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This thesis, being one of exploratory research initially because of a paucity of research of a professional and academic nature, examines cockfighting in its social entirety, focusing upon its social structure. The lack of such previous research on cockfighting necessitated the collection of data through primary as well as secondary sources. Thus, a combination of research methods was employed to facilitate the investigation. A combination of data collection strategies also proved necessary for the realization of the total research objective, that being the presentation of cockfighting as a complete social structure involving a history and tradition, the activity as a sport, its organization, complexity, extent and distribution, as well as other social considerations. In essence then, the research focus addresses a socio-ethnographic investigation of cockfighting. The entire research strategy was intended to study the cockfighting participants au naturel, in the field, as they went about their day to day lives as opposed to depending on a sample studied in non-natural surroundings such as arrest records.

Such observational research yields an immensity of detailed description that does not readily lend itself to the type of summary that is possible with quantifiable data.
However, precise quantification often does not afford the detailed accuracy that is facilitated by observational research, and such detailed description becomes necessary to provide an adequate background of understanding to those having no social experience with such an activity, and for such an activity that has not previously stimulated much research interest. Thus, an ethnographic description of the sport is presented as well as the social and legal history of the sport, the linguistic influences of the activity, the distribution and regional variation of the sport, along with other surrounding activities. Such detailed presentation is essential for an accurate conception of cockfighting and its organization.

In reviewing the literature concerning the concept of subculture, the requisites for the existence and thus the characteristics of a subculture are delineated; such characteristics are then revealed to exist within the realm of cockfighting. Identified as integral to the cockfighting subculture are nine subcultural roles which present themselves in an evolutionary and chronological hierarchy. Also discerned by the research are four major motivations cited by the twenty informants for reason(s) of membership. Such motivational types may be directly associated with certain of the subcultural roles. Throughout the thesis, the culture and tradition of the cockfighting subculture is exposed along with the subcultural values and justifications. An analysis of subcultural "deviance" is presented largely
from the perspectives of the labeling theory and symbolic politics. It was revealed that there seems to be a lack of development of a deviant self-image among members of the cockfighting subculture, and further, as indicated by the twenty informants, members of the cockfighting subculture are apparently rather tolerant of participants in various types of "deviant behaviors," possibly because of their association with a stigmatized activity.

The organization of cockfighting is juxtaposed with the concept of voluntary associations after sufficient literature addressing voluntary associations has been reviewed. This juxtaposition reveals many similarities between the cockfighting subculture and the voluntary association, the one exception being the formal structure of the voluntary association. However, in that the cockfighting subculture has a tradition and a culture that functionally replaces the formal structure in many areas, the concept of "informal voluntary associations" emerges.

This thesis finds that the cockfighting subculture is extremely organized and largely self-regulating and that the participants represent all social classes, thus violating the stereotypical conceptions and attitudes of the public concerning cockfighting. Finally, certain suggestions are made for potential and/or future research into cockfighting and related topics raised by this thesis.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Conception of the Study

The desirability of a study concerning cockfighting as a thesis topic was first conceived in the summer of 1973 after encountering two cockfighters sparring gamecocks in the mountains of eastern Kentucky. Prior to the study the writer knew only what cockfighting was, though in retrospect only vaguely, and had no occasion to consider or question some of the more "commonly accepted" stereotypes concerning cockfighting. Experiencing such a deficit of knowledge concerning cockfighting, there was no definition or statement of problem to research immediately formulated. Thus, the literature, (i. e., secondary sources), served to provide the initial point of departure. After a preliminary survey of the literature the value of such a study became evident.

Review of the Literature

A survey of the literature or rather an attempt to survey all relevant literature revealed a paucity of research of a professional and academic nature. Such became evident through a review of the Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature, The International Index to Periodicals, Poole's Index to Periodical Literature, 19th Century Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature,
Social Sciences and Humanities Index, and the Index of Sociological Abstracts. Articles concerning cockfighting, totaling more than fifty for the period 1900 to 1974, appeared in such popular journals as *Newsweek*, *New Yorker*, *Saturday Evening Post*, *Sports Illustrated*, *Time*, *Travel*, and other similar publications (see Appendix A). Of these articles, the great majority were either fictional, impressionistic, sensate, or in the vein of novelty (because of cockfighting's unfamiliarity to most people). A preponderance of books was found to exist, the great majority being printed in England during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries; however, many dated from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (see Appendix A). Most of the books are of a descriptive, historical, and technical nature (involving breeding, conditioning, fighting, and so on). Appendix A consists of a bibliography of all such books and articles found or referred to during the course of research but not actually employed in the study.

Two articles were found that did provide professional and academic relevance. Parsons' article, "Cockfighting: A Potential Field of Research" (1969: 265-288), notes the lack of research but suggests that "Cockfighting provides a lush field for scholarly endeavor" (p. 265). Parsons sets forth the premise that the three academic professions of cultural history, ethnography, and sociology will find material of particular interest. In that cockfighting "...represents an unbroken thread of human behavior stretching back over the horizon of pre-history" (p. 265), the research topics
for the cultural historian are indeed broad. With respect to the ethnographer, Parsons provides an outline, "The Ethnography of Cockfighting in the United States" (pp. 267-273), of considerable detail. Although this article was not discerned prior to the completion of data collection and some writing, many sections and much structure of this thesis are similar to many of the enumerated points of Parsons' outline. However, compared to the extent of the outline and as will be made explicit later, this study is by no means primarily an ethnographic endeavor. In turning to the sociologist, Parsons suggests research involving socialization or induction, socio-economic and demographic factors, values, norms and mores, all of which were pursued by this study, though independent of Parsons' suggestions.

The second article found to be academically oriented, "Deep Play: Notes on the Balinese Cockfight," by Geertz (1972: 1-37), is an ethnographic description and analysis of cockfighting in Bali. In discussing the relevance and meaning of cockfighting to the Balinese culture, Geertz provides many insights into the allegorical and symbolic considerations of the activity.

prepared for presentation at annual meetings of the Southern Sociological Society, were submitted by the writers, not for quotation, but primarily to provide their respective bibliographies as well as to reveal what research of an academic nature has been conducted. These papers were then used in this capacity. They all cited, at least in part, the lack of much research on cockfighting and noted it to be a potential field for sociological inquiry.

Statement of the Problem

Cockfighting is often regarded, when recognized at all, as a victimless crime and a social problem, its advocates and supporters often being considered deviants. Unlike other social problems and victimless crimes such as drug use and addiction, homosexuality, nudity, pornography, hustling, and prostitution, there have been few sociological studies concerning cockfighting; yet cockfighting continues to constitute a potential and viable untapped area of research.

In that research of a professional and academic nature has largely denied cockfighting any attention, a focus upon a specific and delimited aspect of cockfighting proved difficult to achieve, not because of the magnitude of this task but because of a lack of orientation to and comprehension of the possibilities involved on the writer's part. The specific purpose of this study goes beyond calling attention to the potentially rich field for sociological research
found in the study of cockfighting and the participants. Indeed, Parsons' (1969: 265-288) article explicitly does this; and prior to his article, the numerous other articles appearing in the more popular types of journals should have suggested such a potential field of research to numerous academic professions. However, to merely recognize a potential field of research does little to facilitate research; to recognize and suggest an area of research does not provide any orientation to the data and thus does not provide any specific direction that the research should pursue. Such guidance would be impossible within the realm of cockfighting because of a lack of insight into the involvement of cockfighting.

Given cockfighting's status as a misdemeanor and a deviant activity as well as a social problem, it is quite possible that it is one of the most organized and developed (in terms of subculture, roles, extent and so on) of such concerns. The purpose then of this study is to explore cockfighting in its social entirety, exposing the whole social structure, the orientation of the research being exploratory. As a result of the exploratory research, this thesis intends to expose the realm of cockfighting in sufficient detail to facilitate future research with more specific orientation and structure, i.e., specific problem-oriented research.

The Procedure

Chapter II addresses in detail the methodological design employed in the collection of data. Several research strategies
were employed for collecting data from both primary and secondary sources. This chapter presents the different data collection strategies as well as the types of data obtained through each, commentary on the analysis of data in later chapters, a summary of how the different methodological schemes complement and facilitate each other, and a general focus of the research.

Chapter III, consisting largely of ethnographic description and historical accounts, presents the reader with not only an overview of the sport, revealing its organization, but also other activities taking place during the cockfight, as well as the social and legal history of cockfighting and certain influences and variation of the activity.

Chapter IV reviews the literature concerning the concept of subculture and delineates the requisites for the existence of a subculture, i.e., characteristics of the subculture. Such characteristics are then revealed to exist within the realm of cockfighting. Thus, the subcultural framework is not forced upon cockfighting but rather the concept of subculture facilitates the presentation of data in a manageable and coherent scheme.

Findings, where relevant, are presented in both chapters III and IV in that findings are part of and thus inseparable from observations, either primary or secondary. Thus, to follow the traditional thesis framework and present a separate findings chapter would be arbitrary and would not be conducive to the continuity of the thesis.
Chapter V analyzes cockfighting from the perspective of another sociological concept, that of voluntary association. Literature concerning voluntary associations is surveyed, revealing the presence of a formal nature and structure as part of the characteristics of such associations. Also reviewed is Sagarin's (1969: 17-31) presentation of deviant voluntary associations. Finally, the cockfighting subculture is compared to voluntary associations and is shown to have many similarities, with the major exception of the formal structure. The concept of informal voluntary associations is then discussed in the conclusion of this chapter.

Chapter VI serves as a conclusion and summary to the thesis. Here, socio-economic and other background factors concerning subcultural participation will be briefly reviewed along with closing observations addressing issues pertaining to the subculture itself.

Following chapter VI are the appendices presented in the order of their occurrence and citation within the thesis.

It should be noted that this investigation is not presented as or intended to be the definitive work regarding cockfighting; rather, it is but an introduction to this still fertile field of research. Thus, future or potential areas of research that posed themselves during the course of this research will be presented, therefore revealing further value in the study of this clandestine activity and its organization.
CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGICAL SCHEME

Introduction

As was mentioned in the previous chapter, there is a paucity of studies of a professional and academic nature concerning cockfighting. Such a research deficiency presented several problems, all of serious concern to the success of the present study; indeed, it necessitated the collection of data through primary sources and implicitly classified such an endeavor as exploratory research with its imputed lack of initial hypothesis-testing (Becker, 1958: 653; Festinger and Katz, 1953: 74-77). A further concern upon realizing the necessity of dependence upon primary sources, as is implicit in such a clandestine and largely illegal activity, was the recognition and contact of and receptivity by such participants.

A second area of research was that of secondary sources, i.e., all previous and existing literature, largely historical and descriptive accounts. Thus, as will become clear, not one but a combination of research methods were employed to facilitate the investigation. Further, a combination of data collection strategies proved necessary to the overall research focus in order to present cockfighting as a complete entity, i.e., a total social structure, involving its history and
tradition, the activity as a sport, its organization, complexity, extent and distribution, as well as other social considerations. In essence, the research focus involved a socio-ethnographic expose' of cockfighting.

Such a research project, with its field collection of data, involved ten months of actual field work.

Data Collection Strategies

Lacking guidance and direction from previous studies of cockfighting, a logical point of departure seemed to be the existing historical and ethnographic literature. When a book concerning or containing a section on cockfighting was located, the footnotes and bibliography were used to trace or identify further sources. However, this is not to imply that the research involving secondary sources was completed prior to the research employing primary sources; rather, both were conducted concurrently. Indeed, quite often many of the informants would initially suggest or otherwise introduce the writer to a source previously unknown. As the field collection of data progressed, it became more obvious which types of data from the secondary sources were desirable and useful.

Preliminary research of secondary sources revealed the existence of three monthly cockfighting journals and the publishing address of each. As was determined largely through a content analysis of advertisements placed in each of the journals, many being oriented toward foreign subscribers,
these publications have national as well as some overseas circulation. Each editor of the three journals was written (Appendix B), one at a time, in an attempt to solicit their interest in a readership study. The nature of the proposed study was discussed, explaining its purpose as a master's thesis in sociology; it was hoped that a random sample of those who subscribe to the respective journal could be obtained for the employment of a mail-back questionnaire, anonymity being assured. A viable alternative to this plan was also proposed; rather than the editor returning the random sample list, it would be compiled and remain in the office of the cooperating journal. The mail-back questionnaires would then be sent to the editor and would be addressed and mailed out to the random sample, all incurred costs being assumed by the writer. This alternative was offered in the event that the editor(s) was (were) reluctant to provide such a list of subscribers, thus guaranteeing anonymity of those in the sample. In that it was thought that each journal had a mailing list of approximately 6000 to 7000, every twentieth subscriber was specified as being desirable. The cooperating journal was offered access to the data if they cared to publish some of the findings. As a further enticement to cooperate, each editor was given the opportunity to include a series of his or her own questions in the questionnaire. Even if one of the editors had complied, the return rate was expected to be rather low. However, even with follow-up letters to the editors stressing the sincerity of the study, no cooperation was forthcoming.
At this point, it was decided to continue to pursue the thesis topic, but through a combination of the following methods: 1) direct observation of cockfights as well as cockfighters, handlers, referees, spectators, i.e., the entire social life of the pits, 2) general conversation with those observed at the pits, 3) informal talks and in-depth interviews with participants in the sport, most normally hours long and sometimes continuing for three and four days, 4) conversations and interviews with Kentucky State Police detectives, and 5) a continuation of the review of previous literature as was deemed pertinent and applicable.

During the course of the investigation, several newspapers from around the State of Kentucky were scanned daily to monitor any raids that might take place. Initially, it was thought that such leads might have yielded potential informants (if needed), provided the law enforcement officials involved in such raids would disclose the identities of those arrested or otherwise involved. To increase the degree and percentage of cooperation from such identified participants, it was felt that if they were needed and used, it would be beneficial to the study to only identify and locate such individuals and then wait a period of at least six months before contacting those involved in arrests and/or raids. A formal letter of introduction (Appendix C) was employed as a means of establishing identity and purpose of the study with the State Police detectives, i.e., law enforcement officers involved in the two raids discerned and followed up on during
the period of investigation. Though sufficient informants were located and gave their cooperation independent of those identified through raids and arrests, the conversational type interviews conducted with the State Police detectives yielded significant data.

During the ten months involved in the field, four pits were attended for a total of seven cocking events. A requisite to gain admittance to two of these pits was that the "new comer" either accompany a participant or spectator known to the pit management or accompany a group affiliated with a game club or another pit. While no such requisite was specified for the third pit, such an arrangement was recommended. It should be noted that such a requisite (or arrangement) was cited by the informants; the validity of such a requisite is therefore not conclusive. That is, such an arrangement may or may not have been an actual requisite for physically entering the pit. Indeed, this may well have been an attempt by the informants to protect or ensure the safety of the pits and/or the researcher. In any case, it was through such an arrangement that the writer attended the pits. The specific geographical location of the fourth pit dictated the only requisite of admittance, that being that if one could find the pit then he (or she) was welcome. Three of these pits were located in Kentucky and one was in Tennessee. However, the pit in Tennessee drew much support (both spectators and fighters) from Kentucky. This research (i.e., field observa-
tions) facilitated much interaction with spectators and others who would have been otherwise unknown to the writer.

Before actually attempting to establish contact and confront any informants, an interview schedule (Appendix D) was drafted. Of particular relevance to the type of interview guide designed are comments made by Denzin. He defines participant observation as a field strategy that

...simultaneously combines document analysis, respondent and informant interviewing, direct participation and observation, and introspection.

In participant observation, interviews are typically open-ended, as opposed to closed-ended; census data, when analyzed, are usually not a central portion of the research process, but are used only to describe the characteristics of the population under study; and observation of ongoing events is typically less concerned with recording the frequency and distribution of events than it is with linking interaction patterns with the symbols and meanings believed to underlie that behavior (1970: 186).

That is, what was sought was qualitative data, rather than quantitative data, in order to facilitate the comprehension of cockfighting as a total social structure. The first ten questions of the interview guide, concerning background factors (i.e., census data) of those interviewed, were closed-ended and were employed to describe the characteristics of the population under study.

Hollingshead's "Two Factor Index of Social Position" (Bonjean, Hill, and McLemore, 1967: 381-385, 441-448) was employed to determine the social class of the informants and employs as criteria, occupation and level of education
only (see Appendix E-1). Questions one and two of the interview schedule ("How many years of schooling do you have? That is, what was the last grade of school you were in (If you went to trade school, business school, or college then give that as your answer.)" and "What kind of work do you do for a living? If you are unemployed or retired then use that as your answer." see Appendix D) were used to collect data for determining the social position of each informant. It was felt justified to employ Hollingshead's "Two Factor Index" to eliminate the relevance of income for several reasons. First, a significant number of informants had positions of skilled labor (such as miners) whose income in many instances would be greater than that of professionals and four-year college graduates. Second, Hollingshead's scale determines the social position of the head of the household and all informants were independent of their parents or guardians and were the heads of their own established households. Further, it is felt that there is justification in collapsing Hollingshead's upper-middle and lower-middle classes into middle class and his upper-lower and lower-lower classes into lower class as the nature of the study does not demand such a distinction but rather requires only a general comprehension of the subjects' general positions. As noted by Denzin (1970: 186), such data in and of itself was not pivotal to this study.

Since the research focused upon the total social structure of cockfighting, certain sociological concepts such as culture,
tradition, status, and role were felt to be central to the focus. The relative meanings of these and other concepts came about through composite conceptualizations as the remainder of the interview guide was operationalized. Although the remainder of the interview schedule consisted of both open-ended and closed-ended questions, it is significant to note that many of the "closed-ended" questions, by the nature of their topics and structure, stimulated and invited open conversation rather than a mere choice of the possible responses.

After the interview schedule was designed, it was presented to four college students who were at one time active participants in cockfighting but suspended their participation because of a lack of leisure time. As a result of the pretest, several things became apparent. It was felt by the writer and the four participants (in the pretest) that questions thirty-four through thirty-six would have undesirable results on any rapport and cooperation established in that they concerned cockfighting related arrests as well as all other arrests. Essentially, it was felt that such questions may place the informants on the defensive and therefore jeopardize the completion of the interview. Thus, after considering the value and significance of the potential data being yielded by these questions against the value of the completed interview, these questions were dropped. Question thirty-two was felt to be redundant by the four pretest informants in that by rule and/or tradition, the money in question (i.e., the
spectators' admission costs) always belongs to the pit owner(s). However, it was decided to leave this question in, allowing it to serve as a cross-check on reliability. It was felt that the length of the interview schedule was not feasibly conducive exclusively as an interview. Thus, as will be revealed later in this chapter, several viable attempts were made to minimize, one, the actual length of time involving any one informant, and two, the seeming length of time and effect of direct inquiry on the informants and their cooperation.

As noted by Simmons,

The problems of gathering valid data on the feelings and daily experiences of deviants are tremendous. Unless the researcher is himself a denizen of the deviant social world, he must develop a degree of rapport and candor that is almost never achieved with the ordinary questionnaire or one-shot interview (1969: 11).

For this reason, the informal conversation was adopted as the main data-gathering technique. Such conversations were "focused interviews" in that an attempt was made to keep the topic on cockfighting and to cover definite questions with all informants; however, there was no rigid structure and the informants seemed to feel no sense of being interviewed.

In that in-depth interviews as opposed to mail-back questionnaires (or some other type of short, single opportunity questionnaires) were to be employed, it was felt that twenty such in-depth interviews would be sufficient to supply and confirm the data. Thus, the sample employed in collecting the interview data for this study is in no way viewed as totally representative and further, it is not possible to
demonstrate the representative and random quality of this sample since the universe (all people in the United States involved in the activity of cockfighting) is not known. However, the lack of a random sample in and of itself does not discredit a study nor produce findings that are invalid. Indeed, Coleman (1970: 118-120) notes that the study of social structure (be it that of cockfighting or in any other setting) is undeniably enhanced and facilitated by certain non-random sampling techniques.

Twenty-four individuals were actually contacted to obtain the twenty interviews, there being four who refused to grant interviews. However, this is not particularly significant in that the informants who made reference to three of these four individuals (as well as others) were explicit in stating that it was doubtful if each of these three would cooperate. It was reported to the author that one was too busy and had not even been to the cockfights in two months, having a dairy farm with many newborn calves; another was said to fight cocks without the knowledge of his wife and would probably deny any knowledge of the activity to a stranger. The third potential informant was said to be "sort of peculiar," the implication being that he had little to do with anyone except for several close friends. The fourth individual, while being very apologetic, reported that he had only been involved in cockfighting for about eighteen months and stated that he was afraid that he might say something that would get someone in trouble. Anonymity was re-emphasized
but he still declined cooperation. In that interviews were denied by these four, it could not be determined if they differed (to any extent) from those granting interviews. However, for at least three of these four, the reasons for refusing to grant interviews were, at least for them, real and viable, being either fear or a lack of time.

Two cockfighters were known to the writer in eastern Kentucky and the writer became aware of three in western Kentucky, one being introduced by a fellow student who was aware of this research topic, the other two being discerned through visibility of their cocks and conditioning pens. The cockfighter (who was introduced to the writer by the student) personally knew the other two cockfighters who had been noticed and introduced the writer to them. Thus, of the twenty informants employed in this study, two were previously known by the writer and four, including the one cited above, were introduced by individuals who were aware of the research topic but were not involved in cockfighting. The remaining fourteen informants involved in the study were contacted through a technique quite similar to Coleman's (1970: 118-119) snowball sampling; that is, either during or after an interview with each of those cited above, the informant either recommended another individual (or individuals) to interview or was asked if he might suggest others to interview.

It is particularly interesting to note that in a great many instances, when one cockfighter was referred to by another,
they were not in the same (immediate) geographical area although it was definitely known that there were numerous cockfighters in each immediate area in which an interview was completed. The reasons for the informants not giving reference to those participants in their immediate area are indeed obfuscated (see Appendix F). However, several viable reasons for producing such a pattern of referred informants will be presented later in this thesis (chapter IV, pp. 111-112).

The sampling technique finally resulted in the cooperation of fifteen cockfighters, two pit owners, two breeders, and a cockfighter and producer of chemotherapy supplements. Further, two of the cockfighters also participated as handlers for other cockfighters.

When a potential informant was suggested by a previous informant or by anyone else knowing of the research effort, considerable background material on the potential informant was gathered prior to making contact, when possible, from the one making the reference. This often saved much time in terms of individual interviews. Informants recommending potential informants allowed the researcher to use their names as introductions, a ploy felt to be of extreme value, particularly when clandestine activities are involved.

Prior to entering the field, the interviewer became so familiar with the interview guide, particularly background questions and other short-answer, closed-ended questions, that there was little dependence upon the guide in the presence
of the informants. This enabled many such questions to be posed to the informants via general conversation, most usually upon first encounter when interviewer and informant were "feeling out" each other; this enabled progress to be achieved without the atmosphere of a strict interview and facilitated in part the establishment of good rapport on rather general grounds before continuing to the informant's clandestine activities. It was quite common for the interviewer to exchange such (background) information with the informant so that the informant, knowing something of the interviewer and feeling possibly more secure with him, could better define the interviewer. It was felt that this small reciprocal exchange (on the part of the interviewer) greatly facilitated the establishment of good rapport.

Because of the closed-ended nature of the questions (Appendix D) on the first half of the interview schedule, very little writing had to be done, the indicated response of the informant merely being checked. With respect to the open-ended questions and those closed-ended questions generating conversation, it was decided to attempt only to record in an abbreviated form the key words and points and the recurring words among the informants. However, upon leaving the informant after each interview session, the interview was immediately completed in considerable detail. Although such a technique is subject to question, it was felt (as noted by Polsky, 1967: 128) that much writing would possibly annoy and/or distract the informant or otherwise contaminate the environment. Thus, to be alert for details of action and speech enabled the
interviews to be written up fully and accurately after the interview session and allowed the informant a normal rate of conversation without the aggravation of repetition.

In setting about the task of further establishing good rapport and cooperation with the informants and collecting data, numerous procedures and guidelines were delineated prior to conducting any interviews. Such guidelines, being in part suggested by Polsky (pp. 128-135) and in part by Becker (1958: 655), were felt to be particularly relevant to this research interest. These guidelines were then specified and employed as follows: 1) no gadgets such as tape recorders were employed because of the possible adverse effects on or reactions of the informants; 2) in order to get the feel of the social environment, eyes and ears were initially kept open but the mouth shut; 3) the interview was not limited solely to one time period of straight interview, but rather, it was extended into some of the informants' leisure activities over several interview periods. That is, the informants were to be studied, at least in part, au naturel. Thus, data gathering or interviewing was not conducted solely in a strict interview setting but was rather continued into some of the leisure activities pursued by the various informants; 4) it was felt that while the interviewer would be studying the informant, the informant would be studying the interviewer so it was felt to be advantageous to the research to answer one's questions frankly, particularly back-ground questions concerning the interviewer, so that the informant
could better define the interviewer satisfactorily. In that cockfighting is usually illegal and conducted surreptitiously, it was felt advantageous to the welfare of the study to be open with the informants, a position maintained not only by Polsky (1967: 132-133), but also by Warwick (1975) and Wax (1960: 23). Through this attitude of openness, anonymity could be offered, explaining that the identity of the individual was of no consequence to the study but that the individual's knowledge and insight were of extreme importance and value; thus, 5) the informants' identities and the identities of those mentioned by the informants as well as other personally revealing characteristics were to be protected; 6) there was to be no attempt of pretending to be "one of them" but at the same time care was to be taken not to conspicuously stand out in the cockfighting environment so as not to "cool" the informants' cooperation and rapport; 7) no attempt was made to direct the informants' responses by the wording of the questions. What then was sought was the volunteered statement.

The length of the time necessary to complete one in-depth interview virtually limited interview times to evenings and weekends, i.e., the informants' leisure time. In this sense then there was a certain inherent advantage in keeping written observations during the interview times to a minimum; the informant did not have to submit to a strict interview environment in the confines of his living room but could pursue many regular leisure activities (e.g., playing pool, gardening, fishing, and not the least of which was caring for
and spending time with his cocks). However, upon first contact, normally during the week, the initial interview was usually conducted in the home of the informant, quite often while the informant was relaxing after his evening meal.

Each interview was personally conducted by the writer, it being his responsibility to establish an environment conducive to interviewing - relative quiet, no one else around, listening well, and explaining the purpose of the study - at least primarily for the first interview. However, such an environment was not sought to the exclusion of interviewing the informant au naturel; thus, if the informant wished to listen to music or television, or have his wife or child(ren) present, the interview continued. However, the great majority of initial interviews were conducted in an interview environment, most normally either in the informant's living room or on the front porch.

The initial interview with each informant primarily focused on the first section of the interview guide (questions one through forty-one; Appendix D); however, later interview sessions often provided more detail for and insight into this first section. Further, the interview guide was not approached as a tool to be strictly and consistently adhered to but rather provided a question or topical check list from which questions were drawn and asked or brought up in open or "free range" conversation. The funneling technique was employed, general background questions being asked first so that the informant could become more at ease with the
interviewer before progressing to more specific topics. Cards with the possible responses to be ranked were typed to present to the informants for questions twenty-two, thirty-seven, thirty-eight, and thirty-nine (Appendix D) for the purpose of visual facilitation of the various questions.

The interviewer was conscious of and tried to avoid "prestige bias," i.e., the interviewer allowing his beliefs to be known, perhaps unknowingly, to the respondents. Also, a conscious effort was made by the writer to avoid directing responses. This is not to say that probes were not made but that they were of a neutral nature, asking questions such as "why," and "would you like to go into more detail please."

Since the informant did not experience the full effects of a strict interview and its environment, this permitted several return interview sessions, some lasting as long as three and four hours each. Such subsequent interview sessions, still employing open conversation and covering more general topics such as the last six "issues" of the interview schedule (Appendix D) and going into more detail on topics already addressed in the initial interview session, were most often conducted while the informant pursued some leisure activity or while the informant and interviewer drove to a pit to attend cockfights. In that the informant could pursue some leisure activity, the interview and interviewer were not appreciably in the way and did not interfere significantly with the normal activities of the informant's leisure time. It was felt that studying the informant au naturel contributed
greatly to rapport and cooperation, particularly in light of the length of the interview.

Polsky (1967: 117-149) has developed a sound argument lending justification and demonstrating the need for and value of field studies of both criminals and deviants. Indeed, Polsky makes the point that while it is very well to develop a more complete quantitative picture of the numbers and kinds of deviants (and criminals), this is not to be used to avoid the ultimate qualitative task: "providing well-rounded, contemporary, sociological descriptions and analyses of criminal life-styles, subcultures, and their relation to larger social processes and structures" (p. 122). This has particular relevance with respect to the stated goal of the thesis: to study and expose the total social structure of cockfighting. The study of deviants au naturel, in the field, tends to avoid biases of studies dependent upon samples drawn from jails, institutions, and other artificial settings. Field studies also avoid biases resulting from interacting with subjects in non-natural surroundings and coding data long after the event or phenomenon being studied has taken place (p. 122). Malinowski (1954: 146-147) advocates a similar position for anthropology, that position being termed "open-air anthropology." In this sense, Polsky (1967: 147) advocates more "open-air sociology" as opposed to jailhouse or courthouse sociology. That is, study the subject au naturel rather than in an artificial setting such as jails and arrest records. Simmons (1969: 7) addresses this very issue,
saying, "To generalize about all deviants from only those who have, in some sense, failed at deviance is as one-sided and misleading as to portray school life solely on the basis of dropouts."

**Measurement and Conceptualization**

Just as various data collection strategies were employed, various types of data were obtained through each method. The data collected by each method were not conceived as separate and distinct materials but were rather articulated in a systematic whole objective. This becomes explicit in the discussion of triangulation.

From the various data collection strategies described in the previous section, it becomes clear that with respect to Gold's (1958: 217-223) typology of participant observation (i.e., complete participant, participant-as-observer, observer-as-participant, and complete observer), three roles of participant observation were used during the course of the field work, two intentionally and one as a by-product of one of the others. By definition or explanation of the observer-as-participant, it is feasible to conceive that this role was employed in meeting and interviewing the (two) Kentucky State Police detectives. This participant observation role is normally employed in studies involving one-visit interviews and entails a relatively more formal situation than the other types of participant observation involved in this study (p. 221); hence the letter of introduction to the State Police detectives (Appendix C) to establish the identity
and purpose of the study. This data collection strategy provided little in the way of legal data per se but did provide much supporting data concerning attitudes and "policies" of legal enforcement.

In order to facilitate continuing relationships (i.e., in-depth interviews), the role of participant-as-observer was assumed when the twenty informants were involved. In lacking an intricate knowledge of cockfighting, it was felt that any attempt at playing the full participant would quickly be discerned by the informants and prove disadvantageous to the welfare of the study. In the role of participant-as-observer,

...both field worker and informant are aware that theirs is a field relationship. This mutual awareness tends to minimize problems of role-pretending; yet, the role carries with it numerous opportunities for compartmentalizing mistakes and dilemmas which typically bedevil the complete participant (p. 220).

For example, the cooperation of an informant would not be threatened by improper argot usage in a question posed by the researcher (i.e., participant-as-observer) in that the informant would realize that the researcher was not a participant in the activity but was rather gathering knowledge about it. However, this would not be the situation if the researcher attempted the role of full participant.

This particular role embraces several advantages that were conducive to this study; first, it facilitated the development of relationships with informants through time, not to the point of intimate form of friendship but to the point of
intimate content. "When content of interaction is intimate, secrets may be shared without either of the interactors feeling compelled to maintain the relationship for more than a short time" (p. 221). As an example, while all twenty informants were aware that the researcher would be terminating the relationship at the conclusion of the in-depth interviews, each of the twenty informants, without solicitation, invited the researcher to cockfights, thus disclosing or offering to disclose the locations of pits at which they participated. Second, this role contributed to the establishment of good rapport, as is witnessed by the first point. Third, this role facilitated both formal observation, as in scheduled interview situations, and informal observation, such as common conversation and attending various activities (e.g., cockfights).

This observational role and its employment of the interview guide provided several types of data. The twenty informants were the primary data source for describing the characteristics of those participating in cockfighting. Further, the twenty informants were the major source of the structural data involving organization, attitudes, roles and role relations, status, socialization, and values and norms, as well as other similar data of a sociological and esoterical nature providing an account of the entire social structure of cockfighting. Indeed, though not specifically part of the interview guide, the method by which many of the informants were recognized, that being through snowball sampling, provided
sociometric-type data; that is, data revealing the informant's relation to other specific individuals. With respect to the data collected from the informants, these informants seemed very knowledgeable of the subject, but in light of the consistency of the responses and data yielded, there is no reason to assume that these informants are not typical in their knowledge and views.

Accompanying informants to the cockfights produced an unintended role, that of complete participant; in attending cockfights with the informants, the researcher, to the informants, was still a participant-as-observer. However, to others at the cockfights, the researcher was assumed to be and was approached as merely another participant or spectator in the cockfighting activity. That is, the identity of the researcher and his purpose in being present were not known to the non-informants at the pits. Gold (p. 220) recognizes two potential problems as inherent in the complete participant role. First, it is possible for the complete participant to be handicapped when attempting to perform convincingly in the pretended role because of a self-consciousness about revealing his true identity, and second, it is possible that the researcher may "go native". However, these two dangers were largely minimized in this study in that first, the role of full participant was not devised by the researcher but assumed to be so by those not knowing of the study; therefore, the researcher did not have to contend with a self-consciousness that feared exposure. Second, the duration in which the
full participant was "assumed" was relatively brief, being only as long as the cockfights attended. Thus, the opportunity to "go native" while in the role of full participant - again, not a self-adopted role - was nil.

This vehicle of observation provided not only general conversation with those at the pits but also provided direct observation of the cockfights and the entire social life of the pits. Such data was largely ethnographic in nature, providing detailed description of the cockfight in general and other pit activities. The conversation of the individuals at the pit usually focused upon some pit activity occurring at that time and was therefore commentary on the ethnographical observations resulting in descriptions. However, it was not unusual for such conversation to echo and thus bolster certain specific observations made by the informants during an interview session.

With respect to the literature surveyed, in a strict sense, data were collected largely through content analysis. Sufficient studies employing content analysis (see Champion and Morris, 1973) have been conducted to indicate that content analysis is both a legitimate and useful data collection technique. Berelson (1952: 8) conceives of content analysis as a technique designed to objectively and systematically describe the intended and obvious content of communication. Such communication for this study took the form of books and journals. Given the rather clandestine nature of cockfighting, the first consideration in selecting any data sources
was the availability of such works. A second concern was that the data source provide more than an account of some specific technical process (such as a specific method of conditioning or preparing the cock for an upcoming fight).

It is quite feasible to conceive of content analysis as interview data or even data derived from participant observation. In this study, such analysis afforded the researcher the observation of many intricacies of a clandestine activity that would have proven prohibitively costly in terms of time by any other method. Through this type of "participant observation," several types of data were obtained. The historical data came almost solely via content analysis. Another data type was of ethnographic description providing support and documentation of observations made during field research. A third type of data revealed through the literature gave support to specific insights provided by the informants such as involved norms and value systems as well as other organizational types of data, largely of an esoteric nature. Further, such documentary data is of particular significance in that it is a phenomenon of everyday life; that is, the utilization of such data sources are common occurrence to those involved in cockfighting.

