

Beyond Diffusion: Sport and Its Remaking in Cross-Cultural Contexts

MAARTEN VAN BOTTENBURG[†]
Utrecht School of Governance
Utrecht University

IN 1983, SPORTS HISTORIAN ALLEN GUTTMANN WROTE that the ideal history of European sport had not yet been written and probably never would be. What he could use instead at that time was “a handful of broadly conceived books, mostly collective efforts which tend to be long on data and short on interpretation, and a medley of monographs, some of which are quite admirable.”¹ Twenty-six years later, this situation has changed significantly. Today, there is a substantial and ever-growing literature on the history of sport in Europe, which is by and large empirically robust and theoretically informed, with a large number of national historiographies and many articles, books and volumes on various themes such as national identity, gender, social class and so on.²

Nevertheless, a comprehensive, synthetic volume on the history of European sport is still lacking. Books like *European Cultures in Sport* (2003) are collections of case studies in which the history of sport in different European nations is described separately, without comparative analyses.³ Other studies do compare European historical case studies around such themes as international politics, nationalism, and militarism, or try to integrate an analysis of European sports histories into a study of the wider cultural history and diffusion of sports.⁴ Yet, there has been no attempt to draw these studies together, critically examine the strands of this work, and counterbalance its “large nation-bias.”⁵ Furthermore, European sports history has flourished most in the larger and more influential

[†]Correspondence to m.vanbottenburg@uu.nl.

countries, above all Germany and Britain. As a consequence, the sports history of many peoples in smaller and less influential regions of Europe is un- or understudied, partly for linguistic reasons.⁶

There are additional challenges. Apart from getting access to linguistically diffuse research material and balancing this material evenly across all European countries, regions or zones, there is the challenge of making a *cross*-cultural and *cross*-national analysis of the emergence and diffusion of modern sports, together with the development of national, regional, or zonal sports cultures throughout Europe, in the context of wider societal changes in a globalizing world. A short overview of the paradigm shifts that have occurred in globalization theory helps to comprehend the complexities of this challenge.

Until the 1970s, the modernization approach was the dominant paradigm in development studies. Modernization theorists tried to analyze and explain the transition of traditional societies into modern ones—mainly from the internal dynamics of a country—that resulted from separate constituent political, economic, and cultural processes, like industrialization, occupational specialization, bureaucratization, and secularization.⁷ In the 1970s, this approach was heavily criticized because of the limited attention paid to interdependencies and power relations between nations (exploitation, underdevelopment) and the often implicit assumption that modernization is a linear process following the Western model. New paradigms of societal development came to the fore, in particular the dependency theory and world system theory, both of which tried to analyze and explain social change by focusing on the power hierarchy in the world-system of dominating and dependent countries, or—in terms of sociologist Immanuel Wallerstein—core, semi-periphery, and periphery nations.⁸ In line with these theories, the “cultural imperialism thesis” became popular in the 1980s, and with it notions like Westernization and Americanization.⁹ Its central proposition was that certain dominant cultures threaten to overwhelm other more vulnerable ones, leading to cultural homogenization.¹⁰ In the early 1990s, these notions instigated an extensive debate among sport sociologists and sport historians about the dominant trend of sports diffusion and the usefulness of concepts like Americanization, Westernization, cultural imperialism, and globalization in their fields.¹¹ This debate, however, was left behind in parallel with another paradigm shift in globalization theory.

Already by the end of the 1980s world system theory and the accompanying cultural imperialist thesis had been criticized for the same fallacy as they had blamed modernization theory for: the unidirectional character of economic, social, political, and cultural development—“from the West to the ‘rest.’”¹² In contrast to this interpretation, later generations of globalization theorists have strongly emphasized the active role of people at the local level.¹³ In their view, culture does not diffuse in a unilinear way from centre to periphery. Instead, they analyze and theorize cultural diffusion as an active, complex process of interpretation, translation, modification, mutation, and adaptation.¹⁴ While anthropologist Ulf Hannerz, for example, acknowledges that the distribution of culture is affected by a structure of asymmetrical relationships, he emphasizes that cultural processes are not simply a matter of a constant pressure from the centre towards the periphery but a much more creative interaction between initially alien and already existing, historically developed meanings and cultural forms. This cultural process of “creolization” also “in-

creasingly allows the periphery to talk back.”¹⁵ Renewed cultural products, symbols and meanings from the periphery find their way back—often as new commodities—to the global market. Rather than moving towards cultural homogenization, this represents a trend to cultural differentiation and cultural complexity.¹⁶

