicity manoeuvre not without precedent (see Armstrong & Hobbs 1994), Superintendent Adrian Appleby, head of the National Criminal Intelligence Unit’s football division, declared the mailing to Swedish police of a list naming 200 ‘soccer hooligans’ (The Guardian, 19 May 1992). It contained approximately a dozen names of Scottish ‘potential troublemakers’ (Edinburgh Evening News, 27 May 1992). Finally, on the eve of the Finals, ’some resident Scots [in Göteborg] expressed concern about whether Swedish police have enough experience in handling football casuals [Scottish hooligans]’ (Sunday Post, 7 June 1992).

The principle ‘anti-hooliganism’ measure adopted by Swedish police was as farsighted as it was antithetical to the Scottish authorities’ policies. Swedish bars were given extended opening hours throughout the tournament, with low strength (1.8%) alcohol to be sold inside stadia. Outwith the stadia, ‘cheap beer’ would retail at strongly reduced prices in purpose-built 'beer tents'. The underlying philosophy emphasized the somnolent rather than violent propensities of the seriously intoxicated. A police spokesman explained:

‘If the bars are open until three instead of midnight the fans will get tired and go home without fighting. If the bars close at midnight they will be out in the streets with nothing to do and they will fight with the police.’ The Guardian, 16 May 1992)

In Britain, the discrepancy of these measures to the censorious approach towards drinking was 'slammed by police chiefs’ (Edinburgh Evening News, 25 May 1992), and dignified as 'crapulent thinking’ by sections of the liberal press (The Guardian, 16 May 1992). Unsurprisingly, the STC limited its comments to reiterating, in its members’ guide to Sweden, the ban (rather than relaxation) on public drinking.

Fan Performances and Discourses in Sweden

1) Göteborg, 10-11 June 1992 - Early Fan Segregation
The recurring observation throughout fieldwork in Sweden was the direct contrast of the supporters’ experiences to those in Italy, at the 1990 World Cup Finals. Unlike the situation in Genoa and Turin, the publicized dearth of tickets and accommodation proved unfounded in both Göteborg and Norrkoping. Although the majority of cheap hotels and hostels had been booked up on the eve of the first fixture against the Netherlands, emergency accommodation at unlikely venues, such as an ice-rink and churches, had been prepared by the tournament organizers. Yet local police officers, tutored by Scottish counterparts in an ambiguous conception of the immigrant support, insisted on precautionary segregation of accommodation, and harboured an underlying unease about continuing inter-fan pacificity, with particular regard to the Dutch. Similarly, at the Ullevi Stadium and other official outlets, tickets could be purchased for Scotland’s fixtures.

The most successful capitulation to the Scots’ recreational habits had been well publicized before the tournament: introducing beer tents open to five or six in the morning, and extending the licenses of pubs in Göteborg and Norrkoping to similar, unlikely hours, which very few Scots were able to outlast. However, where the Italians had promoted public events for the various fans to engage in, the Swedish organizers, particularly in Göteborg, failed. Only two major concessions to the Scots’ arrival were forwarded by the host - a pop concert by the remnants of the Scottish teenie-bop band, the Bay City Rollers; and a carnival torcher which included a local Scots pipe band. Neither were of topical interest nor well attended by the supporters, with the latter one of several processions which were badly publicized.

Low Scottish fan involvement in local festivities was partially attributable to their unavoidable social fragmentation during the tournament. Supporters on package holidays were based in resorts far removed from either Göteborg or Norrkoping. This enabled couples or families to convert tournament attendance into a conventional holiday, and thereby reflect economic as well as personal differentials within the overall Scottish support:

We stopped off at Jonkoping one night to see what it was like, and ended up roughing it on some beach. This bloke came over and woke us up. And says, ‘Great to see you boys. You’re the first real Scotland supporters I’ve seen yet. It’s really boring here, nothing to do - the wife and kid spend all their time in the jacuzzi.’ I’m going, ‘What! Lucky you, you know. Fancy sleeping on a beach?’ (Dougie, unemployed rigger, Ayrshire)

Some more experienced travellers were resistant to the bureaucratically-inspired segregations of package holidays, and organized their itinerary accordingly:
What we need is a North-East travel club, put that in your survey. The package holidays to get here were far too expensive. Six hundred quid or so for a few days here, and they stick your accommodation in the middle of nowhere, miles away from Goteborg or the places where everybody is, where you want to be. For the holidays I organize the lads here, you get the cheapest flight over and you're guaranteed you're in the city where the team's playing. (Adrian, van hire manager, Aberdeen)

The advantage of these 'maverick' tours extended to control over and financial savings on internal coach travel in Sweden, between Goteborg and Norrkoping. Alternatively, Scottish fans without these arrangements were forced to make the expensive train journey between the two venues for Scotland's matches. The Swedish organizers had introduced cheaper 'football specials' for the fans, but these were badly scheduled, for immediately before or after match fixtures. Scottish supporters were therefore left with the choice of saving money on transport (and missing out on the festivities before or after fixtures), or travelling when it best suited them between fixtures (and effectively paying over the odds for the privilege).

Another infrastructural aspect of the Swedish tournament which militated against the Scottish football carnival, was the public geography prepared for supporters. The controversial beer tents were located within two miles of the Ullevi Stadium, but in a park which was away from the city centre, at the other side of which were sited the popular Irish pubs, O'Leary's and the Dubliner. This encouragement of the 'disappearance' of the support from public view appeared symptomatic of a tournament where the 'cold seduction' of the audience is achieved through newspaper and televisual presentation rather than actual social interaction (cf. Baudrillard 1990, 162). Ironically, it provided the media with something of an initial handicap, as Scottish photographers and 'mobile news desks' trawled the busy Göteborg streets in search of Scottish enclaves of social fraternity. Individual cameramen were a regular hazard in Goteborg parks and streets, busily arranging groups of fans in a bid to construct and freeze an image of carnival. Central to the storylines routinely penned by Scottish journalists were the ubiquity of alcohol consumption and unanimity of its gregarious effects. ‘The low budget travellers have come well prepared’ reported Reporting Scotland (BBC, 11 June 1992); the Daily Record (13 June 1992) provided an illustration under the heading: ‘2000 CANS ON SCOTS BUS: Swedes uncover a booze bonanza’;

