This thesis is a theorised history of skateboarding. It aims to make a contribution to the methodology of architectural and urban history, positing a general conception that architecture and the city are best understood neither as objects nor as the sole province of architects and urban managers, but better as flows of time and space produced through particular social activities.

The first part is theoretical, and investigates the need for a re-consideration of space, principally through an investigation of the writings of Edward Soja (Chapter 2) and Henri Lefebvre (Chapter 3). Time, space and social being are found to be inter-dependent constituents of social processes, and – together with ideas concerning the political objectives of the author, the body, everyday life, architecture and activities – necessary subjects for historical writing about architecture and the city.

The second part undertakes a detailed study of a specific urban practice – that of skateboarding – with particular reference to the USA and UK. The ideas of Henri Lefebvre in particular are used to provide methodological direction and interpretive tools. Chapter 4, focused mainly on the late 1950s through to the mid 1970s, explores themes of technology, emulation of surfing and initial appropriations and colonisations of space by skateboarding. Chapter 5 explores the constructed space of the purpose built skateparks of the 1970s and the ramps of the 1980s, and also the body space of skateboarders and their engagement with these terrains. Considerations of representation and the lived nature of images are also introduced. Chapter 6 explores the subculture of skateboarding. Themes of gender, race, class, age, sexuality and the family are investigated with reference to the clothes, board design, music, language and other cultural aspects of skateboarding. Chapter 7, focusing on the street-style skateboarding of the 1980s and 1990s, explores skateboarding as a critique of architecture, the city, capitalism and socio-spatial censorship. The performative nature of skateboarding as an urban activity is found to be an essential part of its historical importance. Chapter 8 provides a summary conclusion of the thesis, and also suggests some tentative directions of future work regarding the further development of a materialist history of the experience of architecture.
"Transform the world"— all well and good. It is being transformed. But into what? Here, at your feet, is one small but crucial element in that mutation.

Henri Lefebvre
# Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acknowledgements</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illustrations</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Section I Introduction

1.00 Introduction 26
1.01 Things and Flows 27
1.02 Architectural History 27
1.03 Theory 29
1.04 Epistemology 30
1.05 Content and Structure 31
1.06 Scholarship 33

## Section II Socio-Spatial Theory

2.00 Reassertion of Space 38
2.01 Perceived, Conceived and Lived Space 39
2.02 Space and Social Theory 41
2.03 Macro-Time: Periodisation 45
2.04 Macro-Space: a "Postmodern Geography" of Los Angeles 48
2.05 Reassertion of Space – Conclusion 56

## Section III Skateboarding

4.00 Found Space 82
4.01 Technical Origins 83
4.02 Found Space 91
4.03 Appropriation, Colonisation, Identity Formation, Co-optation 104

5.00 Constructed Space 117
5.01 Constructed Space 118
5.02 Super-Architectural Space 141
5.03 Spaces of Representation, Representations of Space 164

## Section IV Conclusion

8.00 Conclusion 299
8.01 Closure 300
8.02 Aperture 305

Appendix A Skateparks 309
Appendix B Internet Sites 356

Bibliography 361
This thesis began first in 1988 at the Graduate School of Architecture and Urban Planning (as it then was), UCLA, as a student paper on skateboarding. My thanks there to Thomas S. Hines for encouraging what probably seemed at the time to be a strange choice of subject for a class on the history of Los Angeles. Fellow students in this seminar likewise made many invaluable comments and suggestions which helped to fundamentally shape the later work. Ed Soja opened the door to the other main element of this thesis, via an exposure to the work of Henri Lefebvre, and I am grateful to him for his continued friendship. Also at UCLA, Dolores Hayden and Leonie Sandercock provided many clues and insights into the methodological problems of architectural and urban history. Taina Rikala helped to think about all that is to think about.

Many people have helped practically and intellectually with the thesis over the following decade. On the history and interpretation of skateboarding, I am particularly grateful to Neil Bowen, Andrew Brooke, Dan Cousins, Jan Doggen and Duh magazine, Wayne Fenlon, Nigel Fleet, Layla Gibbon, Paul Haynes, Andy Holmes, Andy Horsley and Sidewalk Surfer, David Horwood, Katie, Lindsay Knight, Sandra Lenzhölder, Mike Lorr, Kenny Omond, Pearl Pelfrey, Ben Powell, Ben Sansbury, Jack Smith, David Snow, Bill Stinson, Michelle Tichtin and Daniel Turner who made comments, shared insights and sent valuable material. Talking to Stacy Peralta in 1988 made me realise this was no small subject. Glen E. Friedman provided acerbic criticism and encouragement by e-mail. Thanks also to David “Fridge” Belfrage, Sean Goff, James “Jam” Parry, Peter Staddon, Simon Staddon and others who skated with me in the backwaters of Oxford in the late 1970s; without their co-production of a certain social space, this would not have happened. Naomi Coultou, Ergo Sum, Mike Fordham, Dazed & Confused and XTreme talked to me in the later stages, and have helped communicate my thoughts on skateboarding via the magazine racks of W.H. Smith. Angela Holden, Global Sports and Board Stupid did likewise via Channel 4 television, and The Mag via Channel 5.

I am absolutely indebted to Tim Leighton-Boyce who systematically searched and delivered his large collection of skateboarding magazines and other material – without his help the research would have been impossible. To him I owe very special thanks.

Others who have at various times offered support, information and comments include Larry Barth, Derek Beck, Amanda Birch, Jonathan Charley, Catherine Clayton, Nic Clear, Matthew Cornford, Rachel Cottam, David Cross, Marcello Cruz, Allen Cunningham, Paul Davies, Tom Dyckhoff, Michael Edwards, Paul Finch, David Frisby, Grant Gee, Amelia Gibson, Christine Hawley, Simon Herron, Jonathan Hill, Paul Hyatt, Susanna Isa, Joel Karamath, Joe Kerr, Nam-Joo Kim, Lesley Latimer, Mark Logue, Sandy McCreery, Glen McDougall, Doreen Maseey, Demetrios Matheou, William Menking, Morag Myrescough, Barbara Penner, Steve Pile, Alan Read, Alan Rendell, Beth Rendell, Norma Rosso, Katerina Rüedi, Chris Saunders, Irénée Scalbert, Louise Scriven, Sally Shaw, Kath Shonfield, James Soane, Neil Spiller, Brian Stater, Andy Stone, Paul Sweetman, Philip Tabor, Helen Thomas, Jeremy Till, Jane Tobin, David Tong, Katharina von Ledersteger, Marek Walcew, Kate aan de Wiel, Belinda Wheaton, Caroline Whitehead and Shirley Wong.

Many of the ideas have benefited from the opportunity to speak at numerous different institutions and conferences, and, especially, from ensuing comments, questions and challenges. I am therefore indebted to Sarah Chaplin, Design History and the University of Middlesex; Alex Griffin and the other Diploma students of Liverpool John Moores University; Marino Folin and Giorgio Piccinato of the Istituto Universitario in Venice; Chu-Joe Hsia, Annie Chiu and the National Taiwan University; Richard Patterson and De Montfort University; the Architectural Association, London; the School of
Architecture and Interior Design at the University of North London; Anna Notaro, Douglas Tallack and the University of Nottingham; Chelsea College of Art & Design; Katherine McDermott, Sarah Wigglesworth and Kingston University; Lisa Haskell and the Institute of Contemporary Arts (ICA); Vicky Watson, James Madge, Ed Winters and the University of Westminster; Kolbjørn Nybø, Halina Dunin-Wuyseth and the Arkitekthøgskolen, Oslo; Jeremy Millar, Alec Leggart and the Photographers’ Gallery, London; and Richard Cândida Smith and the Intellectual History Group of the University of Michigan. Lucy Bullivant and Archis provided another architectural audience.

At the Bartlett, University College London, students of the Pre-Diploma Dissertation programme, of design units 4, 10 and 21, and in particular on the master’s programme in architectural history have provided a fruitful arena in which to develop and test ideas.

I am particularly indebted to the continued support and friendship of Bartlett colleague Adrian Forty, and of Graham Ive, who has also been the supervisor for this thesis. Joanna Saxon has constantly provided another, lateral perspective on things.

Belinda Moore offered valuable insights into graphic design and designed the template. Paul Monaghan and Alicia Pivaro provided support from the space next door. Claire Haywood did Australian research.

In a special category of her own is Jane Rendell, whose unique brand of fiery and demanding intellectualism has had a deep and profound influence. To her, my love, respect and gratitude.

Lastly, I thank my parents, Anthony and Shelagh Borden, for supporting and encouraging me over many years. To them, my most heartfelt of thanks.
Illustrations
Information is of three kinds. Subject, source (where appropriate) and photographer. Where no photographer is noted, none is cited in the original source.

**Frontispiece**

00.01 Skateboarder (early 1960s).
*SkateBoarder*, v.6 n.10 (May 1980), p. 78.

**Chapter 2 The Reassertion of Space**


02.02 Sectoral employment changes 1960-1979.

02.03 Residential concentrations of blue-collar and executive-managerial occupations in L.A. County (1980).

02.04 Distribution of major ethnic groups (1980).

02.05 A view of the outer spaces of Los Angeles.

**Chapter 4 Found Space**

04.01 "Skooter Skate" (ca. 1939).

04.02 Scooter (1950s).
*Thrasher*, v.9 n.6 (June 1989), p. 62.

04.03 Roller Derby with metal wheels (ca. 1964).
*SkateBoarder*, v.6 n.10 (May 1980), p. 34.

04.04 Roller Derby with clay wheels (ca. 1965).

04.05 Chicago, Roller Derby and Super Surfer trucks (1960s).
*Thrasher*, v.10 n.2 (February 1990), p. 34.

04.06 Hobie team (1965).
*SkateBoarder*, v.6 n.10 (May 1980), p. 34.

04.07 Zephyr deck, Sure Grip trucks, Cadillac loose bearing wheels (early 1970s).
*Thrasher*, v.9 n.6 (June 1989), p. 63.

04.08 Tracker truck (1977).

04.09 c&s Peralta Warptail 29 inch long deck, Bennett trucks, Road Rider 4 wheels (ca. 1977).
*Thrasher*, v.9 n.6 (June 1989), p. 65.

04.10 Lonnie Toft, on early 8-9 inch wide deck (1977).

04.11 10 inch wide deck, Independent trucks, Z-Groove wheels (ca. 1978-9).
*Thrasher*, v.9 n.6 (June 1989), p. 64.


04.13 UFO Saucer double conical wheels (1979).
*SkateBoarder*, v.5 n.6 (January 1979), p. 105.

*Thrasher*, v.6 n.12 (December 1989), inside front cover.

04.15 Various new school decks (1996).
*Sidewalk Surfer*, n.3 (January-February 1996), unpaginated.

04.16 Various new school wheels (1996).
*Sidewalk Surfer*, n.3 (January-February 1996), unpaginated.

04.17 Unidentified skater, hang five, La Jolla strand, California (ca. 1964).
*SkateBoarder*, v.6 n.10 (May 1980), p. 31.
Stoner

04.20 Jay Adams, Bay Street, Santa Monica, California (1975).

04.21 Danny Bearer, hang five, Paul Revere School, LA (1965).

04.22 Marty Grimes, frontside bank turn, Kenter School, LA (March 1977).

04.23 Frontside surf carve, Foxtail pool, Foxtail Park near Santa Monica (1965).

04.24 Backside surf carve, unidentified pool (ca. 1976).

04.25 Gary Swanson, frontside carve in his own pool, Santa Monica (1967).
*Thrasher*, v.9 n.6 (June 1989), p. 42.


04.27 Vince Klyn, backside edger, unknown pool (1977).

04.28 Jay Adams, frontside grind displacing a coping block, unidentified pool, Rancho Park, West LA (May 1978).

*Thrasher*, v.9 n.6 (June 1989), p. 38.

04.30 Tony Alva, frontside aerial, Dog Bowl, Santa Monica (September/October 1977).

04.31 Gregg Weaver, “San Marcos” pool, San Diego.
*SkateBoarder*, v.2 n.1 (1975), front cover.

04.32 Kevin Thatcher, Yuvis Dam, N. California, (1980).
*SkateBoarder*, v.6 n.11 (June 1980), p. 51.

04.33 Mark Gonzales and Don Pendleton, Mount Baldy, near LA (ca. 1987).

04.34 Gregg Weaver, desert full-pipe (1977).
*SkateBoarder*, v.3 n.6 (July 1977), p. 80.

04.35 Doug Schneider, Project Atlas pipes, Mexico (1979).
*SkateBoarder*, v.5 n.10 (May 1979), p. 64.

04.36 Mellow Cat cartoon, (1978).
*SkateBoarder*, v.4 n.10 (May 1978), p. 129.

04.37 Motel pool, S. California (1976).
*SkateBoarder*, v.3 n.1 (October 1976), pp. 60-1.

04.38 “Buena Vista” pool, Santa Cruz, California (1986).
*Thrasher*, v.6 n.3 (March 1986), p. 95.


04.40 Dennis “Polar Bear” Agnew and other skaters, A-Rab pool, Mar Vista, West LA.
Chapter 5 Constructed Space

05.01 Skatepark Publications, advertisement. 
*SkateBoarder*, v.4 n.11 (June 1978), p. 28.

05.02 Carlsbad skatepark (1976). 
*SkateBoarder*, v.3 n.2 (December 1976), p. 48.
Craig Hancock

*SkateBoarder*, v.3 n.2 (December 1976), p. 52.
Mike Greene

05.04 “Pipeline” skatepark, Upland, California. 12 ft deep concrete bowl with 20ft diameter concrete full-pipe in background (1977). Skateboarder – Gregg Ayres. 
*SkateBoarder*, v.4 n.2 (September 1977), p. 93.
James Cassimus

05.05 “Pipeline.” Overview after building of the Combi-Pool. 

05.06 Shotcrete application, “Black Lion” skatepark, Gillingham (1978). 
*Skateboard*, n.17 (January 1979), p. 28.
Benton Harris

05.07 “Concrete Wave” skatepark, Anaheim, California (1977). 
*SkateBoarder*, v.3 n.6 (July 1977), p. 45.

05.08 “Soul Bowl” pool, San Diego, California (1976). Skateboarder – Gregg Weaver. 
*SkateBoarder*, v.3 n.1 (October 1976), p. 64.
Warren Bolster

*SkateBoarder*, v.4 n.5 (December 1977), p. 84.
Warren Bolster

*SkateBoarder*, v.4 n.5 (December 1977), pp. 78-9.
Warren Bolster

Jim Goodrich

05.12 Pool, Cherry Hill skatepark, New Jersey (1979). 
*SkateBoarder*, v.6 n.2 (September 1979), p. 22.

*SkateBoarder*, v.5 n.6 (January 1979), p. 70.
James Cassimus

Glen E. Friedman

*SkateBoarder*, v.5 n.12 (July 1979), p. 41.
Jim Goodrich

*SkateBoarder*, v.6 n.8 (March 1980), p. 64.
Ted Terrebonne

05.17 Combi-Pool, “Pipeline” (September 1979). 
*SkateBoarder*, v.6 n.6 (January 1980), p. 23.
James Cassimus

05.18 “Skate-Escape” skatepark, Portland Bill. 
*Skateboard*, n.1 (August 1977), front cover.


05.26 Halfpipe, "Black Lion" (1978). *Skateboard!,* n.17 (January 1979), p. 27. Ian Dobbie


05.30 *R.A.D.*, n.83 (January 1990), p. 44. Tim Leighton-Boyce


05.38 "Dominio" skatepark, Brazil (1990). *Skateboard!,* (second series), n.46 (September 1990), p. 6. Didi


05.41 "Burnside Project" (ca. 1997). Skateboarder – Josh Falk.

Jon Humphries

05.42 "Rampage" half-pipe, San Marcos, California (1977).

SkateBoader, v.4 n.8 (March 1978), p. 78.

Warren Bolster

05.43 Lance Mountain's ramp, Alhambra, California (ca. 1984).

Thrasher, v.4 n.12 (November 1984), p. 32.

C.R. Stecyk III

05.44 "Great Desert Ramp," Palmdale, California (mid 1980s).


C.R. Stecyk III


R.A.D., n.137 (February-March 1995), unpaginated.

Andy

05.46 Vision ramp, UC Irvine, California (1988).

Thrasher, v.8 n.7 (July 1988), p. 29.

05.47 Ramp under construction, Hastings (1989).


05.48 "Ramp Ranch," Atlanta, Georgia (1981).

Action Now, v.8 n.6 (January 1982), p. 41.

Hitchcock

05.49 "Raging Waters" ramp, San Jose (1987).

Skateboarder – Hugh "Bod" Boyle.


Bryce Kanights

05.50 "Turning Point" ramp, Florida (April 1979).

Skateboarder – Kent Senatore.


Glen E. Friedman


05.52 Rare Unit steel mini ramp under assembly, Bath (1990).

Skateboard!, (second series), n.41 (April 1990), p. 12.

Steve Kane

05.53 Thrasher quarter-pipe/bank street ramp, Marin County, California (1986).

Skateboarder – Jim Thiebaud.

Thrasher, v.6 n.8 (August 1986), p. 56.

Kevin Thatcher


Kevin Thatcher

05.55 Tony Hawk's ramp, Fallbrook, California (ca. 1989).

Overall, (Brazil), v.3 n.13 (1989).

Annibal Neto


Thrasher, v.10 n.10 (October 1990), p. 51.

Bill Thomas

05.57 "Middle School" indoor skatepark, Wilmington, North Carolina (1995).

Skateboarder – Kenny Hughes.


Pete Thompson

05.58 "Charleston Hangar Bowl" indoor skatepark, Charleston, South Carolina (ca. 1991).

Wooden bowls under construction by Tim Payne.

Kevin J. Thatcher and Brian Brannon,


05.59 "Charleston Hangar Bowl" (ca. 1991). Bowl nearing end of construction.

Kevin J. Thatcher and Brian Brannon, 

05.60 “Thomas I. Punkt” indoor skatepark, Hamburg (ca. 1997).
Florian Schneider

*Sidewalk Surfer*, n.14 (March 1997), unpaginated.
Matthew “Wig” Worland

05.62 Wooden bowl, Caves Beach, NSW, Australia (1990).
*Skatin’ Life*, (May-June 1990), p. 77.

05.63 “Radlands” indoor skatepark, Northampton (1992).


05.66 Bruce Walker, carve, Carlsbad (1976).
*SkateBoarder*, v.3 n.1 (October 1976), p. 43.
Darrell Jones

*SkateBoarder*, v.4 n.10 (May 1978), p. 34.
James Cassimus

05.68 Alan Gelfand, ollie air, Lakewood half-pipe (1978).
*SkateBoarder*, v.5 n.6 (January 1979), p. 73.
James Cassimus

05.69 Bobby Valdez, invert air (1978).
*SkateBoarder*, v.5 n.6 (January 1979), p. 102.

05.70 Jay Smith, layback, Marina del Rey (September 1979).

05.71 Mike Folmer, layback air, Marina del Rey (1979).
*SkateBoarder Photo Annual*, n.1 (Summer 1979), p. 27.
Craig Fineman

05.72 Daniel Miller, Miller flip, Del Mar “Skate Ranch” (1979).
*SkateBoarder*, v.6 n.4 (November 1979), p. 27.

05.73 Greg Weaver, contorted Andrecht handplant, Del Mar “Skate Ranch” (1980).
Jim Goodrich

05.74 Mike McGill, McTwist, Del Mar (April 1984).
*Thrasher*, v.4 n.10 (October 1984), pp. 32-3.

05.75 Eddie Elguera, layback aerial varial (ca. 1980).
*Thrasher*, v.17 n.3 (March 1997), p. 54.

Luke Ogden

05.77 Hugh “Bod” Boyle, ollie to nose grind, “Ramp Riot” contest, Festival Hall, Melbourne (1989).
*Thrasher*, v.10 n.2 (February 1990), p. 51.
Scott Needham

05.78 Christian Hosoi, backside air, (1989).
*Thrasher*, v.9 n.6 (June 1989), p. 61.
Kevin Thatcher

*SkateBoarder*, v.6 n.8 (March 1980), p. 38.
James Cassimus

05.80 Paul “Rocker” Robson, fingerflip, Mountbatten Centre, Portsmouth (1990).
*Skateboard*, (second series), n.45 (August 1990), p. 20.
Meany

05.82 Rod Saunders, backside footplant (1979). *Skateboarder*, v.6 n.2 (September 1979), p. 3.
James Cassimus

Wynn Miller


Jerry Young

05.86 Brenda Levine, corner carve, square pool, Combi-Pool, “Pipeline” (1979). *Skateboarder*, v.6 n.6 (January 1980), p. 69.
James Cassimus

05.87 Pool, Livingston – plan. *Iain Urquhart*

05.88 Pool, Livingston – section. *Iain Urquhart*

05.89 Scott Foss, double-handed frontside aerial, square pool, Combi-Pool, “Pipeline” (September 1979). *Skateboarder*, v.6 n.6 (January 1980), p. 26.
James Cassimus

James Cassimus

Warren Bolster

05.92 “Ads (We’re Not Sure) We’d Like to See: $100, 000 Professional Skate Jam.” *Thrasher*, v.6 n.3 (March 1986), p. 27.

James Cassimus

James Cassimus

05.95 Duane Peters and Tony Alva, pool, Winchester (1979). *Skateboarder*, v.6 n.2 (September 1979), p. 45.
Craig Fineman

James Cassimus


Warren Bolster

James Cassimus

Glen E. Friedman

05.101 *Best of 411 Video Magazine*, v.2, (ca. 1996). *Iain Borden*

05.102 *Ban This*, (Powell-Peralta, 1989). *Iain Borden*

05.103 Steve Caballero with Stacy Peralta filming for...
Illustrations

Powell-Peralta, Bones Brigade video, California (ca. 1984).
C.R. Stecyk III

05.104 *Influx* internet site (1997).
Iain Borden

05.105 *b-grrrl* internet site (1997).
Iain Borden

05.106 Skateboarding in Lansing, Michigan.
*Danskworld* internet site (1997).
Iain Borden

05.107 Quicktime movie.
*Heckler* internet site (1997).
Iain Borden

*Skateboard*, n.13 (September 1978), p. 36.
Ian Dobbie

05.109 Steve Caballero, Caballerial, Combi-Pool, “Pipeline” (Gold Cup competition, 1980).
Glen E. Friedman

05.110 Marc Sinclair, fakie ollie, Marina del Rey (1980).
*SkateBoarder*, v.6 n.8 (March 1980), p. 45.
Ted Terrebonne

05.111 Ramp and drop-in platform (1990).
Jay Podesta

05.112 Omar Hassan, Madonna, with on-looking photographer and skater, World Cup, Münster (1990).
Steve Kane

*Skateboard*, n.14 (October 1978), p. 43.
Jerry Young

05.114 Jay Adams, pool, Brentwood, West LA (October 1976).
Glen E. Friedman

05.115 Florian Böhnm, rock ‘n’ roll, Combi-Pool, “Pipeline” (1980s).
Kalak/Böhm Bildarchiv

Craig Fineman

05.117 Combi-Pool, “Pipeline.”
Kalak/Böhm Bildarchiv

05.118 Eric Jueden, lien-to-tail, square corner, Combi-Pool, “Pipeline” (ca. 1989).
*Skateboard*, (Norway), n.1 (1989), unpaginated.

05.119 Rodga Harvey, “Rom” skatepark (September 1989).
Tim Leighton-Boyce

05.120 Dennis Martinez, frontside grind, pool, Del Mar “Skate Ranch” (ca. 1978).
Glen E. Friedman

Chapter 6 Subculture

06.01 Skaterboarders, Pier 7, San Francisco (1996).
Luke Ogden

06.02 Team Hosoi, advertisement with Christian Hosoi and Monty Nolder.
Illustrations

06.03 *Skateboard Magazine* (France), n.5 (undated, ca. 1978), front cover.

06.04 *Skatin’ Life* (Australia), v.1 n.1 (undated, ca. early 1988), front cover.


Warren Bolster


James Cassimus


06.09 fuct, advertisement. *Big Brother*, n.19 (undated, ca. late 1995), unpaginated.


Larry Clark


SS. Gross

06.14 Skater with baggy clothing (ca. 1993).


06.15 Surf-style imagery on t-shirts (1979). *SkateBoarder*, v.5 n.6 (January 1979), p. 35.


Iain Borden


06.21 Vans and Airwalk shoes, Arndale Centre, Manchester (April 1996). Iain Borden

06.22 *Beneath the Grey Dome* (L.A. Skatezine), n.3 (July 1987), front cover.

06.23 *Street Noise*, (Australia), n.11, (undated, ca. April 1990), front cover.

06.24 *Check My Chops*, n.3 (Spring 1996), front cover.

06.25 *Thrasher*, v.1 n.1 (January 1981), front cover.


Chapter 7 Urban Space

07.01 “Inner City Truckers” skatepark, Chester,

*Skateboard*, (second series), n.41 (April 1990), p. 36.

*Meany*


*Thrasher*, v.9 n.6 (June 1989), p. 127.

Bryce Kanights

07.04 Owen Nieder at demolition of Del Mar “Skate Ranch” (August 1984).


Tod Swank

07.05 Steve Rocco, skatepark invert move applied to street curb.

*SkateBoarder*, v.6 n.11 (June 1980), p. 4.

07.06 Rodney Mullen, wrist flip (1981).


James Cassimus


*Best of Thrasher*, v.1 n.1 (Winter 1988), p. 16,

(front cover of Thrasher, v. 4 n.9 (September 1984).

C.R. Stencyk III

07.08 Eric Dressen, crail wall ride (1988).


07.09 Mark Gonzales, grind on concrete rail, First Interstate bank (ca. 1987).

*Thrasher*, v.17 n.3 (March 1997), p. 60.


*XXX*, v.3 n.4 (November 1990), p. 7.

Giampiero Papi Pelusi

07.11 Gustavo Prado, aerial off street launch ramp, Cachoeira Paulista, Brazil (1989).

*Overall*, (Brazil), v.3 n.16 (1989).

Marcos Yasumura


*TransWorld Skateboarding*, v.9 n.10 (October 1991), pp. 60-1.

Spike Jonze


*Skateboard*, (second series), n.48 (November 1990), p. 44.

07.14 Ost-Westfalen Damm (ca. 1989).

*Monster*, (Germany), n.44 (February 1990), pp. 56-7.

Uli Niewöhner


*Thrasher*, v.8 n.5 (May 1988), inside front cover and p. 23.


*Skateboard*, (second series), n.48 (November 1990), p. 20.

Matthew “Wig” Worland


Ari Marcopoulos

07.18 Howard Cooke, wallride (1996).

*Sidewalk Surfer*, n.12 (December 1996), unpaginated.

Matthew “Wig” Worland

07.19 Phil Chapman, ollie between planters, Milton Keynes (1982).


*Thrasher*, v.17 n.1 (January 1997), front cover.

Gabe Morford


Tim Leighton-Boyce


Captain Wager

07.23 Steve Rocco, backside grind on 45° curb, Hermosa Strand, California (1979).
       Luke Ogden

       *Sidewalk Surfer*, n.12 (December 1996), unpaginated.
       Atiba Jefferson


07.27  Spex, bank carve, Newbury (1990).
       *Skateboard*, (second series), n.41 (April 1990), p. 23.

07.28  Scuff marks on wall, probably San Francisco (1988).
       Luke Ogden

       *Sidewalk Surfer*, n.12 (December 1996), unpaginated.
       Andy Horsley


       *Sidewalk Surfer*, n.3 (January-February 1996), unpaginated.
       Matthew "Wig" Worland

07.32  Chris Senn (1996).
       *Thrasher*, v.16 n.3 (March 1996), p. 66.
       Bryce Kanights

       *Sidewalk Surfer*, n.15 (April 1997), unpaginated.
       Andy Horsley

07.34  Simon Dobson, frontside rail slide on building exterior, contrasted with escalators in interior, Milton Keynes (1990).
       *Skateboard*, (second series), n.48 (November 1990), p. 22.
       Matthew "Wig" Worland

       *Skateboard*, (second series), n.43 (June 1990), front cover.
       Marco Contati


07.37  "Searching, Finding, Living, Sharing."

07.38  Map of five alternative routes through Bristol (1978).

       *Sidewalk Surfer*, n.15 (April 1997), unpaginated.
       Mori

       Geoff Kula

07.41  Fred Gall, Toronto (1996).
       Jody Morris

       Andy Horsley

07.43  Tony Miorana, downtown New Orleans (1997).
       *TransWorld Skateboarding*, v.15 n.10 (October 1997), p. 145.
       Geoffrey Kula

07.45 “Not Nat West.”
  Tim Leighton-Boyce

07.46 “There are 86,400 seconds everyday. On March 15th, 1992, this is how Daewon Song spent one of his.”
  *Thrasher*, v.12 n.6 (June 1992), inside back cover.

  Michael Blabac

07.48 Matt Pritchard, smith grind, window ledge of Barclays Bank, Cardiff (1997).
  *Sidewalk Surfer*, n.15 (April 1997), unpaginated.
  Matthew “Wig” Worland

  Matthew “Wig” Worland

07.50 Jeff, skating in urban traffic, San Francisco (1989).
  John Dettman

  *Sidewalk Surfer*, n.9 (August 1996), unpaginated.
  Andy Horsley

07.52 Joe Pino, ollie over rail, Coronado Island (1996).
  Grant Brittain

  *Thrasher*, v.9 n.2 (February 1989), front cover.
  Torin Boyd

07.54 Scott Underdown (1996).
  *Sidewalk Surfer*, n.12 (December 1996), unpaginated.
  Matthew “Wig” Worland

  Bryce Kanights

  *Thrasher*, v.10 n.8 (August 1990), p. 51.
  Hunter Kimball

  Jonny Donhowe

07.58 Receiving a ticket for the criminal act of skateboarding, California (1989).
  *TransWorld Skateboarding*, v.7 n.3 (June 1989), p. 6.
  Sherman

  *Ian Borden

07.60 Various “no skateboarding” signs (1990).
  *Sk8 Action*, (May 1990), p. 52.


07.62 Banks demolished to prevent skateboarding, Crown Court, Leicester (1989).
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  Matthew “Wig” Worland
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  *Ian Borden
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apparatus which can be used in the commission of an illegal act is in violation of the provision of this section and is guilty of a misdemeanor. Examples of criminal tools are provided for identification purposes along with slang terminology. ‘Syringe,’ ‘Fat Cap,’ ‘Knuckles,’ ‘Skate.’ Think, advertisement.

*Thrasher*, v.15 n.9 (September 1995), p. 121.
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08.01 Dog Bowl, Santa Monica (September 1977). *Skateboarder* – Jay Adams.
Glen E. Friedman

08.02 Bert La Mar, invert, Marina del Rey (1979). *SkateBoarder*, v.6 n.2 (September 1979), p. 46.
Craig Fineman

08.03 “Skate and Destroy” motif, designed by Lowboy (1982).
Iain Borden

Pete Thompson
Introduction
The Unknown, the giant city, to be perceived or guessed at.¹

To discover the uses of things is the work of history.²

This thesis is about the possibilities of living with architecture and the city. It is at once a theorised history, and a proposition about how to know and engage with the urban. The thesis is an approximation of these problematics, suggesting a move from things and ideas to flows and socio-spatial tactics. It shifts from objects to actions, stasis to change, the external to the internal, city to self, past to future — and back again.

1.01 Things and Flows

Architecture offers itself to us as an object, and the city to us as the ultimate technical object: the fantastical concentration of wealth, power, blood and tears crystallised in the office towers, roads, houses and spaces of the city. The appearance of the urban is seemingly as a thing, as a finite set of spaces.³

But consider how the city comes into being, how buildings are constructed and how the whole edifice of the urban is continually reproduced. How much of this is visible, how much is truly discernible as a set of objects? In fact, we can see the results but not the "happening" of building production, for no singular space or time reveals it to us; architecture is not comprehensible to the single glance or view. In cities this is further complicated as here the process continually recurs, at different locations, scales, times and with a myriad of different meanings and power relations. To "watch" architecture, then, is not so much a case of simply slowing down the passage of time with an ever more attentive historical lens, but, as will be shown, of exploding apart the whole notion of time and space, of comprehending with multiple ideas and intellects, with the whole body, with the heart and the hand, with political beliefs as well as with the eye. The object of study, for its part, becomes transposed from a thing into an event, where the "building" is only the apparent trace, the absence and presence of a whole range of flows of space, time, ideas and actions.

1.02 Architectural History

Surely it is the supreme illusion to defer to architects, urbanists or planners as being experts or ultimate authorities in matters relation to space.⁴

A first consideration must be how this conception of architecture as flows can be embedded in the practices of architectural history — for just as architecture is not itself space, but only a way of looking at space,⁵ so the history of space is also not the (traditional) history of art and architecture.⁶ What are the consequences of this for architectural history?

Traditionally, most architectural historians have been concerned with the production of architecture — and at first sight this would seem, given the particular spatial nature of architecture, to be a promising place to look for a history of space and the city. For example, there have been exemplary studies of the labour process of architectural production,⁷ the institution of the profession,⁸ biographies,⁹ patrons,¹⁰ education¹¹ and architectural theory.¹² Such histories, however, replicate exactly that ideological spatial division which occurs between the professions. In short, where, for example, the space of the body is seen as the province of medicine, and the space of the landscape as the province of geography, so the space of the built environment is seen as the province of architecture and, more specifically, of architects and planners. In doing so, historians limit their idea of architectural space to the space of the designed building-object — a fetishism that erases social relations and wider meanings.¹³

To avoid this problem, architectural historians must move away from seeing architecture only as
things, imagination as only that of architects, mapping as only by drawing, and space as only interior, façade, composition and garden.

Of course, architectural historians have already tried to do this in many different ways, such as reading architecture’s iconographic, symbolic and semiological meanings. Recently, a post-structuralist version of such concerns, centred on the US East coast, has followed Jacques Derrida in trying to destabilise architectural semantics. This approach has successfully disrupted commonly-held structures of meaning, showing that such things are always provisional, pregnant with a possibility that lies beyond their apparent closure, yet it remains within the confines of the framework it is trying to upset: Architecture (capital “A”); the two-fold result is to rest within a consideration of reading, so reducing architecture to meaning, and, simultaneously, to remain within the architectural canon of such “great” male architects as Le Corbusier and Loos, consequently leaving the core object of study unchallenged. Architectural history has hence suffered from de-politicisation; the intense post-structuralist focus on matters of representation in architecture has lost sight of notions of social change, urban conditions and of struggles of all kinds. Architecture remains the privileged sphere of professionals and intellectuals, and so outside any revolutionary desire to reformulate its substance and so integrate it with everyday life. Architectural history is in need, therefore, of a reintegration of questions of representation with issues of social and political change.

Architecture does of course have a meaning. But its meaning is neither fixed nor internalised to buildings. Rather,

Architectural historians have tried to address this issue in different ways. In terms of experience, this has been done through the sensual experience of form, psychological empathy between form and the subject, or a more bodily enactment of this empathy process. Such histories, however, avoid social or political connotations to experience, and postulate instead the human subject as a universal, with a constant set of values, senses (primarily sight) and mental faculties. Conversely, those who have emphasised the political, economic and cultural aspects of architecture have tended to see buildings as “congealed ideology,” the products rather than the re-productive agent of social change, and so to ignore the reproduction and experience of architecture.

It might be expected, then, that those who consider the social history of architecture, particularly in relation to everyday or mass cultural processes, would provide a more successful approach to this problem. However, even here, architecture is either reduced to a theatrical backdrop, held apart from the social lives of its inhabitants in a kind of formalised ritual of objects and movements or is used in an explicitly operative manner as a sourcebook for solutions to present-day problems. These works use an extended temporality to explore post-construction life in the building, but nonetheless treat spatiality or temporality as dimensions separate to the human subject, and not as lived productions. Such works are only a discourse about space, not a discourse on the production of space.

Architectural history has not yet turned from conceptions and meanings of space, or experiences of space, to consider the production of space. To do so requires going beyond objects to processes, where architecture’s role in social reproduction is not limited to the spaces it provides or the way it is used, but involves representations embedded in architecture, in codified conceptions of space, in
ideological and experiential as well as material aspects of building use. Furthermore, because architecture promotes a knowledge about cities and space, it is also the site of imagination, of experience, of critical re-examination. This phenomenal and intellectual experience of architecture, showing how people encounter architecture in conditions of, for example, danger, exhilaration, anonymity and sexual freedom, has been successfully shown for cities as Paris, London, Berlin, Los Angeles. Such works, particularly those informed by feminism and marxism, also help to challenge the universalism of experience and to problematise the identity of the subject, while simultaneously denaturalising capitalism and its politics of space.

This is the reproduction rather than production of architecture: what are the ways, over time and in space, in which social processes continue to reproduce the worlds we live in? And how is architecture implicated in this process of reproduction? We might say, following Foucault, that architecture is not an object with a role to play, but constituted by the discourses and practices of social life.

Architecture is not an object but a process, not a thing but a flow, not an abstract idea but a lived thought. Architectural history should follow this course.

1.03 Theory

The procedures adopted by the architectural historian should be informed by "theory," that body of ideas which has been derived outside of the empirical ground of architecture yet which can be brought to bear upon it. To validate this, consider that the notion of history being written "without theory" is an absurdity; it is impossible to approach history using only the ideas of our predecessors. How else is history to be constructed except through our contemporary concerns? And how can those concerns be translated into interpretative questions of the past? Any consideration of the past must deploy a mediating concept to negotiate between it and the historian's present condition. Theory is therefore the making explicit of this negotiation, setting out the interpretative agenda not as an implicit subterfuge but as a necessary set of thought processes.

The question whether to use theory or not is an irrelevance. Rather the questions must be, firstly, which theory to use, and second, how to relate it to the ostensible objects of study - ostensible because history is always a representation, a textual re-construction rather than direct reflection of the past.

Furthermore, as architecture and other built environment professions are inextricably implicated in the practices that control urban affairs, any history seeking to interpret critically the city must not derive its theoretical grounding solely from within architectural discourse. The master will not provide the rope to place around his own neck. Instead, it is necessary to look at other theoretical territories.

This occurs in two ways. Firstly, theory tells us something different to conventional historical discourses about the way people live. Second, theory provides an outside from which to challenge conventional representations. It is this double challenge - to the normative objects of study and to the framing of interpretative questions - that is theory's most important contribution to architectural history. For example, dealing with matters of race, sexuality, class, experience, political action, gender and so forth in architectural and cultural production in general maximises the opportunity to learn all that architecture is and might be capable of. It maximises the opportunity to learn from the past, and so relate history to the present. To speak about architectural history without reference to these things, without reference to other disciplines, without reference to theory, is not only to trivialise current conditions and preoccupations, but is also to dismiss architecture's relevance to the world in general.

Talking about theory, cities and architecture as reproductive entities shows how architecture operates beyond the boundaries of professionalism, and
also enriches architecture for those who encounter it in their everyday lives. And for architectural history as a discipline, this means – rather than being the hand-maiden of architectural design – becoming a more potent part of architectural knowledge than a set of authoritarian facts or lessons.

But theory should not just be applied to architecture; rather, the process is two-way. If architectural history challenges through theory what architecture might be then it must also confront the formulations of that theory, modifying theory through exposure to history, and hence instigating a constant dialectical interplay between the two. Only this can be a truly critical and theoretical architectural history.²¹

1.04 Epistemology

Let us leave a place for events, initiatives, decisions. All the hands have not been played. The sense of history does not suppose any historic determinism, any destiny.²²

Before describing the content and structure of this thesis, a word on epistemology. As already intimated, the role of the "historian" is not to provide an objective account of the past (such considerations are in any case impossible), but the rethinking of the possibilities of the past, and hence, and most importantly, a re-thinking of the possibilities of the present and future. History-writing becomes a concern with social change, with revolution not as the installation of a definitive programme but as the continual unearthing of human activity. This project means critiquing capitalism through both the negative dialectic which denies and resists capitalism, and through the positive dialectic which restlessly searches for new possibilities of representing, imagining and living our lives. As for Manfredo Tafuri, this architectural history is a form of vigilance,²³ watchful of a revolutionary condition, but is also – and here unlike Tafuri's position of despair – imbued with a more definite political direction, seeking to celebrate differences, promoting use values over exchange values, and encouraging architectures of pleasure. That is the epistemological ground of this thesis, and it should be read accordingly.

This does not mean, however, that there is no interest here in the past or "truth." Indeed, it is through the investigation of particular architectural space-times that human life can be re-thought. Just as theory provides an outside to architecture, so the past provides an outside to the present and hence an opening towards potential futures. This, then, is an architectural history unconcerned with promoting a specific kind of architecture as designed building, but resolutely concerned with a certain kind of life and its reproductive engagement with architecture. This is what Henri Lefebvre calls transduction, that which "elaborates and constructs a theoretical object, a possible object from information related to reality and a problematic posed by this reality" and which "assumes an incessant feedback between the conceptual framework used and empirical observations."²⁴ The epistemology here is of speculative interpretation and action, at once encouraged and constrained by the empirical ground. Its knowledge is always provisional, formed by the intersection of theory and the architectural object, and awaiting further development in the maelstrom of future histories.

It should, however, be noted that in history-writing, Lefebvre's dialectical movement between theory and empirical data cannot always be made evident in the final text: exigencies of wordage, the need to avoid redundant repetition of historical information, and the historian's tendency toward narrative textual representation all preclude such an approach. This thesis, then, has tried to follow Lefebvre's procedure in the process of writing, continually rethinking its interpretations in the light of both new data and new theories as they come to the fore – indeed, it has proceeded from an initial, untheorised 3,000 word essay to its present theorised, 100,000 word
form. Nonetheless, in this final form – the words as they appear on the page – the argument in this thesis is less dialectical and more definite than Lefebvre’s own openly dialectical theorisations.

Despite this approach, the aim here is nonetheless to make explicit the approach taken. Through self-conscious methodology, one further product of this thesis (beside the knowledge gained of its subject matter and intellectual pre-occupations) is to identify a new kind of architectural history, one with new objects, methods and questions. This is discussed in more detail in the Conclusion (Chapter 8).

1.05 Content and Structure

Section I of this thesis comprises this introduction, and is followed by two longer sections which form the main body of research. Section II is theoretical, comprising two chapters on the “Reassertion of Space” and “Constitution of Space.” Section III is a theorised history of a particular urban practice, that of skateboarding, and its reproductive encounter with architecture and the city. Section IV comprises the conclusion, which provides a summary and also suggests some possible directions for future work on a materialist history of the experience of architecture.

Section II Socio-Spatial Theory

In terms of theory in this thesis, one particular figure is present throughout: Henri Lefebvre. Born in France in 1901, Lefebvre’s 90 year life as communist, philosopher, sociologist, academic and writer spawned over 70 books on an extensive range of subjects. Most attention has been paid to his writings on the urban, everyday life and, in particular, the production of space, which have been much discussed, especially following the publication of the English translation of La production de l’espace as The Production of Space in 1991. Urban geographers, anthropologists, art historians, cultural theorists, sociologists and feminist theorists have all responded to his work. Surprisingly, however, beyond a few short articles, no concerted attempt has been made to intersect Lefebvre’s theories with a particular geographical or historical ground. In particular, despite the appropriateness of Lefebvre’s concerns for architecture, no such attempt has been made in architectural history beyond those projects which the author has himself been partly responsible for instigating: the Strangely Familiar programme of events, for example, contained notions of the everyday, social production of space and public space both directly and indirectly drawn from Lefebvre.

The one exception to this is Edward Soja. A marxist urban geographer based at ucla, Soja more than any other has developed Lefebvre’s ideas in urban geography and inter-disciplinary debates concerning space, urbanism and postmodernism. Throughout the 1980s Soja wrote a series of articles on the problem of socially-produced space and its significance to city and regional studies, subsequently reworked as Postmodern Geographies (1989). This is the book by which, based on a reading of Lefebvre’s urbanistic and spatial texts of the 1960s and 1970s, Soja became the most overt promulgator of Lefebvrian concepts of socially-produced space. Consequently, prior to the English translation of The Production of Space, Soja’s text was the primary source in Anglo-American academia for Lefebvrian ideas.

Section II therefore begins, in Chapter 2, with an investigation of Postmodern Geographies. Its aim is two-fold: firstly, to consider the reasoning for a focus on the production of space, and to consider its inter-relation with time and social being; second, to consider Soja’s specific application of such Lefebvrian ideas to Los Angeles, and so to identify directions for methodological development. As we shall see, although Soja’s encounter with Lefebvre is extensive, ultimately this remains at a theoretical level, leaving much room for further work. As Soja himself acknowledges, “[t]he most important post-
modern geographies are [. . .] still to be produced."41

The subsequent Chapter 3 therefore looks in more detail than did *Postmodern Geographies* at Lefebvre's ideas, going beyond issues of space alone to consider method, politics, the urban, time, everyday life, the human subject and activity. However, Lefebvrian thought, as Kofman and Lebas note, is more a sensibility than a system.42 Its ultimate test cannot then rest at the level of theoretical abstraction but must, for the historian, be brought about through an encounter with a specific subject matter. Chapter 3 does not then try to resolve the problems highlighted in Chapter 2, but rather simply to identify new directions and concerns beyond those received through Soja and from here to move to more concrete historical work in Section III.

Section III Skateboarding

The third (and largest) part of this thesis concerns the history of skateboarding. Lefebvre, despite his concern with mass culture, everyday life and adolescents did not, to my knowledge, ever write directly about skateboarding or *la planche à roulettes*. Nonetheless, Lefebvre's work remains throughout this section, either through referral to his ideas or through quotations. The purpose here is five-fold: to make explicit the methodological procedures being followed; to help identify new objects of study; to provide interpretive tools by which to crack open these objects, displacing them from the "stuff" of history to the realm of critical thought; to provide a theoretical ground to which I ultimately return in the concluding chapter; and so ultimately to provide an arena in which to retheorise architecture and architectural history.

Skateboarding is perhaps an unusual object of study for architectural history. But it is precisely its marginal position which enables skateboarding to function historically in the same way that Lefebvrian theory functions methodologically in architectural history; as something outside of, yet intrinsically related to, the concerns of more normative histories of architecture, skateboarding provides a critical Other to architecture, and hence helps re-think architecture's possibilities all the more stringently. To give some indication of why this might be the case, consider that skateboarding is local, being fundamentally concerned with the micro-spaces of streets, yet is also a globally dispersed and prolific practice, with tens of millions of practitioners world-wide. It addresses the physical architecture of the modern city, yet responds not with another object but a dynamic presence. It says almost nothing as codified statements, yet presents an extraordinary range of implicit enunciations and meanings. It produces space, but also time and the self. Skateboarding is constantly repressed and legislated against, but counters not through negative destruction but through creativity and production of desires. It has a history, but is unconscious of that history, preferring the immediacy of the present and coming future. It requires a tool (the skateboard), but absorbs that tool into the body. It involves great effort, but produces no commodity ready for exchange. It is highly visual, but refutes the reduction of activity solely to the spectacle of the image. It began in the suburbs, but has come downtown to the core of urban conflicts. It is seen as a child's play activity, but for many practitioners involves nothing less than a complete and alternative way of life. It is, therefore, architecture, not as a thing, but as a production of space, time and social being.

Section III proceeds through four chapters which roughly follow the history of skateboarding. For the period of the late 1950s to mid 1970s, Chapter 4 considers the technical development of the skateboard, before turning to the "found spaces" of the school yard, bank, ditch, pool and pipe. Skateboarders' spatial tactics of appropriation and colonisation are considered. Chapter 5 focuses on two kinds of constructed terrain. The first is that of the purpose-built skatepark, many examples of which were built world-wide in the late 1970s, and the ramp or half-pipe, which took over after the
demise of most skateparks in the early 1980s. The second constructed terrain is that of the body, and the chapter considers the “super-architectural space” by which body, skateboard and architecture are erased and reborn in the encounter between skateboarder and skateboard architecture. The role of the image is also addressed here. Chapter 6 is predominantly social in focus, and provides the necessary consideration of the subculture of skateboarding. Attitudes to age, race, gender, class, sexuality, masculinity, the family and to general conventional standards are explored. Specific aspects of skateboard design, music, clothes, language etc. are also investigated. Section III concludes with Chapter 7. The emergence of street skating in the 1980s and 1990s is seen to derive from the demise of skateparks and, more importantly, from the possibilities of modern architecture. Potential political directions are considered, before a focused investigation of skateboarding’s physical engagement with the city and its architecture, the implicit critique made of capitalism and architecture as commodity, the performative mode of critique adopted, and the socio-spatial conflicts and censorship engendered as a consequence of such actions.

In representing this history, certain problems necessarily remain unresolved. Firstly, despite skateboarding being a global phenomenon, the thesis is predominantly a history of events in the USA and UK – other countries are referred to, but only occasionally. Apart from the defence of available space, this is perhaps justifiable in that skateboarding, while being highly localised in its specific manifestations, is part of a global network of approximately like-minded practitioners. Nonetheless, certain regionalised differences within skateboarding have no doubt been erased. Similarly, the architecture and the fabric of the city referred to is seen to be more or less generic across cities world-wide.

Second, although concerned with the possibilities for social change, this thesis cannot, because of its subject matter, consider changes in material conditions but only changes in experience of material conditions. It therefore accepts this limitation as a given, and tries to consider the most positive critical aspects of skateboarding, perhaps to the denigration of a more “objective” account of its practices.

Third, and related to this point, skateboarders’ self-ideology is sometimes taken at face-value, used as evidence for a purported meaning or intended effect. At this point the historian’s judgement hopefully ensures that no gross instances of false consciousness have been represented as historical fact. At other times, the judgement has been that such a false consciousness is operating, and in such cases the self-ideologies are appropriately critiqued.

1.06 Scholarship

Beyond those written by this author, skateboarding has been the subject of only one, short academic article: a sociological account of a few skateboard competitions, almost entirely devoid of consideration of space, architecture and the city. A few design history books similarly focus on the surfaces of skateboard clothes, boards and other paraphernalia. Beyond this, the academic and external records of skateboarding are extremely limited. In architecture, this means occasional student architectural projects which address skateboarding from a design perspective, and even more infrequent asides by armchair architectural journalists, with such side-swipes as those at modernist architecture for providing “high speed race tracks for children on skateboards.” The national press fares a little better, running features on skateboarding every time it has an upturn, usually with the same material about professional skaters, language, music and other subcultural elements.

Within skateboarding itself, beyond the few sketchy overviews published in skateboarding magazines over the past 20 years, there have been no historical accounts of its internal practices and development, still less its wider social meanings.
There are no official records documenting the progress of skateboarding in the reference sections of your local libraries [...]. There’s no “official” version of skateboarding, no one has any claims to ownership.49

Skateboarding books may also contain potted histories, but these are typically little more than descriptions of equipment, and generally are aimed at the younger, children’s end of the skateboard market.

The archive of skateboarding is predominantly the various magazines which have promoted its development. These magazines, including SkateBoarder, Thrasher, TransWorld Skateboarding and Big Brother in the US and Skateboard!, R.A.D. and Sidewalk Surfer in the UK, provide the best historical source for skateboarding, and it is these which yield much evidence for this thesis. Their particular value lies in three areas. Firstly, they are an implicated part of the development of skateboarding, and are thus what historians call a primary source – unmediated by time and the backward look of the historian. Second, although often highly intelligent in their articles and reports, particularly through their self-deprecating demeanour, these magazines are not highly theorised. Nor are they the products of professional journalists, but the products of skateboarders themselves who have become journalists through working on such publications. Their agenda is not then the external agenda of the intellectual academic or careerist reporter, but the internal agenda of the intellectually active proponent. For this reason, I have not attempted to undertake a series of interviews or questionnaires with skateboarders, but rather have relied on whatever they saw fit to say and publish at the time. These skateboard magazines speak a certain truth about skateboarding, not just in terms of what they have say about something, but about the agenda put forward in the first place. They are, then, a more reliable source for, say, a consideration of the body-centric production of space in the skateparks of the 1970s than asking an older skateboarder to recollect such events some 20 years after the event.

Third, the skateboard magazines are highly illustrated with still and high-speed sequence photography. As such, this imagery as much as the written work provides “the nearest thing that we have to a historical record of what skateboarding is.”50 The photograph in fact has a triple value for this history of skateboarding. Most obviously, it provides a window onto the past, showing what went on and where. Second, the photograph is itself an implicated part of skateboarding, a process explained in Chapter 5. Third, the photographs reproduced here perform part of the argument of the thesis – the large number of images integrated into the text are then not so much just representations of what happened, but have approximately equal status to the words. Although I have not been able to undertake the use of the image conceptually, as I have argued for in architectural history on other occasions51 and as was attempted in the Strangely Familiar graphic-text,52 the performative nature of skateboarding’s consciousness (i.e. it ultimately means something when the skateboarder skateboards) means that the image of skateboarding acquires the status of a statement – it is not only a representation of a thing, the meaning of which is clarified through text, but is a representation of an enunciative act and hence carries meaning in a less mediated manner.

One final note: where necessary I have followed Lefebvre’s use of “man” in order to avoid anachronistic translations and paraphrasing. Elsewhere, the gender neutral “person,” “people,” “they” etc. have been used wherever possible.
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Section II  Socio-Spatial Theory
Reassertion of Space
2.01 Perceived, Conceived and Lived Space

Central to this thesis is the notion that space is not a natural entity but a social production, at once formed by and formative of social and temporal processes. According to Lefebvre:

"[T]he social relations of production have a social existence to the extent that they have a spatial existence; they project themselves into a space, becoming inscribed there, and in the process producing that space itself."¹

This is what Soja, following Lefebvre, refers to as the socio-spatial dialectic, which expresses the integral constitution of social life and space.² Social space includes both objects/people and their distance/distribution such that neither can exist, nor have meaning, without the other. Just as objects and people must exist in space in order to be real, so socially-constructed space must be defined in relation to some material condition in order to be social. It is wrong to speak of space being "occupied," for space has no a priori existence to that which occupies it. Space is only created.

Nonetheless, the treatment of space as if it were natural or a priori entity is common to much philosophical, geographical and historical writing. One of the problems of conceiving of space in this way is that it assumes the character of physical matter, promulgating Soja's "illusion of opacity,"³ (Lefebvre's "illusion réaliste" and "opacité spatiale"⁴), that sees only immediate appearances. Space here becomes physical matter, explained quantitatively through size, distance, distribution and regularity. Such criteria may describe spatial patterns of society, but they cannot explain conditions of production. Absent are "the deeper social origins of spatiality, its problematic production and reproduction, its contextualisation of politics, power and ideology."³

The opposite view of space as a mental construct might then provide some solutions. After all, as Soja notes, this particular tradition is very strong, with roots in Plato, taken up by Leibniz and developed most completely by Kant. Space here is a way of perceiving and ordering phenomena, as Lefebvre describes it, "Kantian space [. . . ] was quite clearly separated (along with time) from the empirical sphere: it belonged to the a priori realm of consciousness (i.e. of the 'subject'), and partook of that realm's internal, ideal – and hence transcendental and essentially ungraspable – structure."⁶

Yet here space becomes purely a matter of perception and cognition, and is ultimately removed from the social except as the intellectual construct of the individual subject. Such Kantian thinking can be seen in a diverse range of thinkers, including Weber and Simmel (see below), and the American transcendentalist Ralph Waldo Emerson's belief that the different spaces of the City and the Country were produced through different modes of thinking.⁷ Similarly, Spanish philosopher José Ortega y Gasset developed after Kant his philosophy of "perspectivism," where every point of view produces its own space.⁸ As Soja points out, while these conceptions of space may provide useful insights, their abstraction highly limits their applicability to materialist understandings of social space, creating an "illusion of transparency"⁹ (Lefebvre's "illusion de la transparence"¹⁰) which transposes concrete spatiality into the realm of intuition and idealism.¹¹ Mental space is only an intellectual abstraction of space, and never socially-produced space itself.

Nevertheless, mental conceptions of space do exist, providing for many their main means to understand space. How, then, are they integrated into the social production of space?

The clearest formulation of material spatiality as incorporating both physical and mental space is in The Production of Space, where Lefebvre expounds a conceptual triad of spatial activities which forms one of the cornerstones of his spatial theory.
The first of these three kinds of space, spatial practice (la pratique spatiale\textsuperscript{12}), concerns the production and reproduction of material life. It includes both everyday life and urban activities, resulting in the various functional spaces ranging from single rooms and buildings to large urban sites which form part of the material production of space. Spatial practice is thus roughly equivalent to the material base, producing the spatial forms and practices appropriate to different productive and reproductive activities.\textsuperscript{13} It is space as "perceived" as apparent, functional space before considering concepts and experiences. This is space as empirically observed.\textsuperscript{14}

The second kind of space, representations of space (les représentations de l'espace\textsuperscript{15}), concerns the conscious, codified conceptions of space typified by abstract understandings of space such as those of planning, science, mathematics and artists of a "scientific bent." Representations of space are a form of knowledge, necessary for spatial practices to take place. They thus tend toward intellectually constructed systems of verbal signs.\textsuperscript{16} This is space as conceived, as "the concept without life."\textsuperscript{17}

The third and last kind of space, spaces of representation (les espaces de représentation\textsuperscript{18}), concerns those spaces subconsciously experienced as symbols and images, or the space of "inhabitants" and "users."\textsuperscript{19} In part, the spaces of representation are the effect that conceptions of reality have in conditioning possibilities for action. In addition, however, they are also liberatory, for it is here that resistance to dominant social orders can take place. Spaces of representation are where space can be invented and imagined. They are thus both the space of the experienced and the space of the imagination, that is space as passively or actively "lived." Spaces of representation tend toward systems of non-verbal symbols and signs.\textsuperscript{21} (Some interpret the space of representation as the trialectical third term of the triad – what Soja, for example, calls a "Thirdspace"\textsuperscript{22} – preserving within itself the perceived and the conceived as well as the lived.

Lefebvre's more explicit definitions of the spaces of representation reject this, as with his description of spaces of representation as "life without concepts."\textsuperscript{23}

We thus have a sophisticated conceptualisation which situates mental conceptions of space in an overall conception of spatiality. Representations of space as explicit knowledge of space are the forms of spatial knowledge necessary for social being, which Lefebvre describes as "shot through with a knowledge (savoir) – i.e. a mixture of understanding (connaissance) and ideology."\textsuperscript{24} Spaces of representation are similarly passively experienced space, or actively imagined space necessary for innovation and thus for dynamic life.\textsuperscript{25} Taken together, representations of space and spaces of representation provide the conceptions and imaging necessary for spatial practice to operate. Mental space is thus rescued from the realm of the abstract, erroneous and immaterial and reconstrued as a necessary part of both spatiality and, a fortiori, of social being itself.

Furthermore, these kinds of space (as with time, space and energy) are not exclusive but only analytic categories.\textsuperscript{26} Spatial practices, representations of space and spaces of representation therefore necessarily incorporate each other in their concrete historical-geographical combinations, and the "long history of space" must account "for both representational spaces and representations of space, but above all for their interrelationships and their links with social practice."\textsuperscript{27} Lefebvre makes this point consistently, asserting that codes of space must be seen as the interaction between "subjects" and their surroundings,\textsuperscript{28} and also, more fundamentally, that such interrelationships form the object of study of life.

Knowledge falls into a trap when it makes representations of space the basis for the study of "life," for in doing so it reduces lived experience. The object of knowledge is, precisely, the fragmented and uncertain
connection between elaborated representations of space on the one hand and representational spaces (along with their underpinnings) on the other; and this "object" implies (and explains) a subject — that subject in whom lived, perceived and conceived (known) come together within a spatial practice.29

Lefebvre emphasises this point with reference to the human body, distinguishing between the use of the body as a social and spatial practice, the representations of the body as contained in science and in the context of nature, and its various cultural symbolisms.

That the lived, conceived and perceived realms should be interconnected, so that the "subject," the individual member of a given social group, may move from one to another without confusion — so much is a logical necessity.30

Real space and spatiality is then not situated at any one kind of spatial practice, representation of space or space of representation, nor composed of some additive combination of them, but is constructed in and through some configuration of their spatial and historical specificity.

2.02 Space and Social Theory

Fundamental to the reassertion of space is the notion that space used to be an important part of social theory. A large part of Postmodern Geographies is therefore given over to the intellectual history of space, from nineteenth century social science to contemporary academic geography, referring to recent figures as diverse as John Berger, Marshall Berman, and Michel Foucault. In Soja’s account, although mid-nineteenth century social thought held historicity and spatiality in roughly equal esteem, as in the work of Fourier, Proudhon, Kropotkin and Bakunin, from 1880 onward space was subordinated to time in the "historicist" social theory of those such as Lenin, Marshall, Pigou, Weber, Durkheim and Simmel.31 Consequently, social theorists have been oblivious to the "spatial fix" of capitalism, where "[a]t every scale of life, from the global to the local, the spatial organization of society was being restructured to meet the urgent demands of capitalism in crisis."32

Soja concludes that against the temporary absence of space in late nineteenth and twentieth century theory there must now be a reassertion of space.

Even though Soja recognises that this history is a sweeping generalisation,33 it poses a number of problems, not least that not all social theory is completely devoid of spatiality in this period, as Soja himself recognises.34 For example, in the work of at least four of the authors — Durkheim, Weber, Simmel and Husserl — referred to by Soja, space is only relatively absent.

In the urban reflections of Weber and Durkheim, space is, according to Soja, peripheralised into a passive container or mirror which alternatively holds or reflects social being.35 Yet in the founding sociology of Emile Durkheim, there is, as David Harvey notes, one of the first recognitions that no objective meaning can be assigned to space (or time) without being grounded in material processes. At any point in history more than one "objective" sense of space may exist, and space is thus socially constructed, with the systemicity of the social depending on its spatial structure (Durkheim’s "social morphology").36 Space is hereby included in an ad hoc manner into sociology, even occasionally inverting this social/spatial hierarchy, as with Durkheim’s contention that the division of labour increases with "moral density."37 Although never central to his sociological theory, space, particularly as manifested in the city and urbanisation, is an important condition in the development of specific sociological relations.38 Indeed, in The Division of Labour in
Society. Durkheim makes what is usually taken as the first use of the term "social space," albeit as a metaphorical rather than material space of social being.

Similarly in Weber, although space is undoubtedly implicitly assumed as a pre-existent phenomenon, in *The City* the medieval city at least is the fundamental unit of social organisation. Space here is the physical space of the city—the fortress, the market, the court—that underlies the social phenomena of modes of production, law and politics, and which vividly illustrates these phenomena without explaining them.

For later historical periods, Weber replaces the autonomous medieval city with the independent nation state as the smallest spatial unit for sociological analysis, and here the nation state and its boundaries deeply embed space into social theory. However, the city, even in capitalist societies, continued to play a reflective role, and Weber's personal diaries contain many reactions to the inscription of unequal social structures within early twentieth century New York, Chicago and St. Louis into spatial and temporal divisions:

When they finish work at five o'clock, people must often travel for hours to get home [...] the whole tremendous city [...] is like a man whose skin has been peeled off and whose intestines are seen at work.

Similarly, Weber noted in non-industrialised societies the relationship between spatial segregation and gender stratification, identifying men's houses as places of power that excluded women.

A phenomenological interest in the cultural everyday may be discerned in the work of Georg Simmel. Simmel is also more significant than Durkheim and Weber spatially, as his founding work on sociology both directly and implicitly recognises the importance of space. As Derek Gregory points out, although Simmel was "acutely sensitive" to the temporal nature of modernity, his work does not justify Soja's charge of historicism. Indeed, although space in Simmel's writings may not assume centre stage, Simmel scholar David Frisby notes that Simmel was "the first sociologist to reveal explicitly the social significance of spatial contexts for human interaction." Elsewhere, in a more extended paper, I have considered Simmel's writings for their exhaustive range of spatialities in the context of the modern metropolis. Questions of space are in fact not only central to much of Simmel's understanding of the city, but also offer many insights into the formulation of social space as currently being debated in multi-disciplinary studies today. In Simmel, a treatment of methodological procedure, size, number, density, exclusivity, boundaries, fixity, distance and movement in space are developed into a conception of space as being beyond the physical, and into a consideration of such things as epistemology, metaphysics, oscillating scales, visibility and experience. Simmel shows space to be a pervasive entity, embedded in the continual reproduction of society and cities.

Simmel's conception of space, then, is in keeping with Soja's definition of spatiality as the social quality of socially-produced space. While the notions of non-visible and non-physical spatiality, and the oscillation of spatial scales, are similar to the kinds of spatial analysis proposed by Soja in *Postmodern Geographies*, Simmel also develops a sense of spatiality beyond that which Soja actually attempts, as shown later in this chapter.

Turning to the fourth of Soja's "historicist" thinkers, Edmund Husserl may perhaps be more accurately located in the rising concentration on time over space, as Lefebvre also accords, yet spatiality nonetheless plays its part. Husserl was considerably influenced by Simmel, and as Soja notes, deploys a "regional" ontology wherein social being and spatiality are combined as part of being-in-the-world, giving rise to positioning within the "lifeworld" (*Lebenswelt*). However, other aspects of
Husserl's work are of interest to the development of spatiality. Most notably, Husserl's eidetic phenomenological abstraction conceived that there can be no distinction between what is perceived (the object) and the perception of it, and thus a system of universal essences is constructed not in the world but in the mind. This system, as Martin Jay points out, carries an implicit critique of "ocularcentrism" (privilege of the eye), undercutting the Cartesian epistemological tradition of installing a spectatorial distance between the viewing subject and the viewed object.53 In particular, consciousness for Husserl was not independent of its object, but, as Jay puts it, "was always of something." As a result, rather than the scientific notion of Soja's "illusion of opacity," this opens up a conception of space beyond both physicality and vision. Furthermore, as Jay also points out, Husserl's later work stresses not the transcendental ego but the pre-reflective Lebenswelt, and hence the historical variations of everyday life and the lived body.54 This move away from a phenomenology of eidetic intuition and pure essences enabled others, notably Maurice Merleau-Ponty but also Jean-Paul Sartre, to extend their own phenomenology into the interrelation of things and the body in space.

The spatiality of Husserl may also be tracked in another way, for his work, with its bracketing off of the outside world, concept of inner man, and concentration on the experience of essences led to a series of phenomenological studies of time and space. Most influential of these is the reading of space and memory undertaken by Gaston Bachelard. *Poetics of Space* has long been a classic, and is frequently referred to in architectural theory.55 Bachelard's importance has also been recognised by Lefebvre for, along with Heidegger, linking spaces of representation with the intimate space of the dwelling, so distinguishing them from scientific representations of space.56 *Poetics of Space* concentrates on images of "felicitous space" (the house, chests and wardrobes, nests and shells, spaces in miniature, intimate immensity, outside and inside, roundness) in order to grasp the human value of space. This space is not the "real" space of the social world but the way space is lived by the imagination - spaces which attract the human mind.57

Bachelard's work is thus quite distinct from Soja's materialist conception of space. Above all, Bachelard's "topoanalysis" is a study of sites of intimacy - a study of being in space, and not in time. The aim is "to go beyond history" for "space is everything, for time ceases to quicken memory." Time does not record concrete duration, and to localise memory in time is merely the act of the biographer. By contrast, memories in space are motionless, more secure and sound.58

Bachelard's work is also significant for his use in *Psychoanalyse de feu* of the term rhythm analysis (rhythmanalysis) - first borrowed from the Brazilian philosopher Peinheiro dos Santos and further developed in *La dialectique de la durée* - and which Lefebvre picks up on in *Production of Space* and develops later in *Éléments de rythmanalyse* as a means of combining the body, space and time.61 The concept of rhythm analysis is returned to later in Chapter 3.

The case of Bachelard moves our attention to other authors absented from Soja's intellectual history of spatiality. In part this is due to his concentration on alternatively academic and/or western marxist thought. While the history of the academic institution may partly support Soja's contention that social theorisation became increasingly dominated by a temporally-minded historical materialism,62 notably those more spatially-minded theorists - Fourier, Kropotkin, Proudhon and Bakunin - excluded from this academy of social science were nonetheless of seminal influence in other areas. The first three in particular were very influential in the nascent disciplines of urban design, planning and architecture, and especially with those proposing alternative modes of living. A pair of examples will
serve to highlight the significance of this intellectual flow.

Thus in the early nineteenth century, communitarian settlements – particularly those in America – were frequently influenced by social theorists, and in particular by Charles Fourier and Robert Owen. Hundreds of socialist towns, such as those by Owenites, Associationists, Shakers and Amana Inspirationists, were built from Maine to California. However, such experiments, although numerous, affected only a small percentage of Americans, and their influence was therefore relatively limited.

A more pervasive example of the influence of these spatially-minded theorists, itself widely disseminated in architecture and urban planning, is the idea of the garden city. Included in the many disparate sources for Ebenezer Howard's conception of the garden city were Fourier and Kropotkin. Fourier's plans for a passionate society were well known to Howard, and a main source for his promotion of co-operative housekeeping in the English garden cities. Alternative forms of living may now seem unexpected elements in the garden city, but in its original form the garden city was far more radical than many now realise, and included common ownership of land, exclusion of private property, and production based on co-operative rather than competitive, capitalist principles. Of fundamental influence here were the territorial ideas of Peter Kropotkin, whose *Fields, Factories and Workshops* in part persuaded Howard to include facilities ranging from agricultural ventures, manufacturing and craft production to full educational, residential and social provision.