Globalization theorists like Arjun Appadurai, John Urry, and Barbara Aboe-El-Haj take a step further and avoid or question terms like “centre” and “periphery.” Appadurai prefers terms like “scapes” and “flows” to express the non-isomorphic paths of cultural streams.¹⁷ Urry borrows concepts and methods from the complexity sciences to avoid notions that are reducible to, or explained through, single processes.¹⁸ Likewise, Aboe-El-Haj realizes that her ambition “to do equal justice to global and local is limited at the outset by our failure to generate a comparative language beyond the tidy binaries which reproduce the global regime in the very attempt to eviscerate it.”¹⁹ In her view, terms like centre/periphery, core/periphery, Western/non-Western, developed/developing, and so on, do not provide descriptive or analytic power to fluid and volatile spheres of activity.

This emphasis on flows and spaces does not imply that power relations are ignored in today’s theories of globalization. On the contrary, as the political theorists David Held and Anthony McGrew argue, the analysis of power relations remains fundamental for understanding the dynamics of globalization.²⁰ However, these power relations are restructured and rescaled.²¹ Saskia Sassen, another leading scholar of globalization, stresses that the nation-state loses specific components of its authority, while other actors, such as global cities and global business networks, gain strategic importance. This process contributes to the partial unbundling or at least weakening of the nation-state, which is more likely to result in a multiplicity of global cultures than just a single one.²²

These paradigm shifts in globalization theory provide interesting food for thought with respect to writing a cultural history of sport in modern Europe. I will elaborate on two key points relating to the pitfalls of writing a synthetic cultural history of sport in Europe. My first point is that such a cultural history should critically re-examine unidirectional models in analyses of sports diffusion. My second point is that this cultural history should pay attention to complex processes of adaptation and reinterpretation, as well as contestation and rejection, and analyze their consequences.

Pluriformity

The standard theory is that Britain is the birthplace of modern sports and that sports diffused from the homeland to the rest of the world. This thesis is very well-founded by many of scholars, starting with the still highly recommendable studies of Maria Kloeren and Herbert Schöffler in the mid 1930s.²³ However, it can be argued that this thesis has become such a commonplace that its meaning, limits, and implications are not always well thought out.

To begin with, the British did not invent sport as such but a new model of sport. It was in Britain that the first pastimes and games were sportized, as sociologist Norbert Elias puts it, either because they organized, regulated, and standardized existing games or pastimes—such as horse racing, cricket, golf, and boxing—or invented, organized, and standardized new sports—such as football, rugby, hockey, and tennis.²⁴ The characteristics of the new sports model have been examined and discussed in detail, particularly from or

against two perspectives. First, a Weberian perspective stressed the formal-structural characteristics that Guttmann identified to distinguish modern sports from earlier games and pastimes: secularism, equality, rationalization, specialization, bureaucratization, quantification, and the quest for records.²⁵ Second, an Eliasian (figurational) perspective stressed the changing level of tolerated violence as the defining demarcation line between modern sports and traditional games and pastimes.²⁶ Although different and to some extent competing, both interpretations trace the origins of modern sports back to Britain. Furthermore, as sports historian Richard Holt contends, they became “an integral part of the image that the British presented to the world, and which outsiders came to associate with the British.”²⁷

Because of Britain’s influence and prestige as a major power in the late nineteenth century, cosmopolitan elites in other countries took an interest in the British lifestyle and adopted the modern sports that they played; or “sportized” several pastimes of their own country in line with the new sports model. An unintended consequence of this innovation and its diffusion was that the new sports and new sportized activities were defined differently—or constructed in opposition—to all other sport-like activities that formed part of the local, regional, and national cultures in Europe. These native sport-like activities were reinterpreted and reclassified as non-sports according to the new values and related terminology. Indigenous games and pastimes that did not meet the characteristics of the British sports model were seen as old-fashioned and backward.²⁸ The introduction of this sport model thus changed the views and perceptions of people on their leisure, body, and movement culture.

This definition of sport, this historical construct, underlies our recognition that Britain is the cradle of modern sport. It is also the basis of our understanding of the *unidirectional development* of sport: “from ritual to record.”²⁹ Although this understanding has a firm basis and has proved to be productive for writing histories of sport, it is by no means unproblematic. As cultural sociologist Henning Eichberg has shown, there are many other trends than those related to competitive, achievement sport; these include the rise of lifestyle and fitness sports, the continuation of many folkloric sports, and the popularization of street sports, grass roots sports, and all kinds of other “bodily configurations” which have challenged the traditional way of practicing and defining sports.³⁰

Whether German gymnastics or *Turnen* can or has to be seen as part of the sport movement or not has been the subject of a fierce struggle in many parts of Europe. Each country still sees the concepts of “sport” and “gymnastics” differently.³¹ The same applies to activities that are labeled in Scandinavia as *idrott* or any of its linguistic variants. It has been noted frequently: sport is a contested concept. But what does that mean for the writing of a cultural history of sports in Europe? Different perspectives on this topic will lead to different perceptions of their origins, developments, and flows.

