

Author Query Form

Journal title: JSSI

Article Number: 332580

Dear Author/Editor,

Greetings, and thank you for publishing with Sage Publications. Your article has been copyedited, and we have a few queries for you. Please respond to these queries by marking up your proofs with the necessary changes/additions.

Thank you for your time and effort.

Please assist us by clarifying the following queries:

Sl. No	Query	Remarks
1.	PLEASE PROVIDE REFERENCE FOR FERRELL, 2001	
2	PLEASE SUPPLY THE PAGE RANGE OF THE CHAPTER CITED IN CRAWFORD (1999).	
3	PLEASE SUPPLY THE PAGE RANGE OF THE CHAPTER CITED IN KELLY, POMERANTZ, & CURRIE (2008)	
4	PLEASE SUPPLY THE PAGE RANGE OF THE CHAPTER CITED IN PROCTOR (2004).	
5	PLEASE SUPPLY THE PAGE RANGE OF THE CHAPTER CITED IN RINEHART (2008)	
6	ZELL, 2006, IS NOT CITED IN THE TEXT. PLEASE INDICATE WHERE A CITATION SHOULD APPEAR OR ALLOW US TO DELETE THE REFERENCE	
7	PLEASE PROVIDE A SHORT 2- TO 3-SENTENCE BIO	

Spots of Spatial Desire

Skateparks, Skateplazas, and Urban Politics

Francisco Vivoni

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

This article examines the intersection of alternative sport practices and spatial regulation ideologies in urban environments through an analysis of skateboarding terrains. It forwards skateboard spaces as contradictory sites for both practicing and contesting urban governance. These urban spaces span the gamut from do-it-yourself struggles for public space to public-private partnerships and corporate brand-building theme parks. Skatespots, skateparks, and skateplazas conform locations of exhilarating desire that frame skateboarding within a landscape of social control. The article surveys the found and purpose-built sites to demonstrate the political potential of skateboarding within variations on the themes of accommodation and resistance to spatial regulation.

Keywords: *skateboarding; built environment; social control*

Alternative sport research embodies productive tensions between the potential for subcultural resistance (Beal, 1995; Kelly, Pomerantz, & Currie, 2008) and key commodification processes (Rinehart, 1998, 2008) within the social practice of skateboarding. These tensions remain productive for studying possibilities of meaningful social change in as much as the wholesale incorporation of cultural expressions that challenge capitalist social relations within the fold of mainstream commercial enterprises remains incomplete. Other alternative sports such as snowboarding (Heino, 2000) and BMX riding (Rinehart & Grenfell, 2002) also hinge on dynamics of contestation and cooptation. At the center of these dynamics lies an incommensurable divide between grassroots practices engaged in trespassing, loitering, and defacement of property and global corporate media images, merchandise, and spectacular mega events. Skateboarding harbors an uneasy rift between significant challenges to normative assumptions about urban land use and political concessions aimed at policing through play. This article examines skateboarding as an alternative sport practice engaged in the production of contradictory spaces. Through the juxtaposition of varied built environments, the article argues for the emergence of skateboarding terrains as sites for both practicing and contesting urban governance.

The argument developed below follows an elliptical path. A below-the-knees approach frames the discussion by focusing urban politics on the ground. This

Author's Note: Please address correspondence to Francisco Vivoni, 326 Lincoln Hall, Urbana, IL 61801; e-mail: vivoni@illinois.edu.

qualitative research method unveils the crafting of inclusive spaces through skateboard scuff. Spatial appropriation is set within a narrative of the entangled emergence of skateboarding styles and terrains. This gestational context stages an exploration of three distinct types of purpose-built terrains that take form under bridges, inside malls, and on plazas. The purpose-built form is then contrasted to found spaces and vernacular landscapes (Jackson, 1984). Everyday struggles for public space frame both variations of skateboarding terrains. Skateboard spaces encompass a wide variety of spatial experiments that range from collective creativity through playful spatial tactics to social control through top-down urban design. The ebb and flow between purpose-built and found spaces that structures this article mimics skateboarders' mobility as they negotiate between sanctioned and unsanctioned spots of spatial desire.

Noteworthy contradictions arise from the study of alternative sport as a meaningful avenue for practicing contestation. Although Beal (1995) depicts skateboarding as a cultural site of social resistance that challenges dominant norms and values, her ethnographic study in northeastern Colorado also unveils male skateboarders' reinforcement of normative patriarchal hierarchies through sexist behavior. Likewise, Rinehart (2005) forcefully demonstrates how skateboarding reproduces misogyny in print media advertisements through a critical content analysis of trade magazines. On both performative and representational fronts, skateboarding lacks the potential for equitable social change when considering these findings. Furthermore, the complicity of this alternative sport with social injustices deepens when accounting for the multiple intersections of gender inequalities, class oppression, and racist social policies. As a generally White, male, upper-middle-class enterprise, skateboarding most often conforms to dominant power hierarchies and reproduces social inequalities that perpetuate contemporary race, class, and gender privileges.

Along with the analysis of observed behavior and researched advertisements, the study of built environments also contributes to an understanding of the contradictions inherent to the practice of skateboarding as a site of privilege and contestation. Ethnographic research on BMX (Bicycle Motocross) spaces (Rinehart & Grenfell, 2002) in San Bernardino, California, exposes two distinct built environments defined mostly by user age. Whereas grassroots ad hoc courses are procured by children, permanent corporate-sponsored tracks remain the domain of adults. Youthful ingenuity and market commodification collude through BMX built forms. These findings further complicate the reproduction of privilege at the intersection of race, class, and gender by considering the relationships between age groups and material spatial practices within an emerging alternative sport.

Skateboarding terrains concur with BMX spaces on a guiding juxtaposition between illicit grassroots initiatives and corporate-sponsored for-profit enterprises. However, these alternative sport sites differ in the material conditions considered most desirable for each activity. Dirt courses and jumps are usually located in woods, mountains, and other rural areas suited for BMX speed, flight, and exhilaration.

A large wheel diameter and a pedal, gear, and chain mechanism allow for greater mobility across a wider range of versatile terrains. Although BMX riders also excel in urban environments, skateboarding thrives in modern cities as an intricate spatial tactic with meaningful political consequences. Street skateboarders constitute unusual stakeholders in urban politics through negotiated struggles for public space and the right to the city (Lefebvre, 1968/1996; Mitchell, 2003).