Many of these ideas subsequently passed into mainstream western planning theory and practice, the enormous significance of which should not be under-estimated. Overt replication and adaptation of the garden city idea took place in state-led initiatives world-wide, such as the New Deal Greenbelt programme of inter-war U.S.A and the post-war New Towns programme of the U.K. Of even more widespread significance are the myriad of twentieth century state and private sector housing projects that, even while often greatly altered from the garden city idea, still incorporate garden city derived features ranging from low-density development and a vague marriage of town and countryside to cottage-style single-residence non-apartment living and an overriding concentration on accommodation for the nuclear family.

These two historical episodes – utopian communities and the garden city – disclose some of the narrowing tendencies in the consideration of spatial theory in the domain of the social science academy. Three tendencies are noted below, each raising themes that will be returned to repeatedly over the course of this critique.

Firstly, theorists who apparently fade from mainstream social scientific thought do not necessarily fade from historical significance, and may indeed continue to have substantial import in other ways. The degree to which space is given attention in theory cannot then be the sole measure of the status of space in society as a whole. Although this may seem obvious, it is, as we shall see, an implicit assumption of Soja's account of space.

Second, spatial activity with ideational qualities may occur at other than theoretical levels. Howard's garden city was only partly influenced by social theorists, whether spatially-minded like Kropotkin or not, and indeed was continually directed at a practical resolution in the form of actual construction and social being as lived. This suggests a more complex relationship between spatial theory and spatial practice than the former informing the latter. Spatial theory is not the sole determinant of spatial practice.

Third, and most importantly, ideas about spatial theory are not exhausted by theorists of the social science academy. The various community projects described by Dolores Hayden show that those concerned with gender have consciously considered space and spatial relations to achieve their objec-
Space and its territorial construction as place has frequently lain at the heart of these struggles, a consideration that Sharon Zukin, Doreen Massey and Rob Shields among many others have addressed. The similar geographical concerns of anti-colonial movements and their theorists are, however, omitted from both Soja's Postmodern Geographies and Harvey's Condition of Postmodernity. Another related omission is of any treatment of the nation and/ or nationalism (true also of twentieth century marxism as a whole).

There are then, beyond those more conventional arenas, other voices and other structures in which spatial concerns may be seen to matter. At the heart of these three criticisms lies a more fundamental problem in Postmodern Geographies: equating theory with reality. In part Soja sees social theory as a reflection of the historical-geography of cities, as when he notes that the crises of capitalist cities are seen "reflected" in the history of theoretical consciousness. There are at least two extremely problematic aspects to this model. Firstly, if the spatial focus of contemporary social theory reflects the spatial nature of social being, and given that there are undoubtedly historical connections between the two, this is nonetheless extremely difficult to demonstrate outside of very specific examples. While it is possible to identify general conceptions of time and space for an epoch, as Stephen Kern has shown, abstract theoretical conceptions do not, as a general historical rule – for this is what Soja implies – adequately represent these general conceptions. Instead, theoretical arenas such as that of modernism are "reaction formations" intended to address the problematic of social change. Social theory does not, therefore, articulate real life, rather it acts as one form of its resolution, one means amongst many of considering social being.

Why then are highly codified elucidations interpreted as reflections of, or evidence for, more commonplace understandings of time and space? The answer to this rests in the second problem with Soja’s model: a concept of base and superstructure. In Soja’s formulation, superstructural activities, here intellectual systems, are held to have an immediate relationship with the base. This is a well-known problem in marxist accounts of culture and society, but its criticism and more sophisticated configuration have been largely confined to cultural and historical analysis. In short, Soja as geographer is following an out-moded conception of culture in marxist thought, in which simultaneity of existence is taken as proof of direct historical connection.

2.03 Macro-Time: Periodisation

Although overly-reliant on simultaneity as historical proof, Postmodern Geographies is not without a conception of historical time; this occurs most notably as a pervasive notion of a macro-time – periodisation.

Soja's historical periodisation is drawn partly from Eric Hobsbawm and David Gordon and in particular from Marshal Berman and Ernst Mandel. The rationale is that of long waves of systematic development: although modernisation is uneven across time and space, it has "on occasion" become systematically synchronic, affecting all capitalist societies simultaneously, and this synchronisation comes in "macro-rhythms" or "wave-like periodicity" of restructuring. Thus while Soja rejects the phasing of modernity with modes of production, he accepts its phasing with the long waves of capitalist development.

The primary exponent of these capitalist macro-rhythms is Mandel who also, Soja notes, is particularly concerned with connecting the periodicity of modernisation with geographical restructurings. First, then, is an historical periodisation, divided into four parts: the classical era of competitive industrial capitalism in the 50 years centred around 1848-51, Hobsbawm’s "age of capital;" the modernisation of capitalism ca. 1875-1914, the "age of empire" and
corporate oligopoly; the modernisation of capitalism, Fordism and bureaucratic state-management from the Russian revolution until the 1960s; and the crisis-induced modernisation of capitalism from the 1960s to the present, Mandel's late capitalism.84

As Gregory notes, this periodisation works better as a temporal than spatial matrix, and is too crude to deal with variations in and across cities.85 In part this is due to Soja's preferred spatial scale, which, with the partial exception of the two LA essays at the end of Postmodern Geographies, focuses on regional or urban development not according to their specific geographical development but their position in the general development of capitalism.

In terms of regional development, Soja follows Harvey's notions of the continual reformation of geographical landscapes, and, again, Mandel in his notion of uneven development as the result of the hierarchical structure in capitalism of different levels of productivity. In the period of "freely competitive capitalism" superprofits derive from regional juxtapositions within countries, from enforced hegemony over dependent territories. The second period of imperialism and corporate monopolies and oligopolies, from the late nineteenth century to the Great Depression, is marked by a global structure of core and periphery – an international juxtaposition of development – while the periods of Fordism and "late capitalism" are marked by the predominance of "technological rents," or profits from advances in productivity created by technological and organisational developments. This last phenomenon leads to sectoral rather than spatial uneven development, which nonetheless produces much more complex spatial patterns of (uneven) development.86

According to Soja, the periodicity of capitalist development and associated spatial regional development is also matched by the evolution of urban form.

[I]t becomes increasingly possible to argue that the evolution of urban form (the internal spatial structure of the capitalist city) has followed the same periodizable rhythm of crisis-induced formation and reformation that has shaped the macro-geographical landscape of capital since the beginnings of large-scale industrialization.87

Thus the "mercantile city" contained pre-capitalist transparencies of immediate social relationships, making inequalities very evident physically, and creating a need for a more spatially and socially opaque mode of capital accumulation.88

Next, the "competitive industrial capitalist city" (1840s-70s) was formed by extraordinary industrial urban growth, leading to a very dense geographic concentration of production. Great expansion of industrial factories and producer services, the industrial bourgeoisie and new urban proletariat were accompanied by intensification of land use in city centres in turn matched by the disciplinary spatialisation of class-based city zoning with residential rings and radial sectors.89

In the "corporate-monopoly capitalist city" (1875-1914), city form followed corporate centralisation, increased segmentation of labour force, and the separation of management and production functions. Industrial production became less concentrated around the city centre, with tertiarised urban cores and residential rings sprawling outward in a first surge of suburbanisation and incorporated municipalities.90

The city as "state-managed urban system" followed the great twentieth century restructuring process in the 1920s-60s, amplifying the processes of the second modernisation: increased centralisation, further suburbanisation, and the selective abandonment of inner core coupled with schemes for downtown "revitalization." Urban growth is based on a prolonged economic boom organised by the state as "state monopoly capitalism."91

Lastly, the current period sees the solutions of the 1940s-60s becoming problematic. The continual
search for superprofits and social control leads to
two processes of intensification and extensification
of capitalism, typified by the increased centralisation
of capital, global production systems, internationalisation of capital, restructuring of international
and regional divisions of labour, and territorial competition. All this results in a spatial kaleidoscope,
with significant de-industrialisation and re-industrialisation, further suburbanisation being matched by
orchestrated downtown “renaissances,” and the
creation of the “outer city” (typified by Orange County).92

This periodisation both raises the question of
the scale of analysis and shows the level at which
this is resolved in Postmodern Geographies. To begin
with, Soja states that the synchronised periodicity of
the city with that of the region and general capitalist
development leads to “a significant recontextual-
ization of the spatiality of social life” or “a different
human geography.”93 However, although the
Mandel-derived periodisation may work with regard
to general capitalist development, it is rather crude
for historical-geography other than at decade-
demarcated temporal and global/regional spatial
scales. The characterisation of different city types
highlights this problem: with little fine grain of time,
space or human agency, historical-geography is
reduced to a diagram – as Soja does in a single
page for the four-stage evolutionary development of
the U.S. city.94 [02.01] It is also exactly the kind of
characterisation – “instant infinity, a situation remi-
niscent of a Mondrian painting”95 – that Lefebvre
warns against, which ignores the true complexity of
social space as constituted by many different super-
imposed and interpenetrated social spaces.96

The periodisation diagram is not incorrect, and
may provide a useful guide to the historical develop-
ment of cities; it is an idealised generalisation, illus-
trating key restructuring processes not always
found together in every city.97 Nonetheless, it is
highly problematic, for not only may the model not
apply in every city, but every city may not be found
in the model. The diagram discloses the reductivity
of long wave periodisation, compressing historical
development into a programmatic form. It also
reveals the problem of scale, for if historical geogra-
phy is really to effect a “significant recontextualiza-
tion of the spatiality of social life” then the scale of
focus will need to be more flexible than Soja’s. His
call for a regional perspective – “critical regional
studies” – synthesising the urban and the global
while attending to the state,98 is incapable of
addressing either the spatiality of the micro-urban
or of social life experienced by human agency. This
is one of the most significant short-comings of the
two concluding LA essays, as we shall see later.

Another problem is also raised here. In following
Mandel, Soja states that the long wave periodicity is
not just a series of historical eras but also “a
sequence of spatialities, a changing regional config-
uration of ‘uneven and combined’ capitalist devel-
opment that can be mapped on to the [historical]
sequence of modernities.” 99 What, however, consti-
tutes this “sequence of spatialities” – not just the
ways they are different, but how the sequence is
effected, and how they are “mapped on to” history?
Soja answers this theoretically when rejecting Massey's conception of a "layering" of specific urban spatialisations, noting instead that each form contains traces of previous forms, and that each also contains representations of the past. He also recognises that these patterns are more complex in cities where pre-capitalist urbanisation has occurred - New York more than Chicago, London more than Manchester.

The need then is for the articulation of those constraints and opportunities through which spatiality of cities develops. Soja’s explanation of the spatial development of LA, seeing it as “shaped primarily by the social and spatial relations of the Corporate City,” while perhaps appropriate for LA itself (although even here we might expect reference to inherited, historical conditions) is too simple for application to other cities. Spatiality here is most explicit in terms of waves of restructuring, and less so in the material constraints that one period places on the next. Whatever the theoretical disposition, the specific articulation of it for LA smacks of Massey’s layering of spaces. As this account of LA makes clear, the problem with following a periodisation is that time and hence historical specificity is forever conceptualised as the long durée, and rarely as the experienced time of past-present-future or time-of-now.

This is particularly obvious when Soja relates LA to his general spatialised periodised restructuring of capitalism, where “a brief historical glance” describes the physical, social and economic growth of the city. Spatialisation here is not only limited to description and association by simultaneity, but LA is continually seen as prototypical of other cities, as for “sunbelt” forms of industrialisation, and as epitomising their characteristics, as with the Watts “riots” generated by urbanisation. If LA really is to provide clues as to the spatial development of other cities, and if human geography really is to be different, the multi-complexity of representations and constraints must be found elsewhere.

2.04 Macro-Space: a “Postmodern Geography” of Los Angeles

It is worth, then, exploring the spatiality of Soja’s own analyses of urban space. Such an exploration discloses a concern more with the macro-space of LA than with the particular historical-geographical intersection of space, time and social being; if the scaling of time in Postmodern Geographies is limited to the period, long wave and epoch, then the scaling of space is similarly limited to the restructured, urban pattern and region.

The two chapters which conclude Postmodern Geographies, “It All Comes Together in Los Angeles” and “Taking Los Angeles Apart: Towards a Postmodern Geography,” are intended as exemplars of Soja’s reassertion of space in urban geography and critical social theory. In the first of these, Soja describes the immense industrial, economic and population development of LA over the past 150 years, bringing together various histories of agriculture, oil, automobiles, suburban expansion, demographics, high technology, garment industries, finance, government administration, Pacific Rim trade, defence, poverty, gangs, multi-ethnicity, Sunbelt post-fordism, “exopolis” developments and global capitalism. As he notes, however, this is essentially a summary, an “informed regional description” depicting “only some of the broad vistas visible from the vantage point of LA.” It is a statistical and historical quantification that uses LA as attenuated reflection of capitalist urban development world-wide.

It is the second LA chapter in which Soja tries “to see if there are other spaces to be explored, other vistas to be opened to view.” It is this chapter which is offered up as a “postmodern geography.”

Soja begins by remarking that, like Jorge Luis Borges’ fictional “Aleph,” LA is at once profoundly conflictual in its history, limitless and changing in its spatiality, and so peculiarly resistant to analysis.
Soja’s response then is to enact a “deconstruction”¹⁰⁹ of L.A.

What follows then is a succession of fragmentary glimpses, a freed association of reflective and interpretive field notes which aim to construct a critical human geography of the Los Angeles urban region. My observations are necessarily and contingently incomplete and ambiguous, but the target I hope will remain clear: to appreciate the specificity and uniqueness of a particularly restless geographical landscape while simultaneously seeking to extract insights at higher levels of abstraction.¹¹⁰

His intention, through L.A., is to explore “glimmers of a fundamental spatiality of social life” and “the adhesive relations between society and space.”¹¹¹

In practice, however, the analysis falls far short of such ambitious aims. In effect, this “postmodern geography” is limited to a kind of lyrical yet statistical description of the “Sixty-Mile Circle”¹¹² around the L.A. Downtown, aimed at uncovering its hidden facets, and in particular its extensive military importance, industrialisation and aerospace industry. Yet the spatiality of the built environment and the quotidian remains an elusive, fragmentary and even metaphorical game between the evocations of Soja’s freewheeling descriptions and the geographic-economic analysis in the previous chapter.

In particular, space is identified by sight (both real and metaphorical) and described by geometry – the Sixty-Mile Circle, a transactional “web” of industrial linkages,¹¹³ geographic “clusters,”¹¹⁴ “transsects of eagerly awaited symmetries,”¹¹⁵ “nodality” of the centre,¹¹⁶ “concentric” residential rhythm,¹¹⁷ urban theory which “radiates” from the nodality of the centre,¹¹⁸ “pentagonal” urban core,¹¹⁹ and even “resultant surfaces of social geometry” visible as “geographic expressions of the crude orderliness induced by the effects of nodality.”¹²⁰
Although in many ways accurate descriptions, what are they accurate descriptions of? They are in fact a précis of physical distribution, patterning, geometry – all the phenomena of exactly that dead physical space of “areal” geography that Soja avoids in his more sophisticated theoretical explanations.121 Both the actual focus of attention (the physicality of the areal) and the language used to describe it (geometric terms) are those previously used by a modern geography which conceives of space only as the product of (and not productive of) social being, and more usually as simply a measurable dimension. Soja even notes that the fit of the Two-Parameter Negative Exponential Population Density Gradient (TPNEDG, derived from Von Thunen, and the primary tool of spatial analysis for geographers from the old Chicago School to the New Urban Economists) seems to work, although also that empirical regularities in the LA surface geometry should not be taken as explanation.122

Soja instead seeks explanation for social-spatial correlations elsewhere. Most usually, this is considered as simultaneity; like his identification of social theory with more general cultures of times and space, Soja tends toward an explanation of space and the social based on their co-existence in any one time and space. Thus we are not told how the “pattern of nodality” is “socially constructed,” what constitutes the “authoritative and allocative power of the urban centre,” just how a city centre serves as a “key surveillant node of the state,” or indeed what might constitute a “Derridean deconstruction of all differences between the ‘central’ and the ‘marginal.’”123

In effect, Soja looks at the things most common to geographers – population and industrial patterns, the economic geography of restructuring processes and so forth – and, as such, his spatial descriptions are rather conventional.124 Occasionally, representations of space and spaces of representations are alluded to (even dramatically in parts), as with brief one-line references to a “shattered metro-sea of fragmented yet homogenized communities,”125 to the “surveillant”126 and “panopticon” government citadel,127 and to “cognitive mapping.”128 but such things are oddly separate to any discussion of the production (or even description) of space. The actual production of space is, for Soja, constituted predominantly as the production of regions by the global patterns of capitalism, and revealed by the distribution and patterning of population, industry etc.

As to buildings and experiences, these are the products of these forces; they appear as simultaneous glosses over sizes and distributions, for architecture here is not involved in the reproduction of space but simply “recapitulates and reflects the sprawling manufactured spaces of LA.”129 Corporate financial buildings in downtown become the evidence or “attachment posts” for “silvery webs of financial and commercial transactions extending practically everywhere on earth,”130 the Hotel Bonaventure is a “simulation” of the LA landscape (and vice-versa),131 and the names of different cities within LA County (City of Industry, City of Commerce) are “simulacra” representations of their origins.132

The reliance on simultaneity and reflection is supported and obscured by Soja’s pervasive use of physically and visually metaphorical language.133 Throughout the LA chapters the Sixty-Mile Circle is “inscribed” on the landscape,134 “cuts” the south coast,135 and operates as a “Herculean wall;”136 the sequence of Pacific wars is an “unfolding” process,137 the city inception in 1781 was “smoky;”138 and we hear of the “lines of sight” of academic “explorers,”139 the “spinning off” of research projects,140 the “flow” of federal contracts,141 the “centripetal force” of nodality,142 people who “adhere,”143 the “surveillant eye” of the city centre,144 the “spatial sanctum” (i.e. building) of the Los Angeles Times,145 etc. All these metaphors use either the visual and/or the physical to make a degree of spatialisation more apparent in Soja’s
text, and, as such, it is open to considerable criticism. While such word-play might be an integral part of a semiotic or poststructuralist reading of texts, Soja’s analysis is not such a project, but an attempt to analyse the spaces and forces of L.A. As such, metaphors do little more than aid the readerly qualities of the text, and cannot help the explication of the city. Indeed, by operating at a level of textual trickery they mask the absence of any detailed appraisal of spatiality. In short, metaphors help obfuscate the essential problem with Soja’s analysis, namely that spatialisation remains at the levels of description and metaphorical association, and so scarcely carries out the elaborate understandings of the socially-spatial dialectic.

The overarching tools of analysis of Soja in these L.A. chapters are then not the Foucaultian, existential, phenomenological or cultural figures invoked in the earlier more theoretical parts of Postmodern Geographies, but a continued deployment of the commonplace models of the city (largely derived from the Chicago School), and which are re-presented in a new vocabulary. The result is to merely revitalise those old geographic traditions, without evoking history and spatiality.¹⁴⁶ The kind of historical-geographic space re-enacted is a chronological layering rather than a continual reproduction of historical constraints, conditions and creativities; space is predominantly a location, quantity and distribution of occupation.

There is, however, one form of spatial experience which does pervade Soja’s account of L.A., which carries some powerful operative procedures and which has already been noted above: vision. Above all, space in these chapters is experienced through the eye, either literally (subject eye and object), representationally (map, diagram), or metaphorically (the epistemology of the all-seeing and hence all-knowing master).¹⁴⁷

In the case of the experiencing eye of the subject, some attempt is made to suggest the physical presence of the author as the real observer of the

---

¹⁴⁶ City of Quartz and “cruised the mean streets” of L.A.¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁷ Instead, it is the representation of seeing that pervades Postmodern Geographies in the form of the map, the overseeing eye, and the macro-description. We are repeatedly presented with descriptions of the city as “a confusing collage of signs,”¹⁵⁰ the “patterning of twentieth century urbanisation,”¹⁵¹ a

---

¹⁴⁸ Like any private-eye operating out of Southern California, he plunges into the past to discover what really happens [. . .]

Pausing only to check his pockets for cigarettes, Soja hits the streets of Los Angeles.¹⁴⁸

---

¹⁴⁸ More usually, however, there is little evidence that Soja emulated Mike Davis’ research for City Of Quartz and “cruised the mean streets” of L.A.¹⁴⁹

---

¹⁴⁹ Edward W. Soja, Postmodern Geographies, p. 226.
“spiralling tour”\textsuperscript{152} around the central city, the “worldview” from Redondo Beach,\textsuperscript{153} and an “extraordinary crazy quilt.”\textsuperscript{154} A “view of the outer spaces of Los Angeles” is in fact a diagrammatic map showing county boundaries, freeways and districts within the Sixty-Mile Circle, annotated with place names and population statistics. [02.05] This, then, is the real space of Soja’s “postmodern geography” of L.A.: map and map-like descriptions in words and lines, annotated with social detail.

The problem is that Soja conceives of the “unseeable” as being revealed through a fiction of himself in the field actually seeing these things. But of course he is not actually in the field looking, and presenting descriptions as a seeing process evokes not explanation but just a more dramatic description. Nor would actually seeing these things have helped – direct observation is by no means the only way to discover historical-geography – but it does suggest that city spatiality cannot be reduced to the map.

Also significant is the epistemology implied here. Primarily, Soja does not realise, unlike Rosalyn Deutsche among many others, that visual space is a set of social relations, and can never innocently reflect “real” social relations.\textsuperscript{155} In terms of epistemology, this error is what James Clifford and George Marcus have termed “visualism:” the enlightenment belief that they who see somehow completely know and master the object seen and of which they speak.\textsuperscript{156} Ultimately, through adopting an elevated position over L.A, Soja seemingly maintains exactly that authoritative, all-seeing and all-knowing position of the enlightenment master.\textsuperscript{157}

Such a position is reinforced by the language deployed in Postmodern Geographies. Beside metaphors, Soja plays with textual form in other ways. Significantly, the book structure is announced as oppositional to the grand narrative, seeking “to deconstruct and recompose the rigidly historical narrative,” inviting readers to consume chapters out of sequence,\textsuperscript{158} and presenting them with a first chapter which is at once “Preface and Postscript.” In fact, the book is quite traditional in structure, being a reworking of previously published essays which ultimately provides a linear intellectual history of the concept of space in social theory, complete with final case studies. As Gregory points out, Postmodern Geographies is postmodern in its theoretical sensibilities, but uses a modernist model of the text.\textsuperscript{159} Instead of postmodern openness, an authoritative argument tends toward leaving out counter-arguments that would distract from Soja’s central attack on historicism. For example, Soja plays little attention to geography itself, which, as Massey points out, was for many decades spatialised to the point of a complete absence of time and the social,\textsuperscript{160} while, in this text at least, Soja also pays little heed to other postmodern thinkers concerned with feminism and postcolonial discourses.\textsuperscript{161}

Specifics of writing style add to this authority effect: alliterations like “compartmentalized corona”\textsuperscript{162} and “simultaneously simulated”\textsuperscript{163} abound, a seeming mimicry of Jean Baudrillard’s writings.\textsuperscript{164} As a result, some discern a “self-presentation” of the author and other important white male academics rather than clarity of communication, a sense of Soja’s (masculinist) presence being reinforced by such anecdotal details as a trip made around L.A in the company of Fredric Jameson and Lefebvre.\textsuperscript{165}

The impression of an influential “in-crowd”\textsuperscript{166} of theorists is also subtly reinforced by Soja’s repeated use of the theoretical phraseology, either with appropriate acknowledgements, as with references to Foucault’s “little tactics of the habitat”\textsuperscript{167} or “heterotopias,”\textsuperscript{168} or without acknowledgement, such as the “prisonhouse of language”\textsuperscript{169} (a reference to a Jameson text, itself a Nietzsche reference), “cognitive mapping”\textsuperscript{170} (Jameson), “simulacra” (Baudrillard),\textsuperscript{171} and “deconstruction”\textsuperscript{172} (Derrida). Acknowledged or not, Soja frequently deploys such terminology without substantive reference to the original idea, and hence as a pseudo-theoretical
surface to otherwise quite conventional ideas. This is most apparent in the supposed "deconstruction" of LA in the last few pages, where Soja in fact attempts none of the three-fold tactics of Derridean deconstruction: reversal of binary terms, movement of displacement, and discovery of a third term undecidable within a binary logic. Instead, Soja's "deconstruction" is a straightforward uncovering of the "economic order" beneath the "semiotic blanket" of LA architecture and urban development.

Similarly, Soja uses the terms of "nodality," in part derived from an extensive discussion of Anthony Giddens' "structuration" theory. In this case, however, the theoretical significance goes far beyond the casual deployment of a word, and a deeper investigation of the spatialised ontology of Giddens in general reveals an influence on Soja which has had deep and far-reaching effects for his own elucidation of social space.

Giddens' theory of structuration is concerned with the dialectical relation between structure and human agency, asserting that all social interaction is situated in time-space. The Constitution of Society provides the most spatialised version of this ontology, introducing "contextuality," "locale," "regionalization," "system integration" and "time-space distanciation." Such formulations Soja describes as "the most rigorous, balanced and systematic ontological statement currently available on the spatio-temporal structuration of social life," allowing Giddens to come, in Soja's view, closer than any other theorist in understanding that "the intelligible lifeworld of being is always and everywhere comprised of a multi-layered system of socially created nodal regions, a configuration of differentiated and hierarchically organized locales."

Giddens' ontological categories such as locale, regionalisation and time-space distanciation constitute a laudable attempt to articulate spatial scales and human interaction in conjunction with each other. However, the socio-spatial scales which Giddens develops are only generalised; while terms - regionalisation and locale in particular - often seem to refer to historically- and geographically-specific subjects, in fact they are curiously unspecified. What, for example, exactly constitutes the "boundaries" or the "locale"? At what scale are we to consider the region? Is regionalisation the situation of a city in its region, a sub-section of a continent, or a formal construction without scale, but necessary to the operation of the ontological system?

Despite this tendency to the abstract, Giddens' ontology offers an oscillation between the single agent, community, and the world. And, notably, Soja follows his assessment of Giddens with his own set of multi-scalar terms: nodalities, localities, and territoriality. The aim here is to tighten the spatial specificity of the ontology. For example, in the case of the "locality" - the "building blocks of urbanization" - Soja emphasises the scalar range which such a concept may cover, ranging from "the smallest settlement or neighborhood to the largest conurbation."

Soja's "locality" is, then, a modified version of the Giddensian "locale," edging away from ontology and closer to an epistemological and materially-specific realm. The aim is to go beyond understandings of cities focusing on size, density and function which tend to conceal the urban as the conjunction of nodality, space and power: cities are "control centres, citadels designed to protect and dominate through what Foucault called 'the little tactics of the habitat,' through a subtle geography of enclosure, confinement, surveillance, partitioning, social discipline and spatial differentiation." Urbanisation then represents "a break from ontological generality and forces a transition to a more concretely specified historical geography," such that it can be seen as a projection of Giddens' ontological system. However, as Soja notes, although scale and hierarchy must be seen as social constructs, there have been relatively few and only initial considerations of
this subject. Further articulation of these spatial scales awaits enquiry in the more specific realms of concrete social being.

But, it is exactly this more historically and geographically specific enquiry which is absent in Soja’s analysis of L.A. In particular, while Soja provides a more specific interpretation of the node, region and even perhaps locale in the two L.A chapters, it is the failure to focus on, still less develop, Giddensian “contextuality” which leads to the unresolved nature of these pages. Contextuality, for Giddens, is “[t]he situated character of interaction in time-space, involving the setting of interaction, actors co-present and communication between them,” and, although Soja specifically states that the human body is the “first and prefigurative of [the] hierarchy of differentiated nodal locales,” it is precisely this domain of human experience and situatedness which Soja signs only by the map and overseeing eye. Quoting Giddens at length in relation to surveillance in L.A serves not to develop an argument or interpret a specific space or event, but only as a parallel theoretical statement on the same page. This, unfortunately, is theory without a ground, space without architecture, maps without people.

The production of space in Postmodern Geographies is ultimately founded on economic logic, a simple reflective urban space rather than human agency in a socio-spatial dialectic. Furthermore, Soja’s understanding of economics is itself based on orthodox micro-economics, where agents’ behaviour is determined by structurally-given opportunities for profit. That Soja fails to develop the dialectic between agents and structure can be seen in his contention that the city’s restructuring involves the restoration of opportunities for superprofits and the establishment of greater control over the labour force, while the spatial dimension of this process is simply the selective destruction and reconstruction of the “economic landscape.” Space here, then, is the product of the relations of production, division of labour and international circulation of capital/finance; this much largely accounts for the existence of certain industries in L.A. This is perhaps the most satisfactory part of the formula – the macro-theory of the production of space by capitalism – and simultaneously the least successful, because of the closures and omissions that accompany it. Soja’s ontology is essentially a general one, tied neither to the specifics of place, nor to the recent developments of late capitalism.

Before leaving Postmodern Geographies, it is worth further considering what has been omitted; doing so provides valuable pointers toward the formulation of a different conception of socially produced space later in this thesis.

As Soja points out, a deconstructive account of social theory, attempting to reconstitute the role of space, is on its own insufficient, and should also be attuned to “all the scales of modern power,” and to “the emancipatory struggles of all those who are peripheralized and oppressed” in order to “contribute to a radical postmodernism of resistance.” Soja does, somewhat sketchily, describe the social, racial and occupational fragmentation of the L.A population. Yet even here space is described as distribution and pattern, and consequently there is little sense of spatiality. Social control in particular is seen to spring effortlessly from segmentation, without any regard to the particular spaces or spatial logics by which it is enacted.

Soja in effect addresses none of the three things suggested above: the oscillation of scales, inclusion of emancipatory struggles, or identification of resistances. This is despite his desire to undertake “cogent interpretation of the dramatic and often confusing fourth modernization of capitalism that is presently taking place.” This may be because Soja is understandably loathe to abandon modern Marxism and social science, stating that such tools should be “flexibly and adaptively restructured” to contend with the “restructured instrumentalities of class
exploitation, gender and racial domination.”

Soja’s does not propose a radical postmodern political programme, but aims to ensure that such a programme is consciously spatialised from the beginning. However, despite assertions to the contrary, he does not investigate the particular spatialities of sexuality, age, gender and race as well as those of class, seeing them as categories where the effect of capital and labour is manifested rather than arenas where space is produced. As Deutsche points out, although Soja does not follow Harvey’s more rigid economistic explanations of space, his cultural readings remain “curiously unmodified” by his encounters with other academic disciplines.

Much criticism of Soja consequently focuses on his account of domination being formed on the oppositions between capital and labour, and the most important axis of power as springing from the relations of production. Consequently, although Soja sees the chapters as offering a space in which “the particular experiences of urban development and change occurring elsewhere in the world are being duplicated,” any exploration (beyond simple noting) of the power structures of patriarchy and colonialist racism is omitted.

This is perhaps unsurprising as the whole question of human agency is absent from Postmodern Geographies. There are no individuals experiencing spatiality, social groups, social movements, women or other repressed and dominated groups. Instead, structured economies dominate Soja’s formulations, such that, as for Berman, capitalism is the only constitutive dimension of modernity, and that there is therefore no escape, no resistance to capitalism (although, as Massey notes, at other times Soja is more ambiguous on the modernity-capitalism relation).

Whatever Soja’s ambiguity, he provides no account of spaces of resistance, and instead simply identifies sites of contestation. Thus while theoretically predisposed to such social movements as housing and homelessness campaigns, Soja nevertheless sees such groups as peripheries to a centre, and interprets the relative silence of organised labour as signs of this mobilisation having been out-maneuvered by capital. Nor is any search conducted for new areas of resistance as new social groupings, codified cultural activity (Lefebvre’s representations of space) or the ways people experience and imagine space (Lefebvre’s spaces of representation).

Such omissions also carry spatial concomitants, principally the spatial scale Soja operates within. In particular, the focus on regions and the urban as city-map means the whole scale of human experience from the human body outward to the room, building, street or neighbourhood is absent from the L A chapters. Again, this is despite the theoretical identification of the need for the “micro-geography of human interaction,” “portable bubbles of personal space zonation and ‘proxemic’ behaviour,” and the “non-verbal and unwritten ordinary language of spatial intersubjectivity,” and, from there out, multiple “layerings of created locales and regionalizations rippling outward from the subjective spatiality of the portable ego.”

This is a problem which Soja addresses in his later work, defending the macro-overview (in time and in space) against the purely micro-historical and the micro-spatial, particularly that of Michel de Certeau and of some feminist urban geographers. Soja’s own attempt to deal with the micro-dimensions of time and space in relation to the global are, however, only partially successful. In his study of squatting and gentrification in Amsterdam, for example, Soja evokes the spaces and social processes of that city, combining detailed physical and spatial description of particular streets and architectures with a wider elucidation of politics. However, the second half of the essay, on the broader global conditions facing contemporary Amsterdam (and L A ) fails to link the two together. The local and the global, like so much of Soja’s place-specific non-theoretical studies, sit side-by-
side, linked by simultaneity in history and co-presence on the page rather than by analytical construct. The everyday remains apart from the production of space. The immediate and pervasive interpenetration of micro and macro, ephemeral and long durée, natural and abstract space, labour and non-labour, object and flow remain unexplained.

2.05 Reassertion of Space – Conclusion

This chapter has been grounded on one central concept: that the relation of the spatial and the social should be conceived of not as space being turned into the social, nor social being turned into the spatial, but of the spatial coming into being socially, and the social coming into being spatially. Becoming as well as being must be addressed, such that we must consider their inter-production; the temporal, spatial and the social have no existence except as part of the socio-spatial dialectic, or the triple-dialectic of time, space and social being.

We have seen, following Lefebvre in particular, how not only spatial practices (perceived space) but the codified representations of space (conceived space) and the uncoded spaces of representation and experience (lived space) are important constituents in the social production of space. The simultaneous incorporation of these three kinds of space in concrete historical-geographical events means that power, knowledge, culture, the everyday, social struggles and contradictions – as well as the global, regional, economic, institutional, industrial, ideational and physical – play their part in the social production of space. Spatiality emerges as a set of practices, ranging from the material and the ideological to the imagined (section 2.01).

In considering such formulations, we must also be wary of finding evidence solely at the level of institutional academic theorisation (section 2.02). There are always theorists who fall outside of the general academic pattern, and who provide an understanding of space quite different to their contemporaries. Furthermore, spatial theorists and social activists may also operate outside academia, offering practical social mobilisations shot through with spatial ideas, strategies and manifestations. Above all spatiality emerges as a lived and continuously reconstructed phenomenon, involving routine inhabitations, social interactivity, vision and the non-visual, the metropolis, the oscillation of scales from the human body to the global, identity, cultural representation, utopian and counter-cultural practices, resistances and social groupings based on class, gender, age and race. And as the final analysis of Soja’s work shows (sections 2.03 and 2.04), to explicate such constructions requires addressing more than the macro-time of a general periodisation and the macro-space of the city, region and world. More sophisticated tools of analysis are needed if the meta-theoretical reassertion of space, time and social being at an ontological and epistemological levels are to be matched in the study of actual human practices and spatialities. In particular, the spaces of human agents and subjects of different kinds – the spaces of Giddens’ “contextuality” – must be developed both in themselves and in relation to the macro-space-times of global economies and urbanisation. This means not the meta-theorisation of a universal production of space for all peoples and times. Instead, it involves the conception of the socio-spatial as an active, fluid inter-production not only of space, time and social being but also as the simultaneous inter-production of different socio-spatial experiences, even within the same historical time or geographic space.

To arrive at this conclusion has so far involved primarily a reflection on the work of Edward Soja, and Postmodern Geographies. We will now turn to investigate the work of Henri Lefebvre to identify theoretical territories by which the simultaneous inter-production of different social experiences may be explored. A relatively short Chapter 3 is then aimed at this identification. It seeks not to produce an a priori theorisation of the socio-spatial, but
rather simply to ascertain particular social and spatial categories which a more concrete historical and spatial study must address. Subsequent chapters of the thesis then explore and investigate these areas with regard to a specific urban practice, and it is here that the ultimate test of the formulations will lie.
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This chapter bridges the reassertion of space conducted in Chapter 2 and the study of skateboarding as a critical urban practice conducted in Chapters 4-7. Its purpose is two-fold: to identify, through a study of Lefebvre, responses to Soja's *Postmodern Geographies* and, closely related to this, to develop directions for a detailed study of the urban practice of skateboarding. Given the lack of historical and geographic specificity of Soja's work, this chapter makes no *a priori* critique of Lefebvre's ideas, but excavates Lefebvre's texts on the everyday, space and the urban with a view to developing them in relation to specific historical material.

### 3.01 Method

Although a form of marxism, Lefebvre's thought is not a Stalinist statism and dogmatism, but a developing process conceiving of marxism as containing many different forms at once insufficient yet indispensable to our understanding of the world. Marxism, for Lefebvre, is not a completed system, but a guide. His dialectic, therefore, is not so much composed of oppositional thesis and antithesis with resultant synthesis within a temporal sequencing, as trialectical, a deconstruction continually seeking a third or Other term unlocatable within the binary logic of the original pair.

This applies at all levels of Lefebvre's work. For the book, for example, texts do not cancel out previous ones but are successive "approximations" proceeding dialectically. In terms of internal argument, Lefebvre's thought is an open dialectic allowing for the "analysis of becoming," a "total" rather than "pure" history incorporating disciplines from history and sociology to philosophy and planning. Textually, Lefebvre's books are conceived not as procedural arguments but as music "to be a cry, a song, a sigh, and simply to be read as a theoretical and discursive statement." They are attempts to speak as much as write.

And in terms of its temporality, Lefebvre's thought is directed as much toward the future as the present and the past, toward the utopian glimpse of the new as to the already achieved.

To understand the past we cannot see it exclusively in terms of the past, we must also see it in terms of the future. Man is nothing unless he can make a reality of what he has glimpsed in his youth and this is impossible [...] Nowadays dreams, imagination and utopianism are exploring the dialectic between the possible and the impossible.

This is a "transduction" elaborating a possible object in which the horizon opens up and calls for actualisation. The human subject, therefore, is not a pregiven but a "developing thing." He constitutes, creates, produces himself in the domain of praxis. There is nothing in him that is not a product of interaction among individuals, groups, classes, societies.

Lefebvre consequently offers no specific programme, rules, or ultimate beliefs. What follows here, then, is set of openings, an orientation rather than prescriptive course of action.

### 3.02 Politics

This does not mean Lefebvrian thinking is without politics. Ultimately, Lefebvre is concerned with enacting Marx's "total revolution" and the end of the state, nation, art, labour, family, politics, history, the everyday, philosophy and so forth – a complete revolution involving new forms of education, industrial production, self-management, property and, most importantly, human beings themselves as an "appropriation of the world, of life and its desires, of space and time, the mastery by
man of his own nature and life.” The resultant “total man” consists of the unity of physical, physiological, psychological, historical, economic and social characteristics.

These goals, however, will not come about inevitably, immediately, or programmatically. Instead, the revolutionary process must be gradually reformist, spontaneous and based on particular historical conditions and conscious thought, and itself subject to new processes and actions.

Revolution, like love, must be reinvented. It must be a “permanent cultural revolution,” not of violence but of an unceasing struggle introducing discontinuities into the overall socio-historical process.

Lefebvre’s project, then, is neither of the right nor classically marxist, but a “third reality.” Specific targets and actions are equally diverse, reaching beyond production, general strikes and working classes to the relations of production, the everyday, the aleatory space, leisure, dwellings, aesthetics, ethics and so forth. Furthermore, only radical change starting from the bottom of society is decisive, as this alone erases obsolete forms.

Particularly important here is a general concern to reassert use values over exchange values, and thus urban dwellers over urban owners, managers and technocrats:

Use value, subordinated for centuries to exchange value, can now come first again. How? By and in urban society, from this reality which still resists and preserves for us use value, the city […] an urban reality for “users” and not for capitalist speculators, builders and technicians.

Other important areas for Lefebvre are: a notion of culture as itself a “means of production,” consumption, pleasure and the pursuit of desires, happiness and loves; and the resurrection of the whole body, removing barriers between thought, desire, action and physicality, between the eye and the other senses.

More than anything, utopian politics for Lefebvre are something lived, not just thought or represented, as “the image of what is possible transferred into reality.” Ultimately, human freedom must be defined on the social, not political, plane.

Revolution involves the death of politics itself.

3.03 The Urban and Architecture

If the revolution must always be an interrogation of the present in relation to the future, Lefebvre identifies the urban as the site of this process.

Utopianism is testing itself out; it is living itself; imagination is becoming a lived experience, something experimental […] It is no longer a question of one leap into the distant future over the head of the present and the near future, but of exploring the possible using the present as a starting point […] And that is why I attach so much importance to new towns and their problems.

It is in the architecture and planning of the modern city, and not in first nature, the medieval town, the industrialised city of the nineteenth century, distant imagination or future space-time that this revolution will be carried out.

This does not mean, however, simply an “architectural” revolution or building programme. Lefebvre’s studies of such places as Nanterre and Lacq-Mourenx new town are not so much architectural studies as attempts to locate the revolution in a generic architectural space.

Spatially, this takes two important forms. Firstly, the urban is not confined to the spatial scale of the city but encompasses the whole, multi-scalar landscape produced by human activity. The urban is
the extensivity of space, from the micro to the macro, and cannot be reduced to the form of the town or city.

Second, the urban is not a set of objects and drawings, nor the product of planners and architects.57 Dismissing the apoliticisation of Jane Jacobs,58 planning as a "science of space,"59 and the fetishism of communication in Robert Goodman and advocacy planning.60 Lefebvre also attacks architects for their privileging of the eye,61 and theorists like Sigfried Giedion, Bruno Zevi, Christopher Alexander and Christian Norberg Schulz for their conception of an *a priori* space62 (architecture's "geometric formant"63) — "talented men" who "believe themselves to be at the centre of knowledge and experience whereas they remain at the centre of systems of writing, projections on paper, visualizations."64

Imbued with masculinist violence and Phallic power65 (its "Phallic formant"66), architecture may, as monuments, express significance in the city, but it will simultaneously "mask the will to power and arbitrariness of power beneath signs and surfaces which claim to express collective will and collective thought," conjuring away social possibilities.67 Architecture for Lefebvre too easily becomes, as with Le Corbusier, a "moral discourse on straight lines, on right angles and straightness in general, combining a figurative appeal to nature (water, air, sunshine) with the worst kind of abstraction (plane geometry, modules, etc.)"68 Such architectural space ignores the space of the body, reduces experience to intellect,69 and renders users passive70 (architecture's "optical" or "visual formant"71).

We build on the basis of papers and plans. We buy on the basis of images. Sight and seeing, which in the Western tradition once epitomized intelligibility, have turned into a trap: the means whereby, in social space, diversity may be stimulated and a travesty of enlightenment and intelligibility ensconced under the sign of transparency.72

Experiencers of architecture consequently tend to view it through *metonymy*, where the small space of a high-rise apartment signals their small role in their relationship with the social whole, or through *metaphorisation*, where their bodies are caught up in parcelled space and projected through the eye into images of themselves as prettified, happy and posed.73

Architects' designs are simply representations within a wider urban production which also encompasses spatial practices and spaces of representations. Architecture is "a specific, partial and specialised practice which has close links with the everyday,"74 not a thing but a continual reproduction of space and politics — a way of life:

The *right to the city* cannot be conceived of as a simple visiting right or as a return to traditional cities. It can only be formulated as a transformed and renewed *right to urban life*. It does not matter whether the urban fabric encloses the countryside and what survives of peasant life, as long as the "urban," place of encounter, priority of use value, inscription in space of a time promoted to the rank of a supreme resource among all resources, finds its morphological base and its practico-material realization.75

It is not then the form of the city or its social accessibility which matter politically, but its operative social qualities as a place of uses, desires and emotions.

Modernist urbanism for Lefebvre is characterised by the zero degree architecture of the new town: dominated spaces of worker housing with strict temporal routines,76 spatial instructions,77 programmed everyday life,78 restricted age cultures,79 mono-functional centres of decision-making80 and aesthetics of dehumanised rationality81.
As yet there are not many traffic lights in Mourenx. But in a sense the place is already nothing but traffic lights: do this, don’t do that […] Everything is clear and intelligible. Everything is trivial. Everything is closure and materialized system. The text of the town is totally legible, as impoverished as it is clear, despite the architects’ efforts to vary the lines. Surprise? Possibilities? From this place, which should have been the home of all that is possible, they have vanished without trace.82

Despite this, city dwellers, particularly outside new towns and suburbs, enjoy the benefits of monuments, chance encounters and distractions of the everyday city experience; they have the potential for the adaptation of time and space.83 Given this opportunity, the city must cease to be understood as an object, and become a “possibilities’ machine,”64 an œuvre,65 a place of artistic production in its widest sense, where the “texture” of the city is its creation of time-spaces through the appropriative activities of its inhabitants,66 a place of non-labour, joy and the fulfilment of desires over toil,67 of qualities, difference, relations in time and space, contradictory uses68 and encounters.69

Urban life suggests meetings, the confrontation of differences, reciprocal knowledge and acknowledgement (including ideological and political confrontation), ways of living, “patterns” which co-exist in the city.90

The city should bring together the “micro” architectural and “macro” planning scales, the everyday realm and the urban, inside and outside, work and non-work, the durable and ephemeral, and so forth.91 It must be situated between the perceived and the lived.92

Epistemologically, the city and the urban can never be understood in their entirety for the “city historically constructed is no longer lived and is no longer understood practically”93 Still less can it be reduced to purely semiological analysis, rendering space into signs.64 Instead, thinking of the city is to try and preserve its complexity and its sense of becoming:

To think about the city is to hold and maintain its conflictual aspects: constraints and possibilities, peacefulness and violence, meetings and solitude, gatherings and separation, the trivial and the poetic, brutal functionalism and surprising improvisation […] Thinking the city moves towards thinking the world (thought as a relationship to the world) … globality as totality … the universe, space-time, energies, information, but without valuing one rather than another.65

3.04 Space

The urban and architecture are Lefebvre’s initial considerations of space during the 1950s and 1960s. But with his spatial turn of the late 1960s and early 1970s, principally the publication of La production de l’espace, this concept comes to the fore.

Again, this is part of the revolutionary project, for all space is part of capitalism,66 a “product literally filled with ideologies,”67 and as such:

To change life […] we must first change space.66

Lefebvre sees space as becoming increasingly important in “modern” societies, operating from micro to global scales and beyond.68 As already seen in Chapter 2, space is not a setting but a social production, at once mental and material.100 a “concrete abstraction,”101 work and product,102 such that social relations have no real existence except in and through space.103
(Social) space is not a thing among other things, nor a product among other products: rather, it subsumes things produced, and encompasses their interrelationships in their coexistence and simultaneity [. . .] At the same time there is nothing imagined, unreal or "ideal" about it as compared, for example, with science, representations, ideas or dreams. Itself the outcome of past actions, social space is what permits fresh actions to occur, while suggesting others and prohibiting yet others.\textsuperscript{104}

It is also a place of diffused power,\textsuperscript{105} fully implicated in the capitalist state's operations. Socially-produced space is thus simultaneously product, part of the forces of production, lived, a representation, and contains the seeds of future forms of living.\textsuperscript{106}

Epistemologically, Lefebvre rejects the "true space" (espace vrai) of philosophy and dogma, reducing real space to the abstract, and instead focuses on a "truth of space" (vérité de l'espace) tying space to social practice.\textsuperscript{107} Lefebvre's main procedure for this is the triadic formulation of spatial practices, representations of space and spaces of representation described in Chapter 2. However, there are three other considerations which should be raised here.

Firstly, Lefebvre posits a four-part historical development of space broadly following a marxist understanding of the development of the productive bases of western civilisation. Each mode epoch produces its own understanding of space and experiences it accordingly.\textsuperscript{108}

Every society – and hence every mode of production [. . .] – produces a space, its own space.\textsuperscript{109}

Thus natural or physical space (a pre-existent natural phenomenon over which activities range – the space of pre-history)\textsuperscript{110} gives way first to absolute space (fragments of natural space rendered sacred, the space of rites, death and the underworld – the space of slavery),\textsuperscript{111} then historical space (the early towns of the West – the space of feudalism),\textsuperscript{112} and finally abstract space (space as commodity, at once concrete and abstract – the space of capitalism).\textsuperscript{113} Each space contains within it both traces of its predecessors and the seeds of the next, creating a complex historical geography of different social spaces.\textsuperscript{114}

Most important for the twentieth century is abstract space, where space is treated as an abstract commodity, a medium of exchange tending to absorb use. Abstract space is not only used but bought and sold to make further profits. It is also, \textit{qua} commodity, simultaneously homogenous and universally applicable to any function, and, consequently, infinitely fragmented into units of equal kinds.\textsuperscript{115} Although infused with latent violence,\textsuperscript{116} abstract space more than any prior space depends on consensus for its continual reproduction.\textsuperscript{117}

Socially, this is the space of the new town, abstraction and passive users, instruction and message, prescriptions and proscriptions, where statements take precedence over bodily action and very little is said, still less "lived."\textsuperscript{118}

Second, Lefebvre's postulates a differential space, a space yet to come.\textsuperscript{119} "Social space" is in fact many social spaces, such that the global does not abolish the local, different spaces are interconnected, and old spaces are preserved in new ones.\textsuperscript{120} In the rigid fragmentations of abstract space, then, there are already present the seeds of its successor, which Lefebvre suggests is a more mixed, inter-penetrative space where differences are respected rather than buried under a homogeneity.\textsuperscript{121} This is "differential space."\textsuperscript{122}

[Differential space] will put an end to those localization which shatter the integrity of the individual body, the social body, the corpus of human needs, and the corpus of
knowledge. By contrast, it will distinguish what abstract space tends to identify — for example, social reproduction and genitality, gratification and biological fertility, social relationships and family relationships.\(^{123}\) Differential space is thus the spatial concomitant of the total revolution and total man, not as a universal entity but as the socialist "space of differences."\(^{124}\)

Third, a psychoanalytic undercurrent runs through much of Lefebvre's writing on space. Although devoid of detailed references to Jacques Lacan, Julia Kristeva and Sigmund Freud, Freudian concerns with repression and sexual and social prohibition, together with the Lacanian concepts of the Real, Symbolic and the Imaginary, all underlie Lefebvre's notion of social relations.\(^{125}\) Hence we find references to the Phallus and Phallic architecture,\(^{126}\) repressed sexual relations,\(^{127}\) "symbolic castration,"\(^{128}\) prohibition,\(^{129}\) Ego and mirror,\(^{130}\) and even a "psychoanalysis of space."\(^{131}\) Lefebvre did not undertake such a psychoanalysis of space, and often simply appropriated its terms,\(^{132}\) but these brief examples disclose a latent and otherwise oft ignored component of his formulations.

### 3.05 Time

Although many commentators see Lefebvre's work as a move away from time to space,\(^{133}\) in fact time remained very much at the heart of his formulations.

Space is a use value, but even more so is time to which it is ultimately linked because time is our life, our fundamental use value.\(^{134}\)

This is integral to Lefebvre's notion of revolutionary politics and the study of the past with a view to present and future, for this was ultimately a project of becoming, of unfolding events in time. The dialectic for Lefebvre is not purely ideational, spatial or formal, but, following Stendhal,\(^{135}\) Hegel and Marx and not Kant,\(^{136}\) an historical process.\(^{137}\) Lefebvre thus, having heard Einstein on the subject, was concerned less with the Bergsonian distinction of time as quality and space as quantity, as with the intimate relation of time and space.\(^{138}\)

The link between time and space remains a fundamental problem, both theoretically and practically. It consists of the use of time in relation to space, the division of space in relation to time, and the measurement of time and space, which are relative in relation to one another.\(^{139}\)

Before me, around me, I have space-time.\(^{140}\)

Thus time and space are not independent constructions but inter-productions, at once separate but necessarily inter-related processes.

Time is distinguishable but not separable from space.\(^{141}\)

Following Heraclitus, time is not an absolute entity, but is self-actualised in space.\(^{142}\)

Space is the envelope of time. When space is split, time is distanced — but it resists reduction. Within and through space, a certain social time is produced and reproduced; but real social time is forever re-emerging complete with its own characteristics and determinants: repetitions, rhythms, cycles, activities.\(^{143}\)

But this was not an easy formulation, and Lefebvre wrote no extended treatise on time or its relation to space.\(^{144}\)

The standing of time as it relates to space is
problematic, and has yet to be defined. Nonetheless, Lefebvre offers important insights that help transcend the reductive periodised macro-time of Postmodern Geographies.

Lefebvre recognises that abstract space reduces time to constraints on the employment of spaces – to distances, pathways, itineraries, and to a general dominance of time by economic space. Time here is a matter of clocks and labour; celebrated not as lived experience but as novelty. However, time can resist such reductions, "re-emerging instead as the supreme form of wealth, as locus and medium of use, and hence of enjoyment." Abstract space fails in the end to lure time into the realm of externality, of signs and images, of dispersion. Time comes back into its own as privacy, inner life, subjectivity.

There are important things to note here, principally that time is a potential resistance to abstract space, that it is a realm of enjoyment, wealth and use, that it requires effort and hence is a production, and, lastly, that it is therefore also a production of space.

This is more complex than Marx’s notion of time as measure of social labour and measure of space for the distribution and sale of goods. Lefebvre did sketch a periodisation of time, from prehistory (time not part of consciousness), to historic and industrialised societies (history acknowledged, homogenous time at centre of consciousness), to a transitional period starting around 1970 (contradictions between homogeneity and difference become more apparent), to an eventual post-history or trans-history (unitary history finally abandoned, disorder), but time for him was more than a developmental history. Looking back in part to medieval society, Lefebvre seeks to reassert "this greatest good of all goods" as diversified time of different social constructions punctuated by festivals and celebrated in space, which, as in Joyce’s Ulysses, is at once linear (the time of progress) and cyclical (the time of nature, of repetitions, death and life).

Time in the city and by the city will be independent of natural cycles but not submitted to the linear divisions of rationalized duration; it will be the time of unexpectedness, not a time without place but a time that dominates the place in which it occurs and through which it emerges. This will be the place and time of desire, above and beyond need. This is a Nietzschean concept of time, maintaining the significance of space within a problematic of becoming.

For Lefebvre, time had been "murdered by society," and its restoration had to start with the spaces of representation, followed by a reunion with representations of space. The spaces of representation are, after all, lived experience, the most immediately active and hence the most temporal of Lefebvre’s three kinds of space.

Representational space is alive: it speaks [. . .] It embraces the loci of passion, of action and of lived situations, and thus immediately implies time. Consequently it may be qualified in various ways: it may be directional, situational or relational, because it is essentially qualitative, fluid and dynamic.
It is by facing the constraints of time imposed within contemporary society that people master their own times, and so make it "fully productive in the widest sense, of art, of knowledge, of the lived."\(^\text{162}\)

Furthermore, it is in the modern city that one must consider the different uses, productions and inscriptions of time.\(^\text{163}\) Rethinking the city necessarily involves the consideration of the temporal.

\[\text{T}he\text{ city will only be rethought and reconstructed on its current ruins when we have properly understood that the city is the deployment of time.}\(^\text{164}\)

Architecture as the "structure of houses and towns, monuments, the meanderings of a road from the gates of a town to its centre" is not just spatial, but temporal.\(^\text{165}\) If the new town does not allow the reading of time, and only of its functions,\(^\text{166}\) then it is precisely here that the temporal should be restored.

### 3.06 Everyday Life

The inter-production of time and space was, for Lefebvre, intimately related to everyday life. In modernity, everyday life (la vie quotidienne), permeated by myths and values, is infiltrated by the everyday (le quotidien or la quotidienne) – that is by the homogenous, repetitive, fragmentary, programmed, mediated and routinised.\(^\text{167}\)

The quotidian is what is humble and solid, what is taken for granted and that of which all the parts follow each other in such a regular, unvarying succession that those concerned have not call to question their sequence.\(^\text{168}\)

The everyday is Hegel's "prose of the world," the insignificant and banal.\(^\text{169}\) Time thus appears here as "constrained" or "compulsed" (as in the practice of commuting),\(^\text{170}\) as repetitions,\(^\text{171}\) while "terroristic" everyday life appears to erase time altogether in a pure, formal space.\(^\text{172}\)

The everyday is also, necessarily spatial, and particularly infiltrates the spaces of representation where the imagination is dominated and rendered passive.\(^\text{173}\)

\[\text{T}he\text{ social control of space weighs heavy indeed upon all those consumers who fail to reject the familiarity of everyday space.}\(^\text{174}\)

But, as stated above, spaces of representation can also be the spaces of imagination and resistance, and it is therefore here that the pervasive power of the everyday\(^\text{175}\) can be turned back on itself through everyday knowledge,\(^\text{176}\) appropriation and re-appropriation.\(^\text{177}\) Doing so involves confronting the reduction of language to advertising objects and desires,\(^\text{178}\) the fetishistic translation of relations into things,\(^\text{179}\) radio and television,\(^\text{180}\) retrenchment in private life and attendant bureaucratisation,\(^\text{181}\) the ideology of technocracy,\(^\text{182}\) privileging of writing over speech,\(^\text{183}\) programming through advertising and publicity ("the poetry of modernity"),\(^\text{184}\) the substitution of eroticism for sexual pleasure,\(^\text{185}\) leisure,\(^\text{186}\) spectatorial sport,\(^\text{187}\) planned obsolescence,\(^\text{188}\) dominant sub-systems like tourism, fashion and the motor car,\(^\text{189}\) and other such pervasive constituents of the "Bureaucratic Society of Controlled Consumption."\(^\text{190}\)

Ultimately, as with Simmel's concern with "finding in each of life's details the totality of its meaning,"\(^\text{191}\) the everyday can reveal the meaning and complexity of human life.\(^\text{192}\)

The most extraordinary things are also the most everyday; the strangest of things are often the most trivial.\(^\text{193}\)

To do so, active man must be reasserted against the consumer as possessor of happiness and
rationality. This means the restoration of the everyday life which still lies within the everyday, and in particular of the ancient Greek and medieval Festival — at once spontaneity, play, seriousness, patience, pain and pleasure, food, laughter, games, marriages, sex, birth and death, scuffles, intimate social relations, cooperation with nature, joy and mystery. By this means, everyday life will become "a place where creative energy is stored in readiness for new creations," a form of critique as well as source of thought. Only here will the revolution be fulfilled.

Everyday life is the supreme court where wisdom, knowledge and power are brought to judgement.

Furthermore, it is in the new town, the site of modern architecture, where such a restoration must take place.

Our task now is to construct everyday life, to produce it, consciously to create it [...] Here, in the new town, boredom is pregnant with desires, frustrated frenzies, unrealized possibilities. A magnificent life is waiting just around the corner, and far, far away.

The new town cannot answer the problem of everyday life, but it does hold a way towards everyday life as an "art of living" composed of "the joy that man gives to himself."

3.07 The Human Subject

Lefebvre opposes both the structuralist and semiological elimination of the subject, and the Husserlian Ego which reduces space to epistemology and mentality, eradicating the living, and social "I." For without the human subject, the production of space cannot be understood.

The question is what intervenes, what occupies the interstices between representations of space and representational spaces. A culture perhaps? Certainly — but the word has less content than it seems to have. The work of artistic creation? No doubt — but that leaves unanswered the queries "By whom?" and "How?" Imagination? Perhaps — but why? and for whom?

Central here is the human body, not just as site of cultural endeavour but of self-appropriation and adaptation. The body is particularly useful for thinking about the triad of perceived, conceived and lived: spatial practices (perceived) presuppose the use of body, hands, sensory organs and gestures — the practical basis of the perception of the outside world; representations of space (conceived) include representations of the body, derived from scientific and anatomical knowledge, and relations with nature; and spaces of representation (lived experience) include bodies imbued with culture and symbolisms. It is thus the body which helps render the triad concrete, not abstract. It is the body which unites cyclical and linear time, need and desire; it is the body which preserves difference within repetition and is therefore, the source of innovation. This is a recovery of the body from its abandonment within western philosophy, a living body now at once subject and object.

The body, then, is the "most extraordinary" contradiction of space, that which counters abstract space.

It will not allow itself to be dismembered without a protest, or to be divided into fragments, deprived of its rhythms, reduced to its catalogued needs, to images and specialisations. The body, at the very heart of space and of the discourse of Power, is irreducible and subversive. It rejects the reproduction of relations which deprive it and crush it.
The body is vulnerable, but cannot be destroyed without destroying society itself. It is therefore a necessary and fruitful site for political action.

Any revolutionary "project" today, whether utopian or realistic, must, if it is to avoid hopeless banality, make the reappropriation of the body, in association with the reappropriation of space, into a non-negotiable part of its agenda.

So how is the body constituted? This is a "practical and fleshy body conceived of as a totality complete with spatial qualities (symmetries, asymmetries) and energetic properties (discharges, economies, waste)," one which rejects the spectacularisation and decorporealisation ("sco-tomization") of Judaeo-Christian traditions and Taylorist-capitalist division of labour, and which follows instead Marx's call in the *1844 Manuscripts* for the senses to become theoreticians in their own right – what Lefebvre memorably calls an "intelligence of the body." Considering space with the whole body, not just the eyes and intellect, allows more awareness of conflicts and so of a space that is Other. This is body of tastes and smells, left-right and front-back orientations, hearing and touch. It resists the tendency of abstract space, and its attendant domination of the visual, to replace sex with the representation of sex, pulverise the body into images, erase history, reduce volume to surface, and flatten and fragment the experience of space.

Through such processes the body produces space outward from itself, engaging with architecture to bring the latter within itself. This is a "spatial body," both constituted by and constitutive of the space it occupies.

[The spatial body's material character derives from space, from the energy that is deployed and put to use there.]

It is also a body of desires beyond defined needs, and which so causes difference, stopping needs from stagnating. More than basic survival, this is a reassertion of the "sensuous enjoyment of the object:" the rehabilitation of the world of senses as practical-sensuous, manifested as the immediate sensing of art, cities, buildings, objects of common use, landscapes and relationships.

A psychoanalytic concern is apparent here. However, for Lefebvre, psychoanalysis yields only a mechanistic and homogenising explanation for different societies and spaces. Similarly, Lacanian thought on the body presupposes a neutral, a priori space. Consequently, although Lefebvre speaks of the Lacanian Phallic and the masculine use of vertical towers, metal, glass, straight lines, right angles and strict perspective to dominate space (Picasso's "dictatorship of the eye" and of the bull, machismo and Mediterranean male), this is a metaphorical rather than essentialist use of psychoanalytic terms, as with his identification of feminine spaces not as literally uterine in form but as lived experience and recognition of the Other. The aim is to replace an architecture of the dominated, masculine space of objects with the appropriated, female space of "pleasure and joy, of community in the use of the gifts of the earth." Appropriation, rather than domination, is the authentic marxist tactic. The subject-body is additionally a preservation and production of time, through various rhythms of breathing, eating, sleeping, through activities of walking, looking and sensing, and through cycles of birth, reproduction and death.

No camera, no image or sequence of images can show these rhythms. One needs equally attentive eyes and ears, a head, a memory, a heart.

This is part of Lefebvre's project of rhythmanalysis – which he considered might replace psychoanalysis.
as "more concrete, more effective, and closer to a pedagogy of appropriation (the appropriation of the body, as of spatial practice)" – where the inter-relation of the subject-body with itself and the external world is dealt with at various spatial and temporal scales and experiences, ranging from breathing, hunger and sleep, to sexuality, social life and thought. Through such processes, buildings cease to be objects and become places of epistemological and social negotiation conducted through the figure of the subject. It is here that the body's importance for the subject "in whom lived, perceived and conceived (known) come together within a spatial practice" is most explicit. Space-time must always involve (although not be reduced to) a production through, and of, the subject as body and mind, thought and action.

For it is by means of the body that space is perceived, lived – and produced.

The subject, then, is not just a body. Lefebvre refers to different forms of social construction as central to the production of space – principally class, but, as a "latent postmodernist," he also sees that modernity requires consideration of gender, ethnicity, sexuality, family relations, age, and "outsiders" of all kinds. Once again, abstract space tends to erase precisely these characteristics, the restoration of which, therefore, the revolutionary project must be directed toward. It is these social constructions which differential space preserves and emphasises, such that the right to the city is not the right to buildings or public space, but the right to be different and not classified into categories enforced by the homogenising powers.

Against Gilles Deleuze, Lefebvre formulates difference as something not based on originality, individualism and particularity but which emerges from struggle, the conceptual and the lived.

3.08 Activity

Lefebvre rejects the terms "users" and "inhabitants" for inferring marginality and underprivilege. "Subjects," however, suggests an entity of social construction, which does something. This is the last attribute of Lefebvre's thought to be revealed here: the idea of activity.

It is not a question of localizing in pre-existing space a need or a function, but on the contrary, of spatializing a social activity, linked to the whole by producing an appropriate space.

The notion of activity is largely unrecognised by Lefebvrian critics and commentators – probably because Lefebvre's consideration of spatial practices, after the first section of *Production of Space*, mostly disappears. Nonetheless, it is preserved within the notion of the body with its "capacity for action, and its various energies," as a site of gestures, desires, needs, senses and imaginative processes. Space, after all, is not an intellectual projection but is enacted.

What, then, is the "activity" of the human subject in its inter-production of the self with time and space? To simply list "functions" would be to reduce activity to tasks, so other directions must be pursued.

For revolutionary politics, a new cultural project should encompass democracy, sociability, adaptations of time and space and the body, life beyond the commodity, and the slow transformation of everyday life – "a project for society that is at the same time cultural, social, and political." It is then no longer Heidegger's question of what does it mean to think, but of "what remains to be thought now?"

Human activity must therefore be directed at new forms of content, seeking not just to symbolise but transform life as a kind of generalised artistic
The highest mission of art is not simply to express, even less to reflect, the real, not to substitute fictions for it [. . . ] The highest mission of art is to metamorphose the real. Practical actions, including techniques, modify the everyday; artwork transfigures it.

Let everyday life become a work of art!

Here, the city and architecture become not just aesthetic objects but dynamic, practical realisations of art unique and irreplaceable "works" and not reproducible products – polyrhythmic compositions of linear and cyclical times and different social spaces, born from multitudinous differing labours. This is art not as the prettifying of urban spaces, but of making time-spaces into works of art.

Leaving aside representation, ornamentation and decoration, art can become praxis and poesis on a social scale: the art of living in the city as work of art.

Such a work of art involves: a new culture of the body – the freedom and jouissance in the everyday which starts with the body; the finding of new places of festival, such as the struggles over time, space and cleanliness at the beach; new moments and situations – fleeting but decisive sensations and points of rupture, revelatory of possibilities contained in everyday existence; exploration of the textures as well as meanings of space; production of creativity of all kinds, including play (ludic) and not just "products;" the combination of academic knowledge with everyday experience – "earthbound and concrete" thought; the "rule of option" – choosing what fascinates, not what is presented as the most important; development of a totalising Romanticist lifestyle emphasising conflict, emotions, rejection of hierarchies, originality, spontaneity; the fight for the right to be different; and pleasure, delight and joy – a kind of "architecture" which rejects the criteria and constraints of the purely necessary and quantitative.

Above all, the inter-production of time, space and social being should be about use values ("the only real wealth") and not exchange values in the city.

Use value, subordinated for centuries to exchange value, can now come first again. How? By and in urban society, from this reality which still resists and preserves for us use value, the city.

It should be about appropriation not ownership, production as creativity in the widest sense. It means representing and thinking, but also doing, being active, transforming everything – thought, politics, work, the self – in the process.

Thus, having stressed throughout The Production of Space the inter-relation of representations of space and spaces of representation, Lefebvre at the end returns to the necessity of spatial practices – the things people do, and the patterns and physicality they create – for disrupting abstract space. It is the "potential energies" of groups which act to transform and create new social spaces.

The city is not only a language, but also a practice.

Experience and representation are here returned to action, to new activities in which they are embedded. And in political terms, this marks the move from critical thought to contesting practice, from writing to more active speech, at which point the subjective becomes an objective intervention. Activity concretises the life-world (as Benno Werlen notes), both as the negative critique which undermines the illusory rationality of the political state and social hierarchy.
Events reactivate the movement of both thought and practice. They pull thinkers out of their comfortable seats and plunge them headlong into a wave of contradictions. Those who are obsessed with stability lose their smiling confidence and good humor.292 and as that which keeps different social space-times together.

Only an act can hold – and hold together – such fragments in a homogeneous totality. Only action can prevent dispersion, like a fist clenched around sand.293

In this way we become true subjects in time and space, not simply users or experiencers of, but produced by, and productive of, the architecture around us.

For the historian, a simple yet profound lesson emerges. Activities as particular rhythms of time and space are not universal constructs, but are constructed in specific conditions.

A rhythm invests places, but is not itself a place; it is not a thing, nor an aggregation of things, nor yet a simple flow. It embodies its own law, its own regularity, which it derives from space – from its own space – and from a relationship between space and time.294

To understand human history, in our considerations of the conceived and the lived, representations and experience, we therefore have to be explicit also about what activities are being undertaken – what are the energies deployed, patterns created, objects produced? In short, what productive work is being studied? This is why the primary object of study for this thesis – skateboarding – is not so much a specific place (for skateboarding occurs in cities across the world), specific moment (for skateboarding changes over the course of a 40 year history) or specific person or persons (skateboarding is practised predominantly by nameless millions), but is a practise, a particular patterning of space-time produced from a specific body-centred origin.

