

“The difficulty seems to be making them more inclusive, rather than the fans”

A Critical Analysis of UEFA’s regulation on political messages and symbols

Author: Johannes Lindelöw

Master Thesis in Gender, Migration and Social Justice

Course: GNVM03

Spring/summer semester 2021

Department of Gender Studies

University of Lund

Supervisor: Katharina Kehl

Word count: 23,560

Abstract

In football, as well as in most sports, the question about politics being within it are highly debated. Questions related to nationalism, homophobia, racism, and sexism are all seen as permeating the sport. This is simultaneously topics that is facing resistance, especially through anti-racism-, and pro-LGBTQ+ campaigns. Although, the question remains, and football organisations are trying to deal with it in different ways. The complexity regarding it has been researched upon from many different perspectives, such as defining what is being political, to interpretations of symbols and meanings, and what is being allowed within the stadiums. This master thesis focuses on UEFA's regulations from 2016 regarding political messages that are unfit for the events and builds on the previous research. The method that is used is Carol Bacchi's *What's the problem represented to be?* and the theoretical framework is based on Chantal Mouffe's theorisation on the political and Nira Yuval-Davis theorisation on nationalism. The findings are that the political is understood closely related to antagonism and nationalism and that UEFA differently apply their regulations depending on the political message's origin and belonging within UEFA.

Key words: *UEFA, Political, Antagonism, Nationalism, WPR.*

Nyckelord: *UEFA, Politiskt, Antagonism, Nationalism, WPR*

Acknowledgements

First of I want to thank my supervisor, Katharina Kehl. You have been more than helpful during the writing process contributing with important feedback, appreciating and encouraging words, as well as a flexibility for my decision to write over the summer, which resulted in meetings in between vacation and family business. I also want to give my regards to my fellow students who foremost ahead of this course has given me invaluable perspectives and insights throughout these two years in the program. This, along with the shared agony and support over what a thesis writing can imply, has all made the writing much more pleasing. Lastly, Malin, Matthew and Sam, without your help editing the grammar and contributing with inputs on the content, I would not be able to finalise this thesis, neither would I be able get my points through or understood. Tack!

Table of Contents

- Abbreviations 5
- 1. Introduction** 6
- 2. Aim & Research questions** 8
- 3. Literature review/previous research** 9
- 4. Theory** 12
- 5. Methodology** 16
- 6. Method and Material** 18
 - 6.1 Method..... 18
 - 6.2 Material 22
- 7. Analysis** 24
 - 7.1 What’s the problem represented to be? 24
 - 7.2 What presuppositions or assumptions underlie this representation of the ‘problem’? 30
 - 7.3 How has this representation of the ‘problem’ come about? 38
 - 7.4 What is left unproblematic in this problem representation? 44
 - 7.5 What effects are produced by this representation of the ‘problem’?..... 49
 - 7.6 How/where is this representation of the ‘problem’ produced, disseminated, and defended? . 53
- 8. Summary of the analysis and conclusion** 58
- 9. References** 61

Abbreviations

CEDB – Control, Ethics and Disciplinary Body

FA - The English Football Association

FIFA – International Federation of Association Football

PR – Problem Representation

Q1 – Question 1; *What's the problem represented to be?*

Q2 – Question 2; *What presuppositions or assumptions underlie this representation of the 'problem'?*

Q3 – Question 3; *How has this representation of the 'problem' come about?*

Q4 – Question 4; *What is left unproblematic in this problem representation?*

Q5 – Question 5; *What effects are produced by this representation of the 'problem'?*

Q6 – Question 6; *How/Where is this representation of the 'problem' produced, disseminated, and defended? How could it be questioned, disrupted, and replaced?*

UEFA – Union of European Football Associations

WPR – What's the problem represented to be?

1. Introduction

Football is one of the biggest sports in the world and reaches out to every corner of it while engaging millions of people every year (Kuhn, 2019). It is present in our everyday life, impacts our understanding of others as well as the idea of ourselves, and helps us connect with people we never met before. The practitioners, supporters, or staff who are all involved in the phenomena in some ways are all coming from different classes, cultures, nations, and contexts and are all involved in the socialisation and participation that has become a part of the game. Apart from all individuals and groups, both professional and grass-root football has in the modern days come to be organised through different organisations and institutions either on a national or an international level. These organisations set the rules, the qualification requirements, and are the main arrangers of the biggest tournaments we follow annually or every second, or fourth year. Many of the organisations that are in charge of the regulations regarding these questions, has earned a bad reputation because of leaked stories of corruption and bribes when it comes to for example the choice of hosts for these huge monetary events, such as the International Federation of association Football [FIFA] World Cup and the Euros (Conn, 2015, 27 May). This has contributed to the common feeling among many supporters that the politics behind the scenes in the institutions are not fair nor made for the common interest, but rather that decisions are made behind closed doors where nepotism and money seem to guide the decision-making processes.

What is, and has been, an ongoing debate when it comes to football is the one about politics and its being within the sport. This debate historically is reaching back to questions of whom is allowed to play, depending on one's sex, class, culture, and more, along with questions of allowed flags, symbols, and languages shown or spoken within the stadiums (Kuhn, 2019). In contemporary times these debates are prolonged. There are numerous cases, such as Nicolas Anelka and the Quenelle-gesture (Guardian Staff, 2014, 21 Jan), the Irish and Scottish supporters waving Palestinian flags (Sherwood & Beaumont, 2016, 23 Aug), Granit Xhaka, Xherdan Shaqiri, and Kosovare Asllani and their depictions of the Albanian eagle (Lowe, 2018, 23 June; Norberg, 2018, 30 Aug), that have been deemed as political when acknowledging or taking a stand for national identities or different forms of discriminations, which afterwards let to fines, suspensions or threats of potential reprisals.

There exists an underlying assumption that the sport and football arena, and its atmosphere, is fair, inclusive and apolitical and that the political is problematic since it goes against these

ideals. This core idea though, that we are all treated equally, has several times been proven more difficult to live up to than as imagined or hoped, both among spectators and athletes (Buzuvis, 2010; Lindelöw, 2019; Kuhn, 2019).

In 2021 this debate has continued, for example in Copa America when the host country, Argentina (originally alongside Colombia) withdraw themselves as hosts of the tournament because of the Covid-19 pandemic, which instead meant that Confederación Sudamericana de Fútbol, Conmebol, handed over the host ship to Brazil who had a very different approach and attitude towards the pandemic (Law, 2021, 9 June). This simultaneously as the Euros 2020, which were held according to the plans of UEFA also during the pandemic, gave us examples of this debate when the German goalkeeper Manuel Neuer wore a rainbow-coloured armband in solidarity to the pride month which were denounced by UEFA, without any reprisals this time though (AFP, 2021, 21 June). This discussion got even more complex when the German Football Association wanted to display the official Uefa stadium, Allianz Arena, in rainbow colours in the upcoming game against Hungary as a response to Hungary's parliament and the decision to ban gay people from featuring in school education materials as well as in tv-shows for under-18s (Connolly, 2021, 22 June). This was not acceptable according to UEFA as they referred to their regulations about political and religious neutrality.

These tournaments are examples of how closely linked political issues are to the sport and foremost its practitioners and supporters but also when it comes to the planning of these events. UEFA's regulations, and how they are applied, are also examples of how the debate is interlinked with questions of human rights, non-discrimination, and the interpretation of what is political. This is what this thesis will investigate further by looking at how UEFA is constructing the boundaries for the political within the game and how the regulations are applied.

2. Aim & Research questions

This study is of interest because of the social impact football can have on a global scale. Since football is one of the most popular and widespread sports, with millions of practitioners and followers (Kuhn, 2019, p. 51), football has an almost unique position to reach out and have a unifying impact. Hence, the discussion regarding politics and the political is of importance to ongoingly scrutinise. As mentioned above, football is directly linked to social phenomena such as class, nationality, sex, and gender among others, and are constantly contributing to reaffirm and redefine notions such as these.

This thesis aims to investigate how UEFA constructs the boundaries of ‘the political’ within the stadiums during their competitions, and accordingly, to explore which identities are, and which are not, seen as political in the stadiums.

Research questions:

General

- How does UEFA construct the boundaries of what is being ‘political’ within football stadiums?

Sub-questions

- What visible symbols are identified as political during their events?
- Which identities are seen as political by UEFA based on the construction of the political?
- How does UEFA’s rules on public expressions affect what kind of displays supporters can make within the stadiums?

3. Literature review/previous research

This chapter aims to present previous research and literature on the topic, to introduce the field of science which I have used as a starting point and to study the subject from an academic point of view. The review both encompasses the debate of politics and football, including issues such as pro-LGBTQ+ and anti-racism campaigns, nation-state identities and nationalism, as well as football and its stadiums as arenas for political leaders to propagate their agendas. Below follows hereby a brief overview of what the literature entails, while a more thorough evaluation of them is followed in the analysis.

In Gabriel Kuhn's (2019) book he provides us with the history of football and its close bound to politics and political actors around the world. Kuhn presents numerous examples of football and politics as interrelated. Football has always been used as a symbol for political purposes, from anti-Franco resistance by the Catalan club FC Barcelona and the Basque clubs Athletic Bilbao and Real Sociedad to nationalistic endeavour in Australia, Chile, and Algeria among many other (Kuhn, 2019, p. 59-65). It is argued in the book that football has always been used as a tool for political success, just as politics have been used for success in football. Kuhn convincingly argues that football not only *can* be a tool but that it rather *is* a tool, for political purposes, just as anything else. What is relevant is when, where and how it is used.

Apart from fermenting nationalistic views and ideas, and disruptions in general regarding political views, Kuhn also shows how football has dealt with violence among the supporters around the world and problematises how the increased fortification and securitisation has had a counterproductive effect and that the argumentation for the need of enhanced security lack empirical basis (Kuhn, 2019, p. 67). Kuhn also describes the complexity for global organisations, such as UEFA and FIFA, to deal with the question of politics in relation to football, since those approaches (so far) have not been examples of neutrality or equal treatment of supporters. One example is the accusations against UEFA for eurocentrism when banning both hijabs and goal celebrations which includes kippas, while allowing players to cross themselves without any repercussions (Kuhn, 2019, p. 55).

All these topics will be touched upon in this research and Kuhn's findings will be used to give insight into the problems that occurs in contemporary football as well as those which has occurred historically.

Martin Polley (2004) presents the history of a growing acceptance and/or understanding of dual or multiple identities within Englishness and the national identity. National identity is treated in a subjective sense, where the focus is on how people feel, or do not feel, English (2004, p. 12). He presents historical athletes who have challenged and changed the discourse of national identity in England. It ranges from examples where black and Asian sports practitioners have increased the diversity of ethnic background, to religious assimilations as in the case of the uncle and nephew of George Cohen and Ben Cohen (Polley, 2004, p. 16 – 18). This is further developed by looking at how, for many following sports, this development has been problematic, since the blending of identities has been viewed as equal to a dilution of Englishness and a division of loyalties.

Jonathan Ervine (2017) writes in his article about the complicated environment the contemporary debate about sport, race, and protest have become. Within that context he analyses the case of the footballer Nicolas Anelka who while playing for West Bromwich Albion in December 2013 did a Quenelle salute. He contributes to the field by assessing the relationship between football, politics, and protest. The gesture led to disciplinary action from the English Football Association [FA] and was seen as a complicated and controversial case. The complexity of the case, and what turned out to be the biggest discussion surrounding it, was that the gesture's is widely associated with anti-Semitism (Ervine, 2017, p. 241). Although, Anelka among some other, argued that it was merely an anti-system symbol. Nonetheless what the meaning of the gesture really is, a conclusion Ervine draws is that the gesture falls under the category of protest gestures.

Based on a survey consisting of 3,500 respondents Cashmore and Cleland (2012) investigates the view of football supporters towards gay footballers. The findings shows that contrary to the assumptions of homophobia, evidence is that homophobia sees a rapidly decrease within football. Based on Eric Anderson's theorisation of *inclusive masculinity*, the authors finds that 93 percent of the supporters do not see any place of homophobia within the sport. The view among the supporters is rather that agents and clubs are lacking in openness. They also see a need to challenge governing football organisations in opposing the secrecy that surrounds gay players and to provide a more inclusive environment to be supportive towards players who wants to come out (Cashmore & Cleland, 2012, p. 383-385).

Cleland (2018) focuses on football the mean that the emergence of regulated and professional association football was quickly recognised as an important and powerful component, especially within the working classes, of local and national identity. Football also became a

symbol of masculinity and engrained millions of boys and men as future generations of male fans. This resulted in a few different aspects, and Cleland focuses in his research on the sexism and homophobia that was seen heightened especially in the 90s. Since then, he argues, there have been a more inclusive change within the sport (Cleland, 2018, p. 415-418). This article focus is on reviewing the empirical research on these matters and focuses on players and fans, as well as the print and online media.

Summary

In relation to the previous research presented above, my aim of contribution to this field will be to enhance the research on how the debate regarding politics and football are being implemented. By looking at the regulations brought forward by UEFA, my aim is to understand outcomes of the implementation of those regulations in practice and to understand what is seen as political within the game of football. The literature relates to my research as it provides important inputs and findings as in combination of critic towards anti-political messages, insight on the complexities a discussion of what a protest is, what is seen as political and how a symbol is to be interpreted (Ervine, 2017; Polley, 2004; Kuhn, 2019). Further, when investigating the historical debate of supporter violence and inclusiveness the previous research brings in aspects that might affect UEFA's and other football organisation's handling of the issue (Cashmore & Cleland, 2012; Cleland, 2018; Kuhn, 2019).

4. Theory

This chapter introduces the theoretical concepts that will be used during the overall analysis of the empirical material and throughout the *What's the problem represented to be* [WPR] approach, as well as showing how I arrived at the concepts best suited to help me understand the puzzle that is looming. I will be using Chantal Mouffe's theorisation on 'the political' along with Nira Yuval-Davis theorisation on nationalism, cultural discourses, and hegemony. Since this thesis aims to investigate the construction of the boundaries of what 'the political' is by UEFA the problem I am looking at is whose conception, of what 'the political' is, is being heard. This further relates to which identities that are being problematised in the stadiums through the implementation of the regulations.

On the political - Chantal Mouffe

Chantal Mouffe writes about 'the political' and its place in the world. She sees a shift where political differences are asked to be put aside, with the argument that the real struggle is between good and evil (Mouffe, 2005, p. 1-5). She problematises this liberal 'third way thinking' that instead of expanding democracy, rather limits and undermines the radical and combative fundamentals of democratic life. In modern-day she sees that the aim for consensus politics, instead of combating extremism rather weakens the potential to challenge it. She questions the view that partisan conflicts are a thing of the past and that we live in a time where consensus is ever reachable through dialogue, something she calls a post-political vision. She is challenging the progressive camp which she means has accepted the optimistic view of globalisation and that advocates for a consensual form of democracy.