This brings me to my second argument, which concerns the *unidirectional diffusion* of sport. Most scholars agree that modern sports, after they originated in Britain, spread throughout the world, first of all to the British dominions, colonies, and neighboring countries. As sports geographer John Bale generalized in the 1980s, “[S]port as a phenomenon had its roots in Britain and tended to diffuse from more advanced to advancing (in a Western economic sense) nations.”³² Likewise, it has been widely recognized, as Guttmann

states, that the United States supplanted Great Britain in the early twentieth century as the prime mover in the global diffusion of modern sports.³³

The whole story is more complicated, of course. The world of sports has been developed in an international and later even global, pluri-centered context. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, this context was characterized in Europe by an increase in interdependencies between (emerging) nation-states. In an economic sense, there was one leader, Britain; the rest were pursuers.³⁴ Nevertheless, Britain competed in Europe with four other great powers—Austria, France, Prussia (later Germany), and Russia, which all had their own cultural traditions and sphere of influence—while several smaller nations, like Belgium, quickly responded to and profited from the growing economies in the fastest industrializing countries. This is of relevance here, since the political, economic, and cultural power of the nations involved has been identified as the most significant factor that determined the process of ludic diffusion, at least in the early phase of the development of modern sports.³⁵ Yet, we do not know the relative weight of each power vector. The cultural centers of the world are not by definition identical with political and economic centers, and being influential in “low culture” might have other implications than being powerful in “high culture.”³⁶

Because of the pluri-centered context in which the early diffusion of sports took place, there are reasons to assume that the role and influence of primarily Germany and France in European sports history should be reconsidered. Most literature that has focused or touched on this subject is limited to the development of sport *in* Germany or France. With some notable exceptions, the influence that their sports development has had on other European countries and the global sports culture is less researched. In one of the few articles on this subject,³⁷ sport sociologist Gertrud Pfister analyzed how German *Turnen*, Swedish gymnastics, and British sports marked themselves off from one another, and influenced each other, and how German *Turnen* was exported to Eastern Europe, Swedish gymnastics to England, and modern sport to Spain. With reference to her own words, this contribution was “one of the many stones hitherto missing in the great mosaic of European sport history.”³⁸

One of the main challenges of writing a history of modern sports in Europe is to examine the confrontation of the German and British models in each country and to look for the dynamics and patterns of these confrontations.³⁹ Both models represented different orientations; the English one was related to games and competitive sports, the German model to physical exercises. In that respect, it is highly interesting to investigate the historical relations between the values and characteristics of the physical exercises promoted by the gymnastics movement and later physical activities like bodybuilding, aerobics, and fitness. For example, is there a relationship between the strength of the gymnastics movement in the early twentieth century and the fitness movement in recent decades? And what impact did the German model have on Britain?

Analyses of the French influence on sports history in other European countries are equally needed. The leading role of the French in the international organization of sports is only one example of this. Many international sports federations were founded in France, initially often without the British and with French as the official language, even in sports which were British in origin. This holds true for the International Lawn Tennis Federa-

tion, which was founded in Paris in 1913; for the International Hockey Federation, formed in Paris, by Austria, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, France, Hungary, Spain, and Switzerland in 1924; and also for the Fédération Internationale de Football Association, formed in 1904 in Paris, by France, Belgium, Denmark, the Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, and Portugal—again without the British. This list can easily be expanded, particularly with reference to another major French contribution to the world of sports: the founding of the modern Olympics. Although the British initially adopted an attitude of aloofness with regard to these French initiatives, their sports history was affected by the policy of these federations and they had to become involved later on. Thus, not Britain, but a figuration of European countries—or, to be more precise, of representatives of European male elite groups—founded almost all international sports federations and ruled these organizations for a long time. Most of these federations still have their main office in France or (French-speaking parts of) Switzerland.