And it is to a consideration of the production of space, time and the subject in this particular urban practice that we now turn. The study begins with Chapter 4, which considers the technical development of the skateboard from the 1950s to the 1990s, before turning to the “found spaces” of the school yard, bank, ditch, pool and pipe favoured in the 1960s and 1970s. Skateboarders’ spatial tactics of appropriation and colonisation are also introduced in this chapter.
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Section III  Skateboarding
The history of skateboarding is shrouded in mystery.¹

4.01 Technical Origins

A typical skateboard specification, as developed by the mid-1970s, covers three main elements: deck, two trucks and four wheels. The riding surface, or deck, is usually made out of wood, covered with high friction grip tape similar to sandpaper. Two trucks provide the suspension and turning mechanism, usually by a “double-action” mechanism consisting of a metal hanger and split axle pivoting around two rubber or urethane bushings on a central king-pin. Turning circle and stability are adjusted by tightening the bushing compression. The truck assembly is cast from an aluminium alloy (originally steel] with steel axles and bolted to the deck via the metal base plate; a 0.25-0.5 inch “riser pad” may be added between base plate and deck to increase wheel clearance and riding height. Wheels, once metal or “clay,” are now exclusively made from moulded polyurethane. Each wheel measures 40-70 mm in diameter and 25-45 mm in width, and contains two sealed bearings held apart by a short metal spacer. This standard skateboard specification was not immediately arrived at, however, but developed over 20 or more years, and it is worth recalling this evolution before turning to more overt considerations of space in skateboarding.

Despite idiosyncratic inventions, such as the Chicago-made “Kne-Koster” (1927)² and three-wheeled “Skooter Skate” (1939),³ the skateboard seems to have originated from scooters in the California of the 1930s-50s. These scooters were make-shift devices, constructed by children from a 2 x 4 plank of wood, an apple crate and a single roller skate.⁴ Holding on to the wooden handlebars and pushing with one foot, the rider could trundle along the sidewalk – the scooter was a suburban vehicle, confined to the horizontal lines already drawn up by architect and developer.

By the mid to late 1950s the first skateboards appeared – at first simply short versions of the scooter, with the crate/handlebars left off the 2x4 wood.⁵

We took an old metal roller skate and strapped it to a short piece of 2x4, hopped on top and took off [. . ] Wheels? That was whatever came on a roller skate. Strictly metal [. . ] The roller skate was its own truck. You were stuck with it. They never wore out, but they didn’t have any cushioning in them either.⁶

We were just using 2 by 4’s and steel skates, our sister’s skates pulled apart and nailed onto a 2 by 4. It was just riding and having fun.⁷
In a significant upgrade, the 2x4 was replaced by short wooden decks about 20 inches long and 6 inches wide, requiring the rider to adopt a free-standing position. Such boards provided, for example, the children of East LA with rattling neighborhood transport. Smaller than the scooter, the skateboard was easier to manoeuvre and store, but it still stopped and skidded whenever the metal wheels encountered a less than smooth surface; even a pebble could prove difficult. The bearings also could easily seize up. The typical ride was "[t]hirty seconds of gritty trundling." It was wobblier than hell, moved way too fast and vibrated on the asphalt enough to jar every bone in your body and loosen every tooth. It was more like getting electrocuted than anything else [. . .] Sand and dirt had no problem getting in, and any that did and you were a gonner for sure. You'd lock up and go flying at the worst possible time, usually just when you were trying to avoid the handlebars of a bike or a parked car.

The first commercial boards - like the Humco 5-ply deck with "Sidewalk Swinger" spring-loaded trucks (1956), Sport Flite and Roller Derby (early 1960s) - came with steel wheels around 50 mm diameter and 10 mm wide. The problems these steel wheels posed were eased with the adoption of "composition" or "clay" wheels, around 50 mm diameter by 30 mm wide, then being used on commercial rink roller skates. Formed from a composite of clay, plastic, paper, finely ground walnut shells and polymer binding agents, these wheels lasted only a few hours on hard pavement, and were still very vulnerable to surface imperfections, but nevertheless offered a smoother ride.

In these earliest stages, skateboarding remained a predominantly us West Coast phenomenon. While skaters were mostly concerned with simply riding downhill, "[h]itting primitive hills at Roger Williams Park and Garden City with rock-hard roller skate garbage wheels," the clay wheels allowed increased control in turning and hence the emulation of a great Californian occupation: the burgeoning surf culture of the late 1950s and 1960s. In 1962, Val Surf, a North Hollywood surf shop, approached Chicago Roller Skates to supply double-action metal trucks and clay wheels ready for assembly. Other trucks included the Super Surfer, Roller Derby, Roller Sport, x-Caliber and Sure Grip -
these were all devices basically adapted from roller skate equipment. Surfers wishing to skate bought complete assemblies from Val Surf or fashioned their own decks and bolted on the extra parts.

We took chisels and we'd chip the wood and make rockers in our noses and in the tail. They were black and looked like the custom surf designs in either colored marker or airbrush, and we'd lacquer them on.

Systematised production of skateboards began a few years later when Ed Morgan, an executive of the Vita-Pak Juice Company of Covina, persuaded the firm to diversify into skateboard manufacture. Taking design advice from professional surfer Hobie Alter, Vita-Pak introduced the “Hobie” skateboard in 1965 with clay wheels and a fibreglass deck, and went on to make over six million skateboards that year. Other firms also went into production, including Makaha Skateboards (founded 1963), based in the Santa Monica offices of Surf-Guide magazine.

Decks at this time were also a little larger than their 1950s predecessors – about 24 x 7 inches in plan form – and overtly shaped like “miniature surfboards” with curving sides and pointed noses.

By 1962, skateboarding had already reached places like Nevada and the US East Coast with a few isolated skateboarders, as well as the surf towns of south England and Wales. In late 1964 SkateBoarder magazine appeared. By the following summer skateboarding had become a nationwide activity, gaining national television coverage for the International Skateboard Championships at Anaheim, appearing on the cover of Life, and forming the central motif in the Academy Award-winning film Skater Dater (1965). Early skateboard teams included Hobie, Jacks and Bayside.

This first phase of skateboarding was, however, short-lived; it peaked in 1965 and by the end of the year SkateBoarder had already ceased publication. 

Skateboarding continued, with some skaters like Torger Johnson and Davey Hilton becoming well-known for their activities, but the expected demand for skateboards in Christmas 1967 never materialised, leaving Vita-Pak with US$4 million worth of unsold equipment. While skateboarding had reached other countries (the UK Daily Mirror announced skateboarding as a craze in 1965), it continued mainly as a Californian beach city phenomenon, including Santa Cruz and La Jolla but particularly Santa Monica, the ocean-side city within LA. Professional skateboarding teams also prospered on a
small scale, including the Makaha team with skaters like Ty Page, Bruce Logan and Brad Blank.  

Around 1972-3, skateboarding entered its second phase with the introduction of new forms of technology. Most significantly, this involved the replacement of the clay, open-bearing wheels with new wheels such as Roller Sports, Metaflex and Stoker, made from polyurethane hot-poured into moulds, and fitted with loose bearings held together by an adjustable cone system. These first urethane wheels measured around 49 mm diameter and 30 mm wide, and 90A on the hardness durometer. The initial application of polyurethane was undertaken in 1972-3 by Frank Nasworthy, a 24 year old surfer from Encinitas, California. Suspended from engineering studies at Virginia Polytechnic Institute for a political demonstration, Nasworthy invested $700 to form Cadillac Wheels and, in conjunction with the roller skate company Creative Urethanes, went into production in 1973 with the first urethane wheel purposely designed for the skateboard.  

As a slow roller skate wheel, urethane was confined to commercial rink skates, but the softer compositions used for skateboards – developed with help from the Uniroyal chemicals conglomerate – offered the right longevity, speed and traction characteristics. As one skater recalled, “going from clay to urethane plastic wheels was like moving from a Lada to a Lexus.” Cadillac wheels and various other skateboard components were advertised in us surf magazines, and around 1974-5, fuelled also by the re-emergence of SkateBoarder in the summer of 1975, skateboarding’s second phase began to take off. With the adoption around 1976 of sealed bearings and improved urethanes in such wheels as the Road Rider, Tunnell “Rocks” and Sims “Competition” skaters could perform new manoeuvres which, as we shall see, took them away from simple transport or the emulation of surfing.  

Skateboard trucks like those made by Sure Grip, x-Caliber, Bahne and Chicago in the early 1970s were still derived from roller-skates. Bennett’s improved 1974 design was higher and had a wider axle, improving manoeuvrability, stability and rigidity. The Tracker truck (1975) had its king-pin welded directly into the base-plate and tightened by a single lock nut at the hanger-end of the truck. Although described as a “revolutionary breakthrough,” the aluminium alloy Trackers were simply a refinement of the Bennett type design. Nonetheless, they offered greater strength and ease of use, and by 1978 most trucks were of this arrangement.  

By the mid 1970s the modern skateboard had arrived – wooden deck, aluminium alloy trucks with steel axles, and urethane wheels. Specialist models have always been developed for slalom (decks cut-away to allow maximum wheel turn, made of fibreglass or other flexible material), downhill (longer boards, larger wheels, and sometimes ridden as a luge with the skater flat on their back, feet first) and freestyle (small boards with parallel sides, narrower trucks and smaller wheels), but generally most skaters have used a standard kind of board; over the following years, this standard specification was refined but rarely altered in any fundamental way. Decks in the first half of the 1970s were around 24-32 inches long and 6.5-7.5 inches wide, and by the
mid 1970s most boasted a 5-15" rear “kicktail” (angled rear end, beginning about 0.5 inch behind the rear truck — possibly invented by Larry Stevenson of Makaha skateboards). Some were made of plastic polypropylene or aluminium, and others from fibreglass (manufacturers like Bahne and G&S/Gordon & Smith in particular promoted fibreglass “flex” decks), but most decks were constructed from laminated maple or solid beech, oak or teak.

In the late 1970s, as skaters explored the vertical walls of pools and skateparks, skateboards became much bigger to provide extra stability. In the latter half of 1977 the average width of a skateboard deck like the G&S “Warptail” was 7.5 inches. But from 1973 onward skater Lonnie Toft experimented with 20 inch wide 8-wheeled and 8-10 inch wide 4-wheeled boards with blunt noses and square tails. In early 1978 the commercial 8 inch wide Sims “Toft” model appeared, while skaters like Wes Humpstone and Jim Muir similarly experimented with wider boards.

From this moment things progressed quickly, and, particularly after the adoption of 10 inch wide decks by Tony Alva and other Dogtown (the Santa Monica and Venice Beach area of LA) skaters in the summer of 1978, many other skaters and manufacturers followed suit. In the UK, skaters like Marc Sinclair and John Sablosky were riding 9 inch wide Benjyboard decks by June 1978. Before the end of the year most decks measured around 10 inches wide; US firms like Sims, Alva and Dogtown were quickly followed by Powell-Peralta, Kryptonics and others. Most decks were made of 5-9 layers of maple, sometimes with additional fibreglass. Late 1979 onward saw the introduction of concave profiles across the width of decks (Alva, 1979; Santa Cruz, “Bevel,” 1980; Variflex, “Elguera/El Gato,” 1980; z-Flex “z-Winger,” 1980). Others experimented with longitudinal strengthening beams (Kryptonics “K-Beam,” 1979; Dogtown “Shogo Kubo Airbeam,” 1979), and lightweight foam-cored and graphite construction (Kryptonics, 1978-9; Sims “George Greenough/Paul Gross” and “Phase 3 Composite” models, 1979), while many skaters also added various hand-grabbing and board-saving devices to their decks, including side rails, nose and tail protectors.

In late 1978-9, truck manufacturers introduced wider models to accommodate the new decks, including the Tracker “Ex-Track” and “Six-Track,” Lazer 8 inch, Megatron 205 mm and Independent “Superwide” models. The Independent truck, with design input from Rick Blackhart, in particular was
a major challenge to Tracker's market domination. Other refinements were also introduced, like ACS and Tracker's lightweight (and very expensive) 90 per cent magnesium models (1978-9), saving 20 per cent of the overall truck weight but with a tendency to brittleness. Trucks could also be modified by adding "lappers" - devices like the "Lip Slider" (1978) and "Clyde Slide" (1979) which prevented the rear truck from being caught on the wall edge - and "copers" - a plastic device first introduced by Tracker in 1979 that clipped on the truck hanger to decrease wear and increase slide capabilities.

Wheels also improved from better urethane compositions, most famously Kryptonics who introduced in 1977 soft red (78a durometer) street wheels, hard green (91a durometer) skatepark wheels and an intermediate blue (86a durometer). Powell-Peralta "Bones" (1978) offered a double radius, and firms like Road Rider, g&s, Sims and Belair also introduced thicker edge-profile skatepark-oriented wheels. In early 1979 wheels like the Sims "Comp II," Alva "Bevel" and UFO "Saucer" models gained sophisticated front radius and back "bevel" or "conical" profiles intended to widen the wheel track and stop the wheel from getting caught on the wall edge. Skater Skitch Hitchcock claimed to have originated the conical back edge in late 1977. More idiosyncratic wheels included the rubber and urethane Emotion (1977), those with an aluminium ("Gyro," 1979) or plastic (Kryptonics "C-Series," 1978; Variflex "x," 1981) hub to reduce weight and increase stiffness, and those with a near spherical shape (g&s "Yoyo Roller-balls," 1980).

After a boom period in the late 1970s, in which it enjoyed the dubious publicity in the UK of competitions organised by the BBC "Nationwide" programme (late 1977) and The Sun (1978), skateboarding underwent a serious decline in popularity. However, despite being dismissed as a craze, skateboarding did not disappear entirely, and has since emerged stronger than ever. In the second half of the 1980s skateboarding began its third boom, particularly on the basis of the new interest in street skating.

Skateboard designs also changed in this process. By the end of the 1980s deck designs - such as the g&s "Danny Webster" (1988) model - included large upturned front ends to help with the new nose-based moves, together with complex concave lateral profiles and wide flared tails. Others, such as the Christian Hosoi "Hammerhead" (1985) decks, experimented with modulated plan profiles to provide different of hand-holds, while some, such as the Powell-Peralta "Tommy Guerrero" model (1989), came with a slight "rocker" shape with up-turned front nose to aid foot placement and turning circle. Most were made of seven-ply maple. Special material decks continued to be made - maple, poplar and vulcanised cellulose laminated "Boneite" decks (Powell-Peralta, 1987). "Airtech" foam-cored
decks (Santa Cruz, 1986). "Fiberlite" foam-cores skinned in fibreglass (G&S, 1986-7), and special-order high-tech cores protected by ply and inset bumpers (Schmitt "x-15," 1990) – but these were exceptional products. Typical deck dimensions in the late 1980s were 31 inches long, 10 inches wide, with 4.5 inch long nose and 6 inch long tail; weight averaged around 1500 gm. 

For trucks, in 1982 Tracker experimented with a production "Ultralite" made of nylon polyamide. By the end of 1980s, G&S, Tracker and Gullwing were introducing plastic baseplates and hollow steel axles to reduce weight, while most manufacturers offered designs in various enamel colours, but these minor variations excepted, trucks remained relatively constant in design. Wheels, for their part, became harder at around 97A durometer, optimised for ramp riding. Similarly, toward the end of the decade, tall and narrow wheels around 66-7 mm diameter and 36 mm wide, such as the Santa Cruz 66 mm "Bullet" (1988), were developed for vertical riding on large half pipes. At the same time, the first new street-oriented wheels began to appear, and these – such as the G&S "Bam Bams" (1987), Vision "Neutrons" (1989), and the Powell-Peralta "Streetstyle" (1987) – were slightly smaller at 57-61 mm diameter and 35 mm width, often with colour graphic designs on their outer sides. Other popular wheel manufacturers included Toxic, Alva and the Australian-made Cockroach. 

But it was at the beginning of the 1990s that skateboard design experienced the most significant evolution since the wide-boards of the late 1970s. By 1987 US manufacturers were already claiming that over 90 per cent of sales were for street-related equipment, and designs were to respond accordingly. Over 1991-92, during which highly technical, unidirectional streetstyle entrenched its domination over all other forms of skateboarding, skateboards became "New School." At the end of the 1980s, the main deck and wheel manufacturers were companies like G&S, Kryptonics, Vision, Powell-Peralta, Dogtown, Alva, Sims, Schmitt, Walker and Santa Cruz, who had originated in the 1970s. But by 1992, as Thrasher realised, many had been caught out by the new trend.

In their place, a whole new range of (particularly deck) manufacturers came to the fore including Acme, Alien Workshop, Blind, Chocolate, New Deal, Plan B, Real, Think and World Industries. Later companies have included Birdhouse, Blueprint, Firm, Flip, Girl, Mad Circle, Panic and Toy Machine.

The new decks were slightly longer at 32-3 inches and narrower at 8-9 inches wide, with parallel side rails and near identical, steeply angled kicktails at front and back – these details accommodat-
ed moves done off the board nose and "switch-stance" skating in which skaters rode as much backward as forward. Some decks, known as "slicks," had a layer of slippery plastic bonded to the bottom to facilitate boardslide moves. Skaters using this equipment, in searching for the lightest possible set-up, tended to avoid the side rails, nose and tail protectors of the 1980s.

Another significant change concerns aesthetics: while older decks often had some kind of design on the underside, with new models brought out annually, by 1995 the turnover rate had become frantic, with new designs frequently produced every few months. Essentially, all skateboard manufacturers now use the same shapes, materials and construction standards, and use graphics to differentiate products and accelerate turnover.

There are so many companies and so many pros. So many angles have been tried. In the end, all you have to separate you from another company is your graphics.

Most “manufacturers” also do not make their decks, but buy unpainted blanks from the three large-scale producers: Taylor-Dykema, Prime and ps Stix. Wheels, similarly, are mostly poured by a few major producers for re-branding, while trucks are predominantly made at two us foundries.

Perhaps because of this, truck design has remained fundamentally unchanged for over two decades, simply widening or narrowing to accommodate changing board widths. Popular models from the 1980s onward include Thunder, Grind King, Venture and Gullwing, as well as Tracker and Independent. Skaters in the early 1990s favoured low-hanger designs, used without riser pads to further reduce ride height.

More significant changes occurred in wheel sizes, averaging 45-55 mm diameter, but occasionally 40 mm or less, such as the Toxic "39er" (1992) and Powell-Peralta "Mini Balls" 39 mm diameter.
models\textsuperscript{88} – small size meant lower weight and centre of gravity, so aiding the ollie moves, faster acceleration and slides favoured by street skaters. They also became harder, such as the 101A durometer Toxic “Meltdown” (1992).\textsuperscript{90} Unlike the multi-colour variations of the 1970s-80s, new school wheels tended to be white with applied sidewall graphics. Popular models included those by Big Spin, Birdhouse, Blind, Blueprint, Flip, Mad Circle, New Deal, Pig, Spitfire, Stereo and STM. \textsuperscript{[04.18]}

The skateboard, then, is a basic piece of equipment, with technology mainly directed at increasing durability and speed while controlling traction and weight. Although some, notably Powell-Peralta, tried to sell skateboards with slogans like “avoid obsolete technologies,”\textsuperscript{91} there have been very few path-breaking designs or production methods. Similarly, while some magazines, particularly the 1970s SkateBoader and Skateboard, undertook serious comparative reviews of components, and ran technical features on, for example, experimental deck construction\textsuperscript{92} and wheel characteristics,\textsuperscript{93} this was not replicated in the later magazines of the 1980s-90s. Skateboards are, then, usually sold on issues of style, general reputation and reliability rather than performance measures.

[A] skateboard is a skateboard. They haven’t changed. It’s the same idea, right? You get on, you go.\textsuperscript{94}

For skateboarders, as this suggests, the skateboard is similarly easy to understand, requiring almost no maintenance, and no skill to use other than the learned body-skill of balancing and moving on the board. How, then, can this technology be appraised socially and spatially? What can it do, not in terms of technical but political and social performance? What can it offer in the context of the restless search for social change?

When considering skateboarding historically and critically the isolated realms of the hardware – the skateboard and the buildings of the city – are by themselves inappropriate arenas in which to assess skateboarding technologies. In terms of the skateboard itself, Wall Street Journal may see vintage skateboards as top collectibles, but the various privatee “historians” of early skateboards\textsuperscript{95} are merely collecting the object-traces of skateboarding, and cannot construct a true history of skateboarding. Similarly, the visual-mental processes of architects, designers and skateboarders – the representational imaginary of urban space, ranging from architectural plans to skateboard magazines and videos – are also by themselves insufficient. Instead, we should consider the integration, to recall Lefebvre, of practices, representations and experiences – the way technologies become lived in social space and time, and so become socially real. The importance of the skateboard is not its manufacture or design, but what can be done with it, becoming a lived component of the body, its actions and its self-image in relation to the terrain and architecture beyond. It is to this inter-relation that I now turn.

4.02 Found Space

Skateboarders in LA first understood space as a pre-existent natural phenomenon, moving through the city’s neighbourhood sidewalks just as the freeway system provided an elaborate transport system for its automobile-bound population.

Seems like you always had your skateboard with you, were always on it. That was your main way of getting around – either the bus or a skateboard.\textsuperscript{96}

As with the use of scooters and primitive skateboards in the 1950s and early 1960s, local transportation continues to be one of the main uses of skateboards, particularly for its younger practitioners.

Apart from this simple movement, skaters
responded to urban space in a more deliberate and substantive manner. Where capitalism sub-divides and controls, measures and turns land into a commodity – in short, produces abstract space – skaters created spatial enclaves within LA and, subsequently, other cities worldwide. This is one of skateboarding's central features, adopting and exploiting a given physical terrain to present skaters with new and distinctive uses other than the original function of that terrain.

Skateboarders in the 1960s-70s were commonly surfers, and used skateboards when the surf was flat. The suburban modernism of LA allowed frustrated surfers to re-enact the sense of being on the sea, rolling down the tarmac drives and roads of its undulating residential sectors as if they were an ocean wave.

We used to skate a lot when the surf was no good; imitate a surf style or perfect a move. Or as Jan and Dean sang in 1964, "you can do the tricks the surfers do [. . .] grab your board and go sidewalk surfing with me." This was artificial, second nature architecture, adopted and re-thought as natural space.

Skateboarding here was about surface horizontality and its gentle curvature. Firstly, skateboarders rode barefoot and upright or, more often, crouched with arms outstretched as a parallel gesture to the flatness of the ground beneath. Second, movement was important, seeking to experience through the moving body the expansive stretch of tarmac in all directions; the body and skateboard operated as floating mirror, a few feet or inches above the surface, reflecting its planar materiality back onto itself. The skater here was a scanning device, partly like a metal detector, checking for the smallest objects and irregularities, and partly as micro-cartographer, mapping the gently undulating contours. This "low center of gravity style" was based on surf-
bank, just as a surfer "carves" across a wave; touching the bank surface as if trailing the hand in watery spray; or re-enacting surf tricks like the "hang five" where the rider hangs five toes over the board nose. 04.21 A "frontside" move was where the skater faced the bank/wave, 04.22 and, conversely, "backside" was where the skater's back was turned toward the bank/wave.

When skating banks, just ride them like a wave [. . .] Banks are really just cement waves.103

How better to ride a wave of cement than to surf-skate it?104

Later in the 1970s, new LA skaters like Marty Grimes, Alva, Stacy Peralta and Jay Adams further extended the surf-skate bank-riding experiences. Similar bank moves were undertaken at Hawaii skate spots like Uluwatu, Wallas and Stoker Hill.105

In the 1970s, such re-enactments of surfing were also transposed to the unlikely setting of European urbanism, skateboarding bringing the joy of surfing to the humblest council estate.106

I started off by rolling down a hill with a pair of sunglasses on, pretending to be Californian.107

In London, the concrete banks below the South Bank's Hayward Gallery proved ideal for early surf-related moves.

A large paved area sweeps into a thre­ sided bank and a seemingly endless stream of kids were hurtling up to the bank, riding it, and turning back down and away [. . .] others were riding along the top edge of the bank, crouched down holding on to their boards ("carving").108

04.21 Danny Bearer, hang five, Paul Revere School, LA (1965).
Stoner

Glen E. Friedman

Other "natural" banks in the UK included Hyson Green in Nottingham.109

On one level this activity appears as urban escapism, just as pot-holing and mountaineering make a "claim to nature" and so "flee the deteriorated and unrenovated city" in order to "really" live.110 However, this early skateboarding was less an escape - as surfing might be construed - than a repositioning of the urban. Through surf-related moves, skaters re-combined body, board and terrain, simultaneously copying one activity (surfing) while initiating a second (skateboarding). The modernist space of suburbia was found, adapted and re-conceived as another kind of space, as a concrete wave.
New hillside housing tracts lost their hideous urban negativity and emerged from the metamorphosis as smooth uncrowded ribbons of winding joy.¹¹¹

This was an attempt to produce from second nature those things which become scarce in capitalism: first nature, air, water, land, light.¹¹² But, importantly, skaters’ “escape” was ideational rather than physical. This recombination of body, image, thought and action lies at the heart of skateboarding – an integration of abstract and concrete, object and performance, to which I constantly return. It also, therefore, has the potential to avoid the “enormous disappointment” which arises from trying to relate to “nature-in-itself.”¹¹³

The emulation of surfing continued into the 1970s, with skaters finding other, more challenging terrains. Above all, LA (particularly the Hollywood Hills and moneyed districts of Santa Monica, Malibu and Pacific Palisades) was the “pool capital”¹¹⁴ with numerous substantial villas boasting private swimming pools. In 1965 a doctor called Gary Swanson, a.k.a. “Swane,” drained the water from his Santa Monica back yard pool, and, realising this Californian pool offered a curved transition from base to wall (unlike, for example, the orthogonal section pools typically found in Australia¹¹⁵), rode his skateboard up the rounded sides.¹¹⁶ [04.25] Alternatively, it is reported that the Foxtail pool in Foxtail Park, just outside Santa Monica, was possibly the first to be skated, carved by skaters like Steve Hilton around March 1965.¹¹⁷ [04.23] Certainly pools were skated regularly after 1965 and became particularly prevalent around 1973-5 and late 1970s. Others quickly followed the discovery of pools, and sculptural oval and kidney-shaped pools all around LA were skated. To begin with, this meant the surf-derived carve, a fundamental skateboard move where the skater attacks the wall at an angle along a single sweeping trajectory, prevented from falling by the centrifugal force generated by their speed. [04.24]

Skateboarding in pools also meant creating an empathy and engagement with the surface of the pool wall. This occurred in two ways, and is particularly connected with the “kickturn” move – possibly first achieved in a pool by Waldo Autry or Alva in the early 1970s¹¹⁸ – where the skater rides up the wall in a near vertical trajectory, and then, as their speed drops, lifts the front wheels and pivots 180° around the rear wheels and drops back down the wall. Firstly, through this move, skaters encounter the wallness of the wall, sensing how the pool presents itself as a surface changing from floor to wall under their very feet. The skater’s experience is a heightening encounter – the higher up they go, the
Gary Swanson, frontside carve in his own pool, Santa Monica (1967).
more vertical, the more wall-like that surface becomes. This involves a quadruple-movement of body and architectural surface: initially comes the sudden compression of body hitting the bottom curve of the transition, where terrain is felt to press back on the skater, translating momentum into a forced acceleration of her/his trajectory up the wall; at this point the second stage arrives, tense compression is released, and the skater feels the enclosed concave curvature of the transition give way to vertical flatness, and to a corresponding sense of speed and expansivity of space. The third stage is that stalling space-time where the skater reaches the top of their trajectory, hangs momentarily, and begins the kickturn - for the skater, this is a highly physical yet simultaneously fantastical and dream-like experience, where space-time are conflated and frozen into a dynamic-yet-stable instance. The fourth moment is the transitional return from pool wall to floor, experiencing in reverse the compression of curvature and body; this last stage is then a recalled rhythm of the first, at once equal and different. This complex procedure is then sequentially replicated, creating a composition of body-time-spaces as the skater combines carves, kickturns and other moves within the same run.

The second engagement with the pool wall is through its pure surface, and particularly its tactility or materiality: smoothness as a texture, like a cloth, and smoothness as a concave plane, like a mathematically complex curve. Here the micro-architecture of grain, asperity, cracks and ripple become evident, translated into body space through judder (from wheels, to deck, to feet and upward), slide and grip. Above all, it involves noise, for the skateboarder's traverse on the white wall creates a non-tonal hum, so near silence yet so clearly audible that it creates a dramatically calm interlude.
to the high-speed fire rasped out by hard wheels passing over blue ceramic tile and metal truck grinding along concrete coping.

[The way everything sounds is different. Every grind has a strange resonating howl.]

Snarls and growls rise from the deep end as skaters get down and out. Shouts and howls rise from the crowded shallow end full of screaming skaters-in-waiting.

These aural salvos remind us that "[s]pace is listened for, in fact, as much as seen, and heard before it comes into view," that hearing mediates between the spatial body and the world outside it, and that it is not therefore only in a cathedral or cloister that "space is measured by the ear:" This is a "sensuous geography" created by a phenomenal experience of architecture, a "sensory space" constituted by "an 'unconsciously' dramatized interplay of relay points and obstacles, reflections, references, mirrors and echoes."

On one level, these experiences were further extensions of the surf-related nature of skateboarding. As late as 1978 skaters commented that pool skating was "[t]he closest thing to surfing," and captions in SkateBoarder (published by Surfer magazine group) described skaters as "[a]dapting from waves to walls with stylistic finesse." [04.27]

When skating I try to think of the walls as a wave and try to do those same (surf) moves [. . .] it’s all so inter-related and interchangeable.

When you’re skating a pool, it’s almost like surfing. It relates because of the climbing and dropping, and the weightlessness of verticalness.

Riding the right pool feels just like being weightless in the tube.

Many skaters at this time also preferred to skate barefoot, a body gesture in direct emulation of the surfer’s "total 'surf' experience," and in particular their reading of surface through board and feet up to the body. [04.31]

But pool skateboarding was not just about emulating surfing. Around 1976-7, skaters’ attitude to the pool began to change away from ocean-related movements.

When you fly up into the air and land on concrete – that’s not water.

Initially surfing was a motivation, but we began to use the terrain as a force, you know to gain speed from the vertical. Most of the older guys just skated over the ground while we worked the surface.

Such “working the surface” involved thinking less about the pool wall as a concrete wave, and more as an element which, together with the skateboard and skater’s own body, could be recombined into an excited body-centric space.
shallow-ends. The faster the better. Go over
the light, then the love-seat, through the
shallow, carve-grind the deep-end pocket
and ride that hip that tips past vert. And
what's the matter . . . are you scared to
frontside grind over the death-box? Haul
ass!131

The first moves in pools done by skaters like
Swanson and Hilton were carves, but skaters soon
found this limiting, realising that "[c]arving's cool,
but after a while you want to do more than just
carve it."132 It was therefore during the mid 1970s
that LA "z-Boy" (Zephyr skateboard team) skaters
such as Adams, Alva, Bob Biniak, Chris Cahill, Paul
Constantineau, Kubo, Muir, Peralta, Nathan Pratt
and Alan Sarlo began to explore both the bound­
aries of the surface on which they skated and the
space beyond, aiming "to project yourself through
the bowl continuously, forever doing off-the-lips,
from one wall to another:"133 To begin with, around
1976, they concentrated on the top of the pool wall,
shuddering over the blue tile to grind the rear truck
against the pool coping blocks before dropping
back down. Biniak's "standards for excellence" con­
cerned "[h]ow close you can ride to the top, how
long you can ride at the top, how fast you go at the
top - frontside off-the-lips at speed, style."134

As the last quotation suggests, this also
involved a particular "style" or attitude to the body-
terrain interaction; for many skaters, this was a kind
of aggression. [04.28]

It was all hardcore aggression. Back then,
you knew it was aggression. Alva, J. Adams,
Yeron, all those guys. I mean it was 100%
aggression.135

Skaters adopted a confrontational stance to the
pool terrain, seeing it as something dangerous to be
conquered. Within this aggression, the edge condi­
tion was paramount, the skater addressing the very
limits of the wall, and the precise micro-space of
the skateboard wheel and truck in relation to that
dge.

It’s like you’re on about 1/8” edge, just pivoting - because the wheels are just about 1/4”
on the edge . . . it’s just an edge, just unreal,
because you feel everything lifting off, then
you feel the edge on the coping while you’re
turning.136

This was a micro-space, measured in fractions of an
inch. [04.29] But it was also more than that.

Yup edgers. The slim difference between yes
and no, between light and dark, genius and insanity - even dawn and dusk. Yeah, it's a fine line, but the results are measured in vertical concrete.137

The space of the edge was, then, not just a quantitative dimension (as might be the high-jumper's consideration of the bar), nor just an experiential engagement between skateboard and architecture, but simultaneously more meaningful: the symbolic limit of danger and achievement, the boundary and terrain deepest within the skater as well as the furthest limit of their externalised activity, representing "the act of skateboarding as throwing one's self out of control and then attempting to pull it back in."138

The edge was the physical and personal edge, the space and moment of confrontation between the self and the external world: "You can't be on the edge if there is no edge."139

But this, ultimately, was not the final limit. More spectacular than edge-oriented moves, the skateboarder could perform an aerial: pass over the top of the wall, torque around in mid-air while holding onto the skateboard with one hand and return to the side-wall. One photograph by Glen E. Friedman provides an early record of this move - performed by Alva in the "Dog Bowl," Santa Monica, (1977) - and still imparts an astonishing sense of spatial invention.140

Here at the Dog Bowl, T.A. [Tony Alva] perfected the "frontside air." I remember seeing him do it the first time above coping. I went back to school the next day and had a tough time just describing it to my friends there, let alone getting them to believe it.141

Floating left to right across the photograph, Alva is
caught emerging from shade into sun, his face and a sliver of front leg starkly lit; the rest of the body and board cast in deep shadow; a solitary skater to the left and a group of fourteen or so to the right look on, redirecting the viewer’s attention back to Alva, for it is in this momentary time and specific space of the frame that the move is centrally enacted. With board gripped in right hand, Alva’s eyes are staring in concentration, not outward on any specific instant or visual point of reference, but inward; for of course the fulcrum point or centre of balance are at once external to the skater, in Alva’s relation to board and pool, and internal, as he senses the change of momentum and trajectory brought about by the interplay of his horizontal traverse and gravity. The front foot and truck are in sharp focus, suggesting the permanence of an historical event, while the rear truck and foot are in slightly blurred movement, suggesting the intensely transient nature of the act.

Moves like these initiated a unique airborne spatial experience, wherein space was produced centrifugally, a spiralling field of influence thrown out from the body, and then centripetally, pulling the terrain underfoot back into the realm of body space. The imaginative separation from surfing created by this kind of skateboarding is evidenced in the many new skateboarding moves subsequently exported back to surfing, with surfers attempting boardslides, aerials, ollies and other skate-related moves from the late 1970s onward.

Pool skateboarding opened up a terrain incomparable with any other in the urban landscape.

Pool skating is it. Sure, I still bomb hills, skate ramps and ditches, and cruise the streets after hours, but pools rule.

Even before Alva’s aerial, pool-riding was being seen as the future of skateboarding; significantly, the front cover of the first re-published SkateBoarder showed not the freestylers, high-jumps and gentle riding depicted in the original series a decade earlier, but Gregg Weaver carving barefoot in the “San Marcos” pool.144

Pool-riding is the state-of-the-art skating style of the 70’s. No other type of riding offers such radical departures from the past, and no other form progresses so swiftly towards the future. Pool riding has the juice.145

Inspired by these kinds of activity, hundreds of skateboarders took to the pools. In and around LA, other backyard pools were found and skated, sometimes in the grounds of a burnt out residence or illegally, without the permission of a temporarily absent owner. A BBC television documentary, “Skateboard Kings,” showed Adams, Alva and other skaters on a search for the perfect Santa Monica back yard pool,146 while other pools across California were discovered, often only skated for short periods of time and known by descriptive or idiosyncratic labels: “Alpine,” “Bel Air Pool,” “Canyon Pool,” “Central Pool,” “Dog Bowl,” 146 (04.30.08.01) “Fruit

Drainage ditches and other large scale water-management projects were another terrain skaters could utilise. Favoured locations included the "Toilet Bowl" in the Hollywood Hills—a dry drainage reservoir forming a shallow concrete bowl 75 ft across and 35 ft deep. Other such locations included "Secret Spot" in the Beverly Hills, the Sepulveda Dam (originally skated in the 1960s), Vermont Avenue funnel and the Escondido reservoir. In northern California, places like the Yuvis Dam spillway [04.32] were supplemented by the "Arab Pool," "Dolphin Pool," "Gilroy Brocieros Pool" and, in particular, the "Los Altos" pool. Around Santa Cruz, favoured skate spots included "The Pit," "Lipton Bowl," Uvas Spillway and Novitiate Winery pool. Ditches and dams were also found in other states, such as the Jefferson, Ventura, Commanche and Four-Hills ditches in Albuquerque.

Even more extreme were the large concrete “full pipes.” At Mount Baldy near LA (first ridden around 1974-5 or possibly late 1960s), skaters discovered a circular drainage pipe in which they worked continuously from side to side. [04.33] Mount Baldy was around 14-15 ft in diameter and 500 ft long. In Northern California, skaters found the 14 ft diameter Ameron plant pipes near Palo Alto, the 22 ft diameter 250 ft long Bombora pipeline and the Berryessa/Bariessa 30 ft run-off pipe.

Yet larger 20-22 ft diameter free-standing pipes, part of a US$1.7 billion federal water project, could also be found out near Lake Pleasant and the Biscuit Flats of the Arizona desert: here the extreme flatness and expansivity of the natural terrain contrasted with the pipes, creating a lunarscape dotted with immense concrete forms. [04.34] This was “the dark side of the moon.”

Just when you get to thinking that you’ve finally found the limits of what can be done on a skateboard, or of what places are left to be found, something new inevitably turns up again to broaden the imagination and boggle the mind.
Taking the main turn-off, and still three miles away, we could just barely see some giant structures across the sandy, flat panorama. "What are those?" Laura asked. I struggled to drive and look at the same time; everyone started hooting as we moved closer. Pipe sections littered the desert floor everywhere as far as the eye could see.159

Within these pipes, skaters instigated a unique spatial exploration. At the long Mount Baldy pipe Chris Miller recalled "riding all the way through it, doing frontside thrusters as high as you could go, skimming your hand along the wall, going very, very fast."160 In the larger diameter but shorter, single section Arizona pipes, skaters began a more upward and rhythmical spatial experience, moving higher and higher, pushing skateboard and body above the vertical, and up into the zone where the pipe pressed back against the skateboarder; here, not only does gravity pull from below but the pipe pushes from above, the overhang forcing the skater into an ever more compressed board-body-terrain space, desperately re-flowing the push-pull into their own turning manoeuvre, fully exhaling to avoid being pitched out.

For that one moment, the skater defies the laws of gravity and floats in space.161

On completing the turn, the skateboarder falls down the pipe surface, inhaling once again, at first feeling the wall move away from the board until the 9 o’clock position is regained, and then feeling the wall come back to the body on the descent. Furthermore, the skater then immediately begins the encounter with the opposite wall, for, unlike the later skateparks and half-pipe constructions discussed in Chapter 5, the simple circular “O” shape section of these full-pipes had no flat-bottom. Consequently skaters undertook a series of immediately-sequential moves on opposite walls – “forevers” – using the compression-decompression of body and board to gain height, just as a child on a playground swing.162 The forever performed a magical rhythm and, emphasised by the strange setting of concrete-meets-lunar-landscape, rapidly attained near mythological status in skateboarding culture.

Even the hardest, the coolest of the cool had to admit – this place was the best!163

This mystique was further emphasised by the "unconquered frontier"164 – the impossible idea that a skater might pass over 12 o’clock and make a full revolution.165 (Duane Peters (1970s) and Tony Hawk (1990s) both completed full rotations, but on a special looped track – the move is essentially unachievable on a normal, closed-circle pipe).166

Full-pipes, although largely eclipsed by the many skateparks built in the late 1970s, continued to fascinate skateboarders: for example, in 1979 SkateBoarder ran an extended article on the discovery in Mexico of long underground sections of 24 ft diameter cooling pipes, possibly part of the US government’s “Project Atlas” missile complex.167 [04.35]

One explanation for the compelling attraction of pools, ditches and full-pipes concerns their appearance as second nature. That these constructions were in the wastelands, deserts and forgotten spaces of the city imbued them with an archaeolog-
ical character – primeval material elements since forgotten. They were also all originally to do with the containment and movement of water, the very absence of water heightening the sense of the world having moved from the presence of nature to the domination of nature. As such, they appeared as pure urban and pure second nature, just as pure first nature is at once "abyss and possible action," yielding a terrifying glimpse of the origins of possibility. In other words, for skateboarders the ditch, suburban road, pool and school yard bank, and particularly the vast sweeps of Californian concrete canalised rivers, causeways, reservoirs and pipes represented the original concrete nature from and against which the possibility of skating was derived. The “Mellow Cat” cartoon in SkateBoarder magazine reflected this meaning, showing a “dreepipe” in a dinosaur-inhabited hidden valley and reached by way of “flow portals” and the “ancient gravitational powers of the Ma-Bu-Hu.”

As a result of the developments in the pipes and pools, publicised in magazines like SkateBoarder, southern Californian skateboarders in places like LA and San Diego gained an international reputation.

Southern California is the Hawaiian Islands of skateboarding. The parks and pools of California are to skating what surf breaks like Sunset Beach, Laniakea or Pipeline are to surfing. It’s the proving ground of the best skateboarders of the world.

In particular, the skaters of Santa Monica invented a new territory, “Dogtown,” setting themselves apart from the rest of LA and California physically and socially. Dogtown was the most intense of skateboarding domains, and became the most famous of skateboard centres, attaining a mythic status and reputation.

Only God could have created Dogtown.

The Dogtown aura had a major influence worldwide, as one skater recalled two decades later.

It’s unbelievable the impact the Dogtown influence had on that teenage boy I was.
4.03 Appropriation, Colonisation, Identity Formation, Co-optation

Above all, it was the urban spatial tactics of Dog-town’s skaters that became most famous, as skaters elsewhere sought not only to emulate the Dog-towners’ moves – a process dealt with in Chapter 5 – but also the treatment of the city as a whole.

On the one hand, this meant finding locations in the city that could be appropriated for skateboarding. The school yard banks, pools, ditches and pipes were all found spaces, already present in the urban realm, which acquired the sense in skateboarding of having been revealed from behind the physical veil of the city. Thus pools were usually on private land, hidden in the back lands of the house lot and obscured by hedges, fences and natural terrain. The drainage ditches were spatially distant from residential areas, found out in the interstitial infrastructural zones, accessible only from unknown (and often protected) entrance points. Pipes, for their part, were mostly in the deserts, away from the city altogether, like forgotten ziggurats within the dense forests of Central America. Even the school yard banks, although part of everyday spatial knowledge, were “discovered” through being rethought as ocean wave. All these terrains were already there, but awaited disclosure.

It also meant inserting a new activity into an area which could accommodate it. Thus while the primary rationale of the villa habitat is that of speculation on plots and property, pool skateboarding was an insertion within suburban residential space – specifically the relatively accessible outdoor space of the pool – and so attacked its property logic, appropriating spaces for use rather than investing for exchange. This process is much more evident in the urban street skating of the 1980s-90s, to which I return in Chapter 7.

The spatial tactics associated with skateboarding were, then, initially those of reconnaissance, roving the city to identify new spaces for skateboarding.

I guess the most fun was stickin’ with all the guys on the team and goin’ out and finding pools and stuff.175

Journeys by bicycle, car and skateboard were used to survey systematically local neighbourhoods and more distant areas, keeping eyes, ears and nose tuned for such telling signs as “[p]ump houses, high pool fencing, pool sweeps, slides, the smell of chlorine, inflatable pool toys, solar-power panels, big hoses gushing for days or chlorine deposits (white salt marks) on the gutters of a street,”176 plus pool cleaning trucks and the hum of pump motors.177 “It’s an art form of sorts, hunting pools.”178 Very occasionally, a small aeroplane would be deployed to over-fly a likely neighbourhood, looking for the tell-tale gleam of a white pool.

Most often, the targets were houses with pools temporarily drained, either for periodic maintenance or for the winter months.179

It’s a long alley through a long suburban block, the boundary of a neighborhood of backyards. From the alley we can tell which yards have pools, so we stop at each one and do a pull-up to peek over the wall. Forty-nine times out of 50 the pool is full of crystal clear, refreshing water – inviting but unskateable. But that one smooth-walled, empty bowl is worth every pull-up, every unrewarding alley.180

Alternatively, the frequent fires in the Hollywood Hills and Santa Monica mountains often left numerous abandoned homes with ridable pools181 – for example, on the first day of a major fire in the Santa Barbara area 20 skateable pools were identified.182 Other favoured targets were homes being architecturally remodelled, airport districts with homes abandoned for health-noise reasons, plus low rental
residential districts and high schools where pools were often drained to save costs. Motel pools—such as Pink’s Motel in the San Fernando Valley—were a particular favourite as they tended to be slightly larger. Aerial maps were also consulted in the local City Hall, enabling suitable pools to be identified, and the municipal authorities could even be enlisted to drain some pools, as, for safety reasons, Californian codes often required this for pools left unsupervised longer than two weeks.

These kinds of searches were replicated across the US, where pools were also skated in places like East Hampton on Long Island, the “Rathole” in Texas, and even in the UK with the “Dustbowl” in the grounds of a house under construction in Croydon. Mostly, however, pool-hunting was a Californian activity, as described by Alva.

The thing we were into most was to find as many skate spots as possible, and making the most of them. We found as many pools as we could and just skated the hell out of them.

Once located, however, a different set of spatial methods set in. Occasionally, the tactic was a one-off hit such as, for example, skateboarding a single session in a back yard pool until the irate owner or police arrived to throw the skaters off the land.

A common practice in skating pools is the fifteen-minute rule. It usually takes five minutes for the people to realize we’re there, five minutes for them to call the cops, and five minutes for the cops to arrive.

Here, the danger of being caught became part of the attraction, heightening the sense of discovery of this otherwise unknown terrain.

If you’re going to skate pools and stuff, it’s better to be ready for anything... ready for police, ready for the owner, for dogs, anything. Part of pool riding is the adventure of being ready for anything that’s gonna come down. Same with riding pipes in Arizona, some radical things happen. There’s these crazy red-neck sheriffs and you gotta look out for them. You gotta be able to skate good and fast, run good and fast or else be able to fight good ... It’s every man for himself. If the cops come, you’re not going to be holding your friend’s hand. Everybody’s just going to go their separate ways. Just hope you get away with it.

This has been a long tradition in pool hunting, with skaters in to the 1980s and 1990s pursuing similar tactics and encountering similar problems.

One time we went to this one, and we staked it out, it was six in the morning. We got in and bailed it, then kicked it for an hour or so in there, waiting for the right time when no one was around. We started skating and shit, and I had the camera. We rode it for like thirty-forty minutes, then all of a sudden this big fat dude comes running out... We just grabbed our shit and hopped like three fences, we had all this shit, this
The emphasis here was on appropriation as spontaneous and the ephemeral - a particularly temporal consideration of the spatial that involves the discontinuous (temporally and spatially) use of particular parts of the city. The social space-time of the pool was thus somewhere between a raid and a party, a short-lived event not to be missed.

PO-OL PARTY TONIGHT

We're going to have a dry pool part tonight! A-WRIGHT!

We're going to have a dry pool part awright! TONIGHT!

We've got nothing better to do than skate this pool and pay some heavy dues

Everybody's gonna hang out here tonight! A-WRIGHT!

We'll pump that water out awright! TONIGHT!

We've got nothing better to do than pump this pool and have a couple of brews

Don't think about anything else we just wanna SKATE
It'll be dry for only two days
I don't wanna be LATE.

Harsh vert wall, real blue tiles, death box, coping.

But not all skate tactics were isolated raids. Wherever possible, skaters returned to the same drainage ditch or pool again and again.

No bust situations are great for morale.

Here naming the space became important, providing a consensus label by which skaters could refer to locations - hence "Toilet Bowl," "Dog Bowl," "Manhole" and so on. In recording these places, photographers like Friedman sometimes made up the names for ephemeral locations - like "bbc Pool," "Barney Miller's" and "A-Rab Pool" - when submitting images for publication, but others - like "Key-Hole," "Fruit Bowl," "Kona Bowl" and "Soul Bowl" - were frequently used and acquired an established reputation. In part this naming process was a matter of communication and orientation, but, contradictorily, it also helped keep the exact location hidden from other skaters, and hence protected it from over-use or unwanted attention - surfers had long done this to keep certain surf spots from becoming overcrowded. This tactic was also adopted for the desert pipes, whose exact location in Arizona was not disclosed to SkateBoarder's readers.

Those locations are top secret. You won't find them listed in the Yellow Pages. It's all strictly classified information - unless, of course, you know someone who knows someone who . . .
and keep them secret.\textsuperscript{200}

The less people you tell, the longer you will skate [. . .] The lips of fools lose pools.\textsuperscript{201}

For some locations, like the “Dog Bowl,” skaters negotiated legal access\textsuperscript{202} and here (particularly when published in magazines) the names helped inculcate the mystique of a remote sun-soaked paradise, clearly real yet excitingly (and frustratingly) known only to a select few.

Protected in this way, some pools and other locations were skated repeatedly, lasting weeks, months or even years; by the end of the 1980s, the “Buena Vista” pool near Santa Cruz was rumoured to have been empty for over 30 years\textsuperscript{203} and skated for over 15.\textsuperscript{204} [04.38] In such cases, pools frequently became colonised by skateboarders, who sought to create their own isolated territories, known and accessible to a carefully controlled group.

Skateboarders were here like anarchist communities, tending to work with nature (found terrains) and to be spontaneous in their actions, but with this spontaneity being rapidly replaced by the socio-spatial tactic of colonisation; established skateboard locations like the “Key-Hole,” “Canyon Pool,” and “Soul Bowl” generated their own names, boundaries, access conditions and internal culture. This was particularly evident in the use of graffiti on many colonised pools, skaters spraying the terrain surface not only to mark it for themselves, celebrating its transfer to the domain of skateboarding, but also against others, marking off the terrain. [04.39] As one skater’s poem, “The Killer Pool,” explained:

\begin{quote}
The location of this radical spot
Is kept a secret, believe it or not
This keeps out the wimps and others who
don’t skate a lot\textsuperscript{205}
\end{quote}

Pools thus became socio-spatial boundaries, those important social spaces forbidding access to any-one outside the sanctioned group.\textsuperscript{206}

But above all, it was the presence of skaters, and not just the pool itself, which defined the social space of the pool. As Peralta described it:

\begin{quote}
If the boys are there, the competitive thing is really intense. I’ve seen outsiders who are pretty good skaters just walk away from a heavy session without riding; I guess they thought it was too insane.\textsuperscript{207}
\end{quote}

It is the skaters and their actions which were important – not just the architecture of the pool. Alex Moul later had the same to say about urban street skating: “everywhere is the best: wherever there’s a session going on.\textsuperscript{208} Beside aiding in territory- and group-formation, specific pools and pipes also served to control the internal relations of particular groups. As Lefebvre notes, people use space, and particularly boundary spaces of passage and encounter, to create their
own social identity, and often do so through spaces of ritual and initiation.209

Man does not live by words alone; all "subjects" are situated in a space in which they must either recognize themselves or lose themselves, a space which they may both enjoy and modify. In order to accede to this space, individuals (children, adolescents) who are, paradoxically, already within it, must pass tests. This has the effect of setting up reserved spaces, such as places of initiation, within social space.210

The pools in particular thus became places of initiation, dangerous (through accident or social confrontation) places where young men proved themselves to their peers. [04.40]

There was a round pool with thirty foot walls. To ride this pool you had to have big balls. [ . . . ]

Three skaters were dead, two had broken legs, one had a broken arm and there were four empty kegs.211

People who sat around didn't say shit, because it was sweat and you knew there could be a brawl. But the brawl was in the pool. You'd go in the pool and you'd tell the guy to fuck off by doing a better run than his last run. You'd stay in longer.212

The focus here was on danger, pain and bodily injury, but also on the competitively collective nature of the group, created from a set of extreme individual attitudes and actions.

If you get the right combination of terrorists, it's going to happen no matter what. You can't prevent it, can't control it, and can't avoid it.213

When the boys are together, you could never find a more aggressive, arrogant, rowdy, perhaps ignorant bunch of people than my friends. That's the way we are; that's the way we skateboard; that's the way we talk.214

It was not the skaters' actions or pools alone which created this condition, but both together, changing specific location and configuration over time.

The site of these high-octane situations continually floats [ . . . ] The site might be in the wilds at a spot known only to the inner circle, or it may be in a more public forum.215

This was a socio-spatial co-production where architecture and activity were each a concrete enaction of the other.

Together, the tactics of appropriation, colonization and identity formation helped skaters redefine both the city and themselves. By making a different edit of the urban realm from alternative locations and times, skateboarders transformed the sedately suburban character of LA into dramatic concrete constructions, exploited under an air of espionage.
Suburbanites see (falsely) the house as representative of Nature, liberty, privacy and escape from everyday life, a "mirror of their 'reality', tranquilizing ideas, and the image of a social world in which they have their own specially labelled, guaranteed place." Skateboarders, however, made the suburb explicitly urban in character, rendering it more confrontational, disclosing the "schizophrenic" character of urban space – the coexistence of spaces of play, spaces of exchange and circulation, political space and cultural space. In particular, skateboarders resurrected the dead street of the suburb, not to reintegrate it with the residential home but with their own social life. Where the decentralised suburb promotes life as divorced from the city, isolating people from participatory creativity, skateboarders related individual life to the form of the city, reintroducing the city as creative and active œuvre and thus conceptually moving the suburb closer to the complex contradictions of the city core. These are all aspects of skateboarding which are even more explicit in the street skating of the 1980s and 1990s, and which are discussed in more detail in Chapter 7.

There is, however, a problem here: while skaters here implicitly treated space as "natural," it is in fact a social product. What they thought to have "found" was really not only a production as first created, but also a production of themselves seeking to use it for skateboarding. In doing so, skateboarders' reproduction of the architecture and urban space of the city conflicted with the reproduction of that same space by others. Thus the pools and pipes used by skaters were commonly reclaimed by these others (police, owners, developers).

That skaters ultimately lost out in this confrontation is because of an inherent time-space contradiction within their tactics at this stage in skateboarding's development. On the one hand, they undertook what Lefebvre calls a "primitive history," merely marking, naming and traversing natural space. However, treating buildings and spaces as texts, rather than as "archi-textures" of time, space and rhythms, means that skateboarders mistook marking natural space for the creation of social space. In particular, where they tried to produce social space, by colonising space for a period of time, it is precisely the temporality over which they ultimately had no control: although a pool or pipe might be appropriated for a short period of time (a few minutes or hours), the longer temporality of colonisation (repeated visits over weeks or months), together with the notion of "ownership" which colonisation implies, is not something that other, more powerful social groups were willing to accept. Occasional appropriations might be tolerated, but permanence was not.

These early skateboarders were in fact not so much appropriating as co-opting space and time – a practice which lies intermediate to domination and appropriation, and between exchange and use. Co-optation means taking over without mastering, appropriating without ephemerality. Except that skateboarders did not own or otherwise control the spaces which they sought to co-opt.

If skateboarders were to be able to skate with impunity, different locations and tactics were required to either escape confrontation altogether or create it under circumstances controllable by skaters themselves. Above all, this means acting in relation to time as well as space, for "appropriation cannot be understood apart from rhythms of time and life." Appropriation is not the simple reuse of a building or space, but a creative reworking of its time and its space. As shown in Chapter 7, for skaters this eventually meant a return to city streets, but first we turn to look at a different form of spatial control and production: the purpose-built skateparks of the 1970s. As Muir realised:

If pool riding is going to survive, you're gonna have to build your own pool to do it.
The next part of this thesis, Chapter 5, therefore focuses on two kinds of constructed terrain. The first is that of the purpose-built skatepark, many examples of which were built world-wide in the late 1970s, and the ramp or half-pipe, which took over after the demise (considered in Chapter 7) of most skateparks in the early 1980s. The second constructed terrain is that of the body, and the chapter considers the "super-architectural space" by which body, skateboard and architecture are erased and reborn in the encounter between skateboarder and skateboard architecture. The role of the image is also addressed here.
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Consciousness is being-towards-the-thing through the intermediary of the body.¹

5.01 Constructed Space

In 1975, southern California had some two million skateboarders.² Fuelled by media coverage in People, Sports Illustrated and Newsweek, and by specialist publications like the re-launched SkateBoarder and Skateboard World in the US and Skateboard!, Skateboard Scene and Skateboard Special in the UK, skateboarding quickly became a global phenomenon: the US alone had around 20-40 million skateboarders by 1978-9.³ By 1978, SkateBoarder had one million readers and had become extraordinarily influential for manufacturers, photographers, professional and ordinary skateboarders alike.⁴

Skateparks
The other group who read SkateBoarder were skatepark designers and investors. Early, unchallenging skateparks had been built in Kelso, Washington, in 1966,⁵ together with a community facility in the Ventura County area of LA in the 1970s,⁶ but it was the commercial sector which predominantly responded to the skateboarding explosion, creating purpose-built skateparks which exaggerated fragments of the city to create intentional skateboarding architecture. Such skateparks were promoted as "one of the 70's most profitable business opportunities,"⁷ and one national conference for skatepark developers attracted 370 delegates from 35 US states and 8 other countries.⁸

The first commercial Californian skatepark, the concrete "Carlsbad," was opened in the summer of 1975.⁹ Developed by John O'Malley (design) and Jack Graham (construction) of Skatepark Constructors, Carlsbad was quickly extended with advanced elements. By December 1976 three new parks had been built in Florida - "Skatboard [sic] City" (Port Orange/Daytona), "Paved Wave" (Cocoa) and one other at

05.01 Skatepark Publications, advertisement, SkateBoarder, v.4 n.11 (June 1978), p. 28.
05.02 The first proper Californian skatepark, Carlsbad (1976). Craig Hancock
05.03 "Skateboard City" skatepark, Port Orange/Daytona, Florida (1976). Skateboarder - Rodney Jesse. Mike Greene
Pensacola – which mimicked Florida’s surfing waves, varying the steepness of sections within one run. Skateboard City opened one week before Carlsbad, and so lays claim to being the first proper skatepark. Others built in 1976 included the “Yagoo Valley” (Slocum, Rhode Island) and “Fun Land” (Myrtle Beach, South Carolina) skateparks. Many new parks were also being planned, with rapid design evolution; “SkaterCross” in Resada, California, offered a variety of elements set within one continuous run. Around 15-20 skateparks were open by July 1977.

The early skateparks did not, however, offer the challenges of the pipes and backyard pools – many early skatepark developers had never even seen skateboarders in action – and they were quickly superseded. One of the premier “second wave” or “second generation” skateparks was “Pipeline” in Upland, in the San Bernadino Valley east of LA, built for around US$125,000. When opened in May 1977, Pipeline boasted the first circular pipe and fully vertical walls in California intended for skateboarding. The full-pipe (20 ft diameter, 40 ft long) fed into a 30 ft diameter, 12 ft deep bowl. Another bowl measured 40 ft across by 15 ft deep, with one side overhanging slightly over vertical. Emulating in exaggerated form the pipes, ditches and pools found in the LA area (especially the nearby Mount Baldy full-pipe), Pipeline was generally considered to be the best skatepark so far – “No way, a full-pipe!”

Pipeline and many other skateparks constructed at this time used the gunite process favoured by swimming pool constructors, whereby concrete is sprayed onto a framework. Gunite is one of the strongest methods of applying concrete to vertical walls – but necessitates an experienced operator. Skatepark constructors also therefore used the similar shotcrete process, which requires less skill but more water than gunite, and so produces a slightly inferior concrete.

Beside Pipeline, other US parks opened in 1977...
included: “Concrete Wave” (Anaheim, California) [05.07]; “Skateboard World” (Torrance, California); “Skate City” (Whittier, California), incorporating an interlocking three-bowl cloverleaf element, full-pipe, capsule pool and small half-pipe; “Skatopia” (Buena Park, California), featuring the “Escondido Bowl” based in part on the found-space Escondido Reservoir, a 15 ft diameter 175 ft long half-pipe, and interlocking four-bowl “Whirlpool” element; “Skateboard Safari” (West Palm Beach, Florida), featuring the “Vermont Drop” based on the Californian found-space Vermont Avenue funnel; “Runway” (Carson, California), also featuring an element based on Vermont Avenue; “Kona,” (Jacksonville, Florida); “Solid Surf” (Fort Lauderdale, Florida), and “Longwood Skateboard Track” (Florida), featuring the first full-pipe (12 ft diameter) in a skatepark.17

From around 1978, skatepark design and construction techniques were further refined to eliminate crude transitions and shapes. In particular, skaters complained that concrete bowls lacked the tiles, coping blocks and smooth white finish of backyard pools. “Upland […] needs coping really bad.”18 In response, many skateparks incorporated pool-style elements. For example, the centre-piece pool at “Skateboard Heaven,” Spring Valley, was a more extreme version of the local backyard “Soul Bowl” pool favoured by San Diego skaters, and also included gunite construction, shallow end coves and love seats derived directly from real swimming pools. [05.08, 05.09] The new pool was not, however, an exact copy, and where backyard pools were often too small with overly tight transitions and too much vertical wall,19 the skatepark version offered carefully tuned transitions and special slightly overhanging coping precisely designed for skateboarding; according to Peralta, it was the “first real pool for skateboarding.”20 Other parks, such as Carlsbad, added features like large mogul bowl fields, resembling a lunar landscape, encouraging the skater to transfer from one mogul to another.21 [05.10]

The new parks opened in 1978 further emphasised pool tiles and coping, including: “Skate Ranch” (Del Mar, San Diego, California), designed by Curtis Hesselgrave and Tom Inouye, with four pools (one copying the local “Kona” backyard pool);22 [05.11, 05.12, 05.13, 05.14, 05.15, 05.16] “Oasis” (San Diego); [05.15, 05.16] “Skate in the Shade” (Tempe, Arizona) with pool constructed by former swimming pool builder Duane Bigelow;23 [05.13] “Winchester” (San Jose, California); [05.17] and “Skatepark Victoria” (Milpitas, California). These third generation skateparks included the indoor Cherry Hill facility in New Jersey; opened in 1978, [05.18] Cherry Hill had four different pools, a half-pipe linked to a three-quarter pipe, and two reservoirs.24 Dogtown finally acquired its own skatepark with the Marina del Rey facility, just south of Venice Beach and Santa Monica, owned and designed by Ray Allen, and incorporating the “Keyhole” and “Dogbowl” pools (named after the famous local pool).25 [05.14, 05.15, 05.16, 05.17, 05.18] Together with Cherry Hill, Marina del Rey rapidly acquired a reputation as one of the most advanced new pool-oriented skateparks.

These are the only 2 parks that I enjoy skating at.26
05.08 “Soul Bowl” pool, San Diego, California (1976). Skateboarder - Gregg Weaver.
Warren Bolster

Warren Bolster

05.10 Moguls, Carlsbad skatepark, California (1977). Skateboarder - Dean Skipper.
Warren Bolster
Jim Goodrich

05.12 Pool, Cherry Hill skatepark, New Jersey (1979).

Skateboarder - Steve Shelton.
James Cassimus

05.14 “Dog Bowl” pool, Marina del Rey skatepark (April 1979).
Skateboarder - Dennis Agnew.
Glen E. Friedman

Jim Goodrich

Ted Terrebonne
Other advanced parks included “Get Away” (Huntsville, Alabama), designed by Wally Hollyday and Peter Drotlef, and “Apple” (Columbus, Ohio), designed by Hollyday and Drotlef with construction by Bigelow. Apple was a 40,000 ft² indoor facility boasting eight pool-bowls, including an egg bowl, large kidney and small keyhole. As with many of these new parks, extreme attention was paid to the piano-wire shaping templates, concrete and gray-coat cement finishing work. 

In response, parks like Skatopia, Skate City and Pipeline added their own pools. For Skate City, this was a simple keyhole pool, but for Pipeline, this meant the famous “Combi-Pool,” constructed in the summer of 1979 — effectively a 32 ft wide and 12 ft deep square pool with rounded corners and a 30 ft diameter 11 ft deep circular pool joined together at a common shallow end and entrance point. Designed by Don Hoffman with professional skateboarders, and constructed by Bigelow for around US$30,000, the Combi-Pool offered the same white walls, blue tiles and concrete coping as a back yard pool, but offered increased depth (and hence danger), greater areas of wall (3 ft of pure vertical), faster transitions from base to wall, a flat bottom between walls and a smoother surface optimised for skateboard wheels. The shallow end, tight corners of the square pool and the hip where the two pools joined together offered further terrain variations, and the overall result was “unquestionably the finest, most demanding terrain ever developed for skating,” the “ultimate playground.” Other skateparks also continued to add similar new centrepiece elements; the “Ranch” (Colton, California) had the rose-tinted “Hollyday Bowl” in 1980, and Skateboard World (Lakewood, California) opened a clam-shaped pool in July 1981.

By the end of the 1970s, the LA region had gained many skateparks of a similar standard to...
Pipeline, including “Big ‘O’” (Orange) [05.90, 07.04] and “Endless Wave” (Bakersfield).\textsuperscript{35} This was big business; construction costs for a large skatepark averaged around US$200-250,000 in the 1975-80 period (although some were built for around US$60,000).\textsuperscript{36} While Get Away and Skateboard World may have cost as much as US$1 million.\textsuperscript{37} By 1982 over 190 skateparks had been built in the US across at least 35 states, of which over a quarter (48\%) were in California, 22 in Florida and 16 in Texas. Many boasted large membership figures – 2,000 at “Olympic” (Olympia, Washington).\textsuperscript{38}

This specialised architectural activity was repeated throughout America, Europe, South America and Asia, all these skateparks mimicking back yard Californian swimming pools, Arizona pipeline projects and other features of American architecture and civil engineering. In the UK, skateboarding started to take off in the summer of 1976,\textsuperscript{39} with Skateboard! magazine [05.18] arguing for new skateparks to be built to accommodate it. This demand was met by over 80 purpose-built skateparks of varying size, sophistication and financial basis.\textsuperscript{40} By the end of the summer of 1977, these already included “Skate-Escape” (Portland Bill), [05.18] built by Lorne Edwards after a visit to Concrete Wave skatepark,\textsuperscript{41} [05.07] “Stalybridge Bowl” (near Manchester),\textsuperscript{42} “Watergate Bowl” (near Newquay),\textsuperscript{43} and the community “Meanwhile Gardens” (Notting Hill, London),\textsuperscript{44} [05.19] but these were rather unchallenging facilities.\textsuperscript{45} Similarly, later in the 1970s innumerable small-scale municipal facilities were built in response to local demands, ranging from single half-pipes, like that in Barton, Oxford, to larger community-built projects like that in Hereford.\textsuperscript{46} The first commercial UK skatepark with vertical bowls was the shotcrete “Skate City” (London), built by Skate Park Construction\textsuperscript{47} and opened in the summer of 1977 [05.20] Although a far cry from the more elaborate US skateparks, Skate City offered the UK’s first real skatepark, with three bowls of varying difficulty, including an “advanced pipeline” dubbed the “Black Bowl.”\textsuperscript{48}
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05.23 “Skateboard City” skatepark, Bolton (1978).
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More complex skateparks began to appear in 1978. These included the "Malibu Dog Bowl" (Nottingham),49 and "Skateboard City" (Bolton).50 With many different investment (Tate & Lyle51), swimming pool (Skate Park Construction, an offshoot of Rainbow Pools52), tennis court (En-tout-cas53) and construction (Bovis54) companies exploiting the new market, but with little expertise, the standards of these facilities were unsurprisingly extremely variable; the Malibu Dog Bowl, for example, suffered from severe transitions, inadequate elevation drops into the bowl, obstructions and distracting lights, rendering it near unridable.55

By mid 1978, the first "second generation" UK skateparks appeared, including the UK£50,000 En-tout-cas designed park at Southsea, with mogul field and numerous bowls.56 "Skateopia" (Knebworth House, Herts) offered various snake runs, bowls and a half-pipe,57 while the indoor "Rolling Thunder" (Brentford, London) contained numerous bowls and a long half-pipe.58 Other large skateparks included "Skateworld" (Wokingham),59 "Earth and Ocean" (Barnstaple), "Plymouth Skatepark" (Plymouth), "Skateopia" (Wolverhampton),61 "Skatestar" (Guildford62 "Stevenage Skatepark" (Stevenage), "Southport Skatepark" (Southport), "Spandrel Skate-Dome" (Uxbridge), "Arrow" (Wolverhampton) and "Roxy Skate" (Swinton, Doncaster).