The Swedes have been taking a tough line with football visitors as supporters try and beat sky-high prices by bringing their own. But the Scots, many wearing kilts, provided entertainment for the customs men by singing and dancing accompanied by bagpipes - and won them over. (Ibid.)
For this sort of discourse to be sustainable, the 'functional need' of manageable integration is essential. The wearing of Scottish club side shirts is a potential source of disharmony and division within the overall support. Individuals failing to recognize this code, particularly the perceivedly 'triumphalist' Glasgow Rangers fans, are targeted for castigation over their nationalist indiscretions. During the early stages of the Swedish championship, breaches in this discipline is relatively high:

It’s shite, isn’t it? I mean, the football season’s finished, you’re over here to watch Scotland, that’s all, and you get these guys walking about in Rangers tops, or Celtic tops or St Mirren tops, or some other fucking club, they’ve not thought about it. Someone should pull them up for it, tell them this is Scotland you’re following not some club team, no matter who. (Steve, carpet-fitter, Strathclyde)

The Scottish fans’ majority resistance to the wearing of club colours on international sojourns is occasionally undermined by fans of minor Scottish League clubs, such as Queen of the South or Alloa Athletic. However, this integrative norm contrasts with the very formal ‘ordered segmentation’ practiced by many groups of England fans, as evidenced at internationals home and away, by their wearing of club shirts and emblazoning of team names across the English or British flags (cf. Murphy et al. 1990). Notably, through these diverging integrative practices, both English and Scottish fans are generally able to morally proscribe internal conflicts. The international reputations of the two supporter groups may be diametrically opposing, but the hype surrounding the arrival of England fans in Sweden, as at any other championship, adroitly deflects attention from the carnival ‘excesses’ within the Scottish support. Prior to the first fixture, some Scottish fans had already toppled over from the precipice of boisterousness. Packing into the Dubliner pub, supporters mounted tables and chairs, singing loudly amongst themselves and to the Irish folk tunes played by the resident band. The profitable custom of the Scots, and their representation among the bar staff, conspired to see any disorder involving fans interpreted decisively in their favour. One local woman to complain forcefully, after a supporter fell from his vantage-point and smashed into her table, was ejected from the premises. Another fan hurtled through the main window, ripping tendons in his arm. On neither occasion did these minor disturbances inspire media or police redefinition of the fans’ model identity abroad.

2) Göteborg, 12 June 1992 – ‘I am Curious, Orange’

On the day of the Netherlands fixture, the largest groups of Scottish and Dutch supporters were separately located and engaged in diverging social activities. Several thousand Dutch supporters
who had arrived on match day were primarily located in the city centre, seated in open-air bars and restaurants, conspicuous in their orange attire and, in the case of a large minority, their face painting. Little attempt was made by them to engage in extensive interaction with locals, save for untranslated epithets targetted at passing Swedish women. Social exchanges within the Dutch support rarely extended beyond the social circles of friends travelling together. The activities of the Dutch here resembled those of Irish fans observed enjoying their own geographically disparate but socially endogamous craic ('crack') during the 1990 World Cup in Genoa (Giulianotti 1991). By contrast, the major locus of the Scots’ pre-match festivities was the cavernous beer tent. At its apogee, the congregation of Scots, Dutch and Swedes numbered over 1,000, with the Scots dominating the attendance through constant singing. Popular themes oscillated between the model Kitsch ('Take the High Road'), the joking uniformity of anti-Englishness ('We Hate Jimmy Hill'), to the pop political('We Have-nae Paid any Poll Tax'). At no stage were these standards conveyed as expressions of an hermetically sealed, cultural nationalism. When outnumbered groups of Dutch supporters were preparing to sing, shouts of 'Ssshhh' would circulate to encourage their audability, with congratulatory cheers for those songs which attained the intended conclusion. In exchange for receiving drinks and paraphernalia, the Dutch and Swedes were invited to extend their grasp of English to Kailyard tunes and Scottish central belt patois.

No uniform procession of fans departed the beer tent for the Ullevi stadium, nor was this felt necessary by the support, given their comparatively limited numbers in Sweden. The route to the stadium was sign-posted with small-scale theatres of incongruous carnival, opposing fans striding behind pipers in full Highland Dress. Police officers encountered were tied into proceedings, tartan strips being knotted to their epaulets. However, on reaching the stadium, the supporters were confronted with a further organizational impediment to their festivities: the unwieldy and officious security arrangements. After penetrating the steel-mesh fencing, erected to cordon off non-ticketholders (of which there appeared to be none), both sets of fans queued to have their tickets checked at two turnstiles. Between the queues, the disorganized jamboree resumed, with Scots in clown outfits and other fancy dress passing their kilted compatriots, who had stopped for alfresco urinating. Local media reportage framed images of distended queues and laborious body-searches within a conflicting narrative of functionality – ‘When TV coverage of the match started, there were still quite a few queuing, but all went smoothly. There were only a few who showed impatience’ (Lokal Nyheterna, 13 June 1992). However, it cannot be denied that this unnecessarily protracted security procedure dampened the spirit of the evening, and saw several thousand fans miss the kick-off.
Once inside the ground, the Scots’ minority status was strikingly visual, outnumbered by Dutch supporters by at least five to one. The latter’s matchdirected songs, chants and drum-beats dominated the first fifteen minutes. From this subaltern position, Scottish fans targeted their attention obscenely at English photographers and the distraction of the in-ground bar. The match also provided a ready forum for carnival humour within the Scottish support, which centred on the team’s unlikely combat aimed at Europe’s footballing elite. While the Dutch supporters continued to outshout them, the Scottish fans revelled in their role as Euro ’92 gate-crashers: ‘Come on, get into these underdog’; ‘Boot it anywhere McKimmie - take the piss’; ‘We’re gonna win the Cup!’. This diverting interpretation of the Scottish team’s status was squarely rejected by the media coverage of the fixture, which echoed the traditional, ‘supportive’ role of the fan in relation to the match itself. One former Scotland captain indicated during a pre-match television discussion:

It looks as if there’s a terrific support out there and it’s great to see that, and the team react to a support behind you. And, its terrific to see so many fans out there. But, we’ve got to be proud of the team, the team’s done terrific to get to this position. And, the fact that they’ve got there, they’ve got there on merit... (Roy Aitken, Scotsport, STV, 12 June 1992)

World-renowned performers in the Dutch side were jeered, though the underlying sentiment was more self-effacingly powerless (‘Ronald Koeman, you’re a wanker’) than heartfelt. Where these personalized attacks on Dutch players threatened to enter the realms of the xenophobic, even prima facie ‘hooligan’ fans policed the miscreants into order. Fans at the front of the Scottish support making ape-noises at the coloured players Gullit and Rijkaard were rebuked by Aberdeen casuals: ‘Fuck off with that racist shit, this is Scotland not England you’re with’.