Over the course of the twentieth century the influence of European powers was gradually eroded by non-European states: first the United States, later the Soviet Union, then Japan, and today China. These changes in the international balance of power have had further impacts on the European sports landscape, such as the introduction and popularization of particular sports (basketball, volleyball, “Californian sports,” martial arts) and new organizational practices (fitness clubs, dojos, centralized elite sport systems). Nevertheless, the European countries never lost their power. They revived fast after the Second World War, formed economic and political alliances, and renewed their influence in the global arena. In this process, the context of the later phases of the development of sports in Europe has become even more pluri-centered, which further complicates the writing of a comparative cultural history. Interestingly, Hannerz has pointed to the fact that in the contemporary world some centers may only have a strong influence in their own region, for example because of a shared language and cultural tradition. Such regional centers may produce and spread new cultural meanings and forms, or may operate as cultural brokers, translating influences from first-tier centers into something more adapted to regional conditions.⁴⁰

Complexity

Besides paying attention to the pluri-centered context in which modern sports originated and diffused in Europe, a comparative cultural history of sport needs to consider the complex processes of interaction that took place in each country when already existing, historically developed cultural practices were confronted with new, alien sports. The literature on the history of sport shows that people on the continent did not unquestioningly replace their own local pastimes with the new British sports and start behaving as a “gentleman amateur.” In each country, the English sports culture was selectively adopted, adapted, interpreted, contested, incorporated, and resisted.

The British were admired by some groups, but this was accompanied by strong feelings of rivalry, aversion, and resistance to the adoption of English sports by others. This was especially true for the main competitors of Britain, Germany, and France. The more powerful countries on the Continent were, the more averse to foreign influences they seemed to be, including British sports. As mentioned before, *Turnen* was presented and

propagated in Germany as an alternative for British sports, which were seen as un-German. The struggle between the propagandists of gymnastics, and related sports like swimming and handball, and the supporters of the English sports raged for a long time in many other countries, especially those under strong German influence on the European Continent.⁴¹

For people in less powerful European countries too, the unequal balance of exchange between their leisure and bodily culture and that of the British did not mean that they were passive recipients.⁴² Holt's comment with respect to the diffusion of British sports to the White Dominions applies equally to the European continent: these countries were no *tabula rasa* on which the British could write as they pleased.⁴³ Prior to the introduction of British sports, every country had its own historical tradition of games, contests, and races, although not according to the British sports format: skiing in the Nordic countries, skating in the Netherlands, shooting in Switzerland, and wrestling in Bulgaria. Depending on the nature and intensity of their relationships with Britain, the responses in these countries to the new sporting culture were a mixture of resistance and admiration, resentment and awe.⁴⁴ How this worked out has to be researched in each country and region separately, as political theorist Alan Bairner has done in relation to the arrival of British sports in Ireland, Scotland, and Sweden.⁴⁵

The standard theory is that the rise of modern sports meant the marginalization of most indigenous pastimes in Europe: only a few activities became popular in a sportized form. Sports associated with less powerful countries on the world stage never attracted much enthusiasm internationally, yet several historical studies have demonstrated the persistence of these traditional sports in specific localities and groups.⁴⁶ They continued to enjoy considerable popularity especially in their countries of origins, and not merely as residues of the past. On the basis of studies like these, it is likely that local sporting traditions continued over time in many regions of Europe. However, we know very little about what happened to those traditions that continued to exist, how popular they still are, whether they have been modeled according to competitive sports or not, and how countries differ from each other in this respect.

In the process of diffusion "games were not simply borrowed *in toto*"; the borrowers modified and frequently transformed what they borrowed.⁴⁷ The diffusion of the constitutive rules was one element in this respect, the adoption of the auxiliary and regulatory rules was quite another.⁴⁸ As happened with cricket in India, table tennis in China, and football in Brazil, in each European country the British sports were incorporated into their own cultures so firmly that, with the passage of time, more and more people came to see them as their own cultural heritage and lost interest in their foreign origins. Although the British sports were adopted in each country so that they all played football, tennis or hockey, their cultures could still diverge. Initially, every country evolved its own sports tradition, with its own values, its own styles of play, its own idols, and its own collective memories.

An important value in sport that diffused parallel to the constitutive rules of sports was the amateur ideology. This notion of "amateurism" is one the most difficult and complex concepts in the history of sport. In Britain, its meanings were subtle and changed over the course of time. When the British sports model was adopted on the Continent, the

concept of amateurism was interpreted—both within and between European countries—in various ways, and with different meanings from those in Britain, causing endless confusion and conflicts.⁴⁹

As a consequence the relationship between amateurs and professionals, as well as the way in which sports federations handled the issue of professionalism and commercialization in their branch of sport, came to differ from sport to sport, and also—even within the same sport—from country to country. We can distinguish in this respect between exclusively amateur sports (like rowing, field hockey, athletics, rugby, and skating), sports with separate amateur and professional organizations (like boxing, cycling, auto racing, tennis), and sports in which professionals and amateurs went hand in hand (like cricket and golf). Pointing to the different ways in which the British sports culture was interpreted and appropriated in European countries, this highly complex topic deserves careful attention in the history of European sport.