Extraordinary feats that require awe-inspiring settings and high-tech equipment, such as a 75-foot mega ramp jump over a section of the Great Wall (Phelps, 2005) or a 1,600-foot skateboard to BASE jump drop into the Grand Canyon (Hamm, 2006), push skateboarding toward the pinnacle of alternative sport spectacular achievements. These death-defying endeavors readily conform to a series of monikers that include *adventure*, *action*, and *extreme* used to qualify alternative sport (Rinehart, 1998; Rinehart & Sydnor, 2003). Research on the sociology of risk taking scrutinizes similar spectacular daredevil enterprises through the critical lens of edgework (Lyng, 2005). At the level of everyday spatial configurations, street skateboarders face a different set of challenges, risks, and goals through the creative appropriation of urban and suburban environments.

This article argues that skateboard space-crafting is wrought with contradictions indicative of current trends within urban politics. Through a skater's-eye view (Flusty, 2000), the article documents social action and built forms that take place mostly below the knees. This on-the-ground perspective shifts from the found spaces of empty swimming pools and dried-out drainage ditches to the purpose-built park. The juxtaposition of the bridge underpass, the suburban mall, and the suburban plaza as skateboarding destinations serves to highlight skatepark contradictions. Even though these built forms span from grassroots to corporate, skateparks forward exclusionary politics intent on marginalizing skateboarders from urban centers. The focus in this article comes full circle from purpose-built cooptation to contestation through newfound spaces. This time around scuff marks the spot as skateboarders take to the streets. The article concludes with an exploration of the political potential of skateboarding that challenges the privatization of urban spaces and contributes to envisioning a more inclusive city.

Below-the-Knees Method

A vast repertoire of skateboard maneuvers serves as a register of the ebb and flow of alternative sport popularity. These moves mark distinct periods within a half century of skateboarding history through the progression of styles and terrains. Built environments—from the found spaces of backyard swimming pools to the purpose-built park to urban street settings—stimulate an ever-expanding stock of body and board interplay. During the 1980s, the Method Air reigned as a spectacular skateboarding maneuver enabling the almost impossible feat of flight. Most dramatically

performed on purpose-built half-pipes, this trick consists of a knee-tucked backside aerial. Proficient skateboarders were able to soar 12 feet over the ramps' coping, arching their backs and looking down at Earth. In current X-Games Big Air competitions, participants double this height while high-definition broadcasts of the Method Air reach the world over.

This article parts ways with the Method Air. Instead, it contributes to alternative sport research through a below-the-knees method. Focus in this article shifts from in-the-sky spectacle to on-the-ground everyday routines. Although research on extraordinary physical feats broadens the register of human experiences and warns of the dangers of doing ethnography at the edge (Ferrell & Hamm, 1998), this article argues that ordinary acts of spatial appropriation harbor the potential for transforming cities into inclusive spaces. Although most practitioners are young White males, the politics of inclusion performed through street skateboarding resonates with other public space advocates fighting against privatization. These political acts take shape through everyday conflict and struggle. Rather than soaring high above the coping, spatial justice through skateboarding happens on flat ground and is most often experienced below the knees.

The field methodologies used in this research are twofold. One takes place in commercial spaces whereas the other unfolds in appropriated public space. The first consists of the perusal of skateboard magazines in big-box bookstores and supermarkets. Most often these texts are located on a rack below the knees and behind official sport print media. At times hard to come by, skateboard magazines are chock-full of vivid photography and insightful reporting on skateboarding destinations around the world. These primary sources inform the argument developed below regarding the interplay of skateboarding and urban politics. The second data source is also found below the knees. Rather than within spaces of consumption, these findings take shape in appropriated public spaces. Skateboarders, police officers, and researchers identify skatespots by observing scuff as the markings of desirable space. In the process of crafting a skatespot, low-set ledges and other landscape features are transformed from tools for social order and urban beautification to temporary autonomous play zones (Bey, 1991). These below-the-knees wax palimpsests represent an alternative vision of the city in which the market value of built forms is contested by the emergence of new urban experiences.¹

Research on material culture shapes the insights gained through combining these participant observation sites (Berg, 1998; Hodder, 2000). Both leafing through glossy media in stores and scouting scuff on streets constitute first steps toward the practice of unobtrusive field methods. Artifact ethnographies unveil meaningful relations of power from everyday materials. On the magazine rack, an alternative sport pecking order (Rinehart, 1998) is evident as skateboarding publications compete with surfing, snowboarding, BMX riding, and aggressive inline skating for shelf space. On closer inspection, the competition among these sport practices plays out as a competition between a handful of corporations such as Transworld Media and

Action Sport Group that publish across the board of the alternative sport market. Within the skateboarding market, each publication has an angle on the sport. *Transworld SKATEboarding* is chock-full of gloss. *Skateboarder* includes helpful tips and insightful reporting whereas *Thrasher Magazine* and *The Skateboard Mag* are steeped in authenticity, with an antiauthoritarian slant. These materials represent both the commodification of skateboarding as a peg within the action sports machine and the voicing of dissent from the trenches of a politically charged subculture.

Although these visual materials are produced by an industry of writers, photographers, graphic designers, advertisers, and professional skateboarders, skatespots are most often anonymous ad hoc exercises. Scuff comes and goes through daily grind, producing below-the-knees clandestine collaborations. The defacement of property takes on another meaning, signaling an alternative use of public space. This alternative use highlights the possibility of experiencing unforeseen pleasures in built forms. Skateboarders, BMX riders, and aggressive inline skaters each produce different traces on the built environment. In contrast to the X-Games spectacle and action sports print media, scuff highlights on-the-ground conflict among alternative sport practitioners. Generous application of wax differentiates the aggressive inliner trace from other forms. The plastic binding underneath inline skates creates greater friction when engaged with concrete and requires more lubrication. In addition, BMX riders use metal pegs attached to the sides of their bikes to mount and grind a wide array of obstacles. This exercise chips concrete surfaces, producing rough edges. Meanwhile, skateboarders leave their board art behind, crafting colorful traces on otherwise bland built forms. Tension between these sport practitioners is commonplace. From a skateboarder's point of view, inliners render skatespots useless by saturating concrete with wax, concocting a slippery mess, and disabling effective board control. Furthermore, BMX bikers break off pieces of concrete while performing stunts and transform smooth surfaces into rugged terrain. The everyday rivalries among these public space users over spatial modification tactics stands in stark contrast to their homogenization under the umbrella of extreme sport marketing.