**Triangulation and Internal Validity**

Triangulation, or the use of multiple methods, is a plan of action that will raise sociologists above the personalistic biases that stem from single methodologies. By combining methods and investigators in the
same study, observers can partially overcome the deficiencies that flow from one investigator and/or one method (Denzin, 1970: 300).

Thus, triangulation is a combination of methodologies in the study of the same phenomenon. As conceived by Denzin (pp. 185-186, 297), participant observation simultaneously employs respondent and informant interviewing, document analysis, direct participation and observation and introspection. Indeed, such has relevance in light of the various methodologies employed in this study.

Denzin recognizes four types of triangulation: data, methodological, investigator, and theory (p. 301). In data triangulation, the researcher explicitly searches "...for as many different data sources as possible which bear upon the events under analysis" (p. 301). As noted earlier in this chapter, there were basically five data sources employed in this research: 1) direct observation of cockfights as well as the entire social life of the pits, 2) general conversation with those observed at the pits, 3) informal talks and in-depth interviews with the informants, 4) conversations and interviews with Kentucky State Police detectives, and 5) a review of the previous literature as was deemed applicable. "By selecting dissimilar settings [of data sources] in a systematic fashion, investigators can discover what their concepts . . . have in common across settings" (p. 301).

Methodological triangulation may assume many forms; however, its basic feature is the combination of multiple
research techniques in the investigation of the same phenomenon (p. 308). For example, in this study the basic strategy was participant observation employing informant interviewing, document analysis, as well as observer-as-participant, participant-as-observer and full participant. Even life histories (of the informants) may be considered as a further research strategy in that "...it is justifiable to admit as life history data any questionnaire or interview schedule that permits the subject to express his opinions" (p. 234).

Though not specifically given the term previously, the structure of much of the interviewing assumed the position of edited, topical life history. The topical life history of each informant focused on cockfighting and the informant's involvement. The major feature of the edited life history is the "...continual interspersing of comments, explanations, and questions by someone other than the focal subject (p. 223).

Investigator triangulation, the third type of triangulation recognized by Denzin (pp. 301, 303) and the last type of triangulation employed by this thesis, utilized multiple observers to escape the potential bias that may result from a single investigator. Further, it insures a greater reliability in observations (see Strauss, Schatzman, Bucher, Ehrlich and Sabshin, 1964: 36). As conceived by Denzin and this study, the informant is an observer employed by the researcher.

The primary functions of the informant are to act as a de facto observer for the
investigator; provide a unique inside perspective on events that the investigator is still "outside" of; serve as a "sounding board" for insights, propositions, and hypotheses developed by the investigator; open otherwise closed doors and avenues to situations and persons . . . (Denzin, 1970: 202).

Thus, the utilization of informants in this manner is actually the utilization of multiple observers or investigators.

The utilization of triangulation of data sources, methods, and observers in the analysis of the same phenomenon approaches the suppression of the intrinsic biases that come from a single-data source, single-method, single-observer study. A form of a built-in reliability check was obtained through triangulation. As each informant (or observer) yielded the same information and made the same kind of observations as the other informants, without prior consultation, confidence in the reliability of the data grew. Further confidence in reliability resulted from different data sources and methodologies providing the same information and thus giving data findings further support. As was noted earlier and as will become evident later, the responses and other data yielded by the twenty informants were very consistent (for more on triangulation see also Zelditch, 1962: 566-576).

The employment of triangulation readily facilitated the application of the concept of internal validity (Denzin, 1970: 201-205).

Internal validity sensitizes the observer to the biasing and distorting effects of the following intrinsic factors: historical factors, subject maturation,
subject bias, subject mortality, reactive effects of the observer, ... and peculiar aspects of the situations in which the observations were conducted (p. 201).

Historical factors, as a dimension of internal validity, played a significant role in the methodological scheme of this study. Documents, i.e., books and journals, were employed to validate or otherwise confirm data obtained through observation and interviews. Further, and aside from its bearing on internal validity, the utilization of such documents also provided information concerning the historical dynamics of cockfighting.

Regarding subject maturation, those individuals providing cooperation became more than respondents; in essence, and with respect to Denzin's definition of informant, such individuals became informants. Informants, as opposed to respondents

... ideally trust the investigator; freely give information about their problems and fears and frankly attempt to explain their own motivations; demonstrate that they will not jeopardize the study; accept information given them by the investigator; provide information and aid that could jeopardize their own careers (p. 202).

Indeed, this became the situation of those cooperating in this study. Not only did the informants openly reveal their extent of participation in cockfighting but welcomed the researcher's company as they actively participated, thus disclosing locations of numerous pits, the physical focal point of the clandestine activity.

Though subject bias may have been present, the informants not being drawn in a random fashion, diverse social positions
were represented (see Appendix E-2). It would be difficult, if not impossible, to determine the extent of subject bias because the percentage of each social class position involved in cockfighting cannot be determined, primarily because of the clandestine and illegal nature of the activity.

Among the twenty informants involved, no subject mortality was experienced. That is, all twenty informants remained available to the investigator until that portion of research involving the informants was completed.

Turning to yet another dimension of internal validity, the reactive effects of the observer, the researcher initially encountered an expected reluctance of acceptance or suspicion by the informants. However, it is noteworthy that this situation may have been one of "breaking the ice" with respect to the relationship between researcher and informants, an occurrence to be at least in part expected when the research focus is a clandestine and largely illegal activity. Regardless, those cooperating grew from respondent to informant, as described above. Further, a significant observation is that there were no non-responses recorded for any of the twenty informants during the interviews. Serving as a further check on the validity of the informants was the consistency between their responses and the behaviors observed at the pits.

Finally, in turning to the situations, i.e., settings, in which observations were gathered, such observational settings coincided with and occurred in the five data sources
employed in this thesis: 1) direct observation of cockfights and the social life of the pits, 2) general conversation with those observed at the pits, 3) informal talks and in-depth interviews with participants in cockfighting, most normally hours long and sometimes continuing for three and four days, 4) conversations and interviews with Kentucky State Police detectives, and 5) a survey of the existing literature. These observational environments have already been exposed in some detail previously, including the dynamics of the settings, the "rules of etiquette" applying to each, and the categories of participants interacting in each setting, as well as restrictions on entering certain of these settings, specifically the pits. Behavioral observations and the associated meanings held by the participants will be exposed (as findings) throughout the remaining chapters.

However, to be noted is the contrast between the settings involving the in-depth interviews and the pits.

...an important dimension of the behavior setting as a unit of analysis is the nature and number of participants present. ...observations [should] be recorded in terms of whether the investigator was alone with the subject or whether there was a group of respondents, since verbalized respondent attitudes will be shaped by group influence. If subjects are alone, they may say things that run counter to group opinion, but in the presence of the group express group consensus (pp. 204-205; see also Becker and Geer, 1960: 267-289).

The in-depth interviews involving the twenty informants normally took place in a setting in which no other cockfighting
participants were present. However, there was much consensus in all the informants' responses. Further, the data gathered from conversations with those present at the pits, being in the presence of potential "group influence," did not counter informant data but rather supported it. From these indications then, the lack or presence of "group influence" did not affect the data reported.

Thus, while triangulation approaches the elimination of biases resulting from single dimension (data source, method, and observer) studies, internal validity sensitizes the observer to certain biasing and distorting effects resulting from factors intrinsic in participant observation studies.

Data Analysis and Presentation

The amount of detailed description produced by observational research is indeed immense, making it difficult to present conclusions so as to convince other social scientists of their validity (Becker, 1958: 653). Further, the data of participant observation do not lend themselves to ready summary, such as is possible with statistical data. Thus, the researcher may deal in "quasi-statistics." While the conclusions of an observational study may be implicitly numerical, they do not require precise quantification (p. 656). One possible solution is to give a description of the natural history of the conclusions,

...presenting the evidence as it came to the attention of the observer... The term "natural history" implies not
the presentation of every datum, but only the characteristic forms data took. . . . This involved description of the form that data took and any significant exceptions. . . (p. 660).

This then in large part is the design of the presentation of the findings. Crucial to the presentation of data is the way in which the methods fit together or complement one another to produce the findings; that is, as the data is presented, its multiple sources are indicated.

Historical and ethnographic data are presented first in order to provide the reader accurate descriptions of cockfighting. From the historical and ethnographic observations, certain sociological concepts were discerned as being present. Such concepts were explicitly drawn from their contextual referents and developed for presentation through further descriptive analysis and documentation. These concepts were also shown in their historical perspectives where applicable. Further, "quasi-statistics" were employed in developing and analyzing certain of the concepts to be revealed as essential to the organization of cockfighting. Last, statistical summarizations were employed to describe certain census characteristics of the informants. The isolation and description of the various sociological concepts found in the organization of cockfighting is necessary to investigate the activity as a total social structure.

This method of presentation lends continuity to the thesis. Thus the thesis will present the findings as they become relevant in the next three chapters rather than in a single findings chapter. Indeed, any descriptions and
findings are in a practical sense inseparable, particularly in light of the lack of academic research being conducted on the phenomenon in question. The field research involved exposed concurrently both descriptions and findings presented, each being but a sorted and interpreted part of the other, or perhaps more correctly, being but a part of the discerned whole.
CHAPTER III

HISTORY AND DESCRIPTION OF THE
SPORT AND SURROUNDING ACTIVITIES

Introduction

In that cockfighting has largely been avoided as a research topic and is conducted as a clandestine activity, it is assumed that the reader does not have any more of an accurate conception of cockfighting and its organization than the writer had prior to the study. There is a responsibility inherent in exploratory research to first present an accurate account of the phenomenon to be studied. Drawing largely from secondary sources, this chapter will present a history (both social and legal) and distribution of cockfighting as well as its social correlates. In addition, an ethnographic description of the sport will be given, revealing its complexity and organization as well as an account of other pit activities, primarily gambling, largely taken from observations and in-depth interviews.

Social History of Cockfighting

Every time that we undertake to explain something human, taken at a given moment in history - be it a religious belief, a moral precept, a legal principle, an aesthetic style or an economic system - it is necessary to commence by going back to its most primitive and simple form,
to try to account for the characteristics by which it was marked at that time, and then to show how it developed and became complicated little by little, and how it became that which it is at the moment in question (Durkheim, 1915: 15).

To actually attempt to trace the entire history of cockfighting would be an exercise in futility, its origins being lost in antiquity. However, not denying that cockfighting has an old and extensive history, it is interesting to review that history which has been recorded.

There seems to be much consensus asserting that cockfighting apparently originated as an Asiatic sport with the domestication of fowl between 3300 and 2500 B.C. in what is now India (or at least that region south of the Himalayas including India, Siam, Malaya, the Sunda Islands, and Archipelago; Carson, 1972: 5, 10; Finsterbusch, 1929: 17-19, 31-32; Fitz-Barnard, [1921]: 4; Scott, [1957]: 5-6; Brasch, 1970: 77). The oldest records preserved and found concerning fowl addressed the gamecock as being common and in the state of domestication. Indeed, by 1000 B.C. cockfighting attained so wide a distribution and became so significant that it was given attention in the Manauadharmaistra or the Institutes of Manu (laws of man), the laws or regulations of the sport being addressed (Finsterbusch, 1929: 32). The history and method of distribution of cockfighting or at least gamefowl is unknown. Finsterbusch (p. 87) contends that the spread of cockfighting occurred with the history of civilization and discovery,
conquest and colonization. This largely seems undeniable in light of the history of cockfighting as it is presented.

The gamecock was more than an object of sport. For many ancient cultures and civilizations, it was an object of worship. Through some form of cultural contact, Babylonia and Syria came to possess gamefowls. The Babylonians worshipped the gamecock as the form of the god Nergal while the Syrians held the gamecock as a principal deity. Likewise, it received veneration as a god from the Persians. Both sport and fowl came to Greece probably by way of Persia. In ancient Greece the gamecock approached the status of a religious institution (Fitz-Barnard, [1921]: 4). Greeks, often calling the gamecock "the Persian bird," sacrificed the fowl to Asklepios, the god of healing (Brasch, 1970: 75). The Greeks also used the gamefowl in combat to teach the necessity of skill, courage, conviction unto death and audacity (Fitz-Barnard, [1921]: 4). Indeed, Themistocles (528 - 462 B. C.), the Athenian statesman and military commander, used a cockfight to inspire his soldiers to defeat the Persians in battle (p. 5; Brasch, 1970: 77; Scott, [1957]: 151). From Greece, the sport was taken to the Mediterranean world, specifically to Rome (Brasch, 1970: 77). It was introduced into Rome from Athens about 471 B. C. and was in part regarded as a religious as well as a political institution; indeed, it even played some part in the economic institution, two cocks in combat being depicted on certain Roman coins.
(Fitz-Barnard, [1921]: 5). In ancient Rome the gamecocks guided and inspired the military commanders and were used to indicate the approaching dawn and the passing of the evil darkness (Scott, [1957]: 88). St. Augustine (A.D. 354 - 430, Father of the Church) is said to have greatly admired the gamecocks in combat, praising publicly their courage and beauty (Fitz-Barnard, [1921]: 8). The Roman historian, Pomponius Mela, asserted that the Roman Empire did not begin to decline until cockfighting had fallen into disrepute among the governors (p. 3; Scott, [1957]: 151).

Prior to the decline of the Roman Empire, Roman colonizers took the activity to western Europe and probably England but this is not conclusive. However, its source of origin into England is not significant compared to the fact that by the twelfth century cockfighting attained immense popularity in England among all classes and ages. William Fitzstephen, in his famous chronicle, gives an account of life in London in the twelfth century, saying, "'The schoole boyes do bring Cockes of the game to their Master, and all the forenoon delight themselves in Cockfighting'" (Carson, 1972: 23). By 1614 the rules presiding at cockfights, becoming formalized, were printed in the book, Pleasures for Princes (Brasch, 1970: 78). Cockfighting was made a royal sport by the English monarchs, Henry VIII building a cockpit in the palace at Westminster (p. 78). Indeed, the more fashionable pits of England in the early decades of the nineteenth century required cocks to fight in silver spurs (Scott, [1957]: 54).
Western Europe, primarily England and Spain, spread cockfighting to other parts of the world, particularly the New World, through colonization (Brasch, 1970: 80). Finsterbusch (1929: 347-348) says of cockfighting in the United States:

It is probable that the most prominent early cockers were Irish and that the greatest percentage of cocks fought along the Atlantic coast States were also Irish. As cocking progressed and communication was fairly established with the hinterland and Pacific coast, there is no doubt that Irish and English cocks were scattered all over the country. In the South, of course, Spanish settlers had introduced their national fowl.

Gamecocks were brought into what is now the United States at least as early as 1650 (Scott, [1957]: 121). In the early history of the United States, cockfighting in the North and New England, though widespread, was conducted secretly while in the South it and other diversionary activities were held openly and with no pretense (Durant and Bettmann, 1965: 2).

This brief review of the history of cockfighting reveals two important points. First, cockfighting is very old, its history seeming to coincide with the history of the development of civilization, and second, gamecocks were often objects of other than mere diversion. They were often prominent in religious, political, and economic institutions, serving as sacrificial offerings, inspiration, and ensuring the fertility of the soil and man (Brasch, 1970: 74-77).
Linguistical Influences

That cockfighting has been and is very much a thread of the fabric of the American culture is undeniable. As noted by Daley and Arlott, "Games are as truly part of the history of a nation as its work, wars and art. They are a reflection of the social life of the people, changing with it and conditioned by its changes in economy, religion and politics" (1968: 14). Indeed, considering the extent and history of cockfighting, it would not be surprising to find some influence of the sport and/or its following upon the American "society" in general. Even though the public is unconscious of and does not realize the influence of cockfighting or its origin, cockfighting has affected legal politics, law enforcement agencies, and humane societies. However, these affected areas involve only "privileged" and limited segments of the larger society. Yet, there is an influence that has been felt by the social whole of the United States.

Cockfighting has been the subject of much literature and art throughout the world (see Finsterbusch, 1929: 253-256; Scott, [1957]: 152-154, 161-164). The influence that cockfighting argot has had on the English language has been formitable as is evidenced by terms and idioms originally derived from the cockfighting argot and that now have different and more general meanings in its everyday usage in the general language of the society at large.
The following phrases, as part of the everyday language, are generally employed to denote bravery and courage: "to die game" refers to fighting to the death however outmatched; "he's a game old cock" and "he's getten his spurs on" mean willing and prepared to fight; "well-heeled" generally means one is prepared to meet all comers and situations that may arise in the struggle of life but it may also mean that one is provided with plenty of money; "heeled" refers to being armed (Scott, [1957]: 118-119).

The following are euphemisms for cowardice: "to turn tail" and "to show a clean pair of heels" refer to one running rather than staying to fight (p. 118); "to show the white feather" indicates cowardice, coming from the old belief of cockfighters that birds with a white feather in its plumage were poor fighters - from this came the practice of attaching a white feather to the hat or clothing of one who did not voluntarily join the armed services during times of war (p. 118; Brasch, 1970: 81); "crestfallen" refers to giving up in defeat, usually without a fight (p. 81).

Metaphors for fights and general squabbles are as follows: "battle royal" (p. 80); "pitted against"; "fights in the round". Other metaphors common to everyday usage include the following: "living like a fighting cock" is "living high on the hog," i.e., the best of everything regardless of costs; "cock of the walk," "cocky," and "cocksure" refer to a person whose attitude is one of self-assurance and who considers himself superior to others; "cock-eyed" may denote a person
who is staggering drunk, acting silly, or an object that is crooked (Scott, [1957]: 119). In that the cockpit was and is often fairly restricted in space, people often applied the term to other small enclosures; the term "cockpit" is used to refer to junior officers' quarters on ships, one because of their small size and two, because these quarters, serving as first-aid posts for the combat wounded, displayed bloody spectacles. Airmen in World War I, because of the size of the cabin, bloody aerial combat, and the courage involved, began referring to the plane cabin as the cockpit (Brasch, 1970: 80-81).

Indeed, even the etymologies of the American institution of the mixed drink, i.e., the cocktail, are credited to cockfighting. It allegedly comes from either "cock-ale," a drink of spirits and bitters prepared for fighting cocks in training or from the early custom of spectators toasting the cock with the most tail feathers left after a fight. As to the latter, the drink was to have the same number of ingredients as the number of tail feathers left (Mencken, 1963: 162-163).

Two combative sports involving man, boxing and wrestling, have allegedly been influenced by cockfighting rules and nomenclature (Fitz-Barnard, [1921]: 57-58). Indeed, there are battle royals in wrestling and sparring in boxing, as well as in cockfighting; as does cockfighting, both boxing and wrestling involve rounds and times or rest periods, counts, disqualifications, seconds or managers, as well as other similarities.
It becomes obvious that the subtle influences of cockfighting on the everyday life of those outside the pale of cockfighting are greater than what might be imagined.

**Contemporary Geographical Distribution**

Gamecocks, through cultural contact and diffusion or in some cases possibly independent development, are found in almost every country of the world. Finsterbusch (1929: 37) says, "We find them [gamecocks] now scattered all over the world and a companion of civilized man. . . the history of civilization of the world is marked by the introduction of the gamecock. Discovery, conquest and colonization is also the history of the scattering of gamefowl."

The geographical extent of cockfighting today is indeed broad, covering such countries and areas as all countries of South and Central America, Africa, Australia, Canada, China, Cuba, Haiti, the Phillipines as well as other South Pacific island chains, Puerto Rico, many countries of Asia and most countries comprising the continent of Europe as well as the United States (pp. 307-465; Brasch, 1970: 74-75; Scott, [1957]: 126-136).

Turning specifically to the United States, the geographical focus for this research, cockfighting occurs in many, if not most or all of the fifty States. Further, it is received with great vigor in the Old Confederacy and in the Southwestern States (Carson, 1972: 171). With respect to the distribution of the sport in Kentucky, a captain of the Kentucky State
Police organized crime section said, "'One thing certain about cockfighting here in Kentucky is that it's popular in every part of the state. No one region is cornering the market on the sport'" (The Courier-Journal Bureau, 1974).

Regional Variation

Given such a wide distribution of cockfighting in the United States, numerous variations may be expected. However, perhaps giving testimony to the strength and solidarity of cockfighting in the United States was the discernment of only one regional variation. To be sure, variations among various countries of the world exist, naked-heeled fighting and the utilization of slashers being perhaps two of the better known (Scott, [1957]: 51-55). Of the twenty informants, seventeen stated that they knew of only one regional variation and the remaining three informants stated that they knew of no variations.

The one regional variation reported was that cockfighters in the northeastern part of the United States use short spurs while long spurs are utilized in the other regions of the country. For this reason, tournaments, derbies, or mains between the northeast and other regions are rarely staged. This was confirmed by Fitz-Barnard ([1921]: 78). The regional variation seems to be traced to two specific causes. First, there is evidently a preference in the northeast for smaller, low stationed (short legged) cocks and such birds cannot utilize the longer spurs because there is a danger that the birds could spur or injure themselves.
Second, as indicated by many of the informants, matches utilizing shorter spurs will most normally last longer because each individual strike or blow is not as damaging as it is with longer spurs and there was reported a desire for longer matches in the northeast (pp. 78-79). However, this regional variation does not preclude regional interaction in that the publications (journals) are nonregional, the rules are largely nonregional (thus leading to the regional exchange of referees), and spectators (often cockfighters in one region) are not bound to a single region. Thus, this regional variation could not be conceived of as a significant weakness of the strength and solidarity of cockfighting. Regardless of where cockfighting takes place in the United States, with the exception of this one variation, the sport itself is similarly conducted.

**Description of the Sport**

To be sure, the cockfight is the focal point, the culminating product of the efforts of those involved in this activity; in essence, it is the realization of their efforts and is thus the essential feature, but (as will become obvious) is not the sole major feature of the clandestine enterprise. For this reason it is necessary to present an ethnographic description of a cockfight and its surroundings. That which follows is drawn from observation, participant observation and discussion with informants and with spectators and others at the pits.
As has been indicated, a cockfight takes place in a cockpit or simply a pit. The pit may range from a circle drawn on the ground to a concrete block wall or wire mesh or wooden fence standing about three feet in height. Within the antiquity of cockfighting, it is to be noted that

Cockfighting had its dangerous features for the onlooker. Cocks trained to fight, in the heat of battle, would pursue each other into the crowd and, with their deadly spurs, could easily inflict serious injuries to anyone in their way. To protect spectators, promoters in the early development of the sport learned to dig round pits to contain the ferocious fighters. This was the origin of the cockpit (Brasch, 1970: 78).

The walled or fenced pit then followed the literal pit. However, the cockpit as it is known today is indeed old and has changed very little since at least the eighteenth century as is noted by a quoted description of a pit cited by Scott ([1957]: 57-58, 122). Naturally, the latter types of pits having fences or walls are to be found only at those locations where cockfighting has some degree of permanency and is rather organized. Such pits are most normally housed in some type of building, ranging from large barns to specially constructed facilities; indeed, some pit houses are made of concrete and brick, having air conditioning, carpet, and plush theater-type seats and requiring an initial investment of 50,000 dollars or more. Regardless of the type of pit building, the actual pit floor is almost always dirt or a mixture of earth, clay, and ash pounded into a hard floor, providing a natural surface.
The more permanent and established pit, having a diameter of twenty feet, is surrounded by bleachers or similar seating arrangements for spectators (see figure 1, p. 54). Most normally, the seating arrangements at these pits encompass only about three-fourths of the pit, the remaining area being occupied by the officials' booth and concession stands. Variations of this arrangement are not uncommon, some officials' booths being suspended over the pit from a domed ceiling. Quite often men's and women's restrooms are part of the pit facilities as even the smaller, one day matches may last for at least six or eight hours. An important point to consider is the influence of the pit facilities upon the time of day that the matches are held. Temporary pits, usually not having lighting facilities, will host daytime (most normally afternoon) matches. The more permanent pits, usually equipped with lights, will host daytime as well as night matches. Pits may be well concealed at the end of a graveled private road or there may be no effort at all to hide and/or disguise such pits, some being within city limits and having paved parking lots. Both permanent and temporary pits were observed during the study, some being concealed while others made no pretense at concealment.

Spectators pay admission fees upon being admitted to the pit, the cost running from about three to five dollars for one day or night of fighting, up to ten or fifteen dollars for a multi-day (often five or six days) match;
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children under twelve years of age are often admitted for half-price and infants free. Referees, cockfighters, and handlers (i.e., participants) are admitted to the pit area free but cockfighters must pay an entry fee for their cocks, usually ranging anywhere from twenty-five to two-hundred dollars for the smaller matches up to as much as 2,000 dollars for the more prestigious matches. The spectators' admission fees go to the pit owner while the purses for the first and second place winners are made up of the entry fees, first place taking seventy percent and second place, thirty percent.

The cockfighters may also pick up the option; the option will normally cost between twenty-five and one-hundred dollars and this money is pooled to form a second purse, all being one money. That is, the option money is not divided. To be eligible for the option money, one must pick up or pay the option; thus, if the first and second place winners did not pay the option and the third place winner (a position not sharing in the first purse) did, then the third place position would collect the option purse.

All cock matches will specify the number of cocks or stags to be shown or entered. Usually an odd number of birds is specified but an even number showing is by no means uncommon. The matches will be designed for either cocks (birds of more than twelve months of age) or stags (birds less than twelve months of age). This designation will be specified weeks or even months prior to the matches, as will be the type of fight, be it a derby, tournament, main,
battle royal, or hack, the last two usually serving as an extra feature of the night's matches and not the sole or even primary type of fight for a meet. A description of each of these types will follow later in this chapter.

Upon entering the pit area, the cockfighter (or his handler) will go to the officials' booth to have his birds weighed, the weight being determined to the closest ounce. Upon having his birds weighed, they will be banded by the officials with leg and/or wing bands, each band for each bird having a different number on it; this number corresponds to a numbered weight card on which the weight of the bird is recorded. The weights and the corresponding band numbers of the cocks of each entrant are entered on such a weight card and the entrant is then assigned an entry number. This information is also used to fill out the match board, check sheet, and call sheets, all paraphernalia necessary for the technical process of matching opponents. Of the many requirements of matching, it is absolutely essential, except for mains and hacks, that the matches be made "blind" (i.e., no one knowing who will be opponents) and no two entrants shall meet more than once during the tournament or derby. The care taken in matching and banding, fully explained in the Modern Tournament and Derby Rules (Wortham, 1961: 22-30), is an attempt to have all cocks which meet be as evenly matched as possible and also to keep entrants honest, i.e., to prevent switching birds before a fight. Normally, while
the referee(s) take(s) care of weighing and banding, the cockfighter will be with the pit owner/manager paying his entry fee, taking or rejecting the option, and attending to such other business as reserved seats for friends and family.

The cockfighter and/or handler will then pick up his banded birds and, being assigned holding pens, will place the cocks in such pens, often located around the inside wall of the pit house and behind the spectators' seats. After all entries have been weighed and matched, the referee or an announcer (another referee or pit manager or personnel), often using a public address system, will welcome the spectators and cockfighters, remind them of and point out the house rules that are posted as well as which set of fighting rules will be employed. The announcer will then call two entry numbers and two band numbers and instruct the entrants (i.e., the cockfighters and/or handlers) to bring their birds so banded to the scales once again to determine that no birds or bands have been switched. This will be the first time that either cockfighter will be aware of whom his opponent is to be.

The handlers or cockfighters will then heel their own birds while the announcer will give the names of the birds, if any, the owners, the handlers, and the ages and weights of the birds. Heeling is the "art" of tying or attaching the artificial (steel) spurs or gaffs to the cocks, one gaff on each leg. The spur, curving and tapering to its very sharp point, is perfectly round and may vary in length from
1-1/4 to 3 inches. The spur is attached to the leg of the cock by means of a socket which fastens and ties over the nub or stump of the sawed-off natural spur of the bird. Just prior to the heeling, the handler or cockfighter will publicly lick the artificial spurs, giving testimony to the fact that no poison was used.

The referee, already in the pit, calls, "get ready"; this is the cue for the cockfighters to step over the pit wall. Once in the pit, the cockfighter assumes the position and role of handler. On the command, "bill your cocks," the handlers cradle the cocks over their arms and, standing on the center scores or lines, being twenty-two inches apart, thrust and hold the birds out to each other, allowing each to peck and generally antagonize the other. After about thirty seconds the referee commands, "pass them once and get ready." The handlers, holding the gamecocks at arm's length, pass them through the air with a circling movement around the pit for the benefit of the spectators to give final observation of the birds prior to the fight; the handlers then retreat to their respective eight foot scores. With the toes of each handler on the backscore lines or eight foot scores and facing each other, the handlers squat down and place the feet of each cock on the respective scores; thus, the cocks are exactly eight feet apart and are held there by their tails. Upon the command, "pit," by the referee, each handler releases the tail of his bird and steps back to the inside wall of the pit or at least six feet away from
both cocks. The birds will most normally rush each other, often trying to get above one another in order to come down on their opponent's back.

As long as the birds are fighting, fighting being defined as "...striking, chasing, pecking or pecking at the other cock..." (p. 13), they are left to their own wills. If the spurs of one or both cocks become hung in the body of the other, the referee calls, "handle." The handler whose bird has been penetrated by the gaffs of the other removes the gaffs from his bird and both handlers pick up their birds and return to their respective eight foot scores. The courtesy of allowing the handler to remove the opponent's spurs from the body of his own bird is granted because it is assumed that he will remove the spurs and inflict no further unnecessary damage to his bird while the converse of this may be questionable. The period of rest between pittings after handling is twenty seconds and may be used to rest the cocks and generally revive them but no foreign matter or substance may be used other than water. At the expiration of the twenty second rest period the referee will again call, "get ready," and, "pit," and the above procedure will be repeated.

A cock is entitled to the count if he fights (striking, chasing, pecking, or pecking at) last or if the other cock runs away. To be given the count, the handler of the bird entitled to it must ask the referee for the count within five seconds after the other cock stops fighting or at any time after a runaway. The count (established by long custom) is three tens
and one twenty, the length of the count being the number of seconds as indicated by the count number (either a "ten" or a "twenty"). If the count is completed by the referee, a twenty second rest period follows with the fight again being started by the commands, "get ready," and, "pit." The three ten counts are utilized first and if one cock has three counts to his credit, that is, his opponent has not fought or has run during three pittings, the next pitting will take place on the center score lines. When using the center score lines, the handlers set their birds down from knee height squarely on the center score only after the referee says, "pit"; the birds are then twenty-two inches apart, or "beak to beak." Any cock refusing to fight or who runs away after having the three ten counts against him may, at the request of the handler of the opposing cock, have the twenty count started against him. After the twenty count, the bird having the count, (i.e., going against his opponent), is awarded the battle.

If for some reason it is necessary to handle the birds during a count, then the count occurring next time shall continue from where it was left off when handling was employed. If a cock being counted out fights (strikes, chases, pecks, or pecks at the other cock), then the referee will call, "count broken," the count then starting over again the next time.

When both cocks stop fighting or run and neither has the count, within five seconds the referee shall call out,
"time is going on," and after twenty seconds call "handle."
After the twenty second rest following the first "time,"
the cocks are pitted beak to beak on the center score.
There is a total of three "times" in a match and if neither
cock fights at the expiration of three "times," the referee
calls the battle a draw. However, if both cocks are running,
then each entrant loses a full fight.

If fight action in the main pit becomes slow but neither
cock is disqualified or eliminated, then at the discretion of
the referee, the birds will be moved by the handlers to a
drag pit. There are normally two or three drag pits, more
or less out of the way, usually behind and to the sides of the
officials' booth or to the sides of the spectators' seating
arrangements; drag pits are smaller than the main pit,
having a diameter of only eight feet. When one battle is
transferred to one of the drag pits, then another referee
starts another fight in the main pit. Thus, as many as
four battles may be in progress at one time (one in the main
pit and one in each of the three drag pits), but most attention
is focused on the main pit because of more action.

Thus, a fight may end in one of several ways: one cock
may kill his opponent and attain victory or a cock may be
victorious by being awarded the count because his opponent
refuses to fight or is unable to fight or runs; if both
cocks die simultaneously and neither has the count or in
any other way is unable to break the count, the fight is a
draw and each entrant is awarded one-half fight or a draw may
be declared if both cocks stop fighting and both take the three "times" as explained above; lastly, if both cocks run, each entrant loses a full fight. In essence, the fight need not be to the death even for a victory to be awarded. At the conclusion of each fight, the results are indicated on the blackboard at the officials' booth. Each entrant's identification number is on the chalk board and each is credited with a win, loss, or draw. The fight, from start to finish, may last as little as five seconds or more than twenty minutes. The cock(s) surviving a fight is (are) normally treated with alcohol or kerosene or some other type of strong disinfectant; even if the cock will never fight again, he may be valuable as a breeding cock.

Types of Fights

There are five categorical divisions or types of cockfights commonly practiced in the United States and certain other countries: the hack fights, tournaments, derbies, mains, and battle royals. These different types of fights, with the exception of the battle royal, may be and are often fought under the jurisdiction of the same set of pit rules; however, when the battle royal progresses to a certain stage, it too becomes subject to the same set of rules that may preside over any one of the other types of cockfights. The difference then among the five specified types of cockfights are not in the manner in which they are fought but in the manner in which the opponents are matched or brought together.
The hack fight occurs in two modes. The first mode, sometimes referred to as a brush fight, occurs when two cockfighters in a rather informal manner agree to fight a specified number of cocks, quite often only one each. Such most normally results from a challenge issued by one of the two cockfighters involved, is often unannounced as it is a "spur of the moment" impulse, apparently is most frequent on a Sunday afternoon, and usually involves a wager (either even money or odds). Because it is unannounced in no way implies that there are no spectators. Indeed, the presence of others is quite often the impetus for issuing a challenge resulting in a hack fight. This mode of the hack fight may take place in an "established" pit if one is readily available but it is not unusual for a hack fight of this nature to occur within a twenty-foot circle drawn or scratched on the ground, this then being the pit. It is to be noted here that this type of fight embraces the only exception with respect to spectators, the spectators being almost consistently males, usually no younger than middle teens. Also, it is at this type of fight that much drinking and inebriation, often resulting in fighting or brief scuffling, may possibly occur. The most feasible explanation of this phenomenon is that this particular segment of the cockfighting activity (avid spectators and participants) congregate on a Sunday afternoon to discuss specifics and generalities of cockfighting as well as to enjoy the comradeship and fraternalism. This is not to imply that women or younger people are not avid spectators. However, at least one latent
function of this clandestine activity is that of fraternalization outside of the pits. Indeed, it is the norm for those seriously involved in cockfighting, either as participants or spectators, particularly the male segment, to gather to "talk shop" in their particular argot. A typical and rather accessible, visible example of this type of hack fight is the film, The Feathered Warrior (Appalshop, Inc., Box 743, Whitesburg, Kentucky 41858). In that it is not unusual for the open consumption of alcoholic beverages to take place at this first mode of hack fighting, it is probably from this type of cockfight that the general public draw their stereotype of cockfighting.