Mouffe differentiates between 'politics' and 'the political', where 'politics' is explained as a set of practices and institutions where an order is created, an order which organises human coexistence in the context of conflicts that is provided through and by the political (2005, p. 9). 'The political' is the dimension of antagonism which according to her is constitutive of human societies. It is her view and theorisation on the political that will be in focus in this thesis. She argues that it is the ontological dimension of 'the political' that lacks an understanding and that this is the cornerstone of our incapacity to think politically.

What Mouffe argues is missing in the debate, and in the strive to reach a world 'beyond hegemony' and 'beyond antagonism', is the acknowledgement of the antagonistic dimensions

that are constitutive of 'the political' (2005, p. 2). Apart from the technical issue related to politics that Mouffe argues can be solved by experts, what she sees is missing is the acknowledgement that all political questions involve a choice between conflicting alternatives (2005, p. 10). She means that the incapacity to think politically is to a large extent due to the uncontested hegemony of liberalism. Hence, the discussion on the political is still missing an honest debate about antagonism and its place within it, or in the political field. Liberalism is seen as consisting of a dominant thought that is characterised by a rationalist and individualistic approach which closes out the nature of collective identities. This leads to an inability to grasp the pluralistic nature of our social world, with the conflicts a pluralistic world entail. Conflicts that cannot be solved by a rational solution. The typical understanding of liberalism is that we live in a world where many perspectives and values exist, and that owing to empirical limitations, it is an impossibility to adopt them all, but when put together a harmonious and non-conflictual ensemble are constituted. Hence, this type of liberalism must deny the antagonistic dimension in the political. This is an important aspect in Mouffe's theorisation, and it will be closely linked to the analysis of UEFA's construction of what is being political.

The other central trait Mouffe emphasises regarding liberal thought is the rationalist belief in the availability of a universal consensus based on reason (2005, p. 11-12). This continues the blind spot of the political. Liberal rationalism needs to negate antagonism since what is revealed by antagonism is the limits of a rational consensus. This blindness to the political in its antagonistic dimension is therefore not seen as a mere empirical omission, but rather a constitutive one, which will prevail as long as liberal thought adheres to individualism and rationalism.

The 'natural order' at this given moment, accompanied with common sense, is the result of what Mouffe calls sedimented practices; the 'natural order' is never a display of deeper objectivity that is external to the practices that bring it into being (2005, p. 18). Along with this, Mouffe's theorisation about antagonism and agonism related to the political will be used in the analysis and especially in Q2, Q3, Q4, and Q6 to help the analysis forward in scrutinising these questions. It will be used to look into why the political is problematised, how I can understand the view on the political, and the links between the political and security, who are being politicised, and how this can be looked at differently by UEFA.

Gender and Nation - Nira Yuval-Davis

Nira Yuval-Davis explores in her book how gender relations contribute to nationalist projects, including a nation's reproduction, culture, and citizenship, where the contesting relations between feminism and nationalism are at the centre (2008). She argues that nationhood is constructed and that within that construction-specific notions of 'manhood' and 'womanhood' are involved. The nationalist ideologies naturalise the hegemony of one collectivity and its access to the ideological apparatus of both the state and the civil society (Yuval-Davis, 2008, p. 11). This naturalisation is also at the roots of the inherent connection between nationalism and racism when minorities are assumed different from the 'normal' and hence are excluded from power resources.

Culture discourses are more a battleground than a shared point of departure (Yuval-Davis, 2008, p. 42-43). The concept of *Cultural Homogeneity* is the result of hegemony, and this homogeneity is more limited and more noticeable in the centre, rather than in the margins, hence being affected by the carriers' social positionings. It is important to recognise the two contradictory coexistent elements in the operation of cultures: the tendency for stabilisation and continuity on one hand, and that for perpetual resistance and change on the other. This is relevant for this thesis since the scrutinization of UEFA allows us to investigate this homogeneity. Yuval-Davis refers to many different scholars in her work, for example to Antonio Gramsci and Michel Foucault as theorists who point out the dynamic social process occurring among cultures and in the intersections between them. In the contested terrains different cultural voices become more or less hegemonic through their interpretations of the world. Other researchers, such as Trinh Minh-ha and Donna Haraway, are also referred to in her discussions on culture and nationalism and will be included in the analysis to contribute with nuanced and related perspectives on the topics.

By analysing UEFA in this thesis, the aim is to see which of these cultural voices are being heard, and which cultural voices are contributing to UEFA's construction of the political and their view on objectivity.

Summary

Mouffe's and Yuval-Davis' theories will be present throughout the analysis in the thesis. The antagonism Mouffe argues are ignored within the field of politics, along with her discussion

on *universal consensus* which is closely linked to the view on *objectivity* (a more comprehensive discussion follows below), together with Yuval-Davis's discussion on *cultural homogeneity* and *hegemony*, will be reoccurring matters of discussion.

Further on, will Yuval-Davis discussion on the concept of *nationalism* and *cultural stuff*, such as symbols and the role they play, when it comes to discussions about nationalism and cultures, be included in the analysis in this thesis along with the idea of a *common destiny* that will be scrutinised as a possible obstacle and reason for UEFA's regulations. The inherent division in the concept will together with the theorisation around antagonism within the political be used to try to understand the reasons for a different treatment of objects especially analysed in Q2, Q4, Q5, and Q6.

5. Methodology

To understand how and why the political are continuously being contested and constructed one ought to examine the structures that legitimise these procedures. In this thesis will a post-structuralist standpoint be used, which means that institutions and norms are interesting to scrutinise since these are seen as the ones creating meaning (Bergström & Boréus, 2012, p. 28-29). One basic benchmark is that post-structuralists questions the taken for granted-attitude in social sciences where categories such as 'woman', 'man' or 'class' are seen as fixed or certain. Rather, post-structuralists believes that a category is constructed by discourses, rather than having a pre-given essence. The cases from the documents will be used as examples of how and what are deemed as political by UEFA, and hence trespassing the boundaries of what is allowed at the stadiums, and accordingly work as indicators on how UEFA construct the meaning of the political.

Sandra Harding is a feminist researcher who differentiates between methodology and methods where she describes methods as a technique to gather material and data, while methodology is a theory and analysis of how research should proceed (1987, p. 2-3). Harding further contributes with her view on science which she explains is about the epistemological discussion regarding knowledge and the problematisation on who can be a researcher, who's experiences and observations that are seen as legitimate for knowledge along with whether subjective truths can be seen as knowledge. Another feminist researcher, Donna Haraway, also problematised the field of science as both masculine and white, and just as Harding, the role of the researcher (1988, p. 578-581). Standpoint Theory has as one of its main goals to deconstruct earlier science claims on truth and objectivity, both regarding the positioning of the researcher and to minimise bias. Objectivity, from a feminist perspective, is closely referred to Situated Knowledge, Haraway's famous concept, which implies that the starting point of the production of knowledge must come from beneath, based on women's experiences and the embodiment of androcentric structures that are limiting and affecting the everyday life. Sharlene Nagy Hesse-Biber and Patricia Lina Leavy are also two feminist researchers who problematises the concept of objectivity and foremost the idea of objective knowledge (2007, p. 45). Their view is that the idea of a universal true necessitates a separation of ideology and science. It is viewed as an understanding of the world which would not be trapped by political and individual beliefs. Feminist empiricists argue that it is

necessary to negotiate and to bridge the boundaries of subject/object and ideology/science to improve the aim for objectivity.

The contributions of the above-mentioned feminist researchers are vital parts of my standpoint in the thesis in a few different ways. First, it relates to the matter of knowledge and UEFA's view on what 'the political' is, as in what they ascribe the notion and for whom this definition aligns. Objectivity relates to this, and very much so to UEFA's handling of this matter through their regulations. As will be further developed in the analysis UEFA's interpretations of both objectivity and the definition of 'the political' has a great impact on how this matter is approached and regulated. This is also closely linked to Yuval-Davis' theorisation on cultural discourses.

Reflexivity is another important and well-debated concept when it comes to feminist research (Doucet & Mauthner, 2006; Harding, 1987). Doucet and Mauthner underscore that the concept of reflexivity has a theoretical diversity (2006, p. 41 – 42). They also point to the fact that listing off one's subject position, in relation to gender, sexuality, class, ethnicity, etc. is not enough. Rather reflexivity is a continuous process of reflecting on *“personal, interpersonal, institutional, pragmatic, emotional, theoretical, epistemological and ontological influences on our research and interpretive processes”* (Doucet & Mauthner, 2006, p. 42). In this thesis, I will reflect throughout my analysis on the different findings and the different crossroads that lead my analysis in different directions based on my interpretations and decisions of approaches. I also want to highlight Doucet and Mauthner's notion of 'reflexivity in retrospect' which is about viewing your research and the knowledge one produces as an open-ended and continuous process as researcher revisit the data and as new researchers examine and re-study old data sets.

6. Method and Material

6.1 Method

Carol Bacchi's WPR approach, is a discourse analysis that looks at the representation of a problem in policies. Bacchi argues that there is a dominant paradigm that politics shall solve problems (Bacchi, 2009, p.31). Problems that exist, can be identified, and thereby adjusted; solving the problem is in focus. What Bacchi is looking for is critical scrutiny of the claimed problem and is therefore implementing another paradigm, which is problem questioning. The aim is to challenge the dominant paradigm of problem-solving. How a problem is represented, instead of just accepting what is claimed to be the problem, is of great importance (Bacchi, 2009, p. 46). What also is an important take in this approach, is that when a solution to a problem is decided upon, this means that a lot of factors must be simplified. This in turn means that the whole story has not been told. Hence the aspect of scrutinising what the problem representation [PR] has included and excluded (Bacchi, 2009, p. xii). Following Bacchi's line of thought, policies contain implicit representations of the 'problems' they claim to address. In turn, this enacts 'problems' as a particular sort of problem, and these are crucial in the way of how governing transpires. The WPR approach, which consists of six questions, will therefore be an important tool to reach the purpose of this study of analysing UEFA's construction of what the political is. This since the approach can help find underlying assumptions that are creating the PR, along with letting us understand *why* the regulations are focusing on the political and answer us how the problematisation has come about. Below follows an introduction of the six questions that the WPR approach consists of.

Q1: What's the problem represented to be?

The argument is that how you feel about an issue will determine how you suggest to 'sort' it, a theory that can also be applied to a policy intervention with the purpose to illuminate how certain issues and PRs are being thought about (Bacchi, 2009, p. 3). The WPR approach works backward, by analysing the concrete proposal to solve the 'problem' to focus on what the proposal represents as a problem. The basic idea, and what is questioned, is that the problems that are represented commonly are seen existing outside their context, it or they are seen as exogenous, something that can be 'found' and 'discovered'. Bacchi's idea rather implies that the problems are endogenous and that they are created from within the process

and context of ‘finding’ the problems. What is argued is that a policy constructs a problem in and through the making. The goal of Q1 in this thesis is to analyse what UEFA constructs as the problem and hence what PR their regulations present.

Q2: What presuppositions or assumptions underlie this representation of the ‘problem’?

The basic idea is that for a proposal to do a certain thing, in a policy, the problem must be assumed to be that certain thing (Bacchi, 2009, p. 5-6). The term presuppositions refer to the ‘knowledge’ that is taken for granted and includes epistemological and ontological assumptions. What is important to clarify though, is that the WPR approach does not want to identify biases or beliefs *held* by the policy makers, but rather to identify presuppositions or assumptions that are lodged within the PR. It is a fine line, but a WPR approach wants to consider how the arguments are *shaped*, and how the ‘knowledge’ is formed for the statements to be intelligible. One looks for how it is possible to happen, not why something happens. Here Foucault’s influence on the approach is clear, a WPR approach is interested in what is possible to think, and what could be thought. Deep-seated cultural values and certain mentalities are what I want to uncover. Discourses are vital to understand deep-seated cultural premises. So, the aim is to dig deeper to understand how meaning is created through ways of using the language. The language that the policies are expressed in. In Q2 I want to understand the knowledge that enable the PR and to analyse the language that UEFA uses in their disciplinary regulations documents, but here I will also look at the cases, where the interpretations and decisions are believed to be helpful to analyse.

Q3: How has this representation of the ‘problem’ come about?

There are two interconnected objectives with Q3 (1) to reflect on developments and decisions that enable, or make the formation of the identified PR, plausible, and (2) to recognise that contesting PRs occur over time and space, and because of that, things could have developed differently (Bacchi, 2009, p. 10-11). This perspective is achieved by drawing on Foucault’s theory on genealogy. Instead of assuming the ‘history’, one must follow the twists and turns to avoid what is common to do, to assume that the current practices and institutions, and the ways we understand ‘problems’, are the inevitable product of natural evolution through time. What needs to be done is to identify specific points in history, when vital decisions were

made, and the issue was taking a certain direction. From there, we can see that the PR is contingent and therefore easily affected by change. What genealogy helps us with is to have a destabilising effect on PRs that most often are taken for granted. We are also given insights on power relations, and hence possibly an understanding of why some PRs were successful, and others not. This gives us the focus on process, on how something came to be. With regards to the aim of this thesis, and keeping in mind the limitations time ascribe us, I will focus on the history of politics in football in general, and link this to UEFA's standpoint on the topic in today's regulations.

Q4: What is left unproblematic in this problem representation? Where are the silences? Can the 'problem' be thought about differently?

This is where the critical potential of WPR makes its entrance. The PR is to be problematised and scrutinised (Bacchi, 2009, p. 12-14). The overall view here is that policies are constrained by the ways the 'problem' is represented, that is why one want to bring in silenced perspectives. Binaries, which simplify complex experiences, can be good to start from since they can indicate where the simplifications misrepresent certain issues. This part of the analysis draws attention to tensions or contradictions in the PR. i.e., highlighting limitations in the way the 'problem' is represented. Genealogies can be helpful to identify other PRs that did not see the light and can help identify silences as well. Q4 will be used to analyse what differs when it comes to the implementation of UEFA's regulations. What is seen as political, and what is not? And hence, what is not problematised because it is not seen as political. Q4 will be an important part of the analysis because it will help answer both how implications differ because of UEFA's regulations, but also who is not regulated in the stadiums.

Q5: What effects are produced by this representation of the 'problem'?