A more substantial, collective contribution to backing their side audibly was encouraged by events on the park as the match progressed. Debatable decisions by the Swedish referee saw him berated en masse, while the failure of the Dutch side to open the scoring had a pacifying effect on their fans. Having secured a relative predominance over the Dutch fan anthems, the Scottish support were quick to respond to the late Dutch match-winning goal with the valedictory, ‘You only sing when you’re winning’. The rejuvenated Dutch response, ’Always look on the bright side of life‘, was a source of individual friction within the Scottish support, being a common anthem for club-supporters to bait the defeated at home. Yet collectively, the international football communion was dominated by the Scottish support outside the stadium. The jouissance of celebrating Dutch supporters was unceremoniously eclipsed by several hundred Scottish fans,
headed by a piper, enacting a confusing simulacrum of the 'bloodied but unbowed' Tartan Army's retreat home.

The kernel, equal role of the defeated Scots, both players and fans, to the match-day occasion provided the primary images of Göteborg's major press coverage. The local press depicted the Dutch victors as 'ORANGE THIEVES!' alongside articles attesting to the fans’ amity, reading 'Side by Side: total brotherhood between the Dutch and the Scots after the match' and 'No match for the police' (Lokal Nyheterna. 13 June 1992). Finally, the broadsheet Göteborgs Posten (13 June 1992) provided the first media interpretation to suggest that the remarkable equanimity of the defeated Scots might have wider connotations. Under the headline 'Intoxicated Scots and the EC feeling', the paper mused, 'The victory intoxicated the Dutch, and only the Scots sang. On the avenue, the Scots played bagpipes and the Dutch applauded smoothly and warmly. Truly, an EC feeling.'

The nexus between fan and team was cemented as a platform for the reciprocity of symbolic exchanges between the two groupings. The Scotland manager observed a sense of responsibility to the intensity of support afforded by the fans in a post-match interview: 'Even now they are still chanting but we can tell them that we feel just as optimistic as they do. Maybe if we battle as hard against Germany we might get a goal' (Andy Roxburgh, quoted in The Herald, 13 June 1992).

3) Göteborg and Norrköping, 13-14 June 1992 - Moving the Goalposts

Saturday, 13 June represented the final night for large numbers of Scots in Göteborg, and an opportunity for collective reflexivity over the night before. There were reports of the collapse of formal social boundaries between players, supporters and media, on the supporters’ own terms. Several of the Scottish press and one or two players were said to have mixed freely and shared drinks with supporters in pubs and hotel bars. Meanwhile, some hard core fans reflected on the changing self-presentation of the Scottish 'Tartan Army' since its first European tour:

They [Scottish fans] look a lot different now than they did back then [1974 World Cup Finals]. In Germany, they were the Ragged Army, pretty scruffy looking. A lot of them were on the dole and just scraped it across. They’re a lot better dressed now. You really noticed it in Italy, the number of guys wearing kilts and the full Highland Dress, looking quite smart. They’re better off than they used to be. (Colin, white-collar worker, Central Scotland)
However, even by this stage, the wearing of Highland Dress had seemed to acquire in Sweden a utility beyond sartorial aesthetics, with several personal testimonies declaiming its utility as a sexual passport to local women. 

The refragmentation of the Scottish support was a major condition for the uneasy evening which some fans enjoyed in Göteborg. In and around the beer tent, over 1,000 people gathered, primarily consisting of Dutch fans and young locals taking full advantage of the cheap alcohol on sale, with an older audience outside watching the resident musician. Scottish fans were largely isolated in small pockets of twenty or so, peripheral to the social exchanges and singing there. The Scots chatted amongst themselves, with some operating a free ‘selfservice’ on the beer taps when bar staff were not supervising. Drunk locals took centre stage in the tent, standing on the flimsy tables and chairs, singing relatively neutral international fan tunes. When furniture collapsed under the precarious weight, the upstaged would tumble into compatriots, apologies would be bartered over, and the singing continue. On one occasion a Swedish youth landed on a Scot who lost the two pints of beer he’d been carrying. The Scot remonstrated fiercely, leading to a tense stand-off between a score of youths from the two sides. A more violent confrontation was promised by the hosts but did not materialize. In the interim, the Scottish fans rationalized their hosts’ misdemeanours in classically masculine terms: ‘YTS hooliganism’, added to their cognitive infirmity in withstanding alcohol. More routinely, however, other young Göteborg fans drew symbolic parallels between themselves and Scottish fans, and the English fans and ‘hooligans’ from Stockholm:

We don’t like the Stockholm people, and we are not the same. In Göteborg, we are much more friendly. The people in Stockholm are cold, they are not open, you would not like Stockholm. And when their hooligans come to fight here, we do not want to know about it. We don’t fight the Black Army, it’s stupid. So they can fight with the police. (Robert, student, Göteborg supporter)

The following day, Scottish supporters moving base to Norrköping were confronted with the fact that the town’s peripheral outlay of camp-site, beer-tents and stadia paralleled that in Göteborg. These important social spaces were situated disagreeably two or more kilometres from the town centre, whose enterprises advertised ‘Euro Mondiale’ specials (beer at £3 per bottle; meals at £6 à la carte). These settings had been further cultivated to reflect organizational scepticism about the likelihood of Scottish fans maintaining a gregarious identity. The camp-site set aside for Scots was strategically located with a river dividing it from the 2-3,000 tented Germans. Both sets of fans counteracted segregation by playing impromptu football friendlies. The spirit of these inter-fan occasions was undermined by Scottish media prerogatives emanating
from home. Some fans objected to the contrived manner in which new arrivals were unceremoniously brought together for the benefit of cameras:

I wouldn’t do what they wanted us to do. It was shite, it wasn’t natural. They wanted us standing there arm-in-arm with all these Germans, so they could say we were all getting on great with the Germans, and slag off England. But we’d only just got here about an hour before. We’d never even met them. (Alex, civil servant, Fife)

More seriously, a heavy police presence at the town railway station, and daytime cruising of streets by officers in specially hired vans, connoted a recurrent concern that English fans would attempt to travel the short distance from Stockholm to provoke Germans or Scots. The everyday over-policing of the town, however, provided some Scottish fans with ready-made taxi-services to the campsite from local bars. The relatively low-key approach adopted by the Scottish Liaison Unit (only one newsletter was widely distributed among supporters at the start of the tournament) hinted at a greater confidence in both the Scots’ disinclination to tackle English hooligans and, probably more importantly, the Swedish police’s ability to stop the English fans from arriving. For their own part, the supporters’ interest in any disorder in Stockholm was exceeded by the exigencies of accommodation and social arrangements in Norrköping.