Sociologist Ruud Stokvis has thrown an original and interesting light on this issue, which might help us understand the differences in commercialization between sports and countries. According to Stokvis, modern sports have evolved out of traditional pastimes that had a long tradition of prizes in cash or in kind. This tradition was interrupted by the era of amateurism, which lasted from around 1880 to 1994 when the International Olympic Committee officially abolished the distinction between amateurs and professionals. Stokvis has characterized this era as “the intermezzo of amateurism,” to indicate that the amateur ideology has to be interpreted as just one phase in the history of sport and not a new beginning.⁵⁰ According to this interpretation, the commercial sport activities of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries need to be interpreted not as a curiosity but as an integral element of the social history of modern sports.

From this perspective, the commercialization of sports often can be regarded as a continuation of an older tradition. In the United States, this tradition of commercialization was carried on quite straightforwardly, in many sports with the development of professional and commercial leagues in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Here, the ideology of amateurism only really impacted on intercollegiate and Olympic sports. In Europe, however, the tradition of commercialization was interrupted by the intermezzo of amateurism in most, although not all, sports and for each sport in most, but not all, countries.⁵¹ Some sports were commercialized at an early stage, other sports much later or not at all, with many historical differences between countries.

The challenge for writing a history of modern sports in Europe is to investigate these processes: which sports were adopted or adapted, and interpreted or contested, in which countries, and how and in what respects did the sport histories and histories of sports in different parts of Europe converge or diverge?

Obviously, this has to be analyzed in a broader social-historical context. Of special importance in the early phases of the development of sport—the emergence and spread of the British sports model—is the rise of the bourgeoisie, the middle classes, and the promotion of their values, against violent sports such as fist fighting and bloody animal sports. Another highly influential social process was educational reform and the rise of student numbers in secondary education in almost all Western European countries at the end of the nineteenth century, together with the role of sport and physical education in the edu-

cation system of each country. The process of nation-building might be even more important. The creation of a national identity was a primary concern for all European countries in the first phase of the diffusion of sports. Peasants were transformed into Frenchmen, as historian Eugen Weber showed.⁵² In the same way, Germany and Italy were constructed as new nations, but these nations still had to create citizens who thought of themselves as Germans and Italians. Confronted with this challenge, each state tried to impose national languages, national education systems, national military services, and national symbols such as anthems, flags, uniforms, and emblems. As many scholars have shown, the rise of sports provided many new expressions of nationalism, which supported this process.⁵³ Even sports adopted from Britain, and above all football, served as a new medium for national identification in countries like Italy, fostered by several invented traditions, such as international matches in which all the national symbols were involved.⁵⁴

Sociologist Raffaele Poli has contended that the growth of nationalism before the First World War imbued sport with strong political meaning but that in the contemporary world some forms of “denationalization” and “deterritorialization” in sport can be witnessed, as a result of accelerated global migratory flows and media coverage. The integration of sportsmen of foreign origin in the national selections of their host countries is a case in point, the identification of people with foreign sports clubs and sports stars another.⁵⁵ This is in line with the views of sociologist Joseph Maguire, who stated that sports today still bind people to nation-based “we” identities, but that it is increasingly difficult to sustain the notion that a single sport represents the nation.⁵⁶

Other authors go even further and argue that in later phases of the development of sport, processes—not confined to any particular nation-state or region—have been influential in reconfiguring sport, in particular corporatization, commercialization, and globalization. “Satellite signals do not conform to national boundaries, and cable subscribers throughout the world watch a variety of programs that would otherwise be locally unavailable.”⁵⁷ Although there are good reasons to assume that the spread of meanings and forms of sport is increasingly influenced by international sport organizations and transnational media and business corporations, states remain important actors through the education system, subsidies for sport organizations, sport related civic rituals, and so on. Contemporary globalization theorists would argue, however, that in the end neither nation states nor transnational organizations have the power to determine the cultural history of sports at the local level, because the capacity of local people and communities to appropriate and give their own meanings to sports goods and practices—within the structuring confines of the state and market framework—should not be underestimated.