Q5 is about clarifying which members of a social group that are more harmed by the policy than other groups (Bacchi, 2009, p. 15). What is analysed is how the policies function to benefit some and harm others. This is not about 'outcomes' as in evaluations, effects are rather seen as more subtle in their way to influence and rely for understanding on poststructuralist and feminist body theory. Three effects need to be weighed up (1) Discursive

effects; which are about the effects that follow from the limitations imposed on what one can think and say, (2) Subjectification effects; the effects shown in how subjects and subjectivities are constituted in discourse, and (3) lived effects; the effects we see impacting life and death.

Discursive effects:

Q2, Q3, and Q4 identify deep-seated assumptions within PRs, how discourses give expression to these, as well as the silences the discourses contain (Bacchi, 2009, p. 16). The proposal is that if some options for possible social interventions are closed off because of the way the ‘problem’ is represented, this can lead to harmful effects for certain people.

Subjectification effects:

The idea is that we become a particular kind of subject through the ways in which policies set up social relationships and where/how we are positioned within them (Bacchi, 2009, p. 16-18). PRs often imply that groups are put in opposition to each other. Foucault calls these dividing practices. The stigmatisation of targeted minorities serves a governmental purpose, where a desired behaviour is indicated and encouraged. Additionally, PRs usually have implications of whom are responsible for the ‘problem’. Hence, the WPR wants to bring the implied attributions of responsibility under scrutiny to ‘decide’ whether responsibilities are being appropriately sheeted home, and what effects are following. Bacchi means that is vital to keep in mind that the effects can reinforce the social status quo. That is why the political implications, that come with the constitution of the subject through the PRs, need attention. This is a crucial part of the methodology. The goal is to be able to say which aspects in the PRs that have effects for which groups. In Q5 I will be focusing mostly on the different cases. What I want to analyse is the discourses around the different cases, as well as looking into the subject positions created by UEFA, when constructing the boundaries of the ‘political’.

The lived effects discussed by Bacchi will not be included in the analysis. This decision is based on a belief that it would require a lot more different empirical material to outline the lived effects of the PRs and to be able to perform an interesting analysis. It is also an effect because of time limitations and prioritisation with regards to the aim of the thesis, where the construction of the boundaries of the political are more related to the two first effects outlined in Q5.

Q6: How/where is this representation of the ‘problem’ produced, disseminated, and defended? How could it be questioned, disrupted and replaced?

Q6 builds on Q3 and asks which practices and processes that allow the PR to dominate and how the PR reach its target audience and achieve legitimacy (Bacchi, 2009, p. 19). Based on Foucault’s thinking, I ought to ask what individuals, groups, or classes have access to a certain kind of discourse. What is also of relevance is the relationship between discourse, speakers, and its audience, and how this is institutionalised. In Q6 I will study how UEFA defends the decisions of the cases and oppose the different appeals and look at how the PR can be rethought and replaced. Here will Mouffe’s theorisation on agonism be in focus.

6.2 Material

To be able to study how UEFA constructs the boundaries of politics, I have decided to use four documents from UEFA as my empirical material. The first one is where I find UEFA’s regulations, the document *UEFA Disciplinary Regulations, Edition 2016* (UEFA, 2016c). In this document, one finds all the regulations that are referred to in the case law documents that will be presented below. These regulations describe the infringements, the application of penalties, how the organisation governs, actions of the disciplinary bodies, as well as the procedures to be followed for these bodies (UEFA, 2016c, p. 7).

Since the aim of this thesis is to investigate UEFA’s construction of the political and to explore which identities are, and are not, seen as political in the stadiums, the focus in this research will be on cases that solely fall under clause 2.e in Article 16. This clause is reading:

“[T]he use of gestures, words, objects or any other means to transmit any message that is not fit for a sports event, particularly messages that are of a political, ideological, religious, offensive or provocative nature” (UEFA, 2016c, p. 15).

The regulations in the above-mentioned document are explained to ensure that the objectives of UEFA are followed accordingly with Article 2 of the *UEFA Statutes* (UEFA, 2016c, p. 7). In *UEFA’s Statutes*, the objectives of UEFA are outlined in article 2 (UEFA, 2016d, p. 1-2). This will also be a document relevant to include in the material for this thesis and its content will be presented in Q1 and referred to as the analysis goes on.

Additionally, apart from the regulations and the statutes, the material will consist of cases issued by UEFA as breaking article 16.2 (e). This will be helpful to answer the aim of the thesis, how UEFA constructs the boundaries of what the political is. The reports where UEFA present the cases from 2016 are:

1. *Case law – Control, Ethics, and Disciplinary Body & Appeals Body, season 2015/2016, January 2016 – June 2016* (UEFA, 2016a),
2. *Case law – Control, Ethics, and Disciplinary Body & Appeals Body, Season 2016/17, July 2016 – December 2016* (UEFA, 2016b),

Twice a year UEFA releases these reports where all the cases under 6 months are summoned up and shared with the public and for those who are interested. The decisions are issued by UEFA's disciplinary bodies (UEFA, 2016a, p. 5; UEFA, 2016b, p. 4). If a decision contains confidential information, UEFA might decide to publish an anonymised version, either as their own choice or as a request by any of the parties of that specific case. Lastly, the two bodies that are involved in the decision making are the UEFA Control, Ethics and Disciplinary Body [CEDB] and the UEFA Appeals Body who answers on the appeals concerning the cases.

That this research is focusing on the cases from 2016 is done for two reasons. The first is that there was a quite famous case that year that caught quite a lot of media attention in Europe. It was in the game between Celtic and Hapoel Be'er Sheva that there were more than a hundred Palestinian flags unfurled during the game by Celtic supporters (Sherwood & Beaumont, 2016, 23 Aug). Celtic was subsequently charged by UEFA for this with reference to Article 16.2 (e). What will be shown as all the cases are presented in the analysis below, is that this case is not included in UEFA's documents. The second reason why 2016 is an interesting year to investigate is based on the researcher's belief that it would be an added value to scrutinise one of the years when UEFA, apart from only arranging club tournaments, also arrange a tournament for national teams, the European championship. As happened to be, during this year the (men's) EURO 2016 was played in France.

7. Analysis

7.1 Q1 – What’s the problem represented to be?

In Q1, I will look at what the regulations propose and read off what the problem is represented to be. So, by adopting Q1 my goal will be to pinpoint the proposal to solve the ‘problem’, which will lead me into what the proposal depicts as a problem (Bacchi, 2009, p.3). I want to illuminate the implied exogenous problem, and instead find the endogenous problem, which has been created within the problem-finding context. To understand this, I will look at the purpose of the regulations, which are based on UEFA’s objectives, and hence also needs clarification, and then will specifically article 16.2 (e) in *UEFA Disciplinary Regulations* (2016c) be scrutinised. The cases will also be included in the Q1 analysis and will as well be further analysed throughout the WPR approach.

In Article 1.2 in the *UEFA Disciplinary Regulations*, it is stated that the purposes of the regulations are to ensure that UEFA’s objectives (2016c, p. 7) are followed in accordance with Article 2 in the *UEFA Statutes* (UEFA, 2016d, p. 1-2). The objectives are fourteen to its number, and among them, I find four objectives that I interpret as relevant for the regulations and hence, for the purpose of this thesis. Those are as follows:

Objective b) - *“promote football in Europe in a spirit of peace, understanding and fair play, without any discrimination on account of politics, gender, religion, race or any other reason”* (UEFA, 2016d, p. 2).

Objective h) – *“promote unity among Member Associations in matters relating to European and world football”*

Objective j) – *“ensure that the needs of the different stakeholders in European football (leagues, clubs, players, supporters) are properly taken into account”*

Objective k) – *“act as a representative voice for the European football family as a whole”*

Additionally, since it was found in objective b), it is of relevance to include UEFA’s definition of Fair play, which goes:

“‘Fair play’ means acting according to ethical principles which, in particular, oppose the concept of sporting success at any price, promote integrity and equal

opportunities for all competitors, and emphasise respect of the personality and worth of everyone involved in a sporting event” (UEFA, 2016d, p. 1).

Further, Article 16 explains that the hosts, both clubs and national associations, of an event, are responsible for the order and security, both inside and in the proximity of the stadiums, before, during, and after the games (UEFA, 2016c, p. 15). The hosts are also liable for any kind of incident and may face, if they cannot prove that they have not been negligent in the organisation of the match, disciplinary measures. Apart from this, all associations and clubs are also liable for any inappropriate behaviour of their supporters and may if occurring face disciplinary measures. It is in the list of inappropriate behaviours that *the political* makes it entrance in Article 16.2 (e). UEFA deems political messages particularly as unfit for a sports event, together with other messages of ideological, religious, offensive, or provocative nature.

So far, I have outlined that the PR is the political, on the basis that it is included in the regulations on what does not fit the sports event and hence in some regards are seen as an obstacle for UEFA and their objectives. One thing that is missing in the regulations and statutes though, is a definition of what UEFA sees as political. This implies that to be able to analyse the political I must deduce the ascription found in the cases deemed as political.

The Cases

Below follows a presentation and analysis of the cases, presented in the same order as presented in the documents. The focus is on all the cases that were issued based on Article 16.2 (e). In total, this means seven cases linked to this article, however, some cases include decisions on both provocative and political messages, and there will, if that is the case, be a separation between these acts where the focus in the analysis will be on what is referred to as political.

Case law: January – June 2016

Liverpool FC – On the 10th and 17th of March 2016, during two games, several Liverpool FC supporters directed shouts and gestures against the opponent supporters of Manchester United FC where the songs for example referred to the Munich air disaster (UEFA, 2016a, p. 44). A tragic incident in 1958 where seven of Manchester United’s players died in a plane crash on their way home from an away game in Belgrade (Wilson, 2018, 5 Feb). The songs were deemed as “*extremely offensive and utterly deplorable*” (UEFA, 2016a, p. 44) by the CEDB.

Liverpool agreed upon the reference to the disaster as being “*utterly inexcusable*” (UEFA, 2016a, p. 46). In summation, the chants and songs were deemed by the Appeals body as provocative, offensive, and insulting, which is unfit for a sports event (UEFA, 2016a, p. 48).

Manchester United FC – On the 10th and 17th of March 2016, during the same two games as in the case above, Manchester United FC supporters sang songs and chants towards the Liverpool FC supporters referring to the Hillsborough and Heysel stadium disasters (UEFA, 2016a, p. 56). 1989, 15 of April during the FA Cup semi-final between Liverpool and Nottingham Forest overcrowded stands meant that 96 people died and more than 700 were injured (Day, 2019, 28 Nov). What exactly happened and the responsibility around the tragic event are still being investigated. Heysel was another sad disaster that happened in Brussels in Belgium (Mullen, 2015, 29 May). On 29 May 1985 during the game between Liverpool and Juventus 39 people died and more than 600 were injured when fans were crushed against a wall that because of the pressure eventually collapsed. The CEDB stated that the songs and chants are deplorable and that they were highly offensive and of provocative nature (UEFA, 2016a, p. 59 - 63).

Football Federation of Ukraine – The flag of the organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists was displayed during the game. The Football Federation of Ukraine appealed against the decision made by the CEDB and argued that the flag is a traditional symbol and part of many Ukrainian regions, especially in the western parts where the match took place (UEFA, 2016a, p. 83). Another argument was that historical analysis shows that “*the formation of Cossacks republics on the territory of Ukraine black-and-red flag together with the blue and yellow flag has been widely used for identification of Ukrainian state*” (UEFA, 2016a, p. 83).

The Appeals body response was to decide whether the banner is illicit, and this was done through an analysis from an objective standpoint and by looking at the particular circumstances of the situation (UEFA, 2016a, p. 84-85). The Appeals body deemed it as not necessary that the flag had intentionally messaged something unfit for the sports event. It is only necessary to appear inappropriate to an objective observer, not necessarily does a message have to have a subjective intention to be deemed as unfit for a sports event. What is explained in this case as well is that the relevant factor in each separate case, in the eyes of the UEFA disciplinary bodies, is the relationship that exists between the potential message and

the football match, and how the potential message can be understood both within the stadium, by the home and away supporters, but also by the objective viewers watching on television (UEFA, 2016a, p. 85). This is explained as being even more relevant when it comes to competitions such as UEFA Champions League, and hence also UEFA Euros, which are followed by millions of football supporters all around the world. The Appeals body further stated that they could not obviate the conflict that was occurring in Ukraine during the time of the event, and because of that context symbols like the flag becomes more significant and sensitive (UEFA, 2016a, p. 86). The argument, therefore, was that “*banners which may content from an objective and reasonable perspective a message connected to the political situation of this country*” (UEFA, 2016a, p. 86) needs to be hindered from entering the stadiums.

FC Viktoria Plzen – On the 10th December 2015 in a game against Villareal CF, a banner was displayed in the crowd saying, ‘AC-AB’, meaning *All Cops Are Bastards*. The club did not appeal the decision but suggested that it was a minor offence (UEFA, 2016a, p. 108-110). The message was by the appeals body deemed clearly provocative/offensive and possibly political. This was not given more evaluation, but the inappropriateness and that it was unfit for a sporting event was emphasised.

Football Association of Serbia – In the game between Russia and Serbia, Serbian supporters displayed a non-formal flag of Kosovo as a part of Serbia and a flag of the Soviet Union during the game (UEFA, 2016a, p. 112 – 113). Kosovo was a region within Serbia until 1998-1999, when a political change in Belgrade and an armed uprising by the ethnic Albanian majority population triggered the violent conflict (Samsó, 2020, 18 June). Since 2008 Kosovo has declared independence but has not gained recognition from Serbia.

The Appeals body supported the decision by CEDB that the flags displayed constituted illicit banners that were not fit for a sports event, and hence fell under article 16.2 (e). The Football Association of Serbia did not question the factual circumstances.

FC Barcelona – 30,000 Estelada flags were distributed – within the stadium and displayed throughout the course of two matches. This was also combined occasionally with the chanting

of “*Independencia*” beginning at minute 17:14 of both halves (UEFA, 2016a, p. 180). The CEDB considered the Estelada-flags as illicit political banners along with the chants of “*Independencia*”. The Estelada flag is common in Barcelona and is seen as one of the most famous and popular ones (Pedregal, 2018, 27 May). Although it is not an official flag per se, it is closely related to the independence movement, and it is seen as the official flag of the movement. The name stems from the Catalan word for a shining star, ‘Estel’.