Interaction with locals began auspiciously in Norrköping, through the celebration of the Swedish side’s victory over Denmark. Four local fans returning from the fixture nourished the visitors’ view that their hosts required some tribal tuition in participatory fandom. Bedecked in Swedish scarves, flags, and Viking hats, the four jigged past the restrained mockery of Scots, singing ‘We are the Swedish football hooligans’. Undoubtedly the most arresting image of the positive interaction between Scottish fans and their hosts involved a supporter exchanging kisses with a Swedish policewoman. The event was shown in lingering detail on BBC television, while the Scottish media went into raptures about ‘the policewoman who stole their hearts’ (Daily Record, 26 June 1992), ‘this Swedish policewoman who won the hearts of millions’ (Edinburgh Evening News, 15 July 1992). A month after the tournament, the woman attended a special ‘Göteborg reunion’ party in Edinburgh, all expenses paid. The sole notable incident of discord between locals and Scots at this time involved the mugging of a drunk Scottish fan, ostensibly by local youths, as he retired to the camp-site after dawn. The attack was reported by neither the victim nor the press.

While the Scots developed an easy sociality with the Swedes, in one of the several central bars and discos used by the Scottish fans, the differences between themselves and sections of the
resident German support seemed incommensurable. Outnumbered by young Germans clad in both 'casual' and 'fan' attire. Scottish fans attempted to initiate a ritualized exchange of popular anthems as they had done with the Dutch in Göteborg. The German reply ignored the Scots’ mode of etiquette; drowning out the first verses, and brandishing Nazi salutes, the young Germans broke into Deutscheland iiber alles and Deutscheland hooligan. Although there was no prospect of this symbolic hiatus being bridged by violence, the Scots’ individual efforts to talk the Germans out of hooliganism were ignored or countered in historically xenophobic terms.

4) Norrköping, 15 June 1992 - An Arresting Occasion

On the day of the Germany fixture, British newspapers were dominated by reports of English fan disorder in Malmö. Whereas English media focused on the alleged failure of Swedish police to act effectively on intelligence from their British counterparts, Scottish media highlighted the government’s ministerial confusion of ‘English’ fan violence with ‘British’ supporters generally. Scotland’s leading tabloid, the Daily Record, proclaimed to the Minister for National Heritage, ‘SCOTS ARE NOT LOUTS: The English are, Mr Mellor’, but then degenerated into an editorial argument ironically composed in hooligan vernacular:

So in his eyes there’s no difference between the English and the Scots when there’s blame to be handed out...In fact, the Tartan Army’s behaviour has set an example to soccer fans everywhere...while English fans have disgraced themselves again. David Mellor deserves to be taught this lesson...with a size 10 boot.

There was substantial evidence on German match day to suggest both that the potential violence between Scots or German and English fans had been significantly exaggerated, and that the excessive behaviour of Scottish fans could border on the inflammatory. In Norrköping, English ticket-touts moved unmolested amongst the increasingly intoxicated Scottish and German fans, as they did an unspectacular trade. Several hundred Scots arrived from outside resorts during the course of the day, heavily under the influence; these new arrivals tended to be the more prominent in singing the recently composed English fan anthem, ‘There’s only cite Bomber Harris’, which generated amusement as well as censure from more sober fans.

The pre-match experiences of Scottish fans in Norrköping mirrored those in Göteborg three days earlier. The Scottish support was again dispersed over a wide terrain, drinking in several pubs and the ‘beer tents’ near the ground, or alfresco in parks and squares. By contrast, few German supporters or locals were located in the town centre on match day, to engage in the festivities. Fans heading to the ground forty-five minutes before kick-off were again left to rue
officious security arrangements. A queue of Scottish fans approximately 100 metres in length congregated, testifying to an organizational clash in spectator cultures. Scottish international fans balance punctual entry to stadia with a collective commitment to maximising pre-game drinking time; accordingly, domestic stadia can tend to continue filling up some time after kick-off, even where entry arrangements are at their most minimalist. By contrast, the entry arrangements at Euro '92 saw fans threading through two turnstiles, before having their tickets’ computer barcodes individually verified. The delay, however, worked to the collective’s advantage, artificially unifying in person and subsequently in sound a gathering of several hundred Scottish fans for the first time since the Netherlands fixture.

Inside the ground, the 1:3 ratio of Scottish to German fans proved more equal than the previous fixture. The Scots’ aural presence was also quantitatively stronger, and more match directed, despite the team losing the tie and subsequent hopes of qualification for the later stages. In this arena, with the world’s press and cameras conveying the sights and sounds of the support to a global audience, the fans’ conscious self-presentation ensured that mocking songs such as ‘Bomber Harris’ were quickly quelled. The half-time pipe-and-drum performance at the foot of the end continued into the second half, though the majority stood up on the terraces to spectate. What they saw was a Scottish football performance which drew praise from the German coach and the President of UEFA, as well as lengthy tributes from all sections of the Scottish media.