This article contributes to research on skateboarding and urban politics (Jones & Graves, 2000; Németh, 2006; Stratford, 2002; Woolley & Johns, 2001) through a low-set method focusing on the political potential of scuff. Although some experiences are taken from magazines and most observations were made on countless street corners, the literature review crafted below is intended as a precursor to future site-specific fieldwork framed within the language of experiential sport ethnography (Sands, 2002). A short exposition on the progression of sidewalk surfing follows. This section serves as an overview of skateboarding progression by focusing on variations of styles and built forms. It sets the tone for highlighting the interplay of purpose-built terrains and urban-suburban politics. The following three sections contrast skateboarding under the bridge, inside the mall, and on the plaza through an array of media coverage. These spaces evidence a wide political spectrum that spans

from purpose-built do-it-yourself ensembles to skateparks and skateplazas as corporate brand-building tools. However, within this breadth of experiences, skateparks are most often built as spaces of exclusion. The next two sections address the politics of exclusion through built forms and offer an alternative through street skateboarding spatial tactics. Skatespots evidence the possibility of inclusive politics through the creative appropriation of public spaces. The final section further links differences between found and purpose-built skateboard spaces. In conclusion, this article argues for inclusive urban politics through the embrace of spatial desires and street skateboarding ethics.

Sidewalk Surfing

The emergence of varied skateboarding modalities in unison with specialized sites of practice may be traced back to the Pacific coast of southern California. The sidewalk surfer would zigzag parallel to the shoreline while anxiously awaiting the rising tide (Brooke, 1999). Smoothly paved schoolyard banks also served as endless asphalt waves on which to practice surf maneuvers. The ancient and spiritual practice of surfing combined with youthful ingenuity underline all variations on the skateboarding theme.

The performative translation from surf to turf would never be completely fulfilled. However, a drought during the late 1970s in southern California left in its wake a catalyst for an unforeseen swell in skateboarding popularity (Peralta, 2001). A dried-up suburban landscape dotted by empty backyard swimming pools allowed for even greater proximity to the adrenaline rush experienced while tearing through the barrel of a breaking wave. Empty pools soon became terrains of pleasure and contestation. Encounters with police multiplied as trespassing further added to the excitement produced by this newly found space (Spasic & Angel, 2003).

Other spaces outside the private suburban backyard were also usurped. Most notable are large-scale dried-up concrete drainage ditches, reservoirs, and pipes (Borden, 2001). These massive water-management projects proved to be welcome challenges to land-locked thrill seekers. Although federal subsidies, such as the GI Bill, in tandem with racist zoning ordinances and the commercial availability of Portland cement, contributed to the proliferation of the suburban private pool, the sheer scale of federally funded water projects on large expanses of public land dwarfed the backyard leisurely pursuit. A crude apocalyptic image of an adaptive organism thriving on the derelict spaces of a once plentiful planet surfaces when imagining this alternative use of empty pools, dried-up ditches, and hollow drainage pipes.

Coterminous with the fiscal crisis of the Keynesian state, entrepreneurs began designing and constructing purpose-built skateboarding terrains inspired by this maverick use of emptied-out swimming pools and large-scale water management projects (Borden, 2001). Skateparks multiplied as private business ventures that

thrived on membership fees. Trespassing became one option among many as the popularity of skateboarding increased. However, this first-wave skatepark boom was short-lived. By the early 1980s many skateparks went bankrupt and were demolished owing to a decline in membership and a staggering increase in insurance premiums (Borden, 2001).

Street skateboarding gained currency as skateparks turned to rubble. Urban public space now hosted a new stranger. The modern city sports all sorts of physical terrain built mostly for the flow of capital and for the enjoyment of a prescribed population. Sidewalks, stairs, handrails, planters, benches, curbs, and ledges are the preferred found spaces of street skateboarders. Much like empty backyard pools, drainage ditches and pipes, modern street furniture and landscaped public plazas become sources of thrill-induced pleasure as well as sites for political and spatial contestation.

As skateboarders drift through the city, traces remain as evidence of an alternative use of the built environment. Similar to the dirt shortcuts created by pedestrians that venture off sidewalks (de Certeau, 1984; BondGraham, 2006), skateboard scuff arises from an unspoken collective effort. Filth traces adorn concrete surfaces as both markers of previous use and harbingers of unscripted encounters in public space. Candle wax and board art coalesce on concrete ledges as skateboarders glide across varied surfaces. Skateboard scuff markings are works-in-progress, smudge palimpsests and friction-regulating technologies. If left unused, spots tend to dry up. Pieces of candle wax are often left behind as gestures of solidarity. The upkeep of a skatespot is a communal practice that entails discretion and fine-tuning.

Under the Bridge

During the fall of 1990, local skaters in Portland, Oregon, mixed a few bags of cement and crafted a steep transition into a wall under the Burnside Bridge (Hamm, 2004). The underside of the bridge was a derelict urban space and notorious stomping ground for all sorts of social misfits. Skateboarders, unhoused folks, sex workers, and transient youth crossed paths under the bridge. The intersection of marginalized people in this type of found space is most evident on a more recent project site in San Pedro, California. Within the initial construction process of the Channel Street Skatepark, El Beardo (2005, p. 69) notes a contentious shift in informal spatial ownership.

Our spot was Popeye's first. He was this mangy old Hobo who lived in this little beater of a car next to the Radiator Shop. He'd bring us brooms and shit.

This statement highlights both cooperation between disparate public space users and displacement of homeless people by skateboarders. Much like the buildup of wax

and board art left as traces of a fleeting performance across the built environment, the Burnside Project, the Channel Street Skatepark, and other concrete skateboarding spaces found under bridges are evolving and open-ended do-it-yourself collaborations. Skateboarders have continuously worked for almost two decades on the undulating concrete surfaces under the Burnside Bridge through ad hoc use modifications rather than a prescribed design plan (Nichols & Charnoski, 2003). City officials in Portland (Hamm, 2004) and San Pedro (Zitzer, 2006) have recognized these grassroots cement projects as legitimate skateparks and effective crime deterrents.

The vast federal highway system includes bridge undersides that are covered spaces for protecting skateboarders from rain while also providing proper shade. Furthermore, bridge pillars not only support above traffic but also serve as skateboard obstacles after cement transition modifications are in place. Pillars anchor these impromptu skateparks while skateboarders skillfully glide from one smooth curved surface to another. Speed and exhilaration are achieved as skilled skateboarders maneuver through these purpose-built terrains. Hamm (2004) explains how the symbiotic relationship between skateboarders' proficiency and the built environment unravels under the Burnside Bridge.

Very soon, however, reaching previously unattainable altitudes on the wall wasn't enough. They had tasted the sky, and within a week's time, it was inevitable that they would need something more to quench their thirst for speed and altitude and weightless thrill. (p. 219)

Dark, dingy and forgotten bridge undersides are redefined as destinations for weightless thrill through skateboarding as spatial appropriation tactic.

Local skateboarders in other cities have also built concrete skateboarding havens under bridges. Examples include Philadelphia's FDR Skatepark, Oakland's Bordertown Skatepark (Zamora, 2005), San Pedro's Channel Street Skatepark (El Beardo, 2005; Zitzer, 2006), and Seattle's Marginal Way Skate Park (Carstens, 2007). Along with skateboard scuff, self-expression through graffiti is prominent on these undulating concrete surfaces. Bridge underside skateparks are built from found and donated construction materials molded through the untrained use of rudimentary tools such as shovels and pickaxes. These lunar-like landscapes incorporate features of backyard pools and drainage ditches into improvised works-in-progress.