FC Barcelona has in previous cases admitted to the political character of the Estelada-flags as well as the chants that were seen referring to the year 1714, the year in which Catalonia lost its independence from Spain (UEFA, 2016, p. 182). This time though, they argued that it was not a political act but rather a representation of “*a historic, cultural and historical group*” (UEFA, 2016, p. 183). They further argued that a political message should be seen as an action where the intention is to promote active conduct among the receivers of the relevant message. This was not the case since the flags did not seek support for any message but rather symbolized a tradition of waving in the stadium without political connotations. Further they argued that the flags nor chants were of aggressive or provocative nature, and hence were not risking the order and security at the stadium (UEFA, 2016a, p. 183). It was argued that this did not influence or had negative effects on the security, which was confirmed by the match delegates who deemed the security to be excellent. The appellant also argued that in support of Swiss law, the Spanish constitution and the European convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms the freedom of expression support the displaying of flags and chants during football matches. Moreover, a recent decision by the Spanish Court where the Estelada-flags had been involved declared it as legal.

The Appeals body response to the appeal was that negative effects on order and security does not relate to article 16.2 a - e, but article 16.1 and is there explained to referring to the possible negligence of clubs and associations to adhere this regulation. It is therefore not necessary that political banners that are not fit for a sport event to be provocative (UEFA, 2016a, p. 186). The Appeals Body also responded to the appeal and whether the flags and chants should be interpreted as political or not (UEFA, 2016a, p. 185-188). The Appeals Body recalled previous proceedings where the appellant had admitted the political connotations of the Estelada-flags and that it then was displayed for such purposes. They also aligned with the CEDB on the regard that the flags were indeed political, and not a historic and cultural symbol. Considering the timing of the chants and flags the Appeals Body argued that a neutral and objective observer must have the impression that the behaviours were of a political

nature. Therefore, they did not agree with the appellant that the behaviour was solely a manifestation of a unity of a historic, cultural, and linguistic group. Additionally, they argued that it is not required beyond reasonable doubt that a banner is intended to be political, it is enough that it does, for an objective viewer, appear political, and therefore to be inappropriate for an event. The Appeals body also referred to the long-standing case law of the UEFA disciplinary bodies as regards the use of “illicit” banners at the stadiums are not the right place for displaying political messages that are not fit for sport events.

Case law: July – December 2016

FC Zurich – “Kurdistan, Kurdistan” were sung during the game and at the end of the game PKK flags were waved along with the displaying of an anti-Erdogan slogan along with shirts that together spelled “Dictator Erdogan” (UEFA, 2016b, p. 55).

The appellant argues that because of Switzerland’s neutrality to the conflict between Turkey and PKK, in addition to the fact that PKK is not regarded as an illegal organisation, plus the fact that the displaying of PKK flags in Switzerland is not illegal, none of the mentioned acts should be considered political messages (UEFA, 2016b, p. 56-58). They further argued that it should not be seen as a negative message unfit to sport, and that the rule refers to political propaganda insults and provocations. To solely mention the origin of certain supporters should not be considered illegal. The neutrality of the country also prohibits the club from making such chants. The Erdogan slogan was agreed upon being provocative and not fit for the sports event.

The CEDB reiterated that it is irrelevant whether a gesture or message is legal or illegal in the relevant country, since only the UEFA Disciplinary Regulations are of relevance. They also meant that the fact that the visiting team was from Turkey clarified that the banners shown by the home team supporters was a political demonstration and provocation.

Summary Q1

Out of the seven cases we are presented as falling under article 16.2 (e), two were not discussed as political, one case was deemed potentially political, while four cases were penalised for being political. Out of those four cases, there were three appellants who

questioned the UEFA bodies' decision or parts of them, while in the fourth case there were no appeal against it.

In short, the political is seen as problematic and unfit for sports event. The representation of this problem is based on a few different understandings. Firstly, it is understood being problematic since it is not in line with UEFA's objectives that the regulations are there to fulfil. Another important detail found when analysing the cases and which will be further analysed, is that the 'political' is something that is to be judged by an objective viewer and observer (UEFA, 2016a). Although, it is clarified in the FC Zurich case that the fact that the visitors was from Turkey was proof that the demonstration was political and provocative (UEFA, 2016b, p. 58). The FC Barcelona case tells that it is the interpretation of the one "receiving" the message that is of interest, not of the one displaying it. Additionally, all the cases that are deemed as political are all relating to issues related to nationalism.

Lastly, a fact that needs more elaboration is that UEFA does not provide us with a definition of the political. This is kept undefined when reading the material, although we learn that the political is something that is up to the observer to decide upon, keeping in mind a worldwide audience following the events and that it is a message which may from an objective and reasonable perspective be connected to the political situation of a country. Something that will be further developed as we continue with the WPR approach, but that is worth mentioning now, is that all the cases UEFA presents are in line with Mouffe's view of 'the political'. That the political is the dimension of antagonism (Mouffe, 2005, p. 9) which resonates with the relation the different involved actors, or their messages, have. Hence, the political is presented as the exogenous problem, while I interpret antagonism as being the endogenous problem that are to be looked for in the Q1 analysis (Bacchi, 2009, p. 3).

7.2 Q2 – What presuppositions or assumptions underlie this representation of the 'problem'?

To start with I want to reiterate what is a central premise in Q2; that I am looking for assumptions that are required for specific PRs to be outlined (Bacchi, 2009, p. 155-156). The baseline is that different understandings support different assumptions about a concept. The

important shift in focus here is to go away from the idea that the ‘problems’ are presumed to provoke a governmental response, to instead looking at in what ways ‘problems’ are thought and how they come about. When it comes to the PR in this analysis it is hence the view of the political as being unfit for sports events and football specifically that needs to be studied, since the deep-seated values is lying behind the PR (Bacchi, 2009, p. 6). These deep-seated cultural values are to be found in the cases, both by looking at CEDB’s and the Appeal Body’s decisions and by looking at what is deemed as political in each case. It is also relevant to look at where we find the regulation in the documents. All this will be done by doing a discourse analysis, which will also be helpful through the interpretations. The discourse analysis used in the WPR approach is based on binaries; *fit/unfit*, concepts; *political, fair play*, and *objectivity* and category; *political identities*.

But, before I proceed, I want to clarify that the analysis from now on will be influenced by my interpretation of the PR in Q1 and will impact the direction the forthcoming analysis in the WPR approach (2009, p. 19 – 20). This in turn, limits and affects other thinkable understandings of presuppositions and assumptions that impact possible PRs. Albeit, proceeding with my findings from Q1 in the further analysis is a choice made keeping both the thesis aim in close regard as well as the feasibility of time and space.

I relate UEFA’s concept of *fair play*, the work with inclusiveness and anti-discrimination, as an important aim and objective in their documents (UEFA, 2016a; UEFA, 2016b; UEFA, 2016c; UEFA, 2016d), to Bacchi’s discussion on equality. What Bacchi means is that equality has been stipulated a taken-for-granted meaning, understood as treating people in the same way (2009, p. 181-184). Equality as an idea is based on the understanding that people should be treated in similar ways and is clarified as a concept of anti-discrimination where likes should be treated alike. The baseline is that those who are similar should be similar treated. This means that discrimination happens when similar people are treated in different ways. The (political) messages that are divided into the dichotomies *fit/unfit* for sports event, is by Bacchi described as creating an ‘A/not-A relationship’. To clarify a little further, Bacchi argues that western public policies base their view on equality on an understanding of binaries, *equal/inequal*. But she claims that this expected dichotomy is not the baseline for a discussion about equality. The debate is rather on *equality/difference*. This shifts the debate from being about lacking equality, to the fact of *being* different. The shared view of the usage sameness/difference as parallel to equality/difference settles that point. This

means that the people we hold as equal are also held as being the same, they are the 'likes' in "*likes should be treated alike*" (Bacchi, 2009, p. 181).

The regulations create political messages that are fit for the stadiums and are simultaneously creating an 'other' by differentiating messages and deem them as unfit for the events. The oversimplification that dichotomies do with social relation also deems the 'unfit' as lesser, through the idea of fair play and inclusiveness. This is correlating with Bacchi's view of what is occurring in the discussion of equality, which as mentioned, I understand UEFA's emphasis of fair play and inclusiveness imply in their regulations. So instead of setting an equality/inequality dichotomy, an equality/difference dichotomy are framed. This is done similarly by UEFA when their regulations are issued, but they, when discussing the unfitness of political messages, rather discuss fit as in similar and unfit as in different political messages. Hence, there is a legitimisation of the discrimination of some 'unfit' political messages. This leads the debate away from the view that political messages per se are unfit, to the differentiation of the *unfit* political messages. This discussion will be further developed as we go on with the other questions in the QPR approach.

So, to explain and understand, what symbols are seen as *being* different, we need to clarify some of the key concepts found in UEFA's material.

Fair play plays a double role in this analysis, partially because of what has been described above where we based on the view of fair play and equality can outline discrepancies through the A/not-A relationship binary, but also because of the affect it is understood having on the purpose of the regulations. Therefore, by putting together the findings from the regulations, statutes and the different cases, the interpretation is that the political are challenging the idea of fair play since it is not respecting the worth of everyone nor promote the unity among member associations as outlined in objective h) and objective k) (UEFA, 2016d, p. 2). According to Mouffe a pure and basic understanding of the political is that we live in an imagination where the politics are aimed at consisting of consensus and reconciliation (2005, p. 2). This means that the status quo must be understood existing under this political consensus, and hence, if 'new' political messages are displayed, these are still under negotiation to achieve a consensus regarding the message. This in turn means that a form of antagonism exists. And this antagonism explains why some of the political messages are seen as opposing the objectives of fair play, inclusiveness, and non-discrimination on account of politics.

The political is also a key concept. Mouffe argues, and what I interpret as occurring in UEFA's handling of this concept, that the liberal 'third way thinking' is limiting and undermining the combative fundamentals of democratic life (2005, p. 1-5). This is explained in how the view of a consensus reachable through dialogue is based on the view that partisan conflicts are a thing of the past. A further dimension is that the liberal thought, of the rationalist belief in a universal consensus, is continuing the blind spot of the political. This is done because liberal rationalism is negating the antagonism because of its inherent limitation of rational consensus. It is furtherly explained that the liberal rationalism must negate antagonism because what is otherwise revealed is the limits a rational consensus implies (Mouffe, 2005, p. 12). What is seen as being consensually agreed upon are not seen as political. This relates to our material in a few various ways.

Firstly, the cases that are defined as political are all having an interconnection to antagonism, and as already stated, an antagonism with close linkage to nationalism (which will be further developed below). Keeping in mind the effects binaries have on our way to comprehend equality, we also see these tendencies taking shape in UEFA's handling of the political. An insight Mouffe bring forward from Carl Schmitt is that political identities consist of a we/they relation, which can emerge from diverse forms of social relations (2005, p. 15 - 16). What she elaborates is based on the challenge to develop other understandings of the we/they, friend/enemy, distinction. We/they relations does not have to mean friend/enemy i.e an antagonistic one. But become antagonistic, when 'they' is putting into question the identity of the 'we' and is somehow threatening 'our' existence. The 'they' in the cases seems to be putting into question the identity of the common 'we', for example that Catalanian flags are opposing Spain, as the Kurds oppose Turkey et cetera. As Mouffe argues, the constitution of us, or of a 'we', always is built on a dependency on a type of 'they', where the 'we' can be differentiated (2005, p. 18-19). She emphasises this point since this understanding always allows us to imagine the possibility of different types of relations when it comes to, we/they, depending on the way the 'they' are formulated and constructed. My interpretation of UEFA's linkage to the antagonistic dimension is further clarified when looking at my second discussion below.

What is shown when looking at the cases is that all the cases fined because of its political messages are somehow related to national identity and/or nation states, while the FC Viktoria Plzen case, which is the only case deemed as possibly political, does not. What is relevant to acknowledge and mention so far in the WPR approach, is that UEFA does not find

the need to define the FC Viktoria Plzen case. Something that should be interesting out of at least two reasons, to fine the responsible club accordingly for potentially validate a regulation, but also since the question of political messages, objectively decided, could be argued for. This is important to clarify since UEFA is missing a definition of what the political is. What is therefore an important finding by looking at the cases is that all the nation states that can be interpreted as ‘facing’ or receiving the political messages are all members of UEFA, Turkey, Ukraine, Spain and Russia (Uefa, n.d.). Here I briefly want to turn to Yuval-Davis. The concept of ‘nation-state’ assumes a correspondence between the boundaries of the nation and the those who live in a specific state (Yuval-Davis, 2008, p. 11). This is the basis of nationalist ideologies. This also naturalises the hegemony of one collectivity and is impacting the ideological apparatus of both the state and the civil society. This root of the connection between nationalism and racism further strengthens my interpretation of a close linkage by UEFA of nationalistic identities and the inherent antagonism these imply. What will be further problematised throughout the WPR approach, especially in Q4, are what kind of implications the concept of nationalism has in UEFA’s construction of the boundaries of the political.

Thirdly, to further analyse UEFA’s definition of what the political is, it is stated that a political message is political when it appears political for an objective viewer. It is also explained that timing and contexts affects the definition of a political symbol or message. For example, when the Appeals body illuminates the fact that the chants sang in the FC Barcelona case was sung in minute 17:14, it is argued being enough for an objective and neutral observer to have the impression of it as being political. My interpretation is therefore that the Estelada-flag would be seen as less provocative the further away symbolically the deployment is to the sensitivity of the question. Apart from being a very subjective and complex baseline for decision making, it is also proved that the symbol becomes more political the closer to the tension the matter is. Trying to avoid defining the antagonism of the matter in general, the fact is that the antagonistic tensions could arguably be more intense when it is referred to 1714 as in the case of FC Barcelona, and in the context of Ukraine, where the context and contemporary situation during 2016 was understood making the Ukrainian case more significant and sensitive. This makes the question about ‘the political’ going from the content per se in a specific message, to focusing more on the sensitivity and the history of the matter.

On this note, as shown in Q1, UEFA sees political messages as something that can be decided upon and observed objectively by the observers at the games. This belief that we can agree upon an objective and reasonable definition of what is being political, correlates to Mouffe's critique against the liberal thought that relies on the liberal belief that a universal consensus is available (2005, p. 11). It also relates to one of the goals in Q2 of the WPR approach, that ontological assumptions are inherit and shaping our conceptual logics (Bacchi, 2009, p. 274). As outlined in the Methodology section, the concept objectivity is problematised by feminist researchers who argue that no knowledge is objective (Hesse-Biber & Lina Leavy, 2007, p. 45; Haraway, 1988; Harding 1987). The idea of the universal true implies a separation of ideology and science, a standpoint of an observation of the world overall that is not trapped by political and individual beliefs. The valuation of science over ideology is normative, and it is summed up in an expression of either/or but not both, often presented in objective social science research. Further discussions on the concept objectivity will be done as we go by with the analysis, especially in Q4.