Other UK skateparks – principally the shotcrete projects designed by g-Force/Adrian Rolt and built by Skate Park Construction – used standardised elements drawn directly from America.63 This series included the "Rom" (Romford),64 "Barn" (Brighton),65 "Beachcomber," (Hemsby, Great Yarmouth),66 "Locomotion" (Hemel Hempstead),67 "Skatecountry" (Bristol),68 "Solid Surf" (Harrow),69 Kidderminster Safari Park,70 "Maddog Bowl" (London)71 and "Black Lion" (Gillingham),72 all being variations on the same repertoire of half-pipe, snake-run, moguls, large concrete bowl, keyhole pool and reservoir elements. The standardised pool element was based on the keyhole pool at Skateboard Heaven in Spring Valley,73 itself based on the San Diego "Soul Bowl" (1967-1969); thus a specific backyard Southern California pool had been transplanted, modified and cloned on the other side of Atlantic. The version at Kidderminster – a "really heavy pool"74 – measured 10 ft deep and 22 ft across, boasting Californian blue tiles, coping and white "marbelite" surface finish.75 The version at the Maddog Bowl was somewhat larger, at 14.5 ft deep and 26 ft diameter,76 but otherwise was the same design. The large 14-15 ft deep "Vertibowl" (also known as the "Performance Bowl") element of the Solid Surf (1972) and Rom skateparks was based on the "Vertibowl" at Skatepark Paramount (California), with sunken section topped by a purely vertical 4.5 ft wall.77

With around 100 skateparks in total constructed in the UK, around 20 were still open by the end of the 1970s.78 A late addition in 1979 was the indoor "Skateslalom" skatepark (Colne, Lancashire), which included a 28 ft diameter, 12 ft deep pool with specially cast coping and described by visiting Californian Kubo as the best pool in England.79 Another late skatepark was "Rock 'n Roll," (Livingston, Edinburgh), built in 1981 with near perfect transitions and finish to designs by architect Iain Urquhart.80 The pool here was based on Marina del Rey's keyhole pool.81

During the late 1970s, other skateparks were built around the world in, among many other places, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Ecuador, France, Germany, Puerto Rico, Guatemala, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Netherlands, Peru, South Africa, Sweden and Switzerland. In New Zealand the Californian "Skatopia" was cloned at Auckland.82 Nearly all purpose-built concrete skateparks were either begun or amended before 1982. A small number, however, were constructed after this date, including the concrete, steel coping bowl at the
05.25 "Black Lion" skatepark, Gillingham (1978). Snake run (centre), pool (left), halfpipe (rear) and reservoir (right).
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05.31 Full-pipe, “Park de Carolina” skatepark, Quito (1997).
  Mike E Reyes

05.32 La Villette skatepark, Paris, under construction (1978).

05.33 “Skatopistas del Sol” skatepark, Gaudalajara (1979).
  Skateboarder - Ernesto P. Bouquet.
  Mike Williams

05.34 “California” skatepark, Tokyo (1979). Skateboarder -
  Yasuhide Harada.
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05.35 “Skatopia” skatepark, Auckland (ca. 1978-9), based on
  “Skatopia” skatepark at Buena Park, California.
  Ferg
“Berg Fidel” skatepark (Münster, Germany, 1989), designed with Claus Grabke and Titus Dittman. Significantly, in a move away from Californian skatepark origins, the bowl here was “a pool for the nineties, not an attempt to simulate a back yard swimming pool,” having a narrow, high and steep channel entry into a pool with 10 ft transitions, 1.5 ft of vertical wall and a 10 ft flat bottom – dimensions similar to a modern wooden half-pipe (see below). In the UK, the Livingston skatepark was substantially extended according to designs by Kenny Omond (1992), while a decade earlier Spanish skaters in Madrid had built themselves a multi-bowl and bank facility. In France, the concrete “Plage du Prado” skatepark (early 1990s) was built in Marseilles to the designs of an architecture student. Slovenia had a concrete pool at Kranj, and a number of skateparks were constructed in Brazil, including the compactly-arranged “Dominio” with two large half-pipes and variegated reservoir element. American projects ranged from “Stone Edge,” (Daytona, Florida, 1989), a “concrete paradise” designed by Bill Danforth with various pools and ramps, reportedly costing US$750,000, to four small free-access skateparks in Benicia, Davis, Palo Alto and San Francisco in northern California.

In a somewhat different vein, the highly successful “Burnside Project” (Portland, Oregon, 1990 onward) was built on the parking lot of an abandoned hotel beneath the Burnside Bridge. Here, Mark Hubbard, Mark “Redneck” Scott and other skaters, together with the local homeless, continually fabricated and modified concrete banks, spines, bowls and fun box without official permission. As with an abortive copycat project in Seattle, many elements were designed during construction, skaters adapting excavations and form-
work before finalising them in steel rebar and concrete. Burnside is the skateboard equivalent of a community squat, a collective-labour facility without private ownership – effectively creating a skatepark as a continual colonisation and co-optation of urban space with the semi-condonement of officialdom. As one skater explained, using this model the "best skatepark a city could give to its skaters would be a piece of land with nothing on it" and let them design and produce it themselves.101

Ramps
From 1977 onward, skateparks were also increasingly complemented by the provision, often by skaters themselves, of ramps. Initially, ramps provided vertical terrain for those without access to skateparks or Californian pools,102 and by 1980 the Rampage company had sold 4,000 ramp plans across America and 45 other countries.103 [05.42] When many skateparks closed in the early 1980s, ramps became the staple terrain for skaters, and greatly contributed to skateboarding's resurgence in the mid 1980s.

The answer to these blues lies close at hand, at the end of a hammer and a saw. The answer is ramps.104

It's time to build.105

In 1981, Action Now (formerly SkateBoarder) gave information on ramp construction.106 New magazine Thrasher did likewise,107 with a 1983 issue giving detailed ramp plans quickly sold out.108 By the 1990s ramp plans were readily available off the internet.109
The first ramps of the 1970s were angled straight surfaces; for example, *Skateboard!* published plans for a 40° angled, 5 ft high construction. Skaters in cities around the world made cruder versions by leaning an 8 x 4 ft sheet of wood (often purloined from a construction site) against some steps or other suitable support. The first ramp with a *curved* transition was possibly constructed by Adam Ziolsowski in Melbourne Beach, Florida, sometime in the early-mid 1970s.

Later, ramps have tended to be independent structures providing autonomous terrain for skateboarding; typically of free-standing, timber construction, the most common is the half-pipe, referring to the u-section profile and two parallel side walls. The earliest of these half-pipes tended to be a classic half-circle in section.

From around 1979 onward, ramps commonly had flat bottoms (possibly pioneered in Sweden and brought back to the USA by a visiting Powell team in 1980) inserted between the two transitions. Overall height varies between 6-15 ft, the walls being topped off with a narrow platform. The riding surface is either plywood (often 2 layers of 9 mm birch ply), masonite (oil-tempered hardboard) or steel (2-3 mm sheets). Coping is also often added using 50-80 mm steel tubing, plastic or even concrete pool coping blocks. The transition section is usually a pure quarter-circle with a radius of ca. 8-12 feet, (although elliptical transitions have occasionally been used), allowing templates to be simply traced. Other ramp features include wall-top modifications like "channels," "extensions," "escalators" and different kinds of coping.

Ramps are commonly single, large half-pipes, such as those at an annual summer camp in Sweden, the "Skatemates" ramp (near Liedsplein, Amsterdam), and Bourges (France), Monrea (Italy), and in the UK at Hastings, Swansea, the Empire.
State Building (Warrington), Farnborough, Latimer Road (London), and Crystal Palace (London) during the mid 1980s. In the US they included Lance Mountain's ramp (Alhambra, California), the Mile High ramp (Lake Tahoe, Nevada), the Mount Trashmore ramp (Virginia Beach, Virginia), the "Great Desert Ramp" (Palmdale, California), and the "Ramp Ranch" (Atlanta, Georgia). Such ramps were commensurate in size with skatepark pools, and offered a ready substitute terrain for vertical skateboarding throughout the 1980s and 1990s.

More complicated multi-unit ramps are sometimes built for demonstrations and competitions. For example, the Vision Skate Escape ramp competition (Irvine, California, 1988) featured a large wooden half-pipe with roll-out platform, and a smaller half-pipe back-to-back down half of the opposite side, linked by both spine and a roll-in transfer ramp. The combination was custom-built by Chuck Hultz and Tim Payne. In 1987, a massive 100 ft long ramp, L-shaped in plan with bowled out corner, was constructed at the Raging Waters water-slide park in San Jose. Idiosyncratic ramps
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were also built for touring demonstrations, such as the polycarbonate Pepsi ramp (1977) or the Turning Point ramp, a see-through "Lexan" 19 ft diameter capsule-shaped device used for an exhibition tour in 1979.

At the other end of the spectrum, smaller versions known as mini ramps became increasingly proliferous at the end of the 1980s, sometimes made for cramped sites, constructed rapidly and at minimal cost. The minimal height reduced the possibility of serious injury and so made mini-ramps popular both with skaters intent on developing intricate lip tricks and with municipal authorities keen to provide relatively risk-free facilities. Many mini ramps in the UK were manufactured on a commercial basis - such as the Zebra (steel or concrete), Rareunit (steel) and Freestyle (timber or steel) units - and installed for private or public usage at places like Bath, Bootle, Chelmsford, Doncaster, Ilchester, Chesham and numerous other sites nationwide. Significantly, these are not the major cities which tended to attract the concrete skateparks, but the small towns and local sites comprising the total urban complex.

Even smaller ramps and obstacles have been built as part of streetstyle courses and for everyday use. These have ranged from angled launch ramps, to quarter-pipes, to pyramid and snow-plough shaped shapes (often with metal piping on their upper edges), to handrails, ledges and other elements mimicking the "natural" features of the quotidian urban street. Small 1-3 ft high launch or jump ramps, from which skaters fly over the lip, were especially popular in the late 1980s.

These half-pipes disclose a craft tradition in skateboard terrain, skateboarders as "enterprising individuals with a few tools and a little wood" being actively involved in the design and construction of their physical environment and often acquiring carpentry skills in the process - as when Southern Ute Indian tribe skaters built a half-pipe with municipal funds in Ignacio, Colorado.
also form an interesting juxtaposition with more traditional forms of architecture. For example, professional skaters like Peralta, Steve Caballero, Ken Park, Jeff Kendall and Hawk all built ramps alongside their residential property. Apart from insertions within open city spaces, ramps can also form skateparks, and these have taken over from outdoor, concrete skateparks as the predominant form of purpose-designed skateboard terrain in the 1980s and 1990s. Early ramp-based skateparks dating from the mid-1980s onward included “Bike Haus” (Hot Springs, Arizona), “Jeff Phillips Skatepark” (Dallas, Texas) constructed by Payne, “Rotation Station” (Loves Park, Illinois), “Mike McGill’s Skatepark” (Carlsbad, California) and

05.55 Tony Hawk’s ramp, Fallbrook, California (ca. 1989).
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"Skatepark of Houston" (Houston, Texas).142 Many of these new ramp-based skateparks were indoor facilities, reducing the problems of humidity and wet weather (damage to wood, loss of wheel grip), cold temperatures (greater risk of bone fractures) and hot temperatures (restricting skating to evenings). In the US, they have included "Southside" (Houston),143 "Skatehut" (Rhode Island) with wooden ramps and bowl by Custom Skate Ramps,144 "Ramp House" (Carolina Beach, North Carolina),145 [05.56] "Ratz" (Biddeford, Maine), also by Custom Skate,146 "Middle School" (Wilmington, North Carolina),147 [05.57] "Charleston Hangar Bowl" (Charleston, South Carolina) constructed by Payne, [05.58, 05.59] "Skate Zone" (Atlanta, Georgia) also constructed by Payne,148 and "Mike McGill's Indoor Skatepark," (Tampa Bay Area, Florida).149 More than 120 skateparks in at least 43 US states were operating in 1991-92, and over 165 in at least 38 states in 1997, the majority being indoor and/or wooden ramp-based facilities. Unlike 1970s skateparks, many were owned and managed by skaters, a factor undoubtedly contributing to their success.150 Some, such as the "Kennedy" warehouse facility in San Jose, California,151 and another warehouse in Dewsbury, Yorkshire,152 were open only to club members, an arrangement adopted to help with financing and insurance.
In other countries, indoor ramp-based skateparks have ranged from the elaborate, like “Skate Ranch” (Vancouver, Canada), “Thomas I. Punkt” (Hamburg, Germany), and “Titus Warehouse” (Münster, Germany) to the moderate, like “Simon’s Skatepark” (Dublin, Ireland) to the very basic, like “Hobbies” (Bandung, West Java, Indonesia). In the UK, ramp skateparks have included “Skate Shack” (Barrow-in-Furness), “Skate & Ride” (Bristol), “Pioneer” (St. Albans), “Rock City” (Hull), “Fast Eddies” (Whitley Bay), “Fearless Ramp Base” (Essex), “Liverpark” (Liverpool), “Re-Hab” (Wakefield), “Radlands” (Northampton), and the lottery-funded “Mount Hawke” (Cornwall). Similar ramp-based facilities were also built in countries like Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Israel, Italy, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Singapore, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain and Sweden.

Ramp skateparks can also be more quickly built (the original Radlands layout, contained in a 9,500 ft² area, was constructed by Tim Payne using skateboarder-labour in just 10 days) and more easily modified than concrete skateparks, allowing, for example, Wakefield and Radlands to exploit cheap out-of-town warehouse space to provide a complex arrangement of wooden ramps and other features. In 1997 Radlands included a 32 ft wide and 10.5 ft high vertical half-pipe, 12 ft wide spine ramp and numerous streetstyle
05.63 The multi-ramp arrangement of "Radlands" indoor skatepark, Northampton (1992), as first reported in "King Rad!" R.A.D., n.116, (January 1993), pp. 16-17.
skating obstacles; Wakefield offered a vertical ramp, mini-ramp with "escalator" and "volcano" features, vertical wall, jump boxes, free-standing spine, driveways, handrails, hips, wallie pole, plus banks and quarter pipes.\textsuperscript{166} [05.6A, 05.65]

Wakefield's the best skatepark I think I've ever skated in my life, there's shit everywhere. You don't even know where to go, you just get lost.\textsuperscript{167}

These new skateparks thus focused less on the single, high-performance pool element of 1970s skateparks, and more on a diverse range of skate terrains from streetstyle obstacles to mini-ramps and large vertical half-pipes.

Skateparks have generally been built with the idea that very radical haphazard structures are somehow challenging to skateboarders. Nothing could be further from the truth [. . . ] Modern skatepark design is then really a mixture of the urban environment and suggestions of skateboarders. It is emphatically not the crazy, mogul-like fantasies of desk-bound architects. Skateparks are not like ballparks or courts that have set rules regarding dimensions and playing surface.\textsuperscript{168}

Taking their cue from this kind of thinking, skateparks like Radlands and Wakefield have constantly modified their various elements in contrast to the relatively static monumentalism of 1970s skateparks.\textsuperscript{169}

This place [Wakefield] breeds obstacles like the US government breeds genetic mutants.\textsuperscript{170}
5.02 Super-Architectural Space

As Lefebvre notes, spatial practices and representations of space are “in thrall to both knowledge and power,” so leaving “only the narrowest leeway” to spaces of representation. But, as he also notes, it is through revolt against normative spaces of representation that there is the “prospect of recovering the world of differences – the natural, the sensory/sensual, sexuality and pleasure.”

A fortiori, it is not solely the various constructed architectures of skateboarding which, despite their unique contribution to the specialist typologies of the differentiated built environment, form the principal contribution of skateboarding to architectural space. This lies instead in the performative, representational aspects of skateboarding – its spaces of representation – wherein skateboarders re-image architectural space and thereby recreate both it and themselves into super-architectural space. The more poetic attempts by skateboarders to talk about their activity provides glimpses of this process.

Your body gets weightless as you drift your airs high.
The blur of the crowd as you grind on by.
Grasping the rail for the next coming air.
Your eyes seek reality, the mind is aware.
Thrust up the wall and click off the tile
Extend your back leg, throw in some style
Pulling back in, the coping looks mean.
Dodging the hang-up, you land real clean.
The glare off the tile, the grind marks are clear.
Getting sketch is no sweat, it’s slamming you fear.

This quotation, although far from good poetry, nonetheless contains much of interest, and in the following, I re-quote lines as appropriate.

The new constructed skateboard terrains from the 1970s onward replicated but also extremetised the terrains found within the modern city, and so enabled a new form of spatial engagement to occur. And these skateparks also offered a controlled social space free of outraged pool owners and patrolling police. Skateparks and ramps thus provided a theatre for the display of skateboarding in which skateboarding and its body moves became partly spectacularised. This is immediately evident from the new moves invented within these terrains.

Early skateparks tended to encourage surf-related skating; in 1976, when skateboarders were beginning to explore vertical skateboarding, Bruce Walker described Florida’s Skateboard City as being akin to an ocean wave.

When I first went [. . .] it was just like surfing [. . .] You just get up on the wall and sock it through the lip a few times.

Checking out the big bowl is like paddling out to Sunset for the first time. And you can get more weightless in a pipe than any other form of skateboarding . . . that’s where the surfing feeling really comes in.
But the second generation of skateparks, particularly the new set-piece pools, inspired a whole new form of skateboarding, with backyard pool moves like the aerial quickly evolving into new manoeuvres like the roll-out/roll-in [05.67] and backside aerial;\(^{175}\) within a couple of years skaters often had little to say about the surf-skateboarding connection.

They're related in some ways, but not too many. Surfing is like a whole different thing.\(^{176}\)

This shift from surfing was stimulated by skaters' own spatial inventiveness but also by the new skateparks, for "[e]xtraordinary terrain dictates extraordinary moves."\(^{177}\)

By late 1978, moves were developing rapidly, the most significant being the "ollie" air, invented by Florida skater Alan Gelfand in the latter half of 1978, wherein the skater performs an aerial \textit{without} holding onto the board;\(^{178}\) the manoeuvre is performed...
by controlled flight and balance, with a delicate relation between body, board, terrain and gravitational force. The ollie became the single most important “cornerstone of modern skateboarding,” adapted into a bewildering range of variants involving differing directions, rotations and combinations.

Other technical moves were also developed, including “invert” aerials (Bobby Valdez, mid 1978), effectively a one-handed handstand, a “layback” (late 1978) stretching the body off the rear of the board and across the pool wall, (mid 1978, 1979) and a “rock ‘n roll” (mid 1978), where the skateboard rocks across the pool wall like a seesaw. Other moves included the “alley oop” aerial, a backside aerial with backwards trajectory (mid 1978), “layback air,” a frontside aerial with rear hand grasping the coping and front hand holding the board (Kelly Lind, 1979), and “Miller Flip” (Darryl Miller, 1979), a 360° frontside invert aerial where the skater flips over to descend backwards. The “Elguerial” backwards invert and fakie ollie were inaugurated by Eddie Elguera and Allen Losi respectively.

By mid 1979, skaters were combining these complex moves within a single run, as with Doug “Pineapple” Saladino’s efforts at a professional contest.
He had his rock 'n roll slides fully wired, sliding three and four coping blocks at a whack. Couple this with long grinders, hand plants, inverts, frontside and backside air all at high speed, and you have an incredible run.182

And a few months later.

Gone are the days where a skater could win with just one extraordinary trick. Pro poolriding has finally grown up into a sport that demands versatility, planning and precision execution.183

As this suggests, the skateboarder’s body-centric space production also involved a sense of time; skaters like Micke Alba emphasised an attitude of "total rad and fast and speed,"184 while skaters like Ziggy Siegfried in 1980 and Neil Blender in the mid 1980s consciously added a greater stall time of several seconds when performing moves like an invert.185 This different treatment of time was in part a regional production, and many UK skaters were surprised to discover that compared to their own calmly unhurried style, their US counterparts skated at a much greater velocity;186 as Skateboarder commented of American Eric Grisham, it was "as if he couldn’t slow down if he wanted to."187

By the early 1980s, skaters were not only emphasising the "ultra modern moves" but also more extreme "bionic" versions of the older moves, with aerials rising 6 ft or more out of the top of the pool wall, or contorted, with the skater’s body thrust into strange configurations. [05.73]

Every year skateboarding skill quite literally keeps on rising: new unreal bio tricks, impossible variations and combinations of moves and perfection in style – all make past efforts look decidedly tame.188

As one commentator put it, these were "moves I
Elguera in particular was creating new moves on a monthly basis; his new moves at the Powell-Peralta Marina Cup (late 1980) included a fakie ollie 180° into a rock 'n roll, a backside layback grinder tail-slide, and a varial layback air into a switch-stance fakie footplant. Elguera’s moves marked a shift in body-centric space production, away from single element moves to combinatorial moves involving multiple body-board-terrain engagements within a single move. They also, consequently, marked a lengthening of the time of the move. Most significantly, Mike McGill learned his 540° “McTwist” aerial (1984), a move which heralded a new era again in vertical skating.

As he flew out 4 or 5 feet, he went upside down and spun. And kept spinning . . . until he had turned 540°, completely inverted at the 360° point with his head 3 feet above the coping [. . .] In that moment when he was flying with his top and bottom reversed, everyone who was watching the pool saw something so amazing as to be unbelievable [. . .] Things had changed. In an instant a new dimension had opened up.

By the end of the 1980s, Hawk was doing varial, ollie and flip variants of the 540, and skaters generally were performing even more complicated varia-
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tions of the combinatorial moves. In particular, by 1988 they began to re-focus on the top edge of the wall (rather than just the air above it), including the Jetton grind (frontside grind to revert), cess-slide 50-50s and other such lip tricks as the “due process” fakie ollie to frontside nosepick, with back truck on deck, followed by frontside aerial to re-enter (Joe Johnson, 1988).194 fakie ollie 180° nose-taps (Hawk, 1989)195 and the ollie to front truck grind (Bod Boyle, 1989).197 These were “balance point” tricks, where the skater controls the lip with both body and board – through this process, the skater could think of their body and the terrain beneath as one entity.198 Alternatively, skaters were spending a longer time in the air through ever more complex body-board spatial productions; by 1991, skaters like Danny Way were experimenting with 900° (2.5 full rotations) aerials.199 By the same date, skaters were also undertaking many moves backward, or switch-stance.

These extremely technical and dangerous moves were partly encouraged by the focus of vertical skating in the 1980s on wooden ramps rather than concrete skateparks. Wooden ramps tended to flex and so be easier to fall on,200 and offered more predictable transitions. Furthermore, while concave pool walls allowed skaters to “change direction a lot while moving very fast,”201 this was not possible on the parallel flat walls of a conventional half-pipe, making skaters focus predominantly on the edge of the ramp and the air beyond.

Skaters’ own experience of these moves is difficult to access, and their occasional accounts provide only descriptive clues. For example, one experienced skater narrated a run on an early 1980s ramp.

Standing on top a 10' high halfpipe with your back foot on your board [. . .] drop in down the first 2 feet of pure flat wall. Then down the curving slope, across the bottom at speed, bending your knees, and pumping

05.77 A “balance point” move focused on the top edge of the wall. Hugh “Bod” Boyle, ollie to nose grind, “Ramp Riot” contest, Festival Hall, Melbourne (1989).
Scott Needham
up the other wall. Popping off the lip into the air, the board flying out with you on it, catching it, and keeping it to your feet, turning back in and releasing, trying to avoid a disastrous hang-up on the coping. Grinding on the coping, the metal of the trucks scraping the metal at the top of the ramp with a rough, grating noise. Or going upside down, one arm extended to the top, the other holding the board above your head, stalling, inverted, then coming back [. . .] Sliding, flying, hurtling through space, an escaped convict from rigid and normally unavoidable physical laws.

But how is this body space constituted? By what compositional procedures is it produced, and how does it integrate with the space of the skateboard and of the terrain beneath?

Len Lye’s short film *Particles in Space* (finished 1979) was created without camera or lens but by scratching directly on to the film, and depicts a swarm of dots and lines pulsing on a black ground. The resulting depiction of compression and tension, eruption and repetition, pulse and stillness, humour and gravity has been described by film-maker and architect Patrick Keiller as the most architectural-spatial film ever made. Although devoid of any “architectural” subject beyond the development of a sense of space, Lye’s film indeed conveys a spatiality absent from most other attempts at representing architecture’s spatial character.

It is this exploration which lies within the skateboarder’s complex spatial actions, using a series of front-back, left-right, up-down reversals and rotations, in combination with precise relations of board, hand/body and terrain, to generate an extraordinary movement and production of body-centric space.

As Hosoi described a fellow professional:

Tony Hawk, who I love to watch skate, is so technical, so precise, so balanced and light...
Before producing effects in the material realm (tools and objects), before producing itself by drawing nourishment from that realm, and before reproducing itself by generating other bodies, each living body is space and has its space.206

In this spatial production, space is produced first from within the body207 (the co-ordinates of left-right, front-back, up-down, spinal rotation etc.), then centrifugally outward as the body undertakes the dynamics of the move ("your body gets weightless"), then centripetally pulled back in ("pulling back in, the coping looks mean").

You must get the feeling that your mind is located in your center of gravity. You must think and act from your center. The rest of your body moves around this center point as a wheel moves around its hub.208

This is a gestural space of flow and action, of direct engagement with the terrain. On the one hand it is a primary space within and around the body ("extend your back leg, throw in some style"), a form of natural space preserved within abstract space and recoverable through what Lefebvre calls "spatial architectonics."209

But even here there is an Other to the body, for remembering that skateboarding had its first origins in surf-related, ocean-based moves, its body-centric space can be seen as an attempt to relate the self to nature. It is, perhaps, a spatial equivalent of Lefebvre's conception that aspects of play can sometimes be the remnant of earlier ways of extending a direct relation to the cosmos.210

Skateboarding's space-production therefore is not - although Scott Lash has erroneously argued this of Lefebvre's spatial architectonics211 - purely body-centric and immediate, rather that, as Simmel described the spatiality of social beings,

Man does not end with the limits of his body or the area comprising his immediate activity. Rather is the range of the person constituted by the sum of effects emanating from him temporally and spatially.212

Following these leads, we might then consider that the spatiality of the skateboarder goes beyond the proximate body, and instead is conducted in relation to two physical "Others" to the skater: the skateboard, and the terrain. We shall deal with each in turn.

To someone learning to skateboard, the skateboard appears as an instrument separate to their body, a platform on which to balance - and this is how most "how to" books explain it. Foot position, standing, pushing off, turning and stopping are followed by "next steps" involving basic manoeuvres like kickturns. By contrast, the more proficient skateboarder quickly reconceives of the skateboard as at once separate to, and part of their body, and so integral to their relation to the external world ("grasping the rail for the next coming air").

As the rider gets more advanced, he begins to realize that there are times when there is almost no weight on his feet. This is when he begins to discover that the skateboard as a vehicle, operates more as part of himself than as something he rides on. A basic frontside aerial demonstrates this very well: rider and board work as one unit that moves around a common center of gravity.213

Alternatively, in a move like a frontside rock 'n roll, the board is very much separate to the body, yet intricately related to it through precise foot movements; first the board is pushed away from the body and over the top of the wall, and then brought back under the body using the toe of the rear foot.214

[55.79] There are two fulcrum points here - the deck underside resting on the wall, and the deck kicktail
beneath the rear toe – each countered against the other to produce a precise body-board combination.

In such phenomenological acts, the skateboard is used not as the simple application of a device against a remote object (Heidegger’s Vorhandenheit, or “presentness-at-hand” of the object “out there”), but concurs with the notion of the tool-object as Zuhandenheit, or “readiness-to-hand.”

The less we just stare at the hammer-Thing, and the more we seize hold of it and use it, the more primordial does our relationship to it become, and the more unveiledly is it encountered as that which it is – as tool.

In skateboarding this primordial relationship is rendered spatial and dynamic, involving the phenomenology of space-time movement as much as essences.

In the old days you moved on the board, while now you move with the board and the board moves with you.

For the skater, the skateboard is related to the body through differing kinds of co-ordinates; freestyler Rodney Mullen described it as thinking in categories “like rolling forward, backward rail, stationary, 50/50 or aerial.” These kinds of categories range from the most basic, such as whether the skater stands with left foot forward (“regular foot”) or right foot forward (“goofy foot”). Other simple descriptors include ways of moving backward (“fakie,” “switch-stance”) or transferring to a backward direction (“revert,” “fakie”). More complicated body-board relations refer to how the board is held with which arm-leg contortion (“indy air,” backside aerial with rear hand holding inner edge of board through the legs; “mute air,” backside aerial with leading hand holding forward inner edge of board; “stalefish,” frontside aerial with inner edge held by rear hand reaching around back of the legs), how the board is

\[\text{05.79 The “readiness-to-hand” of the skateboard in relation to the body. Eddie Elguera, frontside rock ‘n roll, “Skate City,” Whittier (1980).}
\]
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rotated in the hand ("varial," board rotated about its centrepoint; [05.75, 05.97] "finger flip," board rotated about its long axis [05.80]), how board and skater are related to the ground through the body ("frontside," facing the wall; "backside," back to wall; "layback," stretched out across the wall [05.70, 05.84, 05.93, 05.100]; "footplant," foot taken off the board and placed on top of the wall; "invert air," body inverted [05.69]), or how the board and body are related to the ground through the board ("Smith grind," overlapping grind with rear-truck and body over the top of the wall; "blunt," stationary or sliding block with nose or tail of the board) and so on. Some descriptors also refer to the time of the move ("axle stall," where the skater comes to momentary rest on the top of the wall; [05.81] "fast plant," a backside footplant where the foot is taken off and on again quickly [05.82]).

Within the act of these moves, the skateboard is less a piece of equipment and takes on more the character of a prosthetic device, an extension of the body as a kind of fifth limb, absorbed into and diffused inside the body-terrain encounter. [05.83]
Making your board an extension of your body is control of your soul.  

And as this quotation suggests, such an act is not only physical but also mental, involving a projection of the self out into the board and space beyond it. Skateboarders even sometimes remark on how their skateboard takes on their own personality, and becomes "almost an actual part" of themselves. Mullen again gives an insight into this, conceiving of the skateboard both as having an autonomous, organic life and a requirement to be brought within the body, a process for which technical operations are but a secondary consideration. 

I kick my board around sometimes and watch its motions as it twirls around [. . . ] I get an idea of what I want to do, then I think over it a lot, like where my feet have to be to press the board back. I think about the mechanics of it after the fact. 

Or as Bobby Piercy put it, "[t]he footwork is in relationship to you doing your riding." 

In this kind of interaction, appropriate use, performance and manual action "possess their own kind of sight," or what Heidegger calls circumspection, whereby an intimate knowledge of a craft and instrument leads to a faster, more delicate understanding of the relation between self, tool and object. This tripartite formulation suggests that the relation of board and body is a tool-body relation, but not purely so: the skateboard is also a mediation of the body-terrain space ("dodging the hang-up, you land real clean"). The subject and the tool – here the body and the skateboard – are therefore not the sole producers of space in a Leibnizian sense, in which "absolute relative" space
is waiting to be filled, and where a specific body is considered capable of defining space by gesture and movement.²² Or in Heideggerian terms, the subject or "I" is never alone in its experience of Dasein (Being), such that encountering other people and things is part of reciprocal realisations of being.²² Thus sensory-sensual space is, ultimately, simply a component in the construction of social spaces.²²⁶

[T]here is an immediate relationship between the body and its space, between the body’s deployment in space and its occupation of space [. . . ] This is a truly remarkable relationship: the body with the energies at its disposal, the living body, creates or produces its own space; conversely, the laws of space, which is to say the laws of discrimination in space, also govern the living body and the deployment of its energies.²²⁷

In terms of skateboarding’s relation to architecture, its production of space is not purely bodily or sensorial; instead, the skater’s body produces its space dialectically with the production of architectural space. [05.84]

What then is the nature of this dialectical interaction? Given the body-centricity of skateboarding space, it makes sense to consider it in relation the skater’s body operations, particularly their multi- and inter-sensory nature.

Architecture frequently operates as a kind of social mirror, forming a kind of Sartrean “Other’s look,”²²⁸ the user self-
checking their identity against a building or boundary. Within this mirror process, modern architectural space — "the space of blank sheets of paper, drawing-boards, plans, sections, elevations, scale models, geometrical projections" — in particular tends to concentrate on the visual, on objects and surfaces, and correspondingly to ignore the space of the body. And some skateparks were undoubtedly designed more as theme-parks than places for skateboarding, and so relied on this kind of visualisation of space; for example, "The Galaxy" skatepark intended for the San Fernando Valley was themed on the recent "Star Wars" film.

The constructed spaces of the more successful skateparks were, however, very much directed towards the space of the body, particularly its movement as flow, stall and turning. This can be seen in various aspects of park design. Firstly, the curvature in plan of many skatepark elements, particularly the typical roundness of pools, intentionally provoke the skater's high-speed carve across the face of the element, while throwing the skater back against themselves through a centripetal force.

You have more speed in a pool, all your force is going with you.

In pools and on banks, I try to use the inherent power of the forms. No excess movements here, just working with the natural speed.

While such centrifugal gestures were not always successful — for example, the "snake run" feature akin to a bob-sleigh run and incorporated in many early skateparks was frequently designed without due attention to the curves required by a moving skateboarder — the better features of skateparks, in particular those added in 1978 onward, promoted both speed and new moves; for example, the tight corners of the square component of the Upland Combi-Pool enabled skaters to pump...
through and gain extra speed on the carve, and also encouraged a host of new moves such as the corner boardslide. Unlike the relatively simple form of half-pipes which tend to stimulate a trick-oriented approach to skateboarding focused on the lip of ramp, elements like the Combi-Pool – a "pool with a million lines" – tend to encourage a sense of new directions and movements across their whole surface.

Like on a ramp you learn how to manipulate your board, but in a big pool you just ride it.

Second, the specific design of the transition – the curvature in section – of an element’s floor-wall relationship produces varying skateboarding conditions. In particular, tighter transitions lead to greater speed and availability of flat wall above, propelling a "fierce upward drive" to heighten the speed and motion of the body. Again, the 1978 and later elements did this best. As one skateboarder who skated a number of early US skateparks described it,

The design of the Combi pool was perfectly designed to accommodate the flow and motion of the skateboarder producing a sensation of weightlessness that contributed to the ease in which the body would naturally surge.

The Combi-Pool was also thought by SkateBoarder to be particularly suited to a "multiple line approach" to skating. Similarly, it was the carefully-tuned variable transitions and plan forms of Livingston pool which were considered to be "years in advance of anything else."

Third, flat bottoms were first added by skater-designers like Rob Schlaefli to skatepark pools around 1978-9, allowing greater time between moves on opposite walls and also greater pumping
up and down the bordering transitions. Flat bottoms also create a kind of negative space to the explosive moves and high-speed carves undertaken up on the walls, thus forming a counter-rhythm within the skater's run. [05.117]

Fourth, drop-in points forming the entrance to pools and pipes lead to greater initial speed. They also provide a sense of orientation and directionality to otherwise symmetrical designs. [05.90]

Fifth, the smoothness of the element's surface contributes dramatically to the skater's micro-experience, affecting not only speed and comfort but also noise, grip and predictability. Smoothness of surface also encourages through tactility and empathy on the part of the skater a greater speed and smoothness of their own style; surface is translated into body gesture and attitude. [05.70]

Sixth, the symmetry of opposing walls allows a rhythm to be set up by the skater, enabling new moves to be tried out. Good symmetry also allows the compositional sequence of the run to be smoothly extended. [05.17]

Seventh, the edge of the wall, particularly where tiles and/or projecting coping are used, imparts a sudden arrest of that surface, throwing the skater simultaneously off the edge of the element and back onto themselves. These events form contrapuntal moments within the continuity of run generated from symmetry and surface. [05.120]

Eighth, at the other end of the scale, the variation and combination of the elements across a skatepark allow skateboarders to link different kinds of spatial experience, sometimes recombining them together into one run. [05.05, 05.07, 05.22, 05.38, 05.39]

But this constructed skateboarding architecture does not wholly dictate the performativity of skateboarding; rather the constructed architecture of a skatepark like the Del Mar Skate Ranch [05.11, 05.72, 05.73, 05.74, 05.120] was itself a kind of "drawing board" on which the production of new moves took place. In so far as skatepark forms do partially determine skate moves, a process of resistance and re-creation occurs. The Sartrean look is not only returned, but architecture ceases to be purely the Other, and is instead absorbed into the body-board-terrain relation. The spaces created are thus part of skater as well as of the terrain, and each is a unique, active production.

The lines a skater takes are like fingerprints. This process takes place through a very precise (although undoubtedly limited) questioning of architecture put forward by skateboarding. [05.89] What is this architectural form for? To what purpose can it be put? What is the relation of ground, verticals, textures, surfaces?

Ask the coping. It quivers at the sight of a pool rider's bare trucks [. . . ] But that's what it's for; it's round edge protrudes to be pulverized, its cement cries to be ground to the bone, its fat lip exists as an earthly exit for sky-bound wheels.

The skater's body here interrogates architecture as another body in relation to its own actions, a process described by one skater as the "instinct to direct a body mass through the 'unseen corridors' called lines."

Objects touch one another, feel, smell and hear one another. Then they contemplate one another with eye and gaze. One truly gets the impression that every shape in space, every spatial plane, constitutes a mirror and produces a mirage effect; that within each body the rest of the world is reflected, and referred back to, in an ever-renewed to-and-fro of reciprocal reflection, an interplay of shifting colours, lights and forms.
Where the architectural space of modernity tends to homogeneity, fusing geometry and the visual, inspiring physical discomfort and erasing localisation, the body (such as that of the skateboarder) can project its symmetries and actions onto that architecture, refusing to accept it as a pre-existent world and instead (re)producing architecture on its own terms. These questions are unconcerned with architecture’s historical purpose, but are nonetheless demanding in their line of attack, resisting the intellectualisation, “logic of visualization” and “optical formant” which modern architectural space imposes over other senses.251

A narrow and desiccated rationality of this kind overlooks the core and foundation of space, the total body, the brain, gestures and so forth. It forgets that space does not consist in the projection of an intellectual representation, does not arise from the visible-readable realm, but that it is first of all heard (listened to) and enacted (through physical gestures and movements).252

Skateboarding uses, beside intense vision, a responsivity of touch, sense, balance, hearing, posture, muscular control, strength, agility and fluidity by which to perform, “You use your whole body and your whole mind, you can’t help but flow.”253 SkateBoarder referred to “incredible space-orientation (i.e. balance, timing, reflexes),”254 and to the conception that skateboard moves are “felt rather than seen.”255 There is, then, an intense bodily and
mental focus within the move, such that
the two processes become one.

Much of this stems from the dynam­
ic nature of skateboarding; “I’ve gotta be
moving fast.”\textsuperscript{256} As both Merleau-Ponty
and August Schmarsow noted, we tend
to relate space to ourselves by envisag­ing
that we are in motion, using terms
like “extension,” “expanse” and “direc­tion,” and measuring size by the move­
ment of the body and the eye.

Because movement is not limit­
ed to submitting passively to
space and time, it actively
assumes them.\textsuperscript{257}

Or as Schmarsow explains space:

We cannot express its relation to ourselves
in any other way than by imagining that we
are in motion, measuring the length, width
and depth, or by attributing to the static
lines, surfaces, and volumes the movement
that our eyes and our kinesthetic sensations
suggest to us, even through we survey the
dimensions while standing still. The spatial
construct is a human creation and cannot
confront the creative or appreciative subject
as if it were a cold, crystallized form.\textsuperscript{258}

Because skateboarding is both body-centric and
motile, space is projected from the whole body, and
not just the eye or the intellect alone, (“your eyes
seek reality, the mind is aware/thrust up the wall
and click off the tile”).

Skateboarding is a sport that requires whole
body commitment; in other words, the body
must work as a single unit to achieve the
maximum potential available [. . .] put your
mind and your body in tune.\textsuperscript{259}

Above all, it is the engagement with architecture
that is important (“thrust up the wall”), such that
the moving body treats architecture as but one pro­jector of space to be interpolated with the projec­tion of space from itself. For example, Lefebvre
notes that when crossing the street, a conscious
calculation must be made of the steps and distance
involved.\textsuperscript{260} The same thing happens whenever a
skater performs a move in relation to a specific
piece of terrain, and is particularly explicit in a move
like a “canyon jump” aerial where the skater crosses
the pool’s entrance point in an extended lateral
pass.\textsuperscript{05.90} Here the skater’s questions concern the
distance across the gap and the orientation of the
bordering walls, and are answered by a move
involving speed and a bodily-throw. Thus both the
presence (the walls) and the absence (the gap) of
architecture are engaged with, the skater’s flight
bringing the walls together where otherwise they
are not; the gap is at once stressed and removed. In
this context, it is significant that for a 1980 competi­tion event at Oasis skatepark the judges considered
the “entire surface of the pool”\textsuperscript{[05.15, 05.116]} to
include the air above it; the pool’s architecture was
thus defined not by its own physicality but by the skaters’ engagement with it, and their production of a space all over and beyond it.261

Architecture produces living bodies, each with its own distinctive traits. The animating principle of such a body, its presence, is neither visible nor legible as such, nor is it the object of any discourse, for it reproduces itself within those who use the space in question, within their lived experience. Of that experience the tourist, the passive spectator, can grasp but a pale shadow.262

Speed will set you free. Speed is the crack between sketch and style. Catch it and then hang on for the glide. With speed, nothing is impossible.263

It is then the intersection of the moving body and the physicality of architecture which are important in skateboarding; unlike the scopic-dependence of the tourist gaze,264 user and architecture come together to create a new spatial event, an occupied territory. Architecture is at once erased and reborn in the phenomenal act of the skater’s move.

Space, then, is produced dialectically – both outward from the body, and in relation to skateboard and skateboard terrain, each of the last two being erased within the process. But of course this is not a simple additive procedure, in which the body is preserved in its original state – it too is reformulated. As Beatriz Colomina notes,

Architecture is not simply a platform that accommodates the viewing subject. It is a viewing mechanism that produces the subject.265

In the architectural formation of skateboarding, this involves more than just vision, for here the space of the body is equally reconstructed as what Lefebvre calls a “spatial body,” subject to the various symmetries, interactions, planes, centres, peripheries and other determinants of space.266 He also asserts that human beings should not limit their activities to the mastery or appropriation of space but also “take control of their own nature.”267 This process comes to the fore in the context of space, the rhythms of time268 and, in particular, the spatial body. Any study of social being must consequently proceed along these lines.

Dominated by overpowering forces, including a variety of brutal techniques and an extreme emphasis on visualization, the body fragments, abdicates responsibility for itself – in a word, appropriates itself [...] Any revolutionary “project” today, whether utopian or realistic, must, if it is to avoid hopeless banality, make the reappropriation of the body, in association with the reappropriation of space, into a non-negotiable part of its agenda.269

Such a project – “rhythmanalysis” – would also refer to the rhythms of the body, not only as internal rhythms such as breathing, hunger and sleep, but also as relations with the external through such things as sexuality, social life and thought. It might even eventually replace psychoanalysis as “more concrete, more effective, and closer to a pedagogy of appropriation (the appropriation of the body, as of spatial practice).” 270 We must then consider skateboarding in this context, as a partial glimpse in the society of the spectacle of a recovery of the body.

Of course other social activities have emphasised the body, but this has variously involved such things as: the world-stage commercialism of professional sport, perhaps most extremely typified by the intense commercialism of the 1996 Atlanta Olympics,271 including British athlete Lynford Christie wearing contact lenses to transform his
eyes into the logo of his sponsors, Puma; the conscious artistic intellectualism of performance art; and the narcissistic "mirroring body" of such practices as body-building and consumer-shopping, obsessed with their surface and monadic, internalised world. Skateboarding has undoubtedly relied upon specific professionals in order to popularise the activity and, above all, to sell equipment, and has also had sponsorship from major international companies, as with the Pepsi team (1977) and Swatch events (late 1980s and 1990s). And in the 1970s most professional skaters were keen to see skateboarding developed as a professional sport, while occasional events like the globally-televised Xtreme Games held annually in the mid-1990s thrust skateboarding into a highly spectacularised format. Nonetheless, skateboarding has generally resisted not only outright commercialism and institutional control (skateboarders in the 1980s actively campaigned for skateboarding not to be included in the Olympics), but also the commodification of the body. Thrasher, for example, ran a spoof advertisement that "we're not sure we'd like to see," showing a spectacularised skater promoting a "$100,000 Professional Skate Jam" at the "All New Skatorium" with a 20,000 seat arena. Or as another skater put it a decade later, "[t]he only sport that can't be watched is skateboarding. Watching skateboarding is like peanut butter, no jelly."

Resisting this kind of overt commodification, in skateboarding the skater's body is born from the poetry of its intricate spatial distortions and the rehearsal of its conflictual body-board-terrain events ("the glare off the tile, the grind marks are clear/getting sketch is no sweat, it's slamming you fear"). When a skater like Hawk performs a 540° aerial variation, his body becomes a "twisted mass" unrecognisable because of its speed and strange contortion.

I am not in space and time, nor do I con-
receive space and time; I belong to them, my body combines with them and includes them. 

The various names given to moves (see above) are then merely an attempt to understand and classify an otherwise incomprehensible entity. The skater's body itself is an assertive act, constructed out of the activity of skateboarding performed in relation to architecture; as Merleau-Ponty describes it, the spatiality of the body is not an assemblage of points of stimuli, located in relation to other objects, a spatiality of position, but is presented to the self as an attitude directed towards a certain task, a spatiality of situation.

A production of time is also enacted in this situational space, evident in skateboarding through the skater's run across the architecture of the skatepark element or ramp. Whereas time in capitalism is increasingly dominated by the measured time of clocks and economic rationales, time in skateboarding ranges from the duration of the session (see below), the limit of the run dictated by the skater's own abilities and stamina, and the rhythmic pattern of move-transfer-move-transfer as the skater oscillates between walls. In particular, the run is often performed in a fluid manner where the bewitching pendulum rhythm of the skater moving between from one wall and move to another is interspersed with sudden eruptions of aggressive energy; temporally, a series of calm periods, lasting a few seconds, are punctuated by extreme body-contortions and board-terrain engagement much shorter in duration. In terms of energy, periods of calm efficiency are counterpoised against massive releases and concentrations of effort and physicality.

Within each move this temporality and use of energy is further differentiated; in moves like aerials the moment at which the skater leaves the wall is perceived as a sudden departure, followed by a suspended section where board and body hang in space, waiting for gravity to pull the combination back down, and then, once again, the sudden re-engagement through reconnection with terra firma.

The most explosive part of the move in terms of space and physical complexity then is often, contradictorily, also where temporality seemingly stands still momentarily. The effect is like that of a slow-motion explosion in a movie. And this expenditure of energy and production of time is also enacted in relation to something: the architecture of the skate-
board terrain.

Surplus energy qua "normal" energy relates on the one hand to itself, i.e. to the body which stores it, and on the other hand to its "milieu," i.e. to space. In the life of every "being" [. . .] there are moments when the energy available is so abundant that it tends to be explosively discharged. It may be turned back against itself, or it may spread outwards, in gratuitousness or grace.284

As Lefebvre notes, this is productive energy through its producing of some change, no matter how small, in the world.285

In summary, skateboarding is a destructive-absorptive-reproductive process of both body and architecture. Consequently its mode of spatial composition is very different to that of architecture, replacing architecture's "classicist" mode with one of "romanticism."286

You're dealing with something that's beyond the normal balance of things [. . .]
Redefining the order of things.287

In place of the organised cosmos of architecture-classicism's cohesion, internalised hierarchies, imitation and balance, there are the waves, vibrations and oscillations of skateboarding's ludic procedures, suggesting conflict and contradiction, chaos and confusion, internalisation of the external world, emotion and spontaneity.

In particular, like Lefebvre's conceptual space-time of rhythmanalysis, this means not so much analysing rhythms as instead to "give and abandon oneself to its duration;" to fully engage with architecture as a reproduction of the rhythm of urban life one must not, for example, stand outside of a building and stare at its façade, but one should be inside and outside of it as when stood at a window or upon a balcony.288 As an extreme version of this kind of engagement, the skateboarding-architecture encounter involves all manner of physical interrogations, and as such is much closer to the rhythms of music or the imagined spaces of poetry and literature than the sights of the visual arts, linking inner and outer life, body and architecture, action and meaning.289

Music – it does something to make you go faster, make your adrenalin pump [. . .] your feet are set perfect, then you just hear a certain part of a song, say, you're flying down, and you set in your mind that you're going to jam an aerial or something, do something really radical.290
Like music and dance, skateboarding creates "repetitions and redundancies of rhythms" and "symmetries and asymmetries" irreducible to analytic thought.291

What really makes a trick insane is has nothing to do with the trick itself. It's a combination of terrain, the individual, the madness of the moment and the situation at hand.292

Skateboarding is like James Joyce's "festival of language, a delirium of words"293 transposed into a festival of movement, a series of precise spatial-temporal actions rendered demented and deranged, and which ultimately destroys and recreates body and architecture together. (05.95) Through skateboarding, the architecture of the pool and the skatepark "stands battered and abused."294 This is space which is above, beyond, in addition to, and in excess of, the space of objects or the space of the static body. This is super-architectural space.
5.03 Spaces of Representation, Representations of Space

So far consideration of skateboard performance has been mainly as a pure activity, restricted to the skater's body and immediate terrain. However, it is important to avoid the reductivity Lefebvre notes in Merleau-Ponty, where subject and object are unconsidered in relation to social practice; the space of the body is also the space of others.

Space – my space – is not the context of which I constitute the "textuality": instead, it is first of all my body, and then it is my body's counterpart or "other," its mirror-image or shadow.

To consider this textual space of many bodies, I focus here on the integrated nature of representations in skateboarding; through this process, the social performativity of the body, skateboard and architecture is partly played out.

Technical Images

Considering a skateboarder as representation can be undertaken in two ways. Firstly, and most obviously, this involves the technical image as published medium. Originally, this occurred in skateboard magazines as photographs, and among the most prolific of the US skateboard photographers in the 1970s were Skateboarder's Warren Bolster, Jim Goodrich, Craig Fineman, James Cassimus, Ted Terrebonne and freelancer Friedman. In the 1980s and 1990s, US photographers included TransWorld Skateboarding's J. Grant Brittain, Geoff Kula and Spike Jonze, and Thrasher's Morizen Förche ("Mo-Fo"). Jeff Newton, Bryce Kanights and Chris Ortiz. In the UK, 1970s photographers included Skateboard's Robert Vente, Jerry Young and Ian Dobbie, and Skateboard Scene's Gregg Haythorpe. In the late 1980s and early 1990s UK they included R.A.D.'s Jay Podesta, Tim-Leighton-Boyce and Paul Sunman, and Skateboard's (second series) Steve Kane and Paul Duffy. In the mid 1990s they included Sidewalk Surfer's Andy Shaw and Matthew "Wig" Worland.

These photographers began with conventional still imagery. After the advent of skateparks, they used new high-speed motor-drives to capture innovative moves and, in particular, the sequential detail of high-speed skateboard moves. This concern with disclosing the movement of the human body reaches back to the 1870s photography of Eadweard Muybridge, while also intimating at the rapid innovation of new skateboard moves.

The boys were dealing with things too rapid to be observed, the kind that are so quick that they are felt rather than seen. The documentation must be done in sequential overdrive [...] "You should have been here yesterday" has become "You ought to be here tomorrow."

These pictures are already outdated. What you see here is nothing compared to what is going on now. These are just slices of time, thousandths of a second from the past.
05.97 High speed motor-drive sequence of Ken Park, varial invert (1989).
angle lenses to get close to the action, emphasising locational context, at once celebrating and analysing the event. Some photographers also use wide-angles to exaggerate the height and posture of moves ("those 15mm fisheyes distort everything just about right") and, as such lenses are expensive, to make photographs noticeably “professional.”

Bolster and SkateBoader experimented in 1978 with “stroboscopic” images, alongside blurred images, thus “freezing the feeling by blurring the motion.” Later photographers like Worland have also used stroboscopes. Other techniques included multi-image frames, or the combination of flash with slower shutter speeds to portray a sharp skater overlaid onto their blurred movement across surrounding terrain. Although successful as dramatic composites, such images also expose the partial limitation of still photography with respect to time, both eradicating the immediate time of the event, and dehistoricising the time of its location. Although readily available in the specialist magazines, such images are thus restricted by the limitations of the medium.

In response, the moving image has been exploited. The 1970s films like Magic Rolling Board (1977), Skateboard (Universal, 1978), Freewheelin' (Dir. Scott Dittrich), Super Session, Go For It (Dir. Hal Jepsen), Skateboard Madness (Dir. Hal Jepsen, 1977-82), Hot Wheels (James Street, Dir. Richard Gayer, 1978) and London Skateboards (Dir. Ian MacMillan, 1978) were supplemented in the 1970s and 1980s with sporadic tele-
vision coverage on the main US and UK network channels. By mid 1980 Allen, owner of Marina del Rey skatepark, was hosting a weekly cable television programme devoted to skateboarding. Action Now similarly launched a television version of itself in mid 1981. Pipeline skatepark had installed a video system for instant feedback by 1980, while skaters in the 1970s often made 8 mm movies.

But the 1980s saw this kind of representation become most important, when skateboarders exploited new camcorder and video technology to capture and distribute skate moves. A large number of skate videos are now available, some as video magazines with skaters from different locations, such as the American 411 or the English Video-Log, and others as elaborate manufacturer videos showcasing professional skaters. The latter can be very sophisticated, beginning with the first Powell-Peralta videos of the mid 1980s which "blew open" the skateboard world. For example, Ban This (Powell-Peralta, Dir. Peralta and C.R. Stecyk, 1989) manipulated tracked shots, skateboard-mounted cameras, special lighting, overlays, montage, film stock and high-design graphics.

Videos like Bones Brigade (Powell-Peralta, 1984), Future Primitive (Powell-Peralta, 1986), Wheels on Fire (Santa Cruz, 1988), Streets on Fire (Santa Cruz, 1989), Useless Toys (New Deal, 1991), Las Nueve Vidas de Paco (Chocolate/Girl, Dir. Spike Jonze, 1995) and A Mixed Media (Panic/Blueprint, 1996) were intended to promote these manufacturers, but also satisfied skaters' demand to see professionals in action. Some were quick to produce, using television rather than film production values; the H Street company with Mike Ternasky pioneered the exploitation of low-cost camcorders, producing Shackle Me Not (1989), Hocus Pocus (1990) and other videos by giving camcorders to team riders to shoot their best tricks, then hacking together a quick rough-edit for release. Small companies and new skaters were thus able to record and distribute their moves within weeks, and also, given the rapid development of skate moves, to suggest they were ahead of other, larger companies.

In another variation, since the early 1990s local skaters have also increasingly produced their own videos, using domestic formats for production and dubbing onto standard VCR equipment. The results are sold for minimal cost through local skate shops and mail order; UK examples include The Hoods (Big Films, 1997) from Margate, Raging Hull (Hull Skaters, 1997) from Hull, Renaissance (Wayne Fenlon, 1996-7) from Edinburgh, Network Neighbourhood (1997) from Chelmsford, and A Product of Our Surroundings (Martin Meegan, 1997). These low-budget, videos are filmic equivalents of 1980s and 1990s skate 'zines (see Chapter 6), showing local skaters doing moves in a variety...
of quotidian skate spots.323

[N]ews of modern moves, the tricky tricks and the flippity kicks, spread like wildfire via phone, fax, Xerox and mini-cams.324

These are essentially local, informal communications ("[w]e all try to shoot each other")325, giving a sense of a particular place – Renaissance, for example, focuses on the “Bristo Square” skate scene in Edinburgh.326

The videos are then perhaps the most accurate way of reproducing the sound and movement of skateboarding, portraying skateboarding at its most prosaic, ordinary in its accessibility and location, extraordinary in its appearance and context.

Furthermore, skaters are increasingly using the internet to receive and post images; in 1997 the alt.skateboard site was far more active than in the past few years.327 From fledging ventures like Thrasher’s bulletin board328 and R.A.D’s e-mail address in the mid-1980s329 skate cyberspace expanded in 1997 to over 130 sites ranging from commercial manufacturers and shops to professional “digital magazines” like Influx330 (05.104) Heckler331 (05.107) and the UK-focused “digital skate resource” Project (begun 1996),332 to good college sites, like the Dansworld site,333 (05.106) to skaters’ own sites like the Dutch Hupthur334 and female-skater b-grml from Melbourne,335 (05.105) or Skate Geezer, catering for veteran skaters of the 1970s-80s,336 to the Usenet alt.skateboard site, with incessant conversation on a myriad of topics from how to perform tricks, equipment, phrases, ramp design, drugs, the existence of god, general abuse, to (most popular of all) skate shoe design.

Country-specific sites also yield information about places from Finland337 to Canada.338 From these sites skaters represent skate moves through textual descriptions, choreographic codes using the ASCII character set, still photographs (05.106) and movie clips (05.107) – all viewable on the screen or down-loaded. The overall effect is to make it easier for skaters to disseminate material globally, certainly compared to commercial magazines or videos.
Lived Representations
All these kinds of imagery are central to skateboarding's development. The video has thus been seen as "a good recording and learning tool," while photographs have been particularly influential.

Without photographs there wouldn't be a global skate scene, there wouldn't be magazines to allow people to ascend into the public consciousness, in short skateboarding wouldn't exist in the same way as it does now.

Clearly magazines and videos have been extraordinarily influential in encouraging new skaters to skate - ("the first thing that inspired me to skate") and established skaters to develop further.

We see a hot shot in the magazine, and we have to figure what went on before that.

But what is the process by which this occurs?

To address this question, we must consider that skateboard imagery is significant not only for its instructional properties, for images per se are only an apparent stage of the representation process within the skateboarding production of space. Instead, skateboarders use imagery less as pure image, and more as an integration and re-presentation of that imagery through skateboarding practice. The lived representation of skateboard images occurs when skaters undertake the moves themselves, reliving and re-producing photographs, video footage and the internet movie clips through the agency of their body. I now turn to investigate this condition at some length.

The way skaters skate - the elegance, fluidity, speed and, above all, style with they perform are undoubtedly important aspects of skateboarding.

If a rider looks good, if he's got style, his tricks are going to look all the more healthy for it. And he'll feel a lot better . . . a far more complete skater.

It's not how many hard tricks you can do, it's the way you perform the trick. That's where style comes in.

Style is notoriously difficult to define, and while some see it as an "economy of motion," ultimately for many skaters it was "more an attitude than a technique [...] something more akin to a dance" and embedded within the smallest of actions.

Style isn't the full action-wear wardrobe and the upper lip curled sneer. Style is the backspin on the quarters as you put them in the candy machine.

The visit by Alva to Britain in the summer of 1978 produced considerable debate on this matter, for, as a letter to Skateboard! made clear, his reputation was founded as much on his skating style as technical capabilities.

He managed to express so much of what skating is all about . . . force, grace and sheer fluidity; qualities [...] which take skat-
ing beyond the limits of mere accomplishment of "tricks." The fact that Alva did not attempt the aerials that Mark Baker achieved could not have mattered less. It was how he skated that made his performances so unforgettable [. . .] There is too much of this business in skating as to what you can do. The question should be, how do you do it, and with what attitude of mind.348

But as this implies, it is less style than the moves performed which are most important to many skaters. The skateboarder's pre-dominant self-identity is then the number and difficulty of moves they perform. This is seen most explicitly in skateboard magazines, where the highly photographic content is complemented by captions which typically identify the name of the skater and the move being performed. The two come together explicitly whenever a new move is named after its inventor, such as "Bert" (Larry Bertleman), "Elgarrio/Elguerial" (Elguera) "Caballerial" (Caballero), (05.109) "McTwist" (McGill), (05.74) "Miller Flip" (Miller) (05.72) or "Christ air" (Christian Hosoi).

The importance of the move is also evident in that skateboarders spend perhaps more time than any other sports practitioners actually failing to do what they attempt. Furthermore, having spent hours or even days trying a move, once successfully completed they will often progress immediately to an even more difficult manoeuvre. This was especially true of a highly technical phase in street skating in the 1990s, when skaters,
encouraged by camcorder technology, attempted ever more intricate moves until they had just one “make” recorded.\textsuperscript{349} Here, we might even note that skaters share with architects the tendency to treat invention as a highly prized characteristic.

From the very beginning, skateboarders have been obsessed with forging new directions, inventing new tricks, claiming new obstacles and generally ensuring that the available means of skateboard exploration stay as varied as possible.\textsuperscript{350}

Originality is most important to me [. . .] skaters that copy a lot aren’t skating for themselves.\textsuperscript{351}

\textit{Everytime I get on the board, I’m trying to figure out something new.}\textsuperscript{352}

Many moves are more complex evolutions or variants of old ones, such as the “fakie rock’n roll board slide,” in which the skater undertakes a combination of the rock’n roll (see above), sliding the board along the wall (“board slide”) as it rocks, and then returns without turning around (“fakie”). The communicative dissemination of such new moves through internet, video and magazine also takes place through language, with a welter of different terms constantly being invented to describe skate moves. To name every skate move would be a near impossible task,\textsuperscript{353} but to give but a few of these, \textit{Dansworld} lists, among others, “backside,” “boardslide,” “fakie,” “hard flip,” “heelflip,” “kickflip,” “nollie kickflip,” “360 flip,” “varial,” “frontside,” “grind,” “crooked,” “fweeble,” “grapefruit,” “50-50,” “5-0,” “nosegrind,” “Smith,” “lipslide,” “mango-foot,” “noseslide,” “switch-stance” and “tailslide.”\textsuperscript{354}

“Maximal differences” like these, based on change, are also complemented by “minimal differences” based on repetition.\textsuperscript{355} Skaters are often obsessed here with that kind of novelty which, rather than being based on creative struggle, aims at simply being seen to be the first to do something.\textsuperscript{356} Again, magazines, camcorders and the internet play an important role in this process, disseminating new moves around the world quickly, leading to a series of globally-dispersed competitions among local skaters to see who can become the first in their own area to recreate the move.\textsuperscript{357}

Despite the copying involved, skaters see each repetition of a move as a new creation, less of an emulation as producing something forever anew.

No matter how many times you do something on your board, you never truly repeat yourself, every single trick is absolutely unique.\textsuperscript{358}

In either case – the entirely inventive, or the newly produced – the move, then, is that complicated unity of time, desire, space, gesture and tool-manipulation which not only repeats but preserves difference through innovation.\textsuperscript{359}

If the move is the measure of status and achievement, then it is also, consequently, the unit of exchange between skaters, and skaters spend much time poring over photographs in order to understand and acquire them.

\textit{First time I saw Caballero doing a frontside slide-and-roll in a magazine I studied that thing for weeks.}\textsuperscript{360}

This process is analogous to the way consumers accumulate commodities and capitalists money, except that of course skateboard moves cannot be hoarded or invested – there is no bank for real moves, only the image bank of the photograph or video – and to maintain ownership skaters must continually re-perform the move.

\textit{Every new transition in your pocket makes you a better skater.}\textsuperscript{361}
Consequently, when skaters undertake a run, they are not so much performing an act of pure physical spontaneity as reproducing through body-actions the activity of skateboarding as codified in moves and communicated as a set of *produced* images. The skater's move is image and action at once, representation of space and space of representation brought together in a simultaneous production and release of time, energy and space — and is thus in keeping with Lefebvre's call for a production and understanding of the "interconnections, distortions, displacements, mutual interactions" of these different spaces.\(^{362}\)

In social terms, the skateboarder's undertaking of a move is a complex intersection of lived experience and mechanically reproduced imagery, in which the latter acts as a kind of mirror, not only reflecting the subject's image back to themselves but also extending a repetition/symmetry immanent to the body into space;\(^{363}\) the mechanical image projects the skater both back to themselves, and to others. As one skater explained their sense of being a skater:

> To me an image is like when you're standing in a room with two mirrors opposite each other. The first image is you and all the rest are those people who reflect parts of you they choose to carry with them.\(^{364}\)

That both the image/reflection (as pure image) and the skater's own move (as the momentary equilibrium of gravity and trajectory) are "weightless" emphasises the fantastical nature of this projection in which the skater forever dreams — alongside the immediate phenomenal engagement with the terrain — their display to the eyes of other skaters. [05.110]

This is further complicated by the collective nature of skateboarding as a practice in which many skaters perform the same moves, and so act as mirrors both for themselves and others. In terms of specific meetings of skateboarders, this takes the
form of the session, when skaters skate together and sometimes in socially aggressive circumstances.

Sessioneering [...] is that unpredictable aspect of the skateboard experience that occurs whenever the varied personages that comprise the contemporary vanguard assemble together. The action is always faster, always more furious, and limits are always pushed harder than ever before.365

As Peters recalled the first years at Pipeline skatepark:

Sessions got that heavy. It was like a gang fight, but we were skating.366

The same condition applied at Solid Surf skatepark in the UK, where the best known London skaters and "H-Boyz" (Harrow regulars) took over.367

[W]e would terrorize everybody and take over the best runs. Nobody would skate with us, they would just watch [...] the sessions were heavy and most were intimidated.368

The session format involves a group of skaters standing at the pool entrance or half-pipe platform, waiting for their run. As an informal queuing system (skaters do not stand in line), there is a rough understanding that each skater gets one run in turn; jumping this sequence is sometimes referred to as "snaking."369 Further, it is the ground on which the waiting skaters stand that constitutes the primary social space of the audience; although other non-skaters may look on, it is skaters-only who tend to occupy the entrance point/platform, and it is they who shout encouragement, astonishment and abuse at the skater performing. [05.111] A skater exiting from a run then forms part of the audience for the next skater and so on. The system thus produces a kind of collective attack on the element being skated, each skater making their own contribution to the achievements of the session as a whole.

I wanna rip! I wanna rip against everybody. I like to skate with a lot of people.370

The session is thus a kind of informal competition among individuals, but is also a collective activity.

In this context, every time a skater performs a move, they are both reproducing themselves as themselves (seeing themselves do a move), themselves as other than themselves (seeing themselves in the role of others), and other skaters as themselves (they are the reflection of other skaters). Such considerations lie behind Rick Blackhart's question as to whether "[i]f you're skating a ramp and nobody's watching you, are you still skating?"371 The desire to enact the move is then the desire to be, at the same time, oneself, oneself as someone else, and all other skaters in oneself. And the process by which this occurs is the skate move as something simultaneously performed, mechanically-produced and imagined.

The skate move, like the mirror, does not then constitute the unity of the subject,372 but discloses the consciousness of the skater and their body, a
bodily version of Lefebvre’s reminder that “there is no form without content, no content without form.” The skateboard move is the projection of the self through the imaginary-and-real medium of the photograph; it is neither pure activity or image, but a lived image. The skateboard run is at once a communication, development and lived enactment of things like the Influx digital journal or SkateBoarder photographs. Every time the skater makes a move they are at once replaying the photograph and video clip through their own body, reliving and reinventing it, and – ultimately – rendering image, move and themselves into a social, fleshy, living entity. [05.112]

Skateboarding, it is thus revealed, accords with the notion that there is nothing inherently regres-
sive about spectatorship and images, and that readers and communities can be related together through these processes. This has some interesting spatial and temporal effects. Spatially, skaters continually oscillate between the immediate physicality of their bodies and a globally dispersed skate community. There are currently skateboarders in most cities around the world, such that a skater from, say, London’s Notting Hill will frequently feel more in common, and have more communication, with other skaters in Mexico City, Prague or Philadelphia than with non-skaters in Notting Hill. As Hugh “Bod” Boyle saw it:

I could go to Czechoslovakia and meet someone, couldn’t even speak to the guy, but because we skate, have something between us and we can get on.

This community is knitted though a continual exchange and re-experiencing of a lexicon of skate moves. The image becomes not only a locally lived but, simultaneously, a globally reproduced and exchanged phenomenon, part of modernity’s intensification of global communication and simultaneity; unlike the purely localised system of gazes in the space of, for example, a theatre, for skateboarders the stage is the skatepark, the street, the magazine and the internet taken together as one worldwide network.

The skateboarder’s locality is then not just a “production of stability” that such localities often invoke, but is also a response to the emerging meta-space of global mobility; the space is at once stable and unstable, local and global, fixed and dispersed. In this context, the image-move addresses Jameson’s search for a spatialised cognitive mapping that is able to locate the body and self locally and globally; the skater understands both the space of their own body and locality, and the space of the world, as a set of globally-dispersed intimate localities, and as a series of continually repeated and evolving lexicons of image-moves. And in this they seem to be responding to Lefebvre’s “implosion-explosion” process – the extension of urban phenomena internationally, while at the local scale there is a intensifying of the actual urban fabric.

Temporally, skate moves are rarely taught or disseminated through codified means; few skaters use books or such things as the How to Skateboard video produced by Thrasher, relying instead on constant learning from other skateboarders, either directly by copying or by communication over internet and magazine pages. In many cases this occurs locally, as at Sacramento where the older “N-Men” skaters passed on their knowledge and attitude to the next generation.

Without this constant oral and lived communication, skateboarding moves would cease to be active historical moments and indeed this has happened to many older skateboard moves – such as the “tail-block” or “layback air” – which were once fashionable among skaters but which are now rarely performed. “What is hip today will soon be passé.”

The “archive” or bank of moves thus must be constantly re-enacted at a highly localised level in order to survive, both in terms of an individual’s own performance and the collective performance of skateboarders as a whole. It is the skaters’ continual learning and

Glen E. Friedman
repeating of moves and tricks which forms "the basis of skating."³⁸⁴

Jerry [.] put everyone else to shame: 4 foot backside airs, 3 footish frontside airs & lightning quick & long rock’n’roll slides.

Podge skated pretty good but the inverted lay back airs I saw him doing last summer never materialised [.] Paul Price soon had the pipe sussed out with 4 out fakey ollies, frontside airs and rock’n’rolls.³⁸⁵

The reporting of a particular skate event, like this one, thus focuses not just on what moves each skater did, but on how they are managing to repeat and to develop moves; repetition and recurrence become essential components both for the langue of skateboard moves and the parole of skaters’ individual enactions of these moves. It is then in the continual re-performance of the skate move that it is recorded. "History is something you live, not something you read."³⁸⁶

Returning to the consideration of the image, there are two other roles of the image that should be considered. The first concerns the role of the photographer, for, as former skateboard editor and photographer Tim Leighton-Boyce points out, skateboard photography goes far beyond the technical exaggeration of space and temporality.³⁸⁷ Skateboard photographers deployment of wide-angle lenses is extremely unusual (having initially borrowed the technique from water-bound surf-photographers³⁸⁸), for in most other sports photography the main lens is the telephoto. In part skateboard photographers use wide-angles to emphasise location, but also to show other skaters waiting to drop in, thus invoking a sense of collective space around the skater pictured while also suggesting that the viewer too could be part of the session.³⁸⁹ The optical characteristics of the wide-angle also forces photographer and subject into a proximate spatial relationship, such that the photographer often holds the camera underneath or even within the orbit of the skaters’ body. At times this immediacy is directly evidenced in the photograph itself: one of Friedman’s earliest images of skateboarding – of Adams in the “Teardrop” pool – shows his own foot at the base of the images, caught in the same frame as the explosive skater.³⁹⁰ (05.114) Friedman is not a distant observer, recording the action with an external gaze, but a participant, someone intimately – socially and spatially – connected to the activity in front of the camera.