Skateboarders engaged in the construction of clandestine skateparks that follow the Burnside Project model participate in community activism through the practice of spatial justice. Similar to grassroots BMX courses (Rinehart & Grenfell, 2002), these skateparks emerge out of direct action initiatives to reclaim space without permission. Framed as territorial gain, spatial justice unfolds under the bridge through collective appropriation rather than market-rate purchasing. However, within this fold of justice one marginalized groups' gain is another groups' loss as skateboarding works to sanitize public space by displacing prostitution, homelessness, and drug use. Even though skateboarding governs space, struggles against eviction continue. Skateboarders organize to secure the Burnside Project longevity

in their local do-it-yourself skateparks.² Alternative sport spatial creativity and the politics of urban squatting come together under the bridge.

Inside the Mall

During November 1998, Vans Skatepark opened in a 40,000-square-foot Orange, California, retail space. This massive pay-to-play skatepark features a 20,000-square-foot indoor street course, a combi pool, a peewee area, mini ramps, an 80-foot-wide vert ramp, an outdoors street course, an arcade, and a 7,000-square-foot mezzanine observation deck. The combi pool is the skatepark's most notorious feature. It consists of an exact replica of a combined square and round 11 ½-foot-deep pool with 9'9" transitions originally located in the 1970s Pipeline Skatepark in Upland, California. This unique feature was resurrected from first-wave skatepark debacle to second-wave skatepark spectacle. The new combi pool is a second-order simulation that reproduces a demolished purpose-built imitation of the backyard pool.

Located in the Mills Corporation-owned The Block mall, Vans Skatepark contributes to this shopping center's reputation as a hip entertainment-driven space of consumption for teens (Ebenkamp, 2000). Vans forwards the skatepark as business venture through the accommodation of alternative sport practices into the fold of the elite shopping experience. A membership fee or entrance fee greets a prospective user followed by the enforced observance of a long list of rules and regulation that include the wearing of a helmet, full protective gear, shirts, and shoes at all times. Furthermore, management reserves the right to terminate any membership at any time and to eject anyone at anytime for any reason.

The Vans Skatepark is a space for brand building. Along with the Vans Warped Tour music venue and the Vans Triple Crown Series of skateboarding, snowboarding, surfing, and wakeboarding competitive events, the skatepark works to identify the athletic shoe company name with youthful alternative lifestyle choices. Through these spectacular enterprises, Vans seeks to portray authenticity to proposed segments of the population understood as consumer niche markets. Brand loyalty among these niches is sought out through the reproduction of images that suggest alternative cultural values. These business strategies correspond to a significant shift from manufacturing to marketing, resulting in pervasive corporate-branded landscapes (Klein, 2000).

Recognized as a leading global lifestyle brand (Ebenkamp, 2000), Vans has achieved global currency through the strategic incorporation of alternative sport into its business mission. Frank and Mulcahey (1997) identify Vans as an adept lifestyle merchant and quote from a company prospectus the following:

The VANS brand image coincides with what the Company believes is a fundamental shift in the attitudes and lifestyles of young people worldwide, characterized by the rapid growth and acceptance of alternative, outdoor sports and the desire to lead an individualistic, contemporary lifestyle. (p. 78)

The packaging of alternative sport through corporate branding contributes to the process of commodification set forth by the Disney Corporation-owned ESPN X-Games (Rinehart, 1998).

The Burnside Project and Vans Skatepark occupy opposite ends of the purpose-built skateboarding terrain political spectrum. The first is grassroots, illegal, and on the fly whereas the second is air-conditioned, for-profit, and highly regulated. Furthermore, each skatepark claims divergent social settings and reproduces dissimilar social relations. The Burnside Project is founded on do-it-yourself antiauthoritarian camaraderie whereas the Vans Skatepark is set in elite consumption through membership fees and enforced rules and regulations. However, both spaces reproduce vertical transitioned surfaces like those found in backyard pools and drainage ditches fashioned for exhilarating mobility. These similarities in built form also translate to media representations as images of both destinations find their way on the rack below the knees and across skateboard magazine spreads. Shared mainstream media coverage blurs stark political differences between subcultural resistance and processes of commodification.³ The glare of the spectacle colludes variations on the skatepark theme by homogenizing built forms achieved through a variety of means, including grassroots activism and corporate brand building.

On the Plaza

As skateproofing takes over public space, the desire for the experience of authentic street skateboarding is on the rise. Skateplazas are purpose-built skateboarding destinations that cater to street skateboarders. Whereas the Burnside Project and Van's Skatepark harbor simulations of deep pools, ditches, and pipes, skateplazas are composed of simulated street skatespots. These built forms host an array of low-set horizontal lines that enable the performance of flat ground tricks. The speed and height of vertical skateboarding gives way to a below-the-knees experience. Skateplazas host staircases, handrails, benches and ledges within a carefully landscaped environment. As intentionally aesthetic spaces, skateplazas combine public garden landscaping with high-quality construction materials worthy of squares and plazas found in downtown financial districts. These features make for an almost flawless copy of an ever-increasingly regulated realm of social life.

The Rob Dyrdek/DC Shoes Skate Plaza located in Kettering, Ohio, consists of 40,000 square feet of self-policed duplicated skatespots that are free and open to the public. Unlike the Burnside Project that was recognized by the city of Portland as a legitimate skateboarding haven only after its construction or the Vans Skatepark that was built like a theme park with pay-to-play rules and regulations, this skateboard destination constitutes a hybrid space that emerged out of a public-private partnership between the city of Kettering and the DC Shoes company. The city donated the suburban park land while the company raised funds for the construction of the facility. In exchange, DC Shoes logos

are prominently displayed across the plaza's smooth surfaces. Although admission is purchase free, the social costs of the Kettering skateplaza materialize through corporate advertisement and the criminalization of street skateboarding.

In the Rob Dyrdek/DC Shoes Skate Plaza, the University of California at Irvine 10-step staircase, San Francisco's Pier 7 ledges, and Philadelphia's LOVE Park figure among the reproductions on display (Lane, 2005). Whereas the Vans Skatepark recreates the combi pool in an effort to relive the first-wave skatepark era, Kettering's skateplaza rescues notorious spots that either no longer exist or have been in effect outlawed. Similar to museums, skateplazas preserve the memory of public spaces once accessible to skateboarders. However, these new spaces also figure as costly political concessions made by skateboarders in order to forfeit their right to the city (Németh, 2006). Street skateboarding thrives on the urban plaza. The skateplaza functions as training grounds and containment device set on keeping skateboarders off the streets.