According to Bacchi, categories are constructed and affects our understanding of ourselves and others, which in turn shapes the political governing (2009, p. 9). She refers to Ian Hacking, who claims that people and categorisations we are put into, are something made up. He refers to the discussion on perverts, and rhetorically asks whether perverts existed before the latter part of the nineteenth century. The answer is no, and the argument is that perversion was not something that existed before it was "found" by psychiatrists. It was rather something that was created and defined through an understanding of diseases. This process is about ascribing people or groups of people traits, and through these traits categorise them. This is what is meant by making people up and it relates to the analysis since categorisations of people reflects a way of organising humans, identities and behaviours that has not always existed across space and time. The category, political identities, is created by UEFA through their juridical decisions. They do not really exist beforehand but are in a way re-created for every game based on their implementation of the regulations. Since it is for example up to the objective observer to report the 'breaches' and for them to accordingly act upon those reported breaches. The impacts of the categorisation will get further attention in Q5. Related to this is the question of order and security, which I understand are believed to potentially be jeopardised if for example political messages are displayed in and around the stadiums. Hence, my interpretation is that political messages must be understood inherent a potential to disrupt the order and security, which further strengthen my view of UEFA's interpretation of

the political as inheriting an antagonistic dimension. To understand this one must read through the case laws where the decision based on this category and article 16, are issued. What I understand is that UEFA is in line with Mouffe's standpoint, that antagonism and politics are inseparable, and that UEFA therefore sees it as vital to exclude politics to keep the stadiums secure and in order, in other words, that the political inherit dimension can provoke and cause disturbance. This line of thought would than describe the implementation by UEFA of their regulations and the fact that UEFA have included the acts of throwing objects, acts of damage and political or provocative messages under the same article and under the category of Order and Security (UEFA, 2016c, p. 15).

Although, it is stated though by the Appeals Body that political messages do not have to be provocative to be ruled as unfit (UEFA, 2016a, p. 188). When analysing both the FC Barcelona and Football Federation of Ukraine cases, it is stated that negative effects on the security does not relate to article 16.2 (a) - (e), but to article 16.1. It is also emphasised in the cases that the order and security does not have to be disrupted for the political message to be problematic, nor that it is as any direct connotation drawn between the unfitness of the political and the order and security. What matters according to UEFA are that the hosts of the event have not been negligent in the organisation and preparation of the event (UEFA, 2016a, p. 85, 185; UEFA, 2016c, p. 15). It is enough that a message, for an objective viewer, appears political to therefore be seen inappropriate for the event. The issue of the order and security is something that will be further analysed in the Q3 though, when I am looking at historical influences potentially leading up to the PR. Related to this and an argument to analyse this aspect, is that when looking at the Appeals Body's statement in the case of FC Barcelona, an additional factor to the decision to give repercussions is argued being the long-standing regulation the UEFA's Disciplinary bodies regulations on illicit banners is (UEFA, 2016a, p. 188).

Bacchi argues that apart from looking at specific legislations or governments reports, it is also an added value to look at related texts, such as media statements or parliamentary debates, to get a fuller picture of the PR and what it includes (2009, p. 20). Therefore, I believe that it is interesting to analyse the interpretations of the hosts regarding UEFA's regulations. Hence, I turn to the case regarding the Palestinian flags displayed in the Celtic game that was mentioned previously, but that is not included in UEFA's documents. In the second game between the two teams the Israeli police spokesman Micky Rosenfeld said that Scottish fans would not be allowed to wave Palestinian flags at Hapoel's stadium (Silvester, 2016, 21 Aug).

It was described as obvious that the flags would be taken off them since it is a professional game and not a political opportunity. It was seen as unnecessary provocative behaviour and it was developed that it might stir up tensions which could lead to other issues. It was also described as part of the security measures implemented to avoid incidents from taking place, understood as being in line with UEFA's regulations. Additionally, it was explained that the Palestinian flag is not illegal in Israel, but that the provocation of either side is and that this is not tolerated.

Summary Q2

Bacchi mean that by analysing presuppositions that aligns with the PR we can then identify the conceptual logic that supports the same (2009, p. 5). The conceptual logic that validates this representation of the problem is understood to be that politics and football does not belong together because of the antagonistic dimension inherent in the political, in other word my understanding of UEFA's view is that the political per se is not necessarily inappropriate at the stadiums, but that there is a differentiation of political messages. Some are seen as fit for the events, while some differentiated are seen as unfit. The assumption is that the antagonism in the political is problematic and that there exist consensual forms and antagonistic forms of the political. Which in turn means that one form is unproblematised while the other form is not.

In brief summary, the analysis gave these findings. That (1) all the political cases have a clear antagonistic label related to nationalism, (2) the non-defined case is the only one without a clear identification marker, (3) the view on objectivity, regarding deciding on what the political is, is problematic, (4) the antagonism is implying a discrimination which goes against the fair play/inclusiveness objective, but the idea of fair play and equal treatment ends in an differentiating procedure in terms of the equality/difference spectra and (5) that the non-consensual political messages are a risk that could disrupt the order and security at the stadiums.

7.3 Q3 –How has this representation of the ‘problem’ come about?

There are two variables I will investigate in Q3. It is (1) the historical discussion of politics belonging in football, and (2) how this discussion and the understanding of it as unfit, relates to debate regarding order and security.

To grasp the debate on the political’s beingness in football one must look back at historical events that prolong the debate today. To scrutinise this, I will foremost use Gabriel Kuhn’s (2019) historical outlining of this topic but complement it with other research that been done within the field. First of I will present a brief historical overview. To follow the debate on politics in football more easily, this chapter will not focus solely on UEFA and its handling of the question, but rather focus on the historical debate overall and pinpoint events and examples that are seen as contributing to the debate, and additionally to UEFA’s positioning and handling of it through their regulations. Two other major football organisations will be included in the analysis, those are FIFA and the FA. This is seen as relevant because of the argumentation UEFA has regarding their regulations and statutes and that they are referring to them as an important partner considered in their objectives which are aimed at being in line with FIFA’s objectives (UEFA, 2016d) and because of the view of them as important and influential organisations within the sport internationally.

Football has in modern history been viewed as a traditional working-class sport, although history also tells us that the sport has been played much earlier than this by Romans, Vikings and in ancient Chinese and Japanese societies (Kuhn, 2019, p. 13-14). Before our modern days one of the first known calls for controls of the game was not closely linked to the question of politics being in the sport, but rather how to keep the citizens at the marketplace during match days which otherwise cause bad business. During the 19th century the question of class belonging changed. Beforehand, especially in England, the sport was mainly performed by upper- and middle-class people, something that changed when professional team was introduced, which attracted workers to another degree.

Something that is closely linked to the cases we have been presented in UEFA’s documents is the historical and common criticism of football as igniting and amplifying nationalistic and sectarian feelings (Kuhn, 2019; Polley, 2004). Some of the examples outlined are when Argentineans attacked the consulate of Uruguay in Buenos Aires after their defeat in the Men’s World Cup final in 1930, the infamous “Football War” in 1970 between Honduras and El Salvador in the qualification to the Men’s World Cup that left more than 6,000 people

dead, and the game between Senegal and Gambia in 2003, which relit tensions between the countries and led to a temporary closure of the border (Kuhn, 2019, p. 59- 62). Nation-state conflicts have also been a common source for protests within football historically and in modern days. For example in 1950, Turkey and Indonesia refused to play Israel in the qualification to the Men's World Cup. As an example of pro-independence, some of the best-known Algerians players left the French league in 1958 to form the Algerian national team under the token of Front de Libération Nationale. A comparison in contemporary time is the Palestinian team that is seen as a symbol of Palestinian independence. On a club level, both FC Barcelona and the Basque Athletic Bilbao have been symbols of anti-Franco resistance and the cup victory of FC Karapty Liv in Soviet Union in 1969 is still celebrated as a demonstration of Ukrainian sovereignty. Polley's (2004) research relates to this topic as well and his study focuses on English sporting identity. He for example refers to the proliferation of England flags during the Football World Cup in Japan and South Korea during 2002. Polley argues that globalisation in modern time has created ever-increasing opportunities for national representation (2004, p. 27 – 28). No matter if this has been driven by commercial and media agendas and although the sport and national identity may be seen under attack in England from commercial interests, the media, and migration, it is still a fact that fans in most sports have retained a close relationship between the team and nations. Related to this is that football has been exploited by those in power, where politicians have tried to identify with "the people's game" and through that gain support (Kuhn, 2019, p. 52). A common example is that during the World cup in Italy 1934, the Italian team was celebrated with fascist chants and symbols that was displayed on the terraces of the stadiums Stadium of the Fascist Party and the Benito Mussolini Stadium, in Rome respectively in Turin.

To reiterate one of Mouffe's points, the society is always politically instituted, and we must not forget that the terrain in which hegemonic interventions take place is always the outcome of previous hegemonic practices and that it is never a neutral one (2005, p. 34). A related example when it comes to political symbols in contemporary time is the case of Kosovo and the inclusion of them as a member association within UEFA and FIFA. In May 2016 UEFA recognised the Kosovo Football Federation as its 55th member, which was understood as paving the way for FIFA planned vote on the same matter the following week, which had the same result (Montague, 2016, 3 May; BBC Sport, 2016, 13 May). What this eventually meant was that FIFA withdraw the Kosovo flag from the list over banned flags in their tournaments, where it had been alongside flags such as Taiwan and prerevolutionary Iran

(Panja, 2018, 14 July). The decision by UEFA met a lot of critique. The president of Serbia's soccer association, Tomislav Karadzic, for example said that "*we must say no to politics*" (Montague, 2016, 3 May). Serbian officials also considered to file a complaint to the Court of Arbitration for Sport, with the argument that UEFA had violated their statutes. Apart from showing how the terrain where hegemonic interventions takes place, and that they are never neutral, this example also sheds light on the complexity of keeping politics out of the sport. It is also an example on Stuart Hall's description of the modern state, which Yuval-Davis refers to

"Power is shared; rights to participate in government are legally or constitutionally defined; representation is wide, state power is fully secular, and boundaries of national sovereignty are clearly defined" (Yuval-Davis, 2009, p. 23).

This is an idyll though and imperial states which has become a part of most of the modern states in Europe is positioning different civil societies and nations in very different relation to the same state. This ought to be acknowledged to be able to understand how nationalism interrelate with racism in both Europe and post-colonial states.

Banning of words and symbols

When discussing administrative decisions within the game, both UEFA, FIFA, and the FA have faced criticism beforehand. Among the examples that have caught attention and critique is FIFA's decision to ban Iranian women's national team national jersey that included a hijab, which caused accusation of Islamophobia (Kuhn, 2019, p. 55). On this note, the Hapoel Tel Aviv striker Itay Shechter was booked in the UEFA Champions League qualifier for celebrating his goal with a kippa and a short prayer in 2010. Something that was questioned as Eurocentric and a discrimination on religious ground, since European and American players cross themselves continually during games and even sometimes collectively pray on the pitch. Further examples in contemporary time of the complexity interpretations of symbols and words implies, and closely related to UEFA's aim for objectivity and reasoning, are given to us from the English league and the FA. The first example is the heated exchange between Luis Suarez and Patrice Evra in a game between Liverpool and Manchester United in 2011 (Ervine, 2017, p. 237). It was a clear illustration of how diverse the sport is, and therefore impossible to universalise an interpretation. In short, it involved a black Frenchman and a dark-skinned Uruguayan, in the northwest part of England, between two historical rivals,

supported by two dominantly white crowds, teams that were managed by two Scotchmen, with American owners, and where a Dutchman and a Welshman were key witnesses to a dialogue conducted in Spanish. Furtherly, academic experts from South America were involved consulting in the contextualisation and comprehension of the words used by the Uruguayan. Another example Ervine's article provide is the one of the footballer Nicolas Anelka, who celebrated his goal by doing a Quenelle-gesture (2017, p. 236 – 250). Since the player himself acknowledged that the gesture was made as a dedication to Dieudonné M'bala M'bala and described it as an anti-system gesture, the ongoing debate did not concern whether the gesture was political and a protest per se, but rather if the interpretation of the same was to be as Anelka described it being about, or if it was to be interpreted as an anti-semiotic gesture, which many argued. This dilemma, and the impossibility to perform and achieve an objective and universally reasonable decision on symbols or words meanings, will be further analysed and problematised in Q4.

Supporter Violence, Racism and Homophobia

What I also want to give some time for reflection is how antagonism might affect the order and security aspect that is considered in this PR. What has been a present issue within football in modern history is the supporter violence within and surrounding the stadiums. Disturbance and violence, as possible outcomes of controversial matters (such as antagonism might create), is a potential consideration that has created this approach that I understand UEFA are aligning with.

Fans violence in connection to football matches is not a new occurrence. Following the Rangers and Celtic derby in 1909 a riot involved more than 6,000 people where fifty-four policemen were injured and which caused serious damage on the common surroundings (Kuhn, 2019, p. 65-66). The phenomena did not get much attention from the media or authorities though until the 1960s, especially in Britain. Since then, the description of it has met a lot of critics, partially since it is viewed as sensationalising it and help create a violence-prone supporters' culture. Quite soon the term 'hooligan' came to signify the "wild" football fan who caused a public moral panic.

According to Kuhn this picture of the hooligan as an uncontrollable maverick fitted the era's bourgeois' fear of rising juvenile crime and delinquency. Police statistics from this time shows that incidence of violence on match days never increased more than one percent,

neither then nor thereafter. Although, during the 1970s and the 1980s the trend of describing supporters as uncontrollable and wild continued and was the beginning of different measures and motions preventing and banning supporters from attending games both domestically and abroad. These anti-hooligan legislations were eventually also used in other forums, for example preventing activists from attending political gatherings (Kuhn, 2019, p. 67). The fact that hooliganism within football exists is something that is not to be belittled or denied though. Something that is a fact is that football related violence and the policing surrounding matches costs taxpayers millions annually, for example in Sweden. This is often the truth when we look at games of close rivalries and derbies.