The second role concerns the image of the terrain in the specific context of the purpose-built skatepark. While everyday architecture is encountered as a given, the more spectacular forms of architecture, often designed by named architects, are revered more for their aura than for any encounter that we have with them. The same may be applied to particular skatepark features, which as given rather than found terrains are always invested with a conscious, representational quality; this is particularly true for those special attraction features – often the centre-piece pool (Pipeline, ⁰⁵.⁰⁵, ⁰⁵.¹⁷, ⁰⁵.⁸⁸, ⁰⁵.¹⁰⁹, ⁰⁵.¹¹⁵, ⁰⁵.¹¹⁷, ⁰⁵.¹¹⁸, Winchester, ⁰⁵.⁹⁵) Marina del Rey (⁰⁵.¹⁴, ⁰⁵.⁷⁰, ⁰⁵.⁷¹, ⁰⁵.⁹³, ⁰⁵.¹⁰⁰, ⁰⁸.⁰², etc.) or long half-pipe (Lakewood ⁰⁵.⁶⁸) – with reputations for difficulty and danger. Particular elements of skateparks become invested with a spectacular life – Pipeline’s Combi-Pool, for example, “designed to test and push the limits of skateboarding,”³⁹¹ generated an aura beyond the basic ground on which skaters skated. Indeed, this was precisely the intention, for such centre-piece pools were often provided in part to attract publicity to the skatepark.³⁹² As a result, in undertaking a move in a place like the Combi-Pool, skaters perceived themselves as much for their positioning within the image of the element as for the simple phenomenal interaction with a physical terrain. The move became perceived as not just, say, a rock ’n roll, but as a rock ’n roll in the Combi-Pool. (05.¹¹⁵)
This may partly explain the frequent territorialisation of skateparks, in which "locals" claimed that skatepark, and specific elements within it, as their own, and consequently met any outsiders with an attitude ranging from disdain to outright aggression.

The local kids won’t even speak to us. They really resent us coming up to “their” park – they just stand in corners and stare.393

In such a process, locals saw the skatepark and its element less as pure image, their intimate and repeated use of it having stripped it of its external aura, and more as a known entity, re-invested with a character of their own construction.

It was good because it was our park and it was us.394

This is akin to the way sports fans frequently feel a strong emotional attachment to their team’s stadium, or to a particular stand within it.395 Except that while sports fans’ experiences are through witnessing matches, for skateboarders the process is more participatory; through a drawn-out and painful intimacy built up over months and years, skateboarders have an invested physical and emotional relationship with the skateparks elements. [05.116]

I’ve been skating here [Pipeline] for seven years and I’ve slammed a lot here. I’ve been kicked out a lot and let back in. When this place is torn down, I’ll probably quit skating. It’s the only place I have.396

Skaters give the element, and the element returns to them, a knowledge of each other. The incoming outsider, conversely, threatens to obstruct the intensive local use of the skatepark, getting in the way, and possibly even skating better. Consequently, the dangerous nature and associated aura of some skatepark architecture helped local skaters not only
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to distinguish themselves from others, but also to create a certain kind of masculinity. This, for example, was one of the characteristics of the Combi-Pool at Upland's Pipeline skatepark, where local pro skaters like Steve Alba and Jim Gray were able to build up over many years a painful intimacy with the element inaccessible to others. [05.117, 05.118]

This place separates the men from the boys and a lot of the pros are afraid to come here because they're afraid of getting hurt. The people here know how to deal with the pain.397

[C]ome to Upland and ride the pool and show me you're a man.398

However, the spectacular nature of skateparks also created the possibility for skaters to become dissatisfied, becoming bored with skateparks as a whole, perhaps no longer providing the right kind of terrain. Alternatively, skateparks and their elements—such as the intimidatingly deep Combi-Pool or the
Performance Bowl at London's Solid Surf [05.29] were often seen as the "proving ground" where skaters pitted themselves against particular elements, creating a situation whereby the element may "win" and thus become a terrain skaters cannot master or relate adequately to. This was certainly the case with Pipeline and the Combi-Pool, a "concrete nightmare and a concrete wonderland:

It's bumpy and smooth and unpredictable. It's the only place where you can ride a fifteen-foot-deep bowl, a twenty-two-foot pipe, and do corner airs in a square pool [...] About eighty percent of the pros are afraid to skate here, that tells you how burly it is.

The owners of the Pipeline skatepark, Stan and Jeanne Hoffman, subsequently found that the Combi-Pool was not suited to the more complex (and hence more risky) moves developed in the 1980s.

The combi-pool doesn't really lend itself to that; it's steep and has a lot of vertical [...] kids found it was hard for them and they didn't look that good here.

In particular, the depth of the Combi-Pool, its large areas of vertical walls and the high-speed required to reach all areas created an overtly challenging architecture that made even professional skaters wary of it.

[The only really good square pool I've seen is Upland and that was so radical that's its not all that rippable. Not right now. It's so steep, it's a rush. When you are up there you're just looking down, going, "Whoa..."

It was scary and I usually got hurt there.

At one Hester competition, for example, "this full on quality took its toll," with many of the professional skaters, including locals like Alba, suffering heavy falls. The Marina del Rey skatepark suffered similar problems with its original "Dog Bowl" pool, with four feet of pure vertical at the top of its wall, and a smaller keyhole pool was therefore soon added. The concrete pool at Münster had an equal effect on professional skaters like Way, who found its size and hard surface somewhat daunting.

Whatever the challenge it offers, unlike the urban streets of the city itself, the skatepark was always a consciously provided space, a mental projection and representation of skateboarding terrain. As a result, some skateboarders quickly tired of skating on the same ground.

That's the thing about skate parks. The Dogtown guys have hit every skate park and ripped it; then they've split, cuz they've taken it to the limit and then get burned out on a spot.

This was particularly evident when skateparks imposed some kind of social regulation system; some, like the Del Mar Skate Ranch, tried to impose strict opening hours, safety rules, entrance charges and general behaviour codes. More usually, skatepark regulations focused on either time periods, with stewards removing skaters after their paid-for session, or occasionally performance, where skaters have to pass some kind of proficiency test before being allowed to "progress" to more difficult elements within the park. London's Skate City, for example, instituted a coloured badge system, the highest "Black Badge" allowing skaters access to the "Black Bowl." Such insignia ran contrary to skateboarders' anti-institutional sensitivities.

For some skaters, the skatepark thus appeared as a fixed, institutional entity, involving the segregation of skaters behind fences, creating rules and enforcing them rigidly. "skateparks are so boring,
they’re always the same and very restrictive.” This may be why some skaters preferred slides and carves on banks and other more gentle skatepark terrains, partly because they did not represent the extreme challenge of the pool or half-pipe, and partly because they consequently appeared to just be there, allowing skaters to reassume the position of creative adaptive user rather than compelled consumer. [05.119]

How immense are the riding possibilities offered by well designed and finely tuned banks . . . they’re the very fountain of style and creativity.

[B]anks are the most fun and challenging terrains to ride ’cause you can approach them from so many directions and draw so many lines.

Thus in the early 1980s skaters began to turn away from the overtly challenging terrains like the Combi-Pool to the mini-bowls and banks where they could be more creative and relaxed.
To conclude this chapter, we have seen that skateboarding resists the subject's reduction to alternatively mechanistic performer, mental entity or capitalist competitor, and also resists the dissatisfaction deriving from the consumption of things and things-as-signs.417 Socially, skaters' dislike of skateparks was also a resistance to the charging of entrance fees and, particularly in the us, the requiring of membership,418 but also to the imposition of certain safety and behavioural standards. Such economic and social values run against the confrontational and anarchist tendency within skateboarding.

In place of such codification and regulation, skaters enact a "practical and fleshy body conceived of as a totality complete with spatial qualities (symmetries, asymmetries) and energetic properties (discharges, economies, waste)," a "practico-sensory totality."419 Skateboarding as a quantitative set of places (skateparks, elements) and actions (moves, routes, routines) is not only further invested with quantitative measures (size, height, distance, duration, speed) but also with qualitative measures (difficulty, complexity, invention, surprise) and experiential conditions (noise, texture, sound, flow, touch, rhythm, space-time). Placed within the skater's imaginative absorption of the body-subject as an actively-experienced and produced engagement with the terrain underfoot, this creates an interdependent relation of skater and terrain, each internalised within the other. [05.120]

The "other" is present, facing the ego: a body facing another body. The "other" is impenetrable save through violence, or through love, as the object of expenditures of energy, of aggression or desire. Here external is also internal inasmuch as the "other" is another body, a vulnerable flesh, an accessible symmetry.420

Architecture is both external and internal to skateboarding, its concrete presentness being at once the other and the accessible symmetry to the skateboarder's physical activity - separate to, yet brought within, the skateboarding act. Similarly, the architect as designer of built terrain is both the other to the skateboarder, and re-presented within the skateboarder, the creative act being transposed from the "classicist" realm of balanced order into the "romanticist" sphere of destabilised movements. Architecture is dissolved, recast, and re-materialised. Skateboarding is nothing less than a sensual, sensory, physical emotion and desire for one's own body in motion and engagement with the architectural and social other; a Balladesque crash and rebirth of self, body and terrain.421

Skateboarding is not, however, a purely bodily-centric activity, as the analysis of the lived nature of...
the image above indicates. This thesis therefore now turns to consider the more political and urban connotations of skateboarding. Chapter 6 is therefore predominantly social in focus, and provides the necessary consideration of the subculture of skateboarding, with particular reference to the 1980s and 1990s. Attitudes to age, race, gender, class, sexuality, masculinity, the family and to general conventional standards are explored. Specific aspects of skateboard design, music, clothes, language etc. are also investigated.
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Subculture
Chapter 6 Subculture

The opposite of skateboarding is golf.1

[ ] Just owning a skateboard [. . . ] doesn't qualify one as a skater.2

6.01 Subcultural Identity

Today, a loss of identity besets all peoples and individuals, faced with a dissolution of points of reference inherited from the past. This is a "trial by space,"3 which tests the values of social groups. Thrasher: [What is a] non-dictionary, unabridged meaning of life?

Neil Blender: I think it's all a trial.4

What then is the particular cultural identity of skateboarders? This is an important question, for the identity of skateboarders continually informs, and is informed by, their spatial activities. Before turning in Chapter 7 to the specific spatial practices of skateboarding, we must therefore first comprehend that skateboarders create their own subculture: a social world in which self-identifying values and appearances confront conventional codes of behaviour.5

Skaters are like [. . . ] the culture that doesn't want. It's tired of the same old paralyzing stenchy activities that have been going on the whole time [. . . ] Music, clothes, words, mags, video, skateboarding is a lifestyle.6

Skateboarding, like other subcultures, attempts to separate itself from groups like the family, to be oppositional, appropriative of the city, irrational in organisation, ambiguous in constitution, independently creative, and exploitative of its marginal or "sub-" status.7 Skateboarding subculture is obstructive, using irony and other devices to create a "reasonable distance" between skaters and others, breaking up the kind of familiarity which relies upon a transparent identification.8

Thus while skateboarding subculture at once partakes of and criticises the atomisation and socialisation of society within modernity,9 it also makes a special contribution to that process. In particular, the constitution of skateboarders as a small group, and as young of age,10 allows them to instigate different courses of action to those of dominated, mass groups and activities. Skateboarders may then be compared with Lefebvre's characterisation of the nineteenth century critical lifestyle, romanticism,11 for, like romanticism, skateboarding brings together a concern to live out an idealised present, involves coded dress, language and body language, unites individuals of different social construction, and in general tries to live outside of society while being simultaneously within its very heart.12

This is a production of the self with regard to the rest of society and to the self. Just as individuals "are not a passive medium on which cultural meanings are merely inscribed," neither are they an outward projection on to society of a pre-existent presence; instead, individuals are "multiplied, dynamic, participating and determined," continually producing a "site of constantly changing mutations of difference, at once stable and dislocated, at once fixed and changing."13 Skateboarders’ subcultural identity is then a way of thinking, constructing and living that identity in an historical situation.

Skate subculture involves everything skateboarders do; skaters skate "because they want to totally live it."14 As a "total" activity, skateboarding is inwardly as well as outwardly directed, sustained through all aspects of everyday life, a style that finds significance in the slightest things.15 This is a process readily visible in, for example, novels like Jess Mowry's Rats in the Trees (1993)16 and Larry Clark's film Kids (1995), in which skateboarding is absolutely embedded into the characters' everyday lives.17 As skateboarders put it:

Skaters have a completely different culture from the norms of the world's society. We
dress differently, we have our own language, use our own slang, and live by our own rules.18

One way or another skating relates to just about every part of my life.19

I live skateboarding, I think skateboarding.20

Live by the board, die by the board.21

6.02 Age, Race, Gender, Class, Sexuality

What then is the subcultural make-up of skateboarding? Given the bodily nature of skateboarding discussed in Chapter 5, and that capitalism tends to erase distinctions of time and the body,22 it makes sense to explore the socially constructional categories of age, race, gender, class and sexuality.

Of these, for skateboarding age is perhaps the most obvious, as skateboarding is traditionally practised by people 8-18 years old. Certainly this is the age group that skateboarding appealed to during the 1970s, when Southern Californian skateboarders averaged 14,23 but, following an upward movement through the 1980s-90s, many are now in their 20s. Skaters also often reach into their 30s and beyond, as evidenced by Skate Geezer internet site for “veteran” skaters24 and Skateboard’s “Old Gold” skater category,25 but these older practitioners are often discouraged by the “scornful stares of the expert young” skaters26 or by conventionalising peer pressures.4

People look at me like I’m some kind of freak because I’m 20 years old and riding a skateboard.27

The basic attitude I get is, “You’re a professional skateboarder? How old are you?” People consider it to be some little kid’s game.28

Older skateboarders are also put off by their decreasing ability to withstand the continual body strains and breakages that skateboarding usually inflicts.

In terms of race, gender and class, skateboarding, like romanticism, shares common values that can transcend such barriers of class, race or gender, and so tends to marginalise their importance and significance socially.29 For example, skaters tend to come from all kinds of class backgrounds.

[T]here’s no class distinctions [. . . ] you see all different types of economic groups skateboarding.30

Trading in second-hand equipment, together with possibility of making decks at home from plywood, means that costs can be kept low; the current focus on street skating rather than skateparks similarly means reductions in admission charges or safety equipment, although, conversely, the tendency to produce ultra-lightweight street skating decks can create high breakage and replacement costs.31

Racial and ethnic groups are also more easily integrated into skateboarding than in many other areas of youth culture: “it’s a racially mixed world.”32

In skating, there is no segregation really. You don’t look at other skateboarders and become aware of their skin color or the clothes they wear. It just doesn’t matter. There aren’t the biases that exist in other areas of life. It’s like we are our own race.33

This is particularly true of skateboarding in the last decade. While skaters in the 1970s tended to be white, blond haired and called Chip or Brad, in the 1980s skaters were generally of more varied ethnic origin, and called Caballero or Kasai, or in the 1990s Barajas, Hassan, Lieu or Santos. [6.01]

Consequently, there have been little or no racial tensions in skateboarding. Someone like Brian
Casey, editor of 1980s skateboard 'zine Moral Vengeance, was then a typical relatively well-off white skater, choosing to live in a rough, predominantly black neighbourhood of Philadelphia.34

Racial mixing goes beyond simple integration however; for example, Chuck Treece, a 1980s professional skater from Philadelphia, was guitarist for the "McRad" and "McShred" skate-punk-reggae bands,35 and also black. As such, he had that "urban mystique that suburban kids cherish,"36 where black, Latino or Asian skaters can be attractive to white suburban skaters, in the same way that the latter are often heavy purchasers of gangsta rap music, or that Jamaican vocal inflections have become hip among white uk kids in the mid 1990s.37 Christian Hosoi, a professional skater from East LA in the 1980s, employed graffiti and gang culture in his product graphics and public image – and it is precisely these kinds of Hosoi's motifs that were emulated by suburban skaters.38 One advertisement for "Team Hosoi," for example, depicted Hosoi and another skater caught in the glare of a flash gun, as if arrested during a police gang bust; the gang-style logos on their boards are turned toward the camera, suggesting that the skateboards constitute offensive weapons.39 (06.02) Even earlier, the graphics on 1970s Dogtown skateboards had been derived from LA Chicano gang culture lettering styles,40 while later companies like Grind King41 and Neighborhood42 also displayed gangster environments through deck graphics and advertisements.

Skateboarding subculture is – with some distinct regional variations – a global practice. Besides the numerous titles of the usa and uk, skateboard-related magazines have been produced in countries as diverse as Australia (Slam, Australian Skateboarding, Skatin’ Life, Speed Wheels), Brazil (Brasil Skate, Overall, Skatin’), Canada (Concrete Powder), France (B-Side, Skate, Skateboard, Skate France International, Slalom, Zoom), Germany (Monster Mag), Italy (XXX), Japan (Lovely), Mexico (Skate), Portugal (Surf/Skate), Russia (Skeit Novosti), Spain

06.01 Local skaters of different ethnicities. Pier 7, San Francisco (1996).
Luke Ogden

06.02 Team Hosoi, advertisement with Christian Hosoi and Monty Nolder. TransWorld Skateboarding, v6 n.1 (February 1988). p. 38.
(Tres 60 Skate) and Sweden (Funsport, Daredevil). These magazines, together with the internet, ensure that skateboard subculture is a global as well as local activity, with skateboarders today in just about every city around the world. This is a spatial dispersion which transcends geographic, national and, often, racial barriers.

Conversely, at a regional level, skaters have often created socio-spatial competition and tense rivalries. On the one hand, there is the “modern” contradiction between individual loneliness and the bringing-together of masses in large cities, and, in this context, skateboarding is an attempt to know others in a city of unknowns, without resorting to the institutions of family, school and team sports. It uses the locality of immediate neighbourhoods and schools, but also brings together groups from different schools and neighbourhoods across the city. On the other hand, skateboarders can be very territorial about their district or skatepark. Cities in the 1970s and 1980s were given obtuse names by skaters such as “Dogtown” (Santa Monica) and, in emulation, “Fog Town” (London), “Pig City” (Brighton) and so on. More concretely, skaters often reacted with disdain or outright hostility to skaters from elsewhere. As Alva described the attitude of the LA skaters:

It was a pretty heavy scene. When we’re riding somewhere and someone put our area down, we stood up for it. Whether it meant fighting, talking or skating, all the guys were pretty loyal to their home turf and to the influences.

Here the city or skatepark functioned as enclosed, self-contained community in which conflict enhanced the sense of belonging, and which so, conversely, enhanced intra-regional rivalries.

Well it was a Souther’s mouth who started it, and it is the Dogtown challenge that is
going to prove something.\textsuperscript{47}

This was not a ghettoisation of different kinds of skateboarders, but a purely spatial fragmentation. Ultimately, allegiances to other skaters, despite territorial rivalries, far outweigh commonality with non-skaters.

Similar complications exist in terms of the gender relations in skateboarding. Female skaters have always existed even while broader conventions discourage them from skateboarding.\textsuperscript{48} As one female skater put it, "[w]e are few and far between, but we are out here."\textsuperscript{49} Possibly 25 per cent of skaters in Southern California in the 1970s were female\textsuperscript{50} (probably an overestimate), while there have always been notable female skaters, such as Ellen Berryman,\textsuperscript{51} Ellen O`Neal,\textsuperscript{52} Laura Thornhill,\textsuperscript{53} Sue Hazel,\textsuperscript{54} Sheenagh Burdell,\textsuperscript{55} Patti Hoffman,\textsuperscript{56} Stephanie Pearson, Michelle Picktin,\textsuperscript{57} Elissa Steamer,\textsuperscript{58} Vicki Vickers\textsuperscript{59} and Gale Webb.\textsuperscript{60}

Skateboard Scene in the UK ran its "Kate the Skate" column for young women skaters,\textsuperscript{61} and Powell-Peralta encouraged female skaters with advertisements proclaiming that "Some Girls Play With Dolls. Real Women Skate."\textsuperscript{62} More recently, in 1996 Thump marketed its "Tasty" range of decks specifically for female skaters.\textsuperscript{63} But these are rare positive promotions of female skaters, and, while skaters like Mark Baker acknowledged female skaters' achievements,\textsuperscript{64} and, conversely, others like Hosoi and Craig Johnson stated that women should not skate at all,\textsuperscript{65} more usually there is a kind of indifferent acceptance of female skaters by male skaters. Female skaters themselves seem to want more female skaters, but even here some suspicion remains.

[T]here's a lot of girls that sk8 around here . . . unfortunately, most of them just do it to impress guys and then when they get their man they pretty much quit.\textsuperscript{66}
Skateboarding remains a predominantly male activity, and most skate publications usually refer to skaters using the male terms of he, him, his etc. Similarly, a Powell-Peralta advertisement, contemporary with their “Real Women Skate” advertisement, purported to show “just some skaters,” but they all just happened to be male.67 Practices like these signify the assumption that skateboarders are male. While female skaters are not explicitly discouraged, their relative absence is only occasionally noted and implicitly condoned. 

External social factors may also lead to young women not taking up skateboarding, as for sport in general.

Shouldn’t a 15-year-old female be more interested in the conquest of young men than handplants and rock ‘n rolls? [These are] the traditional implications of being a girl involved in a sport generally regarded as male-oriented.58

Pressures include those not to display their body in a non-sexualised manner, not to damage or injure their body (“I can’t blame them for not wanting to get hurt”69), to focus on inter-gender social relations rather than self-development or homosocial exclusions of men, and to generally grow up as a (fully sexualised) adult faster than young men.

The main thing preventing women from participating in this “sport” of ours is not anything real, just familiar stupid ideologies.70

As one female skater recognised,

It’s kinda crazy to see a girl out there skating [. . . ] Girls aren’t supposed to be tough and if they are they’re considered to be butch or tomboy or lesbian maybe.71

Furthermore, other aspects of skateboarding
enforce male, heterosexual and sexist attitudes to women, and it is here that one of the most common contradictions in skateboard subculture occurs. While advertisers in the 1970s-80s were not entirely averse to sexist imagery, in the 1990s this has become more commonplace. For example, Big Brother magazine explicitly attacked the apparently cozy attitudes of manufacturers, magazines and skateboarders. One tactic involved printing explicit sexist articles, photographs and advertisements. For example, one issue contained readers' letters describing themselves as a "pussy getting machine," an advertisement for the "fuct" company with women spanking each other with skateboards, another for "Hooters" skateboard wheels with breast and nipple graphics and the slogan "urethane for men," and an article on "How to Pick Up Girls." Despite inevitable defences on the grounds of humour and general irreverence, skateboard companies and magazines have increasingly used such misogynist treatment of women as a way of selling skateboards. One of the most extreme examples is the World Industries company "Bitch," which used a traffic-sign style logo depicting a man pointing a gun at a woman's head, with the word "bitch" above. Although actually an industry in-joke, referring to a disenchanted offshoot of the "Girl" company, this was not readily discernible to outsiders - some of the furore surrounding this logo, leading to the removal of product and advertisements from some shops and magazines, was subsequently reported in Club International, the uk soft-porn magazine, as an amusing news item.

To raise another form of social difficulty, consider first that much skateboarding takes place collectively, young men watching each other and taking turns to perform. Skaters thus spend much time looking at photographs of other young men, emulating other young men, and displaying themselves to other young men. Skateboarding could thus easily be construed as a homosexual gesture, and perhaps as a result many skaters seem to react in a
number of different ways.

Firstly, there is homophobia. Big Brother itself is not overtly homophobic (despite an obsession with "circle jerking," masturbation and penis pumps), but this is a constant feature of the alt.skateboard dialogues, in which a rather uninformed debate takes place:

Let me tell you a story about gays, ok? Gays wear very tight pants because they like to look at asses[,] you know to stick their cocks in there and such. Skaters wear very baggy pants, I don't know why we just do. So therefore Skaters cannot be gay.

Similarly, in the film Kids two gay men encounter homophobic abuse from skaters hanging out in New York's Washington Park. Such actions are no doubt by no means unique to skateboarding subculture, but, for some skaters they undoubtedly form part of their everyday language and abuse.

Second, there is an induction to heterosexual and homosocial masculinity implicit in attitudes to gender. As Judith Butler has asserted, gender and sexuality are not fixed and a priori conditions, but social and historical, "performatively produced and compelled by the regulatory practices of gender coherence." Again, this is also explicit in Kids, in the relationship between the two main characters Casper and Telly throughout, and where the youngest boys (around 12 years old) are pushed to talk about their sexual proclivities and preferences far in advance of their actual experiences. Through such social activities, skaters like other young men produce themselves as heterosexual males with a particular construction of masculinity. In this light, the exchange of image-moves discussed in Chapter 5 may be interpreted as an exchange of (heterosexual) masculinity, with new skaters becoming inducted through their performance of moves into the repertoire of male skate behaviour, ranging from skateboard moves themselves, to forms of dress,
We’re all like brothers. We fight like brothers, party like brothers, skate like brothers. We have a good time.\textsuperscript{83}

As Ivan Hosoi, father of Christian and manager of Marina del Rey skatepark, commented of the skatepark’s regular punk rock party events which often cumulated in fights and brawls,\textsuperscript{84}

It was kids letting their aggression out. They wanted to get a little cut and bleed.\textsuperscript{85}

This was also the case with skateboarding injuries, the experience of falling sometimes seen by skaters as a way of bonding with other male skaters through aggressive masculinity.

All that gravity sucks you down to the cement and makes you fuckin’ slam, it brings your aggression out. You just go ‘Fuck!’ [. . .] Blood. Getting hurt. Guys need to do that. Its a way of getting together to get aggro with your friends.\textsuperscript{86}

Give Blood. Skateboard.\textsuperscript{87}

In a similar vein are advertisements such as that for the Alva team and products in 1988. [06.13] Here 12 men nearly all dressed in black leather stare indifferently and meanly.\textsuperscript{88} The general effect is of men relating to men through confrontational aggression and gang-like affiliations, a “ganster-don’t-give-a-shit attitude.”\textsuperscript{89} As Alva previously explained, “skateboarding is not for sissies.”\textsuperscript{90}

The third response is to see skateboarding not as a group but solitary practice, each person performing as an individual. Here, the sexual politics are about self-satisfaction, where the skater’s body-centric space production is self-referential, on the one hand largely absolved of social context, and on the other hand imbued with the desire to make the body a realm of highly significant action. Here, that
significance is onanistic, an intimate space produced by individuals in search of self-expression, self-fulfilment and self-satisfaction.

Such inward-directed concerns help explain the connection between skateboarding and the “Straight Edge” movement of the late 1980s-90s. Straight Edge young men (and women) – including Danforth and many other skaters – forswore unsafe sex (or sex altogether), alcohol, drugs, smoking and meat-eating to focus on the body as a lean, pure development of the self. This was a largely middle class, white rejection of drug-taking, and a self-defence against the challenges of sexuality, without openly embracing Moral Majority “just say no” values. In skateboarding, Straight Edge became even more explicit through the aggressive use of the body imbued in its spatialised muscularity, appropriative tactics and general subcultural attitudes. Much of this is also latent in skateboarding as a whole, with even non-Straight Edge skaters seeing themselves distinct from the indulgences of non-skaters. “People that smoke and drink are fake.”

The fourth response, as the celibacy of many Straight Edgers suggests, is to deny sexuality altogether, and this can be seen, for example, in the baggy clothes adopted by many skaters since the late 1980s. Although obviously functional, allowing more freedom to perform moves, such clothes also mask the specific muscularity or shape of the body, and so lessen both the physiological appearance of any skater and the difference between male and female skaters. This may also relate to how skaters are often seen as socially dysfunctional or odd individuals who do not readily fit in with conventional youth cultures. The counter-cultural aspects of skateboarding thus carries within it a social reticence that is not always aggressive or boastful to the rest of society.

Everywhere I’ve ever lived and everyone I’ve ever hung out with has always made me feel out of place. I’ve never fitted in everywhere [...] That’s why I skate.
6.03 Attitude, Design, Rejection

Identity is not who you are, or your ethnic origins, but an individual and collective construction of what you are doing and with what attitude. As Paul Gilroy puts it, quoting rap artist Rakim, "It Ain't Where You're From, It's Where You're At." We must therefore turn to consider skateboarding subculture as a general attitude toward other skaters and to non-skaters.

According to Lefebvre, the romantic's "revolt against society" is also "a protest against the absence of genuine society," in which individuals express their lack of social base by withdrawing into themselves and into "isolated groups" and "deviant milieus." Or as one skater put it,

One of the most powerful forces applied to the average teenager is conformity. In school, you are expected to want to join that elite, popular group of people, and use their standards for hairstyle, dress, talk, and spare time. At home, parents want you to join a "real sport," or get better friends or whatever. Well, remember this, you only live once, so don't live to keep anybody happy but yourself. The genuine people are those who don't choose to follow the lemmings.

Skateboarding subculture thus sees both a specific lack in society, and conceives of itself as somehow more honest and more directly connected to urban living: "I'm here to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth." This is manifested in two distinct yet inter-related aspects of skateboarding subculture: firstly, the rejection of society as a whole, and second the rejection of the normative patterns of the family and, in particular, the work-leisure, workplace-home socio-spatial routines of the traditional nuclear family. We shall consider each in turn.

Rejection of Society


As this quotation (parodied from the film Trainspotter) shows, faced with the normative options offered to them by society, skaters are prompted to ask "am I even existing?," to which their own response is that they exist through electing to skateboard.

In subcultural terms, this is expressed most clearly in the boundaries of the skater's board, body, clothes and actions. While some manufacturers have occasionally tried to create a co-ordinated narrative form - such as the Powell-Peralta "Bones Brigade" military team imagery of the early 1980s - more usually, subculture is developed through a series of complementary but unconsciously co-ordinated internalised worlds, composed of clothes, music, stickers, board design, language and other forms of communication.

The tensions between skaters and non-skaters are thus reflected in the graphic style which skaters have adopted. Typically, this involves the adoption of certain motifs, foremost among in the 1980s of which was the skull (particularly favoured by influential skater-designer Pushead working for Thrasher and Zorlac skateboards) replacing 1970s surf-related themes of sun and ocean with those of death and primitive survival. If these symbols created a code incomprehensible to the outside observer, then that it is all to the good; it mattered only that skateboarding as a "partial group" should be noticed, not understood.

These symbols are equivocal and ambiguous. They manifest, yet they translate and
06.15 Surf-style imagery. T-shirts (1979).

06.16 Bones and skull imagery (1988).

Iain Borden

express the secret aspirations of each group. They are what unites each group and differentiates it from all the others.\textsuperscript{105}

In particular, this imagery involves the bottom of the skateboard deck, where a highly graphic design is usually placed.\textsuperscript{[04.15, 04.17]} Invisible while the skateboard is on the ground, the design becomes highly visible when certain above-ground moves are performed (or when the board is being carried). Since the late 1980s, starting with companies like Powell-Peralta and designers like David Castle at \textit{TransWorld Skateboarding}, skateboard symbolisms have become increasingly pluralistic or "lateral," including such things as light bulbs in a field (Panic "Light bulbs" model), semi-naked women (Acme "Knockers" model), cartoon cows (New Deal "Happy Cow" model), Escher style geometric patterns (Consolidated "Pattern" model), aliens (Alien Workshop "Alien Smacker" model), Oriental figures (World Industries "Daewon" model), and architects’ drawing instruments (Blueprint, "Grand Architects" model).\textsuperscript{106} What they all share is not, then, a common subject matter but a heavily non-realist graphic style, ranging from the airbrushing of heavy metal music album covers to the cartoon style of children’s comics, to medieval or oriental illustrative techniques. One particularly prevalent stream within this, especially in the late 1980s, has been an anarcho-punk use of slogans and political imagery, typified by the work of skater-designer Nick Philip, former art editor of the skateboard \textit{R.A.D.}\textsuperscript{[06.18]} Another stream is a sophisticated typographic and (post)modernist imagery, such as those used in Blueprint skateboard graphics, redolent of such high-profile graphic groups as Sheffield-based "The Designers Republic."\textsuperscript{108}

Consumer products, advertising, Japanese cartoons, instruction manuals, electronic gadgets, \textit{BladeRunner} movies, the Macintosh computer – anything relating to current marketing tactics and/or electronics – all find their way into their work, intentionally creating confusion and chaos which [ . . . ] appropriately reflects today’s society.\textsuperscript{109}

Between the two lies the work of those like skater-designer Ged Wells and his Insane skate clothes company, deploying cartoon imagery of everyday objects and distorted animalistic figures.\textsuperscript{[06.17]}

Skateboarding graphics are thus in keeping with the symbolism of Lefebvre’s "partial groups,” maintaining a curious mix of the modern, futuristic and old, near and distant, familiar and strange.\textsuperscript{111} Like the creation of “skate rock” music in the 1980s\textsuperscript{112} – a mixture of hardcore, rap and other alternative music variants, played by local bands with titles like Beach Blanket Bongout, McRad, Skatemaster Tate and His Concrete Crew, and Tupelo Chain Sex\textsuperscript{113} – the general effect is thoroughly postmodern, an eclectic hybridity of different times, places, cultures and styles. Around 80 per cent of skateboard graphics are done by skaters themselves and, above all, the stylistic and subject hybridity created suggests an alternative reality, parallel to the everyday world of work, money, leisure time, shopping, routines and realist photography. Some skaters like Mark Gonzales and Neil Blender became as famous for their designs as skateboarding prowess,\textsuperscript{114} while exhibitions of skate graphics have been held at such places as the Institute of Contemporary Arts, London ("Uncut," 30-31 August 1997),\textsuperscript{[06.17]} Thread Waxing Space, New York (Aaron Rose, "Shred Sled Symposium"),\textsuperscript{115} and the \textit{Blue Note}, London ("Dysfunctional," summer 1995).\textsuperscript{116} Skate magazines also run occasional features on skater-produced art and design.\textsuperscript{117}

Thus while attempts are continually made to institutionalise and “integrate the adolescent in trade and consumption by offering him a parallel everyday life,”\textsuperscript{118} in skateboarding this process is resisted by young people setting up their own parallel world, distinct from the one organised for them.
by parents and the state. It is not the product of design that is important in skateboarding, but rather the manner and attitude with which it is deployed: a "graphic has to have some kind of attitude." As with Lefebvre, there is "[m]ore importance to style in life than to constructs!" The resonances of skateboarding postmodern graphic fusions are, then, largely incomprehensible to anyone outside skateboarding's own mind-set and, furthermore, are irrational and incoherent even to skaters themselves. The fast turnover of models and the ephemerality of skateboard decks once in use attenuates this situation still further. In terms of consumer products, for example, skateboard deck designs have often re-used such motifs as the Church of Scientology “Dianetics” logo (World Industries Randy Colvin “Colvinetics” model) and Burger King “Bun Halves” motif (World Industries Jason Lee model, designed by Mark McKee) to destabilise their apparent legitimacy. These "appropriations of mainstream corporate imagery" were meant by skater-designers like Jeff Klint as a "post modern commentary; mixed with the other rich graphic and cultural sources open to skaters, such designs are suggestive of the undefined, loose cultural hybridity without strict codes or organisation theorised by, among others, Homi Bhabha.

Of course, skateboard culture is commodified in that capitalism markets skateboarding back to its participants, a business variously estimated at between US$300 million and US$500 million in the late 1980s, and with around 300-400 professional skaters in the 1990s. But skateboarders try to resist even this process. Firstly, this happens through the generation of non-commodifiable items, which, apart from skate moves themselves, are often forms of language. Some terms relate to moves, as described in Chapter 5, but others are value-laden general descriptions, such as words like cool, gnarly, insane, fat/phat, radical, wicked and sick, all signifying approval of some kind.
fact that they are owned and run by current and/or former skaters. Certainly, skaters like Alva, Peralta, Muir and others in the 1970s quickly left the teams of other manufacturers to set up their own skater-run companies; Alva Skates began with a series of decks in late 1977. As Alva described the position of professional skaters at this time:

[They were like puppets ...] we finally said, "we're getting burnt, and we gotta do something about it." We gotta start our own companies, quit making boards and wheels and money for other people so they can put our names on them and we can promote them with our activity.

Later professional skateboarders such as Steve Rocco (World Industries), Tony Magnusson (H-Street), Gonzales (Blind) and Hawk (Birdhouse) did the same thing. Thus while capitalist economic relations between owners and staff are still largely upheld, there is an attempt made to enact a separate circuit of capital which exists entirely within skaters, skaters buying from other skaters, who in turn re-invest in skateboarding by providing not only better equipment but also sponsorship for skaters, skate events, ramps and so forth.

Ultimately, however, this looks increasingly like being a self-delusional ideology. There are apparently a great number of different skateboard companies, some of them quite small, together with at least three skateboard magazines of distinct voice and worldwide distribution (all three US-based): Big Brother, Thrasher and TransWorld Skateboarding.

Together, these suggest an industry made up from a diverse and fragmented set of independent manufacturers.

However, while the numerous retail outlets are indeed commonly independently owned, often acting as much as a kind of hang-out social centre as a shop, the magazines and manufacturers are different in character. Following the demise of skatepark-based skateboarding, street skating took over, requiring smaller, lighter and more manoeuvrable boards. This equipment also wore out faster as smaller wheels flat-spotted and lighter decks broke more quickly, with skaters needing to buy equipment every few months, or even sooner.

This had clear profit advantages to manufacturers and shops.

We love it because kids go through the shit even faster.

Furthermore, the profits in the early 1990s increasingly fell to three dominant Californian manufacturers – Fausto Vitello of San Francisco, Rocco of LA and Lawrence Balma of Torrance – each controlling multitudinous different internationally-distributed companies making skateboard decks, trucks, wheels, clothes, shoes and videos. Complex ownership arrangements masked their direct involvement, but one estimate is that Vitello, Rocco and Balma accounted for 70 per cent of skateboarding sales. This was done while maintaining the image of an industry constituted by small-scale, independent, skater-run companies. In the 1980s, most skateboard manufacturers tried to promote an industry worth between US$300-500 million as a legitimate sport with formalised competition procedures and codes of behaviour; in this they were supported by the magazine TransWorld Skateboarding (1983 onward) and by the US National Skateboard Association (NSA), which organised the majority of contests. Against this legitimised corporate image, more recent manufacturers tried to re-emphasise the anarchic tradition within skateboarding. Rocco was particularly adept at this game, setting up World Industries in the late 1980s to "turn up the heat on everything." Rocco positioned himself as a former skateboard professional sympathetic to his team skaters, allowing them to act as they wanted, minimising rules, and
abusing other manufacturers. Similarly, Balma, while less overtly exploitative of a small-scale skater-run company image than Rocco, saw it as important – he was a more conventional and elderly business-person – that he maintained a low-key presence.

There's a consumer out there who in his early teens really wants to identify with [a product]. If it's part of one corporation, then maybe it's not so neat.

Balma thus kept hidden from skaters his ownership of Tracker, A-1, Skate Rages, House of Kasai, Limpies and many others. Vitello similarly worked with professional skateboarders to set up seemingly independent small companies, such as Think, while editorials in his Thrasher simultaneously affirmed that there were “so many, small skater-run companies out there.” Rocco also adopted this tactic, using professional skaters to head-up seemingly independent brands that were in reality “new paint on old wood – Rocco will soon have set up every skater in the world with his own company.”

Rocco, Balma and Vitello also each controlled one of the three major magazines which supported their businesses, either through advertisements or stories on skaters sponsored by their companies. For example, in the May 1994 issue of the Vitello-published Thrasher, 35 per cent of advertising was for Vitello-associated companies, not including the numerous manufacturers to whom Vitello’s companies supplied wheels and trucks for re-badging as own brand equipment. Similarly, Balma’s TransWorld Skateboarding carried no advertisements from Vitello’s competitive High Speed Productions, although it did feature skaters from Balma’s competitors.

Perhaps becoming more aware of skateboarding’s more profit-oriented side, and like all youth becoming increasingly aware of their own general colonisation by business interests, skateboarders have also tried to resist the commodification of skateboarding by, curiously, returning to mainstream products and rejecting skateboarder-targeted products. The logic here is a complex one, and is predicated once again on the need for a subcultural identity to remain apart from more normative lifestyles. Skateboarding has always had its own clothes and safety equipment associated with it, including, in the 1970s and 1980s, specialist shoes from manufacturers like Vans (founded 1966) and Vision, protective pads from Rector, helmets from Protec and Norton, plus a vast range of proprietary socks, shorts, T-shirts and caps which constituted skateboarding style. In the late 1980s and 1990s, however, as skateboarding has become a more fashionable activity in general, skateboard clothing has become extremely popular in mainstream culture. Specialist skateboard shoes by firms like Vans, Airwalk, Converse and DC could, in 1997, be found in mass-market stores across the UK (Vans and Airwalk reached an annual turnover of US$100 and 200 million respectively by 1996). Clothes such as those made Stussy, originally marketed to skateboarders in the 1980s, similarly became general high-street fare. As a result, suspicious of the reappropriation of a skate-style by non-skaters, some skateboarders have given up wearing their own subcultural clothing. In doing so, skaters realise that the right to be different is meaningful...
only when based on actions to establish differences, and thus that their identity is based on the activity of skateboarding, and not purely on the style adopted in clothes, shoes and so forth.

The embeddedness of skateboard subculture with other counter-cultural practices can be seen in the increasing number from the early 1980s onward of 'zines (home-produced magazines, often duplicated on photocopy machines and sold by post at low cost). To begin with, the 'zines focused mainly on skateboarding itself, and in particular the more hardcore elements of its subculture.

The skate zines speak of alienation, rebelliousness, making your own contests, building your own presence. They're into who's going higher, who's grinding the longest, who's ramp is open, who's building [. . .]

Quotes are frequent such as: "Everybody was lame at one time," "Skate or Die," "Skate Tough or Go Home," "Don't be a poseur," "Live to skate and skate to Live," "Slam the Rules."

Typical titles here included Beneath the Grey Dome, [06.22] Big Beef, Bodyslam, Gut Feel'n, Kona Report, Mutant King Roller, Naughty Nomads, No Pedestrians, Ragged Edge, Skate Fate, Skater of Fortune and Tabby News (US), Street Noise [06.23] (Australia), Death Zone and Scum (Germany), Vertikaal (Sweden), and Go For It, Gutterstrut, Jammer, Rip'n'Tear, Skate Muties from the 5th Dimension, Skateroo, Sketchy and Whiplash (UK).

Later 'zines range from Duh (Belgium) and Cow Pat, Check My Chops, [06.24] Spread, New Spurts and Chimps (UK), available for little more than the cost of postage, to nationally distributed, low-budget magazines like Ergo Sum and Big Cheese, with articles on skateboarding but also on break dancing, drag racing, clothes, art/graphic design, prostitution, music, snowboarding and bicycle mx.

The most constant form of rejection of society
by skateboarding has come not from the ‘zines, however, but from Thrasher magazine which, despite its Vitello-industry associations has been the most accurate and influential mouth-piece for that young generation identified by Lefebvre as having a "hatred - blind or conscious - for the pressures exerted by authority, and for the whole range of established ‘realities,’” which is “no longer seduced, satisfied or overwhelmed by refrigerators and automobiles;” this is a youth who initiates a new way of life via a “revolutionary romanticism, without theory yet highly effective” and who “demand while contesting and contest while demanding.”

Founded in San Francisco in January 1981 and with a circulation of around 160,000 in 1994, Thrasher has offered a complete guide to skateboard subculture including articles on rock music and junk food (“skarfing material - fuelling up for skating”, written by Vietnam veteran Chef-Boy-am-I-Hungry) as well as local scene material, reader photographs, competition reports, interviews and manufacturers’ advertisements. (p.25) Published in the spirit of the ‘zines, Thrasher has used terse articles and by-lines like “Truth and Screw the Consequences” and “Trash” to present skateboarding as something more than hobby or fashion. Of greater importance is the attitude of skaters: their understanding of what skateboarding is all about. Thrasher also exemplifies the comic mode within romanticism, which ridicules those in power (both within and outside of skateboarding) in order to make them human, but also as a form of vengeance and subversion. What skateboarders find humour in is the values of the dominant orders and here they directly fulfil one of Lefebvre’s political expectations of the youth, ridiculing virtues of decency, respect, ostentatious good health and so on, specifically for skateboarders as represented in such things as signs, private property, function, work, respect for elderly, respect for others, authori-
ty against children in general, notions of good behaviour including those to do with movement and noise, the distinction or definition of sports, bodily functions and so on. In turn, skaters’ own values become “acts and decisions, elements in a strategy,” forming a subculture based on an anti-order of nihilism, bad taste, scatological humour, swearing, poor diets – anything that might be construed as being antagonistic or offensive to others.

Skateboarding is the only thing I have that is worth anything to me. It’s the one and only thing that I love. It’s the only thing that gives an otherwise empty life some kind of definition.158

In skating, nothing is defined, everything can be new. There are no laws.159

The use of ramps in urban areas, for example, almost invariably brings complaints from neighbours about noise, for the repetitive cracks and grinds when the skateboarder engages with the ramp creates a sound pattern more akin to a construction site than a residential area: a “hollow thump upon impact” every time a move is made. Apart from the noise itself, implicit in such complaints are often a dislike of the make-shift appearance of many ramps, often made from a patch-work of wood and metal salvaged locally, and of the dishevelled clothing and behaviour of skaters themselves.161 Where local ordinances allow, neighbours have successfully had ramps removed for creating a “visible nuisance.”162 One neighbour complained of a ramp in the beach city of Carmel.

RESIGNATION LETTER

Dear ________________________
I’ve worked for you for __________ years. It seems like ________________
Working for you was more boring than ________________
Well, no more you ________________ You can shove your job up your ________________
I’m no longer your wage slave, and it feels ________________ great.
You think money means more than ________________ but one day you’ll learn otherwise.
I may be skint from ________________ but I’ll be doing what I want. Unlike you.

DATE

__________________________
YOUR NAME

P.S. Fu[c]k work before it fu[c]ks you.


It’s an obscene edifice . . . it’s very ugly, it’s such a disgrace it should be chopped down this minute.163

With objections like these replicated across the us, it became nearly impossible to build a substantial ramp in, for example, LA without going to the valleys and outskirts.164

Ramps, their users and effects are thus part of the disorder that skaters like to create in the city. Above all, what is important is not any specific detail is important – and indeed there are many skaters who do not drink, take drugs, abuse their own bodies etc. – but a general manner by which skateboarding subculture replaces conventional city life with a new totalising self-identity in which partial allegiance is to miss the point. “Right now, I just care about skating.”165 This is expressed in skateboarding as a continual undercurrent, but which is also frequently expressed overtly, as in advertisements offering binary opposition choices such as “Skate or be Stupid” or between skating or a boring job as a wage slave, ending “Fu[c]k work before it fu[c]ks you.”167
Rejection of the Family

Another explicit opposition expressed by skateboarding subculture is that against the family, a theme which of course is a general condition of youth cultures which "revolt against the Fathers."\textsuperscript{168}

Skater kids are not kids bred on milk and cookies. They're not kids whose dads gave them batting practice out in the front yard or drove them to the ice-rink. It's not a father-son deal. It's just the opposite.\textsuperscript{169}

R.A.D.: What's your relationship like with your parents?
Simon Evans: It's kinda bad.\textsuperscript{170}

With few alternatives outside of the given institutions of school, family and organised recreation, skaters opt instead for a sense of personal freedom that flies in the face of Little League America, or normative Britain.\textsuperscript{171} One us skater saw skateboarding in the following context.

Baseball, hotdogs, apple pie, weed, beer, pills, needles, alcohol etc., etc., are all typical hobbies of all the typical people in all the typical states in the typical country of the United States of Amerika [...] Why be a clone? Why be typical? \textsuperscript{172}

Similarly, skaters in Oxford were seen to possess "a vicious disregard for family, society, and the British way of life."\textsuperscript{173} The primary concern of skateboarders is to be not like the conventional family, and, in particular, not to like either the conventional son, and, by extension, not to become the conventional father. On a more concrete level, skaters like Mike Vallely, when they came to be parents themselves, disillusioned with the nuclear family model, often tried to avoid replicating concerns with vaccination, formal schooling and other bugbears of conventional parenting.\textsuperscript{174}

Skaters refuse the model of adulthood their parents require them to participate within.\textsuperscript{175} In doing so, skateboarders refuse the binary choice of opting between opting childhood and conventional adulthood, and creating a third condition which is irreducible to the former two. For older skaters, like Rodga Harvey, Lance Mountain and Rocco, this meant at once being an adult while rejecting some of the normative behaviour patterns that this conventionally entails.

I'm 33 now: if I was going to give in to an "adult" type attitude I'd have given up long ago.\textsuperscript{176}

If it gets too serious, I really don't like it . . . I don't think any skater is into growing up.\textsuperscript{177}

I haven't grown up.\textsuperscript{178}

This may also account for some of the adult disdain toward skateboarding, for the skateboarder/child/adult is a continual reminder that the adult did not necessarily have to make the choices they did.

This concern with age also, inevitably, has its spatial dimension, for as Lefebvre notes, "[T]ime is distinguishable but not separable from space."\textsuperscript{179} Phenomena like growth, maturation and ageing are not only temporal but spatial, as with the tree trunk rings which reveal age spatially. In skateboarding however this time-age relation is not marked in concrete objects but through the spatial performances of skateboarders.

Part of the critique by skaters of public space is then of it as an "adult" space of serious productivity or consumption, or as "high cultural" activities. Skateboarding is then a re-appropriation of the adult realm, and also, especially as skaters get older, a redefinition of what adult space might be. This is also part of the historical development of skateboarding, for where in the 1970s the urban
space of the skater was that of the suburban drive – a traditional place for children to play, especially in cul-de-sacs – in the 1980s and 1990s this has increasingly become the adult space of the city, its streets, squares and roads with all their social complexity and dangers.

"Play" in the street skating of the 1980s and 1990s (explored in more detail in Chapter 7) is then quite different to the street skating of 1970s surf-related skateboarding, and has become a rejection not only of the family as a social unit, and of the Father as social role model, but also of the family home as the social space of the young adult. As Piercy put it:

I'm not interested in staying home and being uncreative.180

In turning to urban space, skateboarders in part reject the attempt by capitalism to "distil its essence into buildings," focusing on the "genitality" of the family and its biological reproduction.181 They oppose not just the family per se, but also both its implicated role in capitalist social reproduction, and spatiality implicit in that relation.

This is also how skateboarders ultimately confront the twin problems of alienation and the construction of self-identity. Skaters are alienated by the externally rational world that they are told, as young adults, they must learn. Skateboarding, however, encourages them to construct relations with others and the city according to their own values. In isolation from non-skaters but in company with other skaters, skateboarding, like any subculture, produces both new alienations and new groupings; and in terms of social power, skating redefines the site or objective of "change" such that skaters get power over something, seeking a place over which they have control: a place which is neither school, family home, nor place of work. And it is this urban realm which is considered in the next chapter of this thesis.

6.04 Subculture and the City

This is an important part of the argument presented here. If we remain purely within the realm of the social or the symbolic, there are too many delusional ideologies which do not make sense; symbols and social relations in particular provide a veneer concealing underlying contradictions.182 On the one hand, skaters try to step outside of the traditional patterns of normative work patterns, clothes, music and so forth, while also trying to keep at bay such institutionalising agencies as the World Skateboard Association (us, 1970s), International Skateboard Association (us, 1970s), Professional Skateboard Association (us, 1970s183), National Skateboard Association (us, founded 1981184), Pacific Skateboard Association (us, founded 1976185) British Skateboarding Association (uk, founded 1977 as an offshoot of the Sports Council)186 and Scottish Skateboard Association (founded 1977).187 On the other hand, skaters set up their own semi-conventionalised rules of behaviour, composed of language, clothes, commodity exchanges and so on. In particular, some of the home-produced 'zines like Cake-Fat, Mad Monks and Cow Pat, through their coverage of issues ranging from video and music reviews, to reports on local skate scenes, to cake recipes, cats, soy milk, manga Japanese graphics, ice cream and alien sightings,188 create a homely sense of security in the face of the threatening insecurity of the modern world and city; it is worth noting in this context that the age group of 15-24 year-olds is increasingly recognised as a stage of vulnerability and high suicide rates, with these young adults threatened by AIDS, unemployment and a general demonisation by the rest of society.189 In this light the search for a kind of counter-cultural stability is more comprehensible; for example, skateboarders' clothes can seem predictably similar, all in the "rigorously shapeless uniform of baseball caps, T-shirts and shorts."190 Of 50 or so skaters outside the Rådhus
(City Hall) in Oslo, April 1997, all but a very few were wearing the same kind of baggy trousers, T-shirt and woolly "Beanie" hat. Such things are not accidental, and whether overtly counter-cultural or not, they aid in the construction of a particular (genderised) identity. As a result, skaters replicate within themselves exactly that "dreary, ludicrous repetition of individuals who are curiously similar in their way of being themselves and of keeping themselves to themselves, in their speech, their gestures, their everyday habits."192

Thus while skateboarding is frequently a non-organised or semi-organised activity, skateboarders remain within the realm of their (masculine) private consciousness, with little sense of communion with their own situation, or with non-skaters; as with any specialism and sub-systems of culture, they often end up communicating only "their own rules of conduct, their empty shell."193

In particular, like many young adults, skateboarders have little sense of history, and indeed see ignorance of the past as something to be proud of in their celebration of themselves as a "pure beginning."194

Skaters have the memory of a stoner who’s spent the last ten years with the shades drawn and his lips glued to the bong.195

Young adults’ “arrogant, virtually unmotivated indifference towards the past,”196 is, among skateboarders, even directed at their own history, for skaters in general display a general ignorance of the development of skate moves and so on.

History, by definition, is a dead issue. The past is the past and the future is sometime else. Skateboarding dwells in the present. Yesterday’s heroes, the mangled messages left molding by the all-fronts media blitz and tomorrow’s tragedies are all meaningless to the contemporary skater. All that matters is

Skateboarding takes place – as far as skateboarders perceive it – also entirely within the present, such that among skateboarders there is the continual view of themselves as being “new” pioneers, while in fact previous generations of skaters (3-4 years or more older) have already undertaken similar actions, As such, although history never reproduces itself completely, there is a risk of repeating what has happened before, and it is therefore essential for skateboarders to deny the past.

While skateboarding critiques normative lifestyles, taken as a purely social activity it is also exactly this normative lifestyle which it tends to replicate or parallel, creating a “surrogate social structure, complete with its own rules and rituals.”199 Or in Antonio Gramsci’s terms, skaters actively consent in the transference of ideas from dominant groups to themselves.200 This is particularly evident with the formation of skateboard companies with professional team skaters, where skateboarding tends to mirror the same business world it purportedly disavows, and where skaters like Hosoi and Hawk earned up to US$200,000 annually, largely
from product endorsements.\textsuperscript{201} And, increasingly, many professional and semi-professional skaters see their ultimate career not in skateboarding as an activity, but as an industry in which to found a skate-oriented equipment/clothes/shoes enterprise.\textsuperscript{202} Here, then, if we take the oppositional attitude as the core of skateboarding subculture, the danger is that skateboarding merely creates a fiction of itself, disguising the degree to which it is compelled both by the external world and its own rules.

Yet as Lefebvre notes, the imaginary does not only disguise fictions but also provides the possibility of adaptation;\textsuperscript{203} and for skateboarding, it is when placed in relation to spatial concerns, as hinted at in the brief discussion of familial space above, that a more distinct practice is disclosed. If skateboarders, as adolescents, become “brutally assertive” in the face of their incapacity to impose values, consuming the adult objects that surround them,\textsuperscript{204} it is the city that this assertive violence is set against. Indeed, this is a necessary process, for differing social groups can only constitute themselves as subjects through producing a space, lest they stay merely as signs; in order to create sustain and reproduce an identity for themselves, groups cannot use space as a mirror, but must appropriate space as part of an historical process.\textsuperscript{205}

To understand skateboarding we must, then, consider it directly in relation to the spatial. Skateboarding subculture is enacted not as a purely socio-economic enterprise, but as a physical activity, undertaken against the materiality of the modern city, and hence it is when practised as a simultaneously spatial, socially lived and temporal practice that a critique, as we shall now see, does emerge.

Thrashing is part of a lifestyle, a fast-paced feeling to fit this modern world. Thrashing is finding something and taking it to the ultimate limit – not dwelling on it, but using it to the fullest and moving on. Skateboarding has not yet reached its maximum potential, and who can say what the limits are? To find out – Grab that board! [. . .] Remember, there are tons of asphalt and concrete being poured every day, so – GRAB THAT BOARD!\textsuperscript{206}

The next chapter therefore investigates the emergence of streetskating in the 1980s and 1990s, seeing it as deriving from the demise of skateparks and, more importantly, from the possibilities of modern architecture. Potential political directions are considered, before a focused investigation of skateboarding’s physical engagement with the city and its architecture, the implicit critique made of capitalism and architecture as commodity, the performative mode of critique adopted, and the socio-spatial conflicts and censorship engendered as a consequence of such actions.
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You self-righteous, blind, arseholes. You cannot control the use of public space.¹

When fun is outlawed, only the outlaws will have fun.²

The urban practice of skateboarding implicitly yet continuously critiques contemporary cities. Furthermore, where capitalist abstract space contains within itself the seeds of its successor – Lefebvre’s putative differential space in which socio-spatial differences are emphasised and celebrated³ – practices like skateboarding may thus partially prefigure what this differential space might be.

Two hundred years of American technology has unwittingly created a massive cement playground of unlimited potential. But it was the minds of 11 year olds that could see that potential.⁴

Diversity. That’s my new word right now.⁵

Through an everyday practice – neither consciously theorised nor programmed – skateboarding suggests that pleasure rather than work, use values rather than exchange values, activity rather than passivity, performing rather than recording, are potential components of the future, as yet unknown city.

To consider this matter, we return to the periodised history of skateboarding, specifically to the late 1970s and 1980s, before moving rapidly to the later 1980s onward.

### 7.01 The Emergence of Street Skating

Spring 1981: skating goes underground and back into the streets.⁶

The 1970s skateparks did not usually prove good investments, partly due to the general down-turn in popularity of skateboarding in the late 1970s; already in 1978 many us skateparks were insolvent after lavish construction costs necessitated admission charges of us$3-6 per 2 hour session,⁷ and by 1980 many had closed.⁸ In the uk, peak skateboard sales in Christmas 1977 were followed by decline;⁹ some skateparks had already closed by July 1978,¹⁰ and many more by February 1979.¹¹ By the end of 1981, the remainder were struggling for survival,¹² often meeting an ignoble fate; Chester’s “Inner City Truckers” concrete forms became derelict or filled with stagnant rain water, with the owner imprisoned for embezzling membership fees.¹³ [07.01] By 1982, most had ceased operations; many closed skateparks were often illegally skated, but they too often met with demolition within a few years. [07.02] Even the most successful of us skateparks faced problems: by 1982, Pipeline was lucky to attract 15
skaters per weekend, with Cherry Hill and Apple reduced to weekend-only opening.

Other problems concerned heavy insurance premiums for, despite maintaining "impressive safety records," skateparks suffered from the us "liability crisis."

Nobody twisted your arm to make you go skateboarding [...] But the American society is so sue conscious that they figure this is the way to riches.

By 1978, skatepark owners found good insurance coverage almost impossible to obtain. California eventually legislated for limited skatepark liability, but this was over a decade away, and in any case still kept skateboarding off the "Hazardous Activities" list preventing participants from suing public organisations. Pipeline eventually did without insurance altogether, while other skateparks asked for a legally-dubious liability release to be signed.

Skatepark owners also faced difficulties from developers seeking more profitable uses as leases ran out. The large size of many US skateparks made redevelopment particularly attractive as when Del Mar Skate Ranch was replaced by a hotel complex. Consequently many skateparks ceased operations. The first of the major Californian facilities to go was Big "O," shortly followed by Lakewood in 1982 which became a McDonald's. Runway became an rv showroom, Hi Roller (Boulder, Colorado) was redeveloped as a condominium and rent-a-car development, and Ranch, after some illegal post-closure skateboarding, eventually became a ploughed field. In Florida, only around a quarter of skateparks remained. Most were demolished or filled in, but some survived either as ruins or semi-buried, such as the large three-quarter pipe of Big "O." Where possible, skaters scavenged coping and other fragments for mementoes or re-use on ramps.

Although some endured (often through the custom of bmx cyclists), with even a few new skateparks built in the 1980s-90s, by the early-1980s the dominance of skateparks over skateboarding was over. In 1980, SkateBoarder transmogrified into the "sports/lifestyle" SkateBoarder's Action Now (later Action Now), covering the "new age sports" of snowboarding, windsurfing, bodyboarding and bmx. The decline also affected companies, many of whom folded, and professional skaters — in 1980 there were 175 pros at the Gold Cup series, while within a year only 15 were left.

Skateboarding itself, however, did not disappear, but was recharged in response to the changing architectural conditions. "Take it where you want
and use it *how you want*.” In the 1980s, skateboarding increasingly focused not on the extreme ramp or skatepark terrain (although magazines continued to cover these kinds of skateboarding), but the quotidian public street.

[0]ut there in the concrete jungle exist literally thousands of shreddable terrains in the form of banks, ramps, pools, curbs, loading docks, steps, parking garages, your driveway, anything!

The use of urban streets was, of course, a long skateboarding tradition, reaching back to the 1970s appropriations of found spaces; even in 1976 as skateparks were being built and pool-riding touted as the ultimate high, SkateBoarder magazine continued to publicise street skating.

Somewhere beyond the formalized spectrum, street skating remains supreme. On the banks, drainage ditches and streets of the land it’s coming down hard and heavy [. . .] working the Amerikan concrete technology for all its worth. While the old flatlanders flounder in their parks, the boys are going upside down in the sewers.

Such skaters were seen as “urban guerrillas” or anarchists.

The skating urban anarchist employs the handiwork of the government/urban corporate structure in a thousand ways that the original architects could never even dream of: sidewalks for parking, streets for driving, pipes for liquids, sewers for refuse etc., all have been reworked into a new social order.

Rocco was applying skatepark tricks like aerials, roll-outs and inverts to the streets of Hermosa,
California, back in 1978,\textsuperscript{37} and by 1980 \textit{SkateBoarder} was promoting street skating partly as a return to skateboarding’s surf-related roots and partly for the “new urban terrorist.”\textsuperscript{38} Freestyle skating was also invigorated by the street-crossover developments of skaters like Jim McCall, Bob Schmelzer and Floridans Tim Scroggs and Mullen.\textsuperscript{39} Manufacturers like Powell-Peralta were anxious to find post-skatepark terrains to stimulate demand,\textsuperscript{40} and by 1981 the Santa Cruz company’s advertisements focused exclusively on street skating equipment.\textsuperscript{41} The Independent truck company was likewise running advertisements with lines such as “Free on the Streets,”\textsuperscript{42} while Powell-Peralta marketed back-to-basics “Street Issue” decks.\textsuperscript{43}

The first coverage of the new street skateboarding came in \textit{Action Now},\textsuperscript{44} but the April 1982 \textit{Thrasher} was the first “gnarly street issue” to be largely devoted to streetstyle.\textsuperscript{45} \textit{Thrasher} in particular promoted streetstyle as the new force in skateboarding, publicising California skaters like John Lucero and Richard Armejo who, deprived of Skate City in Whittier,\textsuperscript{46} began radically extending skateboarding onto the most quotidian of urban elements. Their fundamental move was the “ollie,” the impact-adhesion-ascension procedure by which the skaters unweights the front of the skateboard to make it pop up seemingly unaided into the air,\textsuperscript{47} Gelfand’s skatepark-based invention now being adapted to the street.

Although this new street skating took place across the US, once more a specific concentration took place in the beach cities of LA. In particular, “new blood” Dogtown skaters like Natas Kaupas, Eric Dressen and Jessie Martinez, along with a plethora of other locals, exploited the ollie to ride up onto the walls, steps and street furniture of the Santa Monica strand and Venice Boardwalk.\textsuperscript{45} \textsuperscript{\textit{07.07}, \textit{07.08}} As Kaupas put it,

\begin{quote}
I attempt to make everything skateable – walls, curbs, ramps, whatever.\textsuperscript{49}
\end{quote}
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\caption{Eric Dressen, crail wall ride (1988). \textit{Luke Ogden}}
\end{figure}
Or in the words of Peralta,

[S]katers can exist on the essentials of what is out there. Any terrain. For urban skaters the city is the hardware on their trip.50

As Thrasher saw it, skateboard terrain was no longer restricted to pools ramps or skateparks, but involved anything encountered in the modern city.
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Of course this new skating was not just about new
"For urban skaters the city is the hardware on their trip." Mark Gonzales, grind on concrete rail outside First Interstate bank (ca. 1987).
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terrains, but a mode of engagement. [07.08] Californian Mark Gonzales ("the Gonz") did more than any other to usher in the new streetstyle skating, with moves such as the first boardslide on a handrail and 180° nosegrinds.

With the streets of Southgate as his playground, Mark Gonzales changed the way the world looks at a skateboard. Handrails, stairs, benches and gaps are the canvas of his masterwork.52

Visiting uk skaters were amazed in 1984 to see Gonzales do 3 ft high ollies from the flat onto a wall.53 Other 1980s streetstylers included Lance Mountain, Matt Hensey, Tommy Guerrero, Rob Roskopp, Corey O'Brien, Eddie Reategui, Hawk and Jason Jesse, many of whom also skated vertical terrains. Mullen in particular pursued a highly technical version of streetstyle, with rapid deployment of moves like 360° ollies and the "ollie impossible" in which the board is rolled 360° around the rear or front foot.54

By the mid 1980s, street skating was fully established as a distinct form of skateboarding.

It's 1985 and eighty percent of the pros and ams, as well as skaters world wide are doing vertical tricks on the flat ground. The emergence of the new streetstyle is the biggest thing to hit skateboarding since pool riding in the 70's. It's a whole new form, different, yet a combination of all other aspects of skating.55

The first streetstyle competition, later recalled as the birthplace of streetstyle,56 took place in April 1983 in Golden Gate Park, San Francisco,57 and more elaborate such events – with cars, rails, small ramps and other everyday objects, and called things like "Wake Up and Smell the Pavement," "Terror in Tahoe," "Slaughter in the Sierras" and "Shut Up and Skate" – were soon being organised across the US.58 [05.53] But it was predominantly in the city streets themselves that the new skating took place; the Powell-Peralta Bones Brigade (1984), [05.103] Public Domain (1989) and Ban This (1989) videos – among many others – showed skaters in the streets of LA and Santa Barbara, jumping over cars, riding up the walls of buildings, over hydrants and planters, onto benches, flying over steps, and sliding down the free-standing handrails in front of a bank.59 By 1992, magazines were proclaiming the death of vertical skating; fuelled by the spread of litigation from skateparks to private ramps, by new companies like World Industries, by the street-level consciousness of magazines like Thrasher and R.A.D., and by its relative immediate accessibility, streetstyle now completely dominated the skate scene.60

Television exposure of street skating also became more common in the 1990s, either through cable and satellite (such as the ca. 45 million audience for the ESPN coverage of the multi-sport Xtreme Games61) or occasionally on terrestrial channels (often integrated into snowboarding62 and general youth culture programmes63). Other mass coverage came in films like Back to the Future (Dir. Steven Spielberg, mid 1980s), 8-movie Thrashin' (Fries Entertainment, Dir. David Winters, 1986),64 Police Academy 4 (1987) and Gleaming the Cube (Twentieth Century Fox/Rank, Dir. Graeme Clifford, 1988). Top streetstyle professionals in the 1990s included Salman Agah, Kareem Campbell, John Cardiel, Mike Carroll, Reese Forbes, Omar Hassan, Frankie Hill, Eric Koston, Tom Penny, Willy Santos, Chris Senn, Daewon Song, Ed Templeton, Chet Thomas, Mike Vallely and Simon Woodstock. Similarly, certain skate spots – such as the Embarcadero ("EMB", the "Chartres Cathedral of skateboarding"65) and Pier 7 in San Francisco66 [06.01, 07.67] – became as well known globally through videos and magazines as had skateparks like Pipeline, Marina de Rey and Cherry Hill.