Conclusions

Guttmann’s wish for an ideal history of European sport, consisting of “a single, comprehensive volume . . . by one person whose unifying vision provides a combination of relevant data and persuasive interpretation”⁵⁸ might be aiming too far. But the opportunity to strive for this ideal involving a group of experts has come closer now that the community of European sport historians has extended so much. We can take advantage of an increasing number of primary and secondary research studies on the history of sport in particular European countries and with respect to specific sports. Nevertheless, striving for

this ideal will remain a big challenge because of all the complexities involved in such a project, not only in terms of management and linguistics, but most of all because of methodological and theoretical differences.

In this paper, I have discussed two of these complexities, as lessons to be learned from paradigm shifts in general theories of globalization. The first lesson is that a cultural history of sport in modern Europe should critically re-examine unidirectional models in analyses of sports diffusion. This holds true for both the commonplace that Britain was the centre of diffusion, and the general assumption that these sports diffused from Britain to the rest of the world. In this respect, more attention should also be paid to reverse diffusion processes, both within Europe and between Europe and other continents. Without knowledge of the origins and development of modern sports in Britain, the history of sport on the European continent cannot be understood. But at the same time we cannot understand the history of sport in Britain and Europe without knowledge of the history of sports on the Continent. The second lesson concerns the ways in which sports have diffused from one group to another. To avoid oversimplifying notions of “trickle down” effects between centers and peripheries and dominating and dominated groups, a synthesizing cross-national cultural history of sport in Europe should pay attention to processes of adaptation and reinterpretation, as well as contestation and rejection, and analyze their consequences.

We can conclude that some prevailing views on the origins, diffusion, and development of the European sports culture need to be reconsidered. Has the focus been so much on Britain and the spread of sports from this centre of diffusion that the meaning and impact of traditions and initiatives in other European countries have been overlooked or underestimated? Have we put enough effort into describing and explaining processes of “reverse diffusion” from politically and economically weaker to stronger countries, in sports such as polo, judo, lacrosse, and capoeira, to mention a few?⁵⁹ Have we paid enough attention to sports originating from world powers that hardly flourished outside their homeland?⁶⁰ Have we analyzed adequately the impact that the flows of people (tourists, immigrants, refugees, guest workers, expatriates) and media images and information (papers, magazines, radio, television, Internet) have had on the diffusion of sport practices and values?⁶¹

On the one hand, we can still find general patterns, like hierarchical and contagious diffusion, produced by unequal balances of power and critical junctures in this process; on the other hand, we have to rethink our concepts and theories to meet the complexity and diversity of the rich sports histories of peoples all over Europe.⁶²

¹Allen Guttmann, “Recent Work in European Sport History,” *Journal of Sport History* 10 (1983): 35-49, 36 [QUOTATION].

²Neil Tranter, *Sport, Economy and Society in Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998); Christiane Eisenberg, *English Sports Und Deutsche Bürger. Eine Gesellschaftsgeschichte 1800-1939* (Paderborn, Ger.: Ferdinand Schöningh Verlag, 1999); Richard Holt, *Sport and the British: A Modern History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989); idem, *Sport and Society in Modern France* (London: MacMillan, 1981); Grant Jarvie and Graham Walker, eds., *Scottish Sport in the Making of the Nation* (Leicester, U.K.: Leicester University Press, 1994); Pierre Arnaud and Thierry Terret, *Histoire Du Sport Féminin* (Paris:

L'Harmattan, 1996); J.A. Mangan, ed., *Reformers, Sport, Modernizers: Middle Class Revolutionaries, The European Sports History Review* (London: Frank Cass, 2002).

³James Riordan and Arnd Krüger, eds., *European Cultures in Sport: Examining the Nations and Regions* (Bristol, U.K.: Intellect, 2003).

⁴Pierre Arnaud and James Riordan, eds., *Sport and International Politics: The Impact of Fascism and Communism on Sport* (London: Spon Press, 1998); Alan Bairner, *Sport, Nationalism, and Globalization: European and North American Perspectives* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2001); Mangan, *Reformers, Sport, Modernizers*; Allen Guttmann, *Games and Empires: Modern Sports and Cultural Imperialism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994); Maarten van Bottenburg, *Global Games* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2001); Richard D. Mandell, *Sport: A Cultural History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1984).

⁵Stein Rokkan, "Nation-Building: A Review of Models and Approaches" in *Nation Building: A Review of Recent Comparative Research and a Select Bibliography of Analytical Studies*, eds. Stein Rokkan, Kirsti Saelen, and Joan Warmbrunn (The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1971), 7-39.

⁶Nancy L. Struna, "Social History and Sport" in *Handbook of Sports Studies*, ed. Jay Coakley and Eric Dunning (London: Sage Publications, 2000), 187-203; Allen Guttmann, "Recent Work," 35-49.