The second mode of hack fighting occurs with more organization and structure and occurs in an established club pit. This mode of hack fighting is advertised on the schedules of the club pits and are thus subject to one of the forms of established rules as well as the various individual pit rules possibly posted. Though the schedules advertising hacks will specify a required number of cocks to be shown by each fighter, this type of fight is apparently, at least primarily, for those not having enough cocks to meet the required number specified for a tournament and/or for those having already fought out their best cocks and having only seconds or culls remaining (p. 21). The winner of such a hack fight could then be determined either through a process of elimination, thus pyramiding into a cockfight between those two cock-fighters still undefeated, or by the one who won the most
fights. Originally, the birds' weights were matched as close as possible for determining opponents but the Modern Tournament and Derby Rules now states, "When matching cocks or stags in...hacks, all birds that weigh even or within two ounces of each other automatically match" (p. 5).

The development of the derby as it is known today reportedly came about in 1929 in Kentucky and since it was derby-time, it was named after the Kentucky Derby. Indeed, the derby is credited with being the stimulant that has brought cocking to its present peak of popularity (p. 21). In most situations, a derby implies that a specified number of cocks are to be shown, but weights are not specified, only cocks of "reasonable weights." The meaning of "reasonable weights" will be found to vary from pit to pit but reasonable weights are generally accepted as approximately four pounds, four ounces to six pounds, four ounces. Normally, but not without exception, an odd number of cocks are specified, as the winner of a derby is determined by the greatest number of wins; thus, this would preclude any ties. "In the derby it is only necessary that the total number of cocks shown be matched and there is no obligation on the part of the matchmaker to do more than match the cocks at the closest possible weights and avoid 'double meets' if he can" (p. 17). Weights are matched within weight divisions specified by the pit.

The cocking tournament, as it is known to the participants today, was conceived in 1908 in Louisiana (p. 17). The tournament is similar to the derby in that again, a
specified number of cocks are required to be shown and, for the same reason, it is most normally an odd number. However, unlike the derby, the tournament requires that a specified number of cocks be shown at specified weights, the weight of each cock not being a fractional part of an ounce over the upper limit of each specified weight division nor being more than three ounces lighter than the upper limit of each specified weight division. This then allows a match list of opponents to be predetermined. However, because an entry withdrawal after entrance applications are sent in would prove detrimental to such a predetermined match list, contracts become an essential part of the tournament. The Orlando (Florida) Game Club contract is probably the most notable and copied:

I hereby agree to take an entry in the Orlando Tournament to be held at the Orlando Game Club at Orlando, Fla., Jan. and in so doing agree to abide by the rules. I agree to fight all the scheduled fights in the tournament and acknowledge that my entry is under the jurisdiction of Club rules from the time it enters the grounds.

I am enclosing $200 as a guarantee, which is to be applied on entrance fee, and I agree to put up the balance on or before .

The money is to be made payable to 

Date Signed

Although the potential forfeit involved in a tournament is considerable, one's potential economic gain is usually significantly greater than that of a derby because the entrance fees are generally higher in a tournament, there are often a greater number of entries in a tournament, and
the winning purse is derived from the entrance fees. One informant reported that the entry fee for the International Cocking Tournament was 1,000 dollars, this later being confirmed by three other informants as well as documented (Durant and Bettmann, 1965: 50).

Indeed, the tower of status and prestige among the participants of cockfighting, and particularly for the cockfighter, is participation in the main. The history of the main finds its origins at least as early as the 1700's (Scott [1957]: 65). The main requires a specified odd number of cocks or stags to be shown, one of a specified bottom weight, and one of a specified top weight with any combination of weights in between. The cocks or stags of each entry between the specified bottom and top weights must then be matched within two ounces of each other or otherwise as close as possible. A rather typical contract designed for mains reads as follows:

We, the undersigned, do hereby agree, that on the _____ day of ______, one thousand ______ hundred and ______', will produce, show and weigh ______ cocks (or stags) between the weights of ______ and _______, and to match all that weight within two ounces of each other, and that the party's cocks that win the greatest number of battles shall be entitled to the sum of $__________; the amount to be placed in the hands of Mr. __________, before any cocks are pitted. Be it further agreed that all cocks shall fight with fair heels, fair hackles and to be subject to the _________ rules in cockfighting, and that all profits arising from the spectators, called door money, shall be _______________, after all charges are paid that usually
happen on these occasions. Be it further agreed that the above named rules governing this main shall be considered as part of these articles and all provisions therein will govern any difficulty that may arise. Witness our hand, this ___ day of _____, 19__.

Signed, ______________________

Witnesses: (Lee, n.d.: 27)

This main contract differs only in the style of English from that printed in 1814 in Sketchley's book, The Cocker (Scott, [1957]: 64-65).

One essential difference between the mains and the tournaments and derbies is the method of determining referees. The pit management selects the referee or referees for tournaments and derbies, and signature of contract or payment of entry fees by all entrants indicates the referee or referees as satisfactory. However, in mains, the referee is to be selected or agreed upon by the principals involved (Wortham, 1961: 6). This distinction, however insignificant, holds certain definite social implications that are congruent with the difference between the main and the tournament and/or derby. The main, in a sense, is a "grudge" match between two cockfighters who have reputations of success. The principals' reputations are usually more than merely local as may be inferentially observed by the number of out-of-state vehicle license plates at even the smaller pits when a main is being sponsored. Indeed, a main will attract supporters of each of the principals involved in the main; in that a main often involves two cockfighters who subscribe to two different "theories" of
conditioning, the supporters may come to give backing to the individual *per se* and his reputation or they may be lending support to the method of conditioning that they adhere to. Regardless of their reason or reasons of support, it is quite clear that the two factions are polarized, socially and often physically, at least for the temporal span of the main proper. That is, supporters of the two principals involved in a main may well be good friends and may even ride to the pits together; however, once in the pits, there is a polarization of the two factions or conditioning schools of thought. This is not to necessarily imply that such friends do not sit together but that they do not participate in certain types of interaction, such as betting or actively supporting their choices with each other.

In that a main is very well planned and promoted, often as much as a year in advance, this makes possible a type of gambling that exists in none of the other types of cockfighting, that of a prearranged bet. In none of the other forms of cockfighting do the spectators have prior knowledge of who the opponents are to be. This then enables the spectators to make bets well in advance of the main, and, in following the progress of the one they support, the amount of the bet will often increase as a result of a successful season. However, very seldom will the wager decrease due to a poor season, primarily because the opposition with whom the wager is placed will not consent to decreasing the bet, particularly if the principal he supports has been doing rather well.
Undoubtedly, one of the largest and best known mains (as is supported by the fact that 100 percent of those interviewed mentioned or otherwise referred to it without solicitation) is the New Orleans Main. Of the twenty informants interviewed, three stated that they were there in 1971, and all three, in separate interviews, gave corroborating facts. This particular New Orleans Main allegedly had a 2,500 dollar entry fee paid by each of the two principals with a 200 dollar bank on each of the seven cocks fought by each principal.

The battle royal, another type of cockfight, is rather similar in style to the battle royals of "studio wrestling" and allegedly served as the pattern for the wrestling royals to follow (Fitz-Barnard, [1921]: 58). The cockfighting battle royals, not occurring with any frequency, are employed because of the "sensationalism" to draw large crowds at special tournaments and derbies such as holiday tournaments. As the name implies, any number of cocks or stags, regardless of size or weight, may enter, and are all placed in the pit together. Quite simply, the one cock or stag left, either alive or still displaying aggressive qualities, is declared the winner. Though the battle royals apparently draw large numbers of spectators, many cockfighters and other participants seem to embrace a great distain for such a "spectacle" (Scott, [1957]: 73), contending that such is generally demeaning to a fighting cock or at least to the appreciation one has for a fighting cock. Indeed, in that many contend
that each movement of a pitted cock is a focal point of appreciation, they claim that such appreciation becomes lost in a crowded pit where individual style of movement gives way to mass and chaotic movement. Also, it is argued that the circumstances of the battle royal would never be duplicated or equalled in nature (p. 157). Further, it is pointed out by many that only newcomers or those just getting into fighting cocks will enter a battle royal with hope of quickly acquiring a successful reputation (as the winner is credited with as many wins as are entrants in the battle royal minus his cock). And again, no one will show their best cock since victory may only be a matter of chance, not skill in care and conditioning. Thus, at least to some degree, there is consensus among many of the cockfighters that battle royals are fights of less than excellent quality, and that they are primarily for the benefit of the spectators (and ultimate financial benefit of the pit management) and not for the benefit of the sport and appreciation of fighting cocks.

Rules of Cockfighting

Regardless of the type of cockfight, it will be conducted under the auspices and jurisdiction of a set of "standardized" rules. There are four sets of rules published and readily available from many cockfighting supply houses and from any one of the three major cockfighting journals. The four sets of rules are Modern Tournament and Derby Rules (Wortham, 1961), Modern Chicago and Midwestern Derby Rules (The Chicago and
Midwestern Fraternity, n.d.), McCall's Rules (McCall, [1932]), and Battle Royal Rules (The Feathered Warrior, n.d.). Any one set or any combination of the four sets of rules may be in effect at any given pit and at the discretion of the pit management. These sets of rules are apart from any house or pit rules enforced and posted by the pit management. It is customary and expected for the pit management to post and otherwise make known which set of rules or combination of rules they enforce and adhere to.

With respect to the sets of rules cited above, all are extremely similar, the variations not being in the rulings so much as in the wording of the rules and the extent of detail and explicitness. Indeed, all twenty informants (including two pit owners) interviewed stated a definite preference for Wortham's Modern Tournament and Derby Rules, as did most pit managements (at least where the informants participated), because of Wortham's detail, explicitness, and extensiveness in addressing so many situations, both common and uncommon, which arise in the pits. Generally, all sets of rules include divisions encompassing methods for precisely matching opponents in both the tournaments and the derbies, as well as the hacks and mains, weighing and banding of the cocks prior to the fights, selection of referee(s) for each type of fight, gaffs or artificial spurs and lengths, showing of cocks, fighting rules within the pit, and decisions governing potential situations, as well as a section on penalties.
Not only are the five contemporary sets of rules very similar, but a chronological review of the various rules preserved and available reveal that there has been very little change in the rules for at least 250 years (Scott, [1957]: 61-64, 122-123; Fitz-Barnard, [1921]: 14-19).

The rules of cocking are very old; I do not know how old they are, but at any rate those in vogue now were in use when the Merry Monarch ruled in England, and probably hundreds of years before that... In all other sports the old rules have been revised many times, and in cocking alone are the old rules still adhered to without alteration (p. 14).

Indeed, again the traditional thread of cockfighting bares itself in the rules. However, it is the entire tradition of cockfighting that has preserved the rules as they are, and not just the tradition of rules. An interesting observation regarding the rules is noted by Finsterbusch:

.almost any sort of domestic, and many wild animals, have been used for staging fights, though many never were considered from the sportive point of view, merely because there were no rules to judge the spectacle. It is the rules that make the sport. From a natural point of view, a fight is the hostile competition between two beings with the intention to eliminate each other...[that is, nature makes no attempt to match opponents in size and strength in the interest of fairness]. The knowledge of cocks and their abilities appear to have been responsible for the establishment of all fighting rules. Such rules [have been] handed down by tradition... The first aim of the rules, old and new, is to match a pair of cocks on the level, giving both antagonists even chances to fight it out (1929: 99-100).
If this assumption is indeed the case, then it was man's social concern for a sense of fairness that was the impetus for the establishment of cockfighting rules. As might be imagined, this appeal to a sense of fair play may have been stimulated by participants whose opportunities for victory were less than equal.

The imposition of rules, with their concern for equal and fair play, brought about the consistent utilization of certain equipment in the United States, particularly the spur or gaff. Regardless of the type of fight, be it a hack, tournament, derby, main, or battle royal, all cocks fought in the United States are heeled or are provided with gaffs; that is, there is no naked-heeled fighting. Indeed, it has been argued that the development of the metal spur came about initially as a concern of man, not to provide the birds with more formidable weapons, but to make conditions as equal as possible between two opposing birds, since natural spurs were and are of variable lengths (p. 103). Further, natural spurs had to be sharpened, cleaned, and smoothed, and such fights lasted longer and left very severe wounds and bruises. However, with respect to artificial spurs, all twenty informants noted that the wounds are clean, they heal quickly, and the fight is shorter (Scott, [1957]: 52-53, 157). Naked-heeled fighting does occur, but is largely restricted to India and continental Asia (pp. 51-53). Also, the slasher, a spur variation having a sharp blade-like edge running its entire length, is extremely rare in the
United States, being restricted largely to Mexico, the Philippines, and certain republics of Central and South America (pp. 55, 129, 132; Finsterbusch, 1929: 94-97, 105). It is interesting to note, particularly in light of the sense of fairness surrounding the use of artificial gaffs, that gaffs coming loose or off during any of the different types of fights may not be replaced or reheeled; this may be in compliance with the ruling that there can be no assistance given the cocks after the fight has commenced, by anyone, either in or out of the pit (Wortham, 1961: 15). However, such a rule makes the fight an effort of partnership between man and bird. Not only is the cock dependent upon man for food, conditioning, and exercise, but victory itself may well depend upon the skill of the individual heeling or attaching the gaffs to the cock.

The intricacies of cockfighting rules were not fully addressed within the description of a cockfight and have not been revealed here; however, the analysis of the individual rules per se is not the object of this thesis and would not contribute to the understanding of the social structure of cockfighting (for a more complete understanding of the technical considerations of the cockfighting rules, the reader is referred to the Modern Tournament and Derby Rules, Wortham, 1961; Modern Chicago and Midwestern Derby Rules, The Chicago and Midwestern Fraternity, n.d.; McCall's Rules, McCall, [1932]; and Battle Royal Rules, The Feathered Warrior, n.d.).
Conditioning and Pre-Fight Care

As was noted earlier, the cockfight is the culminating product of those participating in the activity, but it is by no means the entire effort of the cockfighter. There is much preliminary work with the bird before he is ever pitted. At least two months prior to a stag being fought, he must be heel-cut, dubbed, and conditioned. Heel-cutting refers to removing the natural spurs with a spur saw, thus leaving a nub; the artificial spur or gaff sockets slip over the nubs and are firmly secured to the legs of the bird. The spurs are removed even if the bird will never be pitted but will be used only for breeding; this is done so that the cock will not injure the game hen during breeding.

Dubbing refers to removing the stag's comb and wattles, using dubbing shears. This is done for several reasons: 1) the opponent cannot attach its beak to the comb or wattles and, while having a secure hold, spur the "victim"; 2) it takes an ounce of weight off, and; 3) it makes the bird look neater and more streamlined. In some instances, certain feathers are also trimmed, largely to remove those feathers that an opponent may grab, for purposes of keeping the bird cooler, and where the feathers are cut at angles (such as wing feathers), to inflict possible damage to the eyes of the opponent.

Last, conditioning can make the difference between success and defeat. Overall, conditioning includes feeding and a daily life of quality as well as exercise. However,
within limits, it is conceived largely as exercise in preparation for pitting. The number and types of conditioning "theories" seem almost limitless. However, according to the informants, there are apparently several aspects of conditioning that seem widely employed regardless of the "theory." One such common practice is that of sparring or allowing two cocks to "practice" fighting, much like sparring in the sport of boxing. Muffs, quite similar to small leather boxing gloves, are used to cover the nubs of sparring cocks as even the bare nubs may inflict serious injury. Another practice is that of keeps. A keep is employed to raise and maintain the cock. Ideally, the keep will be in the country with a source of fresh water and without the confines of fences. There is only one cock to the keep and he is usually provided with several game hens. Often, because of limited space, keeps are fenced in, encompassing an area about ten feet wide and thirty feet long. About two weeks to a month prior to a scheduled fight, the cocks are taken from their keeps and are placed in conditioning pens. The conditioning pen is a small cage and is employed to stabilize the weight of the cocks, to control their diets and give them vitamin supplements, to strengthen their leg muscles, and to "dry" out the cocks or thicken their blood. To strengthen the leg muscles, the conditioning pen is filled with about six or eight inches of straw; the cock's food will be thrown in the pen and fall to the bottom, thus making the cock scratch through the straw to eat. To "dry" the cock out, it is given no water during
the keep, but obtains its water through tomato or apple chunks. Then, about two or three days before the fight, the cock is provided with no source of water. This is done to thicken the cock's blood so that any blood loss from wounds inflicted during the fight will be minimal.

Also employed during conditioning are flys and runs, types of exercises. A long padded board is used in each exercise; for the run, the cock is placed on the padded board, and the cockfighter, or the one conducting the conditioning exercises, places each hand to either side of the cock. Then by moving his hands back and forth along the board, the cock is forced to run back and forth along the board. This is normally done ten or fifteen minutes each day. The fly consists of setting the cock on the padded board and then moving the board in a sporadic pattern, causing the bird to flap its wings to maintain its balance, thus strengthening wing muscles and the grip of the talons.

Indeed, the full expose' of cockfighting rules, equipment, and conditioning "theories" and practices is left to folklorists and ethnographers. However, it was felt justified to present more than just a passing commentary on such in that they are of some sociological concern, primarily by lending credibility to the assertion of organization as being integral to the social structure of cockfighting; indeed, conditioning is not carried out haphazardly, but certain methods, practices, and "theories" are adhered to.
Another essential element of the cockfighting activity that seems to be second only to the cockfight itself is that of gambling. As Carson states, "Betting is the essential feature of cockfighting... (1972: 174). Although gambling is an integral part of cockfighting, it is unstructured and informal in that it is not conducted by or through third parties, but conducted directly between the two parties involved. The bets, on a person to person basis, are usually settled at the end of each fight, and in cash. Further, there is no "book" and the pit does not receive a cut of the action; the pit owner and/or manager receives no fee for permitting gambling, his payment being the admission fees for spectators. In this entire sense then, gambling at cockfights is not dissimilar from poolroom gambling (Polsky, 1967: 48). From observation, discussion, and participation, there seems to be very little giving of odds unless it is from a "fanatical" or extremely confident spectator or participant (with the exception of it occurring not uncommonly in the fourth mode of gambling cited below). This is probably attributable to the preciseness employed in matching the opposing fighting cocks, thus removing much physical criteria on which odds could be based.

The placing of bets or wagers on any specific cockfight deepens its significance, particularly with the spectators and others making the bets, but such is also true of the cockfighters, particularly if bets are prolific or high or both.
Such is evidenced by Whyte's description of corner boys in a working-class district of Boston:

Gambling plays an important role in the lives of Cornerville people. Whatever game the corner boys play, they nearly always bet on the outcome. When there is nothing at stake, the game is not considered a real contest. This does not mean that the financial element is all-important. I have frequently heard men say that the honor of winning was much more important than the money at stake. The corner boys consider playing for money the real test of skill and, unless a man performs well when money is at stake, he is not considered a good competitor (1955: 140).

In a similar sense, those who readily pay their debts are of the sporting ethic and are seen as somewhat analogous to "a good competitor."

Betting in the realm of cockfighting has four possible modes, the first three being similar to the three modes conceived by Polsky (1967: 46) in his characterization of the betting relationship in pool or billiard games. The four modes of gambling are as follows: 1) participant (i.e., cock owner) against participant; 2) participant against spectator; 3) spectator against spectator, and; 4) a wager involving a "hawker," the hustler of the cockfighting enterprise. The first two modes occur with much less frequency than do the last two. There is apparently an air of reluctance among many of the participants (i.e., cockfighters) to make bets while they are participating in tournaments, derbies, and mains because of the general consensus which permeates those who participate as fighters in the activity - victory being
of greater import than monetary gain. Indeed, those interviewed asserted that most of those who fight cocks are content with the first or second place winnings (when victorious) and contended rather ideally that this money, often being in the thousands, is second to victory. There is further consensus, through implication, that cockfighters refrain from betting because this would be demeaning and contrary to the respect that cockfighters hold for good fighting cocks. While it may or may not be considered deviant (within the realm of cockfighting) for cockfighters to bet, such does occur, and hack fights are but one such example. Further, cockfighters, particularly those who have had several recent poor showings or who are in other ways unfavorable to the spectators, may be goaded and taunted into making wagers with some of the spectators by their jeering and harassment. However, it must be noted that in such situations, the action leading to the engagement of the bet is initiated by the spectators. Thus, the cockfighter enters into the wager through "entrapment" and the wager usually serves the cockfighter as a defensive mechanism (or at least an attempt to employ one).

Betting among cockfighters (specifically the first mode) may be initiated through the same manner; one participant harassing his opponent until the opponent, again searching for a defensive mechanism, probably of status betting, attempts to escape the pressure and center of attention by retorting with an invitation to engage in a wager. Regardless of
whether the invitation is accepted or not, its mere presence will normally terminate any harassment. When this situation does arise, it is not uncommon to find the wagers larger than those with and among spectators. Indeed, the participant is no longer trying to maintain himself with spectators who have only little prestige and status within the realm of cockfighting; rather, he is attempting to maintain his position with and as a member of the cocking cohort. Thus, the larger his wager, the more difficult it is for the goading opponent to maintain his place as the dominant intimidator. It is the general "reluctance" of the cockfighters (i.e., participants) to engage in wagers that limit the frequencies of the first two modes of betting. However, the presence is recognized and noted of those cockfighters who disregard the "stigma" attached to their betting and rather place emphasis on the monetary potential of the situation. Indeed, at least twelve of the twenty informants most discretely suggested that many cockfighters bet on their cocks, and this practice is accepted if they are very subtle and their bets are largely undetected; thus, those cockfighters commonly betting on the outcome of their fights apparently arrange for one of their friends to make any wagers for them. However, such an arrangement would probably be necessary, even discounting the general contention that it would be demeaning and contrary to the respect held for good birds, because the cockfighter would be too preoccupied with his bird and other obligations to place his own bets.
It has been determined from observation and interviews that in the cockfighting situation, the third mode of betting (i.e., spectator against spectator) occurs most frequently for several reasons, not unrelated to the less frequent occurrence of the first two modes of gambling. Gambling among spectators occurs most frequently simply because of the greater number of spectators than participants present, but even in a relative sense, the frequency of occurrence of the third mode is greater than that of the first two modes simply because of the cited reluctance of some of the cockfighters to make bets while they are actively participating as owners and fighters.

A central yet vague figure in the realm of gambling is the hawker. At the cockpit, the hawker may be found in the bleachers working bets with spectators all about him, possibly making more than ten or twelve individual bets per fight. If it is even money, so much the better for the hawker, but it is apparently not unusual for him to give odds to attract individual bets. Another not uncommon place for the hawker to position himself is down in front of the bleachers near the pit; while facing the spectators and constantly checking the progress of the fight after it has commenced, with shouts and gestures of the fingers and hands, the hawker will indicate his preference and odds, if any, as well as the amount he wishes to stake.

A quite unique phenomenon within the realm of gambling in the sport of cockfighting probably finds existence in no other form of gambling; it is apparently quite acceptable
for the hawker to change his preference to the other cock if the progress of the fight is proving his initial choice a bad one. That is, the hawker is, in a sense, covering his bets. However, this is not an extremely common practice for several reasons: first, any bets made by the hawker with respect to his initial choice are still binding; second, the hawker must usually offer extremely unfavorable odds for himself if he switches his choice, because often by the time the hawker switches cocks, it is obvious to many spectators which cock has the advantage; third, many of the hawkers, particularly those not using or having backers (which indeed would be the majority of the hawkers in the opinions of the informants) refrain from switching cocks in all but the most obvious of situations because of the financial burden it would impose on them, particularly in light of their knowledge that just one blow from either cock in the right area could end the fight. It is difficult to estimate the number of hawkers present at any cockfight since many sit in the stands, but as many as six and eight have been observed standing around the pit by the writer when perhaps as few as two hundred spectators were present.

Another rather peculiar phenomenon within the realm of betting is directly related to the physical structure of the cockpits. Indeed, as noted by Goffman (1963a: 151-153), the physical setting may have tremendous import on the social setting and interaction. In that the cockpit per se is circular and bleachers or other seating arrangements are
set up around the pit, spectators will sit facing hawkers around the pit and other spectators in bleachers across the pit; while undoubtedly the majority of bets are made among spectators sitting close to each other, it is by no means uncommon for the engagement of wagers between spectators on opposite sides of the pit to occur. Indeed, settling such bets among physically polarized spectators and hawkers around the pit could hold a great deal of potential spectator movement. However, in many instances when such bets are made, the loser merely folds up the amount owed and, securing it with a rubber band, flips it down to the hawker or across the pit toward the winning spectator. If the monetary projectile falls short of its target, it is picked up and passed back to the winner in question. As there is no great barrage of such rubber-banded missiles after each cockfight, the engagement of such bets apparently occurs only minimally. However, this is one "case in point" cited by the activists of the sport wishing to convey the aura of honesty among the supporters of cockfighting.

Such betting is normally done by finger betting; one finger for one dollar, five fingers for five dollars and on up in some sort of combination to state the desired amount of the wager. Odds, if any, are also given by indications of the fingers. A clinched fist indicates that the individual will go no higher in his wager and/or odds.

Another phenomenon related to the aspect of gambling has as its impetus a concern for social security and
pleasantness. It seems to be an unwritten rule, but one widely known and honored, as was evidenced by sixteen of the twenty informants making specific unsolicited references to it, that when going to cockfights in small groups (usually a car load or several car loads from a single area or pit association), one does not engage in wagers with any of those with whom he is traveling. The reason for this is obviously to enhance the social pleasantness of the return trip. In a similar sense, one does not usually make a wager against the cock of a relative or friend, the latter often including anyone from the same pit association.

Although there was no specific norm discerned concerning the role of sex in gambling or making wagers, it should be noted that gambling is almost exclusively limited to males. However, this may be explained, at least partially, by the observation and general consensus of the informants that women very rarely attend cockfights without the company of men, the relationship most normally being husband and wife. Thus, two members of the same family making wagers may prove prohibitively expensive. This is not to contend that women never bet, but only that the frequency is rare, and the man will probably establish the wager for the woman if she does bet. It should also be noted that there was no specific norm discerned that addressed women attending cockfights by themselves; it was only contended by the informants that the woman's interest in cockfighting, if any, was usually through her husband.
With respect to the size of bets for an "average" size weekend tournament, derby, or main, three informants reported a low of two dollars, two informants reported a high of "about one hundred dollars," while the majority of the informants reported individual wagers of from five to twenty dollars. However, all of the informants explicitly stated that for holiday fights, memorial fights, and multi-day fights drawing larger crowds and more (quality) cockfighters, it is certainly not unusual for bets to run as high as five hundred dollars, and bets of one and two thousand dollars and more are not unheard of. The warning, "Don't wager enough to hurt at home," appears in print (Ruport, n.d.: 13); it is inferred from such a warning then that gambling is but a secondary leisure activity of cockfighting itself.

Indeed then, as has been revealed, betting or gambling is at the very least one essential feature of cockfighting. Further, gambling is in part responsible, along with other features of cockfighting, for the label of "deviant" applied to the activity; however, such is involved in, and is part of the legal history and status of the sport.

**Legal History and Status**

The earliest legal restrictions regarding cockfighting in English-speaking countries were not concerned with the welfare of the birds but rather with the expenditure of leisure time of those supporting cockfighting. Thus it was that in 1365 Edward III ordered the Sheriffs of London to make cockfighting and certain other amusements illegal so
that leisure time could be better spent shooting the bow and learning other defensive arts. Later, the government took a very serious view of the possibilities which cockpits and other public places presented for traitors, rebels, and other trouble-makers to meet and secretly make plans of conspiracy. Hence, the Cromwellian Act of 1654 which prohibited cockfighting was actually a political measure and not a humanitarian act in that Cromwell was concerned with the prevention of rebellion and not cruelty (Fitz-Barnard, [1921]: 8-9; Scott, [1957]: 137-138). Later still, the sentiments of many regarding cockfighting was (and is) expressed in the following statement:

The most unholy feature of cockfighting...has nothing whatever to do with the birds taking part in it. It is concerned exclusively with those who encourage the sport, and who witness the contests... Nor does the purely commercial aspect constitute the main ground for objection. The reason for it lies in the fact that cockfighting, because of its sanguinary features, appeals to, arouses, and develops brutality and savagery in the minds of the spectators (p. 11).

Thus it was that Charles II established a law during his reign (1660-1685) forbidding betting at public cockpits, done to curtail quarreling, fighting, rioting, and other similar incidents (p. 138). In a similar sense, "Pittsburgh in early Federal times was devoted to the fighting chickens, the spectators and handlers willingly risking the three-dollar fine imposed because cocking encouraged idleness, fraud, gambling and profanity" (Carson, 1972: 65). However, the first law to specifically bar the fighting of cocks in the United States was enacted in New York in 1867 (Leavitt, 1970: 18-19).
The contemporary laws concerning cockfighting in the United States are neither uniform nor well defined, as it is a misdemeanor, and each state designs its own statutes. Indeed, the possession of cocks for the purpose of fighting is in itself illegal in some states, while other states may arrest and prosecute spectators at a cockfight whether or not they are owners of participating birds. Other states provide for the law enforcement agencies to seize the birds and necessary equipment (Scott, [1957]: 123).

Of all the States, however, California takes the most rigorous measures against the sport, for not only does it have all the aforementioned penalties, but in addition the possession of artificial spurs is illegal, and dubbing is prohibited. On the other hand, the law in some States does little to prevent the holding of contests. Thus in Kansas, cockfighting is permitted on any weekday; in Alabama it is legal so long as it is held in conditions of strict privacy; in Kentucky, any prohibition applies only to such fights as are "for profit" (p. 123).

With certain restrictions aside, the fighting of cocks are within the bounds of legality in only six states (Alabama, Florida, Kansas, Kentucky, New Mexico, and Oklahoma). However, there are those states that have no specific laws against cockfighting, but rather proceedings are taken on the grounds of cruelty; indeed, one contention is that birds are fowl and not animals. Thus, certain states, Maryland and Vermont notable among them, have defined "animal" as including every form of living creature except man (pp. 123-124).

Though the early laws have such contemporary counterparts, they seem to have little effect, preventative or otherwise,
particularly in light of certain statistics (see Booth, 1970: 31; Finsterbusch, 1929: 352; Scott [1957]: 124), though such statistics may be somewhat questionable in that any accurate figure concerning the extent of cockfighting in the United States is obviously impossible to obtain because of its illegal nature. Further, being a "crime without victims," the laws concerning cockfighting are largely unenforceable, primarily because of the lack of a complainant and the relatively low visibility of the offense; that is, cockfighting, in a sense, does not take place publicly, but is witnessed largely by participants, spectators, and other such supporters of the sport. "Another apparent consequence of privacy and lack of a complainant (combined with public ambivalence about the law) is the invitation to police corruption" (Schur, 1965: 171). "...in many of the States where the sport, on the ground of cruelty, comes under legal prohibition, the law does not appear to be enforced, the authorities often deliberately turning shut-eyes on its violation" (Scott, [1957]: 124). Indeed two detectives for the Kentucky State Police revealed in two separate conversations and interviews that under normal circumstances, they would take no legal action against any cockfights that they had knowledge of unless they received a complaint or "tip"; it was implied that action would then be taken, largely to maintain their position as a law enforcement agency. If state laws concerning cockfighting are so lax and no great effort is made to enforce such laws, it may be asked why interested lobbying groups
do not attempt to remove such laws from the books. Supporters of cockfighting have no real viable interest in removing such prohibitive laws if no concerted effort is made to enforce such laws. That is, as the situation now exists, cockfighting attracts very little attention upon itself and therefore suffers little legal harassment. However, a lobbying group trying to remove such laws would bring on state-wide attention and opposing groups calling for stringent enforcement. Also, individual law enforcement agents not enforcing such laws is not to assert that the state in question condones activities which violate these laws.

Indeed, in support of this contention that a great many, possibly most, advocates of cockfighting are content with the laws as they exist now are the informants' responses to the question, "Should cockfighting be run differently than it is now? If you answered 'yes,' what would you like to see changed?" (question forty-three of the interview schedule, Appendix D). Upon discussion of this question, all twenty informants addressed the laws, the statuses of such, and their attitudes. Only two informants (10%) responded in the affirmative, one expressing a desire for the legalization of cockfighting, the other not only desiring the legalization of cockfighting, but placing it under state control, having the pits licensed and frequently inspected to enforce implemented standards, as well as the establishment of some type of tax system, the taxation system being employed in some unspecified manner to prevent state and local government
corruption from entering. However, of significance are the consistent responses of the eighteen remaining informants (90%). It was their contention that the laws should remain as they are, as even the laws being removed and cockfighting made legal would bring on much attention and harassment by the various humane concerns. As it is, there is evidently very little legal harassment and the few raids taking place are seen as a political move, not an attempt to prohibit cockfighting. Further, they stated that if legalized, there would be too much "red tape" involved and as it is, they are seldom raided. Most stated that they "just want to be left alone."

Similarly, concerning the fairness or unfairness of such laws ("Concerning the laws about cockfighting, do you feel that they are fair, not sure, unfair? Briefly tell why you answered this question the way you did:" question forty-five, Appendix D), as was to be expected, all twenty of the informants contended that the laws restricting or forbidding cockfighting are indeed unfair. It was a unanimous consensus that such laws are infringements upon individual rights and freedoms concerning activities and expenditures of leisure time. Eleven of the informants (55%) also contended that such laws are unfair because those who do not like cockfighting do not attend and are thus not effected; that is, it is a "victimless activity." Three of the informants (15%) stated that the majority of people do not understand the sport and thus have no right to condemn it or to make laws against it.
However, this question elicited responses concerning opinions of the laws per se; similarly, all the informants stated that while the laws are unfair, the enforcement of such laws is not too stringent as there seems to be little enforcement, and they are usually left alone.

**Conclusions**

In setting forth the history and description of cockfighting and the surrounding activities, this chapter largely provided the reader with a description of the activity as it was conceived by this research. It became apparent, largely through secondary sources, that the history of cockfighting is old, its distribution, extensive, and its influences, greater than often realized. However, of further value, this chapter revealed much about the organization and structure of cockfighting through the ethnographic description and discussion of the sport, the various types of cockfights, the rules of cockfighting, the conditioning and care of the cocks, the gambling, and the legal status of cockfighting. In providing the reader a conception of cockfighting that is congruent with the perspectives of this study, this chapter becomes a prerequisite to the following chapter.
CHAPTER IV

COCKFIGHTING AS A SUBCULTURE

Introduction

In this chapter, literature concerning the sociological concept of subculture is surveyed to provide a set of traits, characteristics, and requisites for the existence of a subculture. Such requisites and characteristics are then shown to be existent in cockfighting. This chapter will then move from demonstrating the existence of a subculture to an exposition of the subculture itself. Thus, as cockfighting as an activity was exposed through ethnographic description in the previous chapter, cockfighting as a subculture will be developed and exposed in this chapter. However, this is not to contend that the thesis will shift its orientation from ethnography to sociology; since the thesis is structured about the sociological concept of social structure, it would be more accurate to state that the study has a sociological foundation supplemented by and upon which is built ethnographic description. Again, findings, where relevant, will be presented in this chapter.