Scuff Marks the Spot

Cities the world over host built environments in which skateboarding thrives as an underground youth practice. Skatespots consist of urban sites illicitly appropriated for the purpose of skateboarding. These contested terrains dot modern cities and showcase a variety of architectural and landscape design features that have been deemed desirable for the performance of skateboard maneuvers. Any sort of combination of smooth low-set ledges, planters, benches, stairs and handrails may prove to be a coveted skatespot. Inclined banks and curved ground surfaces that inspire both horizontal and vertical movements also make for desirable spots. Concrete, granite, marble, and other hard surface features enable greater skateboard maneuverability, speed, and body control. Street skateboarding hints at the hidden potential of unintended spatial desires through the creative engagement of bodies and boards with built forms.

Skateboarders scout areas such as downtown financial districts, public squares, college campuses, and suburban strip malls in search of exhilarating terrain. Although a common repertoire of desired street obstacles serves to focus the search, each skateboarder's creativity inspires the performance of unique, novel, and pleasurable uses of otherwise mundane objects. Once a potential skatespot is identified, spatial appropriation is enacted through tactical modifications to the built environment. One copious tactic consists of the meticulous application of wax to hard edges in order to glide or grind with greater ease and increased speed. Palimpsests of board art, wax, and dirt are left behind as meaningful scuff denoting a skatespot in progress.

Skatespot scuff can be interpreted as both erosion and accretion measures. In his exposition of human traces as data sources, Berg (1998, p. 203) defines the former as "indicators of wearing down or away" and the latter as "indicators of accumulation

or build-up.” Examples of these measures include the wear and tear of tiles in museums and books in libraries as indicative of erosion through use patterns whereas the accumulation of garbage and graffiti represent accretion through deposits over time. Scuff both adds to ordinary landscapes through wax buildup and takes away through continued use. Although enthusiastic over the productive potential of unobtrusive measures in qualitative research, Berg is also cautious of affixing meaning solely based on the interpretation of physical traces. “It is not likely,” Berg argues, “that a complete description of some group can be accomplished on the merits of some worn spot on a tile or a smudge on some wall” (p. 205).

Hodder (2000) offers a somewhat similar warning as the knowledge gained from the interpretation of material culture is “often highly chunked and contextualized” (p. 714). However, a critical edge is gained through artifact ethnographies of scuff marks invested in the production of alternative knowledge. According to Hodder, “the material expression of power . . . can be set against the expression of resistance” (p. 706) because “material culture is often a medium in which alternative and often muted voices can be expressed” (p. 714). Skateboard traces most often signal an unsanctioned engagement with the built environment that undermines prescribed uses, social norms, and legal mandates founded on the sanctity of property value and intent on regulating social relations in public space. Building on the interpretive potential of material culture outlined by Hodder, skatespots identified through scuff are set against the material expressions of contemporary trends in spatial regulation and urban governance.

For street skateboarders, wax scuff indicates the presence of desirable space. Great care is taken to ensure the maintenance of these vernacular landscapes (Jackson, 1984) through the practice of everyday urbanism (Crawford, 1999). A sign of solidarity is achieved when pieces of candle wax are purposely left behind to promote the upkeep and use of a skatespot to unknown skateboarders. By sharing wax with strangers, an ethic of care for the built environment unfolds. Urban land takes on new experiential meaning through the collective creation of skatespots. The outcome of these temporary autonomous zones (Bey, 1991) hinges on struggles with dominant spatial enterprises engaged in regulating public conduct and setting the stage for financial gain through urban development.

Notorious skatespot destinations include New York’s Brooklyn Banks, Philadelphia’s LOVE Park, San Francisco’s Pier 7, and London’s Southbank (Salo, 2006a). Some spots such as LOVE Park (Németh, 2006) and Pier 7 (Klein, 2004) have succumbed to the processes of gentrification through urban renewal efforts and are no longer marked by scuff. Others like Brooklyn Banks (Salo, 2006b) and Southbank (Klein, 2007) have been incorporated into the fold of official city life as sanctioned spaces for skateboarding. Although each destination hosts a unique history of struggle within a specific context of urban politics, the demise of the former spots were influenced by their close proximity to emerging downtown elite leisure, consumption, and business sites whereas the accommodation of the latter occurred through organized negotiations for skateboarders’ right to marginalized and out-of-sight city spaces. The struggle continues from spot to spot through everyday tactics of spatial appropriation and contestation.

Know Skateboarding

Our space has strange effects. For one thing, it unleashes desire.

(Lefebvre, 1974/1991, p. 97)

A turnaround of the manifest functions of sidewalks, stairs, handrails, and street furniture is at play in the production of skatespots. Borden (2001) frames this act of spatial resignification within the language of the Situationist tactics of *détournment* and *dérive*. Latent uses of these built structures are revealed through a performative critique of their intended use as tools of social control geared toward governing law-abiding citizens and furthering the circulation of capital. Borden argues that

skateboarding . . . 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 . . . [by] consuming the building while not engaging with its productive activity . . . [it] denies both that labour should be productive of things and that architecture should be directed towards that purpose. (p. 231)

Dérive becomes the modality of choice through which street skateboarders practice *détournment*. Drifting along sidewalks, skaters feel the city in search of hidden spots waiting to be usurped. Skateboarders' keen perception and savvy mobility enable the experience of unimagined pleasures throughout the built environment.

An integral component of performing this form of spatial desire consists of crafting measures to elude antiskateboarding regulations. Skateboarders' exclusion from public space is most often justified through appeals to public safety and property maintenance. Noise pollution, loitering, property defacement, and trespassing figure among the offenses incurred while skateboarding on unsanctioned grounds. Private security guards, state police officers and vigilante property owners work toward ridding skateboarders from city streets. Among the strategies used, "No Skateboarding" signs are posted in places where this improper use of space is discouraged. Skateboarders have taken on the challenge of subverting these signs with the same ingenuity used to redefine downtown workplaces as spaces of play (Flusty, 2000). This spatial tactic of appropriation both resembles Situationist *détournment* and conforms to present-day culture jamming (Lasn, 2000) practices.

The theft or alteration of NO SKATEBOARDING signs constitutes a symbolic act of skatespot liberation. Ferrell (2001, p. 72 **IAQ: I**) claims that

for skaters, such acts exist as skirmishes in an ongoing battle, a battle to liberate public space from legal regulation, and to reencode the meaning of public space within the experience of skating. Toward this end, skaters who don't bother removing "No Skateboarding" signs from strip malls and parks still counter them with a touch of subcultural signage, pasting them over with "Know Skateboarding" stickers that have become almost as common as the signs themselves.