But more than any other phase of skateboard-
ing, streetstyle is based on the everyday activities of its millions of practitioners conducted in cities worldwide (“Everybody, Everywhere”67), rather than the extreme moves of its most spectacular professionals in extravagant purpose-built facilities or events. As one advertisement put it, every skater is yet “another nobody.”68 It is important not to underestimate the sheer quantitative nature of this phenomenon. Already in the early 1980s, Powell-Peralta was receiving letters from countries like Thailand, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Sweden, Germany, New Zealand, Australia and Canada, plus others in South America and elsewhere,69 while Pravda and regional newspapers reported a USSR skateboarding boom.70

Feature it: people are building ramps behind the Iron Curtain, they’re freestyling in the Arctic, they’re concrete carving on the Berlin wall.71

In 1985-6 skateboarding underwent rapid growth,72 reaching near pre-1980 levels by 1986-8873 – by 1989, R.A.D. sold 60,000 issues every month,74 while Thrasher had a declared 1988 global circulation of 245,750.75 In the 1990s, there were healthy skate scenes in places, apart from the established skate countries of Australia, Brazil,76 USA, UK and mainland Europe, in others as diverse as Malaysia, Costa Rica, Indonesia,77 Puerto Rico, Italy,77 Tahiti, Yugoslavia, Slovenia, South Africa, Greenland, Iceland, Japan, China, Turkey, Scandinavia, Saudi Arabia, Israel, Iran and Iraq.78 Absolute numbers of those involved are impossible to fix, but Time estimated US skaters in 1988 at 20 million,79 while another more reliable source estimated around 9.25 million US skaters in 1990, 5.4 million in 1993 and 6.5 million in 199580 – 2-8 per cent of the total US population. The global total of skaters is, then, probably at minimum 10-20 million or 0.2-0.4 per cent of the total global population of ca. 5 billion – TransWorld Skateboarding estimated the global figure in 1997 at 12 million.81
Chapter 7 Urban Space

7.02 Zero Degree Architecture, Rhythm and Urban Senses

Chapter 5 argued that purpose-built skatepark architecture can only be comprehended in combination with the skater's body-space, each being reconstructed through encountering its Other. The same is true of streetstyle, where the technical body space moves like ollie impossibles, no-complys, shove-its, kickflips, rail-slides, 50-50 grinds, nollies and so on are, by themselves, less than half the story. It is, then, in the engagement with the city that the space of street skating is continually reproduced.


The new street skateboarding was no longer situated in the detached villas and pools of the undulating, semi-suburban Hollywood Hills and Santa Monica canyon and had come downtown.

I realised that I would have to leave the hills and open countryside to progress in skating. Towards the urban jungle I headed [...] Bigger and more varied types of terrain were my driving force.

For the type of skating that's going on today, downtown is the place to be.

Where the vertical riders of the 1970s and 1980s were often from the "suburban recreation grounds," the later streetstyle skaters tended to come from "the worst parts of towns and know the true meaning of street life." Thus 1990s skaters have a "life in the big city" in the streets of not only New York, Washington, San Francisco and Philadelphia, but those of London, Reykjavik, Tehran, Vancouver, São Paulo, Prague, Istanbul, Wellington, Beirut, Melbourne, Riyadh, Mexico City, Shanghai and other cities worldwide. The new skateboarding sites are not private houses or suburban roads, hidden from public view, but university campuses, urban squares, public institutions, national theatres, commercial office plazas, as well as the more quotidian spaces of back streets, main roads, alleys, sidewalks, malls and car-parks. All these are appropriations of places, similar to 1970s appropriations of school yard banks and pools, but here skateboarders answer Paul Virilio's call for a "counter-habitation" of habitually uninhabited but nonetheless public "critical spaces." But why is this, and what does it mean for the experience of urban architecture?

Compared to the suburbs, city cores offer more opportunities and concentrated heterogeneous social spaces.

The make-believe existence of [the city dweller's] environment is less fictitious and unsatisfactory than that of his suburban or new-town counterpart; it is enlivened by monuments, chance encounters and the various occupations and distractions forming part of his everyday experience; city make-believe favours the adaptation of time and space.

The rich architectural and social fabric of the city offers skateboarders a plethora of buildings, social relations, times and spaces, many of which are free to access. And streetstyle skateboarding consequently disclosed the "unlimited possibilities our cities offered."

[A] sea of shapeless angles [...] With an imaginative development corporation and Boro Council with an eye for progressive architecture, but no taste in leisure facility for the plank and four wheeled among us, the option seems to be adaptation.
But making a decision about which spaces and relations to enter into is not easy, being conditioned by not only location and economics but time, friendship, gender, race, age, culture and ideology. In particular, it is difficult to make such decisions based on any sense of urban style, for while commercialisation pervades into every aspect of urban life, we have little style of experience beyond the formal "styles" of architecture and the commodified "lifestyles" of fashion, food and such like. Analytically, this is in part due to an inheritance from Marx, who tended to reduce urbanisation to organisation and production, and so ignored the possibilities of adaptation to the city. Instead, Lefebvre argues, productive potential should be oriented to urban society.

In such a city, creation of creations, everyday life would become a creation of which each citizen and each community would be capable.

For their part in this process, skaters reinterpret the spaces of economic production into areas of broader creativity.

The corporate types see their structures as powerful and strong. I see them as something I can enjoy, something I can manipulate to my advantage.

How, then, is this adaptation, manipulation and appropriation achieved? It is sometimes argued that the most effectively appropriated spaces are those occupied by symbols, where social relations can be inverted to create heterotopic space – and skaters and other counter-cultural urbanists like graffiti artists do occasionally work against highly symbolic monuments. For example, favoured skate locations around Europe include national theatres (Prague), historical monuments (Christopher Columbus monument, Colón, Madrid), parks (La Villette, Paris) and tourist attractions (Eiffel Tower, Paris).

But, as Lefebvre notes, it is in the open, public space of streets and squares that counter-cultural activities most readily take place, as these spaces are not yet dominated by the state.

It was in the streets that spontaneity expressed itself – in an area of society not occupied by institutions [. . .] Social space has assumed new meaning.

Correspondingly, skateboarders implicitly realise the importance of the streets and neglected architecture as a place to act.

In a culture stuck on cruise control, the other skater chooses to operate in a forgotten no-man's land. In [f]act, the skater thrives on using the discarded, abandoned and generally disregarded portions and structures of the society at large.

The skaters take the space the others ignore.

In London this has been typified by skaters' adoption of the undercroft of the South Bank, it's angled banks at once on display yet hidden beneath the
07.13 The “heart of London skating” – the banks tucked under the South Bank Centre (1990).


Uli Niewöhner
high art cultural centre, thus turning its discarded forms into a significant social space. [07:13]

The heart of London skating is the South Bank. South Bank has always been much more than a collection of shitty little banks. It is the heart and mother of English skating. 103

Thus rather than the ideologically frontal or monumental, skateboarders usually prefer the lack of meaning and symbolism of everyday spaces – the space of the street, urban plaza, mini-mall – just as graffiti artists tend to tag on out-of-the-way sites. 104

But what exactly are these spaces without explicit meaning? Most obviously, they are the left-over spaces of modernist planning, or the spaces of decision-making (typically the urban plaza) which symbolise not through overt iconography but expansivity of space. Lefebvre characterises these, after Roland Barthes, as a spatial degree zero: zero points of language (everyday speech), objects (functional objects), spaces (traffic circulation, deserted spaces in the heart of the city), needs (predicted, satisfied in advance) and time (programmed, organised according to a pre-existent space). 105 Architecturally, the city is reduced to an instrument, a “juxtaposition of spaces, of functions, of elements on the ground,” where “homogeneity overwhelms the differences” springing from nature and history, and the city appears simply as the “likeness of a sum or combination of elements,” 106 reduced to the legibility of signs. 107 Socially, this new town constitutes a void, an absence where “unhappiness becomes concrete,” 108 or, as skateboard commentators put it, “[u]ban living is fraught with boredom and frustration – a sea of concrete to roam without purpose.” 109 As one skater recognised:

There is concrete, asphalt and metal. There is some brick and wood. Every once in a while there is a tree. It is no mystery why the tree is there: someone planned it, just like everything is planned – and then falls apart. 110

Or again:

We live in a bland culture governed by the sacred principle of CONVENIENCE. Everything around us, right down to the most mundane aspects of our daily lives is pre-planned, pre-arranged and pre-packaged so as to ensure an absolute minimum of time consuming, conscious involvement from us. You don’t think so? Look around you. 111

For the experiencer of such architecture, there is a similarly reductive effect. In Barthes’ concept of “zero point,” the neutralisation of symbols states coldly what is, as if a simple witness. 112 In terms of architecture, the lack of qualitative differences and corresponding surfeit of instructions is experienced as banal monotony, the urban having lost the characteristics of the creative œuvre and of appropriation; a “poverty of daily life” derives from the failure to replace the symbolisms, times, rhythms and different spaces of the traditional city with anything other than dwelling units and the constraints of traffic. 113 Thus for skateboarders towns like Milton Keynes were perceived as having “no real identity,” where culture is alternatively disjointed or non-existent, and where security cameras are “endlessly re-shooting the most interesting of feature films: everyday life.” 114 In such places, metropolitan dwellers are simply witnesses to the functioning of the city, where the experience of urban space is like that of the museum, with visitors’ bodies controlled by an “organised walking” of contrived route, speed, gestures, speaking and sound 115 – a state referred to by one skater as a “cotton wool, padded, tv pro­grammed world.” 116
Our feet wrapped in cotton and leather, we trod upon a concrete and asphalt sheath, the topographical inconsistencies paved over by a more biped-friendly habitat. Mobility is orderly and efficient: sidewalks, stairways and elevators [...]. With our eventual adaptation to our contrived civilization, we've adjusted and now take its sheltered nature for granted.

The crosswalk signal turns red too fast. Please pay cashier first. My calling card has too many numbers on it. Don't even think of merging into my lane.\footnote{117}

However, passivity and ennui are not the only possible responses to such reductive architecture. Resistance to the zero degree architecture of French new towns \footnote{07.15} and the "concrete craziness" of places like Milton Keynes\footnote{118} takes place outside buildings, in the streets, countering the routinised phenomena of privatised urban space and the corresponding pacification of urban experience by enacting a different space and time for the city.

Projected onto the terrain, it is here that they can transcend themselves – in the streets. It is here that student meets worker, and reason reduced to a function again recovers speech.\footnote{119}

New towns feel like they're waiting. The empty buildings, the deserted walkways heading off to somewhere that hasn't been built yet, the neatly landscaped bits-in-between with benches that have never been sat on [...], desolate wastes, abandoned even by the builders, absolutely dead – until the skaters bring them life.\footnote{120}

It is here, then, that skaters consider themselves to be "[o]ne step ahead of the pedestrian or static eye, the architects and the artists,"\footnote{121} finding at Milton Keynes "an infinite number of skate spots [...], hundreds of steps, banks, handrails, curbs, carparks, flowerbeds, gaps, benches, blocks, everything."\footnote{122} In such cities worldwide:

Skaters create their own fun on the periphery of mass culture. Sewers, streets, malls, curbs and a million other concrete constructions have been put to new uses.\footnote{123}

Skateboarders target the space-times of the urban degree zero, re-inscribing themselves onto functional everyday spaces and objects, seeing skateboarding as "a challenge to our everyday concepts of the functions of buildings, and to the closed world we create for ourselves out of this massively unlimited city."\footnote{124} For example, a handrail is a highly functional object, whose time and use...
are wholly programmed. It is - like fire hydrants, bus benches, sidewalks and traffic lights - a signal, a material element within an urban semantic field of precise and imperative utilitarian objects that condition us and with which we cannot converse. Such elements have no meaning as such, imparting only a message. It is this which skateboarders recognise in statements such as:

Empty of cars, car-parks have only form and no function.”

Or:

Go on, put something back into the community [...] this, by the way, doesn’t mean adding another traffic light.

As a critique of the signal, skateboarders do something. In the case of the handrail, the skateboarder’s re-use of the handrail - ollie-ing onto the rail, and, balanced perilously on the skateboard deck, sliding down the fulcrum line of the metal bar - targets something to do with safety and turns it into an object of risk. The whole logic of the handrail is turned on its head.

Most people think handrails are for those with mobility problems. Christian Hosoi says they are for ollie nose grinds.

In particular, such streetstyle skateboarding takes its vitality from unexpected eruptions of meaning, actions that re-translate the objects of the city.

A curb is an obstacle until you grind across it. A wall is but ledge until you drop off it. A cement bank is a useless slab of concrete until you shred it.

Where signals have no expressivity beyond direct signification, skating is a lived utterance, a symbolic
parole to the univalent langue of the city as technical object. Skateboarding is a critique of the emptiness of meaning in zero degree architecture.

How, then, does skateboarding create this critique? What is the precise ground on which it acts? The answer lies less in semantics, and more in the realm of sensory rhythms and the physical.

While cities are made from social relations as conceived by thought, they are not purely ideational.

The urban is not a soul, a spirit, a philosophical entity.

Life is but a dream. City streets are a reality.

The city, then, is the immediate reality, the practico-materiality with which the urban cannot dispense. And of course this "architectural fact" necessarily takes on a particular form, creating certain constraints but also openings. The city is presented to the skater as a pre-existent object, who negates it through its opportunities and specifically through exploiting the texture of that space.

This focus on texture gives skaters a different kind of knowledge about architecture, one derived from an experience of surface and material tactility.

We grew up skating in New York City. You better believe we know all there is to know about asphalt and concrete.

But what form might this textural exploitation adopt? Here we find some clues in Lefebvre's conception of rhythmanalysis, where he notes, for example, that the remarkable stair architecture of Mediterranean cities provides the space-time rhythm for walking in the city. What then if we
applied the same rhythm analysis to the zero degree city. What kind of rhythm and experience does it pre-suppose?

This is exactly the condition for urban skateboarders, being both framed by, and exploitative of, the physical space-times of urban space. As already noted, it is the spaces of the modern metropolis that skateboarders address: squares and streets, campuses and semi-public buildings. Beyond their existence as functional spaces, each is a raw object, a disposition of three-dimensional form in a universal, abstract space. Space here is simultaneously homogeneous and fragmented into any sub-division wished of it.

What then is the principal contradiction to be found? Between the capacity to conceive of and treat space on a global (or worldwide) scale on the one hand, and its fragmentation by a multiplicity of procedures or processes, all fragmentary themselves, on the other: 135

The truth is to be found in the movement of totalization and fragmentation taken as a whole. This is the truth we read in that obscure and legible text: the new town: 136

Skateboarders treat space exactly in this way. Firstly, space becomes a uniform entity, in this case a surface on which to skate. All urban elements are thus reduced to the homogeneous level of skateable terrain, for “[a]nything is part of the run.” 137 Second, from this macro conception of space skaters oscillate to the micro conception architectural element; they move from the open canvas of the urban realm to the close focus of a specific wall, bench, hydrant, kerb or rail.

Bumps, curbs and gaps. The street is really universal: 138

The spatial rhythm adopted is that of a journey from one element to another, the run across the city space interspersed with momentary settlings on specific sites. This is not an activity which could take place in medieval, renaissance, or early industrial cities – which are consequently considered “crap to skate:” 139 It requires the smooth surfaces and running spaces of the concrete city and, above all, it requires the object-space-object-space rhythm born from a fragmentation of objects within a homogeneous space. [07:19] For example, in one of most extreme modernist architectural environments of the West, skaters found that “the polished marble planes of [Mies] van der Rohe’s plazas are Mecca to Chicago’s skateboarders.” 140 One commentator noted that such Chicago spaces were the “natural turf” for skateboarders, whose presence bridges the gap between the public and what critics have called “relentlessly austere, even inhumane” modern struc-
As Project described this city:

The Federal buildings [1959–74, architects Mies van der Rohe and others]: BIG marble benches, nice and long and great for grinds, slides, and tricks off of em.

Amoco Building [1973, architect Edward Durell Stone]: Big marble arrangements, Good stairs and handrails.


Prudential Building [1955, architects Naess & Murphy]: Downhill and long marble ledge that is the best for 50-50s.

Rhythmanalysis refers to time as well as space, and thus the temporal rhythms — the various routines, speeds, durations, repetitions — of the city also offer a frame for skateboarders. Here skateboarders respond to the fragmentary temporality of urban space, interweaving their own compositions into regular temporal patterns, such as waging a fast assault on a handrail outside a bank, or adding a speeding skateboard to the slower pattern of pedestrians, "skating past all the business-suit lames that slog gloomily down the sidewalk, barely lifting their feet, like they're kicking shit with every step."\

As SkateBoarder described Rocco’s early streetstyle movements, this was a new time-space inserted among others on the pavement.

Weaving wildly amidst strand cruisers, roller skaters, skateboarders, and those that still prefer walking, he terrorizes oncoming motion with precision kickflips and slides, always narrowly, but precisely missing, moving on to find vacant areas.

This is a different kind of urban speed, incomprehensible to others.

Most of the action seen is skateboarding these days occurs at such a rapid pace that peds [pedestrians] have little chance of understanding what has transformed.

Alternatively, skaters construct a different temporal rhythm by staying longer in an urban plaza as others hurry through, as happens most evenings at London’s Euston Station, where, while commuters rush to transport connections, a few skaters often spend a few hours riding over its planters, benches and low walls. For the more contested terrains of postmodernity — like shopping malls or
privatised public space – yet another temporal tactic must be deployed. Here, skaters exploit the highly bounded temporality of, for example, London’s Broadgate office development – a privatised urban space with precise usage patterns – by skating in weekend and evening hours.¹⁴⁶ As one commentator noted, “nighttime skateboarders represent a rare example of people using the downtown at night.”¹⁴⁷ Skaters thus use “the dark urban terrain which would otherwise go unnoticed”¹⁴⁸ – spaces outside of their conventional times of use, substituting one temporal rhythm for another. As Arron Bleasdale reflected on a day’s life in London:

Weekends are the best. You can cruise around the City and there’s no one there. Meet up at Cantalowes [Camden skate spot] with some people, then head out to the City, skate around, find some new spots then head back to Camden.¹⁴⁹

This appropriation of the unused time of a particular urban element is also applied to smaller parts of the urban street; the bus bench out of rush hour, or department store car park outside shopping hours, can also be the focus of skateboarders.

Rhythmanalysis is also about the micro experience, the relation of the self to the physical minutiae of the city.

These are my streets. I know every crack of every sidewalk there is down here.¹⁵⁰

Beside intense vision, for skaters this involves hearing; the skater responds to the more obvious city sounds, such as a car accelerating or police siren, and also car doors, people talking, footsteps etc. In particular, the sound of the skateboard over the ground yields much information about surface conditions, such as speed, grip and predictability.
Taken together, the various compositional sound rhythms— the mono-tonal subtle roar of wheels on tarmac, hard rasping of truck on concrete, slippery slide of slick deck on metal rail, rhythmic clicking of paving slabs, combined with intermittent pure silences during ollie flight, and the sudden cracks as the skateboard returns to ground—are a feature of skateboarding’s urban space. Skaters thus also add another sound component to the non-skater’s experience of the urban realm; the skateboard’s distinctive sounds are unlike any others in the city, and overtaking slower pedestrians can cause them consternation. “When a group of kids skates down a sidewalk you can really hear it.”

Micro rhythmanalysis also involves a sense of touch, generated from direct contact with the terrain—hand on building, foot on wall—or from the smoothness and textual rhythms of the surface underneath, passed up through skateboard into feet and body: “the actively involved skater relies on his own feedback.”

I glide over a patch of textured concrete. The little grooves running perpendicular to my flight path pluck a note from my board that I can feel in my body. The noise echoes down the ramp then stops abruptly as I return to porcelain smooth concrete.

As one poetic cartoon spoke of New York, the “city rumbles beneath my skate, like the wheels of so many subway trains— with vibrations that carry up through my legs—and remain like magic long after I have gotten off my board.” What matters to skaters sensorially are such things as “the feeling of a raspy axle grind,” or the “sensation of wheels rolling along the pavement.” In these kinds of urban encounter, small details become highly significant: for example, a curb’s precise angle and surface paint determines its slide qualities and so also the moves made against it.

The skateboard run is conducted in relation to...
zero degree architecture, using its textural and objectival qualities to create a new appropriative rhythm distinct from the routinised, meaningless, passive experiences which it usually enforces; street skateboarding is thus “a total focus of mind, body and environment to a level way beyond that of the dead consumers.”163 And the new school skateboard – with its light deck, small wheels, and equal front-back orientation specifically designed for street skating [04.17, 04.18] – is a tool absorbed into the new rhythmic production of “super-architectural space” discussed in Chapter 5.

Being a skateboarder means that you have some kind of enhanced experience of life. You don’t just walk through space, without learning anything about it, or without having kind of relationship with where you are – through the medium of a skateboard [. . .] you can actually inter-act with the world around you. This is something rare in this synthetic world of plastic and concrete.164

As this quotation suggests, it is not only the city but the body that is changed in the engagement of skater, skateboard and street architecture, for, just as we engage with the city more actively when in motion, so we become more bodily-aware whenever, for example, we cross the road and necessarily calculate the steps involved.165 Skateboarders, through their continuous body-centric and motile encounters with different architectural elements, create many such crossings and encounters and so produce a greatly intensified version of this process. The outcome is not just a new physiology (“[s]uddenly I had new muscles appearing”166), but a newly conscious recognition of the body.

Ben heard the cries of the other skaters, he felt the cold metal of this truck in his hand, and the rough griptape on his skin. A leaf fire filled his nostrils with the woody smell Ben was fond of, he saw the ramp, he tasted blood.167

In terms that recall Simmel’s identification of a fundamental reorientation of the physiology and psychology of metropolitan inhabitants,168 Lefebvre notes that the modern man’s physiological functions “have not yet ‘adapted’ to the conditions of his life, to the speed of its sequences and rhythms,” such that “nerves and senses have not yet been adequately trained by the urban and technical life he leads.”169 In particular, the modern individual cannot abstract out the concept from the thing, creating a confused unity in which relations, order and hierarchy are lost. This is a state of “deliberate semi-neurosis,” partly play-acting and partly “ambivalent infantilism.”170

On the one hand, this is exactly the condition of skateboarders in the modern city, for, in the absence of codified socio-political awareness, many skaters use a “common sense shut down”171 to divert attention away from matters of the rational intellect.

Skateboarding has survived on minimal intellect for years. Yeah!172

On the other hand, Lefebvre suggests that while such attitudes produce only ambivalent infantilism, the same condition contains seeds of critique and creative production. As he notes, that the modern individual is not yet “fully adapted” intimates that a process of evolution is underway – an evolution which involves a transformation of senses.

Practical tools, not simple concepts, are the means by which social man has shaped his perceptible world. As regards the processes of knowledge by means of which we understand this “world” [. . .] they are our senses. But our senses have been transformed by action [. . .] Thus it is that our senses,
organs, vital needs, instincts, feelings have been permeated with consciousness, with human reason, since they too have been shaped by social life.\textsuperscript{173}

It is then in lived experience, rather than abstract theoretical knowledge, that the skateboarder's adaptation can initially be seen. Skateboarding is "not a theory, it's not a style and it's not a symbol – it's a concrete reality."\textsuperscript{174}

Such concerns directly raise the question of spatiality. The skateboarder's highly integrated sense of balance, speed, hearing, sight, touch and responsivity is a product of the modern metropolis, a newly evolved sensory and cognitive mapping;\textsuperscript{0724} the aim is not only to receive the city but to return it to itself, to change the nature of the \textit{experience} of the urban realm. Sound, touch and even smell combine with vision to render architecture into a full body encounter.

A feel of rhythm and an aroma of sweat overcome my senses on this Wednesday evening as the popping sound of wooden tails and the connection of metal trucks to metal coping takes place.\textsuperscript{175}

After about three hours, I'm good and sweaty [...]. The walls have taken on my body's odour.\textsuperscript{176}

In this, skateboarding is an untheorised element of praxis, focusing on the sensuous enjoyment of the object (immediate sensing of cities, objects of common use, relationships), the recognition of particular needs (activity, muscular extension, direct engagement)\textsuperscript{177} and on the spatially immediate (the local and nearby).

Learning the properties of everyday life unwittingly [...] Evolving into a higher state of urban awareness starts with doing and looking. But seeing and feeling begins in this case outside your front door.\textsuperscript{178}

Skateboarding is, as \textit{Thrasher}'s first issue described it, "a fast-paced feeling to fit this modern world,\textsuperscript{179} and the skateboarder's own senses are historically produced from the constraints and opportunities of the city.

But unlike the passivity of the body, and the
These things have purpose because we have movement as well as vision. Andrew Reynolds (1996).

Atiba Jefferson

over-dependence on the eye within modernity,\textsuperscript{180} the skater’s body is an active, motile construct, producing all of its senses through the urban practice of skateboarding. [0725]

It’s better than drugs. You won’t believe the adrenalin. The feeling of accomplishment is insane.\textsuperscript{181}

These things have purpose because we have movement as well as vision.\textsuperscript{182}

These senses are not, then, a basic need to be momentarily satisfied,\textsuperscript{183} but an enjoyment and reproduction of the city, a sensory-spatial version of the Althusserian concept of ideology as the imaginary representation of the subject’s relationship to their real conditions of existence.\textsuperscript{184} Skaters’ actions are how they learn to live with the city, part of the “enigma of the body” which has the ability to produce differences “unconsciously” out of linear (within any one run) and cyclical repetitions (repeating moves, repeating the run on different occasions).\textsuperscript{185}

Skateboarding also makes skaters active mentally and visually, attentive to the details of urban space (the exact form of a concrete ledge or new hand-rail). “Streetskating is emptying your mind onto the streets.”\textsuperscript{186} Vision, too, is reconfigured from passive reception, dominant sense and detached abstract meditation into an integrated and lived everyday epistemology; for the skater, every aspect of the city street becomes a “window” from which to contemplate and engage with the unknown city.\textsuperscript{187} As with Jean-François Lyotard’s conception of the differential spatiality of the visible, vision becomes one among many spatialities produced in the city.\textsuperscript{188}
7.03 Propositions and Directions

What, however, is the meaning that such activities inscribe on zero degree architecture? If skateboarding points towards a different, possible future city, what exactly does it propose, and how are such propositions enunciated?

The scene is set, the playground open: unknown terrain, unknown features, unknown futures. Maybe. . .

Lefebvre provides some clues, suggesting, for example, that state violence (usually latent, occasionally overt) is concerned with accumulation and a political principle of unification. Here we might consider that skateboarding helps declassify space by "keeping things real," hence disclosing such underlying logics. But what are these declassifications, and what logic is challenged?

Alternatively, we might follow Lefebvre's interest in the festival, the café, the funfair and street, seeing skateboarding as a "people's event" that escapes industrialisation. But what is the skateboarding event, and to where does it escape?

Or we might consider the notion of a new style in urban life, not as formal aesthetics but as an attitude toward work. But how is skateboarding's subculture enacted in urban space, and what is its new productive activity? If everyday life is to be built again, drawing on the opportunities and purposeful attitudes as yet constrained within the new town, what are the new desires, and how are they to be expressed?

For Lefebvre, the answers to such things can only be directions and tendencies. Among these possibilities, the simultaneous integration of spontaneity and abstraction is one of the most important.

The thing is that men have two different ways of creating and producing, and as yet these have not intersected: spontaneous vitality and abstraction. On the one hand, in pleasure and play; on the other, in seriousness, patience and painful consciousness, in toil.

Furthermore, it is in the architecture of the new town, of degree zero, that such integrations will be disclosed, not as an answer but as an experiment, as a first approximation of differential space and life.

Our task now is to construct everyday life, to produce it, consciously to create it [. . .] Here, in the new town, boredom is pregnant with desires, frustrated frenzies, unrealized possibilities. A magnificent life is waiting just around the corner, and far,
We will not, therefore, find a new style of living in the new town, but we will find a way towards it. This means not just the great global cities – London, New York, Paris, Tokyo – but also the “average, suburban, dysfunctional, adolescent anonymity” of “everyday towns;” this, too, concords with the development of skateboarding, for in the UK the foremost centres of skateboarding in the 1990s were no longer (only) London, but smaller towns like Oxford, Newbury, Wakefield, Northampton, Swindon and Aberdeen. In the US, pre-eminent skate spots like San Diego were joined by Pittsburgh, Dallas, Edison, Lewisville, Seattle and many others across the country.

It all started back around 1987 or so in a small boonfuck town called Enterprise, Alabama. In this town I learned tic-tacs, early grabs off launch ramps, rode my first handrail and got laid for the first time. I lived there for five years with roasting rednecks in the unbearable heat [. . .] There was nothing to do. It was inevitable that I skate.

To begin with it is important to understand the epistemology of this critique. Predominantly, just as skateboarders have little sense of skateboarding’s history, so too are they largely unaware of the political nature of their own actions – “I don’t read about skating, I just do it.” If all social activities were like this, serious problems would ensue. But it is important not to over-react to this situation. Firstly, skateboarding, as urban practice, renders the subjective into an objective intervention as Clark explained of his film Kids, skateboarders are “out there, having confrontations all the time.” Second, the urban activity of skateboarding is discursively politicised, and we should therefore appreciate it as a realm where a certain newness is born from knowledge, representation and lived experience enacted together.

There are, in any case, distinct advantages to the sort of lived critique sustained by practices like skateboarding. While the bourgeoisie discovered history, making it a cornerstone of its own class consciousness and overloading current culture, skateboarders’ are not encumbered by the “tradition of all the dead generations” which “weighs like a nightmare on the brain of the living,” and are free to critique the immediate present. “The future is now; get on it.”

Similarly, the absence of theory or party institutionalism allows for the resurrection of spontaneity as the enemy of power, as skaters themselves realised in the development of street skating in the early 1980s.

In an American dream turned sour suburban nightmare, the only viable alternative is spontaneous aggression. Furthermore, such spontaneity undertakes a generalised critique against society and the urban, such that skateboarders are largely unconcerned with the function or symbolic presence of any single building or city.

San Diego indeed does suck, as does LA, San Francisco, San Jo, Phoenix, Cincinnati, Tulsa, Mobile, NY, Stockholm, Berlin, Canberra, Independence, MO, etc. (fill in the name of your town here) – get the picture?

Any architecture will do, for all are implicated in the generic urbanism of what skaters see simply as the “Skatropolis.”

We might also consider that practices like skateboarding, while conceptually untheorised, are nonetheless always embedded with ideas.
Skateboarding should be considered as a *lived* concept, one which both occasionally draws on the conceptual for its rationale and which conducts conceptual operations in a non-codified way.

Finally, there is even the possibility that, if representations project themselves in advance of the here-and-now, then being may be ahead of consciousness.\(^{216}\)

It's like we're moving on to something else [. . .] and the thing is, that skateboarding is truly in the forefront.\(^{217}\)

Yesterday is history. What will we do tomorrow?\(^{218}\)

Stagnation is death.\(^{219}\)

Given this self-perception on the part of many skaters, skateboarding just might contain some indication of relations and actions different to the highly codified work-family-leisure routines of late capitalism.

We now turn to consider skateboarding as an urban practice in the small town and in the big city. Sections look in turn at five different aspects of this practice: the purely physical engagement with architecture; the decentring of buildings as objects; performance and the conceptual re-living of time and space; the critique of space and architecture as commodity; and the confrontation with censorship.
7.04 Physical Engagement

Skateboarding responds meaningfully to the city by making a work of art, saying and living the city on its own terms. Like romanticism, it is not confined to discourse, but works upon a material. What, then, are the marks it makes, and what do they signify? This section deals with the first part of this question, identifying the immediate nature of the physical engagement between skateboard and building.

The streetstyle moves of LA skaters in the early 1980s did not just transcend the elements of the street but worked against them in a directly physical manner. For skaters like Dressen and Ron Allen, two of the first of the new street skaters, the marks, scratches, grinds and traces of board paint they left on the walls of LA buildings were an essential component in their relationship with the physicality of the city.

This kid simply craved crumbing lips and delighted in the ferocious bit of a bare-axle frontside carve!

Most would call it senseless vandalism, but loafed curbs, dirty buildings, worked planter boxes and broken benches are true things of beauty. Concrete, wood, rock, or anything in the path is worthy of a skater’s wrath.

When the tough get going, the going gets scuffed.

In street skating, the constant planting of hands and feet build gradually to create a grubby reminder of skaters’ presence. Urethane wheels and painted deck graphics similarly leave technicolour streaks across walls, ledges and benches. In particular, skateboarders grind their trucks on the edges of walls and street furniture, leaving a series of gouges and striations that ultimately either lead to the rounding-off or break up of edges, cutting out a ragged silhouette. Skaters also sometimes apply wax to ledges, curbs and other urban elements to improve sliding qualities.

Visitors? There have always been visitors. I’ve seen their marks.

In this light, the “Skate and Destroy” slogan introduced by “Lowboy” in 1982 is understandably one of the most popular and controversial of skateboard aphorisms. But why attack an object in this way? What is there in architecture that might lend itself to such a response on the part of skaters?

If urban space is constituted by violence, either overt or latent, architecture is part of this process, both as immediate compulsion to obey the physical barriers, surfaces, routes and walls it presents to the urban dweller, and also as a continual reminder that transgressions of space and property rights will be met by more active responses. This is architecture’s “phallic formant,” symbolising masculine force as pure image and as the presence of destructive force.

In this context, skateboarders’ destructive assault on the micro-boundaries of architecture are a tiny yet significant challenge to the threat of violence, meeting like with like.
Each notch is evidence of
endurance and determination, a
message to those who would try
and deter us. Each scuff is a
marking of territory as surely as
dog piss on a fire hydrant.228

This is particularly evident if we consider
the architecture of the city as a "writing
on the ground,"229 inscribing the legiti-
macy of owners and managers over oth-
ers. In this context, urban phenomena
like litter, scuff-marks, smells, noise, pol-
lution, and also deliberate inscriptions of
fly-posting, graffiti, skateboard marks,
school yard scratchings and so on are
all versions of a counter-inscription.
Youth and children are especially good
at this, for while adults disguise marks
as the objects they own (porches, home
decoration, gardens, cars), young adults
make marks on other people's property.

These kinds of urban inscriptions are
then far more than the semantic
encounter with the city favoured by
architectural and cultural semiotists
like Barthes, Charles Jencks, Umberto
Eco and Françoise Choay,230 who mis-
take architecture for a text and urban
reading as an act of distanced cognition. Instead,
as Schmarsow realised long ago, the act of "read-
ing" a building is a bodily act and an experienced
cognition.

As soon as we have learned to experience
ourselves and ourselves alone as the center
of this space, whose coordinates intersect in
us, we have found the precious kernel, the
initial capital investment so to speak, on
which architectural creation is based.231

Furthermore, "reading" can be entirely different to
any intention on the part of the author (architect,
planner, urban manager), such that the re-reading
is more of a new writing across the face of the page.
Thus when a skater like Gary Chevalier noseslides
on the St. Cross Building in Oxford, (1960s, architect
Leslie Martin), he is concerned with neither archi-
tecture nor architect but with his own spatial pro-
duction. [0729] Skateboarders and others inscribing
on the city are literally writing the city, albeit at the
scale of the dispersed, micro-spatial text, creating a
series of registers, traces, indexical signs, notches
and furrows. Thus skaters talk of "drawing" lines
across pools and banks, "like Chinese writing."232
Yet contained within this attempt to re-write city surfaces is a remarkably well-behaved set of objectives. Skateboarding rarely seems to romanticise violence, although some skaters like Peters certainly make it into a feature of their lives. Furthermore, despite its overt physicality, the "destroy" in "Skate and Destroy" is predominantly conceptual, and skateboarding in no way attempts to modify city form in any substantial manner.

The subject experiences space as an obstacle, as a resistant "objectality" at times as implacably hard as a concrete wall, being not only extremely difficult to modify in any way but also hedged about by Draconian rules prohibiting any attempt at such modifications.

Instead of counter-domination, skateboarding is an appropriative negation of the space which preceeds it. As Lefebvre notes, such negation can exploit the texture of space, which offers opportunities to social acts otherwise unconnected with that space. This brings us both back to the dependence of skateboarding upon the physicality of zero degree architecture (see above), and forward to the question as to what constitutes skateboarding's negation of space. If skateboarding is an activity external to the function of the spaces on which it acts, but which is also simultaneously rhythmically predicated on the surfaces, formal articulation and frequency of urban architecture, what is the product of this engagement between separate yet connected presences? What supplement is created?

We find the first clues here if we consider skateboarding as at once consumption (skateboarders use buildings) and production (they deploy energies and tools upon a physical resource). And just as manufactured objects often provide traces of the matériel (tools and techniques) used to make them, the marks made by skateboarding are hence a kind of matériel of consumption via the tool of the skateboard and technique of the move. Furthermore, this is a gradual accretion formed by many skaters continually revisiting a particular site.

A grind mark is trivial when seen as a single scrape but, over time, streams become canyons.

Skateboarding is in this sense represents consumption as a collective act of production: that of marks on buildings and urban fabric.

We find here, then, that skateboarding is far more than a simple physical inscription on the city. There are also suggestions that it involves a critique of objects (skateboarding marks urban objects), a reconceptualisation of how such objects are mapped and recorded (skaters represent objects through their actions upon them), ownership (skateboarders do not own the things they mark) and consumption-production definitions (skateboarders are "productive," but not of things). It is to these areas that we now turn.

7.05 Decentred Objects

Cities are not things, but the apparent form of the urbanisation process. Cities are filled with ideas, culture and memories, with flows of money, information and ideologies, and are dynamically constitutive of the continual reproduction of the urban. To see the city as a collection of objects is then to fail to see its real character. And this is exactly the failure of skateboarding, which does nothing to analyse the processes which form the urban; instead, the phenomenal procedures of skateboarding rely entirely on the objectival nature of the city, treating its surfaces – horizontal, vertical, diagonal, curved – as the physical ground on which to operate.

Yet within this failure lies a profound critique of the city qua object-thing. Capitalism has replaced the city as Œuvre – the unintentional and collective
work of art, richly significant yet embedded in everyday life239 - with "repetitive spaces," "repetitive gestures" and standardised things of all kinds to be exchanged and reproduced, differentiated only by money.240 Skateboarding, however, at once accepts and denies this presentation of cities as collections of repetitive things. On the one hand, skateboarders accept it, by focusing purely on the phenomenal characteristics of architecture, on its compositions of planes, surfaces and textures as accessible to the skateboarder.

Look around. Look at a world full of skate shapes [. . .] shapes left there by architects for you to skate.241

Here the city and its architecture is undoubtedly a thing. On the other hand, it is also through this very focus on the phenomenal that a change is made.

In a world of complex questions, the street strategist must become his own answer. Alleys, curbs, streets, pools, ramps, parking lots, hills, banks, and all other conceivable contours are the arenas of individual advancement. How and what you do with them are your own affair.242

When skateboarders ride along a wall, over a fire hydrant or up a building, they are entirely indifferent to their function or ideological content. They are therefore no longer even concerned with its presence as a building, as a composition of spaces and materials logically disposed as a coherent urban entity. By focusing only on certain elements (ledges, walls, banks, rails) of the building, skateboarders deny architecture's existence as a discrete threedimensional indivisible thing, knowable only as a totality, and treat it instead as a set of floating, detached, physical elements isolated from each other; where architects' considerations of building "users"243 imply a quantification of the body subordinate to space and design, the skater's performative body has "the ability to deal with a given set of pre-determined circumstances and to extract what you want and to discard the rest,"244 and so reproduces architecture in its own measure, re-editing it as series of surfaces, textures and micro-objects.

Buildings are building blocks for the open minded.245

Skaters are the creators.246
Architecture, following Lefebvre’s body-centric formulations, “reproduces itself within those who use the space in question, within their lived experience.”\textsuperscript{247} This occurs in skateboarding through architecture being encountered in relation to height, tactility, transition, slipperiness, roughness, damage to skin on touching, damage to body from a fall, angle and verticality, sequencing, drops (stairs and ramps), kinks and shape (hand-rails), profiles (edges), materials, lengths and so on. And only a very small part of the architecture is used— the “building” for a skater is only an extracted edit of its total existence. For example, a particular English school was known by skaters not as a building or for its function, but for its handrails.

[T]ravel to Ipswich and ask to check out the school with the handrails, they’ll know which one and it’s sick.\textsuperscript{248}

Also in Ipswich, Suffolk College was known primarily for its roof,\textsuperscript{0731} stairs and ledges, a specific church for the wooden benches outside, another school for some steps, and an entire us air base for a single, yellow fire hydrant.\textsuperscript{249} And on the other side of the Atlantic, the Marriott Marquis Hotel in New York, (1985, architect John Portman), offering the usual Portman features of vast glass elevations, spectacular atrium, rocket ship elevators and internal glitz,\textsuperscript{250} was reconceived by skaters as “modern day skate architecture” with “tight transitions,” “black walls,” a street-level walkway and planters.\textsuperscript{251} Similarly, New York’s Museum of Natural History became “100 yards of Italian marble, marble benches curbed for frontside and backside rails, six steps, and statues of famous dudes with marble bases [. . .] basically an awesome skate arena.”\textsuperscript{252}

What ties these elements together is neither compositional, structural, servicing or functional logic, but the entirely separate logic of “another art form”\textsuperscript{253} composed from the skateboarder’s moves. Significantly, 1990s magazines introduced longer
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sequence shots, with 28 or more frames in one image, as a way of representing the travelling, sequential nature of street skating. [0732]

The extended compositional run of street skaters is, however, ultimately beyond the reach of a single photograph, and is particularly evident when skaters move rapidly from one building or urban element to another. Such “strategies embracing architecture” select what in design-architectural terms are a discontinuous series of walls, surfaces, steps and boundaries, but which in skateboarding’s spatetime become a flow of encounters and engagements between board, body and terrain.

You can throw you board down and skate around for hours hitting anything that crosses your path.

It’s a total attack approach where the skater is not a separate entity from his terrain, slaloming to avoid everything in his way. Now he is the terrain with all its intricate pieces. Everything he approaches is part of his whole ride.

Find it. Grind it. Leave it behind.

Skateboarding here resists the standardisation and repetition of the city as a serial production of building types, functions and discrete objects; it de-centres building-objects in time and space in order to recompose them as a strung-out yet newly synchronous arrangement. For example, the path from Fifth and Maple Street to downtown in San Diego was composed of a route “chock full of fun lines: lots of bumps, rails, ledges, banks, et al, scattered along a downhill cruise.”

Skateboarding also suggests that cities can be thought of as series of micro-spaces, rather than as comprehensive urban plans, monuments or grands projets. Consequently, architecture is seen to lie beyond the province of the architect and is thrown

On the street the urban blight is being reworked to new specifications. The man on the avenue is the architect of the future. The blind are no longer leading the blind. There are now no formalized plans. Invent your own life.

Through such compositions, skateboarding brings back that which strictly economistic Marxism evacuates – it brings back the dream, imaginary and “poetic being,” what Peralta called the “skate of the art.” [0733] Skateboarding points to the resurrection of the urban not as a product, but as a way of living.

The urban [...] is a mental and social form,
that of simultaneity, of gathering, of convergence, of encounter (or rather, encounters). It is a quality born from quantities (spaces, objects, products). It is a difference, or rather, an ensemble of differences. [. . .] the urban could present itself as signifiers whose signifieds we are presently looking for.²⁶³

Movement means vitality in a rotting reality.²⁶⁴

And it is specifically the skateboarder’s performative body which provokes the revenge on leisure and work spaces.

Thanks to its sensory organs, from the sense of smell and from sexuality to sight (without any special emphasis being placed on the visual sphere), the body tends to behave as a differential field. It behaves, in other words, as a total body, breaking out of the temporal and spatial shell developed in response to labour, to the division of labour, to the localizing of work and the specialization of places.²⁶⁵

Other recompositions of architecture are also suggested in this process. Most obviously, skateboarding displaces the building’s function from interior to exterior; when Skateboard!, for example, contrasted a skater’s action on a building exterior with the lifeless internal escalators, [2734] it consequently implied that the building’s function was not its commercial work but its relation to the skater’s interrogation.²⁶⁶

What, however, do such recompositions of architecture suggest? What compositional mode do they deploy? What do they imply for a politics of space in the modern city? What do they mean, what effect do they have, and what do they provoke in response?
7.06 Performing Cities

Skateboarding is an aesthetic rather than ethical practice, using the "formants" at its disposal to create an alternative reality. As Thrasher referred (semi-seriously) to the artistic practice of skateboarding, this was a "Sorealist" activity.

Sorealism tears artistic ideologies out of sterile galleries and incestuously exclusive cliques and slaps them down on the pavement for the whole world to see. It's art on real terms.

Skateboarders, then, analyse architecture not for its historical, symbolic or authorial content but for how its surfaces present themselves as skateable surfaces. This is what Thrasher refers to as the "skater's eye."

People who ride skateboards look at the world in a very different way. Angles, spots, lurkers and cops all dot the landscape that we all travel.

How then does this aesthetic activity take place? What techniques or modes of representation are involved?

Cities are at once real and coded, imagined and mediated. Skateboarders enact an extreme version of this process, such that the internalisation of imagery identified in Chapter 5 also has its urban concomitant wherein physical phenomena, conscious representations and the skateboarder's lived experience of the city are constantly re-made. It is to this triadic inter-production which we now turn, showing how skateboarders' particular urban representation is less map or text and more a performance akin to spatialised and temporalised speech.

As shown above, skateboarders undertake a discontinuous edit of architecture and urban space, recomposing their own city from different places, locations, urban elements, routes and times, involving the twin processes of asyndeton (omitting certain elements) and synecdoche (substituting one part for the another, or the whole).

A world that no-one else can see, a world the pedestrians and motorists cannot share. An alternative reality, co-existing on a different plain.

The city for the skateboarder becomes a kind of capriccio, the tourist's postcard where various architectural sites are compressed into an irrational (in time and space) view, except the editing tool is here not eye, camera or tourist coach but motile body. Such "urban transcendentalism" means an appreciation of those everyday architectures generally disregarded by non-skaters.

Benches, banks and smooth pavement are what skaters really like. Citizens use some of these elements everyday, almost to the point of excess, but still have no appreciation for the structure itself.

It also means a different kind of canon of city architecture is drawn up — substituting everyday architecture for great monuments and buildings by famous architects. The city for skateboarders is not buildings but a set of ledges, window sills, walls, roofs, railings, porches, steps, salt bins, fire hydrants, bus benches, water tanks, newspaper stands, pavements, planters, kerbs, handrails, barriers, fences, banks, skips, posts, tables and so on (all elements engaged with by skaters in a single issue of Sidewalk Surfer). "To us these things are more." New York, for example, is for skaters not the New York of the Statue of Liberty, Times Square, 42nd Street, Central Park and the Empire State Building but of the Bear Stearns Building (46th and 47th, Park and Lexington), "Bubble banks" (south side of 747 3rd Avenue), "Brooklyn banks"
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(Manhattan end of Brooklyn Bridge), Washington Square Park, "Harlem banks" (Malcolm x Avenue and 139th), Mullaly Park in Brooklyn, Marriott Marquis Hotel (45th and Broadway), Bell Plaza banks etc. Washington, by the same process, became known architecturally to skaters as Pulaski Park, National Geographic Building, Federal Welfare Archives, Georgetown School banks, "Gold Rail" and "White Steps." Other cities receive the same treatment; Rotterdam is perceived as the Weena covered walkway, Beurs stairs, Blaak interchange, Oosterhof mall and Alexanderpolder station, while Tokyo becomes Akihabara Park, "jabu jabu" banks in Shinjuku, ledges at Tokyo Station, curbs at Yotsuya Station, banks at Tokyo Taikan and various runs across the Aoyama-

Omotesando-Harajuku-Shibuya area.

What is the mode involved in such a recomposition? Occasionally, this takes the form of a map or geographic list, such as alternative routes through Bristol or the Knowhere internet site, where nearly every skate location in the UK is identified.

Magazines in the 1990s, particularly R.A.D. and Sidewalk Surfer, have tended to focus less on professional skaters, major cities and well-known skate places and more on local skate scenes - the "streets and back yards of Anytown" - like those in Oxted, Ipswich, Oxford, Milton Keynes, Stroud, Cirencester and Cardiff; in the US, a single issue of Slap, for example, covered not San Diego and LA but Sacramento (California), Fort
07.37 The skateboarder's lived map of the city.

07.38 A rare example of a conventional skateboarding map. Five alternative routes through Bristol (1978).
Lauderdale (Florida) and the urban backwaters of Nevada, Utah, Iowa, Kentucky, Connecticut, and New Jersey. Thrasher and R.A.D. consistently did the same in the 1980s. In such articles, the reader-skater finds descriptions of local banks, rails, curbs etc., not just to encourage a visit, but to generally demonstrate that such locations are to be found in all urban centres, and so available to all urban skaters.

Here are more pictures of Everyman skating in Everytown. It could be your town. It could be you.

Think of all the different types of terrain: curbs, hills, ditches, pools, ramps, ledges, bumps. Challenge yourself. Skate something different. Go skate.

This is a communication which engenders empathy and similarity between towns and skaters, not a spectacularised Other of terrain and personalities.

In their own locality, therefore, the skateboarder's cognitive representation is neither map nor directory, for skateboarding is “hard to put onto paper” nor of a spectacularised centre-point, but a mental knowledge composed of highly detailed local knowledge about dispersed places, micro-architectures and accessible times.

Adventuring around and finding new spots is without a doubt the best aspect of city skating.

Skaters' representations thus have more in common with the Situationist tactics of the dérive, détournement and psychogeography – “maps” composed from the opportunities offered by the physical and emotional contours of the city, and, above all, enacted through a run across different spaces and moments.

I'm directed most to movements, the way I travel, the directions I move in. I follow my feelings.

When you have no destination, the only reason for movement is the enjoyment of all your movement.

Skating is a continual search for the unknown.

Skateboarders' representational maps are thus always situated through a continual re-living of the city – “an open mind always seeking out new lines and possibilities.” Skaters attempt neither to “see” the city or comprehend it as a totality, but to live it as simultaneously representation and physicality.

Walls aren't just walls, banks aren't just banks, curbs aren't just curbs and so on. Mapping cities out in your head according to the distribution of blocks and stairs, twisting the meaning of your environment around to fit your own needs and imagination. It's brilliant being a skateboarder isn't it?

Always be on the alert for a possible spot. Be alert keep your eyes open and your head oscillating.

Adventuring around and finding new spots is without a doubt the best aspect of city skating.

Another distinction from conventional maps concerns temporality. In the aerial form of map, the entire city is understood simultaneously within a single glance – but in skateboarders' cognitive mapping the time is that of the run, composed of a disparate objects in a sequence (linear time), with some objects “read” once (isolated time), others encountered several times (repeated time) and still others returned to again and again on different occasions (cyclical time). The whole run can also be repeated the same or differently (differential time).
Ridin' from spot to spot, at high speed, during rush hour is my version of the ultimate test for any urban "street skater." On a good day, when all the stop lights are working in my favour, I feel like I've figured out where my place is in this fucked-up world. That lasts for maybe a minute, then the feeling disappears and I'm lost again. So it goes.

Skateboarders are thus more concerned with temporal distance as proximity (temporal closeness of things, temporal locality), and its repetition, than with time as a valuable resource or measure of efficiency; time for skaters is what is lived, experienced and produced, not what is required. It's about time, it's about space, it's about time to skate someplace.

Interestingly, 1970s skaters referred to the skating event as a "session" — a temporal term; 1990s street skaters, however, increasingly refer to the act of repeatedly skating at a particular place as "localising" — a spatial term. While both "session" and "localise" are active meanings, processes which skaters do to the terrains around them, in the latter's spatialised term duration is relocated from a regime of routine and sequence into indeterminacy — a notion not of accuracy but looseness, of time being adapted to the act of skating. The skateboarder's time is a social time.

Another aspect of this sense of adaptive temporality concerns memory and documentation, for the skateboarder's is not an historical but everyday memory, often surviving only for the period in which a set of places are skated. Skateboarders thus negate the "historical" time of the city, being wholly unconcerned with the many decades and processes of its construction, so that the city appears out-of-the-blue with no temporal past. "I've always lived for..."
the present. I live for the present.”

Nor is the city recorded by skateboarders, but is that of the here-and-now, the immediate object, re-born each day of the skater’s run. “This isn’t art, it isn’t business, it’s life.” Just, then, as skateboarders do not attempt to understand the city, nor do they try to document it. Skateboarding leaves almost no text to be read; its marks and assaults leave virtually no discernible script for others to translate and comprehend. We must then revise our earlier depiction of skateboarding as a mode of writing to that of speaking of the city – that “speech doubling” which at once interrogates and increases the meaning of the city, while leaving its original text intact. Above all, speech requires the actual presence of the subject, the active speaker of the city, and so is not “cool” but “hot.” Speaking-skateboarding is not a mimicking of the city, an oration of a pre-given text, but a performative utterance wherein the speaker forms anew themselves and the city.

The new urban strategist realizes that while it may not pay to be different, no one can really afford the price of being the same. In the new master plan, conformation has been replaced by confrontation. Act, don’t react, turn off the air conditioner go outside and move.

It is, therefore, in the continual performance of skateboarding that its meaning and actions are manifested; as one skateboard maxim puts it, “shut up and skate,” or:
Watchin' and Wonderin' won't get you there. Grab your board and get outta that chair. These are not things which can be simply seen or which can be understood through pure abstraction; like rhythms, skateboarding requires a multiplicity of senses, thoughts and activities in order to be represented and comprehended. Rhythms disclose things, not through explanation or codified interpretation, but through lived experience. Above all, because the experiencer relates the fundamental conditions of their own temporality to that of the world outside, they create a subject-object engagement that is ultimately a lived form of dialectical thought. 

Here is found that old philosophical question (the subject and the object and their relationships) posed in non-speculative terms, close to practice. The observer at the window knows that he takes as first reference his time, but that the first impression displaces itself and includes the most diverse rhythms.

Leaves in the city Swirl into dry piles of garbage salad and drown in puddles of grease. City grime fills in cracks and blends, I skate to the tune of the crackle.

Skateboarding is then a kind of unconscious dialectical thinking, an engagement with the spatial and temporal rhythms of the city, skateboarders using themselves as reference but then rethinking the city through their actions. The question now begs as to what thoughts are made through such actions. What does skateboarding implicitly say about the city and its architecture?
Zero degree architecture is a field of the meaningless, a series of signals, a code reductive in individual signs and complex in its multitudinous instructions. Yet the architecture and spaces of the modern city are not wholly constraining, for there is a contradiction between the homogenising reduction of space by business, and the open differentiation of urban space in the city as a whole – and it is this contradiction that skateboarding works within.

While advertisements and controlled spaces contribute to the “terrorism” of everyday life, part of the intensification of the everyday as a mode of production and of administering society, skateboarding offers both an apparently non-commercial realm of compensation and a confrontation of the instructive mechanics of signals. There are no more white lines to stay within, sidewalks to conform to or bases to tag. It’s all an open highway with hydrants, curbs, bumpers, shopping carts, door handles and pedestrians.

Skateboarding counters signal architecture with a body-centric and multi-sensory performative activity, and with an indifference to function, price and regulation, creating new patterns of space and time, and turning the signals of the city into ephemeral symbols of everyday meaning and duration.

Consider also that signals are not there for their own sake, so that when skaters confront these signals they are also necessarily critiquing their underlying logic of profit, exchange, efficiency, control, normalcy, predictability, regulated space and time. Skateboarding, therefore, challenges the notion that space is there to be obeyed, and that we exist solely...
as efficient automata within the processes of exchange and accumulation. Furthermore, if skateboarding suggests the move from things to works, from design to experiential creativity, there should also be a corresponding shift in production and labour and in consumption, exchange and use. It is to these areas which we now turn.

**Production and Labour**

Architecture is intended for the production of things - either products as commodities in factories, knowledge in universities and museums, labour power in housing, information and decisions in offices, and so on. In this sense all buildings are places of the expenditure of energy, engaged in the production and distribution of things. Skateboarding, however, offers no such contribution, consuming the building while not engaging with its productive activity. Consequently, it implicitly denies both that labour should be productive of things, and that architecture should be directed toward that purpose.

They'll never get out of that grind except by dying. I wonder why they ever wanted to get in.311

Life's not a job, it's an adventure.312

For example, *Thrasher* ridiculed in a spoof advertisement the labour of a "pool service technician" attending to the maintenance of empty, skateable swimming pools.313 The clear implication is that, by contrast, the productive labour of skateboarding produces neither things nor services, but is a pleasure-driven activity of its own.

Furthermore, this productive-of-nothing labour is disruptive to the optimal management of urban space. Where business concerns invade not only economics and politics but also social experience, setting itself up as model for social administration in general,314 skateboarding rejects the "efficiency" and "economic" logic of urban space, undertaking
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an activity which, by business standards, has an entirely different rationale.

In a culture that measures progress in terms of cost per square foot, the streetstylist takes matters into his own hands. He dictates his own terms and he makes his own fun.315

This is particularly evident in the city centre, which is increasingly becoming the centre of decision-making, and the new centrality of power.316 Skateboarding is here irrational, for why would one spend so much time balancing on a piece of wood with four wheels? Why would one confront the logic of walking and looking by going up as well as along, touching as well as seeing, impacting as well as remaining apart? [0743]

The true skater surveys all that is offered, takes all that is given, goes after the rest and leaves nothing to chance. In a society on hold and planet on self-destruct, the only safe recourse is an insane approach.317

This irrationality is particularly evident if we consider that the basic spatial plane of street skating is 2-4 feet above the conventional urban ground of the
pavement. Furthermore, its architecture is frequently vertical, as in street skating moves like ollies or wallriding.

Wallriding is the most nonsensical facet of skateboarding, an art of mind over matter.\textsuperscript{318}

This “irrationality” pervades skateboarding practices. For example, when the Vans Warped competition tour came to London’s Canary Wharf in the summer of 1996, skaters spent as much time skating the surrounding banks, steps, blocks, gaps, walls and pathways of this decision-making centre as the competition site itself.\textsuperscript{319} Given that Canary Wharf is one the great centres of the global city,\textsuperscript{320} skateboarding in such places also helps deny the logic of the city as pre-eminently existing solely for the benefit of global forces and flows of information and capital. It reminds us that the city is also a series of diverse place-specific phenomena,\textsuperscript{321} ignorance of the global serving to heighten awareness of the local.

Episodes like this, enacted in the heart of the business city, show that skateboarding is part of that great dialectic between labour and non-labour. Vallely is typical of many skaters’ attitude to waged labour: “I’ve told myself from the age of twelve, ‘I’ll never work a day in my life.’”\textsuperscript{322} In reaction to such attitudes, one critic railed that skateboarding “appears to serve no known purpose in life and does nothing to raise national productivity.”\textsuperscript{323} That, however, is exactly the point.

Nonetheless, the triumph of non-labour does not entail so much an absence of effort\textsuperscript{324} but a redefinition of what “production” might mean, and it is here too that skateboarding offers some insights. At first sight, skateboarders’ labour produces no “products” beyond the move, a “commodity” exchangeable only by means of performative action, so appears to waste effort and time. But that “principle of economy” which sees a “waste” of energy as abnormal is itself a reduction of life to mere survival.\textsuperscript{325} Skateboarding, in contrast, undertakes a release of energy that either creates or modifies space, espousing play (\textit{ludo}), art and festival – Eros (the pleasure principle) opposed to Thanatos (the reality or productivity principle).\textsuperscript{326} [0744]
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\caption{“It looks like Toy Town, so let us play.” Skateboarding outside post-modernist office building, High Wycombe (1991).}
\end{figure}

[\textit{When they work, we’ll skate.}]\textsuperscript{327} The labour of skateboarding is then not the production of commodities but the effort of play, the ludic.

Each trick is the result of the dedication that you’ve put into skateboarding, years and years of concentration and commitment to increasing your abilities and potential for enjoyment, because you genuinely want to, not because you’ve been brainwashed into wanting.\textsuperscript{328} Or as one skateboarder put it, skaters have “moved beyond shiny products and consumerism.”\textsuperscript{329}
All of us we're all existing beyond their shit stained grasp. They (the outside world) can't understand us now, they can't even rip us off anymore. Fuck the fashion theft, you know it doesn't matter. Everyone has the ability to use skating to rise above the repressive, hassle filled, cess pit world. We can all become higher types.3 3 0

Unlike the machine, aimed at the production of things, the skateboard-tool aims to produce new moves and spaces, creating new kinds of labours as uses and pleasures outside of normative work. Production becomes "liberating actions of pure creativity/giving," generating qualities, experiences, phenomenal encounters, relations of body and thing, pain and fun.3 3 3

You earn quality when you skate.3 3 4

Happiness and fun are our staple experiences and, thank christ, they always will be.3 3 5

Similarly, the reproduction of labour power becomes not reproduction of future workers but of energetic desiring bodies, capable of creative expenditures of effort. Skateboarders, as young adults, see themselves not as the reserve army waiting to serve in industry, but as living according to a different rationale. The totality with which skateboarders conceive of their opposition to work and career patterns is crucial, for, as shown in Chapter 6, skateboarders do not so much temporarily escape from the routinised world of school, family and social conventions as replace it with a whole new way of life.

Forget about the mainline and the fast line; the edge of the glide is all that is of value.3 3 7

I'm not gonna be stuck in an office someday.3 3 8

Skateboarding, particularly for those in their twenties or older, thus becomes far more than leisure or respite from school or work; it is considered to be a way of life outside of "labour" altogether. Contrary to the world of offices and banking, its city is "not Nat West." [0745]

One contradiction here is that the extraordinary architectural wealth of the city, from which skateboarding is born, is itself a product of waged labour. It could be argued here that skateboarding is a revival of the "dead labour" (Marx) contained in the city's means of production.3 3 9 On the one hand, this might relate to the re-use of derelict city spaces, as with many UK 1970s skateparks like Rolling Thunder.
There are 86,400 seconds everyday. On March 15th, 1992, this is how Daewon Song spent one of his.

0746  "There are 86,400 seconds everyday. On March 15th, 1992, this is how Daewon Song spent one of his." Ollie double kickflip.
in the disused Brentford Market, Chiswick, or the Cage in a former Brighton fish market, or Mad Dog Bowl (London), Malibu Dog Bowl (Nottingham) and others built in old cinemas. But these are rare instances compared to the globally-dispersed and locally-focused activity of 1980s-90s street skating, and so it is, above all, skateboarders' production of space that facilitates this revival of dead labour and so promotes use over exchange:

...Through the production of space [. . .] living labour can produce something that is no longer a thing, nor simply a set of tools, nor simply a commodity. In space needs and desires can reappear as such [. . .] spaces for play, spaces for enjoyment, architectures of wisdom or pleasure. In and by means of space, the work may shine through the product, use value may gain the upper hand over exchange value.

Skateboarding is a resurrection of the dead labour of construction, either as a new use for an unused building, as a new use for a building simultaneously being used something else, or a new use space with an ambiguous purpose. Thus skateboarding's revival of "dead labour" occurs from the moment the building is constructed, and does not have to await the end of its constructional or functional life-cycle.

There is, then, a temporal production also at work here. Capitalism is a mixture of production and speculation, alternatively sacrificing long-term social benefits to short-term profits or short-term social needs in favour of programmed investment schedules. Skateboarding time, in contrast, is immediate, no more than a second (single move), a minute (run), weeks and months (repeated visits), or few years (a skater's individual activity). Skateboarding time is also discontinuous, composed of a few minutes here and there, spread over space, and in-between the socially programmed activities of production and exchange. It is an alternating rhythm within the regular cyclical rhythm of the city. For example, the long temporality of property ownership, the medium temporality...
Chapter 7 Urban Space

of lease arrangements or the short temporality of the parking meter are all avoided by skateboarders. 

While "economic space subordinates time to itself," and "political space expels it as threatening and dangerous," skateboarding promotes an appropriative recovery of time as well as space. Skateboarding reasserts the here-ness and now-ness of architecture.

Performance transportation is the present and the future. Take it where you want and make it go where you want to take it. Tomorrow is today and you are it.

Time has come...

Skateboarding is "one rhythmical expression in a multitude of rhythmical expressions," and thus helps to restore the urban oeuvre by creating a schizophrenic coexistence of various space-times of play, exchange, circulation, politics and culture.

The citizen resists the State by a particular use of time. A struggle therefore unfolds for appropriation in which rhythms play a major role. Through them social, therefore, civil time, seeks and manages to shield itself from State, linear, unirhythmic measured and measuring time [...] Time is hence linked to space and to the rhythms of the people who occupy this space.

In this coexistence of urban time-spaces we see the dialectic of labour and non-labour at work, wherein skateboarding shows that the production of space is exactly that, and not a production of things in space. And it shows that time as well as space is produced through appropriation, resisting by entangled polyrhythms the domination of space on the part of State power.

Consumption, Exchange and Use

Skateboarding involves a critique of the processes of exchange and consumption in the modern city, and, above all else, proposes a reassertion of use values as opposed to exchange values. Again, this requires further elaboration.

Capitalist space, as commodity, can be likened to any goods – simultaneously abstract and concrete, and produced for the purposes of exchange. We have already seen how a different attitude to labour and production leads skaters to negate the productive labour and routinised work that goes on inside buildings. Thus by the simple act of reasserting use values – using space without paying for it – skateboarding is similarly indifferent to the exchangeability of these places through rents, leases and freeholds. As Sidewalk Surfer put it, skaters oppose "the real criminals, who despoil

07.48 Use over exchange. Matt Pritchard, smith grind on window ledge of Barclays Bank, Cardiff (1997).

Matthew "Wig" Worland
the world in their never ending quest for capital."\textsuperscript{353}

[The oeuvre is use value and the product is exchange value. The eminent use of the city, that is, of streets and squares, edifices and monuments, is \textit{la Fête} (a celebration which consumes unproductively, without other advantage but pleasure and prestige and enormous riches in money and objects).\textsuperscript{354}

Any place you have concrete you can excel. You don’t need anything else to do it, you don’t need teams, you don’t need much money, and it’s infinitely adaptable to circumstances.\textsuperscript{355}

Skateboarding thus works, like the \textit{fête}, through the great wealth of objects at its disposal, but, unlike the \textit{fête}, without the squandering of money and without actually owning them.

[The streets are owned by everyone. Streets give the gift of freedom, so enjoy your possession.\textsuperscript{356}

Abstract space, beyond a commodity in itself, is also the “medium of exchange.”\textsuperscript{357} and this is increasingly the model for the city, where all buildings and spaces are considered as opportunities for commodity exchange and purchase,\textsuperscript{358} such that “exchange value is so dominant over use and use value that it more or less suppresses it.”\textsuperscript{359} But it is precisely this focus on the medium of exchange which skateboarding rejects. \textsuperscript{0749} Where the managers and owners of abstract space wish that society was solely directed at commodity production, exchange and consumption, by occupying those spaces immediately external to stores and offices skateboarders refuse to engage in such processes and instead insert use values where there are supposed to be none – in the \textit{places} of exchange. Skateboarders, then, “represent more than just sec-
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ondary users; they essentially redefine business and governmental spaces. This kind of attitude is also evident in skaters' frequent refusal in the 1990s to pay skatepark charges, preferring to skate elsewhere in the city.

London skaters aren't willing to pay. They'd rather go and skate the streets, there's sick spots everywhere.

As such, skateboarding is a small fragment of that utopian conception of the urban as use, not exchange.

Urban society, a collection of acts taking place in time, privileging a space (site, place) and privileged by it, in turn signifiers and signified, has a logic different from that of merchandise. It is another world. The urban is based on use value.

This is one of the main reasons why urban street skating is more "political" than 1970s skateboarding's use of found terrains; street skating generates new uses that at once work within (in time and space) and negate the original ones.

The opposition of this city of use to the abstract space of economic rationalism is further emphasised if we consider that society itself is being ever more organised for the purposes of the consumption of goods, and that use values are increasingly denied in the act of consumption - we are encouraged to consume signs and ideologies rather than uses.

In architectural terms, this process of the consumption of signs is to be found in the increasing spectacularisation of architectural function into pure form, whereby history, meaning and politics alike are reduced to the thin surface of "popularist" post-modern imagery, creating an urban realm more akin to the theme park than a lived city. Such a lack of distinction between things, and images and signs derived from things, leads to a great dissatisfaction in their consumption. Skateboarders, like everyone else, are confronted with the heightening intensification of advertising in new places and lines of vision.

I grabbed my skateboard and stared rolling towards downtown. All around me there were billboards with new cars, cell phones, fast food, giant heads smoking six foot long cigarettes. Posters advertised movies and TV shows, clothes I couldn't afford being worn by people who looked too good to be human. Everyone wanted my attention.

But in the face of such commodification, street skating does not consume architecture as projected image but as a material ground for action and so gives the human body something to do other than passively stare at advertising surfaces; its motility creates an interest in other things, materials, forms and in the skater's own physical presence in the city.

There was all sorts of craziness going on around me, all over the city, but I skimmed above it on my skateboard. Just gliding along, protected by my board.

Skateboarding in this sense is not only a reassertion of use values, but also of the spatiality and temporality of human needs, desires and actions. As skater Ewan Bowman put it,

Happiness is a state of mind that takes years to achieve, an equilibrium that comes about after hard work and commitment to following your own directions, and acting on your own personal desires, not those thrust upon you by multi corporate entities. There are only a few routes to authentic happiness left that haven't been turned into theme
parks for the brain dead, or criminalised out of existence. Thankfully, skateboarding is one of those alternative routes to fulfillment.

The tactics here are both spatial and temporal, seizing specific spaces for small periods of time; skateboarding is thus rhythmically out-of-step with the dominant routines of the city, "inconsistent with the adapted pace and uses of our molded environment," creating a counter-rhythm of moves and runs. Skateboarding shows that the temporality of appropriation is different to that of ownership, seeking an active, moving time related to the specific needs and actions of urban dwellers.

Appropriated space must be understood in relation to time, and to rhythms of time and life.

For example, Bowman explained his urban experience of London as a mixture of different speeds, actions and emotions.

The raddest thing about skating here is skating on the roads in amongst the traffic, the fear and the adrenaline mixing as you skate from spot to spot nearly being hit by cars. That’s a mad rush going through your body, over-taking the cars, being overtaken, going through a red light in a junction, dicing with big metal f**kers that would probably kill you.