The complementary performances of fans and players were given communion through events immediately after the match, which were initiated by the fans and reciprocated by the players. Following the defeat, individual players first ensured they had swapped jerseys with German opponents before routinely heading across to acknowledge the spectators in the Scotland end, and then strolling from the pitch. The majority of Scottish supporters stayed inside the ground, chanting for an encore appearance by the players. The remainder of the stadium quickly cleared. During the hour-long wait, the lyrics of the incessant singing were predominantly of the friendly Scottish supporter form: ranging from dedicated fandom (‘We shall not be moved’, ‘We’ll support you evermore’) through nationalist Kitsch (‘Flower of Scotland’) to ingratiating local hospitality (‘Sweden, Sweden’, ‘We Love You, Sweden’, ‘We Love the Swedish Police’). Occasionally, the ambassadorial image was displaced by its ritualized mockery through sexual metaphors directed at the empty stadium, with fans singing ‘Scotland boys we are here, shag your women and drink your beer’, and the self-parodic ‘We’re too sexy for the Swedes’. Several Scotland players only reappeared after a team coach had surveyed the scene, and ushered them forward. They appeared somewhat embarrassed by the reception, standing and watching the fans’
performances in an inversion of the actor-audience role. The manager Andy Roxburgh implied the players’ involuntary attendance when commenting on his own display of unity:

> People expect football folk to be macho and not to show emotion, but on this occasion we couldn’t restrain our emotion after the way they responded. We had to throw jerseys to players who were heading for the shower and send them out again. We have to say they got to us. (Andy Roxburgh, quoted in The Herald, 16 June 1992)

Once the Scotland players had disappeared to the changing rooms, the supporters quickly departed, to be greeted with some applause and hand-shaking from locals and Germans outside.

Throughout the remainder of the evening, social boundaries between Scottish fans and various journalists and Swedes were regularly collapsed. Journalists joined fans in pubs along the main street in Norrköping, the Drottninggatan, while local women were drawn into the town centre, some wearing tartan motifs. Staff in pubs adorned Scotland tops and hung Lion Rampants behind bars; discothèques abandoned admission fees to cash in on the Scots’ obstinance and profligacy with buying traditional ‘rounds’ of drinks - one small club, for example, grossed over £10,000 and imported bottled beers from a nearby town to withstand being ‘drank dry’.

Relations between Scots and Germans occasionally deteriorated. Earlier that day, there had been some rumours circulating about English fans’ intentions of stopping in Norrköping en route to Stockholm, to fight with German fans, following disorder between the two sets of fans at Euro ’88 and Italia ’90 (Murphy et al. 1990, 167-193; Williams 1991). Suitably alerted, a group of young German fans in ‘casual’ attire passed by a bar packed with Scots, at the window of which were a small group of Scottish ‘casuals’ wearing few or no Scottish motifs. Apparently mistaking the latter for English supporters, approximately 80 Germans approached the pub, spreading themselves across the Drottninggatan, and chanting ‘Deutsche-land, Hoo-li-gan’. The majority inside watched quietly, passing caustic comments about the stereo-typed hooliganism of the Germans. Young Scottish fans at the front were more agitated, but on the Germans’ arrival were able to demonstrate their nationality. Some spoke individually with the German fans, who clarified their disinclination to either fight or party with the Scottish support.

Alcohol consumption rather than hooligan nationalism underlied the detention of two Scottish fans that night. One fan was given a ‘bed for the night’ by local police, being so drunk that he was unable to stand. A more serious incident involved a physical dispute between two Scots, which fellow fans failed to quell before the police appeared. Witnesses attributed the aggressor’s release to his wife’s argumentative skills, criticizing the police decision to arrest the aggrieved
party, who was freed after three hours without charge. Neither incident was reported in the Scottish or local media. Indeed, The Star (16 June 1992) observed that no Scottish international fans had been arrested abroad in ten years, a frankly inaccurate statement. The ‘Police Notebook’ in the Norrköping Tidningar (17 June 1992) reported:

What a party! I have to give top marks to the Scottish football supporters, and the Germans were not so bad either. We didn’t have to interfere on this occasion either. Our only task has been to show our presence and be there.

The semantics of ‘arrest’ are of important currency in relation to press depictions of Scottish and English international fans. For the Scots, the term is not applied where there seems to be no prospect of an ensuing prosecution; for English supporters, the briefest detainment would appear to confirm a genuine apprehension. The English broadsheet The Independent (19 June 1992) highlighted a ‘Victory for Scottish sense of fraternity’, evidenced in part by the reported ‘no arrests’. The story was contrasted with news of ‘nearly 200’ English fans having been arrested during the course of the championships, although it was expected hardly any would stand trial.

5) Norrköping, 16-17 June 1992 - Hosting the Next Carnival?

The mid-week hiatus between fixtures brought conflicting approaches towards the fans from the Scottish and Swedish authorities, and particularly the Scottish team. 300 Scottish fans berthed at the major camp-site in Norrkoping awoke to police questions. The story later broke that two Norwegians ‘masquerading’ as Scottish fans had been inciting Germans to fight (The Herald, 17 June 1992), although Scottish witnesses attributed any problems to drunk Germans singing and giving Nazi salutes to on-lookers. Rumours were also circulating that the nightly vigil of dozens of Norrköping police at the railway station had paid dividends following the Germany fixture, when up to 150 alighting English fans were reboarded on a Malmö-Stockholm train. The campers eased the afternoon tedium by playing an impromptu match against a local police side, which they lost 2-0 (Norrköping Tidningar, 17 June 1992).

Afternoons were spent in flâneur strolls through the local fair and shopping-centres, sunbathing at the camp-site, sleeping-off the excesses of the nights and mornings previous. Continuing or reflecting upon their interaction with locals, some Scottish fans were reportedly adept at exploiting their recent celebrity status. Illustrations abounded of the humorous and extraordinary hospitality which their raucous, ambassadorial behaviour had extracted from local people. The most regular talking-point focused on Swedish females’ incomprehensible taste for the self-parodying, unglamorous visitors against their own, more Aryan compatriots. Specific
tales related to the Swedish nurse who had bought a tent and delivered hot meals daily for one fan publicly intent upon investing all his remaining monies in alcohol. Or the group of fans who rented a house for a token fee, while the landlady moved into the adjoining shed. The most acutely instrumental fans were the least wealthy. One supporter had been quoted on his arrival in Sweden as having spent most of his money already reimbursing generous English fans en route to the Finals (The Sun, 11 June 1992). Five days later, a photograph of him had been juxtaposed arm-in-arm with a Swedish policeman against a 'star-fish' English fan being arrested in Malmö (Daily Record, 16 June 1992). Later that day, this fan was seated with inebriated Norrköping journalists and their sizeable expenses bill, conventionally reiterating the differences between Swedish-loving Scots and the hooligan English, for the following day's local newspaper. This rather exploitative approach of some Scots towards the hedonistic resources of their hosts extended to their debate on Scotland's World Cup qualifying group draw. Objectively, the ties in Switzerland and Portugal appeared the most attractive destination for travelling fans, but the hard core were more interested in Estonia:

I'm not that interested in Switzerland. It's Estonia that we're looking forward to, yes, if they play the game there. Look, it's basically a Third World country, and if you're sixty pence for a bottle of vodka, I'm in there. (Brian, oil rig worker, Aberdeen)

In the evenings, meanwhile, the festivities between locals and fans failed to ignite until late, through lack of numbers and the consequent discharge of affect. Some fans manipulated the ambient tranquillity and laxity of the bar management to doze upon and under tables. The two groups monitored the Sweden-England game closely on television in central pubs, with the Scots tutoring the Swedes in a medley of anti-English verses, and orchestrating celebrations following the Swedish victory. Norrköping Tidningar (18 June 1992) sought to capture the unity with colour images of Scots and Swedes celebrating the victory, above the accessible chant, 'Oeoh, oeoh, Sveeerige...!' The fellow-feeling was augmented by combined disgust at the subsequent images of violence inflicted on Swedish fans by English supporters, relayed in pornographic detail to a bewitched pub audience. In one disco, whose proportion of Scottish fans had been swollen by the appearance of package-tour Scots bored with their resort, only the appearance of the band on-stage raised the volume and atmosphere inside. In response, the Scots mounted the stage, a hard core fan taking lead vocals, before easing the band aside for 'Flower of Scotland' and another singer to lead on Highland ballads. Among the spectators were a small group of English fans who had abandoned the ‘hassle’ of following their native side to validate further the Scottish communitas.
Over the two-day interval between fixtures, relations between Scottish players and fans developed a new form of ambivalent complexity. The day following the German fixture, the unity of both sides as depicted by the Scottish media appeared to have been lost. Players toured the Norrköping streets in cliques, responding minimally to fans addressing them, most comfortable with the customary informalities (autographs, acknowledging sympathies and queries) which recapitulated the modern player-supporter binary. The same day, however, Scotland’s players were nudged from the headlines by the fans. In Sweden, the press volunteered the view: ‘WHO CAN NOT LOVE THE SCOTTISH FANS? YESTERDAY THEY DANCED WITH THE POLICE IN NORRKOPING’ (Matts Olsson, Expressen, 16 June 1992). The Scottish media preferred to focus on comments from an official source, the UEFA President Lennart Johansson. In an apparent attempt to stem prospective English fan violence in Stockholm, Mr Johansson warned that further trouble could result in the next Euro Finals being moved from England to north of the border, the latter’s attraction being the fans’ behaviour, followed by the playing team’s performances:

‘I would love Scotland to host the finals in the future. The Scottish football fans are the best behaved in Europe. They have helped make the finals the festival it should be... and the football team has been in two of the three best games in the competition.’ (Lennart Johansson, quoted in Daily Express, 17 June 1992)

Accordingly, the following morning, after a light training session, the players arrived at the Scottish fans’ camp-site. Fans dashed out of their tents and caravans to greet and mingle with the players for up to an hour. The fans’ positive profile had placed Scotland at the forefront of UEFA’s planning of future tournaments, and the Scottish press were ready to receive the rewards: ‘Give Scotland Euro finals! (Daily Express), ‘Genuine hope’ (Aberdeen Evening Express), ‘We’ll Host Finals in ’96’ (The Sun), ‘Come to Scotland’ (Edinburgh Evening News). The optimistic euphoria was tempered by the manager, Andy Roxburgh, who noted the host’s prerequisite of having satisfactory stadia and transport links to house Europe’s premier soccer occasion. This allowed the SFA Chief Executive, Jim Farry, to all but scotch the Scots’ opportunity as ‘premature’, adding that the preparation time may be too brief for his institution’s capabilities.10 Neither Roxburgh nor Farry candidly assessed the security exigencies of English fans travelling north for matches - a detail which had effectively curtailed the annual Scotland v. England fixture since 1990. The fans themselves were the most realistic about the likely effects of English fans travelling north, and the Scots’ own equally predictable response:
It would be great if Scotland got the next one [hosting the 1996 European Championship Finals]. The only problem would be if all these silly cunts [English hooligans] came up and started [fighting]. We'd be able to son them out; just phone the troops from the town and half your area comes down. But you don’t want that. (Nodge, offshore worker, Aberdeen)

However, it was left to Scotland’s leading broadsheet to reflect on the centrality of anti-Englishness to the Scottish fans’ persona, and how the violent image of English fans secured rather than threatened their reputation:

Poor England. There was a time when the Scots were vilified in London for causing trouble and the English affected disdain at the presence of kilted celebrants in their capital. Now the average Scots fan is seen as an angel in comparison with his discredited southern neighbour. We are, naturally, enjoying basking in our new international reputation for saintliness - but how on earth will we show we are different when the English learn to behave? (The Herald, 17 June 1992)

6) Norrköping, 18 June 1992 and Beyond - The Politics of Carnival

The CIS fixture provided two contextual contrasts with the two previous matches. Firstly, with only a handful of CIS supporters scattered around Norrköping and the majority of locals working, the Scottish supporters were in almost exclusive control of the town, and hence all the football festivities. Removal from the public eye can have an adverse effect on the regulation of behaviour within the Scottish support (Giulianotti 1991). However, any tendency towards laxity was counteracted by the arrival of bus-loads of supporters based outwith Norrköping, who were evidently intent upon transforming this fixture into the peak event of the entire Swedish sojourn. The new arrivals clustered in bars and squares, dominating the festivities with humour, chants and the emergence of ‘character’ figures. The Scottish fans based in Norrköping, who tended to be fragmented into smaller groups of travellers, played a supportive role in the social exchanges that followed.