Knowing skateboarding entails the recognition of skateboarders as legitimate public space participants and the symbolic victory over antiskateboarding spatial regulation. A similar culture jamming tactic was devised by the Emerica skateboard shoe company through the purchase-free distribution of “de-sign” kits that consisted of a 14 × 21.5-cm sheet of different sized letter *G* stickers. Proctor (2004) states, “The idea was to place the ‘G’ sticker over the letter ‘N’ of a ‘No skateboarding’ sign, reversing the meaning to . . . ‘Go skateboarding’!!!” (p. 72). The defacement of posted rules of conduct is a second-order subversion of dominant meanings inscribed in the built environment that harbors the potential for imagining alternative social horizons.

“No Skateboarding” signs are just one component of an intricate system of public space regulation that includes police-issued fines for trespassing, loitering, and defacement of public and private property, skateboarding deterrents designed into the built environment and purpose-built skateboarding terrains such as skateparks and skateplazas. Skateproofing devices, much like “No Skateboarding” signs, dot the urban landscape. Metal brackets are fastened to concrete ledges, knobs are welded to handrails, and ornamental features are strategically placed in hopes of deterring scuff. An advertisement slogan for a company in the business of skateproofing reads: “Because Signs Alone Are Not Enough!”

Skateproofing conforms to recent practices of urban spatial regulation informed by the ideological tenets of defensible space (Newman, 1972) and broken windows (Wilson & Kelling, 1982). Crime prevention through environmental design forwards a holistic approach to community policing founded on a strong correlation between rising crime rates and the deterioration of built environments (Schneider, 2005). From this social policy perspective, unlawful activities in public space are addressed through built forms. Critics contend that defensible space and broken windows constitute instrumentalist policing ideologies founded on environmental determinism that effectively only relocate lawlessness rather than addressing longstanding social inequalities (Rentschler, 2003; Shaftoe, 2006). Among the new spatial relations that emerge from the practice of these ideologies, hard plazas result in defensible spaces in lacking trees, shrubbery, and ornamental vegetation in order to increase visibility set on deterring crime and reduce public spending on maintenance (Low, 2000). Unexpectedly, these hard places built from smooth concrete and granite and marble slabs and intentioned on securing public safety also comprise desirable skateboard destinations. The afterthought of skateproofing comes to bear only after scuff has settled on the new surfaces.

Antiskateboarding landscapes form part of a series of surveillance technologies, including graffiti-proof walls, CCTV cameras, automated sprinkler systems, pigeon-proof ledges and bum-proof benches (Davis, 1992). These material expressions of power (Hodder, 2000) forge social relations through geographies of exclusion (Sibley, 1995). Under these social conditions, dirt, filth, and scuff are construed as evidence for the reproduction of dominant truth claims and social inequalities. Both from a

biopolitical standpoint concerned with hygiene and a criminological standpoint concerned with public safety, scuff and freely moving skateboarding bodies must be deterred in order to uphold the symbolic purchase of private property and state authority.

Set against a stage of systematic social exclusion, skatespots constitute material expressions of resistance (Hodder, 2000) that proliferate under the wire (Mitchell, 2003). The Skatespot Liberation Front promises the steadfast eradication of antiskateboarding devices inscribed into the built environment. Rather than a hierarchal organization, this clandestine collective is composed of anyone willing to trespass, deface, and loiter public or private property for the purpose of reclaiming space for skateboarding. Along with inverting the message of antiskateboarding signage, hacking metal brackets fastened to low-set ledges, sawing knobs welded onto handrails and smoothing ground surface cracks with automotive body dent fillers figure among skatespot liberation tactics (Panhead, 2005). Construction materials such as QuickCrete and Portland cement are applied to sidewalk cracks to allow for smooth entries and landings in and out of spots and used to produce ad hoc transitioned surfaces allowing for vertical prowess. Also, angle iron is fastened to ledges in tandem with the application of wax to ensure greater speed. These proskateboarding devices adapt the city through spatial desire. The Skatespot Liberation Front materializes a politics of difference without exclusion (Young, 1990) through built counter-narratives to skateboard deterrents and the privatization of public space.

Found and Purpose-Built Conclusions

The ideological tensions between found and purpose-built skateboarding spaces correspond to the collusion of contestation and cooptation through the built environment. The sidewalk surfer developed novel ways in which to experience built forms by carving concrete while barefoot. These skills translate body movements from ocean waves to schoolyard embankments and backyard swimming pools. Physical prowess on found spaces enabled the progression of skateboarding into a varied mix of creative performance, competitive sport, and spectacular media industry. Skateparks quickly sprouted as training grounds that fueled the rising popularity of this new social practice. These purpose-built destinations simulated the terrains usurped by skateboarders for translating surf-style moves onto hard surfaces. With the ebb and flow of skateboarding popularity came a shift back to the streets through an unleashing of the hidden potential lodged within urban spaces. The modification of street furniture through the application of wax redefined the city into an impromptu playground. Skatespots emerged as appropriated public spaces that signal the possibility of an alternative urban politics founded on use and pleasure rather than exchange and accumulation. The enclosure of skateboarding through skatepark proliferation thrives along with continued clandestine efforts to transform cities into skate-friendly environments and more inclusive spaces.

The dichotomous relationship between found and purpose-built sites is blurred through on-the-ground everyday practices. A below-the-knees method that couples mainstream media with criminalized uses of public space unveils key variations on the theme from a flat ground solitary pastime to transnational spectacles disseminated across glossy print. Skilled skateboarders perform on a wide range of terrains. Purpose-built spaces such as public skateparks both marginalize skateboarders from city centers and serve as training grounds for appropriating urban spaces. While in the streets, skateboarders are both criminalized for defacement of property and commodified as urban guerrilla performance artistry. These contradictions disable straightforward claims founded on mutually exclusive processes of contestation and cooptation. While weaving in and out of found and purpose-built terrains, skateboarders elude fixed categorizations. Instead, their spatial desires unfold somewhere in between domination and resistance.

Recent skatepark design and construction practices also follow a betwixt strategy that hinges on the production of spaces of exclusion through environmentalist sensibilities. Green skatepark builders seek to reduce their footprint through environmental sustainability goals set forth by the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Green Building Rating System. Some techniques include locating sites outside Environmental Conservation and Preservation zones, using recycled construction materials and managing storm water at the surface through natural infiltration (Mohler & Brooke, 2008). These eco-friendly practices seek to transform skateparks from mere skateboarding destinations into hands-on learning centers through the promotion of environmental awareness (Hines, 2005). Although efforts to incorporate sustainable design into skatepark construction are commendable, this trend fails to address the varied politics of exclusion produced by traditional skatepark sites. Green skateparks highlight the entanglement of local land use practices and global environmental issues. However, the greening of skatepark construction procedures obfuscates both the exclusion of skateboarders from city centers and the further exclusion of marginalized groups making use of future skatepark sites.