Or as an American skater reflected:

If you haven’t dodged traffic in the urban jungle, then you haven’t lived. Whatever gets in my way is skated and vacated as I weave through the throngs of suit-wearing mutards that do their best to get in the way.

Significantly, this spatiality and temporality is different to that of 1970s found terrains; whereas the latter colonised a specific place for a weekend or afternoon, and so mimicked the idea of ownership, urban street skating is more ephemeral, taking over a number of sites for shorter periods, often just a few minutes or seconds. "Always move on." For example, New York skaters considered 20 minutes to be a lengthy session on a single site.

Stagnating at the same spot is a step backward to a place where the regular world will always know where to find us.

Urban skateboarding is not so much a colonisation as a series of rolling encounters, an eventful journey. It is also, consequently, the reverse of the temporal logic of built-in obsolescence; where capi-
talism produces objects which wear out faster than necessary (a light-bulb), or which become technically out-of-date (audio formats), skateboarding creates a use which is shorter than the life-time of the object.

Televisions, file cabinets, and cars are the offal of a disposable society. Wasted resources alone are a crime, but not recycling is high treason [. . .] From now, its search and destroy.377

Skateboarding here is a critique of ownership, but not of wealth. If society should involve the rehabilitation of wealth as the socialised sharing of amenity,378 possession is not private ownership but the ability to "have the most complex, the 'richest' relationships of joy or happiness with the 'object."

-- we should own not nothing but more of things, without recourse to legal relations.382 And it is this which street skating addresses, being concerned with those parts of the city "which people own but no one possesses."381

The important thing is not that I should become the owner of a little plot of land in the mountains, but that the mountains be open to me.382

Or as one skater put it:

Just because you own it doesn't mean you're in charge of it.383

If the relation between the skater and the city is not one of production or exchange, what is it? For the skateboarder, consider that "primary relationships are not with his fellow man, but with the earth beneath his feet, concrete and all384 -- the relation is of the self to the city, where human needs are rescued from the blind necessity of staying alive to become the appropriation of the self and the city.
together. Thus where possession focuses on the sense of having, the rejection of ownership enables the resurrection of all the senses; and where some have seen the modern architecture of the city as alienating of the self, this architecture can also be the means by which social relations are constructed. Practices like skateboarding therefore suggest not only the re-distribution of urban space according to the maxim "to each according to his needs," but also the reformulation of the self according to the physical potential of the built environment. The experience of the self in relation to the city is, then, neither production or consumption, but having that "mad rush" described by Bowman above. "It's all amazing, an unexplainable feeling that you have to feel to understand."

This occurs emotionally as well as physically, so that just as the skater's body is developed perceptually and physiologically, so the relation to the city becomes one of attraction and respect. Our relations with cities are like our relations with people, and as one Brighton skater described this town — known as "Pig City" — this was a conceptual and not purely geographic relationship.

Not everyone who lives here and skates, lives in Pig City. It's a place that you live in your head.

In this context, it is unsurprising that the Red Hot Chili Peppers, a band closely associated with skateboarding, often include what amount to love songs to cities in their recordings, including one to LA and the individual's movement through it:

```
Sometimes I feel
Like I don't have a partner
Sometimes I feel
Like my only friend
Is the city I live in
The City of Angels
Lonely as I am
```

Together we cry

```
I drive on her streets
'Cause she's my companion
I walk through her hills
'Cause she knows who I am
She sees my good deeds
And she kisses me windy
I never worry
Now that is a lie
```

The city is the place of love, desire, turmoil and uncertainty. It is not owned, but related to.

In terms of social relations with others, the Self and the Other are not cut off but mediated by the city. Where the city frequently tries to dictate the social identity of its inhabitants, a spatialised version of the "marketing orientation" which encourages people to play a role, skateboarders use their particular appropriation of the city to construct themselves and their relations with others; the rhythm of the city as external to the self and the rhythm of the self as intimate forms of consciousness and behaviour are counterposed.

The skater is not a separate entity from his terrain [... he is the terrain with all its intricate pieces.]

It's the only thing that I know how to do, and if I ever stopped doing it I would be no one [... Skateboarding is my only identity for better or worse.]

In particular, for the skater it is the outdoor spaces, not interiors, which form the socio-space of self-identity and construction — a theme implicit throughout both Lefebvre's writings and skateboarding subcultural practice.

Our home life is exposed on the pavement. Everybody joins in with us, let's get rid of the
Counterposing the rhythms of city and self. Joe Fino, ollie over rail, Coronado Island (1986).
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cars and put all the furniture into the street. One big living room, and everyone's welcome.399

[S]katers are a different breed. Not a breed apart. A breed that exists within a steel, asphalt and concrete framework.400

The meaning of skateboarding, then, comes from its engagement with the spatial nature of production, exchange, consumption and its reassertion of use values, together with the subcultural values of a generalised rejection of society already identified above. Significantly, when Thrasher first showed the new street skating, it was not the skaters as individuals but their performance of moves which they promoted as "studies in non-conformity."401 We must therefore consider that the spatial act of skateboarding is meaningless devoid of its subcultural attitudes, while, conversely, its subcultural attitudes have no substance except as produced in space in relation to urban architecture. This is a true dialectic of the social and the spatial, each produced through the other. Rather than allowing architecture and the city to dictate who they are, the skateboarder poses in response the question of "who am I?"

In terms of the kind of society this might indicate, clearly skateboarders as a group of young people are not about to take over the revolutionary mission of the proletariat;402 as "small bait in a sea of corporate sharks"403 they in no way seek to fundamentally alter anything. "We're not out to fight the world."404 A Thrasher cover proclaiming "Skaters of the World Unite" over an image of Lenin was simply rhetoric, highlighting a feature on skaters in different countries worldwide.405 [0753]

Nor do skateboarders undertake in any way a self-critique, relying instead on an adolescent marginal negation of the adult world.406 They offer only an "infrapolitics" of resistance, a "hidden transcript" intelligible only to other skaters.407 [0754] On the
other hand, young people pre-figure the horizon of the future, becoming increasingly dominant in UK inner cities and new towns like London, Slough and Luton (while retirement towns like Christchurch, Worthing and Eastbourne absorb older populations), so allowing their beliefs and activities to become explicit in these areas. In particular, this prefiguration is enacted through an "ironic" assault on the rest of the world, exploiting their position of weakness to become "aggressive whenever the opportunity arises" and so to defiantly "irritate giants." Thus through highlighting certain conflicts (especially private property and social use, rational efficiencies and social space), skaters utilise their position of weakness (youth) to irritate authority and convention, thereby making comments regarding the whole nature of the city: "always question authority."

As such, although a "counter-culture" or "alternative society" is always difficult to define, skateboarding concurs with Lefebvre’s idea that a new society might include a primacy of use over exchange, a countering of quantity by quality, and that the centralised rationale of capitalism and state can be challenged through "local powers," however small. Skateboarding is "an infinite postmodern mutant," a critical tactic that denaturalises the city of abstract space and exchange. It suggests that changing the manner of consumption can help identify new, radical requirements that the city must meet, that confronting needs and desires – not products and things – creates change, and it proposes a return to art not as aestheticism but adaptation of time and space, an engagement with objects unrestricted to their use qua commodities but as the common property of social experience.

Skateboarding is an adaptation to the concrete jungle, a sport for the evolving American landscape [. . .] streetstyle is about turning the ugly urban shit around you into fodder for fun. Skateboarding shows that pre-existing uses of space are not the only possible ones, that architecture can instead be productive of things, and consumed by activities, which are not explicitly commodified. Buildings, architecture and urban space, we might propose, should be thought of as places of use, lived experiences, love, objects and concepts all at once. Here, architecture is not a thing, but part of the appropriation of the world, life and desires, space and time. Correspondingly, socio-spatial freedom becomes not the negative, bourgeois right of separation from others, but Marx’s "development of human powers as an end in itself."

7.08 Spatial and Temporal Censorship

Skateboarding is antagonistic towards the urban environment – as one skater described it, "a skateboard is the one thing you can use as a weapon in the street that you don’t get patted down for." In redefining space for themselves, skateboarders take over space conceptually as well as physically and so strike at the heart of what everyone else understands by the city: they “hammer the panic buttons of those uninterested in this pursuit of thrill and achievement.”

Skating [. . .] makes you appreciate things on a different level.

Around 37th, there is a quiet garden spot where students can relax in the shade of some flowering trees and enjoy a restful moment. Be sure to do some grinds on the edge of the steps down to this place, or just drop right down them (there are only two). Do a slide or something before you go. They’re in a city. Don’t let them forget it.

This is the most overt political space produced by skateboarders, a pleasure ground carved out of the
city as a kind of continuous reaffirmation of one of the central Lefebvrian slogans of 1968, that beneath the pavement, lies the beach.\textsuperscript{423} As Lefebvre notes, hegemony and homogeneity are refused by different groups' rhythms of time and space. Or as one skater saw it, “[s]ome of us, at some point of the song, skip out of our track.”\textsuperscript{424} Rhythms are, then, always in negotiation with each other, and polyrhythm is always a conflict.\textsuperscript{425} Yet this is not always a conflict of equal powers. Skateboarders' actions are neither a significant force nor a real threat to established ideologies. Its mode of critique, as noted above, is ironic - weak yet ever defiantly aggressive.

As such, it is important to identify the results of this kind of critical activity. Even in the 1960s skaters met with protests from the California Medical Association and legislative restrictions imposed by city councils.\textsuperscript{426} In the 1970s, LA skaters met with fines of US$250-2,000 for riding in pools and full-pipes,\textsuperscript{427} while in Florida and across the US skaters encountered similar reactions.\textsuperscript{428} Every time someone managed to find a slight slant, the cops would erect a NO SKATEBOARDING SIGN.\textsuperscript{429}

City ordinances of the 1970s were mostly intended to reduce collisions between skaters and pedestrians, and were passed in places ranging from Santa Monica and Carmel in California to Zurich and The Hague.\textsuperscript{430} Such legal actions, fuelled by innumerable local newspapers articles about the “hazards of skateboarding,”\textsuperscript{431} were also common in the UK: Kensington Gardens Broadwalk was resurfaced with gravel to deter skateboarders;\textsuperscript{432} 20 Dudley skateboarders faced public prosecution under local by-laws in 1978;\textsuperscript{433} and skaters were banned from places as diverse as Blackpool promenade,\textsuperscript{434} Cardiff roads,\textsuperscript{435} British Rail concourses and (perhaps wisely) platforms,\textsuperscript{436} and London’s Royal Festival Hall.\textsuperscript{437} While The Times saw skateboarding as the “best youthful antidote to urban boredom that has come along for years,”\textsuperscript{438} more usually the cry, as in London’s Evening News,\textsuperscript{439} was to ban skateboarding from city streets.\textsuperscript{440}

Another area of institutional concern addressed the physical safety of skateboarders themselves.\textsuperscript{441} “Official” advice here addressed a range of issues: equipment standards, “safe” skateboarding procedures, tuition and first aid. Pseudo-scientific surveys of skateboard equipment were carried out in the UK by the consumer organisation Which? and the Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents (RoSPA).\textsuperscript{442} In 1977, the US National Safety Committee and Consumer Product Safety Committee (CPSC) discussed standards for skateboards, skateparks and personal safety equipment.\textsuperscript{443} A number of detailed studies of personal safety in skateboarding were carried out in the late 1970s. One by the CPSC estimated that 325,000 skateboard-related accidents took place in 1978,\textsuperscript{444} while various organisations in the US and UK, such as RoSPA, tried, without success, first to ban skateboarding altogether\textsuperscript{445} and then institutionalise it through public service announcements, organised training programmes, a national conference and an accident prevention code called The Skatcats Quizbook.\textsuperscript{446} Safety films were also produced in the USA for skaters and parents to watch.\textsuperscript{447} Skateboard magazines themselves frequently ran features on these issues, such as the “Skate Safe” column in SkateBoarder, and “The Skateboarding Safety Code” in Skateboard\textsuperscript{448} professional skateboarders often contributed to safety clinics in the 1970s.\textsuperscript{449}

This did not stop, however, groups like the “Americans for Democratic Action” calling for a complete skateboarding ban and the CPSC from considering similar legislation.\textsuperscript{450} Skateboards were banned entirely in Norway in 1979, and skaters were forced to smuggle boards across the border and to skate in surveillance-free areas.\textsuperscript{451} This regulation was relaxed by 1985,\textsuperscript{452} but street skating was not made legal until the early 1990s.\textsuperscript{453}
Such concerns have now died away, perhaps from the realisation that skateboarding although physically robust is not inherently life-threatening; common skatepark injuries typically concerned only cuts, gashes, minor sprains and breaks to the wrist. Exceptions tended to occur when skaters collided with cars or skated on inappropriate areas like car park roofs.

Instead, the intensification of skateboarding in public streets has lead to a more pervasive form of repression. Some US cities such as San Samon and San Diego in California placed curfews or banned skateboarding in public areas, while Dogtown skaters in Venice Beach had to fight off a ban in 1989. "Skateboard ticket" fines for US$75 were being handed out by Huntington Beach police in 1995. Other such legislation was passed in Arizona, Chicago, Denver, Fort Worth, Philadelphia, Portland, Sacramento, San Francisco, Santa Cruz, Savannah and elsewhere across the US. In the UK, city councils including Chelmsford, Birmingham, Manchester, Leeds and Plymouth banned skateboarding from parks and promenades. This pattern has been repeated worldwide in countries from Australia and Sweden to Netherlands, Brazil and Canada. The general effect has been to embed the threat of arrest, fines and even imprisonment within skateboarding's everyday activity.

Abstract space is more often about prohibitions than stimulation (except concerning consumption) and this often involves issues of time. While the UK Labour Party and police forces consider imposing curfews for children, for many skateboarders this has long been a reality; San Francisco City and County, for example, banned skateboarding from all roads and sidewalks during night-time hours. Skateboarding, contradictorily, is at once "criminalised" as a night-time activity (as US President George Bush remarked of skateboarders, "I just thank God they don't have guns") and rep-
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resented as "child's play" at other times. Even usu­
ally thoughtful newspapers like the *Washington Post*
have cited skateboarding as an irresponsible and
vandalous activity to be banned from city streets.486

In more spatial terms, particularly in those areas
hovering between private and public domains,
skateboarders have encountered a politics of space
similar to the experiences of the homeless. Like the
homeless, skateboarders occupy urban space with­
out engaging in economic activity of interiors, to the
annoyance of building owners and managers.

The local business leaders do not want the
kids interfering with their customers. Kids
are only ok when they are spending
money.487

As a result, urban managers have declared skaters
as trespassers, or cited the marks skateboarding
causes as criminal damage: "they smash up all the
new kerbs and scratch all the banisters."488 (0759)
Skaters are also arrested for waxing curbs and
other street architecture.489 Even private citizens
seem to delight in "confiscating" skateboards - an
action which is legally theft490 - while skate maga­
zines have since the late 1980s detailed a litany of
aggressive actions by skater-phobic police officers
and neighbourhood residents. To give one specific
example, at the prestigious Liverpool Street and
Broadgate office development in London's City area,
skateboarders who frequented the stone benches
on Bishopsgate, and more occasionally the street
furniture deeper within its pseudo-public spaces,
chipped away edges and left coloured streaks.491
The City Corporation, its police force and private
security forces consequently began systematic video
surveillance of skateboarders, (0761) and implem­
ented a uk£30 fine. Skaters were removed from the site,
or prosecuted using legislation dating from 1839.492

With sparks flying and the grinding sound of
truck against marble echoing throughout the
night sky, we are inevitably clocked by the notoriously petty Liverpool Street security brigade.493

Another, 1990 bylaw banned skateboarders from all City walkways, with a UK£20 fine.494

A different response by urban managers has been to similar to their actions against the homeless. Where the homeless are ejected from business and retail areas by such measures like curved bus benches, window ledge spikes and doorway sprinkler systems,495 so skaters encounter rough textured surfaces,496 spikes and bumps added to handrails, blocks of concrete placed at the foot of banks, chains across ditches and steps, and new, unridable surfaces like gravel and sand. Leicester Council spent UK£10,000 making the banks around its Crown Court unskateable,497 while the Broadgate managers added vertical dividers to the Bishopsgate benches (a favourite place for board-slides) in the summer of 1997498

There is an increasing tendency for the state and pseudo-official groups to confront spatialised forms of social protest, ranging from the “zero tolerance” of the UK Labour Party toward graffiti artists,499 mass arrests at “Reclaim the Streets” event-parties,500 “farm watch” schemes to prevent raves,501 and direct action against road protesters.502 In Germany, the annual “Chaos Days” anarcho-punk festival held in Hanover is now controlled by police out-numbering punks by six to one.503 Skateboarding does not mount the kind of explicit political critique of many of these groups, nor does it provoke much social disruption. But it threatens nonetheless because it is neither explicit protest nor quiet conformism, game nor sport, public nor private activity, adult nor childish and, above all, precisely because it is a spatially and temporally diffused and dispersed activity. The repression of skateboarding is then, rarely systematic, certainly when compared to national laws against serious crimes. But it does point towards a dialectic between counter-culture and hegemonic
social practices, whether in London:

You always get grief from security guards, the police and drunk businessmen.504

Or small town America: [0765]

[M]uch of America is small towns where there is little or no crime [. . .] Why not go down the street and find some skaters making some noise and drag them downtown [. . .] Naturally we were the scapegoats of the whole town. Every crime or act of vandalism was blamed on us.505

The consequence has been that from the mid 1990s onward skateboarding has been ever-increasingly repressed through a pervasive tightening of geographically-dispersed localised conventions, laws and reactions.

Hardly a session goes by these days without someone hurling threats of bye-laws, cops and/or fines in our faces. Gone are the days when complaints about skateboarders were met with uncomprehending indifference from the relevant authorities.506

Or as one skater commented after having moved to central London:

I hadn’t counted on being moved on by the police every minute; had not expected to encounter so many skater-hating pedestrians and had not even begun to imagine that such ignorant gorillas could be employed as security guards at the new office complexes that served as our work hours playground.507

But treating skateboarding as a crime verges on the ridiculous, and such accusations "are founded on nothing and soon fall apart under cross examination."508 Consider the comparison with automobiles.

[S]kateboard made of wood, metal and plastic, costs about £100, runs on leg power; causes chips and scratches on bits of stone and metal. Car, costs a fortune, runs on poisonous shit, pollutes the air and water, fills the city with "smog," causes the death of hundreds of thousands of people every year. Mmmm? And yet despite all this cars are o.k. but skateboards are evil, objects of van-
dalism, a dangerous menace that must be stopped.509

One US skateboard company made similar comparisons, this time with more serious crimes.

We live in a society where thieves, rapists and murderers enjoy the luxury of wandering the streets clueless, while skaters are constantly bombarded with signs, harassment and just about every type of brain-washing known to man.510

Considered this way, skateboarding can only be rendered criminal through the most petty-minded of laws. This is largely because skateboarding is aimed at the appropriation – and not domination – of time and space. Thus skaters care little of ownership, and so implicitly oppose this capitalist principle. “All space is public space.”511 Nevertheless, skateboarding confronts neither the causes or the conditions of zero degree architecture, but simply denies its implicit logic, and hence its symbolic repression.512

Legislature directed at skateboarding is perhaps then not so much concerned with a crime as finding ever new ways for the conventionalised operations of the society to be legitimised.513 Skateboarding is here one of those “false crimes” used to help legitimise conventional orders and power,514 and is consequently legislated against to help validate the business- and commodity-oriented city. The only places in San Francisco where skateboarding was entirely banned, notably, were its business districts and roads.515

Furthermore, activities like skateboarding allow the State to divert attention from real problems and to create room for new actions.516 The rave parties and travellers in 1990s Britain thus resulted in the Conservative government’s Criminal Justice Act, through which it gained a range of powers previously denied to it and entirely out of scale with the problem at hand.

On this level, the conflict between skateboarding and hegemonic practices is representational. It is telling here that the most co-ordinated resistance on the part of skateboarding to the rest of society has come not from spatial contestations but in such campaigns as those to “Stop Skate Harassment”517 or assert that “Skateboarding Is Not a Crime.” This latter programme, begun in late 1987, used stickers in particular, plastered over every available public
Similar challenges to the rationality of banning skateboarding can be seen in a myriad of other tactics, such as the "Skateboarding Allowed" stencils applied to the street architecture of Pier 7 in San Francisco. Ultimately, being banned from the public domain becomes simply another obstacle to be overcome, and so even adds to the anarchist tradition of skateboarding.

I'm one of the many skaters in the world and I, for one, like skate harassment. Have you ever thought of the rush you get kicking down the street from some raving shop owner, or even better, the police?

They can kick us out, but we don't care, we'll be back. In the meantime, we'll just go on to the next spot and keep breaking it down.

For all you hopeful law enforcers out there,

YOU'LL NEVER GET US OFF THE STREETS!

The point is f**ck 'em all, they can't touch us now.

Legislation and authority are there to be resisted, for "[r]einterpretation and often downright subversion of such regulation is the skateboarder's creed." In this respect, skateboarders are part of a long process in the history of cities, a fight by the unempowered and disenfranchised for a distinctive social space of their own. In doing so, they bring time, space and social being together through a performative confrontation of the body and board with the architectural surface; theirs is "not only the space of 'no,' it is also the space of the body, and the space of 'yes,' of the affirmation of life."

This is just a small dream. A dream of endless pure creation. A movement without words.
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I began this thesis with the aim of identifying "a new kind of architectural history, one with new objects, methods and questions." This concluding chapter therefore addresses such concerns by way of a summary of what has gone before, giving a sense of closure to the thesis. I then turn to give a few intimations, identifying new directions and tendencies, for which no specific prescriptions can be given here. Future work, future architectural histories, future time-spaces alone will move things on once again.

8.01 Closure

As Chapter 2 showed through an analysis of work by Lefebvre and, in particular, Soja, that space is part of a dialectical process between itself and human agency; rather than an a priori entity it is produced by, and productive of, social being. As such, time, space and social being are inter-produced. Space-production cannot then be reduced to theory, but must be seen as a process involving not only theories but also practices, objects, ideas, imagination and experience. For the historian, this involves thinking about histories of spatiality through different levels of consciousness, temporalities and periodisation, social events and actions, and spatial scales. Textual play and the dominance of the scopic regime of epistemology can do no more than allude to such thinking, which must instead rest on the study of particular times, spaces and actions using the full battery of questions and techniques available to the historian.

Chapter 3, through a closer reading of Lefebvre, provided further clues as to how the historian of spatiality might approach their task. Firstly, the historian interested in the work of Lefebvre must realise that there is no method, no patented system to be found therein. Instead, Lefebvre delineates a set of theoretical ideas as discursive texts, and which are only ever approximations of a possible subject or method. Second, there are political objec-
life into a work of art. Actions are important not for their production of things, but for their production of meanings, subjects, relations, uses and desires.

Chapter 4 began the extension of this kind of thinking into a study of a specific urban practice: skateboarding. While the skateboard itself is a relatively basic piece of technology, its deployment within the space of the city yields some significant social, spatial and conceptual effects. Primarily, the engagement with the found terrains of LA and southern California showed that even at its outset skateboarding dissolved the physicality of the modern city into an imaginative re-enactment of an other space, the skateboarder's micro-experience of the found terrain causing a new space-production to occur. [08.01] At a macro scale, the city was surveyed for specific kinds of spaces — primarily banks, ditches, pools and pipes — in order to locate and appropriate such spaces for as long a time as possible, thus colonising them as localised territories of competition and rivalry. By implication, the city too was redefined from a place of suburban homogeneity and comfort to that of confrontation and conflict. Yet skateboarders ultimately had little control over such processes, their temporal tactics falling foul of the legalised forms of property ownership.

Chapter 5 therefore began by showing how skateboarders from the mid-1970s onward enjoyed the benefits of their own legalised spaces. A rapid construction of skateparks took place, with over 190 constructed in the US and about half that figure in the UK, beside numerous other examples worldwide. Such skateparks initially copied surf wave forms and pipes, and then backyard pools, before quickly creating new terrains which while based on pools were designed primarily with skateboarders' movements in mind. During the 1980s, wooden-based ramp and half-pipe constructions came to the fore, either as stand-alone elements or as the basis for new skateparks, many of which were indoor facilities. The spatial nature of these skateparks is not best understood, however, through conventional
architectural historical notions of production such as design, construction, authorship, intention and evolution, but through the skateboarder's engagement with these terrains. In skateparks and on ramps, skaters developed an ever more complex series of technical moves, each with a precise consideration of time, space and speed. Space here is a production outward from the skater's body, created in relation to genetic properties of its symmetries and orientation. However, this is not the only space production involved. The skateboard itself is another focus, at once external to and absorbed within the dynamism of the skater's move, a mediation and tool necessary to the skater's relation to the terrain underfoot. And, equally importantly, architecture is questioned by the skater for its ability to project space in relation to the move. Verticals, curves, symmetries, projections, transitions and so forth are brought to life, no longer static objects or formal qualities but now propulsive elements, the skater becoming like the metal ball propelled between the accelerative cushions, roundels and flippers of a pinball machine. All takes this place in the course of an event, the movement of the skater, as a result all three projectors of space – body, tool, architecture – are erased and reproduced. This is what I term "super-architectural space," space that lies beyond the space of subject, tool or terrain, and which is compositionally quite distinct from the ordered hierarchies of architecture-as-object, architecture-as-drawing or architecture-as-idea; it is a rhythmical procedure, continually repeated yet forever new, like the waves of the sea, the playing of music or declamation of poetry. [08.02]

The process by which this occurs is not solely phenomenal, however, and the role of the image is also significant. While photography, film and video have always been important to the communication of skateboarding, it is in the lived experience of skateboarding that the full power of these media comes to the fore. The skateboarders' move is a re-performance of the imagery that they see in maga-
zines and videos, and hence is a unit of exchange between each other. In performing the move, skaters are therefore at once undertaking a directly experienced action while also projecting an image of themselves as seen by both themselves and by others. The skater's move is at once action, image and social relation, and is also at once a local and globally dispersed phenomenon. Similarly, particular elements within a skatepark take on a mediated aura, both through imagery of such elements shown in magazines and videos and through reputation born from painful encounters.

Chapter 6 pursued a direction intimated at in Chapter 5: skaters' relations with themselves and with others. In particular, skateboarding is seen here to be an oppositional subculture, by which skaters constitute a complete way of life for themselves. Skaters are shown to be predominantly young men in their teens and early twenties, with broadly accommodating dispositions toward skaters of different classes and ethnicity. Gender relations are, however, more problematic, with female skaters usually discouraged by the forces of convention, including within skateboarding those of sexist objectification. Similarly, homophobic attitudes have also been increasingly evident in the 1990s - one way in which skaters try to fabricate a homosocial masculinity between each other. In terms of relations with the external world, skateboard subculture uses a range of differing graphics, words and ideologies to create a generalised rejection of this external world, particularly aspects of paid work and the family.

Ultimately, however, skateboarding takes its meanings not from its equipment or surfaces but from its actions. Chapter 7 therefore turns to consider the emergence of streetstyle skating in the 1980s and 1990s. Responding to the possibilities of everyday architecture, the new street skateboarding appropriates any element in the urban landscape, seeking to use the meaningless, zero degree modernism of the new town and city centre as places to
assert new meanings and actions. (08.04) Skateboarders create new edits of the city, rethinking architecture as a set of discrete features and elements, and recomposing it through new speeds, spaces and times during their run through the city. Once again the body is also recomposed in the process, thus resisting the intense scopic determinations of modernist space through a reassertion of touch, hearing, adrenalin, rhythms, balance, movement and highly detailed focus. (08.04)

Once again, this also involves a different compositional process to that of architecture as conventionally considered. Here, the composition is not that of writing, drawing or indeed any form of codified theorisation, but the performative act of skateboarding itself. The edit and mapping of architecture and the city on the part of the skater produces few visual codifications, but is instead a situated and "spoken" record, continually relived in time as well as space.

Unlike, however, the super-architectural space of 1970s skateboarding in skateparks, this is an action which takes place in public, in the semi-official, semi-private zone of city streets, and hence has an entirely different social character. Reconsidering some of the subcultural attitudes identified in the previous chapter in this urban context discloses that skateboarding’s marks, scratches and other material manifestations are only the traces of much deeper critique of contemporary urban life. Embedded in the actions of skateboarders are reconceptualisations of: architecture as reproducible micro-spaces rather than produced grand projets; production not as the production of things but of play, desires and actions; the purpose of space as use rather than exchange; richness as social wealth rather than ownership; place as composed of time and speed as well as a quantity of space; and the city as interrogator rather than determinant of the self.

Lastly, Chapter 7 shows some of the social responses to this kind of skateboarding. Despite its lack of real criminal activity, skateboarding has
become increasingly repressed and legislated against, not by national or federal laws but by a series of local reactions aimed at suppressing that which is different (and misunderstood). Skateboarding also becomes a way of increasing local powers, an excuse rather than a cause. Conversely, such laws add to the anarchic character of skateboarding, part of its continual dependence on, as well as struggle against, the modern city.

8.02 Aperture

The theorised history of skateboarding undertaken in this thesis obviously, as with any historical writing, has its limitations. There has been, for example, comparatively little consideration of the skateboarding industry or of the economics of skatepark construction and demolition. Similarly, there have been few comparisons between skateboarding and other forms of spatial practice, and none between skateparks and other forms of leisure space such as football stadia or swimming pools. Instead, the focus has been on the practice of skateboarding as a form of experience of architecture, and, consequently, on issues pertinent to this intersection of a particular practice and architectural forms.

As such, following the kind of Lefebvrian methodology and history summarised above, we can begin to delineate a kind of architectural history which does not focus on things, effects, production, authorship or exchange but upon process, possibilities, reproduction, performance and use. Space, time and social being must be considered equally, with particular regard to political goals, everyday life, the human subject, the body and its various actions. The particular study of skateboarding further shows how this might involve the consideration of not only built spaces but also tools, everyday spaces, imaginative experiences, city mapping, body moves, compositional processes, social relations, images both visual and lived, social identities and rejections, graphically presented designs and surfaces, textual discourses, urban terrains, implicit or performative critiques, institutional responses and subcultural re-responses.

To undertake further architectural historical work in this vein could then be a repetition of this kind of study, looking for these kinds of things in a different yet similar historical arena – the history of urban cycling, running and driving, or of scaffolding, couriering and radio broadcasting, or of countless other urban spatial practices, could all be subjected to such an analysis. However, such a study would, inevitably, not be the same, either in its methodology or in its evidential conclusion. I would therefore like to end here by drawing out just a few of the underlining themes in this thesis which seem to me be already “not the same,” which are already indicative of unresolved problems and hence future directions for historical work. They range from the practical, to the thematic, to the epistemological.

To begin with the most practical issue, it seems to me that for this kind of history to succeed, it is likely that traditional techniques of observation may not be sufficient, for, like texts, “[n]o camera, no image or sequence of images can show these rhythms.” This then is partly a matter of analysis and partly a matter of communication, for the study of the performative and everyday may require an integrative consideration of sound, vision, movement and even touch and smell to convey something of the experiential nature of these processes. History as film, history as music, history as media-montage might all be possible responses. On another practical note, this thesis has relied heavily on magazines for its archive, and thus certain practices would not be as easily researched by this procedure – illegal activities such as drug-smuggling would be particularly resistant to such analysis.

More conceptually, the main ground that this thesis opens up seems to me to be the question of how to construct a materialist history of the experience of architecture. In particular, how can one relate the specific phenomenal procedures by which
people engage with the built world to the ideologi­
cal and material processes which condition them?
In particular, is there a correlation between walking,
talking, breathing, listening and so forth in the same
way that has begun to be understood for vision and
the gaze? It may well be, then, that further theoreti­
cal study of the encounter and debate between
existentialism, phenomenology and marxism in the
1950s would be a fruitful arena of further theoreti­
cal study. How might, for example, we relate
Merleau-Ponty’s assertions that the body “con­
tributes more than it receives,” and that “movement,
touch, vision” are all part of the “paradox of expres­
sion,” to the strictures and demands of the modern,
capitalist city?

Rather than the repetition of this kind of study
onto new activities, I would suggest here that the
way to progress such a materialist history of experi­
ence of architecture is by looking at the more funda­
mental processes by which architecture is
engaged. This would mean thinking about
modes rather than activities or functions, and differ­
ent kinds of elemental spaces rather than the
bounded spaces of buildings, cities or countries.
Such a study might then consider things of the fol­
lowing ilk:

**ELEMENTAL SPACES**

*Elemental Spaces (small)*
- wall, door, window, ledge, boundary, room,
- foundation, roof, ornament, servicing, water,
- screen, stair, basement, porch, balcony, gar­
- den, beam, fixture, furniture, gate, floor, ceil­
- ing, architrave, column, frame, overhang, vir­
- tual, planter, curtain, insulation . . .

*Elemental Spaces (large)*
- neighbourhood, quarter, section, zone, river,
- ocean, plate, region, rim, global, virtual,
- atmospheric, cosmos . . .

**MODES**

*Orientation*
- left/right, up/down, back/front, direction,
- rotational, centrifugal/centripetal,
- inward/outward, clockwise/anticlockwise,
- latitude/longitude, north/sea/east/west, axial,
- length/brevity, width/narrowness,
- distance/propinquity, symmetrical/asymmet­
- rical, centric/decentric, large/small (absolute
- size), scale (relative size), concentrated/dis­
- persed, tessellation/unfittingness . . .

*Form*
- cyclical, linear, repetition, wave, discordance,
- multi-layering, montage . . .

*Time*
- second, minute, hour, morning/afternoon/
- evening/night, day/night, week, month, sea­
- son, year, period, generation, century, epoch,
- millennium, age, species, planetary, cosmos,
- cyclical, linear, repetition, past/present/
- future, memory, lived, measured, historical,
- social . . .

*Body*
- birth/death, growth/decay, age, disease,
- decay, illness, madness, sex, surface, inter­
- nality, extensivity, breathing, tasting, recoil­
- ing, memory . . .

*Sound*
- music, noise, silence, beat, speed, frequency,
- noisy/quiet, gentle/harsh, pitch, timbre, tone,
- mood, purity/distortion . . .

*Touch*
- roughness, smoothness, grip, warmth, tex­
- ture, association, pain, wetness, ripple, jud­
- der, repetition, signalling . . .
Condition
enclosure, shelter, privacy, publicity, disclosure, openness, sight, security, exhilaration, eroticism, intimacy, anger, love, receptivity, exclusion, drama, fear, assertion . . .

Such things on their own would, of course, not be enough – the task would be to combine these kinds of phenomenological concerns with the particular economic, material, ideological, cultural and social conditions of specific space-times and peoples. This, for example, is the kind of study I briefly undertake in a short study of different kinds of boundary in London, including an ideological interpretation of the phenomenology of walking through a set of gates in the context of the Broadgate office development. In particular, bearing in mind a Lefebvrian sensibility to always search for differential space, it seems that we are in need of such a consideration in the context of a theory and history of appropriation.

What does it mean to adopt, take over, colonise, emulate, repeat, work within, work against, re-imagine, re-temporalise, reject, edit and recompose the spaces of the city and its architecture? How can differential space be sought in the land and epoch of the commodified, the abstract, the homogenised, the reductive and the powerful? Only here, I suggest, will a properly materialist history of the experience of architecture emerge.
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Notes

Sections are divided into dates of original construction. Some early skateparks from the 1970s continue to operate in the 1990s.

The comment "earliest published reference" signifies the earliest published date found of a skateboard magazine which confirms that the skatepark in question is in operation (as opposed to being planned and/or under construction).

The "Rest of the World" sections are highly selective, being based largely on information from US magazines.

Many of the 1983-98 skateparks were ramp facilities. There were numerous small single-ramp facilities built during the 1980s and 1990s – the listings for the 1983-98 period are therefore mostly restricted to those places with more than one ramp, with a half-pipe of national standard, and/or to those which appeared in published listings.


* indicates the skatepark is known to be a free access facility.
A1  USA 1976-82

ALABAMA
“Flying Wheels”
1000 Rainbow Dr, Gadsden, Alabama

“Get Away”
3058 Leeman Ferry Road, Huntsville, Alabama

“Skatewave”
Mobile, Alabama

“Wheel A Wave”
179 West Valley Avenue, Birmingham, Alabama

ALASKA
Unknown name
Anchorage, Alaska
1979 earliest published reference.

ARIZONA
“Hi Roller”
9111 North 7th Street, Phoenix, Arizona
February 1979 earliest published reference. [1980]

“Permanent Wave”
Mesa, Arizona
Opened October 1977.

“Skate in the Shade”
Tempe, Arizona
Opened 1978. [1980]

ARKANSAS
“Skater Town”
Little Rock, Arkansas
Opened November 1977.

CALIFORNIA
“Alameda Skateboard Park”
San Francisco
Opened 1977.

“Aloha Skate Town”
29525 Canwood Street, Agoura, California

“Badlands”
Long Beach, California

“Big ‘O’”
157 North Wayfield, Orange, California, 92680.

“Boogie Bowl”
3857 Foothill Boulevard, Glendale, California
Opened 1977. [1980]

“Canyon Country”
20601 Santa Clara Street, Canyon Country, California
Opened 1977.

“Carlsbad/Sparks/Mike McGill’s”
corner of Palomar Airport Road and Business Park Drive, Carlsbad, California, 92008

“Clayton Valley”
Concord, California
1979 earliest published reference.

“Concrete Wave”
Anaheim, California
Opened 1977.

“Derby”*
Frederick Street, Santa Cruz, California
Opened ca. 1979. [1991a]

“El Cajon”
El Cajon, California

“Empire”
6600 South Santa Rosa Avenue, Rohnert Park, California
February 1979 earliest published reference.

“Endless Wave”
Bakersfield, California
Opened 1 September 1977.
"Endless Wave"
Oxnard, California
"Flow Motion"
3722 Mill Street, Reno, California
Opened 1977. [1980]
"Fountain Valley Skateboard Park"
Fountain Valley, California.
Opened 1977.
"Frederick Street"
Frederick Street, Santa Cruz, California
"Golf 'n Fun"
Santa Barbara, California
"Heat Wave"
Modesto, California
"Hi-Flite"
San Diego, California
"Hilltop"
Hudson and Whitney, Young Street, San Francisco, California, 94124
Opened Fall 1978. [1991a, 1992]
"Lakewood Center Skateboard World"
5210 Faculty (Clark and Candlewood), Lakewood, California, 90712
"Marina del Rey"
12980 Culver Boulevard, Marina del Rey, Los Angeles, California, 90066
"Mogul Bowl"
Fresno, California
"Moving-On"
Home Avenue, San Diego, California
Opened 1977.
"New Wave"
See "Willow"
"Oasis"
2928 Camino del Rio South, Mission Valley, San Diego, California
"Paved Pacific"
Milton Avenue, Westminster, California
"Pipe and Pool"
see "Willow"
"Pipeline"
1777 West Arrow Highway, Upland, California, 91786
"Rancho Mediterrania/Ranch"
22849 Coolley Road, Colton, California
"Runway"
19401 South Main, Gardena, California
"Sierra Wave"
Sacramento, California
"Skateboard Heaven"
Spring Valley, San Diego, California
Opened 1977.
"Skateboard Odyssey"
Mission Viejo, California
"Skateboard Palace"
Carmichael, North California
"Skateboard World"
4475 Emerald Street, Torrance, California
"Skate City"
14330 East Telegraph Road, Whittier, California,
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90604
"Skatepark Montebello"
Montebello, California
Opened 1977.
"Skatepark Paramount"
14925 Paramount Boulevard, Los Angeles,
California, 90723
"Skatepark Soquel"
2590 Main Street, Soquel, California
"Skatepark Victoria"
Milpitas, North California
"Skate Ranch"
1555 Turf Road, Del Mar, San Diego, California,
92014
"SkaterCross"
6734 Resada Boulevard, Reseda, California, 91335
[1980]
"Skate World"
7100 Johnson Industrial Drive, Pleasanton,
California
Opened September 1977.
"Skatopia"
7100 Knott Avenue, Buena Park, California
Opened 1 June 1977. First half-pipe in a park.
"Solid Wave"
1103 El Camino Real, Arroyo Grande, California
1979 earliest published reference. [1980]
"Sparks"
Goleta, Santa Barbara, California
1979 earliest published reference.
"Sparks"
Carlsbad, California – see “Carlsbad”
"Surf de Earth"
Vista, California
Unknown name*

Irvine, California
Opened ca. 1977-8.
"Ventura Skateboard Park"
Ventura County, California
"Whirlin' Wheels"
505 West Felicita Avenue, Escondido, California
January 1979 earliest published reference. [1980]
Closed by March 1981.
"Willow/Pipe and Pool/New Wave"
2455 North Garey Avenue, Pomona, California,
91767
October 1978 earliest published reference. Renamed
[1980]
"Winchester"
2885 Winchester Boulevard, Campbell/Newark, San
Jose, California
[1980]

COLORADO
"Concrete Curl"
Denver, Colorado
"Earth Surfer"
Colorado Springs, Colorado
"Hi Roller"
4949 Laguna Drive, Boulder, Colorado
[1980]
"Mom's Hill"
Lakewood, Colorado

FLORIDA
"Cadillac Wheels Skateboard Concourse"
Lighthouse Point, Florida
Opened 1977. Owned by Frank Nasworthy and
Cadillac Wheels.
"Clearwater"
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2525 Drew Street, Clearwater, Tampa Bay, Florida
1979 earliest published reference. [1980]
“Earthin Surfin”
1155 Pasadena Avenue, St. Petersburg, Florida
“Groundswell”
Fort Pierce, Florida
Opened 1977.
“Indian Harbor Beach”
Florida
Opened 1977.
“Kissimmee Skateboard Park/Skateboard World”
Florida
Opened 1977.
“Kona usa”
8735 Kona Avenue, Jacksonville, Florida, 32211
“Longwood Skateboard Track”
Route 4, Box 400, (Dog Track Road), Longwood, Florida
Opened March 1977. [1980]
“Paved Wave”
Cocoa, Florida
“Rainbow Wave”
1519 East Fletcher Avenue, Tampa Bay, Florida
“Runway Skatopia”
18555 South West 109th Avenue, Miami, Florida
“Safe Surf”
2201 Okeechobee Road, Fort Pierce, Florida
Opened Fall 1977.
“Saturn”
Titusville, Florida
Opened 1977.
“Sensation Basin”
5719 North West 13 Street, Gainesville, Florida
Opened 1978. [1980]

“Skateboard City/Skateboard City”
5000 Nova Road, Port Orange/Daytona, Florida
“Skateboard Heaven”
Fort Lauderdale, Florida
Opened 1977.
“Skateboard Safari”
West Palm Beach, Florida
Opened 1977.
“SkateWave”
4412 West Hillsborough Avenue, Tampa, Florida
“Solid Surf”
455 East Overland Park Boulevard, Fort Lauderdale, Florida
“Surfer Drome”
Sarasota, Florida
Opened 1977.
“Tomoka Moon Forest Park”
Ormond Beach, Florida
Opened 1977.
Unknown name
Pensacola, Florida

GEORGIA
“National Skateboard Park of Georgia”
5051 North Lake Drive, Lake City, Georgia
Opened 1977. [1980]
“Nova”
2930 Glynn Avenue, Brunswick, Georgia

HAWAII
“Aala Park”*
River and Beretania Streets/280 North Kings Street/1290 Aala Street, Honolulu, Hawaii, 96817
ILLINOIS

“Country Surf’n”
PO Box 468, RR #5, Springfield, Illinois
“Rainbo”
4836 North Clark Street, Chicago, Illinois

IOWA

“Fun Park Skateboard Centre”
5110 Park Avenue, Des Moines, Iowa 50322

KANSAS

“Rolling Magic”
9633 Roehill Road, Lenexa, Kansas

KENTUCKY

“Inland Surf”
2620 Wilhite, Lexington, Kentucky
“Ride’n’Glide”
1800 Neville Drive, Louisville, Kentucky

LOUISIANA

“Solid Surf”
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

MARYLAND

“Cascade”
1015 Leslie Avenue, Catonsville, Maryland
1979 earliest published reference. [1980]
“Concrete Surf”
7930 Pulaski Highway, Baltimore, Maryland
1979 earliest published reference. [1980]
“Crofton Recreation Park”
Routes 3 and 450, Crofton, Maryland
“Freestyle”
Gaithersburg, Maryland
Opened 1977.
“Lansdowne”
Lansdowne, Baltimore, Maryland
Opened ca. 1978.
“Ocean Bowl”
3rd Street and Baltimore Avenue/St. Louis Avenue,
Ocean City, Maryland
1992, 1997c]
“St. Charles”
1208 Hickory Avenue, Waldorf, Maryland

MASSACHUSETTS

“Shooting Star”
Malden, Massachusetts
“Zero Gravity”
Cambridge, Massachusetts

MICHIGAN

“Astro Speedway”
Jenison, South Grand Rapids, Michigan
1979 earliest published reference. [1980]
“Cosmic Wave”
4200 West Michigan Avenue, Kalamazoo, Michigan
1979 earliest published reference. [1980]
“Endless Summer”
31900 Little Mack, Roseville, Michigan
August 1978 earliest published reference. Closed
1985. [1980]
“Skateboard USA”
Michigan

MINNESOTA

“Maplewood”
Minneapolis, Minnesota
Opened 1977
“Ride-the-Glass”
Eden Prairie, Minnesota

MONTANA
“Fun Town”
301 27th Street North West, Great Falls, Montana

NEVADA
“Las Vegas Desert Surf”
4825 West Flamingo, Las Vegas, Nevada
Opened 22 October 1977. [1980]

NEW HAMPSHIRE
“Big Bear”
Big Bear Recreation Center, Route 13, Brookline, New Hampshire
“Great Bay Arena”
Newington, New Hampshire
Opened 15 October 1977.
“Wizard”
Manchester, New Hampshire
Opened 1977.

NEW JERSEY
“Casino Arena”
Ashbury Park, New Jersey
“Cherry Hill”
622 Hollywood Avenue, Cherry Hill, New Jersey
“Fyber Rider”
Lakewood, New Jersey
Opened September 1977.
“Off the Wall”
500 Washington Avenue, Pt. Pleasant Beach, New Jersey
“Paved Wave”
Oakhurst, New Jersey
Opened 1977.
“Super Surf”
Delsea and Landis Avenue, Vineland, New Jersey
Opened 1977. [1980]
“Vernon Valley Skate Park”
New Jersey
Opened 1977.
“Wonder Wave”
6th Street, Ocean City, New Jersey
Opened 1977.

NEW YORK
“Competition Indoor Skateboard Center”
6115 Gillette Road, Clay, New York
1979 earliest published reference.
“Concrete Wave”
979 Conklin Street, Long Island, New York
Opened 1977. [1980]
“Darien Lake Skateboard City”
Route 77, Corfu, New York
“East Coast Skate Arena”
Huntingdon, Long Island, New York
“Indoor Skateboard Center”
17 Roosevelt Avenue, Jackson Heights, New York
“Island Skateboard”
Staten Island, New York
“Skate Away Skateboard Arena”
50 Rockland Plaza Mall, Nantuet, New York
Opened 1 February 1978.
“Skatopia”
Northport, New York
“Sonic Wave”
Albany, New York
December 1984 earliest published reference.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North Carolina</th>
<th></th>
<th>Idaho</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Concrete Connection&quot;</td>
<td>4226 South Boulevard, Charlotte, North Carolina</td>
<td>Opened 16 October 1977. [1980]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Wizard&quot;</td>
<td>Oleander Drive, Wilmington, North Carolina</td>
<td>Opened 20 November 1976.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Apple&quot;</td>
<td>5100 Sinclair Road, Columbus, Ohio</td>
<td>Opened 1979. Closed by July 1981. [1980]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Concrete Oasis&quot;</td>
<td>Collins Road, off Route 33, Lancaster, Ohio</td>
<td>November 1981 earliest published reference.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Soaring High&quot;</td>
<td>6854 Spring Valley Drive, Holland, Ohio</td>
<td>January 1979 earliest published reference.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Riverdale&quot;</td>
<td>East Road, Warwick, Rhode Island</td>
<td>1980 earliest published reference. [1980]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SOUTH CAROLINA

“Funland”
3105 North Kings Highway, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina

“North Myrtle Beach Skateboard Park”
Myrtle Beach, South Carolina

“Palmetto”
Bypass 123, Easley, South Carolina

“Spartanburg”
3025 East Main Street, Spartanburg, South Carolina
February 1979 earliest published reference. [1980]

“Wave Rider”
1342 Raintree Drive, Columbia, South Carolina

“Westside”
2215 West Palmetto Street, Florence, South Carolina

“Wizard”
Dunn, South Carolina
Opened 1977.

“Wizard”
Florence, South Carolina
Opened 1977.

TEXAS

“Desert Surfing”
El Paso, Texas

“Earth Surf”
10356 Dyer Street, El Paso, Texas
May 1978 earliest published reference. [1980]

“Free Flight”
1210 North I-35, Carrollton, Texas
Opened 1977. [1980].

“Galveston Skateboard Park”
8510 Seawall Boulevard, Galveston, Texas
April 1979 earliest published reference.

“Gulf Coast”
Houston, Texas
Opened 1978.

“Lonestar/Lone Skate”
3101 Florence Road, Killeen, Texas

“Midcity Skateboard Park”
Irving-Prairie, Dallas, Texas
Opened 1977.

“Pipeline”
Houston, Texas

“Skateboard City”
1717 Bingle, Houston, Texas
Opened 1977. [1980]

“Skateboard Slopes”
San Antonio, Texas

“South Bay”
north Texas
Opened 1977.

“Surf City”
4110 Ben Ficklin Road, San Angelo, Texas
1979 earliest published reference.

“Twister”
Houston, Texas

UNKNOWN NAME

Corpus Christi, Texas

"USA Skateboard"
Irving-Prairie, Dallas, Texas
Opened 1977.

"Wizard"
Dallas, Texas
Opened 1977.

UTAH

"Nordic Valley"
3567 Nordic Valley Way, Nordic Valley, Utah

"Rocky Mountain Surf"
Salt Lake City, Utah
1979 earliest published reference. [1980]

VIRGINIA

"City Park Skateboard Bowls"
South Boulevard, Virginia Beach, Virginia

"Flow Motion"
Richmond, Virginia

"Mount Trashmore Park"
South Boulevard and Edwin Drive, Virginia Beach, Virginia

"Skateboarding USA"
10500 Lomond Drive, Manassas, Virginia

"Skateboard Park of Norfolk"
Norfolk, Virginia
Opened 1977. [1980]

"Skateworld"
3700 Wheeler Avenue, Alexandria, Virginia
May 1978 earliest published reference. [1980]

"Thunderbowl"
1060 South Lynnhaven Parkway, Virginia Beach, Virginia

WASHINGTON

"Falcon"
1205 Martin Way, Olympia, Washington

"Olympic"
8910 Martin Way Olympia, Washington

"Tri Cities"
Kennewick, Washington
1979 earliest published reference.

WISCONSIN

"Moondust"
4024 North Highway 42, Sheboygan, Wisconsin
1979 earliest published reference.

"Surf 'n Turf/The Turf"
4267 West Loomis Road, Greenfield, Wisconsin, 53221

"Turf"
See "Surfin' Turf"
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A2 USA 1983–97

ALABAMA

“Rampage”
501 Springville Circle, Birmingham, Alabama 35215

“Underground”
11805 South Memorial Park, Huntsville, Alabama, 35803
[1989, 1990a]

“uv Sports Park”
3315 Indian Hills Road, Decatur, Alabama, 35603
[1997c]

ARIZONA

“kc California Skate Gear”
2202 Military, Benton, Arizona, 72015
[1990a]

“Phoenix”
110th Avenue and Glendale, Phoenix, Arizona
[1997c]

“Rocktown”
2728 West Orangewood, Arizona 85051
[1991a]

“Skate and Surf Connection”
Jefferson Square #33, Pine Bluff, Arizona, 71603
[1990a]

“Thrasherland”
11748 West Glendale Avenue, Glendale, Arizona 85307

“Tower”
Phoenix, Arizona
Opened by December 1989. [1990a]

“Zone”
331 East Dunlap, Phoenix, Arizona
[1997c]

ARKANSAS

“Bike Haus”
111 Buena Vista, Hot Springs, Arkansas, 71913

“Rollersports”
1520 Macon Drive, Little Rock, Arkansas, 72211
[1997c]

“Skatepark of Little Rock”*
Kanis Park, South Mississippi Avenue, Little Rock, Arkansas, 72205

“Skate Station”
225 North Gregg Street, Fayetteville, Arkansas, 72701

CALIFORNIA

“Basic Pool”
Huntingdon Beach, California
Opened by Christmas 1994.

“Birdhouse Ramp”
Orange County California

“City Skates”
610 Hawkeye Avenue, Turlock, California, 95380
[1991a, 1992]

“Daily Grind/The Grind”
2709 Del Monte, Sacramento, California
[1997c]

“Davis Public”*
Davis, California
Opened 4 April 1992. [1997c]

“Derby Park”*
Sacramento and Woodland on West Side, Santa Cruz, California, 95060.

“Edge”
Irwindale, California

“Encinitas YMCA”
Encinitas, California, 93277

“Pogo”*
Valley and Hopyard, Pleasanton, California
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April 1996 earliest published reference. [1997c]

"Greer Park"*
West Bayshore Road and Colorado Avenue, Palo Alto, California

"Harbor City Skate Bowl"*
25931 Frampton, Harbor City, California, 90710.
[1997c]

"Huntingdon Beach #1"*
Golden West and Warner Avenue, Huntingdon Beach, California
[1997c]

"Huntingdon Beach #2/Main Street"*
Main Street, Huntingdon Beach, California
April 1996 earliest published reference. [1997c]

"Kennedy Warehouse"
San Jose, California

"Kings County YMCA"
Hanford, California
[1991b]

"Lipside"
1509 Bonnie Beach Place, Los Angeles, California 90063
[1991b]

"Magdalena Ecke Family YMCA"
200 Saxony Road, Encinitas, California, 92023
[1997c]

"Mike McGill's"
See "Carsbad" in USA 1976-82 section.

"Mission Valley"
9115 Claremont Mesa Boulevard, San Diego, California, 92023
[1997c]

"Monterey Bay Sk8 Station"
1855 East Avenue, Sand City, California, 93955
[1997c]

"Murdy Park"
Murdy Park, Huntingdon Beach, California
April 1996 earliest published reference.

"Napa Public"*
Napa, California
May 1995 earliest published reference.[1997c]

"Petaluma"*
Petaluma, California
October 1997 earliest published reference.

"Powell-Peralta Skatezone"
30 South La Patera, Goleta, California, 93117
[1991a, 1992]

"Razor's Edge Boys Club"
2230 Jewett street, San Diego, CA 92111
[1990a, 1992]

"San Jose"
634 North 8th Street, San Jose, California, 95112
[1991a, 1991b]

"slo"
Oak Street and Santa Rosa Street, San Luis Obispo, California
[1997c]

"Santa Rosa Public"*
Santa Rosa, California
Opened 1995. [1997c]

"Shasta County YMCA"
1155 Court Street, Redding, California, 96001

"sk8 Underground"
24550 Sunnymead Boulevard, Moreno Valley, California, 92388
[1991a, 1991b, 1997c]

"Skate Street"
Ventura, California
Opened March 1997. [1997c]

"Snow Valley"
Running Springs, California
October 1997 earliest published reference.

"Stuart's Extreme"
2190 Canal Street, Orange, California, 92665
[1997c]

"Sugar Hill Park"
4202 West Sierra Madre, Fresno, California, 93722
[1997c]

"Temecula"
Temecula, California
January 1997 earliest published reference. [1997c]
“Thrasher”*  
Davis Street, San Leandro, California  

“Transition”  
640 South Atlantic, Los Angeles, California, 90022  
[1991a]

“Visalia YMCA”  
21 West Tulare Avenue, Visalia, California, 93277  

“Wheelhouse Skate Center”  
2850 West Florida Avenue, Hermet, California, 92545  
[1997c]

“Willow Glen Amphitheatre”  
West 7th and K Street, Benicia, California, 94510  

“Yuba City”*  
Gray Avenue, Yuba City, California  
July 1997 earliest published reference. [1997c]

COLORADO  

“Arno”  
404 Noland Avenue, Grand Junction, Colorado, 81503  
[1997c]

“Apocalypse”*  
City on the Hill Church, 75th Street and Arapahoe Road, Boulder, Colorado  
[1997c]

“Arvada”*  
Arvada, Colorado  
[1997c]

“Bigfish”  
156 County Road 450, Breckenridge, Colorado, 80244  
[1997c]

“Breckenridge”*  
Breckenridge, Colorado  
[1997c]

“Brighton”  
Next to city pool, Brighton, Colorado  
[1997c]

“Craig East”  
Next to cemetery, Craig East, Colorado  
[1997c]

“Fort Collins”*  
Fort Collins, Colorado  
[1990a, 1997c]

“Fort Skate”  
105 East Lincoln Avenue, Fort Collins, Colorado, 80524  
[1991a, 1991b]

“Glacier View Ranch”  
8748 Overland Road, Ward, Colorado, 80481  
[1991a]

“Golden”*  
Golden, Colorado  
[1997c]

“Idaho Springs”  
Idaho Springs, Colorado  
[1997c]

“Independent”  
123 Rear East Bijou, Colorado Springs, Colorado, 80903  

“Jamaica Jim’s”  
3040 South Platte River Drive, Englewood, Colorado, 80110  

“Scott Carpenter Park”  
Boulder, Colorado  
[1997c]

“Steamboat Springs”  
Steamboat Springs, Colorado  
[1997c]

“Telluride”*  
Telluride, Colorado  
[1997c]

CONNECTICUT  

“Connecticut Bike and Skate”  
86 South Street, Bristol, Connecticut, 06010  
[1991b, 1997c]
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570 Boston Post Road, Milford, Connecticut, 06460 [1997c]
"Green River"
463 Spurlington Road, Campbellsville, Connecticut, 42718 [1990a]
"Marina"
South Benson Marina and Post Road, Fairfield, Connecticut, 06430 [1997c]
"Playground"

FLORIDA
"Astro Skating Centre"
"Badlands"
750 Orange Avenue, Altamonte Springs, Florida, 32714 [1991b, 1997c]
"Brotherhood"
1920 Honda Road, Fort Myers, Florida, 33907 [1991a, 1991b, 1992]
January 1997 earliest published reference. [1997c]
"Bulldog"
"Grinders"
"Island"
"Miami"
13444 South West 131st Street, Miami, Florida, 33186 [1997c]
"Mike McGill's Indoor"
"Myrtle Grove YMCA"
5406 Lillian Highway, Box 3175, Myrtle Grove, Florida, 32506 [1991a, 1992]
"North East Pensacola YMCA"
Langly Avenue, Pensacola, Florida, 32503 [1991a, 1992]
"Ramp Age"
1105 South Division Avenue, Orlando, Florida, 32805 [1991a, 1991b]
"Skate Asylum"
Beach Boulevard, Jacksonville, Florida [1997c]
"Skatepark of Tampa"
Tampa Bay Area, Florida March 1997 earliest published reference. [1997c]
"Skateboard Connection"
472-D Flowing Wells Road, Martinez, Georgia, 30907 [1990a, 1991a, 1991b, 1992]
"Skateboard Warehouse"
"Skate Zone"
3602 Lawrenceville Highway, Tucker, Georgia, 30084 October 1991 earliest published reference. [1991a,
1992]
“Skates 'N Bruises”
2220 North Cable Parkway, Kennesaw, Georgia, 30144
[1997c]
“Streetwaves”
6709 Tribble Street, Lithonia, Georgia, 30058
“The Wall”
2209 Mountain Terrace Road, Dalton, Georgia, 30720

HAWAII
“Hickham Hangar”
Hickam Air Force Base, near Pearl Harbor, Hawaii
[1997c]
“Jungle Land”
next to the Salvation Army, Shaw Street, Lahaina, Maui, Hawaii
“Kahului”
Kahului Beach Road, Kahalui, Maui, Hawaii
[1997c]
“Kailua Recreation Center”*
21 South Kainalu Drive, Kailua Drive, Kailua, Hawaii, 96734
“Kalakua Recreation Center”*
720 McNeill Street, Honolulu, Hawaii, 96817

IDAHO
“Cour d’Alene”
Cour d’Alene, Idaho
[1997c]
“Ketchum”*
Warm Springs Road and Saddle Road, Ketchum, Idaho
[1997c]
“Rhodes Park”
16th and Grove, Boise, Idaho

[1997c]

ILLINOIS
“Air Waves skate Park”
2021 South West Washington Street, Peoria, Illinois, 61650
[1991b]
“Drop In”
106 Edison Drive, New Lenox, Illinois, 60451
[1997c]
“4 Wheels Out/Skate Cycle Rollerblade Action Park (SCRAP)”
2350 Hassell Road, Hoffman Estates, Illinois, 60195
“Private Indoor Terrain (p)rt”
Rockford, Illinois
[1997c]
“Rotation Station”
7915 North Alpine Road, Loves Park, Illinois, 61111
“Skank Skates”
1101 South Grand Avenue East, Springfield, Illinois, 62703
[1991a, 1991b, 1997c]
“Skate Cycle Rollerblade Action Park (SCRAP)”
See “4 Wheels Out”

INDIANA
“Cedar Crest”
2025 Cedar Crest Drive, Kokomo, Indiana, 46902
“Dr's Indoor”
1016 Main Street, Kokomo, Indiana, 46902
[1997c]
“Edgewood Indoor Skateboard Facility”
1220 West Main Street, Greenfield, Indiana, 46140
[1991b]
“Swinney Park Skateboard Center”*
off West Jefferson, in Swinney Park, Fort Wayne, Indiana, 46805
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“Travel Alternative”
5612 Massachusetts Avenue, Indianapolis, Indiana, 46218
[1997c]
“Westside”
54850 Meadowview, South Bend, Indiana, 46628
[1997c]
“YMCA”
Behind YMCA, Muncie, Indiana, 47035
[1991b]

IOWA
“Central Skate Complex”
338 South West 6th Street, Des Moines, Iowa, 50309
[1991a]
“Linn Skate Co. Inc.”
295 12th Street, Marion, Iowa, 52302
[1997c]
“Metroplex”
524 East 6th Street, Des Moines, Iowa
[1997c]
“Ollie in Outdoor”
Dubuque Sports Complex, Nightingale Lane, Dubuque, Iowa, 52001
[1991b]
“Rampage Indoor”
4004 West Kimberly, Davenport, Iowa, 52806

KANSAS
“Ally Oops”
940 North Wichita Street, Wichita, Kansas, 67203
[1990a, 1991b]
“b’s”
3525 West 30th Street, Wichita, Kansas, 67217
[1991a]
“Wild West sk8 Park”
9020 West Harry, Wichita, Kansas, 67209

KENTUCKY
“Audubon”
3310 South Preston Street, Louisville, Kentucky, 40213
“Green River”
463 Spurlington Road, Campbellsville, Kentucky, 42718
“Skate Station”
3320 Frankfort Avenue, Louisville, Kentucky, 40206
[1991a, 1991b]

LOUISIANA
“Explorer/Surf N Skate”
116 Guilbeau Road, Lafayette, Louisiana, 70506
[1990a, 1991a, 1991b]
“Gulf Skates Warehouse”
535 North Beck Street, Baton Rouge, Lousiana, 70806
[1997c]
“Monsoon”
16818 Florida Boulevard, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, 70815
[1997c]
“Surf N Skate”
See “Explorer”

MAINE
“Belfast”
Belfast, Maine
[1997c]
“Ratz”
19 Landry Street, Biddeford, Maine, 04005
“Zone”
33 Allen Street, Portland, Maine, 04103
[1997c]

MARYLAND
“EOM”
910 Elsworth Avenue, Silver Spring, Maryland
[1997c]
“Lansdowne”*  
Baltimore, Maryland  
[1997c]  
“M-Pire”  
1940 Bethel Road, Pittsburgh, Maryland, 21048  
[1997c]  
“Pipeline”  
302 Compton Avenue, Laurel, Maryland, 20707  
[1990a, 1991a, 1992]  

MASSACHUSETTS  
“Aplin Playground”  
Clarendon Street, North Andover, Massachusetts, 01077  
[1991a, 1997c]  
“Cross”  
5 First Street, Southwick, Massachusetts, 01077  
[1991b]  
“Eight Ball”  
163 Mendon Street, Bellingham, Massachusetts, 02019  
[1997c]  
“HardCore Sports’ Big Bad Bowl”  
Routes 7 and 9, Great Barrington, Massachusetts  
[1997c]  
“Nantuckett”  
Nantuckett, Massachusetts  
[1997c]  
“zr Maximus Motor Sports”  
324 Ridge Avenue, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 02138  

MICHIGAN  
“Grand Traverse YMCA”  
Racquet Club Drive, Traverse City, Michigan, 49684  
[1991a, 1992]  
“k-Zoo Skate Zoo”  
1502 Ravine Road, Kalamazoo, Michigan, 49007  

MINNESOTA  
“Third Lair”  
1201 E. Lake Street, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 55406  
[1997c]  
“Twin Cities Skate Oasis”  
1201 East Lake Street, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 55407  
“Gregg Witt’s Funhouse Ramps”  
Winona, Minnesota, 55987  
[1991b]  

MISSISSIPPI  
“Oasis Surf and Skate”  
200 Pass Road Ste #1, Gulfport, Mississippi, 39507  
[1991b]  
“Sideshow”  
627 E. President Street, Tupelo, Mississippi, 38801  
[1997c]  
“Steve’s Southcoast”  
515 Krebs Avenue, Passagoula, Mississippi, 39567  

MISSOURI  
“Bemos Burnside”  
RR3 Box 94, Joplin, Missouri, 65606  
[1997c]
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“Bullet Skateclub Inc.”
505 West 13th Street, Japlin, Missouri, 64801

“Radz”
1300 St. Louis Street, Springfield, Missouri, 65002

“Splash”
Elm and Glendale, Webster Groves, Missouri
[1990a, 1991a, 1991b]

“YMCA”
1950 Flowers Drive, Jackson, Missouri, 39204
[1990a]

NEBRASKA

“Eat Concrete”
6101 Irvington Road, Omaha, Nebraska, 68134

“Fast Ramp”
300 North Second Street, Lincoln, Nebraska, 68508-2340

NEVADA

“Rock Solid”
Las Vegas, Nevada
September 1997 earliest published reference

“Roller Edge Sports Fitness Center”
264 Keystone, Reno, Nevada, 89503
[1997c]

NEW HAMPSHIRE

“Alliance Indoor”
North Conway, New Hampshire, 03863
[1997c]

“Nu Wave Sports”
Downtown Laconia Mall, Laconia, New Hampshire, 03246
[1997c]

“Zero Gravity Inc.”
522 Amherst Street, Nashua, New Hampshire, 03063

NEW JERSEY

“Brick”
Asbury Park, New Jersey

“City Run”
42nd Avenue, Brigantine, New Jersey,
[1997c]

“Extremes Skate and Inline Park”
Building 3c, Chimney Rock Road, Bridgewater, New Jersey
[1997c]

“Hacketstown Sports Park”
13 Route 57, Hacketstown, New Jersey, 07840
[1997c]

“Washington Lake Park”
Sewell, New Jersey,
[1997c]

“Wood Ways”
516 East Bay Avenue, Manahawkin, New Jersey, 08050
[1991a, 1991b]

NEW YORK

“Back Alley Skates”
200 Main Street Binghampton, New York, 13905
[1991b]

“Board Sports”
146 Roe Boulevard, Patchogue, New York, 11772
[1997c]

“Boarder Transitions”
1801 Ontario Avenue, Niagara Falls, New York, 14305
[1991a, 1992]

“Corning”
Off Denison Parkway, Corning, New York
[1997c]

“Halfpipe Indoor Skate Park”
612 Corporate Way, Valley Cottage, New York, 10989

“Mountain Run”
359 Main Street, Lake Placid, New York, 12946
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[1997c]
“Rockland Grand Slam”
612 Corporate Way, Valley Cottage, New York, 10989
[1990a]
“Saratoga Springs”
Lake Avenue and Granger Street, Saratoga Springs, New York, 12866
“Skateboard Madness”
2466 Charles Court, Bellmore, Long Island, New York, 11710
“Underworld”
845 Washington Street, Buffalo, New York, 14203
[1997c]
Unknown name
108th Street, Riverside Park, New York
10385 Route 219, Ashford, New York, 14141
[1997c]
“YMCA of Kingston and Ulster County”
507 Broadway, Kingston, New York, 12401
[1991b, 1997c]

NORTH CAROLINA
“Big Kahuna Skate and DanceDome”
Gallelon Esplanade Beach Road, Milepost 11, Nags Head, North Carolina, 27959
[1991a, 1992]
“Charlotte Rolling Thunder”
5428 North Sharon Amity, Charlotte, North Carolina, 28215
[1992]
“Eastern Vert”
2390 East Sprague Street, Winston-Salem, North Carolina, 27117
“GP”
Fayetteville, North Carolina
May 1995 earliest published reference. [1997c]
“Jaycee’s Park”
End of Cedar Lane, Greenville, North Carolina [1997c]
“Middle School”
Wilmington, North Carolina
May 1995 earliest published reference. [1997c]
“Ramp House Indoor”
220 Winner Avenue, Carolina Beach, North Carolina, 28428
“Royal Pines”
Peachtree Street, Route 2 Box 30, Arden, North Carolina, 28704
[1989]

OHIO
“Barn”
Indian Lake, Ohio.
Closed by July 1997.
“Berea Skate Triangle”
451 Front Street, Cleveland, Ohio, 44017
[1990a, 1991a, 1992]
“Boarder’s Edge Skate Shop”
320 West National Road/107 Taywood, Englewood, Ohio, 45322
[1990a, 1991b]
“Brook Park Ramp”
Brook Park, Ohio [1997c]
“Chenga-World”
38835 Center Ridge Road, North Ridgeville, Ohio, 44039
[1997c]
“Cincinnati”
Cincinnati, Ohio [1997c]
“Club Soda Graffitis”
1003 Lila Avenue, Milford, Ohio, 45410
[1990a]
“Coe Lake”
Berea, Ohio


OREGON

“Burnside Project”*
Burnside Bridge, Portland, Oregon
Started 1990a. [1997c]

“Cannon Beach”
Cannon Beach, Oregon
[1997c]

“Eugene”
Eugene, Oregon
[1997c]

“Lake Oswego”
Lake Oswego, Oregon
[1997c]

“Salem”
Salem, Oregon
[1997c]

“US”
A and 3rd, Lebanon, Oregon, 97355
[1991b]

PENNSYLVANIA

“Cheap Skates II”
13 Swartley Road, Line Lexington, Pennsylvania,
18932

“Chris Bernstine Memorial”
Fourth Street, Elm Park, Williamsport, Pennsylvania,
17701

“Jo’s Indoor”
1414 Broadhead Road, Aliquippa, Pennsylvania,
15001

“Phillyside”*
Ford Park, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
March 1997 earliest published reference

“Kid’s Mountain Skateway”
3100 Fairway Drive, Altoona, Pennsylvania, 16602
[1990a, 1991a, 1992]

“Magic”
Route 562, Jacksonwald, Pennsylvania, 19606
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City, State, Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;PA Cheapskates&quot;</td>
<td>1064 3rd Street, North Versailles, Pennsylvania, 15137</td>
<td>North Versailles, Pennsylvania, 15137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Phillyside&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See &quot;Phillyside&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rip the Lip&quot;</td>
<td>110 Brimmer Avenue, New Holland, Pennsylvania, 17557</td>
<td>New Holland, Pennsylvania, 17557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;River View&quot;</td>
<td>Behind Chamber Plaza, Charleroi, Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Charleroi, Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Shady Skates&quot;</td>
<td>7501 Penn Avenue, Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, 15208</td>
<td>Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, 15208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Shymerville&quot;</td>
<td>Allentown, Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Allentown, Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1997c]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Skatepark of Pittsburg&quot;</td>
<td>1295 Airport Road, Aliquoppa, Pennsylvania, 15001</td>
<td>Aliquoppa, Pennsylvania, 15001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1997c]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Spunk&quot;</td>
<td>Columbia, Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Columbia, Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1997c]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Starting Gate&quot;</td>
<td>5200 Milford Road (Route 209), Marshall's Creek, Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Marshall's Creek, Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1997c]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;West End&quot;</td>
<td>1420 Switzgable Drive, Bradsheadsville, Pennsylvania, 18322</td>
<td>Bradsheadsville, Pennsylvania, 18322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1997c]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Woodward Skateboard Camp&quot;</td>
<td>Woodward, Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Woodward, Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHODE ISLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Skatehut&quot;</td>
<td>7 Dike Street, Providence, Rhode Island, 02909</td>
<td>Providence, Rhode Island, 02909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Skater's Edge&quot;</td>
<td>334 Knight Street, Building 3, Warwick, Rhode Island, 02886</td>
<td>Warwick, Rhode Island, 02886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH CAROLINA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Charleston Hangar Bowl&quot;</td>
<td>7282 Spa Road, Charleston, South Carolina, 29418</td>
<td>Charleston, South Carolina, 29418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Kanawah Skate Club&quot;</td>
<td>3716-A MacCorkle Avenue, Charleston, South Carolina, 25304</td>
<td>Charleston, South Carolina, 25304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1997c]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Slab&quot;</td>
<td>Columbia, South Carolina</td>
<td>Columbia, South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1997c]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Transitions Indoor&quot;</td>
<td>50-c Woods Lake Road, Greenville, South Carolina, 29609</td>
<td>Greenville, South Carolina, 29609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH DAKOTA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Roosevelt Park&quot;</td>
<td>2915 Canyon Lake Drive, Rapid City, South Dakota, 57702</td>
<td>Rapid City, South Dakota, 57702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENNESSEE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Crown Inc.&quot;</td>
<td>Highway 41, Winchester, Tennessee, 37398</td>
<td>Winchester, Tennessee, 37398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Edge&quot;</td>
<td>5456 Pleasant View, Memphis, Tennessee, 38134</td>
<td>Memphis, Tennessee, 38134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1991b]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Hi-Rollers Skateboard Park&quot;</td>
<td>6217 Charlotte Road, Nashville, Tennessee, 37209</td>
<td>Nashville, Tennessee, 37209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"i-Level Skateboard Training Facility"
Iodent Way, Elizabethan, Tennessee, 37643
[1991b]

"Kahuna"
1046 Avondale Road, Hendersonville, Tennessee, 37075
[1989]

"Pluto Sports"
128 Sherlake Lane, Knoxville, Tennessee, 37922

"xxx"
1180 Antioch Pike, Nashville, Tennessee
[1991b]

TEXAS

"Austin"
4115 South Congress Avenue, Austin, Texas, 78745
[1990a]

"Dillo"
9701 Brown Lane, Austin, Texas, 78754
[1989]

"Evans Brothers Bike and Skate"
5821 Ayres Street, Corpus Christi, Texas, 78415

"Fast Track"
829 South Georgia, Amarillo, Texas, 79106
[1991a, 1992]

"Freestyle"
4130 Eden Road South, Kennedale, Texas, 76060
[1997c]

"Island"
2501 Padre Boulevard, South Padre Island, Texas, 78597
[1990a, 1991b, 1997c]

"Jeff Philips’ Indoor/Rapid Revolutions"
2551 Lombardy Lane #250, Dallas, Texas, 75220

"Power Plant"
2309 Gardenia, Austin, Texas, 78728

"Ramp & Rage"
250 Austin Highway, San Antonio, Texas, 78209
[1989, 1991b]

"Rapid Revolutions"
See "Jeff Philips’ Indoor"

"San Antonio Heights"
2250 Austin Highway, San Antonio, Texas, 78218
[1991a, 1992]

"Skateboard Alley"
109 East Bailey Drive, Nash, Texas, 75569
[1991a, 1991b]

"Skatepark of Houston"
4818 Orange Grove, Houston, Texas, 77039

"Skatet ime"
2935 Bachman Drive, Dallas, Texas, 75220

"Southside Indoor"
1313 Missouri, South Houston, Texas, 77587
January 1996 earliest published reference. [1997c]

"v-Not sk8 Warehouse"
927 Crosstimbers Drive, Houston, Texas, 77022
[1991b]

UTAH

"Fun City"
1750 South 1350 West, Ogden, Utah, 84404

"Mrs. C's"
9139 South 255 West, Sandy, Utah, 84070

VERMONT

"Cutting Edge"
160 Benmot Avenue, Bennington, Vermont, 05201
[1991a, 1997c]

"Flat Street"
17 Fleet Street, Brattleboro, Vermont, 05301
[1997c]

"Stowe"
Spruce Peak base area, Stowe, Vermont
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VIRGINIA

“Chesapeake”
Chesapeake, Virginia
[1997c]

“Laurel”
Glen Allen, Virginia, 23060
[1991b, 1997c]

“Lynnhaven Park”*
Great Neck Road and 1st Colonial Road, Virginia Beach, Virginia, 23456

“Mount Trashmore”*
South Boulevard and Edwin Drive, Virginia Beach, Virginia, 23456

“Red Wing Park”*
Old Poor Farm Road/General Booth Boulevard and Prosperity Road, Virginia Beach, Virginia, 23456

“Scott D. Eagles Memorial”
14300 Featherstone Road, Woodbridge, Virginia, 22191
[1997c]

WASHINGTON

“Air Radical”
111 North 3rd Avenue, Yakima, Washington, 98902

“Bellevue”
Bellevue, Washington
[1997c]

“Concrete”
Kent, Washington, 98902
July 1997 earliest published reference.