Culminating Evidence of a Subculture

As a point of initial clarification, this thesis does not assert, as is so often done in the discipline of
sociology, an implicit association of the term "subculture" (and its connotations) solely with criminal, delinquent, or deviant phenomena. The author agrees with Arnold (1970: 4) that the study of subcultures in any substantive area of sociology may well furnish the much sought-after data for the theories of the middle range, thus escaping confrontation with the abstract data of macrosociology and likewise escaping the disjointed data analysis plaguing microsociology. Subcultural analysis, whether deviant or not, facilitates the gathering of data in quantities small enough for systematic analysis and large enough to be of theoretical and practical significance. Following from Gordon (1947: 40), it is thus felt academically profitable to make more extensive use of the concept of the subculture.

In "Deep Play: Notes on the Balinese Cockfight" (Geertz, 1972: 10), one of the only two professional and academic articles concerning the social milieu and structure of cockfighting, Geertz contends that the Balinese people attending cockfights are not vertebrate enough to be called a group and not structureless enough to be called a crowd. Geertz (p. 10) turns to Goffman’s "focused gathering" (see Goffman, 1961: 9-10):

...a set of persons engrossed in a common flow of activity and relating to one another in terms of that flow. Such gatherings meet and disperse; the participants in them fluctuate; the activity that focuses them is discreet - a particulate process that reoccurs rather than a continuous one that endures. They take their form from the situation that evokes them, the floor
on which they are placed, as Goffman puts it; but it is a form, and an articulate one, nonetheless. For the situation, the floor is itself created. . .by the cultural preoccupations (Geertz, 1972: 10).

By the clandestine nature and very lack of general knowledge about cockfighting in the United States, those actively participating in or observing the activity with some degree of regularity constitute more than a "focused gathering," being more structured and vertebrate. They must maintain rather close-knit contacts with others of a similar position since, unlike the Balinese culture, it is not widely accepted as a sport, legitimate or otherwise. It is in this sense that those involved in cockfighting in the United States constitute more than a "focused gathering"; it will be analyzed in this thesis as a subculture.

There is a high level of consistency in the subcultural literature (to be cited) with respect to the concept of subculture and its components, and such characteristics and requisites will be employed to give direction and support to the contention that the social milieu and organization of American cockfighting is subcultural. Gordon says of subculture that it is

...a concept used...to refer to a sub-division of a national culture composed of a combination of factorable social situations such as class status, ethnic background, regional affiliation, but forming in their combination a functioning unity which has an integrated impact on the participating individual (Gordon, 1947: 40-41).
Similarly, Lasswell argues that

. . .every group that is at all functional
must have a culture of its own that is
somewhat similar to the cultures of other
groups with whom it interacts. Such a
group culture is not partial or miniature,
it is a complete, full-blown set of beliefs,
knowledges, and ways for adjustment to
the physical and social environment (Lasswell,
1965: 211).

Indeed, this is not unlike Hollingshead's contention when
he said,

Persons in more or less continuous
association evolve behavior traits and
cultural mechanisms which are unique to
the group and differ in some way from those
of other groups and from the larger socio-
cultural complex. That is, every continuing
social group develops a variant culture and
a body of social relations peculiar and
common to its members (Hollingshead, 1939:
816).

Clearly, Hollingshead was not referring to subculture but
rather to behavior systems. However, Hollingshead's article,
written in 1939, appeared seven years prior to Green's passing
use of "subculture" and eight years prior to the first
specific attention focused on the term "subculture" by
Gordon in his article, "The Concept of the Sub-culture and
its Application" (Arnold, 1970: 8). Indeed, Arnold makes
the explicit point that "...in studying the notion of
subculture it is important not to equate the term with the
idea" (p. 8). That is, a great deal was written about
subcultures prior to the application of the term and
label "subculture," and Arnold makes the point in
drawing the concept of subculture from Sutherland's
"Behavior Systems in Crime" (see Sutherland, 1966: 287-301).
For the purposes of specificity and consistency, it is advantageous to briefly examine the concept of a subculture as a behavior system. Specifically applying the concept to crime, Sutherland states,

...a behavior system...includes, in addition to the individual acts, the codes, traditions, esprit de corps, social relationships among the direct participants, and indirect participation of many other persons. It is essentially a groupway of life (Sutherland, 1966: 239).

Similarly, Hollingshead states,

The general characteristics of a specific behavior system include the following: (1) a group of specialists recognized by society, as well as by themselves, who possess an identifiable complex of common culture values, communication devices (argot or other symbols), techniques, and appropriate behavior patterns; (2) the acquisition by initiates of the body of esoteric knowledge and appropriate behavior patterns before the novices are accepted by the initiated; (3) appropriate sanctions applied by the membership to control members in their relations with one another and with the larger society, and to control nonmembers in their relations with members (Hollingshead, 1939: 816-817).

Indeed, several points, as noted by Irwin, are particularly relevant with respect to studying deviant behavior as a subcultural phenomenon. To paraphrase, 1) systematic deviant behavior will have no meaning outside its subcultural context, and a comprehension and appreciation of the values, beliefs, and symbolic systems of the members of the subculture is a prerequisite to understanding the behavior. Further, 2) the development of a subculture requires that a group of persons remains in interaction and/or communication over an
extended period of time, thus enabling a re-organization of their beliefs, values, and symbolic systems around the particular circumstances of their common relationships. Such re-organization requires a protracted time period of interaction, a strong commitment to the group, a general congruence of the individual members' values and beliefs, and distinct qualities in the activities and interests of the group. Also, 3) a subculture must develop certain aspects which are in violation of the standards of the conventional society; thus, there cannot be a strong commitment to certain conventional values and beliefs by the subcultural participants. Finally, 4) the subculture must be able to perpetuate itself not only through the recruitment and induction of new members but also through resisting informal and formal sanctions and other attempts to destroy the group by the larger host culture (Irwin, 1970: 109-111).

It should be noted that of the different sources reviewed in this thesis which outline the fundamental prerequisites for the existence of a subculture, all focus, although to varying degrees, on essentially the same qualities and conditions. Thus, to review further descriptive and analytical essays of subcultures (or behavior systems) would only prove to be redundant. In using then the above citations to establish the parameters of a subculture, this formulation will be employed to establish the following subcultural requisites and characteristics, and ultimately will be
employed in the analysis of cockfighting. It becomes obvious that the requisites for the existence of a subculture become the possessions of the subculture, those being members of diverse backgrounds but sharing a common interest (Gordon, 1947: 40-41), a body of social relations (involving statuses and roles) peculiar and common to its members (Hollingshead, 1939: 816; Sutherland, 1966: 289), socialization of new members through the acquisition of the body of (esoteric) knowledge unique to the subculture, appropriate behavior patterns for members (Hollingshead, 1939: 817), an atmosphere of esprit de corps among the members, codes, traditions (Sutherland, 1966: 289), beliefs, knowledges (often esoteric), a complex of culture values (Lasswell, 1965: 211; Irwin, 1970: 110; Hollingshead, 1939: 817), symbolic systems (Irwin, 1970: 110), and devices of communication and/or interaction (p. 110; Hollingshead, 1939: 817). All such requisites or possessions, being unique to the subculture, will have no meaning outside of the subcultural context and thus a comprehension and appreciation of such is necessary in understanding the behavior of the subculture (Irwin, 1970: 109).

**Communication Devices**

While some of the evidence of a cockfighting subculture is quite tangible and obvious, other evidence, being no less significant, is extremely subtle. Perhaps the most obvious, and an essential point of verification for the existence of a subculture (Hollingshead, 1939: 817), is that of communication
devices. The most tangible of communication devices are the several magazines published currently in the United States and devoted to the sport of cockfighting. Such publications "...enjoy the advertising support of breeders of game cocks, announce dates of future tournaments, and function as a buying guide to cockfighting equipment and supplies" (Carson, 1972: 170). Further, many articles and editorials appear concerning the values, conduct, and the esprit de corps of those actively involved in cockfighting. Two of these magazines, Grit and Steel and The Gamecock, are edited by women; they are published in Gaffney, South Carolina and Hartford, Arkansas, respectively. A third monthly publication is the Feathered Warrior, published in DeQueen, Arkansas. The Gamecock has been in continuous publication since 1934, Feathered Warrior since 1904, and Grit and Steel since 1899.

The existence of such publications is not in itself a requisite for the existence of a subculture, but further support for its existence is that while all twenty of the informants were very familiar with these publications, it is extremely rare for anyone never having been associated with cockfighting or subcultural members to even realize the existence of such publications. Such publications are then of an esoteric nature and thus constitute a body of esoteric knowledge. All of the informants proved so familiar with the three publications that they were readily able to tell of the respective places of publication, the editors by name, and regular features and columns appearing
in each. Eighteen of the twenty informants (90%) subscribed to at least two of the three publications, the two varying among the three, while the remaining two informants (10%) each subscribed to one of the three publications. Extremely significant, both in terms of explaining the lack of all informants subscribing to all the magazines and giving a more accurate account of the distribution and extent of the magazines, is the fact that all of the informants reported that they had ready access through friends to the publication or publications to which they did not subscribe.

The contemporary publications are but a part of the existing cockfighting literature. All such literature has a unique position in the realm of cockfighting with respect to the content and the uses of the publications. These books and periodicals offer subcultural members much in the way of innovation in cock breeding, raising, and training for the improvement of their cocks' pit performance, general history of the sport, history and special qualities of various breeds, conducts and codes, as well as announcements of important mains, tournaments, and derbies. "In short, the literature of cocking may be described as extensive, esoteric, and primarily practical. . ." (Parsons, 1969: 275).

The cockfighting literature, which is by and large unknown to outsiders, cannot be assembled in its entirety due to the voluminous quantity and the relative rarity of many of the books and periodicals. Much of the literature (see Appendix A) dates from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. At
the time of many of the publications, the press runs were limited and many publications are now to be found only in the private libraries of a rather reticent people (p. 275).

The existence and utilization of such literature, whether contemporary or of an antiquated period, lends much to support the existence of a subculture, as well as to its perpetuation and support. The circulation of literature among subcultural participants brings standardization to cockfighting rules, procedures, and various fighting forms. The wide distribution of literature also helps to preserve and perpetuate the tradition and lore of cockfighting by keeping at the surface certain indices of the subculture. Finsterbusch (1929: 352) contends that the cocking literature does indeed help preserve the tradition of cockfighting. Of cocking literature, he says, "Should the press slacken, the whole sport would come to grief" (p. 352). Clearly then, the literature serves to strengthen the rather extensive cockfighting network.

Another device of communication is an effort of and has its origin with pit owners, many having printed seasonal schedule cards for distribution to those attending fights at the pits, not unlike the wallet size schedule cards for baseball, football, and other sports. Such schedule cards normally measure no more than two and a half inches by four inches, and include date and time of the match, type of match, entry fee and options, referees, location of pit, pit owner and telephone number and address, and spectator
admission costs. Such cards, while largely for the financial benefit of the pit owners, provide a certain quantity of subcultural solidarity and support, ensuring that an adequate number of spectators and participants are aware of upcoming matches and will be present.

Another device of communication, having even greater significance than publications in lending support to the existence of a subculture, is that of argot or cant. As noted by Polsky (1967: 107), linguists usually make a distinction between two kinds of specialized slang: argot and cant.

(a) a noncriminal group's specialized slang, called argot, which of course is unintelligible to outsiders (and thus may occasionally be used for secrecy), but nevertheless is developed and used primarily to meet the need for technical terms and secondarily as a way of bolstering group solidarity; and (b) a criminal group's specialized slang, called cant, which is designed and used primarily to make the group's conversation unintelligible to outsiders. . . . I [Polsky] contend that "cant," in the linguists' sense of the term, has not been demonstrated to exist, and cannot be demonstrated to exist, for any American criminal group whatsoever. (pp. 107-108).

Thus, given Polsky's distinction and argument and the above description of "argot," this term will be used to refer to the unique language employed by those of the cockfighting subculture. Indeed, Mencken (1963: 754) recognizes the existence of a rather extensive cockfighting argot. The analysis of the argot of any subculture or group normally requires an amount of time and space disproportionate to
its significance in an overall account of the group. What follows is not intended to be a complete study of the cockfighters' argot and the vocabulary list contained in Appendix G is not to be taken as exhaustive. Rather, an examination of the cockfighting argot from a sociological perspective will be made.

As noted by Polsky (1967: 106-107), a common misapprehension, even among linguists and social scientists, is that the slang of any socially deviant group is developed through a desire of secrecy and protection of the group; this is commonly believed to be the argot's primary function. Indeed, "common sense" does not allow the total disregard of this assumption. "But all it shows eo ipso is that the argot of any special group (deviant or otherwise) includes many terms for things peculiar to that type of group, is in good part a technical vocabulary that must be learned" (p. 107). The argot of the cockfighting subculture is no exception.

The cockfighters' argot, like other American deviant argots, reveals several facets that do not support the "secrecy" interpretation. First, as was determined by complete participation at the pits where the researcher was assumed to be another subcultural member, cockfighters and other subcultural participants invariably employ their argot among themselves even when outsiders are not present, a fact which tends to discredit any secretive intent. Second, the meanings of cockfighting argot may be picked up quite
easily by any outsider who is an attentive listener or questioner. Indeed, the majority of cockfighters and others in the cockfighting subculture seem to take a great deal of pride in explaining and defining to interested outsiders the terms unique to the subcultural social milieu. Often the argot is used in such a context that the meanings are obvious. Third, the elaboration of the cockfighting argot exceeds any conceivable necessity for developing either a set of terms for deviant phenomena or a complete technical vocabulary. It is this third point that tacitly implies the real impetus for the development of argot, cockfighting and otherwise.

...in various specialized groups, be they deviant or merely specialized occupational groups, argots develop partly to provide a shorthand way of referring to technical processes but partly also as an elaborately inventive, ritualistic, often rather playful way of reinforcing group identity or "we-feeling." Thus the argot...sets them off not for the purpose of secrecy, but rather by way of helping their sense of colleagueship and esprit de corps (p. 107).

Even a cursory review of Appendix G will reveal that the lexicon in the cockfighting argot is largely representative of technical processes, materials, and techniques; that is, the great majority of the words making up the cockfighting argot refers to items, equipment, and processes that have no place, function, or use outside the cockfighting subculture. Thus, the argot is largely a technical language, but its usage by members does seem to function latently as a focal point for stimulating an environment conducive to a feeling of fraternalism and esprit de corps.
Unlike many other argots of subcultures and/or groups (see Polsky, 1967: 110), the cockfighting argot apparently does not have a discernable geography; that is, much like certain occupational argots, the cockfighting argot is apparently remarkably uniform from one pit to another, as well as from one region of the United States to another. At first impression, it is reasonable to attribute this relative uniformity to the wide circulation and distribution of cocking literature. However, the historical existence of such uniform argot discredits this assumption. Indeed, as is witnessed by various early books of a rather limited pressrun (see Fitz-Barnard, [1921]; Finsterbusch, 1929; Scott, [1957]; see also Appendix A), a uniform and consistent cockfighting argot preceded any mass publication and distribution of literature. Such may be at least partially inferred from the section, "Linguistical Influences" (pp. 46-49, this thesis). For this same historical reason, it is not possible to credit extensive travel (for the purpose of attending cockfights) and communication with the maintenance of this uniform argot. However, in part, it may be attributable to the importance of the tradition and culture of cockfighting.

Polsky (1967: 111) contends that the argot of most groups and subcultures, deviant and otherwise, normally varies temporally as well as spatially, some words being added or dropped, others remaining the same but receiving new meanings. Furthermore, the argot of socially deviant groups normally tends to change fairly rapidly, usually because an argot word becomes common coin among outsiders. A new word may then
take the place of the old one, not to ensure secrecy but to close their ranks, reaffirming their separateness and solidarity. Polsky says,

>. . .the argots of socially deviant groups (e.g., drug addicts, jazz musicians, professional criminals) tend to change even more rapidly than argots of respectable trades; when an argot word of such a group gets to be common coin among outsiders, the insiders often replace it. . . . not for purposes of secrecy, but by way of reaffirming their separateness and "in-groupness." (Thus, only outsiders these days still refer to a marijuana cigarette as a "reefer.") (p. l1l).

However, despite these strong predisposing factors, the cockfighters' argot does not display such change or replacement. There are several plausible reasons for this: first, the words borrowed are applied in a different sense than their original meaning, and thus have different connotations; second, many of those encountering and/or using such borrowed words often assume them to be "quaint" figures of speech, and rarely associate them with or recognize their origins as being that of the activity of cockfighting; third, in that there seems to be no deviant self-image developed (as will be revealed later), it is feasible to suspect that the followers of cockfighting do not feel threatened by such argot borrowing.

Further, a historical content analysis of the cockfighters' argot employing several early and/or short pressrun books concerning cockfighting (Fitz-Barnard, [1921]; Finsterbusch, 1929; Scott, [1957]) reveals very few changes when compared to the argot as discussed by the informants;
some processes, techniques, and objects had duplicate or several technical terms referring to each, and some of the duplicate terms have been dropped in lieu of the more prominent term or terms. Of all the terms and lexicon listed in Appendix G, only one, "hawker," has been found to have been added within the past twenty years; further, it is to be noted that of the cursory review of the argot's history, no process, technique, or item having a specific term (or terms), at least within the past fifty-five years and according to historical accounts from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (found within the three books cited above), has become obsolete, thus ensuring the maintenance of the cockfighters' argot as a whole. However, this is not to say that there were no words discerned which have become obsolete or obsolescent (i.e., used or understood only by "old timers"). Indeed, eight words were found to be obsolete and seven were found to be obsolescent, (these terms being so indicated in Appendix G). It should be noted that these obsolete and obsolescent terms, while being superseded by other terms, were not (found to have been) borrowed from the cockfighting argot and used in a more general way. Thus, it seems that in the situation of duplicate terms, one has merely come to be preferred over the other, and has not been replaced because the term has become common coin among outsiders.

What may explain not the mere survival but the actual well-being and maintenance of the cockfighting argot in its
historical sense? It is the writer's contention that the argot maintenance is seemingly related to the strong element of traditionalism in the subcultural ideology; the cockfighter seems to be more aware of, involved with, and has more reverence for his outstanding predecessors and their accomplishments than many other deviant groups have for their historical counterparts. Indeed, as became evident through the informants, cockfighters generally seem to take a great deal of pride in their knowledge and conveyance of the oral history of the sport. The acquisition of such esoteric knowledge seems to be almost a prerequisite to becoming a member of the subculture and such is employed in indoctrinating new members into the subculture.

Another form of communication, though more "formal," is a shorthand of cocking. Unfortunately, the writer did not detect the presence of such a communication device until six informants had already been interviewed. However, of the fourteen remaining informants, eleven (78.5%) proved their familiarity with the shorthand through translation and composition while the remaining three, (self) admittedly newcomers to the subculture, had only little success in understanding and translating the established shorthand. The following are but two examples of the shorthand:
Phst. B Bir. yel., hi. co., clct., ylgs., 3.8, translating as pheasant-breasted birchen yellow, high comb, clear cut, yellow legs, three pounds and eight ounces; B. B. Sil. Wi., lo. co., straw. frd., wlgs., 4.8, translating as black breasted silver wing, low comb, strawberry forward, white
legs, four pounds and eight ounces (Fitz-Barnard, [1921]: 23). As is obvious, this shorthand is useful largely for giving an accurate description of cocks participating in matches, thus preventing a switch of cocks at the last minute. However, such a communication device is also used in advertisements in magazines when one is selling a large number of cocks. There seems to be no book or other publication teaching this skill, and all fourteen informants stated that what they knew of the shorthand, they learned orally and through utilization from other subcultural members. Further, this communication device does not seem to be relatively new as it is referred to by Fitz-Barnard (p. 23), but no indication as to its origin was provided.

For a visual example of the patterns of subcultural membership communication via friendship and acquaintances, the reader is referred to Appendix F. This also provides a further indication of the existence and extent of the cockfighting subculture. Called a "reference-gram," because after contacting and interviewing the initial informants, the writer was often referred by the informants to other cockfighters who might grant interviews; this device visually displays, at least in part, the existing network with respect to comradery. It is particularly interesting to note that in a great many instances, when one cockfighter was referred to by another, they were not in the same (immediate) geographical area, although it is definitely known that there were numerous cockfighters in each immediate area in which an interview was completed.
The reason or reasons for the informants not giving reference to those subcultural members in their immediate area(s) are unclear. At first impression, one might assume that this is but a defensive ploy if the subcultural brotherhood and solidarity is stronger and more tightly knit in each locality. However, if this was an attempt to protect those in the immediate physical and social vicinity, then much greater protection could have been afforded by completely refusing to comply with the request for an interview. It is possible that when asked if they knew of anyone else they thought willing to grant an interview, they recommended only a very good friend (or a very strong enemy), but it seems highly unlikely that either would produce such a high occurrence of geographical separation. Further, the subjects were not consistent in recommending others of either more or less involvement in cockfighting than themselves, so it is doubtful that they were attempting to present themselves in a more favorable way through association. However, it is possible that the cockfighter (or other member) may feel a great deal of pride, as he does of his social value of traditionalism, concerning the extent of the subculture. This sentiment was explicitly expressed by all of the informants as they recalled other cockfighters and breeders, as well as various pits in numerous states, many with locations as far away as 800 or 1000 miles.

It should be noted that the various communicative devices discussed above are not isolated phenomena, but are functions intrinsic to the cockfighting subculture.
Subcultural Statuses and Roles

As it is with any social group or situation, there are certain statuses and roles to be fulfilled by the actors. Status, as defined by Horton and Hunt (1972: 105), is the "rank or position of an individual in a group. Role is the behavior expected of one who holds a certain status." Thus, "A role represents what a person is supposed to do in a given situation by virtue of the social position he holds" (Coutu, 1951: 180). Nine distinct, but by no means mutually exclusive, positions with their accompanying roles have been discerned within the cockfighting subculture. They are as follows: publishers and writers of cockfighting literature, handlers, referees, pit owners and managers, makers and suppliers of equipment and supplies, breeders, cockfighters, hawkers, and spectators. While some of the roles are fundamental to and necessary for the basic existence of the sport, other roles are but ancillary. However, ancillary roles are real and viable and a significant component of the subculture. Particular social status or "distribution of prestige, sometimes also called social honor" (Gusfield, 1963: 14) is attached to certain of these positions. Prestige in this sense is the "approval, respect, admiration, or deference a person or group is able to command by virtue of his or its imputed qualities or performances" (Johnson, 1960: 469). "Insofar as such...[positions] are identifiable and owe their unity to other than class elements, it is analytically useful to
call them 'status groups'" (Gusfield, 1963: 14). In
essence, these positions are but groups within the subculture
which receive their prestige from other groups within the
subculture. Of this situation, Gusfield says,

Since the social status of a group consists
in the evaluation and respect which it
receives from others, the status structure
is necessarily "subjective." Approval,
respect, and admiration are attitudes rather
than actions. They are conveyed through
acts, including language, which express
prestige by symbolizing an attitudinal
state of respect. Sociologists label such
prestige-laden acts as instances of
deference or, in negative terms, instances
of degradation (p. 15).

Such acts are largely ceremonial, marking the imputed prestige
of one group (or position) vis-à-vis other subcultural groups
(or positions).

One role (or status group) on which the existence and
functioning of a cockfight is not dependent, but which con-
tributes much to the existence of the subculture, is that
of the publishers and writers of cockfighting literature.
As noted above, these publications provide solidarity for
the subculture; not only is strength provided through
solidarity, but also through the standardization of roles,
preservation of tradition and history, and esprit de corps,
all provided partially through publications and literature.
However, possibly of even greater significance with respect
to subcultural solidarity and communication are the monthly
publications. At one time or another between 1879 and
the present, there were thirty-five journals published in the
United States (see Appendix A), but only three remain,
Grit and Steel, The Gamecock, and Feathered Warrior. Two of these magazines, Grit and Steel and The Gamecock, are edited by women. Indeed, it is not uncommon for females to author several articles within each issue of the three periodicals. Further, many articles are by younger cockers and Grit and Steel has a regular column, "Meet Our Younger Cockers," in which young cockfighters and others, often no older than ten years, contribute articles. With respect to ethnic origins and races, on occasion, articles appear coming from the Philippines, as well as by American Indians, Blacks, and Spanish Americans.

Further, these publications contain feature stories of quite successful cockfighters and cocks, have regular columns concerning the sciences involved in breeding, raising and conditioning cocks, and fight results from various pits around the country. A study of this nature, largely because of its methodological orientation, could not determine the value and significance of such publications in providing stability and solidarity to the subculture. However, their worth in this respect is not to be doubted, as their broad circulations (entering all fifty states along with overseas mailing lists) obviously contributes much in preserving traditionalism and providing solidarity. Further, the circulations are in part dependent upon the publications' stability and consistency, and these three journals are evidently rather stable, one enjoying seventy-seven continuous years of publication from the same community.
A second position, one not only an essential component of the subculture but completely necessary for the commencement of a cockfight, is that of the handler. Pitting or "Setting is the art of handling and assisting the game-cock in the pit, or, in the language of the prize-ring, of seconding him" (Fitz-Barnard, [1921]: 71). Indeed, a handler can make the difference between victory and defeat. Handling requires quickness in getting to the cock and saving him from another blow, judgment as when to press and when to rest the cock (p. 71), the ability to properly heel or attach the spurs (at the proper angle) to the bird's legs, as well as a body of other esoteric knowledge that is gained only after years of close involvement with the sport. Such knowledge is normally acquired only after years of active association with the subculture; indeed, evidently the majority of handlers are successful cockfighters in their own right. However, such handlers usually participate in larger and more prestigious tournaments and derbies than they are accustomed to entering as cockfighters, usually because of rather large entry fees and other costs and a level of prestige that many have not attained.

The handling, according to a general consensus among the informants, is normally performed for a more prominent cockfighter, quite often on a regular basis. Thus, a rather prominent cockfighter and a handler work together, forming an association of pit action. Further, it is not uncommon for such a handler to also assume much of the responsibility and care for the cockfighter's birds.
A handler serving in this capacity is generally at least in his twenties, probably because of the time investment required to attain the necessary esoteric knowledge and experience, and may be in his fifties or sixties. However, on occasion, a handler may be only twelve or fifteen if he has the proper skills and knowledge, often handling initially for his father or some other relative. It is possible that in such situations, family relations may provide as much impetus for youthful handlers as skills and knowledge. The physical requirements of quickness and agility often eliminate older people from this position. It is not uncommon for girls and women to serve as handlers, but their numbers are extremely small. This may be due to the possibility of injury, sometimes quite serious, to the handlers from the flurry of spurred cocks. Indeed, it seems that females participating in the other statuses or positions are positively encouraged by the male membership and the subculture in general. According to fourteen of the informants who have traveled widely to attend cockfights, it is not uncommon for American Indians, Spanish-speaking Americans, and Blacks to serve as handlers, particularly in the West and Southwestern United States. Many cock-fighters, particularly those participating in the less prestigious matches, serve as their own handlers.

The knowledge of cockfighting required of a handler is indeed universal. Not only must the handler be responsible for heeling, i.e., attaching the artificial spurs, but he
must possess the knowledge as when to press the cock and when to rest him, and to attend to the injuries of the cock during the rest periods, (not uncommonly sucking blood clots from the throats of the cocks), as well as much more esoteric knowledge. Further, "It is of extreme importance that the setter (pitter or handler) should know the rules thoroughly, and should be able to act accordingly with greatest alertness" (Finsterbusch, 1929: 233). That is, the handler must be so familiar with the rules of cockfighting that he may anticipate the referee's next call, thus enabling him to respond with a minimum of delay. Also, "It stands to reason that a setter must be perfectly experienced to do well, and such a man stands in high repute for his wonderful knowledge and ability" (p. 237). The position of handler then is one of high esteem and status; in essence, it is one of group status. Of those interviewed for this study, all made references generally to the role of handler as demanding respect and that handlers enjoy much esteem.

A third position found within the cockfighting subculture, and also constituting a status group, is that of referee. According to the twenty informants, those assuming the subcultural role of referee find it a revered position because of the respect that other subcultural members have for the vast knowledge (of rules specifically and cocking in general) required of a referee. Not only must the referee be familiar with any special pit rules in effect, he must also know thoroughly the formal rules of cockfighting (McCall's Rules, Modern Tournament and Derby Rules, Modern
Chicago and Midwestern Derby Rules, and Battle Royal Rules). The referee is selected by the pit management for tournaments and derbies, and is selected or agreed upon by the two principals involved in a main. The referee is accepted as satisfactory by all entrants upon signature of contract or payment of entry fee and his decision is final and irrevocable. The referee's word in the pit is law and there is no appeal from this decision. It becomes quite obvious that the referee's function is one of the most important at a cockfight, and thus, he commands much respect. The acquisition of the esoteric knowledge required of a referee does not normally come about through study, but again, through continuous and active association within the subculture, most of the time being spent as a cockfighter. The avocational path one follows to become a referee is neither specified nor clear, but a pit owner or manager, upon feeling that an individual is competent with respect to the required knowledge, may ask the individual in question to referee a rather small fight.

Quite often the referee is older, sometimes no longer fighting or even owning cocks, but is recognized for his knowledge and extensive experience. From observation and discussion, it has been determined that many, if not most, referees are older and well-established members of the subculture, many being more than forty years of age. Indeed, the acquisition of the necessary esoteric knowledge is a factor here. It is necessary that an element of respect
be present, and all those interviewed for this study either explicitly stated or tacitly implied that age within the subculture is quite often the object of much respect, normally because of the recognized potential in possessing much knowledge and history of cockfighting; several of the informants even suggested that the older subcultural members were somewhat analogous to old gamecocks. That is, they had to show "grit" in order to survive to an old age. However, this is not to the denial of the existence of younger referees; also, females and ethnic "minorities" may and do serve as referees. The primary requisite, like that of the handler, is that the referee have the necessary knowledge and familiarity with the rules. It is not unusual to find large tournaments, derbies, and mains promoting themselves by advertising a prominent and popular referee as doing the officiating. Such prominence and popularity usually develop with the individual's reputation over a period of time, often beginning while the referee was still only a cockfighter.

A fourth position and accompanying role, usually conceived as necessary for the cock matches themselves, is that of pit owners and managers. An implication of distinction is not intended as most pit owners are also the managers and operators; however, in some cases, the owners and managers are distinct and separate. The pit owner has many responsibilities, chief among these is providing the physical setting for a cockfight. Other responsibilities include providing a referee, making provision for the concession stands and
employees to work them, as well as providing protection from legal prosecution and/or harassment; this is achieved either through the element of secrecy or "buying" protection from the local law enforcement agencies (Carson, 1972: 171; Scott, [1957]: 124). Three of the informants told of pit owners who stimulated cockfighting interest in certain local public officials, and then allowed them to fight their cocks at the pits without paying entry fees, the result then being inherent protection even if these officials discontinued the activity.

The pit owner/manager is responsible for the control of spectators' behavior within general limits, usually accomplishing this by posting and "enforcing" four house or pit rules (not to be confused with the established cockfighting rules) that seem to be universal with respect to pits in the United States. These four pit rules or variations of them were observed at pits in Kentucky, Tennessee, and Oklahoma, and were reported by all informants to be quite consistent. These posted pit rules are as follows: no drinking, no profanity, no gambling, no fighting. Obviously, it is essential to the structure of the cockfighting subculture that some of these rules be strictly enforced, while the enforcement of all of these rules would delete an essential part of the subculture. Indeed, not only is gambling tolerated by the pit management, but it is even encouraged by and within the spectator segment (for a more explicit comprehension of the essentials of gambling
in the cockfighting subculture, see the section, "Gambling," pp. 79-87).

However, because of the socially and physically volatile nature of alcohol, drinking is usually not tolerated within the pit facilities. For this reason, a fairly consistent observation at many cockfights is for many of the men and some of the women, at different times, to retreat in two's and three's to their automobile trunk coolers for periods of fifteen to twenty minutes. However, when they return, they return empty-handed and the action in the pit proper will normally prevent more than two or three such retreats, thus ensuring against inebriation which could possibly culminate in physical violence. This is not to deny the presence of those who attempt to "brown bag" it or otherwise smuggle alcoholic beverages into the pit area by concealing or disguising the container. However, usage must be hidden or very subtle and not conducted by many present, or the pit management may very well ask them to either dispose of the drink or leave the pit house.

In that anything more than a very discrete and subtle usage of profanity of only a commentary nature could also lead to physical violence due to an offended party, the pit management discourages its usage and will threaten anyone using profanity loudly and constantly with banishment from the pit. However, the use of profanity is not as rampant as might be assumed in the "general stereotype" of cockfighting, the main inhibition against its usage for all social
classes, as noted by Polsky (1967: 109), being the presence of women.

It is not the consumption of alcohol or the use of profanity in and of themselves that the pit management discourages; rather, it is the potential for physical violence that such holds. Likewise, it is not so much the physical violence or fighting that the management fears, although exceptions to this are to be found at those pits having rather "plush" facilities, but rather it is injury from physical violence that is the major concern. A serious injury requiring immediate or emergency medical attention will also bring about inquiries and investigations from various law enforcement agencies. Even those pits operating with the knowledge of the "turned heads" of agencies of law enforcement may be forced to close by the very same agencies of law enforcement having this knowledge simply because of public expectations of the law enforcement agencies and other public pressures. Indeed, for this very reason, anyone may be banished from the pits for continuous violations of any pit rules not condoned by the pit management. Depending upon the seriousness of the violation, the period of banishment may be for the one night on which the violation occurs through the duration of the season. Not only will the pit banish spectators, but it will banish cockfighters and handlers if accused of unfair practices by the referee. This is not so much to prevent any violence, though of course it may, but to castigate those who have violated the subcultural code of honor and honesty.
It is clear that the pit owners/managers provide much cohesion and subcultural cooperation, not only with regard to spectators, but also in the pit, as any foul play will bring about immediate expulsion from the pit and warnings to other pit managers of such conduct by the individual or individuals. In essence, the pit management holds the power to "black-ball" or excommunicate a cocker from activity, at least within the particular region. One method or vehicle used by pit owners (as well as by other cockfighters, breeders and referees) to expel and otherwise discredit one's reputation is the placement of a notice of such in the cockfighting journals (see Guneau, 1970: 48 for such an example). This may be a result of foul play in the pits, welching on bets, failure to pay breeders and others for products and/or services, as well as other violations of the subcultural expectations. It is well known within the subculture that "In tournaments and derbies, entries, upon arriving on the club grounds, are under the jurisdiction of the pit management" (Wortham, 1961: 7).