Green skateparks also fail to remedy issues of gender, age, and social inequalities within the alternative sport practice of skateboarding. Both media representations and on-the-ground performances evidence key contradictions between antiauthoritarian subcultural values and an affirmation of patriarchal power. By focusing on the minimization of natural resource depletion, green skatepark builders overlook the social inequalities reproduced by a young, affluent, White male-dominated sport. Furthermore, the enclosure of skateboarding within green skateparks weakens potential coalitions among disparate public space users. Whether on purpose-built or found terrain, street skateboarding more closely embodies a politics of resistance and social inclusion. Practitioners of this style skate over distinctions between man-made and natural surfaces through spatial tactics of appropriation that transform the city into a playground (Woolley & Johns, 2001).

The skateplaza forwards an alternative design and construction ethic. Through this built form, environmental preservation takes on a new meaning that exceeds green

ambition. Rather than preserving pristine nature, skateplazas bring defunct skatespots back to life through simulation. An ethic of care for the built environment unfolds as skateboarders collaborate with developers in preserving found spaces through purpose-built forms. Skatespots that gained notoriety through media coverage get a second chance as they are collected and put on display in these museums of condemned spaces. The preservation of vernacular landscapes (Jackson, 1984) forwards an alternative understanding of urban space based on creative appropriation through everyday use. Skateplazas conform ingenious destinations that further the progression of street skateboarding while eluding the sting of skateproofing devices and criminal prosecution. However, the emergence of skateplazas as designated areas for skateboarding signifies the legal exclusion of skateboarders from urban spaces. Similar to first-wave, second-wave, and green skateparks, skateplazas also constitute political concessions (Németh, 2006) that most often forfeit skateboarders' ability to either move or stay put throughout the city.

Skatepark systems decentralize the purpose-built conundrum. The politics of exclusion inherent to purpose-built skateboarding facilities are spread out over a large expanse of land, alleviating the experience of the skatepark as a space of confinement. These systems consist of constellations of skateboard-oriented sites such as skate dots, skate paths, and skateparks intended on enabling spontaneous mobility from site to site achieved through the practice of street skateboarding on found space (Dahlgren, 2006). Skatepark systems most resemble the experience of public space appropriation. Instead of fenced-in or pay-to-play facilities, these systems allow skateboarders to move from dot to path to park without being subject to police fines and skateboard deterrents.

Street skateboarding knowledge through scuff-marks-the-spot spatial tactics contributes to a vision of the city that fosters collective uses and creative experimentations with built environments. Unintended pleasurable engagements with architectural forms challenge prescribed uses by welcoming unexpected encounters. Furthermore, street skateboarding fosters communal land use practices that challenge the primacy of market-rate private property. Although purpose-built skateboarding spaces may work as training facilities to further this quest, the appropriation of found urban spaces through street skateboarding contests the given meanings of cities as growth machines (Logan & Molotch, 1987), theme parks (Sorkin, 1992), and spectacle (Debord, 1967/1995). Street skateboarders scout, usurp, and maintain spots of spatial desire by practicing an ethic of care for the built environment that transforms ordinary urban spaces into temporary autonomous play zones (Bey, 1991). The spaces crafted through the ethic of care outlined above are both subject to an urban politics of disciplined accommodation and figure as groundwork toward resistance to spatial regulation.

Notes

1. Eight skatespots consisting of 16 architectural objects that sport skate traces were observed throughout the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign campus during five outings in April 2005.

Horizontal and vertical mobility emerged as consistent themes among field sites. Horizontal skatespots consist of scuffed lower-set concrete ledges, planters, and benches that enable movement close to the ground on an alternative surface. Vertical skatespots consist of scuffed loading dock ledges, handrails, and staircase ledges that enable movement at a greater distance from the ground through increased speed. Informal open-ended interviews with several local skateboarders revealed that vertical skatespots are most frequented because they require more skill and enable greater exhilaration.

2. Skateboarders faced eviction from an illegal skatepark located underneath a section of Interstate 580 in Oakland, California. During July 2004, transportation officials scouted the site, claimed it for building material storage and called in the California Highway Patrol to enforce a skateboarding ban. Skateboarders came together to lift the ban through coalitions with local media and city officials. The cement pour continues under the bridge (Zamora, 2005).

3. In *Thrasher Magazine*, a feature report of the 2006 Vans Combi-Pool Classic competitive event (Phelps, 2006) in one issue was followed in a later issue by a two-page spread of a never-before-seen maneuver in the Burnside Project's almost two-decade history (Trujillo, 2006). Representations of both spaces in the same publication made it to the magazine rack within a 3-month span. These representations gloss over key political differences between skateboarding at the mall and under the bridge.

References

- Beal, B. (1995). Disqualifying the official: An exploration of social resistance through the subculture of skateboarding. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 12(3), 252-267.
- Berg, B. (1998). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bey, H. (1991). *T.A.Z.: Temporary autonomous zone, ontological anarchy, poetic terrorism*. New York: Autonomedia.
- BondGraham, D. (2006). Anarchitecture: A manifesto for rebuilding place and community. *Z Magazine*, 19(9), 49-52.
- Borden, I. (2001). *Skateboarding, space and the city: Architecture and the body*. Oxford: Berg.
- Brooke, M. (1999). *The concrete wave: A history of skateboarding*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Warwick.
- Carstens, A. (2007). Spots: Marginal Way Skate Park. *Transworld SKATEboarding*, 25(2), 109.
- Crawford, M. (1999). Introduction. In J. Chase, M., Crawford, & J. Kaliski (Eds.), *Everyday urbanism*. New York: Monacelli **LAQ: 2**.
- Dahlgren, K. (2006). Taking it to the street. *Parks and Recreation*, 41(8), 39-43.
- Davis, M. (1992). *City of quartz: Excavating the future in Los Angeles*. New York: Vintage.
- Debord, G. (1995). *The society of the spectacle*. New York: Zone Books. (Original work published 1967)
- de Certeau, M. (1984). *The practice of everyday life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Ebenkamp, B. (2000). Vans' board room battle. *Brandweek*, 41(12), 17-19.
- El Beardo (2005, August). The never ending story: The ongoing saga of the Channel Street skatepark, San Pedro. *Thrasher Magazine*, 297, 68-73.
- Ferrell, J., & Hamm, M. (Eds.). (1998) *Ethnography at the edge: Crime, deviance, and field research*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Flusty, S. (2000). Thrashing downtown: Play as resistance to the spatial and representational regulation of Los Angeles. *Cities*, 17(2), 149-158.
- Frank, T., & Mulcahey, D. (1997). Consolidated deviance, Inc. In T. Frank & M. Weiland (Eds.), *Commodify your dissent*. New York: Norton.
- Hamm, K. (2004). *Scarred for life: Eleven stories about skateboarders*. San Francisco: Chronicle.
- Hamm, K. (2006). Bob versus the Abyss: Burnquist's giant leap for skateboardkind. *Transworld SKATEboarding*, 24(8), 134-145.
- Heino, R. (2000). New sports: What is so punk about snowboarding? *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 24(2), 176-191.