Secondly, the kick-off time for the CIS fixture was 20.15, the latest yet, which allowed the Scottish fans the unusual opportunity to drink from morning through to evening prior to the match. By early evening, most fans were already heavily intoxicated, but there was no evidence of violent behaviour, and hence no nourishment for the simple etiological association of alcohol consumption with football-related disorder. Moreover, the late kick-off enabled a comparatively greater number of Scottish fans to satisfy their pre-match drinking habits and queue early to enter the ground punctually.
Inside the ground, the Scottish support also dominated the small Idrottsplats stadium, being packed into one end, while large spaces remained unfilled in the other three ground sections. Culturally, the activities of the support moved towards a stage beyond the tribal limitations of ‘Scottish fan as ambassador’ to ‘Scottish fan as embodiment of fandom’. Proceedings began with a continuing symbolic collapse of Swedish and Scottish boundaries. Again, anti-Englishness provided a convenient form of vocal entree, celebrating the Swedes’ victory over England the night before: ‘Sweden, Sweden, Sweden, Sweden’, ‘Tommy Brolin’s Tartan Army’, ‘Who put the ball in the English net? Tommy, Tommy Brolin’. Cardboard cut-outs of Brolin and the tournament mascot ‘Berni’, adorned with tartan scarves and hats, were hoisted for spectator and TV viewer consumption. Inattentive camera-work robbed armchair spectators of the most subliminal moments of fan feeling, during the CIS anthem, Beethoven’s ‘Ninth Symphony’. Scottish fans quelled extended celebration of their own anthem with widespread ‘Ssshhs’, in preparation for a manifestly respectful acknowledgement of their opponents’ musical signature. But this sign of ‘traditional’ sportsmanship was quickly rejected as overly formal. Within four bars of the opening movement, Scottish fans had begun to hum the anthem, hands in air, swaying en masse to the tempo. A self-congratulatory cheer brought the reverie to a premature end, whereupon the Scots picked up again to another climax, this time in unison with the band. At their anthem’s conclusion, several bemused CIS players looked up to the cheering Scottish support, who had also pilfered the extended applause of local spectators in the adjacent stand. The playing side had provided a similar, voluntary exchange with Swedish police prior to the match. Manager Andy Roxburgh had stopped the team coach heading for the Idrottsplats to kit the escorting police motorcyclists in Scotland jerseys.

During the early stages of the match, pro-Swedish tunes combined with celebrations of England’s elimination from the tournament (‘Bye, Bye, England’, ‘Fuck off, England’), including rewordings of ‘God Save the Queen’ and ‘Rule Britannia’ (both to give the schadenfreude ‘Ha, ha, England’). When Scotland scored twice in quick succession, the fans responded with ‘We’ve scored more goals than England’. Anti-Englishness was central to the Scottish nationalism of one hard core fan regularly captured on television leading the fans’ chanting:

I don’t support anyone, just Scotland. Just Scotland. I used to support Rangers, but I stopped that after they started signing all these English players and that. I follow Scotland more for political reasons than anything else. Scotland as a nation doesn’t have a true expression of its identity within the political sphere, so it has to find that in the cultural sphere. (Alan, company director, Glasgow)
At half-time the semiotics of orderly partying were sustained; a conga of Scots wormed through the support to the tempo of ‘techno’ music. One fan broadcast an unctuous, well-received vote of thanks to local people over the ground’s PA system (the motion’s author had been too drunk to deliver the address personally). The second half brought further celebrations of the Scots’ third goal, warmly applauded by local fans.

Post-match celebrations inside the ground repeated those following the Germany fixture, though on a larger scale and with the Scottish players keener to participate. Following more ‘curtain calls’, the players and coaching staff appeared to throw jerseys over the three metre-high fencing into the support. Applause directed at either side ensued, and the players turned to have ‘team photos’ taken with the support in the background. One photograph printed by the Daily Record was subsequently elected by the SFA for public sale as a poster souvenir of the tournament. It was also chosen for distribution to Travel Club members who had been to Sweden, although all attending Scots fans were in principle eligible for both souvenir and the accompanying ‘fair play’ badge awarded by UEFA. The poster depicted the playing side smiling together at the front, arranged in two rows. At the foot, the legend announced ‘SCOTTISH FOOTBALL agrees FAIR PLAY please!’ while above half of the background supporters were obliterated by the tiered legends ‘SCOTLAND’S TARTAN ARMY’, ‘FAIR PLAY CHAMPIONS OF EUROPE’. To either side were two further symbols of officialdom: the ‘Fair Play’ motto, and the SFA’s official badge.

Post-match parties throughout Norrkoping reflected the strong, supporter-led Scottish communion. Players and media pundits mixed freely with Scottish fans in bars outwith the town centre, receiving and rebutting jokes and witty sarcasm in good humour. Club-based rivalries between young fans and current or ex-players were circulated through joke songs, skirting clear of sectarianism or hooligan significations. By this stage, the carnival’s politics of inclusion represented an enforceable social norm. Some groups of fans failed to engage in the boisterous atmosphere of heavy drinking, loud conversation, singing and chanting; they underwent some animated criticism from the more committed participants, before abandoning the scene.

Headlines in the British press again accorded the Scottish fans an equal billing to the victorious players. The Star (20 June 1992), for example, provided the ambiguous leader ‘SCOTLAND THE RAVE!’, poised by the sub-headings ‘Roxy’s aces are talk of Europe’ and ‘No praise is too high for the Tartan army’. English journalists counterpoised the behaviour of Scottish fans with
their compatriots’ activities in Malmö and Stockholm. The different effects of alcohol consumption on the two nationalities was the main topic of inquiry:

For the England fans, or at least a sizeable minority of them, alcohol seems to have been a catalyst for the most cowardly violence. In the Scots, it brought out a sense of fraternity and friendship which won over police and public alike in Göteborg and Norrköping. *(The Independent, 19 June 1992)*

Patrick Barclay in *The Observer* (21 June 1992) and David Lacey in *The Guardian* (27 June 1992) made similar observations, as did the *London Evening Standard* (20 June 1992) which had done much to typify the Scots during the 1970s:

There was a time when England could teach Scotland very little about hooliganism. The behaviour during the infamous 'Wembley Weekends' was unseemly and at times disgraceful. Those days are long gone. They enjoyed their drink and were boisterous. But they didn’t feel the need to rampage through town centres bringing violence and mayhem - like the so-called English fans.

Local media were more circumspect in their congratulations. Front page headings 'Thank you, Scotland' (*Folkbladet*, 19 June 1992) and ‘A dignified exit by the favourite gang’ (*Norrköping Tidningar*, 19 June 1992) introduced acclaim for the Scots’ performances, followed by predictions that local businesses would complain about the lack of profitability from the tournament.