It is quite common for the pit owners to operate under the guise of some type of sports club such as the _______ville Dog Club or the Northern _______ Sport and Game Club. Such a guise is usually superficial, particularly after the pit is well established, in that most law enforcement officials know of their existence and activity. The two clubs cited above are two such pits in the State of Kentucky; according to the informants who were regular
attendants at these pits, both pits have been in operation for many years and the local law enforcement agencies are quite familiar with both their operations and locations. It is possible that the pit owner initially operates under such a guise until he has an opportunity to sound out the law enforcement agencies for their potential "turned heads." However, it is unlikely that one would open a pit without first establishing working relationships with the law authorities. Thus, it is likely that club names are used primarily for advertising purposes and making general references to the particular pit.

According to the twenty informants, two of whom are pit owners, most pit owners are not new inductees into the subculture, but have been associated for a considerable period of time, usually assuming the role of cockfighter for the majority of the time. Because of the responsibilities cited above and the financial investment required to establish and operate a pit, many pit owners, possibly most, are at least thirty years of age, and, as revealed by the advertisements in the cockfighting magazines, are pit owners and operators with their wives. Others are in partnership with friends or relatives. A partnership is sometimes necessary because of the financial investment required, particularly at the pits hosting the more prominent matches such as the International Tournament, Orlando Tournament, New Orleans Main, Oaklawn Derby, Sunset Tournament, Biloxi Tournament, and the Copper State Tournament. It is interesting
to note the cooperation existing between pit owners. There is apparently only one pit within a given geographical area, therefore reducing competition. Many pits hold matches only every second weekend, normally on a Saturday night or a Sunday, or only once a month, alternating with other pits in the region. In this study, which involved four pits, each alternated their schedule to facilitate the schedules of the other pits. No two of these pits were closer than 150 miles. Such cooperation is normally resolved among the pit owners in question, and is usually done in the interest of attendance and concomitant profit.

Another position, now completely essential to the cockfighting subculture, is that of makers and suppliers of equipment and supplies. A review of any of the journals of cockfighting reveals a whole host of equipment and supplies such as gaffs or spurs, spur saws, muffs, scales, wing and leg bands, (waxed) tie or heeling cords, carrying cases, books concerning cocking in general, as well as rule books and conditioning methods, and a whole line of drugs, vitamins, and diet supplements and much more. Many of these makers and suppliers were in the subculture previously as cockfighters, and their products were initially produced by themselves solely for their own personal consumption. They then found a small demand for their products among friends and associates before realizing the commercial potential of their product. The percentage of subcultural members who actually enter this position is thought to be rather small for several reasons:
first, the product must be proven to be of commercial value and many potential developers may fail consistently; second, certain skills and/or knowledges are fundamental to the development of many of the supplies; third, advertisements concerning supplies and equipment seem to invariably come from the same individuals in all three of the monthly cockfighting journals, indicating a limit to those that have become successful. One of the twenty informants cooperating in this study is a hospital administrator who, having the necessary knowledge and facilities, began experimenting with male hormones to improve the performance of his own cocks. He now has continuous orders coming in from all over the United States. However, this is not to deny the presence of those who have inherited profitable sidelines from fathers or other relatives. Of the makers and suppliers of spurs, Finsterbusch (1929: 107) says:

In America we find modern equipped shops where accurate machinery can take care of any sort of job, and where, usually very fine [spur] specimens in steel are turned out in numbers. Not all the process of spur making, however, can be entrusted to machinery; as of old, brains and knowledge play an important part, and are responsible for the high quality of some products and the lack of it in others.

Cockfighting is not the simple activity that is so often stereotypically described, but instead requires an extensive amount of equipment and supplies including spurs or gaffs, spur saws, blade polishers, leg and wing bands, heeling tape, waxed string (that will not absorb blood and thus loosen) used to heel the spurs, pit supplies (weighing
scales, band and weight cards, match sheets, call forms, and check-off sheets are but a few), and a host of literature concerning "theories" and benefits of different breeding, feeding, conditioning, and heeling techniques. Recent additions to the cockfighting subculture in the area of equipment and supplies are different drugs and pharmaceutical compounds. All three of the monthly cocking journals are filled with advertisements revealing the positive effects of various vitamins, conditioning capsules, energy additives containing glucose, maltose, and dextrins (for quick energy and stimulating muscles and respiratory system), hormone capsules, diet supplements such as alfalfa tablets, red oxide of iron and liver capsules, as well as coagulants for the blood, all for use during the conditioning of the cocks. Many such advertisements assert that medical doctors, chemists, and medical technicians developed the products being sold (see the advertisements placed by Laurent, 1970: 45; Smith and Hoover, 1973: 32; Given, 1973: inside back cover). Regardless, it seems that chemotherapy has entered the cockfighting subculture, adding another aspect of "true science" to the sport. According to such advertisements, orders are accepted via the mail, telegraph, or telephone, and are sent out by air express within twelve hours after the order arrives.

All twenty of the informants either explicitly stated or tacitly implied that certain such "skilled artisans" are known not only throughout the subculture in the United States
but also around the world for their fine products. However, it is not necessarily the maker that receives the prestige, but the cocker who may possess a fine and rare pair of spurs or use some drug compound produced only in a very limited quantity.

A sixth position and role possibly assumed in the cockfighting subculture is that of breeder, quite often constituting a status group within the subculture. With respect to cockfighting, there are generally two accepted types of domestic fowl: game fowls and non-game fowls. Breeders of either type embrace a certain disdain for the other. Game breeders classify any fowl other than game fowl as "dung-hills" (Finsterbusch, 1929: 17; Scott, [1957]: 16-17). Indeed, literally hundreds of thousands of these game fowl are raised each year. Some of the more prominent American breed strains are Warhorses, Shufflers, Roundheads, Mugwamps, Cubans, Kelsoes, and Doms. However, as noted by Finsterbusch (1929: 254-256), the American game strains are not separate breeds but combinations. "The name of the strain has no bearing on the high quality of the individual [gamecock] and in most cases, if not in all, the man behind the strain is the real and unique cause of superlative quality" (p. 355).

Breeders generally take pride in tracing the history of their strain (as they have evolved from breeder to breeder), and the cost of a cock may well be dependent upon the strain and its (genetic and competitive) history. A particular "strain" or "breed" is quite often given the name of the breeder
and is thus identified as such. A strain or breed of cock, not an individual cock, becomes famous because an individual cock's first fight is often his last, even if he survives; he is but one of a strain that fights for victory (Fitz-Barnard, [1921]: 104). "Many of the so-called strains have been consistent winners and appear to justify a detailed description. But it is not so much the strain as the man in back of it" (Finsterbusch, 1929: 359).

The position of breeder may carry a good deal of prestige and have much achieved status associated with it. However, one does not merely become a full-blown breeder. Much knowledge, both esoteric and general breeding knowledge, must be acquired to be successful at breeding. Indeed, most breeders are or were normally active as cockfighters, developing their own strain for their own satisfaction. It seems a universal denial that luck plays a large part in breeding, the informants asserting that success comes about only through dedicated perseverance, work, and experience.

Most breeders are also cockfighters. However, with respect to the position of breeder, this thesis refers to the individual who has developed a constantly successful strain and has made the transition to a full-time breeder, quite often no longer fighting, but following the results of the cocks he has sold to others. However, according to the two breeders interviewed during this study, there are those breeders, possibly a considerable minority, who were
never cockfighters, but breed gamecocks because they see in them an aesthetic quality, and also those breeders who have inherited their strain from a relative who was a successful breeder. It is not uncommon for many breeders to be above fifty years of age because it takes a long and active association to acquire the knowledge and skills necessary, and it takes literally years to develop and "test" a successful strain.

Indeed, a cursory review of any of the breeders' advertisements in almost any issue of any cockfighting journal will reveal their stating that their breeding experience and breed or strain exceeds thirty, forty, or even fifty years, and some advertise experience exceeding seventy years. Because of the amount of work and financial investment involved, many breeders will be in partnership, quite often with their wives. Many breeders' advertisements boast of their investments in pens and buildings, some claiming more than 100,000 dollars. Such breeders are often referred to within the subculture as "professional breeders"; however, this does not mean that they attain their livelihood by breeding game fowl. Rather, it most normally implies that the breeder advertises somewhat extensively, using the monthly publications and other means, and sells many cocks, stags, and game hens fairly regularly and extensively. This merely augments their occupational income. A good many breeders, as might be suspected because of their age, are retired and use breeding to supplement their social
security and retirement pensions. "Large scale" breeding and sale is considerably profitable with a constant demand for the birds because of continuous pit fatalities. However, sixteen of the twenty informants (80%, including the two breeders) explicitly encouraged caution in procuring cocks from anyone other than a reputable breeder, because there have been sales made through the mail of "dung-hill" cocks with rather exotic breed names. Reputable breeders are normally those consistently advertising in the three cocking journals, having tested strains, and often offering a guarantee. Indeed, many breeders, in advertising in one of the three monthly publications, are now offering a full money-back guarantee, stating, "Notice: We aren't chicken hustlers. We raise all the fowl and back them 100%" (see advertisement placed by DeBusk, 1973: 99).

A feature common among some game breeders and pit owners is the establishment of cocking schools. The existence of such schools is largely limited to breeders and pit owners because they alone normally have the room and the facilities to conduct such an undertaking. The schools may run from one to three weeks with entrance costs running as high as 300 dollars. Enrollment is often limited to a rather small number of students and is primarily designed as a means of socialization for older late-comers to the subculture. Such schools are often held during the summer, between cockfighting seasons, so that they may coincide with the vacations of those wishing to take advantage
of this feature. In this way, the school schedules do not interfere with the cockfighting season and the facilities still pay for themselves in the slack period.

A further feature unique to the game breeders, and testifying to the organization of the cockfighting subculture in general and the breeders specifically, are the regional game fowl breeders associations. Two of the twenty informants (i.e., the breeders) contributing to this study are members of the Southeastern Game Fowl Breeders Association, having offices and general headquarters in North Carolina. Conferences and elections for officers are held annually. It is suspected, though could not be substantiated by the two breeders, that such regional associations have coverage of the entire United States.

The knowledge required to be successful in breeding is so extensive that entire books have been published on the subject. Essential knowledge for breeders includes different forms and "theories" of breeding, stock selection, care of chicks, dieting, diseases and veterinary science, conditioning, testing, and much more (for further requirements of breeders, see Finsterbusch, 1929: 135-169, 203-231; Fitz-Barnard, [1921]: 23-51; Scott, [1957]: 30-40).

A seventh position within the cockfighting subculture, that of cockfighter, is probably the one that is most prominent in the minds of the general public when any reference is made to cockfighting. This role, traditionally constituting a status group, concerns itself with caring
for and fighting cocks. Such individuals are often referred to by the subculture as simply cockers. Cockers may range in age from about eight to over seventy, and while most are males, females are by no means denied entrance. It was a general consensus of the twenty informants that women were probably denied all roles in the subculture except that of spectator until about twenty or twenty-five years ago.

Like the breeders, cockers commonly provide excellent care for their cocks, keeping them in open walks or clean spacious pens, providing the best food, and generally allowing the cocks to want for nothing. There are four reasons why cockfighters give the gamecocks so much care and attention. First, investment and other financial considerations are paramount since the cocker finds this diversion rather expensive. After purchasing the initial breeding stock, raising even a relatively small number of gamecocks requires several hours each day, and feed and other expenses, including equipment and dietary supplements, may be considerable. Since some cockers enter the activity in anticipation of turning a profit and none have a desire to lose any investment, it is quickly realized that a cock receiving less than good care and attention will have less than an even chance of winning a match. Thus, it is to the financial interest of the owner to provide excellent care for his birds. However, many cockfighters, and all interviewed for this thesis, denied the profit motive to the
importance of the sport itself. Thus, of even more significance for providing such care is a second consideration, that being an appreciation of and for the sport. Like the first reason, if the cock is not in excellent condition, he will make a poor showing, and the essence of the sport is two opponents with equal chance for victory. Perhaps an even stronger reason for providing such care is the third consideration, a respect for gamecocks of good quality. There seems to be a common value shared by most subcultural participants - their respect and esteem for fighting cocks of good quality. Related to this is the fourth reason, the maintenance of personal respect from other members of the subculture. The informants reported that the prestige of the individual who owns a good cock may be further enhanced by providing good care and showing respect for his birds. By the same token, one who provides poor care and shows little respect for his fighting cocks comes under much criticism and even ostracism from the other members of the cockfighting subculture. Not only is one's prestige lost, but also one's status may be irreparably damaged.

The gamecock then is the symbol and the essence of the sport, and those of good quality deserve the attention, respect, and admiration of the subcultural members.

Successful cockfighters, like the other statuses already discussed, find their position very rewarding in that they receive respect and are held in high esteem by the other members of the cockfighting subculture. This is a further
incentive to be successful and success usually requires being gainfully employed or at least having some means of income independent of the financial rewards of cockfighting. Indeed, nineteen of the twenty informants (95%) were gainfully employed while the one informant was unemployed. Of the nineteen informants, one was an unskilled employee (construction worker), two were semiskilled employees (bartender and machine operator in a factory), eight were skilled manual employees (distiller, mason, three miners, welder, electrician), one was classified as a technician (Army sergeant, E-6), one was a minor professional (ordained Baptist minister, no formal training), one was an owner of a small business (grocery), one was a business executive (plant manager), two were lesser professionals (labor relations and social worker), two were higher executives of large concerns (hospital director and supervisor of postal transportation), and one was the proprietor of a major concern (dairy farm, value over 100,000 dollars). In that education often has much to do with one's occupation, it was felt beneficial to determine the educational levels of the informants; two had less than seven years of school, nine were high school graduates, five had one to three years of college or high school plus trade school, two were college graduates, and two had advanced degrees (see Appendix E-2 for the specific types of employment correlated with the informants' educations). As noted by Finsterbusch (1929: 361) of the cockers, "...they are not professional but amateurs..."
keeping and fighting fowls as a hobby. Their general income is derived from any profession except cocking." There may be those few cockers who derive their entire incomes from cocking since it is not unknown for purses of a single tournament or main to exceed 10,000 dollars (see Durant and Bettman, 1965: 50); however, the existence of such "professional cockfighters" is doubtful in that cockfighting is a seasonal sport, not being practiced during the hotter months of the year, normally June or July through September, while the birds are molting. Further, unlike other seasonal sports such as baseball, the cockfighter is not receiving a fixed income but may go through an entire season and win very little.

It is not at all uncommon for several cockers to pool their cocks and share in the costs and care of the fowl, thus forming a "combine." They may then enter their better cocks in a match and fight as a combine, a joint effort reaching its pinnacle in the pit. Combines, according to the informants, often rival the reputations of the best cockfighters in the United States. One such combine, noted by seven of the twenty informants (35%), reputedly consists of lawyers, doctors, and the mayor of a city in Missouri, fighting under the name of the city, the ________ Cocking Syndicate.

Related to the respect and esteem received by a successful cockfighter, there is an even greater reason for their overall investment for the enhancement of their success.
It may be argued that the cock in the pit is but an extension of, and for, the cocker's own ego. This interpretation is noted by Geertz (1972: 6) in his discussion of Balinese cockfighters. It is readily observed that a cockfighter having just been defeated in the pit, almost regardless of the performance of his cock, be it good and honorable or poor, experiences embarrassment and regret for being in the presence of friends and acquaintances as well as the "generalized others" of the subcultural milieu. Further, there seems to be a direct association made by many of the subcultural members between performance in the pit and employment of knowledge concerning genetics (breeding), dietetics (feeding), and reinforcement (conditioning) "theories." In essence, when a cockfighter pits his cock, he not only presents a fowl of considerable investment, but also presents his respect, esteem, and knowledge, all for evaluation by those present.

Another role is that of the hawker, what the members of the cockfighting subculture refer to as a hustler. Hawkers are not necessarily present at all pits, and of those known to the informants cooperating in this study, all were males, ranging in age from their late twenties to their late fifties. While there is no reason to suspect an informal maximum age limit, it is felt that a minimum age limit may tend to exist because of financial considerations. The term "hustler," as used in the cockfighting subculture to quickly define hawker, can be linked to its meaning within the poolroom,
yet there are few similarities between hawker and hustler, at least in terms of Polsky's (1967: 41-117) description and meaning of the poolroom hustler.

"The terms 'hustler'...and 'hustling'...have been in poolroom argot for decades, antedating their application to prostitutes" (p. 41). While some hawkers, like hustlers, engage in heavy betting and may use either their own money or backers' money, for most hawkers, this seems to be a form of moonlighting or secondary occupation, contrary to the primary interests of the poolroom hustler. The betting (actually the hustling) is the occupation of the poolroom hustler, and if he finds he must augment his fluctuating income, then he will turn to a form of moonlighting distinct from his occupation (pp. 91-92). This is not to deny the presence of those hawkers who, following the various tournaments, derbies, and mains, may hawk as a primary means of support. However, the existence of such hawkers is extremely dubious for two reasons. First is the seasonality of cockfighting, the sport being suspended during the hotter months of the year while the birds are molting, the feasibility of one being a professional hawker is nil. Unlike other seasonal sports, the hawker does not have a steady income. The second reason, and perhaps the greatest contrast between the hawker and the hustler, is that the hustler constantly has control of the situation; that is, the hustler sets the game up so that it is pretty much a sure thing for him. To truly hustle, one must engage
in deception by never showing one's true speed and skill, intentionally missing some of the more "difficult" shots, winning most games by only a small margin, and even losing occasionally, and generally toying with the opponent until the hustler feels he has received the opponent's maximum bet. In short, the hustler must be a con man, thereby manipulating the opponent to a position deemed favorable by the hustler. Thus, the hustler never gambles, he only bets (pp. 50-51, 53-55). Such are the job-related skills and traits of the hustler. Hawkers claim to have skills, though not nearly so congenial as those of the hustlers. Given that the cockfight is fought fairly and is in no way "fixed," the hawker has no control over the situation—the potential outcome is unknown. Where then lies the skill of the hawker? In many circumstances, he relies upon the reputation of the cockfighter or the particular cock. This requires little more than following previous fights, newsletters, and publications to ascertain reputations. In some situations, the decisions of hawkers will be dictated by the general physical appearance of the particular cocks, some claiming to be able to determine the more superior cock, in a rather mystical context, by the feathers of the cock, the qualities being the luster and sheen, color, texture, and form.

Unlike the hustler (p. 53), the hawker bets with spectators rather than the opponent (possibly conceived of as the owner of the cock fighting the cock that the hawker
backs). After engaging a spectator in a bet, the hawker does not "string him along" or let him win occasionally in hopes that the spectator will increase future wagers, because the hawker has no control over the results of the cockfight. However, even having no control over the outcome of the fight, there is no reason to assume that many hawkers are not fairly successful, particularly in light of the fact that many spend a good deal of time studying past performances of cocks and owners to ascertain reputations. Thus, while many members of the cockfighting subculture may often explain a hawker as a hustler, it is clear that a hustler only bets, while a hawker gambles.

While hawkers are occasionally the topic and focal point for a good deal of humorous profanity and ridicule, they seem to be for the most part widely accepted as but part of the "sporting life" ethic accompanying the cockfighting subculture. However, the position and role of hawker does not seem to be the object of respect, esteem, or status that is so much a part of most other roles already cited (for more on the role of hawkers, see the section, "Gambling," this thesis, pp. 79-87).

The last role, that of spectator, involves more subcultural members than any of the other roles cited. Further, it is most heterogeneous in terms of age, sex, and race. Both sexes are represented, males being the majority, but females being a significant minority, particularly at the larger and more prominent pits. Ages run the entire
spectrum, from babes in the arms of mothers (infants usually being admitted free) to older people in their seventies and eighties. A stipulation made at most pits is that children must at no time be permitted to run around free, but must be controlled by parents. However, a review of pit advertisements in any issue of the three journals reveals the presence of those pits that will not admit children under a certain age, often being ten or twelve. Whites are the majority in all positions here identified, but "minority" ethnic groups, mostly American Indians, peoples of the Spanish-speaking Americans, and Blacks are represented, particularly in the role of spectator, with their next highest representation probably being in the role of cockfighter. Though no patterns concerning the socio-economic statuses of spectators were discernable, there is no particular reason to suspect that the socio-economic factors would vary or differ significantly from that of the other roles, especially that of cockfighter and to a lesser extent, that of breeder.

The role of spectator does not seem to embrace any achieved status, esteem, or respect within the subculture. Further, in that the spectators are of primary (financial) importance only to pit owners, it is feasible to assume that cockfighting is a spectator sport only because spectators are present. That is, cockfighters by and large raise and fight cocks for their own satisfaction and not for that of the spectators, and cockfighters are not
dependent upon the spectators for any financial reward received for victory - purse money is made up of entry fees paid by the cockfighters. Therefore, cockfighting would probably occur with the same frequency that it now does even if it were without the spectator support and interest that it enjoys presently. For this reason, spectators are without formal powers of sanction and ostracism. However, the importance of spectators is not as insignificant and sterile as implied. They lend vocal support to those cockfighters, handlers, and referees recognized by other cockfighters as being worthy of respect and esteem. Spectators, attending cockfights for recreational entertainment and enjoyment, consciously and unconsciously provide support, solidarity, and uniformity to the subculture; this is only logical since the role of spectator is the largest participating role in the cockfighting subculture.

An interesting feature of many of the positions and roles, particularly writers in cocking journals, pit owners, breeders, referees, cockfighters and handlers, and hawkers, is the use of monikers or nicknames. To be sure, some monikers (e.g., Beak, Hoghead, Splithead) refer to physical characteristics of the individuals. Many participants who are given or adopt monikers prior to gaining prominence are often better known by and through their monikers. Thus, it is advantageous for many breeders to advertise, cockers to fight, referees and handlers to participate, and hawkers to operate, all under their monikers.
In essence, one's reputation may be known to the subcultural members only through the moniker used. In this sense then, the moniker functions much like a stage name. Many of those monikers not referring to individual physical characteristics usually refer to a method of conditioning, feeding, fighting, raising, a type of spur used, or something else employed by the individual and for which he or she is noted. It is not uncommon for the moniker to assume the position of the first name, and the individual often uses it as such in conjunction with the last name. Examples of such monikers are Muff, Fulldrop, Tan Bark, Shuffles, Pit Powers, String King, Twister, and others. There seems to be no discernable reason for the use of monikers other than it being the preference of the individual, and it may be that he would not be recognized by his real name.

Few of the roles involved in the cockfighting subculture are mutually exclusive. A cockfighter, referee, breeder, or handler may assume the role of the other at certain cock-fights, as well as merely attend as a spectator. Breeders often attend fights as spectators and may also be a pit owner or write a feature column for one or more of the cockfighting journals. Even the hawker at times, because of a lack of finances, assumes the role of spectator. The interplay between and among the various statuses and roles of the cockfighting subculture is the social fabric constituting the subcultural network responsible for its existence, support, and continuation.
Because the roles are not mutually exclusive, it would be difficult to assert any hierarchy of positions and roles. If, however, one considers the chronological order with respect to one's history of association and membership in the subculture, then an evolutionary and chronological hierarchy of roles may be represented (see figure 2, p. 146). It should be noted that as one ascends the hierarchy presented in figure 2, investment of time also increases; also as one ascends this hierarchy, the prestige, esteem, and esoteric knowledge also increases. Prestige and esteem within the cockfighting subculture seem to be largely a result of esoteric knowledge, success, and honesty or adherence to the sporting ethic. Generally, to become a pit owner, particularly after passing through the hierarchy of positions to acquire the necessary knowledge and experience, it requires little more than the necessary capital and demand for a pit in the area. It is most likely that either pit owners or breeders will establish and conduct cocking schools, not necessarily because only they have the knowledge to do so, but because anyone having a pit, or breeding and raising cocks, would have the room and physical facilities to engage in such a task. With respect to the two positions of cockfighters (in figure 2), the second position is but a higher order of the same role, involving more prestige, knowledge, experience, and entry into the larger and more prominent cock matches.

This evolutionary and chronological hierarchy of roles is not a step-by-step process of socialization terminating
FIGURE 2
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in a pinnacle of accomplishment toward which members
unconditionally strive. One does not merely desire to be
and find himself or herself serving as a handler or
referee without first going through a period of socialization
which largely involves the roles preceding the role assumed.
Yet there are no strict requisites for any of the roles,
and one may become a handler or even pit owner after only
being an ardent spectator. However, according to the informants,
this would be an exception since the role hierarchy of passage
(largely for socialization and gaining necessary esoteric
knowledge), though strictly informal, is apparently common
to the subculture.

Membership Motivation

The preceding section, while describing the statuses or
positions and roles of the cockfighting subculture, did not
fully address the motivation(s) for membership in the
subculture. Like the previously specified positions and roles,
the motivations identified by this study are not necessarily
mutually exclusive. In essence, it is not so much motivation
as it is a "motivational type" which identifies the individual
occupying a position and acting out the role. Any individual
occupying any one of the nine positions cited in the previous
section may occupy that position for one or a combination of
the following reasons.

One motivational type is that of the "gamecock
entrepreneur." The existence of such a motivation cannot be
denied, though many of the subcultural members do deny this
as a motive, either sincerely or merely mimicking an "ideal" or "subcultural value." Indeed, the opportunities for profit are considerable. Cockfighting is enjoying more popularity today than ever before (Finsterbusch, 1929: 352; Wortham, 1961: 21). It was estimated in an issue of Grit and Steel (Booth, 1970: 31) that there are 70,000 gamecock breeders and 500,000 cockers in the United States. A later issue (September, 1972: 29) asserted that there are more than 250 cockfighting pits in New York City alone. Scott ([1957]: 124) notes a November, 1952 editorial in The National Humane Review as stating that cockfighting is at least a 10,000,000 dollar-a-year business. Though no indication was given of the nature of this dollar flow, it is suspected that this estimate would involve all financial considerations of the sport, from spectator admission costs, to the cost of the gamecocks and their maintenance, to the subscription costs of the various publications. Thus, it is readily obvious that cockfighting, as a major American avocation, provides extensive opportunities for profit.

"No country since the beginning of the world has offered to the game fraternity such generous protection as the United States, which fact is evidenced through its game press, now as good as ever. Poultry journalism. . .supports itself by immense commercial values. . ." (Finsterbusch, 1929: 352). A review of any issue of the various monthly periodicals, yearly subscription rates being between five and seven dollars, will begin to only hint at the size of commercialism.
present in the realm of cockfighting. Makers and suppliers of equipment pay as much as fifty dollars for a half-page advertisement running one issue to sell equipment and the necessary paraphernalia, as well as personalized items such as billfolds embossed with fighting cocks and the owner's name and are to be had for the ordering (and the seven dollars). However, this is not to contend that all makers and suppliers are motivated by profit; indeed, there are those who contend that they are merely sharing their developments and advantages with their "fraternity brothers" at cost. To be sure, many breeders utilize the advertising avenues available in the various publications to sell their game cocks for fifty to 250 dollars apiece. Quite often higher prices are paid. Indeed, one of the interviewees, a breeder, had shipped one gamecock, one stag, and two game hens to Hawaii about one week prior to the interview, reportedly for 1,500 dollars. However, many breeders deny profit as a motive. In this instance the breeder asserted that he did not advertise in publications, as he was not in it for the money, and he let his reputation do his advertising. This breeder then contended that he was engaged in breeding strictly as an avocation and for the joy and pleasure of participating in a satisfying pastime. However, this contention seemed to be mimicking a subcultural value and is certainly subject to question in this individual case because of the insistent attention that the breeder placed on his 1,500 dollar sale.
With respect to the pits, from observation and interviews, it is determined that in the majority of cases, the pits are privately owned and operated as opposed to club ownership. The four pits observed during this study were privately owned, and the two pit owners as well as the other eighteen informants reported that the great majority of pits are privately owned. Admission fees to a one night cockfight may run from three to six dollars (as they did for the fights attended during the collection of data), and for a three day tournament or derby, a pass may cost as much as ten dollars. Thus, a rather handsome income may be derived from the use of pit and facilities, particularly when one considers that the smallest of established pits usually accommodate and attract more than 200 spectators, the larger pits reportedly accommodating 1,000 or more people. However, it is quite easy for a pit owner to deny any interest in profit by contending that he is only furnishing a required facility necessary for cockfighting, and that overhead expenses, such as referees, concession employees, utility bills, and such are covered by admission fees. Yet the two pit owners cooperating in this study readily stated that they, as do most pit owners, make a rather handsome profit even after paying bills and employees. Referees participating in the pits may be doing so for monetary rewards - normally averaging between fifty and one hundred dollars for a full night of refereeing at the "average size" pits - or they may be serving as referees because of their appreciation and
knowledge of cockfighting; however, even the referees participating because of the latter reason are still payed for their services.

Unlike the referee whose monetary interest is independent of anyone's victory or defeat, the handler's pay is directly related to the success of the birds he is handling, sometimes receiving thirty percent of the cock owner's winnings and sometimes fifty percent. Such may be significant in that it is not at all unusual for the victorious cocker to claim a purse of 500 to 1,000 dollars for one night of fighting. At the larger and more prominent matches, sometimes lasting three to five days, a 40,000 dollar purse is not unknown (Durant and Bettmann, 1965: 50). Further, it seems to be a fairly established and consistent practice for the first place cocker to take seventy percent of the total purse, and the second place winner to claim thirty percent of the purse. Such an arrangement may be of primary interest to a cockfighter, but either implicitly or explicitly, all twenty of the informants contended that many cockfighters are not motivated by profit but rather fight cocks for the appreciation and enjoyment of the sport. However, the informants admitted that there were those who have no other interest but profit. Sixteen of the twenty informants (excluding the two pit owners, one breeder, and one cockfighter) fervently denied monetary gain as even a secondary interest.

It becomes apparent from the role of the hawker that the solitary, or at least primary, interest of the individual
in this position is financial gain. This is also of primary importance to many spectators. This is not to contend that some spectators and hawkers are seeking solely a financial gain but that their chief entertainment may be derived from the thrill and excitement of the wager rather than the cockfight itself. While the "gamecock entrepreneur" may embrace financial gain as the primary consideration, many subcultural members may be true enthusiasts of the sport.

A second motivational type then is that of the "true sportsman." The cockfighter is most often typified and idealized by the subculture as being the true sportsman. The cocking sportsman has a deep and abiding respect for gamecocks and their fighting ability. His overriding interest and principal source of enjoyment is the fight (i.e., the birds and their movements). It is for this type of cockfighter that the cock in the pit becomes an extension of, and for, his (i.e., the cocker's) ego and pride. Nineteen of the twenty informants contended that the cocker fights to win honorably and disregards the purse and its size. It is he (the "true sportsman") who not only has the zest to improve the breed to fight a better fight just for the love of it, but also has the desire to improve the sport and the members and strengthen the subculture for the betterment of the sport. Bentley (1970: 35) says of him:

The backbone of this sport has always been and always will be the real cockers, the ones that have great admiration and feeling for the gamecock and
raises, conditions, heels and handles his roosters only for the great pleasure he receives in accomplishing his choice of brood fowl in the pit. He is a man who respects the rules of the pit and tries to abide by them. He strives each year to either hold what he has accomplished in his breeding pens or improve upon their fighting ability. Gameness is first with a man that loves this great sport of ours, as this trait is what fascinated us to begin with and started us in the sport of cockfighting.

Fitz-Barnard ([1921]: 7) says of them, "Cockers were always honourable men - they took their natures from their birds - and it would be difficult for a real cocker to be otherwise."

In the words of one cocker, "If I can't win a fight honest, I don't want it. It may sound funny, but I never fought a rooster for the money, it's the joy. If I can stay even I am satisfied" (Crock, 1970: 40). Indeed, all twenty of the informants echoed these sentiments as being characteristic of most cockfighters. Cockers, however, do not enjoy a monopoly on this motivational type. Many handlers, referees, pit owners, breeders, and even spectators may play out such roles primarily because of their great respect, love, and admiration of good fighting cocks.

The third motivational type, the "gamefowl connoisseur," is seemingly largely restricted to breeders and a probable minority of cockfighters, spectators, and referees. The motivational force here is an appreciation of the aesthetic quality of gamefowl, involving beauty of form and color.

It was noted by Scott ([1957]: 12) that even if cockfighting ceased, the breeding and raising of gamecocks would continue
so that they could be entered in shows and judged for fine points. The two breeders and three of the cockfighters cooperating in this study noted that such shows are one of the annual functions of the various regional Game Fowl Breeders Associations. Appendix H consists of a list of the characteristics that are judged at such cock shows. However, the pit is the testing grounds for many, if not most, breeders. That is, while form and color are values that may be judged separately from the fight and strength of the bird, it is important to most breeders, whether they fight their own birds or sell them to others to fight, to know the "grit" of the breed. This is quite similar to gun collectors; besides being beautifully tooled and handcrafted, the gun must also be deadly accurate.

It is obvious from the above that each motivational type is sufficient to induce occupancy of any of the statuses or positions, as well as the same position. However, the isolation of each motivational type is for purposes of clarity and presentation and is not an implication of singularity of active motivations. Thus, some combination of the motivations cited above is suspected and probable.

Of these different motivational types, it would be tenable to conceive of them as membership types or social dividend returns for social investments in a leisure activity. In a similar sense is the import of status within the cockfighting subculture. As noted in the section addressing the positions and roles of the subculture, much
prestige, esteem, honor, dignity, respect - in a word, status - may be found within any of the nine roles and may offer motivation or impetus for membership and improvement. For the true cocker who identifies with his cock, the cockfight is not merely that, but rather an *affaire d'honneur*. This is then the apotheosis of the sporting ethic in cockfighting. Even the successful hawker or the knowledgeable and long-time spectator may receive some prestige and be emulated, at least in part, by other hawkers or by new members of the subculture, primarily because of the esoteric knowledge that the older members possess. Some long-time spectators, as was observed and as was revealed by several of the informants, seem to become "permanent fixtures" at a pit and are addressed by a great many spectators and other members as "Uncle ________"; there is a certain amount of status for them then by such wide recognition. The cockfight would seem then to be fundamentally a dramatization of status concerns. Status, with the necessity to affirm it, defend it, justify it, celebrate it, even seek it, is perhaps the central social motivational aspect of the cockfight (Geertz, 1972: 17-18) and even membership within the subculture. To borrow a term from Goffman (1961: 78), the cockfight is a "status bloodbath." That is, a cockfight is a ". . .leveling up and leveling down of all present, a mutual contamination. . ." (p. 78). Goffman argues that ". . .informal social participation is an ultimate validation of relationships of intimacy and equality with those with
whom one shares this activity" (p. 78). More specifically, a cockfight is an "...opportunity to engage in encounters that will widen one's social horizons through, for example, sexual bond-formation, informality with those of high rank, or extending one's invitation circle" (p. 78). In this sense then it would seem that a significant aspect of cockfighting is that, at least in terms of functionalist sociology, it reinforces status discriminations. Of status and cockfighting, Geertz (1972: 23) says:

Men go on allegorically humiliating one another and being allegorically humiliated by one another, day after day, glorying quietly in the experience if they have triumphed, crushed only slightly more openly by it if they have not. But no one's status really changes. You cannot ascend the status ladder by winning cockfights; you cannot, as an individual, really ascend it at all. Nor can you descend it that way. All you can do is enjoy and savor, or suffer and withstand, the concocted sensation of drastic and momentary movement along an aesthetic semblance of that ladder, a kind of behind-the-mirror status jump which has the look of mobility without its actuality.