This topic also closely relates to what Cleland outlines where football was a symbol of masculinity which engrained millions of boys and men (2018, p. 412). Apart from leading to heightened violence, sexism, and homophobia within the sport this also implied an enhanced powerful component of local and national identity. In England it has since the 1980s been a thorough and ongoing work against racism and homophobia within football, which has been, and still is, a major problem. One of the more known case is the one of the professional footballer Justin Fashanu, who “came out” as gay 1990, and after that faced horrendous outrage because of his sexual orientation and that ended with his suicide 1998 (Watson-Smyth, 1998, May 4). This case tends to be used as an argument among football organisations as an argument where for example the FA mean that the supporters are not ready for pro-gay campaigns. Something that has been refuted by scholars and science through evidence of a decline of homophobia within the football among players and its supporters (Cashmore & Cleland, 2012; Cleland, 2018). Simultaneously as a growing acceptance among supporters seems to be the case, a lot in contribution of organisation as *Kick It Out* (n.d.) and *Show Racism the Red Card* (n.d.), the discourse seems to be more and more that football solely shall be about the sport related achievements on the pitch (Cleland, 2018; Ervine, 2017). What science has told us of this topic in the near history is that a player’s sexual orientation is of none concern among 93% of the supporters (Cleland, 2018, p. 415). What concerns personal matters of the football player is hence not seen as a part of the judgment of the player per se.

The above mentioned relates to the cases and UEFA’s regulations since there seem to exist a belief that the supporters are needed to be protected from political questions, partially because of the un-readiness to face certain campaigns. I also interpret the heavy regulations historically surrounding supporter violence are being linked to the discussion on order and security. It is shown both in the literature research outlined (Cleland, 2018; Ervine, 2017;

Kuhn, 2019) and in the way UEFA argues for the need of their regulations discussed in Q1 and Q2.

Summary Q3

Kuhn uses a famous quote from Stanley Rous, a former English FA secretary and FIFA president, where he in 1952, a few years after the second world war, stated that in a world that has been haunted by the hydrogen and napalm bombs, football and the pitch was a place where sanity and hope was still unmolested (2019, p. 51). My interpretation is that this symbolises a desire by the administrative organisations to keep the sport clean from controversial politics, and as is shown in the cases from UEFA's document, issues and matters that has an antagonistic dimension. This PR correlates with the issue of inclusiveness and acceptance that Cashmore and Cleland discuss. They refer to the example mentioned above of the English FA's decision to not proceed with a suggested pro-LGBTQ+ campaign (Cashmore & Cleland, 2012, p. 385). They argue that the difficulty is to make the different football organisations more inclusive, rather than the fans. This statement seems to be in line when looking at the cases, since the matter of inclusiveness closely relates to UEFA's PR of controversial political issues. No matter what has been allowed and what has not, football stadiums has always, and will always, be a location of where power are displayed (Kuhn, 2019, p. 32). Nonetheless if we talk about authoritarian rulers executing their power, people who resist power or as presented to us in this analysis where we see different interpretations towards similar symbols. This will be further investigated and developed as we scrutinise these regulations in Q4.

The history of violence surrounding the sport is also understood to have impact on the procedure by UEFA and other football administrative organisations. The work done to prevent a hostile environment and to reduce the negative impact the violence has had and have, through regulating and focusing on the order and security, are therefore understood as been a necessary mean. This is in line with the assumptions and conceptual logic discussed in Q2. What is also related to the purpose of Q3 when looking at how the PR have come about is that the Appeals body explicitly refers to UEFA's long-standing regulations of illicit banners, and the consideration that football stadiums are not the place for displaying ideological or political messages, as an argument to not reconsider CEDB's decision of the FC Barcelona case (UEFA, 2016a, p. 188).

7.4 Q4 – What is left unproblematic in this problem representation? Where are the silences? Can the ‘problem’ be thought about differently?

As already been mentioned, but which needs reiteration, is the fact that my position and my interpretations of UEFA’s regulations and cases impacts the shape my analysis gets through the process. Hence, I want to acknowledge that what is left unproblematic is more than what can be depicted and scrutinised in this thesis. With that said, I will focus on two circumstances that I find problematic in terms of silences and aspects that are left unproblematised, based on my analysis so far of UEFA’s regulations and handling of the political and its place in football.

The analysis in Q4 will be focusing on (1) UEFA’s argumentation of objectivity and proximity/sensitivity when arguing against the cases. This relates to the second concern in Q4, (2) the unproblematised fact that, based on the theory of antagonism, one of the two adversaries which the dichotomy antagonism implies are left unproblematic. This in turn means that the voices of the people finding the other adversary political, in the antagonistic sense, are being unacknowledged, or by using the linguistic in a WPR approach, are being silenced.

Objectivity is as mentioned a concept that is highly problematised and criticised within feminist research (Hesse-Biber & Lina Leavy, 2007; Harding, 1987; Haraway, 1988). This mentality and belief seem to resonate a lot with the idea of positivism. Which is an idea that objective facts exist about the world, a belief that there is a ‘real’ world or reality that can be understood, known, and obtained through objective scientific practices (Hesse-Biber & Lina Leavy, 2007, p. 44). This also relates to the idea of universalism, which is one of the features of modernity, and this refers to the idea that there exists objective, universal values, and right ways of being and living (which are the one of the West). What is unproblematised by UEFA, apart from the fact that objectivity is impossible to perform, is the fact that they do not provide a thorough explanation of how objectivity is to be achieved or what bases are needed for the observer to do so more than considering the possible situation in a country.

When looking at the FC Barcelona case I am presented with the fact that the Appeals body agrees with CEDB’s classification of the flags as being political, and not a historical and cultural symbol. There is not even a presentation on the discussion of objectivity, and it gets more complicated when the FC Zurich case is included. Both appellants are referring to their own countries national laws to question the decision of the

symbols as political. FC Zurich are arguing that PKK are seen as a legal organisation, that Switzerland is neutral in the conflict between the two parties, PKK and Turkey, plus that PKK flags in Switzerland are not illegal. The CEDB reject these arguments and emphasise that only UEFA's regulations are of relevance, along with the fact that since the visiting team was from Turkey, the political message was clear. This factor was not relevant in the FC Barcelona case though. There the argument is that the opposition team is not of interest, rather the timing of the chants. As the timing of them (in minute 17:14) is explained as enough evidence for a neutral and objective observer to have the impression of its political nature.

The proximity to the context, and the sensitivity of it, are therefore both explained contributing to the decision of deeming the symbols as political (UEFA, 2016a, p. 86). This resonates with Mouffe's theory on the attempt to neglect the antagonistic within the political and the belief of a consensual view, where there is no room for a sensitive antagonistic dimension (2005, p. 11-12). This can be understood because the flags of the member associations shown and depicted during the games, in the Euros and during other tournaments, exemplified by the normalisation of waving some nation flags during the world cup in 2002 (Polley, 2004, p. 27-28), are examples of how the shared consensual view on the recognised and acknowledged states are unproblematised as political symbols. Those are through this understanding fit for the events. This also enhance my impression that the unrecognised and/or unacknowledged states and nationalities has a more direct association to the antagonistic dimension and can be understood through Mouffe's argumentation, that the political cannot be defined independently of any contextual reference (2005, p. 17-18). As she put is, the 'natural order' is never a display of deeper objectivity that in any way is external to the practices that bring it into being. Every order, that is, society where the political are defined, is a precarious and temporary articulation of contingent practices. That is how we can understand the political as social constructed because the frontier of the political is unstable and are constantly renegotiated between social actors. So, everything could always be otherwise, therefore is every order, every discourse, predicated on the exclusion of other possibilities. In that sense we cannot escape from the political, because what is shown is the expression of a particular structure of power relations that are by themselves shaped by political interests. This makes the whole debate even more precarious since the observers are to keep the globally diverse and widespread supporters' objective views in mind, counting to 3 billion people during some of the events (Kuhn, 2019, p. 51).

Similar criticism has been forwarded and is linked to how the equality/difference implications turn out (Q2). This is, since similar symbols, flags, emblems or any other expressions, containing antagonistic traits or not, are differently defined as political and/or as unfit. Hapoel Tel-Aviv in Israel or St Pauli in Germany are just two examples of clubs that have close links to the trade union movement and the Labour parties (Kuhn, 2019, p. 29). Nor does teams who have more close links to nationalistic and/or political and ideological agendas being problematised because of their symbols, such as Maccabi Haifa, which is one of the best-known teams of the Maccabi teams, that is supporting the Zionist movement or as Beitar Jerusalem, whose supporters openly reject Arab players on the team. Similar examples from Spain are Athletic Bilbao who only allow players from the Basque region to be part of the team.

What is further left unproblematic, if we agree upon the theory on antagonism presented by Mouffe (2005), is that it is only one out of the two adversaries in the antagonistic dichotomy that are problematised. A tendency that can be partially explained by looking at the history of banning political signs and messages. It was common, and is still happening, that a state or an authoritarian leader is deciding or at least has a saying in what is appropriate and what is not appropriate within the stadiums (Kuhn, 2019, p. 59 - 65). What could explain why this potential tendency are prolonging is Mouffe's theorisation on hegemony. Hegemony is according to her, as well as antagonism, a key notion for addressing the questions surrounding the political (Mouffe, 2005, p. 17). When discussing what is political it is required to acknowledge the hegemonic nature of every social order and to recognise that all societies are products of practices that aim at establishing order in a contingency context. What is needed is a differentiation between the social from the political. The social are practices that repeats the acts of their political institutions, and hence also conceals these acts, which in turn makes them as taken for granted.

It is in the above sense that something can be called 'political' since a particular structure of power relations is expressed. These are what Mouffe calls *sedimented practices* (2005, p. 21). The results of these are what is at a given moment considered as the natural order, together with a common sense which accompanies it. The point is that every order is political and inherit some form of exclusion. Hegemonic practices are when a certain order is established, and the meaning of social institutions are static. In liberal discourses antagonism is not eliminated though, it is rather 'sublimated'. Because in these discourses an adversary is only a

competitor. They compete on neutral ground over positions of power, and their mission is to dislodge others to occupy their space. The dominant hegemony is not questioned, and there is no strive to transform the relations of power. The antagonistic dimension is always present, as we can see in the examples, but played out under the conditions regulated by the democratic procedure, that is accepted by the non-problematized adversaries.

My interpretation is therefore that antagonism is not negated in the cases presented by UEFA, but only problematized when the hegemonic order is disrupted. This naturalized order is already acknowledging Spain, Turkey, Ukraine, Kosovo and Russia as part of the community (discussed with help of Yuval-Davis (2008) below), while the Kurds, Catalans, and Ukraine nationalists are all disrupting the rational consensus believed existing in the liberal view of “the political”. The Serbian case differs a little here but is still reaffirming the problematization occurring when it is facing a part of the community. Although themselves are also part of it.

To develop the problematisations outlined above further I will turn to Yuval-Davis. She explains that “cultural stuff”, such as symbols and flags, needs to be described as a resource, wealthy with its many meanings, full of contradictions, which always, depending on the power relations and political discourses will be used selectively by different actors in various projects (Yuval-Davis, 2008, p. 43-44). With this in mind, identities are important to clarify, because they are specific forms of cultural narratives, where the commonalities and differences between us/they are constituted. This means that our social positionings are interpreted in more or less stable ways. These narratives often relate to *myths of common destiny*. These kind of identity narratives are constitutive tools of ethnic projects. They divide the world into ‘us’ and ‘them’ and are used in the politics of collectivity boundaries that in turns relates to ethnicity. Ethnicity are defined as a political process which constructs the collective and their interests. Not only as a result of the collectives general positioning, but as well as a result of the relations within that collectivity amongst them engaged in ‘ethnic politics’. Polley mean that those who are pushing the boundaries of national identity in sport, such as women’s gay, and disabled sports movements demonstrate how national identities are fluid (2004, p. 24).

These collective identifications are always formed and shaped through the differentiation of we/they, and this is how we can understand that issues of nationalism can easily be translated into enmity (Mouffe, 2005, p. 27 – 28). Mouffe refers to Slavoj Zizek and his explanation on

how nationalist hatred are enhanced and transpires when our enjoyment is believed threatened by another nation. It originates from the way that different social groups are handling their lack of enjoyment, by assigning this lack to the presence of the enemy and their “theft” of it.

What the cases shows are that the definition of the political are linked to the idea of belonging. What are already seen as belonging are also not deemed as political. This is possibly because of the belief of disruption that antagonistic messages are seen having on the order and security discussed in Q3. Therefore, what already is seen as belonging, that is, being part of the collective identity of UEFA as member associations, are not a threat to anyone’s, who is included, common destiny and hence are not viewed as antagonistic and in turn political. The Serbia case differs here though, but since the message put the common destiny of two of the member associations at risk or questions them, since this symbol was a map over contested area and nation-states, they are trespassing the question of a common destiny.

UEFA does not look at the common origin aspect since everyone is included no matter where you are coming from, but if the common destiny is at “risk”, as all the cases could be seen as examples of, it seems to affect the interpretation of the symbol. This belonging can be seen as based on the Negation of antagonism and explain why some symbols or flags are not problematised and can be understood as “unmarked”. This can be understood through Mouffe’s explanation of the liberal rationalism where antagonism has to be negated because what is otherwise revealed is the limits a rational consensus implies (2005, p. 12). What is seen as being consensually agreed upon are not seen as political.

Summary Q4

UEFA’s policies are meant to acknowledge and include everyone, but they do not seem to be living up to that goal. Rather, based on the cases we have at hand, the political seems to be defined based on the symbols’ antagonistic relation to the member associations within UEFA. What is understood as consensual is a part of the harmonious and non-conflictual ensemble that is discussed by Mouffe (2005, p. 10). Therefore, these members are included in the equal, as in equal to be treated equally. What is not explicitly denied, but what is not part of the hegemony is the nationalities and identities that are not being included in the same ensemble. Hence, they are found seen as the different in the equal/different binarity discussed in Q2.

What is interpreted to be the case is that the matter depends on whether one is part of UEFA as a member association or not.

Additionally, if aiming for fair play and non-discrimination, it is impossible to achieve an all-inclusive consensual view. This is only possible if the antagonism inherent in the hegemonic nations and nationalities are ignored. Which, as already been clarified, will end in a same/different treatment that was outlined in Q2 above. Another unproblematised fact is that the receiver of a message, not the “sender” that are to define the political content. By using Mouffe’s theorisation on the hegemonic order, I understand that this also contributes to the decision that for example the Catalan flags are deemed as a political adversary, but not the Spanish ones.

7.5 Q5 – What effects are produced by this representation of the ‘problem’?

Before I proceed, I want to clarify what my analysis is focusing on below, and that is the collective identity of UEFA, considering their objectives of inclusiveness and fair play. So, when I discuss the discursive and subjectification effects, I keep in mind the notion of affinity and equalness that I interpret being one of the aims within UEFA. One thing to remember when reading the analysis of Q5 though is that the effects that are to be clarified, are foremost an analysis of potential effects that the PR implies. Since the empirical material is limited, this also affects the analysis and the findings.