However, the most reasonable public appraisal of the Scottish support came from within. After they had been publicly ‘awarded’ the Fair Play championship for spectators, the Scottish tabloids proclaimed ‘We’re the finest in Europe’ (*The Sun*, 26 June 1992); and ‘WE’RE THE TOPS! - And that’s official!’ (*Daily Record*, 26 June 1992). Three months later, however, the Scots lost 3-1 in Switzerland, and the spectators repeated their post-match Swedish curtain-calls for players, who duly trooped out to acknowledge them. Evidently, the Scottish press could now no longer identify with the support. One reporter wrote:

Much as I admire the Tartan Army, it’s time they stopped willy-nilly adulation of losing teams. Or do they now consider defeat acceptable? (*Daily Record*, II September 1992)

It required one Scottish fan writing in a low circulation, monthly publication to highlight the fact that fans had made deep personal investments in following the national side abroad which deserved some symbolic recompense. In underlining his point, the media’s ubiquitous contrast of English and Scottish fans was thrown back at them.
The fans are entitled to sing, dance and have a right good ceilidh - no matter the score. They pay hard earned cash for that right. And surely it is better for them to have a terracing Highland Fling than to go into the streets and kick some poor local senseless as our English counterparts are prone to do. (Scottish Football Today, October 1992)

**Conclusion: The Heart of the Matter**

Ethnography from Sweden and beyond would suggest that Scottish fans’ association with carnival behaviour does not always sustain the Scottish football authorities’ presentation of them. By definition, fan carnival harbours the potentialities of socially and politically disruptive activity. For the Scottish supporters, this activity would seem to be most perspicuously manifested in two areas.

Firstly, given the duration of football tournaments and the levels of alcohol consumed by the Scots throughout, incidents of behavioural excess are inevitable. Occasions when the animated, celebratory fans’ actions are an unwitting physical danger to others, fall into the cachet of ‘excess’. The self-monitoring of supporters (either personally or by more sober fellow fans) tends to minimize the number of these instances. Within the support, several social conventions are already well established to maximise the integration of fellow fans to the main fan corpus. They suppression of club identities or the long-standing prohibition on translating aggressive behaviour into violence are two key ingredients here. Anti-Englishness then plays an adhesive part in cementing positive relations with both the Scots’ hosts and opposition fans. There have been occasions when actual fan disorder and violence have taken place, during which fan activity might otherwise be mediated as beyond the party ‘excess’ and within the realms of conscious ‘hooliganism’. However, these episodes tend to be presented by fans, media and authorities as isolated incidents or, more commonly, consciously ignored.

So long as this taciturnity obtains, the greatest symbolic challenge from the supporters to the football authorities and media operates within the second, politically problematic area of fan carnival: control over the event itself. Contra the authorities, the fans’ positive, gregarious persona cannot be said to have been largely procured from governmental legislation and good PR by the men in suits. The claims that little has changed in any case by some fans, the brazen demonstration of boisterous agency by others, and the desire for autonomous travel and accommodation arrangements by the majority, are all testimonies to this dissenting position (Giulianotti 1994a). Media endeavours to construct images of unrealistically wholesome fan identities are resisted, while the full *mise en scène* of carnival cannot be recaptured by photographers’ directions.
Yet perhaps the greatest symbolic challenge contained within the fans’ carnival relates to their redefined role as ‘supporters’ of the team. It occurs where the barriers between authorities, players, media and fans are deconstructed in the latter’s favour. Often, power differentials are voluntarily ceded, such as after the valedictory victory over the CIS, when players and media mixed freely. More routinely, however, the possible ‘hijacking’ of the football event by supporters is contested by the authorities and media alike. But, having achieved the major Scottish triumph at the European Championships, the Tartan Army’s carnival can now seek to ‘dictate the play’ and dominate the football carnival on its own raucous, friendly terms. A day after the victory over the CIS, I met a famously Italophile journalist in Göteborg. By way of praising the Tartan Army’s performances in Sweden, he quoted a spectator there, the great striker Altofini, as saying: ‘The Scottish fans, they touched my heart’. Indeed. But what about his liver?

Notes

1 This research was financed by the U.K. Economic and Social Research Council. I am also grateful to Gerry Finn and Eric Dunning for their advice and comments on an earlier version of this paper.

2 Perhaps the most notorious inversion of bipolar opposites involving the Scottish carnivalesque occurred in Portugal in April 1993. Two fans from Edinburgh were arrested and convicted of gross indecency following what was described as a public ‘gay sex’ frolic on the Algarve. An ultimately successful campaign to release the men was led by their respective girlfriends, on the grounds that the men were purely heterosexual and their actions had been misinterpreted and exaggerated by the local Portugese.

3 The mythology of the Scottish ‘hard man’ is heavily imbued with the industrial, working-class cultural imagery of Glasgow and Red Clydeside. See Spring (1990: 76-91), which provides a valuable discussion of how the gangland machismo of No Mean City (Arthur & Long, 1935) has retained a post-war aurality in Clydeside popular culture. Macllvanney (1991: 166-184) also offers a characteristically empathetic tribute to Glasgow (male) citizens, ‘the unpretentious, the unintimidated’, in their mixture of sociability and machismo.

4 Firhill is the home ground of Partick Thistle F.C., Glasgow’s third biggest club.

5 The four stadia utilized by Euro ’92 were in Göteborg (Ullevi, 35,000 capacity), Stockholm (Råsunda Stadion, 27,000), Malmö (Malmö Stadion, 26,000), and Norrköping (Norrköping Idrottsplats, 17,000). Scotland played three Group Two matches only during the 1992 European Championship Finals: on 12 June, v. Netherlands (0-1) in Göteborg; on 15 June, v. Germany (0-2) in Norrköping; on 18 June, v. C.I.S. (3-0) in Norrköping.

6 Examples include, ‘Ole, Ole, Ole, Ole, Sverige, Sverige’, and the ‘Chorus of the Hebrew Slaves’ from Verdi’s Nabucco. The latter especially requires no translation for international participation - the complete inverse of the Scots’ lyric-orientated standards.

7 YTS stands for ‘Youth Training Scheme’. A British government creation ostensibly designed to enable the industrial training of school-leavers, it is popularly derided for exploitatively low wages, low guarantee of job prospects, and its political function in cutting official unemployment figures.
Arthur ‘Bomber’ Harris was the British wartime bomber command chief. Against the stated wishes of several German political leaders, a statue to his memory was unveiled in London by the Queen Mother a fortnight before the championships commenced.

The same statement was made by the head of the Scottish Liaison Unit, Deputy Chief Constable Bill Spence (Norrköping Tidningar 16 June 1992).

Jim Farry had already shown his disinterest in hosting the championships on the eve of the draw for the 1992 Finals, declining UEFA’s invitation to bid for the 1996 Finals, which were eventually awarded to England.
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