⁷S.N. Eisenstadt, "Studies of Modernization and Sociological Theory," *History and Theory* 8 (1974): 225-252.

⁸Fernando Henrique Cardoso and Faletto Enzo, *Dependency and Development in Latin America* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979); Immanuel Wallerstein, "Culture as the Ideological Battleground of the Modern World System," *Theory, Culture and Society* 7 (1990): 31-55.

⁹Cees J. Hamelink, *Cultural Autonomy in Global Communication* (New York: Longman, 1983); Herbert I. Schiller, *Communication and Cultural Domination* (New York: International Arts and Sciences Press, 1976).

¹⁰John Tomlinson, *Globalization and Culture* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999).

¹¹Joseph Maguire, "More Than a Sporting Touchdown: The Making of American Football in England 1982-1990," *Sociology of Sport Journal* 7 (1990): 213-237; Eric A. Wagner, "Sport in Asia and Africa: Americanization or Mundialization?" *Sociology of Sport Journal* 7 (1990): 399-402; Allen Guttmann, "Sports Diffusion: A Response to Maguire and the Americanization Commentaries," *Sociology of Sport Journal* 8 (1991): 185-190; Bruce Kidd, "How Do We Find Our Own Voices in the 'New World Order'? A Commentary on Americanization," *Sociology of Sport Journal* 8 (1991): 178-184; Alan M. Klein, "Sport and Culture as Contested Terrain: Americanization in the Caribbean," *Sociology of Sport Journal* 8 (1991): 79-85; Jim McKay and Toby Miller, "From Old Boys to Men and Women of the Corporation: The Americanization and Commodification of Australian Sport," *Sociology of Sport Journal* 8 (1991): 86-94.

¹²Joseph Maguire, *Global Sport: Identities, Societies, Civilizations* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1999).

¹³Ulf Hannerz, *Cultural Complexity: Studies in the Social Organization of Meaning* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1992); Jan Nederveen Pieterse, "A Critique of World System Theory," *International Sociology* 3 (1988): 251-266; Roland Robertson, *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture* (London: Sage, 1992); Saskia Sassen, *A Sociology of Globalization* (London: Norton & Company, 2006).

¹⁴Anthony McGrew and David Held, eds., *Globalization Theory: Approaches and Controversies* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2007); Tomlinson, *Globalization and Culture*; Ino Rossi, ed., *Frontiers of Globalization Research: Theoretical and Methodological Approaches* (New York: Springer, 2007).

¹⁵Hannerz, *Cultural Complexity*, 265 [QUOTATION].

¹⁶Anthony D. King, "Introduction: Spaces of Culture, Spaces of Knowledge," in *Culture, Globalization and the World-System: Contemporary Conditions for the Representation of Identity*, ed. Anthony D. King (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997).

¹⁷Arjun Appadurai, "Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy," *Theory, Culture and Society* 7 (1990): 295-310; idem, *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996).

¹⁸John Urry, *Global Complexity* (Cambridge: Polity, 2003).

¹⁹Barbara Abou-El-Haj, "Languages and Models for Cultural Exchange," in *Culture, Globalization and the World-System*, ed. King: 139-144, 142 [QUOTATION].

²⁰Held and McGrew, *Globalization/Anti-Globalization*.

²¹Rossi, *Frontiers of Globalization Research*; Saskia Sassen, *Territory, Authority, Rights: From Medieval to Global Assemblages* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2008).

²²Sassen, *Territory, Authority, Rights*; Mike Featherstone, ed., *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity* (London: Sage, 1990).

²³Herbert Schöffler, *England Das Land Des Sportes* (1935; Münster: Lit Verlag, 1986); Maria Kloeren, *Sport Und Rekord. Kultursoziologische Untersuchungen Zum England Des Sechzehnten Bis Achtzehnten Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig: Von Bernhard Tauchnitz, 1935).

²⁴Norbert Elias, "The Genesis of Sport as a Sociological Problem," in *The Sociology of Sport: A Selection of Readings*, ed. Eric Dunning (London: Frank Cass, 1971), 88-115.

²⁵Allen Guttmann, *From Ritual to Record* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1978); Henning Eichberg, *Leistung, Spannung, Geschwindigkeit* (Stuttgart, Ger.: Klett-Cotta, 1978); Susan Brownell, "The Problems with Ritual and Modernization Theory, and Why We Need Marx: A Commentary on from Ritual to Record," *Sport History Review* 32 (2001): 28-41.