Geertz is accurate in his contention of no status change, regardless of victory or defeat, in that he is referring to a status ladder of an entire society and not a specified portion (i.e., a subculture) of the society. Such status cannot be taken outside of the subcultural context and experienced as such within the host society, but upon returning to the activity of the subculture, the status conferred upon the members is again theirs; such status within the subculture is not to be denied in that it is
recognized by members of the subculture. Thus, the symbolic status rewards of cockfighting can be significant. This is particularly true of the apparently large middle-class following who, not being able to compete for social status in other areas, find status gratification within the cockfighting subculture. In that social status is so often indicative of and determined by education and occupation (i.e., social position), it becomes apparent that the cockfighting subculture is a viable and significant means of status attainment and recognition for the great majority of the informants cooperating in this study (see Appendix E-2). Employing Hollingshead's "Two Factor Index of Social Position" (Bonjean, Hill and McLemore, 1967: 381-385, 441-448), it was determined that eighteen of the twenty informants (90%) are of middle- or lower-class social position; thirteen of the informants (65%) had no college education and only four (20%) of the informants had college degrees. With respect to these variables, there is no reason to assume that these informants possess any more social resources than others of the same social positions; therefore, it is suspected that the informants receive little status gratification and recognition in their various activities outside of cockfighting. Yet all twenty of the informants, either implicitly or explicitly, stated that they receive much prestige, esteem, and respect through their participation in cockfighting. In essence, their participation is the source of much status recognition that
they would not receive in other societal activities requiring more social resources and competition.

As already noted, status or any of the motivational types or any combination of any or all of these may induce occupancy of any of the statuses or positions of the cockfighting subculture. Table 1 is a cross-tabulation of motivational types and positions or roles, not presenting individual cases but rather presenting the recognized major inducement(s) for each role.

| TABLE 1 |
| CROSS-TABULATION OF MOTIVATIONAL TYPES AND ROLES |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>gamecock entrepreneur</th>
<th>true sportsman</th>
<th>gamefowl connoisseur</th>
<th>status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>writer</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pit owner</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>breeder</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>referee</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cockfighter</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>handler</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>makers &amp; suppliers</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hawkers</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spectators</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Such indicates that the motivational type is potentially more accessible to the role but not to the total exclusion of the other roles.
Introduction and Socialization into the Subculture

The socialization of potential new members into the subculture is somewhat analogous to the germination of a seed. If the seed survives, it grows into a plant markedly different from the seed. Likewise, if the newcomer likes the sport and remains as a spectator, then it is not uncommon for the individual to assume another position within the subculture. Thus, the cockfighting spectator, unlike most other American sports spectators, is highly likely to become an active participant. Further, unlike many other sports, there is very little passive interest or indifferent toleration for cockfighting; it is either liked, or it is not. Many people at football and baseball games go simply because friends or family are going and have tickets for them; however, many of these individuals do not understand the fundamentals of the sport in question and have no real interest. The new spectator to cockfighting will normally return to witness his or her second match only if he or she likes the sport and is then a spectator rather than a curious outsider. Thus, there is no "drift" nor is there "seduction" involved in becoming a subcultural member, but the matter is largely one of free choice. Unlike many other "deviant" subcultures, the individual, after seeing his or her first cockfight, knows if he or she will become part of the cocking fraternity. In this sense, membership in the cockfighting subculture is even more voluntary than other victimless crimes. That is, a wider range of choice is
operationalized, and little or no "drift" or "seduction" is employed in membership recruitment.

As the cockfighting spectator keeps returning, he will gradually learn, either through exposure or intent and purpose, the differences in the various game strains, as well as much other esoteric knowledge, including the cockfighting rules and argot. Indeed, such knowledge is transmitted, at least initially, through the oral tradition of cockfighting. As can be at least partially determined by the argot of the subculture, the acquisition and internalization of such knowledge is necessary to effectively interact with the other members of the subculture. After being exposed to the subculture for but a short period of time, most, if not all new members, will become familiar not only with the contemporary journals of cocking, but also with the many books, at least by title and author, long out of print.

Most subcultural members, at least males, apparently develop an interest in cockfighting rather early in life, most normally being exposed to their first and subsequent fights by a relative or close friend. Of the twenty informants, four (20%) were introduced to the sport before the age of ten, seven (35%) before fifteen years of age, five (25%) before twenty years of age, three (15%) before twenty-five years of age, and one (5%) after twenty-five years of age. Further, sixteen (80%) were introduced by relatives (nine (45%) by fathers, five (25%) by uncles, two (10%) by other relatives), and four (20%) by friends. Indeed, it is common
for the various cockfighting journals to feature pictures and articles about youngsters who not only participate in the subculture as spectators but also as handlers, breeders, and cockfighters. *Grit and Steel* features a regular column, "Meet Our Younger Cockers." Some females are likewise brought into the subculture early in life, but most of the informants suspected that many are exposed to cockfighting after marriage by their husbands.

Of particular relevance here are observations made during the course of field observations. Of the four different pits visited by the researcher for a total of seven separate events, an attempt was made to determine the male/female ratio present. At two of these events, the pit managements involved reported approximately 200 paying spectators; at another event, the pit management reported 237 paying spectators. At each of these events, approximately thirty-five to forty females were observed (17% - 20% and 15% - 17%, respectively). At a fourth event, the pit management reported approximately 280 present; of those present, about forty-five females (16%) were observed. It is to be noted that these four observations were made at three separate pits, the assertion being that the majority of those in attendance at one pit were not present at the other two pits during the observations. In addition, no such observations were attempted at the first three cockfights attended. Because of the limited number of observations made, and no assurance that those spectators observed were a representative sample, these statistics are only suggestive.
However, there is an obvious clustering between 15% and 20% and this range has particular significance with respect to question twenty-nine on the interview schedule: "Do you ever take your family or a date to cockfights? If you answered no, briefly tell why you don’t." Of the twenty informants, three (15%) answered in the affirmative. The remaining seventeen simply replied that their families, specifically wives or girlfriends, did not really care to go. A Kentucky State Police detective, in providing data resulting from a raid on one cockfight, stated that 312 adult spectators were present, of which eighty-two (26%) were females. Unfortunately, no count was made of children and adolescents under eighteen years of age, but it was estimated that there were approximately sixty to seventy.

An apparent prerequisite, as ascertained through conversations and interviews with the twenty informants, as well as others at the various pits, has to do with a rural setting. It seems that either the newcomers are largely from a rural area, or the members introducing them to the sport are from a rural area, or at least either (or both) group’s preceding generation was from a rural area, and those that fight cocks usually either live in a rural area or at least maintain their cocks in a rural area. Of the twenty informants, eleven (55%) spent most of their childhood (up to the age of sixteen) on a farm, five (25%) in villages (under 1,000), one (5%) in a small town (1,000 – 2,499), two (10%) in large towns (2,500 – 9,999), none in small
cities (10,000 - 49,999), and one (5%) in a large city (50,000 or more). Of these informants, eight (40%) now live on farms, one (5%) in a village, two (10%) in small towns, three (15%) in large towns, four (20%) in small cities, and two (10%) in large cities. Of those that introduced these informants to cockfighting, at the time of introduction, twelve (60%) lived on farms, none in villages, two (10%) in small towns, four (20%) in large towns, one (5%) in a small city, and one (5%) in a large city. Although cockfighting may be largely conceived as a rural activity, it would be dubious to assert that ruralism is a necessary prerequisite, but it does seem to be a dominant feature of cockfighting.

There seems to be no conscious effort of recruiting new members, most of the informants stating that an outsider would have to ask them about cockfighting and display a certain curiosity before they would actually introduce the individual to the sport. Parsons (1969: 275) cites only one book advocating actively recruiting members, that being Tim Pridgen's *Courage: The Story of Modern Cockfighting* (1938).

In the main, this section has discussed preliminary or early socialization, but of those who have been socialized, Parsons (1969: 274) states:

> The photographs I have seen and everything I have read lead me to believe that cockfighting draws its followers from the full spectrum of human society: rich and poor, male and female, black and white (even at the same meets, even in the South), young and old, from every region of the
country. Yet they call themselves "the Fraternity," "sons of the sod," and they know one another when they meet.

Fisher (1970: 49-51) notes that subcultural members are drawn from all walks of life, from all occupations, including farmers, manual laborers, factory workers, doctors, lawyers, as well as others. These observations are rather consistent with the observations concerning social positions made by this study.

With respect to race, all twenty of the informants were white (one being part American Indian). This is by no means representative, as most of the informants stated that there were many Black members of the cockfighting subculture, and several Black participants, i.e., not spectators, were observed by the researcher at least at two of the four pits attended.

With respect to marital status, two of the informants (10%) were single, one (5%) was widowed, none were separated, two (10%) were divorced, and fourteen (70%) were married; one (5%) was divorced and remarried. The ages of informants ranged from twenty to sixty-two. However, subcultural membership spans a much broader range. Indeed, numerous cockfighters were observed, some of their ages being early and middle teens, others being in their late sixties and seventies. As was noted in the section, "Subcultural Statuses and Roles," age may play a part in determining the positions filled by the various subcultural members. All of the informants were males, but female participants (i.e., not just spectators) were both reported and observed. Again, it was noted in the section, "Subcultural Statuses and Roles," that women are
not denied participation in any of the roles and are often in partnership with their husbands. Indeed, membership in the cockfighting subculture is composed of all social and socio-economic positions; such is revealed in Table 2 which follows. All findings presented in the table results from the informants participating in this investigation and is therefore not necessarily representative, but is significant with respect to the other findings revealed in this research.

TABLE 2
SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF INFORMANTS

AGE:

mean = 36.4 years
6 - between 20 and 30 (20, 24, 25, 27, 29, 30)
9 - between 31 and 40 (32, 32, 33, 33, 34, 34, 37, 39, 40)
3 - between 41 and 50 (42, 47, 50)
1 - between 51 and 60 (58)
1 - 61 and over (62)

MARITAL STATUS: 14 married, 2 single, 2 divorced, 1 remarried, 1 widowed

AGE OF INFORMANT AT INTRODUCTION TO SPORT:

mean = 15.0 years
4 - before age 10 (7, 7, 8, 9)
7 - before age 15 (10, 11, 12, 12, 13, 13, 14)
5 - before age 20 (15, 17, 17, 18, 19)
3 - before age 25 (21, 23, 24)
1 - after age 25 (30)
### TABLE 2 (continued)

| INTRODUCTION BY: | 9 - by father  
|                 | 5 - by uncle  
|                 | 2 - by other relatives  
|                 | 4 - by friend  

| PLACE OF CHILDHOOD OF* INFORMANTS: | 11 - farm  
| mean = 1.9 (village) | 5 - village (under 1,000)  
| 1 - small town (1,000 - 2,499)  
| 2 - large town (2,500 - 9,999)  
| 0 - small city (10,000 - 49,999)  
| 1 - large city (50,000 or more)  

| PLACE OF PRESENT RESIDENCE: | 8 - farm  
| mean = 3.0 (small town) | 1 - village  
| 2 - small town  
| 3 - large town  
| 4 - small city  
| 2 - large city  

| RESIDENCE OF THOSE* INTRODUCING INFORMANTS TO SPORT: | 12 - farm  
| (at time of introduction) | 0 - village  
| mean = 2.25 (village) | 2 - small town  
| 4 - large town  
| 1 - small city  
| 1 - large city  

| EDUCATION OF INFORMANTS: | 2 - less than eighth grade  
| mean = 12.8 years of school | 9 - high school  
| 2 - high school and trade school  
| 3 - 2 to 3 years of college  
| 2 - B. A. to B. A. +  
| 2 - M. A. to M. A. +  

| SOCIAL CLASS: | 2 - upper class  
| mean = 3.2 (lower-middle) | 4 - upper-middle  
| 5 - lower-middle  
| 6 - upper-lower  
| 3 - upper-lower  

| OCCUPATION: | 3 - higher executives of large concerns, proprietors, and major professionals.  
| mean = 4.0 (clerical and sales workers, technicians and owners of little businesses) | 3 - business managers, proprietors of medium-sized businesses, and professionals.  
| 2 - administrative personnel, owners of small businesses, and minor professionals.  

TABLE 2 (continued)

OCCUPATION: (continued)

1 - clerical and sales workers, technicians, and owners of little businesses.
7 - skilled manual employees.
2 - machine operators and semi-skilled employees.
2 - unskilled employees and unemployed.

*Population sizes of those residential categories cited were determined for the periods of time (or ages) in question and were not based on present populations of the specific residential areas in question.

Subcultural Values

The socialization involved in the cockfighting subculture not only relates the argot and technical aspects of the sport to the new members, but it also facilitates the internalization of the subcultural value systems. As in any situation, the actor has, as termed by Schutz (Heeren, 1970: 47), his unique stock of knowledge to which reference may be made. It is what Berger and Luckmann (1966: 65) refer to as recipe knowledge. Every individual comes into contact with

...a group of people among whom all the general types of situation which may arise have already been defined and corresponding rules of conduct developed, and where...[the new member] has not the slightest chance of making his definitions and following his wishes without interference (Thomas, 1972: 331).

In the cockfighting subculture, values, codes, and conducts are defined and specified, and the members but internalize these components. The actor, concerned with
his (social) presentation of self, will commit only those acts and functions which those about him will deem acceptable, and they will be committed only through acceptable means (p. 336). It becomes obvious that such behaviors are acceptable only within the social limits of the subculture, but within those limits, such behaviors are considered proper.

Through socialization, the values, codes, and even the perception of the subculture are learned and internalized. It is sometimes difficult to separate the notion of motivation from that of perception. Not all "cockfighting entrepreneurs" perceive or embrace cockfighting merely as a monetary venture for potential returns, and many would deny such a perception even were it realized. Thus, motivation is not indicative of nor necessarily dictates values or perception of values. The great majority of the informants were consistent in denying the significance of profit, noting that while there were those members who were primarily seeking profit, the subcultural value in this sense was the sporting ethic, i.e., fighting "purely" for the sport, not the money. Certainly, reservations are to be employed in accepting such subcultural values, particularly those discerned in this type of study, in that it is difficult to determine if they - the members - are exposing and revealing actual values and concepts, or if they are revealing those values that they wish outsiders to have of the subculture. The writer contends that some resolution with respect to this "dilemma" is provided by the consistency, even in word usage, with which
all twenty informants openly, and often without solicitation, responded to and discussed this topic. Further is the consistency and same word usage found in published materials, many more than fifty years old. Indeed, it may be that as there is such consistency in the responses, as well as in the literature, the informants, and presumably the majority of subcultural members, may only mimic that which they have read and heard, and think that it "should" be that way. However, even if their "values" are being strived for and are not actualities, this reveals a great deal about the sub-culture, possibly exposing more of its philosophy and ideology than discerned anywhere else by this study.

A major focus of the subcultural values displaying such consistency is honor. All twenty informants used the words "honor" and "honorable" repeatedly. Their contentions were not dissimilar to Fitz-Barnard's ([1921]: 7), saying, "Cockers were always honourable men - they took their natures from their birds - and it would be difficult for a real cocker to be otherwise." Further, "He [the cocker] is a man who respects the rules of the pit and tries to abide by them" (Bentley, 1970: 35). While admitting that their reputation, i.e., the subcultural reputation, is being tarnished somewhat by a few "undesirables," the informants still assert the importance and presence of much honor. Such "undesirables" were generally defined by the informants as those who participated only for the money and/or those who did not abide by the rules (both the established fighting
rules and the pit management rules) and who would do "anything" to win. Examples of such actions included cockers giving their obviously defeated birds lethal doses of arsenic or other poisons to get a last violent reaction out of their birds in hopes that such would be sufficient to inflict a fatal injury to the opposing bird; such poisons are discretely administered during one of the rest periods. Another less than honorable ploy usually occurs when the birds have become hung up on each other's spurs; here a handler, in "attempting" to free his bird, will twist or push the spurs in the opponent's bird or will try to injure the eyes or throat of the opponent's bird, sometimes using his fingernail to scratch the bird's eye. Again, this is sometimes attempted when the birds become hung up and the handlers have the opportunity to be near both birds. As has already been revealed, the cockfighting subculture is self-regulating, handling and punishing the subcultural violators. Thus, such violators as described above, when detected, will be disqualified and expelled from the pit. Though no such actions were observed by the researcher during the course of the seven events attended, the twenty informants were unanimous in this assertion.

Articles and editorials commonly appear in all three journals attesting to the general honesty and honor associated with cocking, and the various published and established cockfighting rules are particularly concerned with honor and conduct. The Modern Chicago and Midwestern Derby Rules
(The Chicago and Midwestern Fraternity, n.d.), though only eight pages long, makes specific reference to honor with respect to the rules on four of the eight pages (1, 3, 5, 6); further, this set of rules is made up of forty-two separate and numbered rules, and more than fourteen refer either explicitly or implicitly to a code of honor. Wortham's Modern Tournament and Derby Rules (1961) has throughout it implications referring to honor and honesty, and concludes by asserting, "May always the cock win who can and will fight last under the rules" (p. 30).

Also quite consistent with and possibly inseparable from the idealism generally embraced by the cockfighting subculture is the value and notion of patriotism:

I believe that we cockers, and I do mean every one of us who love and admire the gamecock for his gameness, fighting abilities, and beauty, are as "American" as they come. . . . Let us all fight together against this tyrant (Communism) with every means we can as Americans who, like our Gamecocks, will fight into death for what we believe in - Freedom (Grit and Steel, 1971: 25).

This value of patriotism may be further inferred by the responses to question thirty-nine of the interview schedule. Fifteen of the twenty informants cited "draft evasion" as being quite a serious offense, and six of these fifteen respondents indicated that it was the only serious one of the "victimless crimes" listed in question thirty-nine (see Appendix D). Further, eleven of the fifteen contended that if drafted, it was one's duty as an American to serve;
the remaining four of the fifteen asserted that draft evasion was not "victimless" because someone else would have to take the evader's place so that the quota would be met.

Not unrelated to this value of patriotism is the pride the subculture maintains with respect to the oral and written history of cockfighting. That the history of cockfighting is lost in the antiquity of the world's early civilizations is undeniable (Fitz-Barnard, [1921]: 3-8; Finsterbusch, 1929: 31-32, 87, 99). Many, if not most subcultural members, are aware of cockfighting's early history, and again, many, if not most, are aware that the sport was at one time actively supported by nobility and royalty (Scott, [1957]: 54, 57-58; Dulles, 1965: 52). Seventeen of the twenty informants made specific reference to the participation of nobility in cockfighting as did many of those who were present at the events attended by the researcher. Further, many, either through exposure to the oral tradition or through published material or both, are aware of, and boast rather proudly, yet modestly (particularly to the unthreatening newcomer or inquisitive outsider), of the great American "heroes" who fought cocks in the early history of our country. Those American figures most noted, documented and otherwise, by the twenty informants are George Washington, Andrew Jackson, Abraham Lincoln (p. 75; Durant, 1964: 16, 43, 130), Mark Twain (Arlott and Daley, 1968: 71), Thomas Jefferson (Brasch,
Indeed, many contend that Lincoln was given the nickname "Honest Abe" for his fair refereeing of cockfights. Such citations are employed by the subcultural members to lend honor and honesty to the sport. However, the participation of such early American "notables" seems to be valued in and of itself by the cockfighting subculture, almost as if it gave the "illegitimate" sport parentage.

Again, a fairly consistent ideal embraced by the subcultural members, and related to the honor and honesty cited earlier, is the perception and concept held by many regarding a gamecock. This relationship is possibly best expressed by a quote from *Australian Barkers and Bletters*, published in 1914 in Sydney, Australia and cited by Brasch (1970: 80), saying that cockfighting is "'...the fairest and cleanest sport on earth, and the cockers the best-hearted men you could meet anywhere. ...because fighting begets courage and courage honesty, and every man and woman is shaped by a hobby.'" As explicitly substantiated by most of the twenty informants, the gamecock and its value transcends any monetary import. Indeed, the bird's principal virtue, courage, is augmented by other virtues, all deemed worthy of emulation, as was suggested by the above quote concerning patriotism and Communism. "A gamecock signifies a noble disposition of mind, there being no bird of a more generous or undaunted courage at the sight of imminent danger" (Grit and Steel, 1972: 32-c). Further, as noted by George Wilson, the poet, in 1607,
The Cockes of the game are so called, because they carry the credit away from all other Cockes in battell, which is the onely cause they are so highly esteemed, and so much valued as they be; for it is generally and commonly seene, that the most hericall and nobel-hearted men, take greatest delight in those thinges which are of most courage, and greatest valour, and that of all others (in my opinion) is the Cockes of the game; . . . (Scott, [1957]: 17).

Also,

. . . the cocker fixes his admiring attention on the skill and courage, and the deathless struggle against adversity, of these truly wonderful birds, and by their example he is driven to endeavor to emulate these noble qualities (Fitz-Barnard, [1921]: 12).

In that the cock, as asserted by the twenty informants, is the embodiment of courage and spirit, this may in part explain their attitude toward patriotism and draft evasion, given the contention that a cock will fight not just in the pit but for his territory in the barnyard. Thus it is that the gamecock becomes the object of much respect and honor. This in part contributes to the aesthetic value of the cockfight, many subcultural members, as revealed by the twenty informants and others at the various pits attended during field observations, perceiving of the cockfight as an art form.

The cockfight as an art form presents ordinary, everyday life experiences as real in an ideational sense by taking up the themes of life and death, reward and loss, status and pride, discipline, and chance and facilitates the articulation and perception of the meaning of each.
Thus, cockfighting is more than a sport or even a pastime or rite; it is an art form of life and a critique on life. The cockfight's use of emotion for cognitive ends is central to this (Geertz, 1972: 16, 23).

What the cockfight says it says in a vocabulary of sentiment - the thrill of risk, the despair of loss, the pleasure of triumph. Yet what it says is not merely that risk is exciting, loss depressing, or triumph gratifying... but that it is of these emotions, thus exampled, that society is built and individuals put together. Attending cockfights and participating in them is... a kind of sentimental education. What he learns there is what his culture's ethos and his private sensibility (or, anyway, certain aspects of them) look like when spelled out externally in a collective test;... the two are near enough alike to be articulated in the symbolics of a single such text... (p. 27).

These allegorical values were expressed in various ways by fourteen (70%) of the twenty informants and by at least six subcultural members present at the different events attended by the researcher. The cockfight then, in part, facilitates the comprehension of the meaning of life, and, as contended by Weber, the burden of such is not only the essential end but the primary condition of human existence, this being regardless of economic costs (Weber, 1963). Indeed, in recent years, the question of how it is that one perceives certain qualities in things that cannot literally be asserted to be present has become the subject of aesthetic theory (for various treatments of this, see Langer, 1953; Wollheim, 1968; Goodman, 1968; Merleau-Ponty, 1964).
The perception of the subcultural values then transcends that of mere sport and embodies honor, loyalty, and a treatise of life. Thus, if possible, the cockfight itself assumes even greater meaning than if these assertions were denied.

Subcultural Justifications

The term "justification" as utilized here is similar to the definition used by Scott and Lyman (1968: 47): "Justifications are accounts in which one accepts responsibility for the act in question, but denies the pejorative quality associated with it." An "account" is a "...linguistic device employed whenever an action is subjected to valuative inquiry" (p. 46). The sources of information used to compile the following "justifications" were derived from three sources: 1) conversations and discussions with subcultural members, 2) in-depth interviews with the twenty informants, and 3) a review of cockfighting literature.

The case against cockfighting, with one important point of difference, is the case against every other form of blood sport. The choice of whether to fight or not lies with the bird itself and the threat of death as a penalty for failing to fight has neither weight nor purpose. The case against so many other sports is that the hunters only are willing (Scott, [1957]: 11).

Similarly,

Where you have unwilling agents there must be cruelty, and no sane person can pretend that the fish enjoys being lured to death, often with live bait; that the fox or hare likes to be hunted ...; or that the birds and beasts prefer a ...death from gun-shot wounds.
Where the agents are willing, there can be no cruelty; one man can put a cock in the pit, but fifty cannot make him fight (Fitz-Barnard, [1921]: 10-11).

Because of the presence of this element of willingness on the part of the cocks, Fitz-Barnard (p. 12) states, "Cockfighting is the most humane, perhaps the only humane, sport there is."

All twenty of the informants with no solicitation asserted that the cocks fight voluntarily, with no intimidation from the owners. However, this is only half of the assertion or justification. The other half is that "The concept of cruelty presents numerous inconsistencies and anomalies. In many instances the most vigorous denouncers of one form of cruelty applaud some other form of cruelty" (Scott, [1957]: 9). This method of justification is similar to the "technique of neutralization" described by Sykes and Matza (1957: 664-670). In this situation, the subcultural members charge their critics with hypocrisy and inconsistency in demanding the prohibition of cockfighting and yet permitting other forms of cruelty toward animals to continue. This justification may be conceived as weak, however, with the issue of cruelty remaining, in that the opponents of cockfighting are not claiming necessarily that other sports are not cruel. However, when cockfighting is juxtaposed with any other "blood sport," the question so many subcultural members seem to ask is, "Not whether the former is equally humane with the latter, but whether the latter is not as much at variance with the dictates of the humanity as the former?" (Scott, [1957]: 164).
Similar to this position is the contention that the gamecocks are by nature fighters; that is, they fight through instinct and a desire to do so (pp. 155-156).

The game-cock loves fighting, the joy of battle is his greatest joy; if he dies, he dies as all brave things would wish to die. As a chicken he is brought up with the tenderest care and attention; as a young cock he is kept in luxury and freedom, monarch of all he surveys; after two years he is given the joy of battle, and if he dies, what more could a brave heart ask? This is called cruelty! Compare the life of the common cockerel; dragged up in dirt and squalor, then confined with others in a narrow pen, stuffed with food, if he is lucky, and then bled to death (a by no means pleasant ending) after a few months of miserable existence (Fitz-Barnard, [1921]: 12-13).

Again with no solicitation, all twenty of the informants, and many subcultural members present at the pits attended by the researcher, voiced support for the excellent care that gamecocks receive and further suggested that cruelty would lie in not allowing such birds to enter into combat. Indeed, Blaine (1852: 1213) has even stated that "...this irresistible attachment to fighting among themselves has certainly furnished the cockpit amateurs with their best defense against the tax of cruelty. . . ."

A further contention often stated as a "justification" for the existence of cockfighting is the genetic improvement of the gamecock breed. That is, as the gamecocks are raised to fight and fought to win, there are constantly attempts to improve the various strains of gamecocks (Scott, [1957]: 159). Thus, in a sense, the cockfight is not the focal
point of the sport but merely the test for the focal point, that being the improvement of the gamefowl. It is significant to note here that three of the informants said that the improvement of the breed was the essential aspect, two contended the fight was, while fifteen said they felt that the two could not be separated, as each was for the purpose and benefit of the other.

In essence, the justifications for neutralizing the concept of cruelty consist of the following: 1) the gamecock enters into battle voluntarily; 2) the gamecock is fulfilling his genetically endowed proclivities; 3) the gamecock receives excellent care and attention and is thus optimally prepared for combat; 4) the gamecock, if successful in battle, attains the highest level of accomplishment and satisfaction. These justifications have been designed specifically for cockfighting as a sport and address themselves to the stigma of cruelty, demanding that the opponents of cockfighting reexamine their attitudinal and behavioral consonance.

Such justifications may be conceived of as points for attempting to neutralize the stigma associated with cockfighting as an illegal sport. Furthermore, such justifications imply that the legal order is not the sole source of legitimacy, but rather, other forms of legitimacy may transcend the legal order (formal legitimacy) of a social system. Two forms of informal legitimacy which are viable and significant for the cockfighting subculture are historical legitimacy and traditional legitimacy. As has
been revealed, the existence of cockfighting in antiquity, i.e., its significance in early civilizations, and its support from historically notable individuals of the past provide grounds for transcending the legal order or the formal legitimacy as a dictate of behavior. The social worth of cockfighting in promoting value of life, competition, and fair play is embraced as further evidence for the continuation of the sport as an honorable tradition.

A third source of legitimacy that transcends the legal order comes about through the conception of participation in cockfighting as a form of discretionary behavior; i.e., freedom in the expenditure of leisure time that has no effect on non-participants (p. 11). As became evident through the in-depth interviews and the conversations with those who were in attendance at the pits, the cockfighters, as well as other members of the cockfighting subculture, perceive their involvement as a form of discretionary behavior constituting a satisfying and intrinsically rewarding activity and freedom in the expenditure of leisure time, as well as a potential source of supplemental income.

It is just in this sense, at least in part, that cockfighting is conceived as being deviant. That is, with numerous sources of legitimacy, the assertion of certain sources will violate other sources, in this instance the formal or legal legitimacy. Thus, cockfighting is conceived by many as deviant because it coexists with laws forbidding it.
Analysis of Subcultural Deviance

It is not the purpose or the intention of this section to redefine deviance or to construct yet another theory of the etiology of deviance. Rather, cockfighting can be (and has been) identified as deviant by reference to the (type of) reactions of the public or the agents of organized society. Becker (1963: 14) makes the point that "...deviance is not a quality that lies in behavior itself, but in the interaction between the person who commits an act and those who respond to it." In this sense then,

...social groups create deviance by making the rules whose infraction constitutes deviance. ...deviance is not a quality of the act the person commits, but rather a consequence of the application by others of rules and sanctions to an "offender." The deviant is one to whom that label has successfully been applied; deviant behavior is behavior that people so label (p. 9).

Thus, the acts or actors who are to be labeled as deviant depend upon the legitimate power to perceive such acts as deviant (proponents of this viewpoint, the labeling theory, include Becker, 1963; Goffman, 1963b; Kitsuse, 1962: 247-256; Matza, 1969; Simmons, 1969; indeed, Szasz, 1960: 113-118, has even questioned the existence of deviance apart from the label).

The enactment of legislation and its subsequent enforcement very often depend less upon consensus with respect to those concerned parties than upon the ability of certain interest groups and power elites to influence the legal system
(see Simmons, 1969: 5). Indeed, this seems to be particularly true of "crimes without victims" (Schur, 1965: 169-171), that is, when the legislation is directed toward behavior defined in moral terms. Becker (1963: 148), in this sense, states, "Many moral crusades have strong humanitarian overtones. The crusader is not only interested in seeing to it that other people do what he thinks is right. He believes that if they do what is right it will be good for them." Of significance here is the symbolic politics described by Gusfield (1963: 171-172) as "gestures of differentiation." Gestures of differentiation imply that some people have a legitimate claim to greater authority and importance than have some others in the society. "In such gestures, governments take sides in social conflicts and place the power and prestige of the public, operating through the political institution, on one side or the other" (p. 172). These gestures of differentiation serve as indicators for the types of "...persons, the tastes, the moralities, and the general life styles toward which the government is sympathetic or censorious" (p. 172).

Scott ([1957]: 11) notes that, "Outstanding among that which history has to teach is that there can be no suppression of cruel sports or practices absolutely or in any wholesale way." Indeed, various histories of moral crusades imply that the laws have apparently been ineffective when the concern is private morality and the acts are essentially conceived as "victimless." Of such legislative attempts,
Schur (1965: 169) says:

Crimes without victims involve attempts to legislate morality for its own sake. . . . From the sociological standpoint. . . . reference to the victimless nature of the offence may. . . . reveal the basis for saying that certain laws are indeed designed merely to legislate morality. It also highlights an important criterion for determining which laws fall into this category — the question: "Is there, in this particular situation, any real victimization?"

Further, "...the 'harm' seen in the proscribed transaction seems primarily to be harm to the participating individuals themselves (apart from any alleged harm to general morals)" (p. 170).

Indeed, the essence of the deviant label attached to cockfighting is the bounds of conflict existing between the cockfighting subculture and the prohibitive legislative actions as well as opposing interest groups such as the various humane societies. However, the ideologies of the humane groups are largely embodied in the contemporary laws prohibiting cockfighting. Such conflict is similar to Kluckhohn's (1951: 391) "ideological conflict," which is characterized by a clash of what is conceived as desirable. In a similar sense,

There is... always a rivalry between the spontaneous definitions of the situation made by the member of an organized society and the definitions which his society has provided for him. . . . Organized society seeks . . . to regulate the conflict and competition inevitable between its members in the pursuit of their wishes . . . (Thomas, 1972: 332).
Further, this conflict may be conceived as cultural conflict embodying conflicting ideologies and interests (Mack and Snyder, 1957: 221). Essentially, this is again addressing symbolic politics (Gusfield, 1963: 172) with the government supporting or sympathizing with the ideologies and interests of one group to the opposition of the other group.

The contemporary laws concerning cockfighting embody prohibitions concerning cruelty to animals. Indeed, such a concern is the basis for the conflict existing between humane societies and groups and the cockfighting subculture. The ideology of such humane groups, as well as much anticruelty legislation, is directed toward the prevention of animal sufferage through abandonment, starvation, exposure, maiming, trapping, and other forms of mistreatment (further duties, obligations, and ideologies of man toward animals may be reviewed in Godlovitch and Harris, 1972: 149-238).

However, some contemporary laws concerning cockfighting also embody not only a concern over cruelty but overtones that such a spectacle may be a demoralizing factor and have adverse effects upon the individuals involved. As was revealed in the section, "Legal History and Status" of chapter 3 in this thesis, this was the concern of several of the earlier laws passed. This then focuses upon the moral issues involving definitions not only of cockfighting as cruel and generally debasing to man but of cockfighting as deviant. This is of relevance to the concept of symbolic politics in that legislation and its subsequent enforcement often depend
more upon the ability of the power elite and interest groups to influence the legal system than upon consensus among concerned parties, particularly when the issue is behavior defined in moral terms.

While many "victimless crimes" and acts of deviance receive a good deal of public attention, many seem to experience increased legal and public toleration (see Benjamin and Masters, 1964; Becker, 1963; Jackman, O'Toole, and Geis, 1963; Polsky, 1967; Schur, 1965; Weinberg, 1966, 1967); however, cockfighting does not seem to attract much public or legal attention. It is this very lack of attention and/or a relatively low degree of visibility that seems conducive to a lack of consensus of values concerning the criminalization of cockfighting. Therefore, those not a part of the cockfighting subculture or involved in opposition groups (i.e., humane societies) are seemingly unconcerned with and largely unaware of cockfighting. That is, many such people are unaware of cockfighting activities in their area, and stereotypically conceive of it as occurring in an area geographically and socially separated from them; this became apparent during the course of this research and thesis writing. The writer, in either discussing the thesis topic or being questioned about the thesis topic by those having no association with either cockfighting or organized opposition groups, was met with the general opinion that such research would have to be conducted "in the mountains" or some other area(s) distant from them. For many people, cockfighting
is not defined as a significant social problem. There even seems to be a good deal of apathy within the various law enforcement agencies. Scott ([1957]: 124) cites a November, 1952 editorial in The National Humane Review that notes the extent of cockfighting and suggests "corrupt protection":

There is hardly a sizeable community in the whole of the United States in which cockfights are not being conducted more or less regularly. And where this condition exists it is very often the fact that local law enforcement authorities know about it - or don't want to know about it. Cockfights are always fairly widely publicized. They have to be to attract the necessary crowd of "fanciers" and spectators. They are staged over and over at the same pits. They often are announced weeks and months in advance in national magazines. Any law enforcement officer who wants to prevent the cockfights will have little difficulty in locating most of them.