Discursive effects

To start with I will investigate the discursive effects of the PR, that is, the limitations on what one can think and speak. Q2, Q3 and Q4 identified deep-seated assumptions within the PR, how discourses gave expression to those, as well as the silences the discourses contain (Bacchi, 2009, p. 15-16). The proposal in Q5 is that if some options for possible social interventions are closed off because of the way the ‘problem’ is represented, this can lead to harmful effects for certain people. With that said, what one wants to find out is how a policy differently function to harm some and benefit others. As been outlined earlier I have

understood that ‘consensual’ matters are not seen as political, and that it is rather necessary with an antagonistic tension for the matter to be so. What I also have found is that this antagonistic tension, which necessitates two adversaries, does not seem to be appealed equally towards these adversaries. What has also been clarified earlier, is that the PR is based on UEFA observers’ view on the political. It is explained that the political is to be defined upon the view of an objective viewer, and this is up to the UEFA observer to judge. Mouffe's discussion on how the political cannot be defined outside or exclusive from a contextual reference is a relevant point to departure from. All the presented cases are linked to national identities and nationalism in some way. The cases also show some identities that cannot identify with a collective identity without being politicised. The identity marker is hereby also a political marker. Which would not be that noteworthy if it was not for the fact that identity markers for some, the member associations, are acceptable and un-politicised. This state of affairs is something that will be further analysed as we go by in this section.

What Mouffe problematises with liberal rationalism is that when it ignores the affective dimension that is mobilised by collective identities, and its belief that the ‘passions’ will disappear with the advancement of individualism and rationality, this reveals how badly prepared this democratic theory is to handle phenomenon such as nationalism and the nature of ‘mass’ political movements (2005, p. 6). On the other hand, she means that ‘passions’ plays a part in politics, and that to fully come to terms with the political, liberal theory must do more than solely acknowledge the existence of a plurality of values and interests, and to celebrate toleration. She means that the dimension of ‘passion’, which are referring to affective forces that are the origin of collective identification, is a fundamental dimension in the political (2005, p. 24). What is problematic is that the current democratic theory is not capable to acknowledge this, and the role it has as a moving force within the field. It is closely linked to the limitations that UEFA’s PR bring forward, mentioned above. This also becomes clear when keeping in mind that at least two adversaries are present when we discuss antagonism and the fact that the ‘passion’ shown towards national identity are as mentioned a normality within football among supporters both during international games as well as during club games (Polley, 2004; Kuhn, 2019).

What this is further related to is the discussion of symbols in general as was developed in Q4 and Yuval-Davis view on “cultural stuff”, when discussing symbols and the role they play in the construction of national identities and cultures (2008, p. 43). The “cultural stuff” are rich

resources, full of contradictories which are used and interpreted differently both internally, but also externally, by different social groups and in various social projects. What I relate the above-mentioned natural order's effects and impact on the different interpretations of the symbols is to Sirma Bilge's, with help of Ruth Frankenberg, discussion on whiteness (Bilge, 2013, p. 412 - 413) and Donna Haraway's view of the unmarked positions of Man and White (1988, p. 581). They outline how it is an intellectual tradition where whiteness is untied from skin colour, physiology, or biology. It is understood as a structurally advantaged position, referred to as a race privilege. This privileged position, or standpoint, is from which white people see themselves, others, and society as a whole.

Subjectification Effects

Yuval-Davis discusses 'otherness' when it comes to cultural differences and ideas of identities (2008, p. 46 -47). She argues along with Zygmunt Bauman that all societies have cultural traditions, a 'common sense' and collective memories that shapes the image of the 'other' and how they should be handled. As in any cultural production, constructions of 'otherness' are dynamic, and consists of contradictions that gives different availability for different social groups and categories. She argues that, instead of transcending gender, class, religions and so on, the 'imagined communities' can create these categories as signifiers, as a partial 'otherness', where the specific group or category are constructed as coming from another 'stock'. In her book she discusses how women usually have an ambivalent position within the collectivity. On the one hand their symbol is that of a collective unity, while they are also excluded from the collective 'we', whereas they are gaining an object-, rather than a subject position. This is usually withheld through cultural codes based on the idea of being a proper woman, which also tends to keep women in an inferior position. This collective wisdom as Yuval-Davis calls it, are then used to justify the natural order, and is similar to the exclusion, subjugation or inferiorisation of 'others'. She means that the collective wisdom is usually linked and similar to the 'common sense' notions that also are a used as ways to exclude, inferiorise or subjugate 'others'. Something I interpret as being shown in the cases presented by UEFA, where the 'otherness' seems to rely on an exclusion shown through being part of the member association, or not. Which follows Bacchi's theorisation regarding subjectification effects, where groups are put in opposition to each other, and where also a desired behaviour are indicated (2009, p. 17).

This is also shown through the fact that UEFA's objectives related to fair play and inclusiveness are depending on the impression of individuality or collectivity. Yuval-Davis discusses and criticise how the universal inclusiveness of assimilation are misleading, because individuals might get access and entry on the basis of the hegemonic collectivity, but the collective identity of those individuals are not (2008, p. 54). This is similar to what is happening to the individuals behind the cases of FC Barcelona, FC Zurich and Football Federation of Ukraine. They are welcomed and can enter the stadiums and the events as "neutral" and equal individuals, but to come as and to display their collective identity is not allowed. This leads us back to the theorisation above the common destiny discussed in Q4. It is shown in the fact that the *common destiny* that is interpreted as being at stake because of the adversary symbols, are not problematised the other way around. Since the individual 'other's' being is already included in the hegemonic collectivity, while the collective 'other' are not. Which means that their *common destiny* is not considered at stake, since it is not even acknowledged as being part of the hegemonic collectivity from the start. The problematisation of the antagonistic dimension of the political, leads us into Trinh Minh-ha's differentiation of social and cultural differences, where she argues that there only exist two sides in the differentiation, those which threaten and those which does not (Yuval-Davis, 2008, p. 55), but as in the cases we are presented to, those who are considered threatened and those who are not. This is important to emphasize since Mouffe also discusses this through the notion of a *constitutive outside* which has been proposed by Henry Staten and which aims at unveiling the stakes at risk in the constitution of identity (2005, p. 15). The aim is to clarify that the creation of an identity also implies an establishment of a difference which often is based on a hierarchical division, which I understand is being the case when looking at the material.

What we also see the case of, in line with the discursive effects regarding "cultural stuff", is Bacchi's explanation that discursive effects make certain subject positions available (2009, p. 17). This means that how we feel and understand ourselves and others is a result of policies, and the positions these creates and make available. What the implementation of the regulation has for effect is that different responsibilities are facing different groups. The group identities that are 'outsiders' are themselves held responsible for the problem, since their identity symbols are interpreted differently. The different treatment hence means that if you are part of a member association, in other words part of the common destiny, your group identity is not at risk of being problematised, since the hegemony does not consider the "cultural stuff" as threatening the collective common destiny. While, as an outsider, your possibility to be a part

of the interpretation of the symbols are neglected. As we can see in the responses to the appeals of FC Barcelona and FC Zurich.

Summary Q5

The discursive effects of the PR seem to be in line with Bacchi theory that the status quo is reinforced (2009, p. 17), based on the findings that there is a differentiation of group identities. The effects are that a set of cultural practices, and symbols as in UEFA's case, are put in a position of being 'unmarked'. Although only 'unmarked' if they are viewed as belonging, understood through being part of the member association. I interpret this as also being the case when we look at the different symbols that are being fined, and the antagonistic adversaries that are being unproblematised, since the state of affairs clarified and withheld through the member associations are implicating the effects already outlined above; that the fair play and inclusiveness objective held by UEFA are resulting in a different debate when we come to interpret symbols as identification markers or as political markers.

With help of Yuval-Davis I also understand that there exists an ambivalent position for the individual supporter within UEFA's collectivity (2008, p. 47). On the one hand their individuality as a symbol is meant to be included in UEFA's objectives of inclusiveness, while their collective 'we' are excluded, whereas they are gaining an object position rather than a subject position. Which resonates with Bacchi's argumentation that the subject is either divided within oneself or from others, a process that is objectifying the subject (2009, p. 17).

7.6 Q6 – How/where is this representation of the 'problem' produced, disseminated, and defended? How could it be questioned, disrupted and replaced?

In Q6 there will be a brief analysis and discussion on UEFA's opposition to the different appeals we find in some of the cases and how they defend the decisions. Secondly, focus will be given to how the PR can be rethought and replaced.

How/where is the PR defended and produced?

As been discussed already, the hegemonic discourse that impact UEFA's definition of what is political seems to rely on the current situation of the member associations. Their perspective is in turn influencing the decisions we see coming from the regulations. This can be understood through Yuval-Davis' explanation of the concept of nation-states. They assume a correspondence between the boundaries of the nation and the those who live in a specific state, and this naturalises, as mentioned, the hegemonic order (Yuval-Davis, 2008, p. 11). On this note, what is noteworthy in the case of FC Barcelona is that UEFA oversees the decision made by the Spanish constitution and the European convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms both in term of the right to display the flag, but also in terms of interpreting the flag as legal. This means that if we are going back to the discussion on antagonism and the different standpoints that exists between the adversaries, we here have a form of acceptance from the member association (Spain), but not the same from UEFA. FC Barcelona is in their appeal seeking legitimacy from their "antagonists", who has deemed the flag as legal, to support their case against UEFA. What I therefore understand is that UEFA is the ones defending and upholding this problematisation of the political inherit antagonism. Something that correlates with Cashmore and Cleland's argumentation that instead of being the supporters that are opposing progressive changes and a more inclusive environment within the sport, it is rather the organisation, UEFA, that seems more difficult to make inclusive (2012, p. 385).

Liberal democracy is constituted by sedimented forms of power relations. This is the result from an ensemble of ongoing hegemonic interventions, and these are not recognised today because of the non-existing counter-hegemonic projects (Mouffe, 2005, p. 33). UEFA, in this sense, needs to be open to counter-hegemonic projects and discussions. Their attempt to annihilate the political within the sport and their events, just as the liberal discourse attempts to, is bound to fail according to Mouffe (2005, p. 12). According to her the political cannot be eradicated since it derives its energy from the most varied human endeavours. Hence, there is a need to rethink what the political is. A new construction of the idea of antagonism will be developed below.

How can the PR be questioned, disrupted and replaced?

Mouffe means that only by acknowledging ‘the political’ in its antagonistic dimension it is then possible to pose the central question for democratic politics. This is not about negotiating competing interests, nor to reach a rational fully inclusive consensus without exclusion.

Democratic politics is not about overcoming the opposition created between us/they, but rather how this is established (Mouffe, 2005, p. 14). A discussion on how this can be done, and how the PR can be thought about differently is something that will be scrutinised in the following and last section of the WPR approach.

In line with Hesse-Bieber and many other feminist researchers, this final section will focus on social change and the possibility to create difference through research (2007; Haraway, 1988; Harding 1987). I will therefore outline a possible direction UEFA could take to embrace the dilemmas that has occurred through their regulations. By looking at factors that have been analysed throughout this thesis, I want to evaluate on the possibility of combining two changes that I see are required to follow UEFA’s objective more fully when it comes to fair play and inclusiveness. To start with, in the example of the Spanish government’s interpretation of the Estelada flag, one could argue that an alternative discourse has opened up the discussion and let more perspective being heard. If one agrees upon that interpretation, one consequently ends up with the fact that UEFA are lacking behind in their interpretation, or are restrained by their own perception, through their opposition to the matter. What Uefa ought to do if they are to stick with the problematisation of the antagonistic dimension in the political, is to be more all-encompassing in their interpretation of what is included in what the political is. Meaning, that they are also acknowledging the perspective from Catalonia. This would in the long run require a more encompassing attitude to the multitude of standpoints questions regarding nationalism imply.

What then is required, which is based on Mouffe's argumentation, is to also embrace the antagonistic dimension, and by doing that, taking a step back from the discussion of the political in general, and to enable an even more inclusive atmosphere within the stadiums regarding the political. By following Mouffe’s argumentation, we need to acknowledge the political in its antagonistic dimension, and only then can we advance to the central question for democratic politics. This is not about negotiating compromises among different interests, nor is it about reaching a rational decision under consensus and without any exclusion (Mouffe, 2005, p. 14). What she means is that we have to take a further step away from the

idea that the specificity of democratic politics would be to overcome the we/they relationship. Rather it is about how this relationship is established. There is a need to draw we/they distinctions in new ways, that are compatible with the recognition of pluralism. While Mouffe's focus is on modern democracy with an emphasis on the procedure and approach within states, I believe that this idea would be of value to adopt also in the case of UEFA. So how do we construct a 'tamed' relation of antagonism, what form would that imply?

This is where Mouffe's theorisation on agonism enters the analysis. Agonism is a we/they relation where the parties who has a conflict recognises the legitimacy of the conflicting parties and opponents, while acknowledging that there is no rational solution to their conflict (Mouffe, 2005, p. 20-21). The conflicting parties are adversaries but sees themselves in conflict belonging to the same political association, which means that they share a common space, symbolic one might say, where the conflict takes place. To transform antagonism into agonism is the task of democracy. She argues that it is less likely that we face, or that we see it emerging, conflicts if agonistic legitimate political channels for different voices exists. The establishment of agonistic relations is the task of democratic relations and a potential steppingstone for UEFA in regard to their objectives.

One of the desired changes Mouffe wants to see is regarding the antagonism related to nationalism. This is also a reason why the parallels drawn between UEFA and their presented cases with Mouffe's theory could be done. What she is questioning and wants to see a change regarding, is the impotence of liberal theory to deal with the eruption of national antagonism, which foreclosed by the rationalist approaches (Mouffe, 2005, p. 28). To avoid this, or to envisage a change in how the national identifications as friend/enemy relations can be avoided, we therefore need to accept the ways these are supported i.e. to recognise the affective bonds. She further explains that collective identifications never will disappear since it is constitutive of the mode of existence of human beings. She also says that consensus is necessary, but it must be accompanied by dissent (Mouffe, 2005, p. 31). Relating to this is that we want to avoid focusing collectively on our 'origins'. Here I want to draw a parallel to Yuval-Davis notion of *common destiny*. What could be desirable with this approach is that a form of unity could be taking shape where the focus is not on the differences (to also avoid the one-sided perspective), but rather on a shared view of a togetherness based on a bond found in a *common destiny*. She explains that *Common destiny* is about, more than just individual and communal assimilations, a subjective sense of people to collectivities and

nations, in which there is no shared myth of common origin (Yuval-Davis, 2008, p. 19). Additionally, she argues that it can as well explain the dynamic nature of any nation or collectivity, as in the case with UEFA, and within those the processes of reconstruction of boundaries that are taking place within them, e.g. via immigration, naturalisation, or social and political processes.