- Hines, S. (2005). Green building: Leftovers. *Landscape Architecture*, 95(8), 38, 40-43.
- Hodder, I. (2000). The interpretation of documents and material culture. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 703-715). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Jackson, J. B. (1984). *Discovering the vernacular landscape*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Jones, S., & Graves, A. (2000). Power plays in public space: Skateboard parks as battlegrounds, gifts, and expressions of self. *Landscape Journal*, 19(1/2), 136-148.
- Kelly, D., Pomerantz, S., & Currie, D. (2008). "You can break so many more rules": The identity work and play of becoming a skater girl. In M. Giardina & M. Donnelly (Eds.), *Youth culture and sport: Identity, power, and politics*. New York: Routledge. **FAQ: 3**
- Klein, A. (2004). Pier 7: An end of an era. *Skateboarder*, 14(3), 56-59.
- Klein, A. (2007). 15 Things you didn't know about Southbank. *Skateboarder*, 16(10), 124.
- Klein, N. (2000). *No logo*. New York: Picador.
- Lane, E. K. (2005). DC Plaza. *SLAP Magazine*, 14(8), 102-105.
- Lasn, K. (2000). *Culture jam*. New York: Quill.
- Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The production of space*. Oxford: Blackwell. (Original work published 1974)
- Lefebvre, H. (1996). The right to the city. In *Writings on Cities*. Oxford: Blackwell. (Original work published 1968)
- Logan, J., & Molotch, H. (1987). *Urban fortunes: The political economy of place*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Low, S. M. (2000). *On the plaza: The politics of public space and culture*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Lyng, S. (2005). Edgework and the risk-taking experience. In S. Lyng (Ed.), *Edgework: Sociology of risk-taking* (pp. 1-20). New York: Routledge.
- Mitchell, D. (2003). *The right to the city: Social justice and the fight for public space*. New York: Guilford.
- Mohler, S., & Brooke, M. (2008). The new cooldown skate green: Design and build smart. *Concrete Wave*, 6(4), 50-57.
- Németh, J. (2006). Conflict, exclusion, relocation: Skateboarding and public space. *Journal of Urban Design*, 11(3), 297-318.
- Newman, O. (1972). *Defensible space: Crime prevention through urban design*. New York: Macmillan.
- Nichols, C., & Chamoski, R. (Designers). (2003). *Northwest* [Super 8 mm travelogue]. United States: Plexifilm.
- Panhead. (2005). Taking back the streets. *Transworld SKATEboarding*, 23(4), 175-184.
- Peralta, S. (Director). (2001). *Dogtown and Z-boys* [motion picture]. United States: Columbia Tristar Home.
- Phelps, J. (2005, October). I was just where? *Thrasher Magazine*, 299, 68-71.
- Phelps, J. (2006, August). Mall it all: The 2006 Vans Combi-Pool Classic. *Thrasher Magazine*, 310, 68-71.
- Proctor, Y. (2004). Go skateboarding! In S. Cardwell & M. Munson (Eds.), *Skateboard stickers*. New York: Laurence King. **FAQ: 4**
- Rentschler, C. A. (2003). Designing fear: How environmental security protects property at the expense of people. In J. Z. Bratich, J. Packer, & C. McCarthy (Eds.), *Foucault, cultural studies, and governmentality* (pp. 243-271). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Rinehart, R. (1998). Inside of the outside: Pecking orders within alternative sport at ESPN's 1995 "The eXtreme Games." *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 22(4), 398-415.
- Rinehart, R. (2005). "Babes" & boards: Opportunities in new millennium sports? *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 29(8), 232-255.
- Rinehart, R. (2008). Exploiting a new generation: Corporate branding and the co-optation of action sport. In M. Giardina & M. Donnelly (Eds.), *Youth culture and sport: Identity, power, and politics*. New York: Routledge. **FAQ: 5**

- Rinehart, R., & Grenfell, C. (2002). BMX spaces: Children's grass roots' courses and corporate-sponsored tracks. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 19(3), 302-314.
- Rinehart, R., & Sydnor, S. (2003). *To the extreme: Alternative sports, inside and out*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Salo, A. (2006a). 10 Spots you gotta skate before you die. *Skateboarder*, 15(7), 32.
- Salo, A. (2006b). 15 Things you didn't know about Brooklyn Banks. *Skateboarder*, 15(6), 118.
- Sands, R. (2002). *Sport ethnography*. Champaign: Human Kinetics.
- Schneider, R. (2005). Introduction: Crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED): Themes, theories, practice, and conflict. *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research*, 22(4), 271-283.
- Shaftoe, H. (2006). Behaving badly in public places. *Urban Design*, 97, 19-21.
- Sibley, D. (1995). *Geographies of exclusion: Society and difference in the West*. New York: Routledge.
- Sorkin, M. (Ed.). (1992). *Variations on a theme park: The new American city and the end of public space*. New York: Hill & Wang.
- Spasic, M., & Angel, J. (Creators). (2003). *Chlorine: A pool skating documentary* [Documentary]. United States: Rise Above Entertainment.
- Stratford, E. (2002). On the edge: A tale of skaters and urban governance. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 3(2), 193-206.
- Trujillo, T. (2006, October). Like locusts we ride: Antihero in Montana. *Thrasher Magazine*, 312, 92-103.
- Wilson, J. Q., & Kelling, G. L. (1982, March). Broken windows. *The Atlantic Monthly*, pp. 29-38.
- Woolley, H., & Johns, R. (2001). Skateboarding: The city as a playground. *Journal of Urban Design*, 6(2), 211-230.
- Young, I. M. (1990). *Justice and the politics of difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Zamora, J. (2005). Skatepark stays. *Landscape Architecture*, 95(11), 18, 20.
- Zell, J. (2006). Pipe dreams: Can a skatepark do more for a community than keep kids away from the streets and public plazas? *Landscape Architecture*, 96(3), 86, 88-93. [AQ: 6]
- Zitzer, P. (2006). Skater built, government approved. *Landscape Architecture*, 96(3), 22.

Francisco Vivoni [AQ: 7]