It is because of this apathy or opposition that the twenty informants (and probably the subculture as a whole) have operationalized a rather concise typology employing four categories for classifying those individuals that are encountered. First, there are those with whom the informants feel they can be open; this largely included other members of the subculture, family, and those who are interested in cockfighting and pose no threat. Second, there are those with whom the informants have friendly relations but feel that they must conceal their activity; most of the informants reported that this would include those that they work with, as well as other acquaintances. Third, there are those who are irrelevant and seem largely apathetic; this
would include most outsiders or the general public and quite often the law enforcement agencies. Fourth, there are those whom the informants feel are a threat or at least a potential threat; this undeniably includes the humane societies and other organized opposition groups and sometimes includes the law enforcement agencies.

Unlike other "victimless crimes" and "moral deviance" (see Becker, 1963: 37; Schur, 1965: 171-172), those involved in the cockfighting subculture do not seem to develop a deviant self-image because 1) they do not perceive of their behavior and/or deny it, as defined by the formal legitimacy, as being outside the pale of respectability, largely through the employment of their justifications, and 2) cockfighting, as a deviant activity, receives little attention, the dominant society being largely apathetic toward cockfighting.

Of particular relevance here is Merton's (1968: 413-415) distinction among the various forms of deviant behavior. Merton is explicit in his distinction between nonconformity and such other kinds of deviant behavior as crime and delinquency. "These kinds of 'deviant behavior' differ structurally, culturally, and functionally" (p. 414), and it is therefore not to be assumed that "...they are all adequately caught up in a single concept of 'deviant behavior'" (p. 414). One use of Merton's term, "nonconformity," represents conformity to certain values, standards, and practices from an earlier time in society which have been superceded or have fallen into neglect. Simmons echoes this contention,
saying, "...virtually all of our cherished habits and values and institutions were once considered unnatural and perverse - and that most everything which may seem disgusting and abhorrent to us has been the normal, accepted way of doing things somewhere else [or in some other time]" (1969: 4). It is significant to note here that the first law to specifically bar the fighting of cocks in the United States was not enacted until 1867 (Leavitt, 1970: 18-19). Merton (1968: 414-415) further notes the profound differences between the nonconformist and the other labels of deviance. First, the nonconformist does not attempt to hide his departures from the formal legitimate norms of the group but rather proclaims his dissent; hence, the specific justifications of the cockfighting subculture addressing the issue of cruelty. Second, unlike the criminal, the nonconformist (i.e., the cockfighter or other subcultural member) "...challenges the legitimacy of the norms and expectations he rejects or at least challenges their applicability to certain situations" (p. 414). The subculture then recognizes other sources of legitimacy to the exclusion of the formal legitimacy (legal order). Third, the nonconformist desires a change of the societal norms, "...to supplant what he takes to be morally illegitimate norms with norms having an alternative moral basis" (p. 415). It is quite conceivable through Merton's conceptual distinctions among the various forms of deviance for the members of the cockfighting subculture, as a "nonconforming" group, to lack a deviant self-image.
Indeed, all twenty informants either explicitly or implicitly denied the development of a deviant self-image and further denied cockfighting as a deviant activity; in response to question forty-two on the interview schedule, "In your opinion, is cockfighting as a sport understood by outsiders (those who do not go or are not involved in the sport)?", all twenty of the informants replied negatively. And there was further unanimous consensus through the contention that most outsiders did not care or were not concerned with cockfighting, but those who were concerned or were asked about it conceived it as a deviant activity and stereotyped cock-fighters as a "bunch of rubes, rednecks, and ruffians," or as cockfighting taking place between "thieves and thugs."

Further, Schur (1965: 172) asserts that the deviant self-image is related to the degree of primacy taken on by the deviant role "...or the extent to which the deviant behavior comes to be elaborated into a role at all. And primacy relates closely to the extent to which the deviant must, in order to satisfy the proscribed demand, engage himself in various instrumental and supportive activities." It further follows that "It is not...merely the continuing nature of the basic deviant act that establishes the basis for a subculture but...the need for continuous contact with other like individuals in order for the basic deviant acts to be carried out" (pp. 172-173). This "contact with other like individuals" is integral and basic to the structure of the rules and conditions of cockfighting. However, many other subcultures
involving deviant acts (e.g., drug use and abuse, homosexuality, and the like) whose participants are often identified as having developed deviant self-images seem to develop through the exertion of pressure by psychological and social considerations. That is, the deviant individual "...may withdraw into...[a deviant] subsociety, which may then serve as an emotional refuge and...as the social base for the objectivation of his deviant definitions of reality" (Berger and Luckmann, 1966: 126). In developing this supposition further, "Some roles, like those of the radical or the drug users, may not actually require interaction, but kindred spirits are desirable to alleviate feelings of isolation and alienation..." (Simmons, 1969: 78).

In response to society's disapproval and harassment deviants usually band together with others in the same plight. Beyond the ties of similar interests and views which lie at the base of most human associations, deviants find that establishing fairly stable relationships with other deviants does much to ease procurement and coping problems and to provide a more stable and reliable source of direct support and interaction. In these indirect ways, society's condemnation "creates" the deviant subculture (p. 88).

However, such is not true of the cockfighting subculture; rather, the cockfighting subculture with its interaction is a necessary requisite to the activity per se. Upon becoming a cockfighter, one simultaneously becomes a member of the subculture and must do so to achieve his ends, that being the fighting of cocks; however, the marijuana user may commence use long before "drifting" into the marijuana
subculture, and although membership may facilitate the acquisition of the substance, it is not a requisite to its use. Thus, in this sense, it would seem that the cockfighting subculture is one of a physical necessity or requisite to the activity itself while many other deviant subcultures are of a psychological and social need or support.

Thus, possibly contributing to the lack of a development of a deviant self-image among the participants of the cockfighting subculture is that theirs is a subculture au naturel to the activity per se; that is, the cockfighting subculture is integral to the activity while "other deviant" subcultures are socially and psychologically ancillary to the activities associated with the subcultures. In this sense then, just as Merton (1968: 414) identified the concept of "deviant behavior" as being inadequate to subsume all forms of behavior previously termed as such, it should be recognized sociologically that all subcultural forms are too complex and diverse to be adequately caught up in the single concept of "subculture." It is then feasible to postulate that the development of a deviant self-image may be related to some degree to ancillary subcultures (as opposed to subcultures au naturel) in that one's participation in such a subculture would not be necessary to the associated activity. Unlike the cockfighting subculture, the participation in such ancillary subcultures is not for the realization of the "deviant" activity but for emotional refuge (i.e., need and support), because, at least in part, they have perceived
their activities as deviant and have thus developed a deviant self-image.

Perhaps the subcultural members' participation in a stigmatized and clandestine activity and without the development of a deviant self-image contributes to their toleration (an perhaps even empathy) of participants in other "victimless crimes." Of relevance here are the twenty informants' responses to question thirty-nine of the interview schedule:

Even those people who do not go to cock-fights are aware that cockfighting is against the law. They rank it with other crimes that have no victims; that is, no one is hurt by the act. However, others feel that some "victimless crimes" are worse than others. Rank the following victimless crimes from what you feel is the most serious to the least serious. The most serious gets 1, the second most serious gets 2, and so on.

The six "victimless crimes" that they were presented were prostitution, cockfighting, pornography (including stag films and X rated movies, magazines and books), smoking marijuana, homosexuality, and draft evasion.

One informant placed a "one" by each of the victimless crimes listed, including cockfighting, indicating that he thought all were quite serious. However, these responses, as an indication of this individual's beliefs, are suspect in that he implied that these responses would be expected of him because of his profession, that being an ordained Baptist minister. Of the nineteen informants remaining (95%), no one indicated prostitution, cockfighting, or pornography as being serious at all. Further, five of the
nineteen respondents contended that there was nothing wrong with any of those "victimless crimes" cited above as long as all concerned parties were consenting; of the fourteen respondents remaining, six asserted that only draft evasion was serious, and four of these six respondents replied that draft evasion was not victimless since quotas had to be met in times of conscription, and thus someone would have to take the evader's place. Of the eight respondents remaining who indicated that more than one of the "victimless crimes" were serious, all indicated that draft evasion was the second most serious. Of the fifteen total indicating draft evasion to be serious, eleven contended that if drafted, it was one's duty as an American to serve. Of the eight respondents remaining, six stated that they felt homosexuality to be the most serious, and the remaining two said that smoking marijuana was the most serious. Thus, as a whole, the members of the cockfighting subculture interviewed seemed to be fairly tolerant of other "victimless crimes"; five of the informants (25%) indicated that there was nothing wrong with any of the "victimless crimes" listed; six (30%) indicated that only draft evasion was serious; six (30%) stated that homosexuality and draft evasion were serious while two (10%) felt that marijuana smoking and draft evasion were serious; only one (5%) felt that all were serious, and this may be suspect in that the informant may have been responding in a manner that he thought would be expected of him in light of his occupation.
The percentage of those who were completely tolerant of the various "victimless crimes" listed would increase to forty-five percent if those four who contended that draft evasion was serious because it is not victimless were added to the five who saw nothing wrong in any of the "crimes" listed.

Of significance in giving support to this observation is a study of tolerance/intolerance and deviant or semi-deviant groups conducted by Simmons (1969: 31-33). One finding of the study asserted that those tolerant of one type of "deviance" would be tolerant of other types of "deviance." The study also reported that "Respondents over forty years old were significantly less tolerant of every deviant. . . . group" (p. 33) and the mean age of the twenty informants was 36.4 years. Simmons also reported that "The sexes differed significantly in attitudes toward only three of the deviant groups; women were significantly more intolerant of prostitutes and lesbians, and men were more intolerant of male homosexuals" (p. 33). It is quite possible then that the toleration of participants in other forms of "deviance" as voiced by the twenty informants is partially a result of them all being males and may have been influenced by the types of victimless crimes with which they were presented. However, this toleration of other "victimless crimes" coupled with the apparent lack of a deviant self-image is not to deny that the members of the cockfighting subculture do not realize their unfavorable, and often deviant, image
held by others, which results from the illegality of the sport as well as the stigma of "cruelty," such ramifications being maintained and bolstered largely by opposition or humane groups.

As was noted at the beginning of this section, the intention was not to redefine deviance or to construct still another theory of the etiology of deviance to add to the already existing plethora of such but to provide some analysis of the labeled deviance of cockfighting. As was revealed, the conceptualization and application of this "deviance" finds its fertility in opposition groups (or the humane societies), with the general public (i.e., those having no vested interests in either the cockfighting subculture or the opposition groups) having only peripheral cognizance of the activity and issue and thus providing little, if any, operationalization of the concept of deviance as relevant to the cockfighting subculture.

Conclusions

The analysis and exploration of the organization of cockfighting is greatly facilitated by the utilization of the sociological concept of the subculture. Much was revealed about the internal structure, the organization, and the social relationships of cockfighting through the exposure and discussion of the subcultural statuses and roles, and the introduction and socialization into the subculture. The exposure of certain membership motivations, subcultural values, and subcultural justifications revealed, at least in part,
the codes, traditions, and values of the cockfighting subculture. Last, in subscribing to forms of legitimacy other than the formal legitimacy, cockfighting is often considered "deviant"; however, participants in the cockfighting subculture apparently lack a deviant self-image.
Notes From Chapter IV

The twenty informants represented knowledge of 127 pits in Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia.
CHAPTER V

COCKFIGHTING: AN INFORMAL VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATION

Introduction

The history of the development of America has coincided with that of voluntary associations, embracing the notion of open, formal, and structured organizations (Merrill, 1961: 523-524). In support of this is the following, written more than 135 years ago:

In no country in the world has the principle of association been more successfully used, or more unsparingly applied to a multitude of different objects, than in America. Americans of all ages, all conditions, and all dispositions constantly form associations. They have not only commercial and manufacturing companies, in which all take part, but associations of a thousand other kinds, religious, moral, serious, futile, general or restricted, enormous or diminutive. The Americans make associations to give entertainments, to found seminaries, to build inns, to construct churches, to diffuse books, to send missionaries to the antipodes; in this manner they found hospitals, prisons, and schools. If it is proposed to inculcate some truth or to foster some feeling by the encouragement of a great example, they form a society (de Tocqueville, 1945: 106).

Today it has been estimated that there are well over 100,000 voluntary associations in the United States (Rose, 1956: 309).
Deviant Associations

However, in recent years, America has witnessed a similar, yet unique, social movement. It embodies the idea of open, formal, and structured organizations (what sociologists call voluntary associations) among people whom society has characterized as deviant - people who are subject to scorn, discrimination, gossip, sometimes pity, and sometimes punishment, because they carry a stigma. That many of these people have been apparently successful in hiding their stigmatizing characteristic - concealment made possible by low visibility - makes the fact of these organizations all the more remarkable (Sagarin, 1969: 17).

Members of such deviant associations, and thus the associations themselves, are either viewed as pariahs and subjected to social opprobrium or are looked upon as more quaint than evil. Further, the assignment of social opprobrium may follow one of two modes: some memberships are perceived as disgraceful simply because of the affiliation with a particular organization while others form or join organizations because they find themselves already in trouble with the attitudes of society (pp. 19-20). This contrast is strongly similar to that of ancillary subcultures and subcultures au naturel. "This difference is crucial in many respects, but particularly from such viewpoints as self-image and self-righteousness, the voluntariness or involuntariness of one's status, and the nature of one's expectations from the group" (p. 20).

This point lends further credibility to the explanation of the apparent lack of a deviant self-image developing among the cockfighting subculture as developed in this thesis.
An individual is not identified as involved in cockfighting (and thus deviant), even by himself, until he becomes involved in the subculture. Thus, any social opprobrium present is (perceived to be) a result of affiliation with a particular organization. However, unlike many other "deviant" associations (e.g., Ku Klux Klan, drug and homosexual associations), cockfighting has low visibility and recognition, receiving its opposition from specific factions and associations (i.e., humane groups), the general public giving it very little attention, primarily through a lack of awareness of the extent and existence of cockfighting. Therefore, it is not an expressed societal opinion with which the cockfighting subculture must cope but the opinion of opposition groups or associations.

Generally, deviant and stigmatized associations may be one of two types, depending on the individual member's perception of the group's goal. "In forming, supporting, or joining a group the deviant always seeks to escape his stigma, but he does so by seeking either 1) to conform to the norms of society, or 2) to change those norms to include acceptance of his own behavior" (p. 21). However, this does not hold consistent with the subculture of cockfighting; it is obvious that anyone associated with the cockfighting subculture is not associated with it to "conform to the norms of society," and it has been revealed that there is no attempt or large desire by the subculture to change the norms to include the acceptance of cockfighting. Further, the
individual, in becoming involved in the cockfighting subculture, does not do so to escape his stigma but rather does so to facilitate his interest in the activity; as testified to by the lack of a deviant self-image, there seems to be little (if any) stigma perceived by a subcultural member on an individual basis. That is, the individual subcultural member recognizes that cockfighting as an activity has a stigma assigned to it by the various opposition groups but does not perceive it on an individual or personal level, as do other types of "deviants."

One may actually increase the stigma by increasing his visibility as a member of a socially discouraged association if, indeed, one does join with other similarly labeled "deviants" (Sagarin, 1969: 21). However, this situation may be countered in one or a combination of three ways; "by protecting the individual through anonymity; by using the greater visibility as a mechanism to reduce social disapproval; and by concealing the nature of the organization behind a neutral name" (p. 21). Indeed, anonymity is an essential feature to any clandestine activity; further, it was revealed (pp. 124-125, this thesis) that many pit associations often fight under the guise of a neutral name.

Cockfighting and Formal Voluntary Association: A Juxtaposition

Given the long history of formal voluntary associations in the United States and the recent growth of deviant voluntary associations, it is felt to be useful to compare and contrast the two gross forms of voluntary associations in this thesis,
employing the cockfighting subculture as a voluntary association. However, there seem to be certain inherent problems in the analysis of voluntary associations. Lowie (1948: 295) states that, "Since sodalities [voluntary associations] represent a conglomerie of diverse associations set off by negative rather than positive criteria, they defy logical classification. Indeed, given their marked fluidity, classification of that sort would wrest asunder phenomena that are genetically related." Lowie then confined his work to description and discussion. Similarly, Anderson (1971: 213), in reviewing the works of anthropologists, states that attempts to generalize about associations in the "middle-range" of societal evolution have not been particularly successful, the best alternative being to characterize associations "...broadly and note regularities limited to particular parts of the world or to particularly associational mechanisms such as secrecy or age alignment." However, much understanding may be gained by noting discrepancies and contrasts as well.

There seems to be much consensus in the literature as to what constitutes voluntary associations. Maccoby (1958: 524) says,

The distinguishing characteristics of the voluntary associations are that it be private, non-profit, voluntary in that entrance rests on mutual consent while exit is at the will of either party, and formal in that there are offices to be filled in accordance with stipulated rules. These traits serve to differentiate the voluntary association from public and governmental bodies; profit-making corporations and
partnerships; family, clan, church, nation and other groups into which the individual is born; informal friendship groups, cliques, or gangs.

Remarkably similar to this is Smith's and Freedman's (1972: viii) description of a voluntary association as being

...a nonprofit, nongovernment, private group which an individual joins by choice. Members are not born into such associations as they are in the family or church, nor drafted into them as in the case with the military, nor are required to join in order to make a living as is frequently true of unions and professional groups. ... Finally, it should be noted that...[such associations are] structured, formally organized, relatively permanent, secondary groupings as opposed to less structured, informal, ephemeral, or primary groupings. A formal organization is identified by the presence of offices which are filled through some established procedure; periodic, scheduled meetings; qualifying criteria for membership; and some formalized division and specialization of labor, although the organizations do not necessarily exhibit all those characteristics to the same degree.

Further, voluntary associations as social structures have explicit features of formal leadership, specific activity, rules for operating, definite place and time of meeting, and so on (Rose, 1956: 305).

To be sure, the cockfighting subculture shares many of these characteristics; though certain rules of the subculture hold potential for financial profit, most individuals do not enter into membership fully expecting and anticipating economic returns as do those involved in profit-sharing plans, consumers' cooperatives, or mutual aid societies. Thus, the cockfighting subculture is largely non-profit. Further, it is obvious that the subculture is private and
membership voluntary. While no offices to be filled were discerned, the scheduled cock matches may be conceived as being somewhat analogous to scheduled meetings, and a division and specialization of labor occurs through the specialization of roles and statuses involved in cockfighting. While the cockfighting subculture does not possess a formal leadership per se, publishers, and journals, as well as others assuming the more respected roles (referee, pit owner, breeder, et al.), may provide leadership. Also, cockfighting as an association has rules for operating, definite place (i.e., the pit) and time of meeting, and a specific activity, that of fighting gamecocks.

Formal voluntary associations are developed when groups of people having certain interests or purposes in common act together in order to attain the specified goals (Merrill, 1961: 524; Rose, 1956: 305). The purpose or purposes of any given association are limited, and seldom will an association act for a purpose different from the original purpose bringing the members together (p. 314). Again, this is quite similar to the position of the subculture of cockfighting in that the major, even sole interest, is cockfighting. It is not to be denied that the interests of the subcultural members may be as diversified as the statuses and roles involved, but they all focus on the activity in the pit.

The specific nature of the purposes of voluntary associations gives to American culture a characteristic which was originally known as "cultural pluralism" (although that term has recently been distorted to refer
solely to religious and nationality diversity). In its original meaning — as stated by Dewey, Cooley, and Kallen — cultural pluralism referred to the encouragement of all kinds of group differences characteristic of American life and especially to those group differences that one voluntarily chooses to cultivate. Most individuals are encouraged to be "culturally plural" as they are encouraged to belong to several associations, with quite different purposes and often with different memberships (p. 315).

Even if Rose is accurate in his contention that most individuals are encouraged to be affiliated with several associations, at least one article (Wright and Hyman, 1958: 294) states that almost half (47%) of all families in the United States have no affiliation with voluntary associations, at least formal voluntary associations. About one-third (31%) of all families belong to only one such organization while approximately one-fifth (21%) of all families belong to more than one voluntary association. Membership in voluntary associations is much more characteristic of white persons than of Blacks. This was reported to be the case by the twenty informants involved in the cockfighting subculture but to what extent could not be accurately discerned. However, it was reported that Black participation is by no means unusual. The study (Wright and Hyman, 1958) further reported that urban and rural non-farm families are more likely to belong to voluntary associations than are rural-farm families. This is partly supported and partly denied by the findings of this study. The majority of the informants had rural-farm backgrounds and had rural-farm residences when
they became involved in cockfighting. However, the majority of the informants now have urban or rural non-farm residences (see pp. 162-163, this thesis). Wright and Hyman (1958: 294) finally indicated that membership is "directly related to socio-economic status." Again, this is not compatible with the findings produced by the study of cockfighting. Although the majority of the informants are of the "middle class," it is recognized that the members of the cockfighting subculture represent all social classes. Membership then, at least in this instance, seems to be directly related to individual interest, largely irrespective of socio-economic status. In that informants suggested potential informants (producing a type of sociometric data) with different or varying socio-economic statuses, this indicates that the social relations of those involved are more often built upon their common leisure interests than upon similarities in background and social position.

Indeed, Rose (1956: 312-313), in noting several studies citing significant differentials in participation, also states that middle and higher income Americans are more likely to join associations than are people of lower income, and most usually, those of different income levels are more likely to join different associations. Although Hollingshead's Two Factor Index of Social Position was employed on the interview schedule, and thus no questions were asked to reveal the informants' incomes, it is felt that the various occupations (see Appendix E-2) represent
a broad range of incomes. Rose also contended that participation in voluntary associations is stronger by men than by women. This seems to be generally consistent with the findings of membership by sex in the cockfighting subculture. A further contention is that those to participate the least are young adults (aged twenty to thirty). This would be difficult to support or deny because of a lack of a representative and random sample, but of the informants, six (30%) were aged twenty to thirty. Last, Rose noted that married people are more likely to participate than single persons. Whether marital status influences participation or if the age ranges for participation and marriage coincide cannot be stated definitely by the research conducted for this thesis. However, the twenty informants tended to support Rose, fifteen of them (75%) being married and three more (15%) being married previously.

Maccoby (1958: 526-529) discloses that members in voluntary associations are more likely to be voters than non-voters and are more likely to become voters if they were previously non-voters. Voluntary associations seem then to have a role in maintaining and/or stimulating political activity. Unfortunately, data concerning political activity per se was not sought. However, not unrelated to political activity was the informants' general consensus of positive attitude toward national patriotism (see pp. 171-172, 193, this thesis).
Given those individuals that do participate in voluntary associations, the question arises as to the purpose of participation, beyond mutual interests and goals. The Kluckhohns (1947: 250) state:

Why are Americans a nation of joiners? In part this is a defensive mechanism against the excessive fluidity of our social structure. Because of the tension of continual struggle for social place, people have tried to gain a degree of routinized and recognized fixity by allying themselves with others in voluntary associations.

In a similar sense, Sagarin (1969: 28) says, "The lack of rigid class distinctions in America gave rise to social mobility which, in turn, encouraged the formation of organizations that granted status to the joiner." Rose (1956: 315, 329-330) contends that individuals turn to voluntary associations for self expression and satisfaction of interests. Also, voluntary associations distribute and diversify power and influence. Power and influence are but constituents of status and prestige. Among the various roles involved in cockfighting and cited in this thesis (pp. 113-147), it was noted that many embraced the opportunity for status and prestige. Indeed, in that it has been revealed that cockfighting has a large lower-middle and upper-lower class following, this activity provides a source of potential status and achievement to these individuals who, because of a lack of resources or other social deficits, may not achieve status and prestige in other "more salient" areas.
In light of this predominant type of social class following, it is interesting to note that Veblen (1953: 102) asserts as part of the pecuniary canons of taste of the leisure class the "...pervading guidance of taste by pecuniary repute...traceable in the prevalent standards of beauty in animals." Veblen (p. 102) makes the case that beauty is not readily imputed to domestic animals (e.g., barnyard fowl, hogs, sheep, cattle, draft animals) since they are industrially useful to the community, serving a useful end and providing goods. "The case is different with those domestic animals which ordinarily serve no industrial end... These commonly are items of conspicuous consumption, and are therefore honorific in their nature and may legitimately be accounted beautiful" (p. 102). It cannot be argued that a gamecock is industrially useful to the community, and thus in Veblen's terms is an "item of conspicuous consumption." Thus, this in itself may provide status and prestige; that is, a subcultural member owning a very beautiful or rare breed or owning a very large number of gamecocks may be accorded prestige on such a basis.

A further explanation of participation may be explained in the following quote:

Many intellectuals overlook the fact that there are many compensations for, controls over, and satisfactory adjustments to, the monotony of work on the factory production line. Not the least of these is participation in voluntary associations (Rose, 1956: 330).
In support of such participation within the cockfighting subculture are the informants' categorical responses to question ten of the interview schedule, concerning any organizations or clubs to which the informants belonged. Fifteen (75%) stated that they had no affiliation or membership in any organization or club other than cockfighting; three (15%) replied with some type of labor union or other type of work oriented association; two (10%) gave church as their response. In light of the informants' responses to this question then, it is quite feasible that their participation in the cockfighting subculture, at least in part, is a compensation for the monotony of their work.

A voluntary association of this nature (one compensating for the monotony one experiences) is in Rose's term, an "expressive" voluntary association, the first of two types of voluntary associations recognized and delineated by Rose (1956: 305-306). The two types are the "expressive" and the "social-influence" voluntary associations, the former acting only to express or satisfy the interests of their members (such as recreational and sports associations, social and hobby clubs as well as professional "societies"), the latter directing their activities outward in an attempt to bring about some condition or change (such as social welfare and social reform groups as well as the various humane "societies"). Though using somewhat different terminologies, Clark and Wilson (1961), Gordon and Babchuk (1966), and Lundberg, Komarovsky and McInery (1934: 126-127) develop
the same sort of typologies of voluntary associations as that of Rose's. Gordon and Babchuk (1966) also classify the status and accessibility (or entrance) of the formal voluntary associations as being high/low. As it is with most voluntary associations, if either status or accessibility is low (or high), the other is low (or high, respectively). However, cockfighting as a voluntary association experiences a conversely alternating situation. That is, if an individual is not familiar with the activity, or only vaguely so, he would find it difficult to find out where such takes place, who is involved, and so on. In essence, accessibility would be high, while the status associated with such an activity would be low. Yet, an individual demonstrating a sincere interest would find accessibility low and at least several of the involved roles high in status. Further, it is not necessary that those involved as well as outsiders perceive status and prestige in the roles in that such roles only have relevance and social reality to those involved, and thus an interplay of status gratification exists and is real only among those involved.

Grossly, Clark and Wilson (1961), Gordon and Babchuk (1966), Lundberg, Komarovsky and McInery (1934: 126-127), as well as Rose (1956: 305-306) conceive of voluntary associations as either leisure organizations or instrumental organizations. Cockfighting is with no doubt a leisure activity, or at least requiring leisure time.
Being a leisure association, there have been stated several reasons for participation in the cockfighting subculture. Booth (1970: 31), a pit operator, stated that 1) cockfighting as a sporting activity requires a small investment and is not overcrowded, unlike many other activities; 2) the entire family may participate, victory often providing much family cohesion; 3) the activity is ideal for the participation of the aged and handicapped in that it does not require great physical strength or stamina. Perhaps as a point of terminology, cockfighting should be referred to as an activity of recreation rather than leisure, since leisure time is a free time, and those involved in cockfighting have chosen it to fill at least a large portion of their free time (Weiss, 1964: 21). Being a leisure or recreational activity, Fitz-Barnard ([1921]: 26) says,

The cocker that does not himself breed and rear his stock loses half the pleasure of cocking.

For one of the charms of this great sport is that it gives enjoyment and occupation all the year round; what with selecting and attending to your breeding-pens, caring for your chicks, raising your stags, procuring walks, etc., and then the final joy of seeing them in the pit, finds you pleasure and profit for all times of the year.

Thus, like many other voluntary associations, cockfighting offers the opportunity for status and prestige. However, unlike many other voluntary associations limiting its membership to only certain segments of the population, cockfighting may be pursued by those of wealth as well as those of only minimum incomes, by individual efforts as well as family
efforts, and by the young and healthy as well as by the aged and handicapped.

Cockfighting as a pleasure activity can "... add a sense of play and sport to the values of productivity and solidarity. On the other hand, pleasure-seeking often leads to an unfair downgrading of everyday life" (Dumazedier, 1967: 83). In an allegorical or symbolic sense however, cockfighting presents a situation quite the converse.

While many voluntary associations, particularly the "expressive" type, serves as an escape from the realities of life, an opportunity to "get away from it all for awhile," cockfighting, at least symbolically, brings certain realities of life to the surface and focuses upon them: victory and defeat, life and death, struggle for survival, violence. As stated by Durkheim (1915: 14),

... one must know how to go underneath the symbol to the reality which it represents and which gives it its meaning. The most barbarous and the most fanatic rites and the strangest myths translate some human need, some aspect of life, either individual or social.

The cockfight, as the activity and consequences in the pit, takes up the themes of death, victory, masculinity, rage, pride, loss, chance, and placing them in a stratified encompassing structure, presents them, at least in an ideational sense, as real and meaningful - visible, tangible, graspable. The cockfight is then a means of expression, its function being neither to mollify nor heighten social passions, but rather to display them (Geertz, 1972: 23). Of life and death, one cocker said:
Cocking is for the rurally oriented type of man who likes the realities of life. . . . You have to scratch and fight and face eventual death. The cock faces this reality with dignity (Newsweek, 1962: 79).

In that the cock in the pit may be conceived as an extension of and for the cocker's own ego (Geertz, 1972: 6, 17-18), it becomes obvious that what is at stake, aside from any material consideration, is esteem, masculinity, honor, dignity, respect, in essence, status. The long-range success or failure of a cockfighter becomes more than victory or defeat for his birds; they become symbolic and operational (connecting theory with practice) indicators of the cockfighter's knowledge and ability. The cockfight, in a large sense, becomes a dramatization of status concerns.

Informal Voluntary Associations

Thus, while the cockfighting subculture as a voluntary association is similar in its characteristics to the characteristics and points of development of the formal voluntary associations, the discrepancies are sufficient to exclude it as a formal voluntary association. However, because of the similarities and the nature of the discrepancies, being as a matter of degree less formal in structure, it would be conceivable to classify the cockfighting subculture as an "informal voluntary association." Chapin (1957: 263-264) contends that (formal) voluntary associations come about to satisfy some need, and, after the life careers begin, progress toward formalization of structure.
As growth in size of membership proceeds, structure subdivides into subgroups of smaller size and with different functions. Although relatively large in membership, the voluntary associations may become veritable congeries of small constituent groups with mutually supporting or competitive relationships, within the larger system of the overall group. Attitudes of members then become conditioned to the norms of the groups (often embodied in codes) that stipulate the expected behaviors, to the symbols of the authority and the function of the organization, and to its physical property. An increasing emphasis on conformity and status develops and the voluntary organization begins to have traditions (pp. 263-264).

Of significance here is the consideration of traditions. As has been noted, the origins of cockfighting and its traditions have been lost in antiquity. However, the traditions per se have been maintained and perpetuated. Thus, already possessing traditions, duties, obligations, conduct, functions, requisites, and such are delineated by these traditions, suspending the necessity of formal offices, leadership, and structure. The informal voluntary association (i.e., the cockfighting subculture) then seems to be facilitated by the prior existence of tradition.
CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS AND SUMMARY

Introduction

To attempt a concluding summary statement for a study employing ethnographic description would prove at best lengthy and repetitive, and at worst an exercise in futility. However, certain summarizing observations concerning the extent and membership of the cockfighting subculture may prove useful and not redundant. Again, it is to be noted that this research is not presented as the definitive and exhaustive work regarding the activity or subculture of cockfighting. Thus, as a conclusion to the thesis (and this chapter), future and/or potential areas of research that became obvious and significant during the course of this research will be presented.

Summarizing Observations

From all data discerned during the course of this investigation, there were no indicators exposed to suggest or imply that the clandestine activity of cockfighting and its subculture does not experience an extremely broad and full distribution in the United States. Indeed, Brasch (1970: 73) notes that cockfighting probably has had more followers than any other sport in the world. As has been noted, the
symbolic rewards (specifically, that of status) derived from membership in the cockfighting subculture can be significant, particularly to those individuals who, because of a lack of resources, may not achieve status and prestige in other areas; however, membership is not to the exclusion of those experiencing such status in other situations. This is particularly significant in light of the large lower-middle class following that cockfighting experiences. However, membership in the cockfighting subculture is composed of all social and socio-economic positions. As was revealed by the findings of this study and as is supported by many "deviant" studies (see Simmons, 1969: 39-41), those involved in the activity in question are usually more "typical" than "atypical," more "non-deviant" than "deviant." "The vast bulk of a deviant's characteristics will be statistically common and morally accepted" (p. 40).

The characteristic of traditionalism is reflected, in part, in that many participants (in this study, 80%) are introduced to cockfighting by relatives. The rural character of the sport is reflected in the childhood residences of the informants, residences of those introducing the informants to the sport, and the present residences of the informants. However, few of the other factors typify a rural situation. Further, the residence patterns, while not necessarily typifying the existing situation per se, is felt to typify a possible trend; the mean residences (see Table 2, pp. 165-167) of those introducing the informants to cockfighting (at that
time) were villages. This was also the case for the childhood residences of the informants, and the great majority contended that this was home for them until they left for marriage or some similar reason. Thus, for most, they were living at their childhood residences when introduced to the sport. An essential part of the trend is that the mean residence of those being introduced was skewed (or pulled) toward a smaller populated area while the mean residence of those introducing the informants was skewed (or pulled) toward a larger populated area. Living in a larger populated area, the cocks are often kept in a less populated area, sometimes on the farm of a close friend or relative; here, the potential members (specifically the informants cooperating in this study) were introduced to the activity by participants from more populated areas (with respect to the means) than they themselves lived in. Next, in continuing the trend, the informants, in pursuit of an occupation or for some other reason, showed a trend of migration to more populated areas (with respect to the means). The informants, maintaining their interest in cockfighting, have strong rural ties for the maintenance of their gamefowl, probably much like those who introduced them, thus completing a cyclical trend.

Also revealed by the research, being implicit throughout the thesis, was the strong relationship between certain cocking practices and written accounts of such practices, thus indicating "...the cocker's dependence on printed
material vis à vis tradition and his own invention" (Parsons, 1969: 273). Indeed, as became obvious in the investigation, the cockfighting subculture is heavily laden with, and directed by, tradition involving ideals and values such as patriotism, honor, honesty, and the like. It is undoubtedly this regard for tradition, at least in part, that provides, and is indicative of, much subcultural stability and thus minimizes any regional subcultural variation.