²⁶Norbert Elias and Eric Dunning *Quest for Excitement: Sport and Leisure in the Civilizing Process* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986); Eric Dunning and Christopher Rojek, eds., *Sport and Leisure in the Civilizing Process: Critique and Counter-Critique* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992); Wray Vamplew, "Empiricist Versus Sociological History: Some Comments on the 'Civilizing Process,'" *Sport in History* 27 (2007): 161-171.

²⁷Holt, *Sport and the British*, 2 [QUOTATION].

²⁸Bottenburg, *Global Games*.

²⁹Alan G. Ingham, "Review of Games and Empires: Modern Sports and Cultural Imperialism by Allen Guttmann," *Sociology of Sport Journal* 14 (1997): 304-309; Guttmann, *From Ritual to Record*.

³⁰John Bale and Chris Philo, eds., *Body Cultures: Essays on Sport, Space and Identity by Henning Eichberg* (London: Routledge, 1998).

³¹Riordan and Krüger, *European Cultures in Sport*.

³²John Bale, *Sports Geography* (London: E. & F.N. Spon, 1989), 71 [QUOTATION].

³³Guttmann, "Sports Diffusion," 185-190.

³⁴David Landes, *The Unbound Prometheus: Technological Change and Industrial Development in Western Europe from 1750 to the Present*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

³⁵Ruud Stokvis, "The International and National Expansion of Sport," in *Sport in Asia and Africa*, ed. Eric A. Wagner, (New York: Greenwood Press, 1989), 13-24; Guttmann, *Games and Empires*; Bottenburg, *Global Games*.

³⁶Hannerz, *Cultural Complexity*.

³⁷See, for instance, Roland Naul, ed., *Turnen and Sport: The Cross-Cultural Exchange* (New York/ Münster: Waxmann, 1991).

³⁸Gertrud Pfister, "Cultural Confrontations: German Turnen, Swedish Gymnastics and English Sport—European Diversity in Physical Activities from a Historical Perspective," *Sport in Society* 6 (2003): 61-91, 61 [QUOTATION].

³⁹See, for instance, Riordan and Krüger, *European Cultures in Sport*.

⁴⁰Hannerz, *Cultural Complexity*.

⁴¹Bottenburg, *Global Games*; Pfister, "Cultural Confrontations"; Mandell, *A Cultural History*.

⁴²Barrie Houlihan, "Homogenization, Americanization, and Creolization of Sport: Varieties of Globalization," *Sociology of Sport Journal* 11 (1994): 356-375.

⁴³Holt, *Sport and the British*.

⁴⁴Bottenburg, *Global Games*.

⁴⁵Bairner, *Sport, Nationalism, and Globalization*.

⁴⁶Roland Renson and Herman Smulders, "Research Methods and Development of the Flemish Folk Games File," *International Review of Sport Sociology* 16 (1981): 97-107; Richard Holt, ed., *Sport and the Working Class in Modern Britain* (Manchester, U.K.: Manchester University Press, 1990).

⁴⁷Allen Guttman, "'Our Former Colonial Masters': The Diffusion of Sports and the Question of Cultural Imperialism," *Stadion* 14 (1988): 49-64.

⁴⁸Wray Vamplew, "Playing with the Rules: Influences on the Development of Regulation in Sport," *International Journal of the History of Sport* 24 (2007): 843-871.

⁴⁹Holt, *Sport and the British*.

⁵⁰Ruud Stokvis, *Sport, Publiek En De Media* (Amsterdam: Aksant, 2003).

⁵¹Ibid.

⁵²Eugen Weber, *Peasants into Frenchmen: The Modernization of Rural France, 1870-1914* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1976).

⁵³J.A. Mangan, ed., *Tribal Identities: Historical Perspectives on Nationalism, Europe and Sport* (London: Frank Cass, 1995); Bairner, *Sport, Nationalism, and Globalization*.

⁵⁴Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, eds., *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

⁵⁵Raffaele Poli, "The Denationalization of Sport: De-Ethnicization of the Nation and Identity Deterritorialization," *Sport in Society* 10 (2007): 646-661.

⁵⁶Joseph Maguire, "Globalization and Sportization: A Figurational Process/Sociological Perspective," *Avante* 4 (1998): 67-89.

⁵⁷Toby Miller *et al.*, *Globalization and Sport: Playing the World* (London: Sage, 2001).

⁵⁸Guttman, "Recent Work in European Sport History," 36 [QUOTATION].

⁵⁹Guttman, *From Ritual to Record*.

⁶⁰Maarten van Bottenburg, "Thrown for a Loss? (American) Football and the European Sport Space," *American Behavioral Scientist* 46 (2003): 1550-1562.

⁶¹Appadurai, *Modernity at Large*.

⁶²Bale, *Sports Geography*.