“Kirkland”
Peter Kirk Park, Kirkland, Washington
[1997c]

“Mercer Island”
Mercer Island, near Seattle, Washington
[1997c]

“Moses Lake”
Moses Lake, Washington
[1997c]

“Mount Vernon Skateboard and Roller Hockey Park”*
Bakerview Park, Mount Vernon, Washington
[1997c]

“Ramphouse”
Seattle Washington

“Scoops”
1943 W. Lauridsen Boulevard, Port Angeles, Washington, 98362
[1997c]

“Sea Sk8”
955 Harrison Street #102, Seattle, Washington, 98109
[1997c]

WISCONSIN

“Beach Front”
1133 A Winneconne Avenue, Neenah, Wisconsin, 54956
[1992]

“DASL”
Sturgeon Bay, Wisconsin
[1997c]

“Kenosha Public”
Kenosha, Wisconsin
[1997c]

“Oshkosh Public”
Oshkosh, Wisconsin
[1997c]

“Red Arrow Park”*
Taft Avenue and Northwestfield Street, Osh Kosh, Wisconsin, 54901
[1991a, 1992]

“Sky High/Racine YMCA”
725 Lake Avenue, Racine, Wisconsin, 53402
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[1997c]
“Wausau”
Fulton and Third, Wausau, Wisconsin

[1997c]
Wyoming
“Cheyenne”
Cheyenne, Wyoming

[1997c]
“Green River”
Green River, Wyoming

[1997c]

A3 UK 1976-82

Avon

“Dame Emily Smythe Skate Park”*
Dame Emily Smythe Park, Bedminster, Bristol, Avon

“Lockleaze”
Lockleaze Adventure Playground, Shaldon Road,
Lockleaze, Bristol, Avon
Opened by 1982. [1991c]

“Skatecountry”
Ashton Court Country Club, Ashton Park, Beggar
Bush Lane, Failand, Bristol, Avon

“Skate-Inn”
Penpole Lane, Shirehampton Park, Bristol, Avon
[1978a]

Bedfordshire

“California Skateboard Scene”
Whipsnade Road, Dunstable, Bedfordshire

Berkshire

“Newbury Indoor Skateboard Arena”
West Street, Newbury, Berkshire
February 1978 earliest published reference. Closed
summer 1978. [1978a, 1978b]

“Skatewave/Winkfield”
Billy Smart’s Winkfield Zoo, North Street, Winkfield
Row, nr Windsor, Berkshire
1978 earliest published reference. [1978a]

“Skateworld”
Wokingham Town Football Club, Finchampstead
Road, Wokingham, Berkshire
Phase 1 opened April 1978. [1978a, 1978b]

Cambridgeshire

“Cambridge”
Cheddars Lane, off Newmarket Road, Cambridge,
Cambridgeshire

CHESHIRE

“Arena Skate Centre”
Wellington Mill, Daw Bank (off Mersey Square), Stockport, Cheshire
September 1978 earliest published reference.

“Inner City Truckers”
Chester Football Club, Sealand Road, Chester, Cheshire

“Superskate”
Northgate Leisure Centre, Chester, Cheshire [1978a]

CORNWALL

“Flamingo”
A30 between Redruth and Cambourne, Cornwall [1978a, 1978b]

“Holywell Bay”
Holywell Bay Leisure Park, Holywell Bay, Newquay, Cornwall

“Looe”
Melandreth Holiday Camp, Melandreth Beach, Looe, Cornwall
Opened May 1978. [1978a, 1991c]

“St. Austell”
Pollyth Recreation Centre, Carylon Road, St. Austell, Cornwall
July 1978 earliest published reference. [1978a]

“Wadebridge Indoor Skatebowl”
Commissioners Road, Wadebridge, Cornwall
Opened summer 1977. [1978b]

“Watergate Bowl”
Watergate Bay, Newquay, Cornwall

DEVON

“Earth and Ocean”
Seven Brethren Bank Leisure Center, Barnstaple, Devon

Opened summer 1978. [1978a, 1978b]

“Exmouth Skateboard Centre”
near bus and train stations, Exmouth, Devon

Opened by March 1978. [1978a, 1978b]

“Plymouth”
Old Plymouth Zoo, Central Park, Plymouth, Devon

Opened summer 1978. [1978a, 1978b]

“Torbay”
YMCA, Clennon Valley, Paignton, Torbay, Devon [1978a]

DORSET

“Le Cardinal Skatebowl”
Maison Royale, Glenfern Road, Bournemouth, Dorset

[1978a, 1978b]

“Skate-Escape”
Opposite Portland Heights Motel, Portland Bill, Weymouth, Dorset


DURHAM

“Durham Skatebowl”
Sherburn Road, Durham [1978b]

ESSEX

“Martello”
Martello Holiday Camp, Kirkby Road, Walton-on-Naze, Essex

July 1978 earliest published reference. [1978a]

“Skatopia”
Old Warwick Castle Site, Clacton-on-Sea, Essex

Opened June 1978. [1978a]

HAMPSHIRE

“Fleet Country Club”
Fleet Country Club, Old Cove Road, Fleet, Hampshire
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Year Opened</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire</td>
<td>Unit A, Blue Peter Industrial Estate, Basingstoke, Hampshire</td>
<td>September 1977</td>
<td>[1978a, 1978b]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire</td>
<td>Thruxton</td>
<td>December 1977</td>
<td>[1978a, 1978b]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
<td>Grundy Park</td>
<td>Grundy Park, Windmill Lane, Cheshunt, Hertfordshire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
<td>Locomotion</td>
<td>Wheelers Lane, Hemel Hempstead, Hertfordshire</td>
<td>Opened summer 1978.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
<td>Stevenage</td>
<td>See &quot;Bowes Lyon&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Glass Rider</td>
<td>Beechenden, Kent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire</td>
<td>Blackpool Pleasure Beach</td>
<td>Pleasure Beach, Blackpool, Lancashire</td>
<td>Opened June 1978. [1978a]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire</td>
<td>Hard Surf</td>
<td>Hoston Road, Greengate, Middleton Junction, Manchester, Lancashire</td>
<td>May 1978 earliest published reference. [1978a]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire</td>
<td>Salford Skate Centre</td>
<td>Great Cheetham Street, Salford, Greater Manchester, Lancashire</td>
<td>[1978b]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire</td>
<td>Skateboard City</td>
<td>Wyton Wrestling Stadium, Higher Bridge Street, Bolton, Lancashire</td>
<td>Opened February 1978. [1978a, 1978b]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire</td>
<td>Skateslalom</td>
<td>near ASDA store, Colne, Lancashire</td>
<td>Opened 1979.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire</td>
<td>Solid Surf</td>
<td>Helens Sportsland, Marine Drive, Southport, Lancashire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire</td>
<td>Southport</td>
<td>Southport Pleasure Beach, Southport, Lancashire</td>
<td>August 1978 earliest published reference. [1978a]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stalybridge Indoor Sports Centre, Castle Street, Stalybridge, Manchester, Lancashire
Opened 8 August 1977. [1978a, 1978b]

LEICESTERSHIRE
“Humberstone Park”
Humberstone Park, Uppingham Road, Leicestershire
September 1978 earliest published reference.
“Wanlip”
Wanlip Countryside Club, Syston, Leicestershire

LINCOLNSHIRE
“The Broadwalk”
Grimsby, Lincolnshire
June 1978 earliest published reference. [1978b]

LONDON
“Fortham”*
Fortham, New Cross, London
“Glass Rider”
Peter Pan’s Playground, Bromley Road, Catford, London SE6
September 1978 earliest published reference.
“Harrow”
See “Solid Surf”
“Kennington Park”
Kennington Park, London
Opened ca. 1978. [1991c, 1997b]
“Maddog Bowl”
601 Old Kent Road, London SE15
“Meanwhile Gardens”*
Westbourne Park Road/Kensal Road, off Great Western Road, London, W9
“Meanwhile II”*
under Westway, Royal Oak, London
Opened 1979. [1991c, 1997b]
“Radical Banking Module”*
Lisson Green action playground, Penfold Street, Church Street, London NW1
“Rolling Thunder”
Brentford Market, Kew Bridge Road, Brentford, London
“Rom/Skateland”
Old Hornchurch Car-Drome Site, Upper Rainham Road, Hornchurch, Romford, Essex
“Sinclair Super Skate”
See “Wheelies”
“Skate City/Skateways”
Abbots Lane off Tooley Street, London, W1
“Skateland”
See “Rom”
“Skateways”
See “Skate City”
“Skatecircus”
130 Wandsworth Road, Wandsworth, London SW1
“Solid Surf”
Wealdstone Leisure Centre, Harrow, Middlesex
“Spandrel Skate-Dome”
Hillingdon Leisure Complex, Park Road, Uxbridge, Middlesex
“Stockwell Park”
Stockwell Park Walk, Brixton, London
Opened ca. 1978. [1991c, 1997b]
“Talacre”*
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Talacre Street, Kentish Town, London NW5 [1978a, 1991c]
“Wheelies Skate Space/Sinclair Super Skate”
Putney Hill/Upper Richmond Road, Putney, London.

MERSEY
“Edge Lane”
Edge Lane, Liverpool, Mersey
“Golden Gate”
Stanley Road, Bootle, Mersey
“WASP”
Quarry Street, Woolton, Liverpool, Mersey
August 1978 earliest published reference. [1978b]

NORFOLK
“Beachcomber”
Beach Road, Hemsby, Great Yarmouth, Norfolk
“Skatescene”
St. Mary’s Plain, Norwich, Norfolk
June 1978 earliest published reference. [1978b]

NORTHAMPTONSHIRE
“Skateside Stadium”
The Bowling Green, Kettering Town Football Club,
Rockingham Lane, Kettering, Northamptonshire
“Wicksteed Park Track”
Wicksteed Park, Kettering, Northamptonshire

NOTTINGHAMSHIRE
“Malibu Dog Bowl”
Classic Cinema, 66 Derby Road, Lenton Abbey,
Nottingham, Nottinghamshire

OXFORDSHIRE
“Barton Half-pipe”*
Barton, Oxford, Oxfordshire
Opened by 1979.
“Coombe Bowl”*
Coombe, Oxfordshire
Opened by 1979. [1991c]

SCOTLAND
“Kelvingrove Wheelies”
Kelvingrove Park, Glasgow, Scotland
“Livingston/Rock ’n Roll”*
16 Northwood Park, Almondvale North, Livingston,
near Edinburgh, Scotland
“Rock ’n Roll”
See “Livingston”
“St. Mirren”
St. Mirren, Scotland
June 1978 earliest published reference. [1978b]
“Skateboard Land”
Grangemouth Road, Falkirk, Stirlingshire, Scotland [1978b]
Unknown name
Fraserburgh, Scotland
Unknown name
Heathyryfild, Aberdeen, Scotland

SOMERSET
“Breach Down”
Mid Somerset Leisure Centre, near Burnham-on-Sea, Somerset
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Skatepark Name</th>
<th>Location Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOMERSET</td>
<td>Birnbeck Island</td>
<td>The Old Pier, Birnbeck Island, Weston-Super-Mare, Somerset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFFORDSHIRE</td>
<td>Alexandra</td>
<td>Edensor Road, Longton, Stoke-on-Trent, Staffordshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arrow</td>
<td>Hambleden House, Broad Street, Wolverhampton, Staffordshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUFFOLK</td>
<td>East Coaster Indoor Skate Park</td>
<td>Alexandra Road, Lowestoft, Suffolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orvell/Ipswich Skateboard Arena</td>
<td>69 Upper Orwell Street, Ipswich, Suffolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURREY</td>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>Croydon Golf Range, Long Lane, Croydon, Surrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skatestar</td>
<td>William Road, Guildford, Surrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSSEX</td>
<td>Barn</td>
<td>Old Barn Way, Southwick, Brighton, Sussex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALES</td>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>Mostyn Broadway, Llandudno, Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hollywood Bowl</td>
<td>Bryngwyn Estate, Gorseinon, Swansea, South Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Wave</td>
<td>Pendine, Dyfed, West Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILTSHIRE</td>
<td>Pipeline</td>
<td>County Road, Swindon, Wiltshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORCESTERSHIRE</td>
<td>West Midland Safari Park</td>
<td>West Midlands Safari Park, Spring Grove, Bewdley, Kidderminster, Worcestershire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORKSHIRE</td>
<td>Armley Wash House Bowl/Skatebowl</td>
<td>Armley Baths, Carrcrofts Street, Leeds 12, Yorkshire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Westage, Wakefield, Yorkshire [1978b]
“Queens Hall Park”
Leeds, Yorkshire [1978b]
“Pure Fun”
The Mere, corner of Seamer Road and St. Margarets Road, Scarborough, Yorkshire
September 1978 earliest published reference.
“Roxyskate”
Swinton, near Mexborough, South Yorkshire
“Surfrider Skateboard Arena”
Gibbet Street, Halifax, Yorkshire

AVON
“Pink Palace”
Park Street, Bristol, Avon
Opened 1990a.
“Skate & Ride”
Bristol, Avon
March 1997 earliest published reference. [1997a, 1997b]
“St. Georges”
St. Georges Park, Bristol, Avon [1991c]

BERKSHIRE
“Bracknell”
Bracknell Sports Centre, Bracknell, Berkshire [1991c]
“Castle Hill”
Castle Hill Youth Centre, Maidenhead, Berkshire [1997b]
“Roller Rink”
Windsor, Berkshire

CAMBRIDGESHIRE
“St. Neots”
St. Neots, Cambridgeshire. [1991c, 1997b]

CHESHIRE
“Empire Skate”
Museum Street, Warrington, Cheshire
“Northwich”
Northwich, Cheshire [1997b]
“Tattenhall”
Chester, Cheshire
Opened ca. December 1997. [1997b]
CORNWALL
"Newlyn East"
Newlyn East, near Newquay, Cornwall
Opened 1988. [1991c]

"Mount Hawke"
Mount Hawke, near Truro, Cornwall
Opened 1988. [1991c, 1997b]

"Perranporth"
Perranporth, Cornwall
[1991c]

CUMBRIA
"Skate Shack"
Salthouse Mills, Barrow-in-Furness, Cumbria

DERBYSHIRE
Unknown name
Storm Basketball Arena, Derby, Derbyshire
Opened December 1997

DEVON
"Braunton"
Braunton, Devon
[1997b]

"Raging Sewers"
100 Club, Gasworks, Exeter, Devon
[1991c]

"Sidmouth"
Sidmouth, Devon
[1997b]

"Slades Farm"
Slades Farm, Wallsdown, Poole, Devon
[1991c, 1997b]

ESSEX
"Chelmsford Park"
Chelmsford, Essex
[1997b]

"Fearless Ramp Base"
Essex
March 1997 earliest published reference. [1997a]

"Rampage"
next to rail station, Leigh on Sea, Essex
[1991c, 1997b]

HAMPSHIRE
"Farnborough ramp"
Farnborough, Hampshire
1980s.

"Littledown"
Littledown Leisure Centre, Bournemouth, Hampshire
Opened Summer 1997. [1997b]

"Mayflower Park"
Mayflower Park, Southampton, Hampshire
Opened 27 July 1997. [1997b]

HERTFORDSHIRE
"Pioneer"
St. Albans, Hertfordshire

HUMBERSIDE
"Rock City"
Hull, Humberside
Opened March 1997. [1997a, 1997b]

ISLE OF WIGHT
"Seaclose Park"
Isle of Wight

KENT
"Maidstone"
Maidstone, Kent
[1997b]

LANCASHIRE
"Bunker 21"
Heysham, Lancashire
Opened by August 1997. [1997b]

"Goshen Sports Centre"
Bury, Lancashire
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“Roller-rink”
Wigan, Lancashire

“Bones Sk8 Park”
Stockport, Lancashire
October 1997 earliest published reference. [1997b]

LINCOLNSHIRE

“Cleethorpes Wonderland”
Cleethorpes, Lincolnshire.
[1997b]

LONDON

“Black Friars”*
Black Friars Bridge, London
[1991b]

“Cantelowes”*
Camden, Camden Road, London
[1991b, 1991c, 1997b]

“City Track”
Spitalfields Market, Spitalfields, London
Opened 1992

“Crystal Palace ramp”*
Crystal Palace sports centre, London
Closed by 1989.

“Dickeridge”
Dickeridge Adventure Playground, Kingston, London
[1997b]

“Fassnidge Park”
Uxbridge, London
Opened 1997.

“Latimer Road ramp”*
under Westway, near Latimer Road, London

“Playstation”*
Acklam Road, London
Opened ca. 1997. [1997b]

“Ravenscourt Park”
Hammersmith, London
[1997b]

“Twickenham”
Heatham House, Twickenham, London
Opened ca. 1997.

“Vertical”
Hayes, London
Opened late 1997.

“Westbourne Park”*
Westbourne Park, London
Opened ca. 1997.

MERSEY

“Liverpark”
Liverpool
March 1997 earliest published reference. [1997a]

“Rampworx”
Liverpool
[1997b]

NORFOLK

“Fakenham”
Fakenham, Norfolk
April 1990 earliest published reference.

NORTHAMPTONSHIRE

“Radlands”
Studland Road, Northampton, Northamptonshire
Opened 1992. [1997a, 1997b]

NORTHERN IRELAND

“Port Rush”
Port Rush, Northern Ireland
[1997b]

NOTTINGHAMSHIRE

“Chilwell Olympia”
Nottingham, Nottinghamshire
[1997b]

“Rollersnakes”
Nottingham, Nottinghamshire
Opened by 1990a.

“St Annes”
Nottingham, Nottinghamshire
[1997b]
OXFORDSHIRE

"Botley pool"
Botley, Oxford, Oxfordshire
[1991c, 1997b]

SCOTLAND

"Aberdeen ramp"
Exhibition and Conference Centre, Bridge of Don,
Aberdeen, Scotland

"Angel Light's Interplanetary"
Old Temple Church, Strathcona Drive, Glasgow,
Scotland
December 1989 earliest published reference. Closed
by November 1990a.

"Stoneywood"
Dyce, Aberdeen, Scotland
[1997b]

SHROPSHIRE

"Monk Moor"
104 Monk Moor Road, Shrewsbury, Shropshire
[1991c, 1997b]

"Hadley Fields"
Hadley Fields, Telford, Shropshire
[1997b]

SOMERSET

"Hamilton"
Hamilton Road, Taunton, Somerset
[1997b]

"Victoria Park"
Bath, Somerset
[1997b]

SUSSEX

"Hastings ramp"
near seafront, Hastings, Sussex
Opened 1999. [1991c]

"The Level"
Brighton, Sussex
[1991c, 1997b]

"White Rock"
White Rock, Hastings, Sussex
[1997b]

Unknown name
Crawley, Sussex
Opened 1997. [1997b]

TYNE AND WEAR

"Fast Eddies"
Whitley Bay, Tyne and Wear
March 1997 earliest published reference. [1997a,
1997b]

"Shibdon Park"
Blaydon, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
[1997b]

"South Shields"
South Shields, Tyne and Wear
October 1997 earliest published reference. [1997b]

WALES

"Barry"
Barry, Glamorgan, Wales
[1997b]

"Cardiff"
Leckwith Athletics Stadium, Cardiff, Wales
[1991c]

"Skate Extreme"
Newport, Wales
Opened by November 1997.

"Swansea ramp"
Morfa Stadium, Swansea, Wales
Opened by summer 1986. [1991b, 1991c]

WARWICKSHIRE

"Leamington Spa"
Boys Club, near rail station, Leamington Spa,
Warwickshire
[1991b, 1991c]

WEST MIDLANDS

"Birmingham Wheels"
Wheels Project, Bordesley Green Road, Bordesley
Green, Birmingham, West Midlands
1989 earliest published reference. [1991c]

WILTSHIRE
"Calne"
Calne, Wiltshire
[1997b]
"Oasis"
Oasis Leisure Centre, Swindon, Wiltshire
[1997b]

YORKSHIRE
"Bingley"
Bradford, Yorkshire
[1997b]
"Hyde Park"
Hyde Park, Leeds, Yorkshire
[1997b]
"Re-Hab"
Old Skill Centre, Doncaster Road, Wakefield, Yorkshire
Opened 1994. [1997a, 1997b]
"Saltaire Park"
Saltaire, Yorkshire
[1997b]
"The Warehouse"
Sheffield, Yorkshire
"Wibsey Park"
Bradford, Yorkshire
[1997b]
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ARGENTINA
"Caracola Bowl"
Argentina

AUSTRALIA
"Albany Skateboard Park"
Albany, Australia
1979 earliest published reference. [1990b]
"Erindale"
Erindale Centre, Canberra, Australia
"Melton"
West Melton, Australia
"Peppermint Park"
Port Macquarie, Australia
"Ryde"
Sydney, Australia
Unknown name
Hobart, Tasmania, Australia
Unknown name
Mainly, Australia
Opened 1979.

BELGIUM
Unknown name
University of Louvain-La-Neuve, Belgium

BRAZIL
"Anchieta Keyhole"
Belo Horizonte (?), Brazil.
"Buzios"
Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
“Campo Grande”
Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

“Guara Bowl”
São Paulo, Brazil.

“Itaguara Keyhole”
Belo Horizonte (?), Brazil.

“Polidromo”
São Paulo, Brazil.

“Keyhole Pool”*
Belo Horizonte, Brazil.

Unknown name*
Belo Horizonte, Brazil.

“Wave Cat Skatecenter”
São Paulo, Brazil.

“Wave Park”
São Paulo, Brazil.

“Skateboard Palace”
Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada
Opened Fall 1977.

“West Vancouver”
Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada
Opened 1977.

“Park de Carolina”
Quito, Ecuador
March 1997 earliest published reference.

“Beton Hurlant”
Paris, France
1979 earliest published reference.

“Erromdadi”
France

“La Roche Sur Yon”
Paris, France

“Porte de la Villette”
Paris, France

“Skatepark de St-Jean de Luz”
St-Jean de Luz, France

Unknown name
Toulouse, France

“Saanich Skatewave”
Vancouver Island, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada
1979 earliest published reference.

“Skateboard and Roller Skate World/Coast Skateboard World”
7325 MacPhearson Avenue, Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada
1979 earliest published reference. [1980]

“North Van”**
Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

“Ontario Skateboard Park”
Markham, Canada

Unknown name
Munich Olympic Park, Germany

GUATEMALA
Unknown name
Guatemala
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>City, Country</th>
<th>Opened/Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Hewajima&quot;</td>
<td>outer Tokyo, Japan</td>
<td>1980 earliest published reference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown name</td>
<td>Osaka, Japan</td>
<td>1980 earliest published reference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Yoyogi&quot;</td>
<td>Tokyo, Japan</td>
<td>January 1985 earliest published reference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEXICO</td>
<td>&quot;Dogtown&quot;</td>
<td>Mexico City, Mexico</td>
<td>Opened 1978.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Skapistas de Mexico&quot;</td>
<td>Tijuana, Mexico</td>
<td>Tijuana, Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Skatopistas del Sol&quot;</td>
<td>Avenue Lopez Mateos by Plaza del Sol, Guadalajara, Mexico</td>
<td>1979 earliest published reference. [1991b]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NETHERLANDS</td>
<td>Unknown name</td>
<td>Amsterdam, Netherlands</td>
<td>Amsterdam, Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Wiahi&quot;</td>
<td>Main Road, Waihi, New Zealand</td>
<td>1977 earliest published reference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Skateboard Park of Puerto Rico&quot;</td>
<td>Call Box sp, Guaynabo, Puerto Rico</td>
<td>Unknown date. Probably closed ca. 1981.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SOUTH AFRICA
“Cresta Wave”
PO Box 84141, Greenside 2034, Johannesburg, South Africa.
Unknown date.

SWEDEN
“New Sport House”
Stockholm, Sweden
Opened summer 1978.
“Skateland”
Gothenburg, Sweden
Opened 1979.
“Uplands”
Vasby, Sweden

SWITZERLAND
Unknown name
Geneva, Switzerland
1979 earliest published reference.

ARGENTINA
“Plata”
Praia de Plata, Salvador, Buenos Aires, Argentina
[1991b]

AUSTRALIA
“Annandale Bowl”
Whites Creek Park, Annandale, Australia
“Ballarat”
Wendouree, Dowling Street, Ballarat, Victoria, Australia
“Bathurst”
Bathurst, New South Wales, Australia
[1990b]
“Balconen”
Belconnen, Canberra, Australia
“Brown Street Bowl”
Brown Street, West Hobart, Australia
1988 earliest published reference. [1990b]
“Bulleen Bowl”
Melbourne, Australia
“Canberra”
Melbourne, Australia
October 1997 earliest published reference.
“Canberra Civic”
Northbourne Avenue, Canberra, Australia
“Caves Beach”
Strathmore Road, Caves Beach, New South Wales, Australia
“Charnwood”
Park Need P1, Charnwood, Canberra, Australia
1989 earliest published reference. [1990b]
“Collins Reserve Skate Park”
Valletta Road, Fulham, Adelaide, Australia

A6 Rest of the World 1983–97
1989 earliest published reference. [1990b]
“Corio Bowl”
Anakie Road, Geelong, Victoria, Australia

1989 earliest published reference. [1990b]
“Doveton”
Reserve Road, Doveton, Victoria, Australia

1989 earliest published reference. [1990b]
“The Edge”
Fremantle, Perth, Australia

“Factory”
Tyabb Road, Mornington, Victoria, Australia

“Fadden Pines”
Bugden Avenue, Fadden Pines, Canberra, Australia
[1990b]

“Fairfield”
Fairfield Leisure Centre, 8 Vine Street, Fairfield, New South Wales, Australia


[1990b]
“Fitzroy”
Fitzroy, Melbourne, Australia

“Five Dock”
New South Wales, Australia
1989 earliest published reference. [1990b]

“Grafton”
Highway 91, Grafton, New South Wales, Australia
[1990b]

“Jindalee”
Queensland, Australia

“Kawana Waters”
Australia

“Kempt Park”
Hurstville, Australia

“Knox”
Lewis Road, Knox, Victoria, Australia
[1990b]

“The Labyrinth”
100 Spencer Street, Bunbury, Western Australia
[1990b]

“Lismore”
Victoria Street, Lismore, New South Wales, Australia


“Mandurah”
Perth, Australia
1989 earliest published reference. [1990b]

“Manly”
Keirrie Park, Manly, Australia


“Newcastle”
Newcastle, Australia

October 1997 earliest published reference.

“Nexus”
Brisbane, Australia

October 1997 earliest published reference.

“Peregian Bowl”
Peregian Beach, Sunshine Coast, Queensland, Australia

May 1988 earliest published reference. [1990b]

“Pizzy Park”
Miami, Queensland, Australia

1989 earliest published reference. [1990b]

“Prahan Bowl”
Commercial Road, Prahan, Melbourne, Australia

1989 earliest published reference. [1990b]

“Queanbeyan”
Queanbeyan, New South Wales, Australia


“Ringwood”
Bedford Park, Victoria, Australia
[1990b]

“Rivers Edge”
550 Latrobe Terrace, Geelong, Victoria, Australia


“St. Mary’s”
108 Forrest Road, St. Mary’s, Sydney, Australia


[1990b]

“Sixth Sense”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Opened</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41 Cavan Road, Gepps Cross, Adelaide, Australia</td>
<td>41 Cavan Road, Gepps Cross, Adelaide, Australia</td>
<td>November 1996</td>
<td>[1991b]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Skateboard City”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>481 Gympie Road, Strathpine, Queensland, Australia</td>
<td>481 Gympie Road, Strathpine, Queensland, Australia</td>
<td>18 March 1988</td>
<td>[1990b]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Skate Shed”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A/25 Michlin Street, Moorooka, Queensland 4105, Australia</td>
<td>1A/25 Michlin Street, Moorooka, Queensland 4105, Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td>[1991b]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Thomastown”</td>
<td>Main Street Reserve, Thomastown, Victoria, Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td>[1990b]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Underwood”</td>
<td>Underwood Sports Park, Underwood, Queensland, Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td>[1990b]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Woden Bowl”</td>
<td>opposite swimming pool, Phillip, Canberra, Australia</td>
<td>1988 earliest published reference.</td>
<td>[1991b]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Wollongong”</td>
<td>Wollongong, Australia</td>
<td>October 1997 earliest published reference.</td>
<td>[1991b]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELGIUM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Raes”</td>
<td>Moerstraat, 116, 9230 Wetteren, Belgium</td>
<td></td>
<td>[1991b]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Roller Skating Dream”</td>
<td>Slippesteenweg, 24, 8432 Leffinge-Middelkerke, Belgium</td>
<td></td>
<td>[1991b]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“United Skates”</td>
<td>Torhoutsesteenweg, 90f, Oostende, Belgium</td>
<td></td>
<td>[1991b]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAZIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Abaeté”</td>
<td>Clube de Campo, Abaeté, Taubaté, São Paulo, Brazil</td>
<td></td>
<td>[1991b]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Academia Kickskate”</td>
<td>Avenue Nacoes Unidos, 1091, Novo Hamburgo, Brazil</td>
<td></td>
<td>[1991b]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Aproador”</td>
<td>Parque Garota de Ipanema-Aproador, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil</td>
<td></td>
<td>[1991b]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Barramares”</td>
<td>Condomínio, Barramares-Barra da Tijuca, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil</td>
<td></td>
<td>[1991b]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Dominio”</td>
<td>Rua Lucas Nogueira, Garcez, 2940, Atibala, São Paulo, Brazil</td>
<td>September 1990a earliest published reference.</td>
<td>[1991b]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Fox”</td>
<td>Rua Maria Candida, 1312, São Paulo, Brazil</td>
<td></td>
<td>[1991b]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Itagua Country Club”</td>
<td>Praca 13 de Maio, 90, Guaratingueta, São Paulo, Brazil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Junior”</td>
<td>Rua Fernando, Simonsen, s/n, Sao Caetano do Sul, São Paulo, Brazil</td>
<td></td>
<td>[1991b]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Lipton”</td>
<td>São Paulo, Brazil</td>
<td>1989 earliest published reference.</td>
<td>[1991b]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Marina”</td>
<td>Marina Barra Clube-Barra da Tijuca, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil</td>
<td></td>
<td>[1991b]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Nautico”</td>
<td>Clubo Nautico de Araraquara, São Paulo, Brazil</td>
<td></td>
<td>[1991b]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A Skateparks

[1991b] "Potato"
Avenue Sete de Setembro, 1465, Guarulhos, São Paulo, Brazil

[1991b] "Pontoes da Barra"
Barra da Tijuca, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

[1991b] "Prestige"
Rua Schilling, 475, São Paulo, Brazil

[1991b] "Rampa Do Quadrado"
Bairro da Urca, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

[1991b] "Rio Sul pool"
Rio Sul shopping centre, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

[1991b] "Raticida Park"
Avenue Paes de Barros, 2694, São Paulo, Brazil

[1991b] "Riviera"
Riviera del Fiori-Barra da Tijuca, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

[1991b] "São Bernardo -Assac"
Avenue Pereira Barreto, s/n, São Bernado do Campo, São Paulo, Brazil

[1991b] "Santo André"
Avenue Corrego do Cemitério, s/n, Santo André, São Paulo, Brazil

[1991b] "Top Sport"
Rua Cardosa de Almeida, 80, São Paulo, Brazil

[1991b] "Turbo Jet"
Camboriu-sc, Brazil

[1991b] "Ultra Skate Center"
Avenue Morumbi, 8440, São Paulo, Brazil

[1991b] "Wave Cat"
São Bernardo, Brazil

[1991b] "2N"
Avenue Guaca, s/n, São Paulo, Brazil

[1991b]

CANADA

[1997c] "Abbotsford Optimist Club"
Abbotsford, British Columbia, Canada

[1997c] "Archibald Arena"
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada

[1997c] "Boucherville"
3535 Jules-Leger Boucherville, Montreal, Quebec, Canada
May 1996 earliest published reference. [1997c]

[1997c] "Century"
10533 123 Street, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada
tSN1N9

[1997c] "Chilliwack"
Tyson Drive, Chilliwack, British Columbia, Canada

[1997c] "China Creek"
Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

[1991a] "Clubhouse"
Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

[1997c] "Collingwood"
Collingwood, Ontario, Canada

[1997c] "Five-0"
1892 First Street, Saint Romauld, Quebec, Canada, 69w 5M6

[1997c] "Garage"
608 Lake Street, Nelson, British Columbia, Canada, V1L 4C8

[1997c] "Grassroots"
12 Fisherman Drive, Brampton, Ontario, Canada [1991a, 1991b]

"Jarry Park"
Montreal, Canada
May 1996 earliest published reference.

"Ladner Public"
Ladner, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada
Opened 1996. [1997c]

"Langley Skate Ranch"
20445 62nd Avenue, Langley, British Columbia, Canada V3A 5E6 [1990a, 1991a, 1991b, 1997c]

"M and J's Skate Town"
810 Rye Street, Peterborough, Ontario, Canada [1990a, 1991a, 1991b]

"Neutral Zone"
Maple Ridge, British Columbia, Canada [1997c]

"Off the Wall"
1395 Ellice Avenue, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada, R3A 0C3 [1991b]

"On Deck"
141 Bentely Avenue, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada [1997c]

"Optimist Club"
Thames Street, Ingersoll, Ontario, Canada [1997c]

"Paul and Mark's Majestic Skate Palace"
9718 102nd Street, Peace River, Alberta, Canada [1997c]

"Rampage"
4100 Chesswood Drive, Toronto, Ontario, Canada [1997c]

"Revelstoke"
Edward Street, Revelstoke, British Columbia, Canada [1997c]

"Richmond Skate Ranch"
7391 Elm Bridge Way, Richmond, British Columbia, Canada, V6E 1H8

"Sarnia"
Maxwell Street, Sarnia, Ontario, Canada [1997c]

"Seylynn Park"
North Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada [1991a, 1997c]

"Sk8 City"
2-2212 Gladwin Crescent, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, K1B 5N1 [1997c]

"Skate Ranch"
Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

"Slot Machine"
Grimsby, Ontario, Canada [1997c]

"Spine and Grind Warehouse"
32 Confederation Bay, Brandon, Manitoba, Canada, R7B 2T1 [1991b]

"Sports Afield"
310 Patillo Road, Tecumseh, Ontario, Canada, N8N 2L9 [1990a, 1991a, 1991b]

"Sud Skates"
5A Bond Street, St. Catherines, Ontario, Canada [1991a, 1997c]

"Tazmahal"
1650 Berri, Montreal, Quebec, Canada [1997c]

"Tiffino Park"
Tiffino, Vancouver Island, British Columbia, Canada [1991a]

"Tortosaurus"
3721 Chesswood Drive, Downsview Ontario, Canada, M3J 2P6 [1991a, 1991b]

"Transition"
Donevan Recreation Complex, 171 Harmony Road, Oshawa, Ontario, Canada, L1H 6T4 [1990a, 1991a, 1991b]

"Victoria"
Victoria, British Columbia, Canada
"Whistler"*
Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada
February 1996 earliest published reference. [1997c]
"White Rock"*
Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada
February 1996 earliest published reference. [1997c]
"William Griffin Park"*
North Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada
[1991a, 1997c]

CZECHOSLOVAKIA
"Jules Fuckis Park"
Jules Fuckis Park, Prague, Czechoslovakia

DENMARK
"Fabrikken"
Rudolfgårdsvej 13, 8260 Vibj J, Århus, Denmark
[1991b]
"Faelled Parken"
Nørre Allé and Borgmester Jensens Allé, Nørrebo,
Copenhagen, Denmark
Opened by 1989. [1991b]
"Klubben Skatezone"
near Nørreport Station, Copenhagen, Denmark
Opened by 1989.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
"World on Wheels"
Winston Churchill Avenue, Santo Domingo,
Dominican Republic
[1991b]

FINLAND
Unknown name
Helsinki, Finland

FRANCE
"Petit Pois Sauteurs Skate Camp"

base de sport et de loisirs de Pinot, chemin d’aussonne, 31700, Blagnac, Toulouse, France
"Plage du Prado"
Point Rogue beach, Marseilles, France
Opened ca. 1991.
Unknown name
Lyon, France
Unknown name
Sports Complex, Montpellier, France
MArch 1993 earliest published reference.

GERMANY
Action Sports Dome
Mönchengladbach, Germany
"Berg Fidel/Münster"
Münster, Germany
Opened 1989. [1991b]
"Skate House"
Max-Keith Street 25, 4300 Essen-Sued, BRD,
Germany
March 1990 earliest published reference. Closed by
"Thomas I. Punkt"
Hamburg, Germany
"Titus Warehouse"*
Münster, Germany

GREECE
"Glyfada"
Glyfada Park, Athens, Greece
[1991b]

INDONESIA
"Hobbies"
Bandung, West Java, Indonesia
July 1997 earliest published reference.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Skatepark Name</th>
<th>Location Details</th>
<th>Publication Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRELAND</td>
<td>“Simon’s Skatepark”</td>
<td>76 Sir John Rogerson’s Quay, Dublin 2, Ireland</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISRAEL</td>
<td>“Sportek”</td>
<td>Tel-Aviv, Israel</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITALY</td>
<td>“Salussola”</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>October 1990a, earliest published reference.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Skate-Snowboard Concrete Park”</td>
<td>Via Sabonaro 30, Milano, Gratosoglio, Italy</td>
<td>1991b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAPAN</td>
<td>“Ascot Board Park”</td>
<td>Osaka, Japan</td>
<td>1991b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[1991b]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown name</td>
<td>Fukuoka, Japan</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1985, earliest published reference.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown name</td>
<td>Nagoya, Japan</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1985, earliest published reference.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JERSEY</td>
<td>“The Works”</td>
<td>St. Helier, Jersey</td>
<td>1997b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEXICO</td>
<td>“Bony”</td>
<td>Hermosillo, Sonaro, Mexico</td>
<td>1991b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[1991b]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Club Bal-Skate”</td>
<td>Avenue 4 Number 81, Mexico City, Mexico</td>
<td>1991b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[1991b]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Coloso”</td>
<td>Avenue Aldama, Ensenada, Baja California, Mexico</td>
<td>1991b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[1991b]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Desastre”</td>
<td>Avenue Morelos 1503, Toluca, Mexico</td>
<td>1991b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[1991b]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Garra”</td>
<td>Boulevard Estancia et Carro, Ensenada, Baja California, Mexico</td>
<td>1991b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[1991b]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Grand Prix”</td>
<td>Papagayo Park, Acapulco, Mexico</td>
<td>1991b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[1991b]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Heart Beat Club”</td>
<td>Avenue San Luis Potosi and Monterrey, Mexico City, Mexico</td>
<td>1991b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[1991b]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Jungle Boy”</td>
<td>Tulum con Flamboyan, Smza. 23 L. 11-1 dep. 1, Cancun, q.Roo, Mexico</td>
<td>1991b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[1991b]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Mictian”</td>
<td>Avenue Hamm at Rio, Fuerte, Mazatlan, Mexico</td>
<td>1991b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[1991b]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Parque Metalico”</td>
<td>Plaza del Angel, Guadalajara, Mexico</td>
<td>1991b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[1991b]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Roller Condesa”</td>
<td>Plaza Condesa, Acapulco, Mexico</td>
<td>1991b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[1991b]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Skate Paradise”</td>
<td>Avenue Lomas Verdes, Bazar Perinorte, Naucalpan, Mexico</td>
<td>1991b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[1991b]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Skate Rock”</td>
<td>Independencia 1580, Los Mochis, Sinaloa, Mexico</td>
<td>1991b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[1991b]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Skate World”</td>
<td>Culican, Sinaloa, Mexico</td>
<td>1991b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[1991b]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Sport Plaza”</td>
<td>Avenue Azueta at Constitucion Mazatlan, Mexico</td>
<td>1991b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[1991b]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“10 1/2”
Avenue Patria near Avenue Americas, Guadalajara, Mexico
[1991b]
“Tijuana”
Tijuana, Mexico
[1991b]
“Tiquius Skate and Surf”
Calle de Ignacio, La Paz, Baja Sur, Mexico
[1991b]
“Tropico Mini Ramp”
Avenue Bangines at Plaza Loyola, Ensenada, Baja California, Mexico
[1991b]

NETHERLANDS
“Bridge-Ramp”
Under Schellingswoudebrdige, Amsterdam, Netherlands
Opened by 1990a.
“Powell Warehouse”
Gyroscoopweg 64, NL 1042 AC, Amsterdam, Netherlands
Opened by 1990a.
“Skatepark Van Nierup Sport”
Drive Phillipsplaan 25, 6042CT Roermond, Netherlands
[1991b]

NEW ZEALAND
“Allenby”
Allenby Road, Papatoetoe, New Zealand
[1990b]
“Brown’s Bay”
Brown’s Bay, New Zealand
“Hamilton Bay”*
Melville Park, Hamilton, Auckland, New Zealand
[1990b]
“Havelock North bowls”
Havelock North, New Zealand

“Lynfield”
The Avenue, Lynfield, New Zealand
[1990b]
“New Lynn”
Bob Hill Park, off Portage Road, New Lynn, New Zealand
[1990b]
“Palmerston North”
Palmerston North, New Zealand
[1990b]
“Skate Pit”
Waterloo Quay, Wellington, New Zealand
“Taupo”
Taupo, New Zealand
[1990b]
“Upland”
Upland Road, Remeura, New Zealand
[1990b]
“Whangamata”
Whangamata, New Zealand
[1990b]
“Whangarei”
Auckland, New Zealand
[1990b]

NORWAY
“Skateout”
Hamang, Sandvika, Baerum, Norway
[1991b]
“Rad Mini Park”
Ostre Akerveien 91, Oslo 6, Norway
[1991b]
“Session”
Bergen Mekaniske, Verksted, Bergen, Norway
[1991b]
“Session”
Stavanger, Norway
[1991b]
PERU
“La Rampa”
Esquina de Javier Prado y Avenue Nicolas Arriala,
San Isidro, Lima 27, Peru
Opened 23 December 1988. [1991b]

SINGAPORE
“Rock’n’Roll”
Block 21, #01-45, Flanders Square, Petain Road,
Singapore 0820
[1991b]

SLOVENIA
“Kodeljevo Sport Park”
Ljubljana, Slovenia
“Kranj Sport Centre”
Kranj, Slovenia

SOUTH AFRICA
“Aston Bay Ramp”
Natal, South Africa
[1991b]
“Boogaloos”
Johannesburg, South Africa
[1991b]
“Legends”
Krugerdorp, South Africa
[1991b]
“Look Ahead”
Johannesburg, South Africa
[1991b]
“Parrow”
Cape Town, South Africa
[1991b]
“Pink Pipe”
Pretoria, South Africa
[1991b]
“Prichard Security”
Cape Town, South Africa
[1991b]
“Rox”

Natal, South Africa
[1991b]
“Skateboard Warehouse”
Pretoria East, South Africa
[1991b]
“Surf News”
Natal, South Africa
[1991b]

SPAIN
“Barcelona”
Barcelona, Cataluña, Spain
[1991b]
“Duesto”
Bilbao, Pais Vasco, Spain
[1991b]
“La Cantera”
Algorta, País Vasco, Spain
[1991b]
“Las Arenas”
Algorta, País Vasco, Spain
[1991b]
“Madrid”
Carretera, Madrid, Spain
[1991b]
“Mini Ramp of Tapia”
Tapia, Asturias, Spain
[1991b]
“Mini Skatepark of Avilés”
Avilés, Asturias, Spain
[1991b]
“Puerta de Hierro”
Madrid, Spain
[1991b]
“Ramp of Pontevedra”
Pontevedra, Galicia, Spain
[1991b]
“Ramp of Zarauz”
Zarauz, País Vasco, Spain
[1991b]
“Skatepark of Malaga”
Malaga, Andalucía, Spain
[1991b]  
"Skatepark of Palma de Mallorca"  
Palma de Mallorca, Baleares, Spain  
[1991b]  
Unknown name  
Alcalá de Henares, Spain  
Unknown name  
Lerida, Spain  
Unknown name*  
Seville, Spain  
Unknown name  
Sitges, near Barcelona, Cataluña, Spain  
[1991b]  

SWEDEN  
"Summerland"  
Stockholm, Sweden  
Notes

The following list of internet sites is predominantly derived from that posted on the Usenet alt.skateboard site by Adam Bender, (accessed 5 January 1997).

Internet Sites

Acme
www.sk8acme.com
Airwalk shoes
www.airwalk.com
Arcadia
www.address.net/arcadia/sk/8
Balance Magazine
pscinfo.psc.edu/~peleckis/balance/contents.html
Beach Plus Rainbow
www.arc.net/company/rainbow
Beer City skateboards
beercity.com/

b-grn
netspace.net.au/~butta/butta.htm
Big Deal skate shop
www.bigdeal.com/
Black Warrior Skateboarding Association
www.ebicom.net/~early/bwsa
Blair
www.blairmag.com/
Blindside
www4.ncsu.edu/unity/users/g/gbhhahn/www/hp.html
Bobby Hance’s Skate Page
www.fidalgo.net/%7Ehyn/bobby2.htm
California Boardriders
www.caliboards.com/
Calvin’s sk8 Shop
www.public.asu.edu/~smitob
Capital and Nicotine
www.nicotine.com
Capital Seven Films
www.uidaho.edu/~mtkeller/
Captain’s Home Page
www.geocities.com/SunsetStrip/Alley/4051/index.html
Catchin’ Air
www.hotspots.hawaii.com/skate.html
C.F.S. Skate Shop
www.sundial.net/~access/cfs/
Charged
www.charged.com
Click mail order
www.theclick.com
Cobra Skateboards
www.hula.net/~cyber/cobra.html
Cold Sweat
users.aol.com/dgemulsion/
Contrabond skate shop
www.cyberenet.net/~pack666/
Cops Eat Donuts
niweb.com/dnet/dnetQKZw/
Core
funnelweb.utcc.utk.edu/~jashrie/chaos.html
CrackedAss
home.earthlink.net/~ddiekmann/sk8_sn0/skate.html
Cruiser
www.convert.com/skatebrd
Cyberboarder
www.cyberboarder.com/ C
DansWORLD: FAQs, ramp files, files
web.cps.msu.edu/~dunhamda/dw/
Deplo Skateboards
pw2.netcom.com/~deplo/d_home.html

www.geocities.com/Colosseum/Field/2020
Destination Extreme
www.burstmum.com/destinationex.html
Dr. Skate
www.angelfire.com/pg0/DrSkate/index.html
Exklusiv
www.exklusiv.com/
Faceplant
www.ugcs.caltech.edu/~face/
GenX
www.mersinet.co.uk/~irl/genx.html
telnet surfers.org.uk 4242
Appendix E Internet Sites

Gullwing Trucks
www.gullwingtrucks.com

HardCore Sports
www.bcn.net/~hardcore/

Heckler Magazine: Ramp plans
www.heckler.com/

How to Ollie and Kickflip
home.earthlink.net/~benhertz/

Huphtur Magazine
www.huphtur.nl

Influx magazine
www.internet.com/skate/skate.html

Iceman
www.hooked.net/users/jester/iceman.html

Insect skateboards
www.dezinfl.com/insect/insect.htm

Intensity Skates
www.intensity.com

Invisible Skateboards
www.invisibleskateboards.com

Jeff's Page
www.angelfire.com/ma/jmwood/index.html

JFA
home.earthlink.net/~brianjfa/

Journal
www.skatenerd.com

Knowhere: UK skate parks
www.state51.co.uk/knowhere/skindex.html

Links to ramp plans
www.aeros.net/~nelson/rampplans.html

Links to skate sites
www.igc.net/~loutina/index.html

Liquor Skateboards
www.liquorworld.com/

Magic Rolling Board
www.ecf.toronto.edu/~steve/sk8.html

Matthew Desmond's Skateboarding World
members.aol.com/tatsuo01/skate/skate.html

Motorvation Skateboard Ramp Trailer
ffcol.com/skate

My SK8 Page
www.geocities.com/SunsetStrip/Alley/9549/index.html

Netskate
www.netskate.com

Newboy's Prototype Home-Page
www.ee.port.ac.uk/~eb1-wwww/newboy/

NYCSKATE Skateboards
www.nycskate.com/skateboards/index.html

Obsession Watersports skateboarding
www.gate.net/~ows/obs-skbo.htm

Ocean Gear Skateboards
users.aol.com/zuck13/ocean_gear/skatebds.html

Outline Magazine
www.voicenet.com/~outline/

Penn's Page
www.msms.doe.k12.ms.us/~ptaylor/

Pimpin' Skate Videos
www.pimpin.com/skatevids.html

Pit
www.geocities.com/Colosseum/7851

Planet X mailorder
www.shocking.com/planetx

Port Skateboards
planetx.bloomu.edu/~jmryme/port.html

Premier Boards
www.pcprom.net/premierboards

Push
duh.reference.be/

Quake City Skates
www.wco.com/~qcs/qcshome.html

Ramptech
www.ramptech.com

Rare Breed
nj5.injersey.com/~rb007/

Real Deal Magazine
members.aol.com/Simon9949/home.html

Reebosak
www.athenet.net/~reebosak/

RPMonlinemagazine
www.kaiwan.com/~rpm

Ryan's Home Page
cavern.nmsu.edu/~rwilcox

7 Up Skate Open
www.jyu.fi/~vmpa/skate/
Appendix B  Internet Sites

Shorty's Inc  www.shortysinc.com
Shred Shop  jibco.com/shredshop/
SK8@Halifax  www.keltic.ca/hfxsk8
*SK8BC*  www.geocities.com/Yosemite/1036/index.html
SK8 page: Links, files  www.acs.appstate.edu/~jp8992/sk8.html
Sk8punk Skateboarding Homepage  www.geocities.com/Colosseum/2011/
Skatanic Zine  copper.ucs.indiana.edu/~dclester/skatanic.home.html
Skate  www.wpi.edu/~halle
Skateboard  www.sirius.com/~mcmardon/Come/Skateboard.htm
Skateboarding  www.netlife.fi/users/saksi/m/home/skate.htm
Skateboard.co.uk  www.skeateboard.co.uk/index1.html
Skateboard.com  www.tumyeto.com/tydu/skatebrd/skate.htm
Skateboarding Legalization Resource  www.cs.earlham.edu/~stosbma/skate.html
Skateboarding Stuff  www.halcyon.com/lkblair/skate.html
Skate City  www.travel-net.com:80/~clone
Skate City Supply  www.nmia.com/~scs
Skate Geezer  www.terraport.net/abrook/skateggezer.html
Skate links  www.netzone.com/~etnies23
SkateNet  www.skatenet.com/
Skate.net: Reviews of products  www.webtrax.com/skate/
#skate page  www.huphtur.nl/irc/
Skatemilk page  xx.acs.appstate.edu/~jh13875/skate.html
Skaters  www.magicnet.net/~choux/index.html
#skaters homepage  skaters.netwizards.net
Skaters Suck  weber.u.washington.edu/~jessie/skateboarding.html
Skates on Haight  www.skates.com
Skate State  www.compusmart.ab.ca/danwiebe/index.htm
Skatestuff  www.angelfire.com/az/SKATESTUFF
Skating in Finland  www.lypoly.fi/~harpuu/skate.htm
Sketchy Wear  www.mcs.net/~sburke/sketchywear/catalog.html
SLAM the page  www.tiac.net/users/rudos1
Snap On Skate Page  www.geocities.com/Yosemite/1629/Skate.html
Snowskate.com mail order  www.snowskate.com
So Bored  www.sobored.com/
Stereosounds's Home Page  www.geocities.com/Colosseum/9025
Surf Plus skateboards  www.sonic.net/surplus/skate.html
3rdfloor  www.xs4all.nl/~3rdfloor/
TransWorld Skateboarding  www.skateboarding.com
Tumyeto Digiverse: companies  www.tumyeto.com/tydu/homepage.html
Tunafish Homepage
www.geocities.com/SunsetStrip/Towers/3477/home.html
Union of BNB
merlion.singnet.com.sg/~shan8210/bnb.htm
Unorganized Skate Page
www.netpower.no/~troy/skate.html
Vans shoes
vansshoes.com/
Vert home page
www.vert.com/stephen_sandve/
Vert page
mindlink.net/stephen_sandve/
Woodmyster’s Home Page
www.geocities.com/Colosseum/9026
Zooyork
www.zooyork.com
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Skateboarding: Magazine Issues


*Asylum*, (uk), n.2 (undated, ca. Summer 1996).

*Asylum*, (uk), n.4 (undated, ca. February 1997).

*Australian Skateboarding*, (Australia), v.4 n.2 (undated, ca. November 1997).

*Bicross and Skate*, (France), n.71 (September 1988).

*Big Brother*, (us), n.17, (undated, ca. Summer 1995).

*Big Brother*, (us), n.19, (undated, ca. late 1995).

*Big Brother*, (us), n.25, (June 1997).

*Big Brother*, (us), n.26, (August 1997).

*Big Brother*, (us), n.27, (September 1997).

*Big Brother*, (us), n.28, (August 1997).

*Big Cheese*, (uk), n.2, (undated, ca. early 1997).

*Big Cheese*, (uk), n.5, (July/August 1997).

*BMX Action Bike*, (uk), (later R.A.D.), n.50 (March 1987).

*BMX Action Bike*, (uk), (later R.A.D.), n.51 (April 1987).

*BMX Action Bike*, (uk), (later R.A.D.), n.52 (May 1987).

*BMX Action Bike*, (uk), (later R.A.D.), n.53 (June 1987).

*Cake Fat*, (uk), n.2, (undated, ca. 1996).

*Concrete Powder*, (Canada), v.1 n.2 (ca. April 1990).

*Cow Pat*, (uk), n.3 (1995).

*Duh*, (Belgium), n.7 (Spring 1995).

*Ergo Sum*, (uk), n.1, (undated, ca. early 1997).

*Ergo Sum*, (uk), n.2 (Summer 1997).

*Euroskate 88*, (Czechoslovakia), (undated, ca. late 1989).

*Five 40*, (Australia), v.1 n.2, (Summer 1988).

*Five 40*, (Australia), v.1 n.3, (May 1988).

*Five 40*, (Australia), (August 1989).

*Five 40*, (Australia), (October 1989).

*Five 40*, (Australia), (December 1989).

*Five 40*, (Australia), (February 1990).

*Mad Monks Magazines*, (uk), ns. 1-3 (undated, ca. 1995-6).

*Monster*, (Germany), n.1 (January-February 1982).

*Monster*, (Germany), n.25 (February-March 1987).

*Monster*, (Germany), n.34 (September-October 1988).

*Monster*, (Germany), n.36 (January-February 1988).

*Monster*, (Germany), n.37 (March-April 1989).

*Monster*, (Germany), n.38 (May-June 1989).

*Monster*, (Germany), n.39 (July-August 1989).

*Monster*, (Germany), n.40 (September 1989).

*Monster*, (Germany), n.42 (November 1989).

*Monster*, (Germany), n.43 (December 1989).

*Monster*, (Germany), n.44 (February 1990).

*Monster*, (Germany), n.45 (March 1990).

*Monster*, (Germany), n.48 (June 1990).

*Monster*, (Germany), n.49 (July 1990).

*Monster*, (Germany), n.50 (August 1990).

*Monster*, (Germany), n.51 (September 1990).

*Monster*, (Germany), n.53 (November 1990).

*Monster*, (Germany), n.54 (December 1990).

*Monster*, (Germany), n.55 (January 1991).

*Noway*, (France), n.12 (October 1990).

*Noway*, (France), n.13 (November 1990).

*Noway*, (France), hors-serie n.1 (undated, ca. late 1990).

*Overall*, (Brazil), n.10 (June-July 1989).

*Overall*, (Brazil), v.3 n.13 (1989).

*Overall*, (Brazil), v.3 n.14 (1989).

*Overall*, (Brazil), v.3 n.16 (1989).

*Perfect Transition*, (Australia), v.1 n.6 (September/October 1988).

*Poweredge*, (us), (January 1988).

*R.A.D.*, (uk), n.54, (July 1987).


*R.A.D.*, (uk), n.56, (September 1987).

*R.A.D.*, (uk), n.57, (October 1987).

*R.A.D.*, (uk), n.58, (November 1987).


*R.A.D.*, (uk), n.60, (February 1988).

*R.A.D.*, (uk), n.61, (March 1988).


*R.A.D.*, (uk), n.64, (June 1988).
RA.D. (UK), n.65, (July 1988).
RA.D. (UK), n.67, (September 1988).
RA.D. (UK), n.68, (October 1988).
RA.D. (UK), n.69, (November 1988).
RA.D. (UK), n.70, (December 1988).
RA.D. (UK), n.72, (February 1989).
RA.D. (UK), n.73, (March 1989).
RA.D. (UK), n.74, (April 1989).
RA.D. (UK), n.75, (May 1989).
RA.D. (UK), n.76, (June 1989).
RA.D. (UK), n.77, (July 1989).
RA.D. (UK), n.79, (September 1989).
RA.D. (UK), n.80, (October 1989).
RA.D. (UK), n.81, (November 1989).
RA.D. (UK), n.82, (December 1989).
RA.D. (UK), n.84, (February 1990).
RA.D. (UK), n.85, (March 1990).
RA.D. (UK), n.87, (May 1990).
RA.D. (UK), n.88, (June 1990).
RA.D. (UK), n.91, (December 1990).
RA.D. (UK), n.92, (February 1991).
RA.D. (UK), n.97, (June 1991).
RA.D. (UK), n.100, (September 1991).
RA.D. (UK), n.103, (December 1991).
RA.D. (UK), n.117, (February 1993).
RA.D. (UK), n.118, (March 1993).
RA.D. (UK), n.137, (February-March 1995).
Sidewalk Surfer, (UK), n.1 (September-October 1995).
Sidewalk Surfer, (UK), n.2 (November-December 1995).
Sidewalk Surfer, (UK), n.3 (January-February 1996).
Sidewalk Surfer, (UK), n.9 (August 1996).
Sidewalk Surfer, (UK), n.12 (December 1996).
Sidewalk Surfer, (UK), n.13 (January-February 1997).
Sidewalk Surfer, (UK), n.14 (March 1997).
Sidewalk Surfer, (UK), n.15 (April 1997).
Sidewalk Surfer, (UK), n.19 (August 1997).
Sidewalk Surfer, (UK), n.20 (September 1997).
Sidewalk Surfer, (UK), n.21 (October-November 1997).
Sidewalk Surfer, (UK), n.22 (December 1997).
Sidewalk Surfer, (UK), n.23 (January-February 1998).
Sk8 Action, (UK), (May 1990).
Skate, (France), n.2 (Mars-April 1978).
Skateboard, (Norway), n.2 (1990).
Skateboard, (UK), n.1 (August 1977).
Skateboard, (UK), n.2 (October 1977).
Skateboard, (UK), n.3 (November 1977).
Skateboard, (UK), n.4 (December 1977).
Skateboard, (UK), n.5 (January 1978).
Skateboard, (UK), n.6 (February 1978).
Skateboard, (UK), n.7 (March 1978).
Skateboard, (UK), n.8 (April 1978).
Skateboard, (UK), n.9 (May 1978).
Skateboard, (UK), n.10 (June 1978).
Skateboard, (UK), n.11 (July 1978).
Skateboard, (UK), n.12 (August 1978).
Skateboard, (UK), n.13 (September 1978).
Skateboard, (UK), n.14 (October 1978).
Skateboard, (UK), n.15 (November 1978).
Skateboard, (UK), n.16 (December 1978).
Skateboard, (UK), n.17 (January 1979).
Skateboard, (UK), n.18 (February 1979).
Skateboard, (UK), n.19 (June 1979).
Skateboard! (second series), (UK), n.4 (September 1989).
Skateboard! (second series), (UK), n.6 (November 1989).
Skateboard! (second series), (UK), n.7 (December 1989).
Skateboard! (second series), (UK), n.39 (January 1990).
Skateboard! (second series), (UK), n.40 (February-March 1990).
Skateboard! (second series), (UK), n.41 (April 1990).
Skateboard! (second series), (UK), n.42 (May 1990).
Skateboard! (second series), (UK), n.43 (June 1990).
Skateboard! (second series), (UK), n.45 (August 1990).
Skateboard! (second series), (UK), n.46 (September 1990).
Skateboard! (second series), (UK), n.47 (October 1990).
Skateboard! (second series), (UK), n.48 (November 1990).
Skateboarder, (US), v.2 n.2 (Fall 1975).
Skateboarder, (US), v.3 n.1 (October 1976).
Skateboarder, (US), v.3 n.2 (December 1976).
Skateboarder, (US), v.3 n.4 (April 1977).
Skateboarder, (US), v.3 n.6 (July 1977).
Skateboarder, (US), v.4 n.1 (August 1977).
Skateboarder, (US), v.4 n.2 (September 1977).
Skateboarder, (US), v.4 n.3 (October 1977).
Skateboarder, (US), v.4 n.4 (November 1977).
Skateboarder, (US), v.4 n.5 (December 1977).
Skateboarder, (US), v.4 n.6 (January 1978).
Skateboarder, (US), v.4 n.7 (February 1978).
Skateboarder, (US), v.4 n.8 (March 1978).
Skateboarder, (US), v.4 n.10 (May 1978).
Skateboarder, (US), v.4 n.11 (June 1978).
Skateboarder, (US), v.5 n.3 (October 1978).
Skateboarder, (US), v.5 n.6 (January 1979).
Skateboarder, (US), v.5 n.7 (February 1979).
Skateboarder, (US), v.5 n.9 (April 1979).
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