**Future Research Concerns**

Hardly a question can be answered, a problem solved, or a research topic investigated without giving rise to further questions and research interests. It is with respect to academic curiosity then that further research topics, themselves being a resultant of this investigation, are posed.

A future concern embracing much research potential involves the role of tradition within subcultures and/or voluntary associations. Tradition may, at least in part, contribute to the lack of a development of a deviant self-image by those involved in cockfighting. Further research into the role and employment of tradition may provide useful insights into the development of deviant self-images in other deviant activities, perhaps suggesting a means of identity rehabilitation through exposing historically the existence of tradition associated with the deviant activity in question.
Possibly related to the lack of a development of a deviant self-image is the status gratification that cockfighting offers to those individuals who, because of a lack of social resources, are unable to compete for such status and prestige in other areas. What is the significance of such status with respect to the self-concepts and perceptions of those who are socially inept or lack the social resources to compete for recognition through other means? How do they compare to other individuals who, for similar reasons, are also unable to compete for status and recognition but who have no participation in activities which offer a source of status gratification? Does cockfighting offer to its large "lower-middle class" following a code of honor and fair play that is largely absent in their everyday lives, and does such carry over or otherwise affect their day to day social relationships with nonparticipants in the cockfighting subculture?

Just as Merton (1968: 414) recognized that the various kinds of behavior presently being described by sociologists as "deviant behavior" cannot be adequately caught up in a single concept of "deviant behavior," the single concept of "voluntary association" must be recognized sociologically as being inadequate for the inclusion of those organizations so conceived. Merton (p. 421) warns that

Unless the distinction between types of nonconformist and deviant behavior is maintained, conceptually and terminologically, sociology will by inadvertence continue on the path it has sometimes begun to tread.
and become that science of society which implicitly sees virtue only in social conformity.

Likewise, if the concept of "voluntary association" is not broadened to include informal voluntary associations (rather than just voluntary associations of a formal structure) then sociology may inadvertently walk a path over the ground of groups and organization which has only roadsigns that place a premium on formal structure, thus ignoring the two lane highway of informal and formal voluntary associations. What is then being advocated is not merely the employment of a new term, "informal voluntary association," but a conceptual addition to the study of voluntary associations.

In light of the subcultural justifications and rationalizations for the sport and the subcultural members' pride in the history and tradition of cockfighting, it cannot be denied that cockfighting plays a very significant role in the lives of those who are participants, the extent of its significance even now not fully being comprehended. Thus, even now, cockfighting invites research from sociologists of leisure, deviance, organization, and other substantive areas.
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APPENDIX B

LETTERS TO EDITORS

Copies of the following letter were sent to the editors of Grit and Steel, Gaffney, South Carolina; The Feathered Warrior, DeQueen, Arkansas; and The Gamecock, Hartford, Arkansas, one at a time. An identical letter, with the exception of a paragraph noting that a previous letter had been sent, but may have been lost in the mail, was sent as a follow-up letter about a month after the initial letter had been mailed. However, no cooperation was forthcoming.
Gary S. Foster
Western Kentucky University
Department of Sociology and Anthropology
Bowling Green, Kentucky 42101

Mrs.
c/o Grit and Steel
Gaffney, South Carolina

Dear Mrs.

I am writing in hopes of soliciting some general information concerning cockfighting for a master's thesis. My name is Gary Foster and I am currently attending Western Kentucky University, where I am completing graduate work in sociology. This past summer I was conducting an archaeological survey in eastern Kentucky, and while there, I had the opportunity to observe several cockfights. I immediately became fascinated with this sport and deeply interested in the nature and meaning of cockfighting. Since almost no sociological work has been done on cockfighting, I have chosen to do a study of this topic for my thesis. To make my own interests and intentions clear, I would like to take this opportunity to say that I am not interested in identifying individuals I may study and their anonymity is assured. My major interests are in the organization of this sport and the meaning of it in the lives of those who participate. As the editor of a major publication dealing with this sport, I thought you might be able to assist me in obtaining some of the information I seek on the organization of cockfighting. I found the reference to your publication (along with its address) in a book by Gerald Carson, entitled Men, Beasts, and God: A History of Cruelty and Kindness to Animals.

There are several specific ways in which you might help me. First, I would like to know the total number of people who subscribe to Grit and Steel. Second, and more important to my research, it would be extremely helpful if you could provide me with the number of your subscribers by zip-code areas. I would like to examine the factor of regional ecology or the geographical distribution of the interest in the sport of cockfighting. The zip-code distribution of your subscribers would enable me to describe the areas of cockfighting interest. While this information would be a useful part of my thesis, I stress again that it could and would not be used to identify individuals or groups.
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Third, I was wondering if Grit and Steel has ever conducted a readership study dealing with topics such as the types of articles the readers like, the services and advertisements they find useful, as well as other reactions to the magazine. If so, I would be very interested in obtaining a copy of the findings of such a study, since this sort of information would help me describe and define the types of issues and interests readers have in the sport and in your publication in particular.

The fourth issue concerns the feasibility of my using a systematic mailing list of your subscribers for the purposes of mailing out questionnaires to a sample of them. I would like to be able to send out questionnaires to a sample of people (about 300) interested in the sport of cockfighting. For example, if your subscription list has 6000 names, I was hoping I could send very 20th person a copy of my questionnaire. I am sensitive to the problem of guarding the identity of persons who receive the questionnaires, and if I myself were given permission to use the list, I would destroy the list immediately after sampling the names and sending out the questionnaires. Furthermore, my questionnaire would not ask for names or addresses so individuals could not be identified. However, if you feel that my using the mailing list would be a betrayal of readers' confidence, then perhaps you would consider assisting me with an alternative data collection plan. Another possibility would be for me to send the 300 questionnaires along with their accompanying stamped envelopes to you. They could then be addressed from the systematic mailing list at the offices of Grit and Steel. If this second plan seems more reasonable than the first, I would be willing to pay for any clerical help required to address the envelopes. If you were to select the sample and send the questionnaires for me, it would help me if you would consider assisting me in sending a follow-up letter to some of those persons who did not send back the questionnaire. This would be an added burden, I realize, and I would do it only if the initial response rate were very low. I would, of course, be willing to supply you with these follow-up letters and envelopes and pay for the postage.

All of this discussion of sampling your readers undoubtedly must seem like an unnecessary burden and imposition on what I am sure is a busy editorial staff. In defense of my requests, I want to stress that the questionnaire would include several items (of your own design and choice) on what parts of your magazine readers spend most time with, how long they have subscribed, and so forth. This sort of readership information may be of value to you and I would be happy to analyze the results on such items for you on our computer system here at Western. Indeed, I would be willing to supply you a copy of my entire thesis when it is completed. I would think that enough information could be gathered from the magazine reading items to be worth publishing in your magazine. In addition, I would be happy
for you to review and ok the questionnaire I send out. At this point, I am really asking for your possible interest in assisting me to mail out the questionnaires which would be designed to provide you with ample readership information as well as items that I would use in my thesis analysis. In addition, I would be willing to pay for any clerical help and postage necessary to distribute the questionnaires.

In closing, let me stress my academic interest in and commitment to the completion of a master's thesis on cockfighting. I hope you might be able to give me some help in the areas mentioned above. Your willingness to help me out hopefully would assist me in the completion of my thesis, and might also allow the collection of data of interest to Grit and Steel and its readers. I would like to take this time to sincerely thank you for your time and any consideration you feel you can give my requests. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Gary S. Foster
APPENDIX C

LETTER OF INTRODUCTION TO POLICE

Initially, it was thought that a discussion and interview with state police detectives who had participated in recent raids on cockfights might provide some unique insights and approaches to the study. However, they only provided support to the finding that all social classes were involved in some proportion; yet their attitude toward cockfighting as discussed in this thesis proved to be rather interesting. The following letter was used as an introduction to the state police detectives interviewed.
To whom it may concern,

This gentleman is coming to you in hopes of soliciting some general information concerning cockfighting for a master’s thesis. His name is Gary Foster and he is currently attending Western Kentucky University, where he is completing graduate work in sociology. Since almost no sociological work has been done on cockfighting, he has chosen to do a study of this topic for his thesis. To make his own interests and intentions clear, I would like to take this opportunity to say that he is not interested in identifying individuals that he may study and their anonymity is assured. His major interests are in the organization of this sport and the meaning of it in the lives of those who participate. As a law enforcement officer who has been involved in an intensive investigation of cockfighting and those involved, your assistance would be invaluable to the completion of the thesis in question.

In closing, let me stress Mr. Foster’s academic interest in and commitment to the completion of a master’s thesis on cockfighting. I hope you might be able to give him some help, as it would most surely be a great thrust to the completion of his thesis. I would like to take this time to sincerely thank you for your time and any consideration you feel you can give Mr. Foster. Please feel free to call me for any further verification.

Sincerely,

Dr. James Grimm
Associate Professor of Sociology

P.S. My interest in this research may be explained by me being the thesis director for Mr. Foster.
APPENDIX D

INTERVIEW GUIDE

The following interview guide was employed in the field collection of data involving the twenty informants. Though each question is stated specifically, each question became only a cue for the researcher to state the questions in a "practical" sense, most normally within the context of general conversation with the informants. Questions marked by a single asterisk ("*" ) were deleted from use (as was explained in chapter II of this thesis); questions marked by a double asterisk ("**" ) had cards with the possible responses prepared for presentation to the informants for the purpose of visual facilitation of the various questions.

INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. How many years of schooling do you have? That is, what was the last grade of school you were in? (If you went to trade school, business school, or college, then give that as your answer).

2. What kind of work do you do for a living? If you are unemployed or retired, then use that as your answer.

3. Are you
   ____ 1. American Indian
   ____ 2. Black
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3. Mexican American
4. White
5. Other (Tell what):

4. Where did you spend most of your childhood up to the age of 16?
1. Farm
2. Village (under 1,000 people)
3. Small town (1,000 - 2,499 people)
4. Large town (2,500 - 9,999 people)
5. Small city (10,000 - 49,999 people)
6. Large city (50,000 people or more)

5. Where do you live now?
1. Farm
2. Village (under 1,000 people)
3. Small town (1,000 - 2,499 people)
4. Large town (2,500 - 9,999 people)
5. Small city (10,000 - 49,999 people)
6. Large city (50,000 people or more)

6. What is your marital status?
1. Never married
2. Married
3. Separated
4. Divorced
5. Widowed

7. Do you have any brothers and/or sisters, either living or dead?
1. Yes
2. No
   If so, how many?
8. How old are you?

9. Are you
   ___ 1. Male
   ___ 2. Female

10. To what clubs or organizations (if any) do you belong? This would include church clubs, sports clubs, social and service clubs, and so on.

   
   
   

11. Do you ever attend cockfights?
   ___ 1. Yes
   ___ 2. No

12. If you do attend cockfights, how often do you go?
   ___ 1. About once a month
   ___ 2. 2 to 4 times a month
   ___ 3. Once every 2 months
   ___ 4. Less than 5 times a year

13. Who got you interested in cockfighting and where did they live?
   ___ 1. Friend
   ___ 2. Father
   ___ 3. Other relative (specify relationship): __________
   ___ 4. Someone else (specify relationship): __________

Where did they live?
   ___ 1. Farm
   ___ 2. Village (under 1,000 people)
3. Small town (1,000 - 2,499 people)
4. Large town (2,500 - 9,999 people)
5. Small city (10,000 - 49,999 people)
6. Large city (50,000 people or more)

14. When did you first become interested in cockfighting?
   1. Before you were 10 years old
   2. Before you were 15 years old
   3. Before you were 20 years old
   4. Before you were 25 years old
   5. After you were 25 years old

15. Do you raise your own cocks for fighting? (If no, then skip to question 22).
   1. Yes
   2. No

16. How many hours a week do you spend taking care of your cocks? (This includes feeding, cleaning cages or pens, exercising, and so on).
   1. 1 - 5 hours a week
   2. 6 - 10 hours a week
   3. 11 - 15 hours a week
   4. 16 or more hours a week

17. When did you get your first fighting cock?
   1. Before you were 10 years old
   2. Before you were 15 years old
   3. Before you were 20 years old
   4. Before you were 25 years old
   5. After you were 25 years old

18. Who did you get your first fighting cock from?
   1. Friend
2. Father
3. Other relative (specify relationship): __________
4. Just another cockfighter
5. You raised it from the nest

19. How many fighting cocks do you own?

____________________

20. What does a good fighting cock usually cost?

____________________

21. On the average, how successful are your birds in the pits?
1. Very successful
2. Fairly successful
3. About average
4. Fairly unlucky
5. Very unlucky

22.**The following are some things that the laws concerning cockfighting are against. Rank them, giving a 1 for that which the laws are against the most, a 2 for that which the laws are against the second most, and so on.
1. You and your rights
2. The killing of the cocks
3. The betting that goes on
4. Something else (what): ______________________

23. How often do you make bets at cock fights?
1. Every time you go
2. Only if you know one of the owners of a bird
3. Only on occasion
4. Never bet
24. Whether you bet or not, what do you think an average bet is?
   ___ 1. $2 or less
   ___ 2. $2 - 5
   ___ 3. $5 - 10
   ___ 4. $10 - 15
   ___ 5. $15 - 20
   ___ 6. More than $20

25. What is cockfighting for you?
   ___ 1. Business
   ___ 2. Entertainment
   ___ 3. Chance to be with friends
   ___ 4. Chance to travel
   ___ 5. Chance to get away from home for awhile
   ___ 6. Something else (what): ________________________

26. Would you say that most of your friends are involved in cockfighting either as participants or spectators?
   ___ 1. yes
   ___ 2. No

27. Do your friends usually go to cockfights more or less than you?
   ___ 1. More
   ___ 2. Less
   ___ 3. Usually about the same as we often go together
   ___ 4. My friends do not go to cockfights

28. About how many of your friends usually travel to cockfights with you?
29. Do you ever take your family or a date to cockfights?
   ___ 1. Yes
   ___ 2. No
   If you answered no, briefly tell why you don't: __________

30. Do most cockfights you go to charge admissions? (If no, go to question 33).
   ___ 1. Yes
   ___ 2. No

31. How much is usually charged for admission?
   ____________

32. What is done with the money collected for admission?
   ___ 1. It is divided up among those who brought their cocks to fight
   ___ 2. It is divided up among the owners of winning cocks
   ___ 3. It is used as bond money and to pay other legal fees if the cockfights are raided
   ___ 4. Won by a lucky ticket holder
   ___ 5. Given to charity or some other organization
   ___ 6. Any one of the above, depending on the situation
   ___ 7. Something else is done with the money (what): ____________

33. How long have you been involved in cockfighting?
   ____________

34.* Have you ever been arrested for cockfighting? (If no, go to question 36).
   ___ 1. Yes
35. How many times have you been arrested for cockfighting?  
    ________

36. Have you ever been arrested for anything besides cockfighting and traffic violations? 
    ______ 1. Yes 
    ______ 2. No 
    If yes, what were the nature of the other arrests: 
    ________

37. Why do fighting cocks get such good care and attention? Rank the following reasons from the most important to the least important. The most important gets 1, the second most important gets 2, and so on. 
    ______ 1. Money invested in the cock 
    ______ 2. General respect for a good fighting cock 
    ______ 3. So the owner can keep the respect that other cockfighters have for him 
    ______ 4. Some other reason (what): ____________

38. What makes a cockfighter good and receive respect from other cockfighters? Rank the following points from most important to least important. The most important gets 1, the second most important gets 2, and so on. 
    ______ 1. Success of one's cocks in the pits 
    ______ 2. Care and attention one gives his birds 
    ______ 3. His honesty as a cockfighter 
    ______ 4. Being a good loser 
    ______ 5. Something else (what): ____________________

39. **Even those people who do not go to cockfights are aware that cockfighting is against the law. They rank it with other crimes that have no victims; that is, no one is hurt by the act. However, others feel that some "victimless crimes" are worse than others. Rank the following victimless crimes from what you feel is the most serious to the least serious. The most serious gets 1, the second most serious gets 2, and so on.**

___ 1. Prostitution
___ 2. Cockfighting
___ 3. Pornography (including stag films and X rated movies, magazines, and books)
___ 4. Smoking marijuana
___ 5. Homosexuality
___ 6. Draft evasion

40. Have you ever heard of the following magazines about cockfighting?

___ 1. Grit and Steel
___ 2. The Gamecock
___ 3. Feathered Warrior

41. To which of the following journals do you subscribe?

___ 1. Grit and Steel
___ 2. The Gamecock
___ 3. Feathered Warrior
___ 4. Some kind of news letter or other publication about cockfighting

42. In your opinion, is cockfighting as a sport understood by outsiders (those who do not go or are not involved in the sport)?

___ 1. Yes
___ 2. No

Briefly explain your answer: _________________________________

_________________________________________________________
43. Should cockfighting be run any differently than it is now?
   ___ 1. Yes
   ___ 2. No
   If you answered yes, what would you like to see changed:
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

44. Do you ever go out of the state or more than 100 miles from home to go to a cockfight?
   ___ 1. Yes
   ___ 2. No

45. Concerning the laws about cockfighting, do you feel that they are
   ___ 1. Fair
   ___ 2. Unfair
   ___ 3. Not sure
   Briefly tell why you answered this question the way you did:
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

List of topics to maintain field notes on as the informant makes free conversation. How does the informant think that those involved perceive:

1. Social Background Factors of Others Involved: (generally, education; occupation; male or female; adults and/or children; rural/town/urban; age; race; clubs or organizations they belong to; other uses of leisure time)

2. Spectators: (how do they get involved; are most children, teenagers, or adults when they get involved; do they go fairly regularly; is it the same crowd; why do they go to cockfights; do they arrive in small groups together; are they friends)

3. Participants: (how do they get involved; are most children, teenagers, or adults when they get their first fighting cock; why do they fight cocks; what makes a good
and successful cock owner; why do they give fighting cocks so much care and attention)

4. Physical and Social Setting of Cockfighting: (do people usually travel together to cockfights; is admission charged and if so what is done with the money; is betting a usual part of cockfighting; are women and children a normal part of the crowd; fighting among the spectators)

5. Laws: (how do they see the laws; what are the laws against; why are there such laws; why are they enforced; why and when do raids take place)

6. Outsiders: (how are they seen: prejudiced; ignorant of the sport; a threat; what do those involved think of outsiders)
APPENDIX E-1

THE TWO FACTOR INDEX OF SOCIAL POSITION

In Hollingshead's "Two Factor Index of Social Position" (Bonjean, Hill, and McLemore, 1967: 381-385, 441-448), the two factors employed are occupation, given a weight of seven, and education, given a weight of four. The score resulting from the utilization of this scale is determined in the following manner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>SCALE SCORE</th>
<th>FACTOR WEIGHT</th>
<th>PARTIAL SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Index of social position score: **

**The educational and occupational scales are as follows:

EDUCATIONAL SCALE

2. Four-year college graduate (A.B., B.S., B.M.).
3. 1 - 3 years college (also business schools).
4. High school graduate.
5. 10 - 11 years of school (part high school).
6. 7 - 9 years of school.
7. Under 7 years of school.

OCCUPATIONAL SCALE*

1. Higher executives of large concerns, proprietors, and major professionals.
2. Business managers, proprietors of medium-sized businesses, and lesser professionals.

*An expanded version of the occupational scale is to be found in Bonjean, Hill, and McLemore (1967: 442-448).
3. Administrative personnel, owners of small businesses, and minor professionals.
4. Clerical and sales workers, technicians, and owners of little businesses.
5. Skilled manual employees.
7. Unskilled employees (including unemployed).

To determine the social position of the individual, place the individual score (the index of social position score) as determined by the above computation within the range of scores in each class as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
<th>Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 - 17</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 - 31</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 - 47</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 - 63</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 - 77</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDIX E-2**

**EDUCATION, OCCUPATION, AND SOCIAL POSITION OF INFORMANTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFORMANTS</th>
<th>EDUCATION</th>
<th>OCCUPATION*</th>
<th>SOCIAL POSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>6th grade</td>
<td>unemployed</td>
<td>77 - V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3rd grade</td>
<td>factory worker (machine operator)</td>
<td>70 - V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>H.S.</td>
<td>distiller</td>
<td>51 - IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>H.S.</td>
<td>construction worker</td>
<td>65 - V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>H.S.</td>
<td>mason</td>
<td>51 - IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>H.S.</td>
<td>miner**</td>
<td>51 - IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>H.S.</td>
<td>miner**</td>
<td>51 - IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>H.S.</td>
<td>miner**</td>
<td>51 - IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>H.S.</td>
<td>grocery owner</td>
<td>37 - III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>H.S.</td>
<td>Army sergeant (E6)</td>
<td>44 - III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>H.S.</td>
<td>ordained minister</td>
<td>37 - III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>H.S. &amp; trade school</td>
<td>welder</td>
<td>47 - III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>H.S. &amp; trade school</td>
<td>electrician</td>
<td>47 - III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>2 yrs. college</td>
<td>bartender</td>
<td>54 - IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>2 yrs. college</td>
<td>supervisor of postal transportation</td>
<td>19 - II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>3 yrs. college</td>
<td>plant manager</td>
<td>26 - II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>dairy farm owner ($100,000)</td>
<td>15 - I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>B.A.+</td>
<td>labor relations</td>
<td>22 - II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>social worker</td>
<td>18 - II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>M.A.+</td>
<td>hospital director</td>
<td>11 - I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Eight of these informants also farm but seven of them derive their incomes from occupations other than farming.

**After a discussion with a mining engineer, it was determined that each job position in a (coal) mine is so specialized due to mechanization that miners are skilled manual employees.
APPENDIX F

REFERENCE-GFAM

The figure* which follows on the next page visually displays the potential informants recommended by the actual informants, as well as who was contacted and who did not grant an interview. This figure (or map) also makes clear, at least in part, the subcultural network and its extent. It becomes readily obvious that not all informants or potential informants were referred by other informants (those having no reference paths going to them). In these cases, the informants (or potential informants) were referred by cohorts, i.e., other students, or others knowing of the research interest in cockfighting. However, as can be noted, what Coleman (1970: 118-119) calls snowball sampling was largely employed to gain informants. Further, it is to be noted that those giving reference to other informants were not attempting to recall all of their friends and acquaintances involved in cockfighting, but were casually mentioning others that might be helpful and informative.

*The location of informants and potential informants are accurate with respect to the counties of Kentucky. That is, if a map of equal scale and having the counties were superimposed over the reference-gram, then the informants and potential informants would be located within their respective counties of residence.
APPENDIX G

A GLOSSARY OF COCKFIGHTING ARGOT

This glossary consists of words and terms encountered during the collection of data (including interviewing, observation, and a review of literature or historical accounts). While by no means exhaustive, it was felt useful to include such a glossary as the cockfighting argot is essential to the activity and subculture as well as to the comprehension of the sport. Those terms that have become obsolescent will be so indicated by a single asterisk ("*") while those terms that have become obsolete will be indicated by a double asterisk ("**").

Artificial Stubs: Stubs used to attach spurs to the legs of cocks when the natural stubs have been cut too short.

Backscore Lines: Two lines parallel to each other and eight feet apart on the floor of the pit. To start the cockfight, each cock is released on his respective line.

Battle Royal: A type of cockfight in which any number of cocks may take part, the cock either left standing or alive being declared the winner.

Bill: The act of taking two opposing cocks just prior to their fight and, being cradled in the arms of the handlers, thrusting and holding them out toward each other, letting each peck at and antagonize the other.

Blade: The shaft of the artificial gaff or spur; that part of the spur that inflicts injury.

Blinker: A cock that is either blinded or injured in one eye.
Bloody-Heeled: A cock having a deadly stroke of the spur or one that characteristically draws blood from its opponent.

Board, on the: A conditioning exercise in which the cock is placed on a padded board and then made to run back and forth along the board's length by the cockfighter who places his arms on the board, one on each side of the cock, and then moves his arms back and forth along the board.

Boxing Gloves*: see muffs.

Breed: A specific type of gamefowl distinguished by well defined characteristics.

Breeder: One who breeds and raises gamefowl, this being his primary interest in the cockfighting subculture. The gamefowl raised are usually raised for the purpose of sale.

Call-Sheet: A sheet, usually mass produced by a print shop, used by pit officials that denotes the fight number as well as the entry number, weight, band number, and owner's name of each of the two cocks that will meet in the fight. Termed a call-sheet because pit officials use this form to call the two opponents to the pit for the fight.

Center Score: Two lines parallel to each other and twenty-two inches apart in the center of the pit. The birds are pitted on the center score when the fighting becomes slow.

Cock: The male species of gamefowl that is more than twelve months of age.

Cock Case: A box-like container used in the transportation of fighting cocks to and from the pit. Sometimes called a cock bag.

Cocker: A staunch member of the cockfighting subculture; most normally used to refer to cockfighters as opposed to one of the other roles.

Cockerel**: see stag.

Cockfight: A contest between two gamecocks or among several gamecocks under the planned direction of man.

Cockfighter: One who raises and prepares his own cocks for fighting.

Cockfighting: The sport of fighting gamecocks.

Cocking: see cockfighting.
Cock Match: see cockfight.

Cock-Penny**: A yearly contribution at one time made by students in England at Shrovetide and used toward the cost of buying or training fighting cocks for use in school cockfights.

Cockpit: A circular arena or other enclosure in which cockfights take place, usually having a diameter of twenty feet.

Cock Scales: Scales used to weigh the cocks in order to match them for a cockfight. They are usually of the balance beam type and must be accurate to the closest ounce.

Comb: The red flesh-like material attached to the crest of the cock's head.

Combines: When two or more cockfighters pool their cocks and enter a cockfight as one entry, thus enabling them to use the best cocks of each combine member; a joint pit effort.

Conditioning: A theory and practice or a combination of theories and practices used in preparing a cock for an upcoming fight.

Conditioning Pens: A pen in which the cock is kept while he is being conditioned, thus preventing any interference in diet, weight maintenance, and so on.

Cutting Short: A term used to describe a cock that is not penetrating or injuring his opponent.

Derby: A slate of cockfights in which the number of cocks to be shown by each cockfighter is specified but the weights of the cocks are not specified.

Drag Pit: A pit smaller than the main pit, having only an eight-foot diameter, in which the cocks are placed when the action gets slow in the main pit.

Dry Heeled: Descriptive of a cock that seldom draws blood from its opponent.

Drying Out: A process of reducing the water consumption of a cock several weeks prior to a fight so that the blood will thicken, thus reducing the chances of the cock bleeding to death in the fight.

Dub: To cut off or remove a cock's comb and wattles.

Dubbing Shears: "Long nosed" scissors having thin and sometimes curved blades used in dubbing.
Ducker: A term applied to a cock because of its style of fighting, usually implying that the cock will go in and/or stay low in an attempt to avoid the spurs of its opponent.

Dunghill: A term used to refer to fowl of mixed or unknown breeding. The term is often used in association with a bird that will run rather than fight.

Fly, on the: A conditioning exercise in which the cock is placed on a padded board, the board then being moved, not violently but in a random fashion, causing the cock to flap his wings to maintain his balance on the board. The cock does not actually fly but his wing muscles are strengthened as well as the grip of his talons.

Flyer: Descriptive of a cock that does his fighting in the air as opposed to on the ground.

Free Range: Used to describe how a cock is raised and/or kept. Free range denotes the lack of pens or cages, the cock being allowed to live in the open.

Gablocks**: see gaff or spur.

Gaff: A steel or other type of artificial spur.

Gaffet*: see gaff.

Gaffle*: see gaff.

Gaflet*: see gaff.

Gaff*: see gaff.

Gavelocks**: see gaff.

Greenleg: A term used to refer to a hatch or a very young fowl, normally of either sex.

Hack: A type of cockfight in which two cockfighters decide to fight some of their cocks rather informally, not necessarily at a pit. It also denotes a formally arranged fight at a pit for those cockfighters who have already fought out their best birds. Weights of the birds are matched as close as possible but weight differences are of little consequence.

Hackle: That part of the fowl's plumage covering the neck and being comprised of long slender feathers. Usually only the hackle on the back of the neck is trimmed.
Handler: One possessing a broad body of knowledge concerning the preparation of cocks before battle and handling of the cocks during the actual fight.

Hawker: One whose primary interest in the cockfighting subculture is betting on the outcome of the fights, generally betting with numerous spectators on the outcome of one fight.

Heel: To tie or attach the artificial spurs to the legs of the cock.

Heeling Cord: String or line used to tie the artificial spurs to the legs of the cock. Heeling cord is wax covered or saturated so that it does not absorb blood and loosen.

Heeling Pads: Small squares of chamois or moleskin placed between the sockets of the artificial spurs and the legs of the cock to act as a cushion.

Hen: A female species of fowl that is more than twelve months of age.

Henny: Used to describe a male bird possessing a plumage characteristic of the female specimen.

High Station: A term used to denote a cock with long legs, thus permitting long spurs or gaffs to be used.

Holding Pen: Small pens that are part of the pit facilities in which cocks are kept until it is time for them to fight.

Hots**: see muffs.

Hotts**: see muffs.

Keep: A noun used to refer generally to the way a cock is maintained, usually during conditioning.

Leathers: Thin leather strips used to heel or attach the spurs to the legs of the cock; also a synonym for heeling cord.

Leg Bands: Numbered bands put on by pit officials when the cock is weighed, the number identifying the bird, its weight, and its owner.

Linebreeding: A specific form of inbreeding where related specimens are mated together along definitely prescribed lines, usually mother to son and father to daughter.

Low Station: A term used to denote a cock having rather short legs, thus preventing the use of long spurs.
Main: A type of cockfight between the cocks of two cockfighters. An odd number of cocks is required from each of the two cockfighters, the bottom weight and the top weight of the cocks being specified with any combination of weights in between. A main lasting longer than three days is usually called a Long Main. A Short Main runs from one to three days.

Match-Board: A large board visible to the spectators at a pit which identifies each entrant only by a number and each entrant's opponents, again only by number, and the win/loss record of each.

Matching: The act or process of weighing cocks to determine the entrants or opponents to meet in each fight.

Muffles*: see muffs.

Muffs: Soft leather pads used to cover the stubs on the legs of a cock, thus enabling cocks to spar or practice without causing injury.

Naked-Heeled: A term referring either to a cock having its natural spurs or to a fight between two cocks having their natural spurs as opposed to artificial spurs.

Outbreeding: The breeding of unrelated cocks and hens of the same breed or variety.

Outcrossing: Breeding a male of one breed or variety with a female of another breed or variety.

Pit: Used to refer to a cockpit, i.e., the main pit as opposed to a drag pit.

Pullet: A female fowl (here a gamehen) that is younger than twelve months of age.

Referee: One who is extremely knowledgeable of cockfighting and the rules and presides over each fight; there being no higher authority, his decision is final.

Ring General: Descriptive of a cock that stays low on the ground to fight.

Scratch Pen: A pen having six to eight inches of straw in the bottom; when grain is thrown in the pen, the cock must scratch through the straw to eat, thus strengthening the leg muscles. Often a part of conditioning.

Setter*: see handler.

Setter-To**: see handler.
Shakebag: A gamecock so large or heavy that it cannot usually be matched to fight. Usually any cock weighing over six pounds, six ounces.

Slasher: A steel spur having a razor-like edge running its length. It is very rarely used in the United States, finding favor in the Philippines and South America.

Socket: The rounded part of the spur or gaff with the flanged hole that fits over the stub and against the leg of the cock.

Sparring: Part of a gamecock's training and conditioning in which he practices fighting with another cock, both wearing muffs to prevent injury.

Spur: A term usually referring to the artificial spur or gaff.

Spur Saw: A fine-toothed saw, looking much like a coping saw, used to remove the natural spurs from the legs of a gamecock.

Stag: A male bird that is younger than twelve months of age.

Streamers: The long flowing tail feathers of a cock that are not trimmed.

String, on the: A term used to indicate that a cock is tethered; see tether.

Stub: The short bony projection left after the natural spur has been removed. The artificial spur, by means of the socket, is attached to the stub. The stub is occasionally referred to as a nub.

Tether: A light nylon cord, one end being attached to a stationary object, the other end being attached to one of the legs of a cock which allows the cock to roam freely within certain bounds.

Tournament: A type of cockfight specifying not only the number of cocks shown by each cockfighter but also specifying the weights of the cocks.

Trimmed: A term used to describe a cock that has been prepared for battle by having his hackle, wing, and tail feathers clipped.

Turn-Out**: see shakebag.

Walk: An open area, normally in the country, where a gamecock is given liberty but kept away from other cocks and sometimes hens.
Wattle: A pendent-like piece of red flesh attached to the head of a fowl just beneath the beak, one on each side.

Weight Card: A card produced in mass and used by pit officials; the weight divisions to be fought are printed on the cards and each weight division will correspond to the band number found on the wing or leg band placed on the cock. Its purpose is to double-check the weight of the cock against the indicated weight of the band number, thus preventing fighters to switch cocks.

Weight Trainers: A weighted strap, usually weighted with small washers, that is attached to the legs of a cock to strengthen the leg muscles while the cock walks around. It also serves to familiarize the cock with straps so that such a feeling will not be strange when the cock is heeled.

Wing Band: Identical in purpose to leg bands; the wing bands are attached to the wings of the cock; see leg band.

Wing Flyer: Descriptive of a cock that will wear himself out if he does not win quickly.
APPENDIX H

POINTS FOR JUDGING GAME FOWL*

Point Scale

Shape and Carriage . . . . . 40
Handling and Condition . . . . 15
Head and Eye . . . . . . . . . 10
Legs and Feet . . . . . . . . . 15
Color and Plumage . . . . . 20
Total . . . . . . . . . . . . . 100

SHAPE AND CARRIAGE:

The ideal cock is to have a short back, broad across the shoulders and tapering well to the tail, with a full and broad chest. Wings are to be full and round and inclining to meet just under the tail, projecting as little as possible past the body. The cock's carriage is to be bold and smart with quick but graceful movements and conveying a sense of pride.

HANDLING AND CONDITION:

With respect to handling, the flesh must be firm but corky, with an abundance of muscle. The condition of the cock (i.e., its health) is to be no less than excellent.

HEAD AND EYE:

The cock's head is to be strong and bold with eyes that are large, bright, and prominent; the eyes must be full of expression. The beak is to be strong at the base with a slight curvature. The comb and wattles are to be small and of fine texture, the comb being serrated at its edge.

LEGS AND FEET:

The thighs are to be short, thick and muscular, being set well apart. The shanks (that portion of the leg having no feathers) are to be of medium length with good round bone,

*See Scott ([1957]: 179-180) for more complete points for judging.
not being flat on the shins. There are to be four toes on each foot and they should be even, long, and spreading, the back toe being well backward and flat on the ground. The spur should be low on the leg.

COLOR AND PLUMAGE:

   The color is to be bright and have a satin-like appearance. The plumage is to be hard, glossy and firm with hard, strong quills.

NOTE: It is not desirable to breed cocks over six pounds, six ounces.
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