

devotion to a cause, whatever the cost. Rather too often on a Saturday afternoon one realizes the absolute appropriateness of this association!

Of course the very game of football itself, like many others, is basically territorial. The teams each have their own half of the pitch with their own goal as its heartland, which must be defended at all costs. Behind this on the Kop the faithful gather patiently waiting not only for the game to begin but also for enough of the opposing fans to arrive to make it worth the effort of hurling defiance in their direction. The songs and chants which recall historic victories, celebrate individual players and denigrate the opposition form a kind of community singing, bringing together the crowd into a single shared experience. This seems so fundamental and basic that having once experienced it one cannot dismiss altogether the elemental nature of our territorial behaviour. One is also struck by the fact that it is the very antagonism of the fans for the opposing supporters that seems enjoyable to them. The so-called 'local derby', where two geographically neighbouring teams compete, is often a particularly passionate affair since the antagonism is all the greater for its neighbourliness! Ardrey makes this point about our embarrassing wish to enjoy aggressive behaviour:

Nature may abhor a vacuum, but it has even less use for boredom. In species after species, natural selection has encouraged social mechanisms that seem ultimately to exist for no reason other than to provide conditions for antagonism, conflict and excitement.

Thankfully on such occasions the home team is more likely to win than the away team, since they have 'home' advantage. Desmond Morris, in his amusing analysis of the social dimension of football, has considered the effect of this territorial advantage of the home team (Morris 1981), and his figures show that it is roughly twice as easy to win at home as away. Of course in reality there are many contributing factors here. The away team suffers a journey and may not have such good knowledge about the peculiarities of the pitch, but the effect of being on someone else's turf and in their territory also seems likely to have a significant psychological effect.

One is struck time and again by the remarkable similarity between this behaviour and what Ardrey describes as the *noyau*, a French term used by the ethologist Jean-Jacques Petter and taken to mean a society based on inward antagonism. Ardrey charmingly describes the *noyau* through the example of the callicebus monkey, a treetop animal living in family groups that occupy exclusive territories. Each day the family awakes in its sleeping tree, to be found in the heart of the territory. After only minor feeding, the family leaves the sleeping tree and moves to boundary of its territory:

The little family makes no compromise with principle, but bright and early is on duty at the border, only partly fed, hankering for action, waiting for the