With reference to the discussion above, when it comes to UEFA's handling of the situation now, it would be desirable to avoid the different treatment between member associations and non-members. This should be the goal and a possible achievement, through an adoption to the agonism and which would hence include both the previous antagonistic adversaries in UEFA's common destiny.

Problematizations of the suggestions:

What is necessary to clarify when with my discussion, is that it is still vital for UEFA to differentiate symbols and messages that are exclusive or discriminatory towards certain groups. This of course demands a debate and discussion on perspectives regarding any specific matter, but what could be guidelines when developing the approach is whether the messages or symbols are offensive or not. As with the FC Zurich there are a difference with the PKK-flags per se versus the slogan "*Erdogan dictator*". In the case of the flags that could be seen as a form of identity or sympathy towards the certain collectivity. While the message towards Erdogan is directed outwards and would be falling under the interpretation of a diminishing. What could be interesting to remember is that if we look at FC Zurich's respond to the appeal, they also seem to be inline with the interpretation of the message as problematic in a political way, while arguing that the flags should not be put in the same category. The case of the Football Association of Serbia different in that sense, since it is not only referring solely to the mere existence of a group identity, but rather draws on a debated geographic area.

8. Summary of analysis and conclusion

So, to answer the research question on how UEFA construct the boundaries on what is being political the analysis outlines a few different answers for us. What the analysis has shown is that political messages are viewed as unfit for the sports event according to UEFA's regulations. This is understood being the case because it is viewed as exclusionary (explained through Yuval-Davis) and therefore not inline with UEFA's objectives. More specifically, the cases shows that UEFA acknowledge the antagonistic dimension that Mouffe discusses, and is hence banning messages or symbols, both by looking at the exclusionary dimension but also as it is linked to the work on order and security, that might be at risk if antagonistic messages are displayed.

Additionally, UEFA present the political as something that can be decided upon objectively, and that there exist a consensual and universal understanding of it. This has been problematised through feminist research because of for example the limitation and the silences found in Q4. The typical understanding of liberalism is that we live in a world where many perspectives and values exist, and that owing to empirical limitations, it is an impossibility to adopt them all, but when put together a harmonious and non-conflictual ensemble are constituted. Hence, this liberalism denies the antagonistic dimension in the political, an important aspect in Mouffe's theorisation, and it is understood to be linked to UEFA's construction of what 'the political' is.

The boundaries of what is included within 'the political', by looking at the cases, are also restrained to matters of nationalism. What is viewed as 'unfit' political messages, are the messages that have antagonistic dimensions related to nationalism, this aligns with the view of football as an arena where nationalistic and sectarian feelings are being ignited and amplified (Kuhn, 2019; Polley, 2004). This is also explained as being a result of the historical background of political issues in general, but nationalistic issues especially.

Other findings in the analysis are that the deep-seated values, that we were to search for by following the WPR approach, forms the conceptual logic and are based on the idea that 'consensual' matters do not seem to be deemed as political. Rather, an antagonistic tension seems necessary for the political message to fall under the unfit category. These antagonistic political messages are also possibly, but not necessarily according to the Appeals body, risks to disrupt the order and security. How this conceptual logic, consisting of

presuppositions and assumptions, have come about was analysed in Q3. Different football organisations throughout the world have for a long time been struggling with the issue surrounding political statements and the political in general when it comes to football. The historical overview showed that nationalism, antagonism and supporter violence all have played in as potential factors shaping UEFA's regulations we see today.

The discursive effects are that the regulations do not allow nor enables a discussion on the political from positions that are not in line with the natural order. In turn this means that the objective UEFA have are not fulfilled as being neither objective nor taking every supporter's perspective in consideration (UEFA, 2016a, p. 58). In turn this means that the acknowledgement of the antagonistic dimension is not neutral. It only considers the aspect of the member associations and are excluding the antagonistic dimension facing other group identities that are not included as a member.

The subjectification effects are that the individual can be seen as part of the collective identity of UEFA. Although it is not for the collectivity to express their identity. This also puts the 'others' as responsible to the responsibility since it is only for them it is possible to be affected by the regulations. What is important to remember is what Bacchi argues regarding implications of PRs, that the responsibility of the problem is often put on the targeted groups (2009, p. 17). This reproduce the understanding of the 'other' group as being the problem and the ones bringing 'the political' into the stadiums. A conclusion that is not approached and scrutinized from another perspective because of the silences discussed in Q4. This effect base on the discursive difference that relates to the different treatment in the equal/different nexus, that were discussed in Q2, and are hence being reinforced by UEFA themselves. An interesting take away from these conclusions, and something that would be interesting to analyse further, is whether where the discrepancy exists between the adversaries, could potentially be why people are interested to emphasise their identity. If they would have been included, the exclusionary experience would obviously not exist, and they would not have to be deemed as political.

These effects create a privileged position for the members. The position implies that one's own cultural practices, and symbols as in this case of UEFA's members, are seen as 'unmarked'. The natural order, as meaning the unity found among member association withheld through a common destiny, is clarified through the member associations. This

implicates the effects outlined above; that the objective UEFA has regarding fair play and inclusiveness results in a different debate, depending on who's symbols that are displayed.

Finally, a suggestion on how the PR could be rethought was outlined. Where the antagonistic dimension should not be pushed away or be problematised, rather it should be embraced and rethought through agonism. Where emphasis is put on the need to re-organise the we/they relationship, and to make it compatible with pluralism.

9. References

- Agence France-Presse. (2021, 21 June). No UEFA action for German ‘keeper Neuer’s rainbow armband at Euro 2020. *Guardian Nigeria*. Retrieved 2021-08-10 from <https://guardian.ng/sport/no-uefa-action-for-german-keeper-neuers-rainbow-armband-at-euro-2020/>
- Bacchi, C. (2009). *Analysing policy: What’s the problem represented to be?*. Pearson.
- BBC Sport. (2016, 13 May). Fifa: Kosovo and Gibraltar become members of world governing body. *BBC Sport*. Retrieved 2021-08-05 from <https://www.bbc.com/sport/football/36290169>
- Bergström, G., & Boréus, K. (2012). *Textens, Mening och Makt: Metodbok i Samhällsvetenskaplig Text- och Diskursanalys*. Studentlitteratur.
- Bilge, S. (2013). Intersectionality Undone: Saving Intersectionality from Feminist Intersectionality Studies. *Du Bois Review*, 10(2), 405-424. DOI: 10.1017/S1742058X13000283
- Buzuvis, E. (2010). Caster Semenya and the Myth of a Level Playing Field. *The Modern American*, 6(2), 36-68.
- Carol Bacchi. (n.d.). *Introducing WPR*. Retrieved 2021-05-20 from <https://carolbacchi.com/about/>
- Cashmore, E., & Cleland, J. (2012). Fans, homophobia and masculinities in association football: Evidence of a more inclusive environment. *British Journal of Sociology*, 63(2), 370-387. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-4446.2012.01414.x
- Cleland, J. (2018). Sexuality, masculinity and homophobia in association football: An empirical overview of a changing cultural context. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 53(4), 411-423. DOI: 10.1177/10126902 16663189

- Conn, D. (2015, 27 May). Bribe upon bribe upon bribe: How Fifa and its cronies carved up football. *The Guardian*. Retrieved 2021-08-09 from <https://www.theguardian.com/football/2015/may/27/fifa-executives-charges-jack-warner>
- Connolly, K. (2021, 22 June). ‘Shameful’: Uefa blocks LGBTQ+ rainbow stadium protest in Munich. *The Guardian*. Retrieved 2021-07-19 from <https://www.theguardian.com/football/2021/jun/22/uefa-blocks-lgbtq-rainbow-stadium-protest-in-munich>
- Day, A. (2019, 28 November). What Happened at Hillsborough? How the Disaster Unfolded. *Huffington post*. Retrieved 2021-05-21 from https://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/entry/what-happened-hillsborough-disaster-explained-timeline_uk_5c9a548ce4b049d4aba68244
- Doucet, A., & Mauthner, N. S. (2006). Feminist Methodologies and Epistemology. *Handbook of 21st century sociology* (2). 36 – 43.
- Ervine, J. (2017). Nicolas Anelka and the Quenelle Gesture: A Study of the Complexities of Protest in Contemporary Football. *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 34(3-4), 236-250. DOI: 10.1080/09523367.2017.1359161
- Guardian staff. (2014, 21 jan). Nicolas Anelka faces minimum five-match ban over 'quenelle'. *The Guardian*. Retrieved 2021-06-08 from <https://www.theguardian.com/football/2014/jan/21/nicolas-anelka-charged-fa-quenelle-gesture>
- Haraway, D. (1988). Situated Knowledges: the Science Question in Feminism and the Privelege of Partial Perspective. *Feminist Studies*, 14(3), 575 – 599.
- Harding, S. (1987). Introduction: Is there a Feminist Method? In Sandra Harding (ed.) *Feminism and Methodology*. (p. 1-14). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

- Hesse-Biber, S. N. & Lina Leavy, P. (2007). *Feminist Research Practice: A Primer*. Sage Publications, Inc.
- Kick It Out. (n.d.). *About us*. Retrieved 2020-08-11 from <https://www.kickitout.org/about-us>
- Kuhn, G. (2019). *Soccer vs. the State – Tackling Football and Radical Politics (2nd edition)*. PM Press.
- Law, J. (2021, 9 June). Scandal, Covid and political meddling: Brazil in crisis as Copa America looms. *Planet football*. Retrieved 2021-08-02 from <https://www.planetfootball.com/in-depth/scandal-covid-and-political-meddling-brazil-in-crisis-as-copa-america-looms/>
- Lindelöw, J. (2019). “*She is a woman, but maybe not 100 percent*” – *A Critical Analysis of IAAF’s Problem Representation*. Course: GS1511, Bachelor in Global Studies. Gothenburg: Gothenburg University.
- Lowe, S. (2018, 23 jun). Switzerland's Xhaka and Shaqiri charged by Fifa over Serbia goal celebrations. *The Guardians*. Retrieved 2021-06-09 from <https://www.theguardian.com/football/2018/jun/23/xhaka-and-shaqiri-goal-celebrations-bring-balkan-politics-to-world-cup>
- Montague, J. (2016, 3 May). UEFA’s Recognition of Kosovo Angers Serbs. *The New York Times*. Retrieved 2021-08-03 from <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/04/sports/soccer/uefa-recognizes-kosovo-paving-way-for-fifa-membership.html>
- Mullen, T. (2015, 29 May). Heysel disaster: English football’s forgotten tragedy?. *BBC News*. Retrieved 2021-05-21 from <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-england-merseyside-32898612>

- Norberg, S. (2018, 30 Aug). Asllani gjorde laddad gest efter målet. *Aftonbladet*. Retrieved 2021-06-10 from <https://www.aftonbladet.se/sportbladet/fotboll/a/5VqAa6/asllani-gjorde-laddad-gest-efter-malet>
- Panja, T. (2018, 14 July). A Full Member of FIFA, Kosovo Finds Its Flag Barred From World Cup Stadiums. *The New York Times*. Retrieved 2021-08-05 from <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/07/14/sports/world-cup/banned-flags-kosovo-world-cup.html>
- Pedregal, M. (2018, 27 May). Balcony Politics. *Catalan News*. Retrieved 2021-05-21 from <https://www.catalannews.com/society-science/item/balcony-politics>
- Polley, M. (2004). Sport and national identity in contemporary England. In A. Smith, & D. Porter (Eds.), *Sport and National Identity in the Post-War World*. (p. 10 – 30). Routledge.
- Samsø, J. (2020, 18 June). Russia hits back as US takes lead in Kosovo-Serbia peace talks. *Euronews*. Retrieved 2021-08-05 from <https://www.euronews.com/2020/06/18/russia-hits-back-as-us-takes-lead-in-kosovo-serbia-peace-talks>
- Show Racism the Red Card. (n.d.). *Our Story*. Retrieved 2020-08-01 from <https://www.theredcard.org/ourstory>
- Silvester, N. (2016, 21 Aug). Israeli cops warn Celtic fans that flying Palestinian flags in Champions League tie could lead to JAIL. *Daily Record*. Retrieved 2021-07-19 from <https://www.dailyrecord.co.uk/news/scottish-news/israeli-cops-warn-celtic-fans-8674111>
- Sherwood, H. & Beaumont, P. (2016, 23 Aug). Celtic fans warned not to fly Palestinian flags at match in Israel. *The Guardian*. Retrieved 2021-07-19 from <https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2016/aug/23/celtic-fans-warned-not-to-fly-palestinian-flags-at-match-in-israel>

- UEFA. (2016a). *CASE LAW. Control, Ethics and Disciplinary Body & Appeals Body, Season 2015/16. January 2016 – June 2016*. Retrieved 2021-04-28 from https://editorial.uefa.com/resources/0258-0e30441614cb-7bfd6de5c2c5-1000/uefa_competitions_cases_january-june_2016.pdf
- UEFA. (2016b). *CASE LAW. Control, Ethics and Disciplinary Body & Appeals Body, Season 2016/17. July 2016 – December 2016*. Retrieved 2021-04-28 from https://editorial.uefa.com/resources/0258-0e30442379fb-f8836a68fa2f-1000/uefa_competitions_cases_july-december_2016.pdf
- UEFA. (2016c). *UEFA Disciplinary Regulations*. Retrieved 2021-05-04 from https://www.uefa.com/MultimediaFiles/Download/Regulations/uefaorg/UEFACompDisCases/02/37/00/86/2370086_DOWNLOAD.pdf
- UEFA. (2016d). *UEFA Statutes. Rules of Procedure of the UEFA Congress. Regulations governing the Implementation of the UEFA Statutes - March 2016 edition*. Retrieved 2021-05-04 from https://www.uefa.com/MultimediaFiles/Download/OfficialDocument/uefaorg/WhatUEFAis/02/33/81/40/2338140_DOWNLOAD.pdf
- UEFA. (n.d.). *Member Associations*. Retrieved 2021-07-06 from <https://www.uefa.com/insideuefa/member-associations/>
- Watson-Smyth, K. (1998, 4 May). Justin Fashanu found hanged in lock-up garage. *Independent*. Retrieved 2021-05-19 from <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/justin-fashanu-found-hanged-in-lock-up-garage-1161425.html>
- Wilson, P. (2018, 5 February). As long as there is football there is a good reason to remember Munich. *The Guardian*. Retrieved 2021-05-22 from <https://www.theguardian.com/football/2018/feb/05/munich-air-disaster-manchester-united-memories>