

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION: GOING GLOBAL—SPORTS, POLITICS, AND IDENTITIES

Sports matter. They hold a singular position among leisure time activities and have an unparalleled impact on the everyday lives of billions of people.¹ We show how, why, and for whom this has been the case for well over a century on both sides of the Atlantic. Analyzing the continuities and changes that have characterized sports cultures in the United States and Europe, we find complex processes involving global transformations alongside persistent local and national factors.

This book poses the following questions: How has a continuing process that we call “postindustrialization” and “second globalization” transformed sports? More specifically, How have developments since roughly the 1970s—in the advanced industrial capitalist economies of the liberal democracies of the United States and Europe—altered key aspects of contemporary sports cultures? And, to what degree have globalized sports and their participating athletes in turn influenced postindustrial societies and identities? Which role do sports play in globalization, and to what extent are they an engine of cosmopolitan political and cultural change? At the same time, how have sports successfully maintained traditions in the continuing battles for their very identities? And how have sports reconciled

¹A humoristic and exaggerated example of a sports fan’s dedicated life can be found in Joe Queenan, *True Believers: The Tragic Inner Life of Sports Fans* (New York: Henry Holt, 2003). Of course, in Queenan’s ironic book the problem of political fanaticism among mass movements resonates, which is the subject of Eric Hoffer’s 1951 social science classic; see Eric Hoffer, *The True Believers: Thoughts on the Nature of Mass Movements* (New York: HarperCollins, 2002 [1951]).

the new challenges that have emerged by their becoming globalizing cultural forces with new affiliations and allegiances far beyond local and national venues? To resolve this puzzle, we examine the global, national, and local layers of the dynamics that comprise present-day sports in Europe and America.²

Our approach follows the Hegelian notion of *Aufhebung*, a German term that means both “preserving” and “transcending.” Many of the distinctive cultural narratives and special patterns that first shaped sports cultures as we know them in the late nineteenth century—in the wake of globalization’s first wave—now continue unabated, perhaps even augmented, in a global arena. Yet, we argue that even as the national and the local continue to be resilient forces, the substantial changes befalling sports through the processes of second globalization—and the cosmopolitan changes accompanying it—also transcend national and local affiliations.

Both terms—cosmopolitanism and globalization—are equally disputed. We conceive of cosmopolitanism broadly as the respect for strangers and the universal recognition of individuals independent of their cultural or racial background, citizenship, and heritage. Thus hegemonic sports, as part of popular culture, play a crucial role in shaping more inclusive collective identities and a cosmopolitan outlook open to complex allegiances.³ While local fans identify with their teams, they also want to watch the very best players perform at the peak of their game. This, in turn, leads these fans to accept, even admire and love, “foreign” players and those belonging to ethnic minorities whom these fans otherwise might have ignored, or possibly disdained and hated. In other words, the sport consumers’ wish to watch and follow the best of the best may enhance acceptance of an otherwise possibly disliked “other.” Sports, in this cosmopolitan context, fulfill what Robert Putnam has so aptly called “bridging capital,” an integrative force among different groups and their cultural boundaries. Yet, in the very

²When we speak of “America,” we refer to the United States of America. While we are aware that the United States is only part of North America, we use “America” here as a signifier that corresponds to its popular use.

³In contrast to multiculturalism, which has received broad criticism for resting upon rather rigid notions of culture and group belonging, we use instead the term “cosmopolitanism” to avoid the pitfalls of essentialism or all-or-nothing understandings of identity. See Bhikhu Parekh, *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000); Steven Vertovec and Robin Cohen, “Introduction: Conceiving Cosmopolitanism,” in Vertovec and Cohen, eds., *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context, and Practice* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 2. On variations of political cosmopolitanism see Seyla Benhabib, *Another Cosmopolitanism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006) and Daniele Archibugi, *The Global Commonwealth of Citizens: Toward Cosmopolitan Democracy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008).

process of doing so, sports also conjure up forces that reaffirm emotions and identities akin to Putnam's "bonding capital," a hardening of boundaries among different constituencies and their cultures.⁴

Global Players, the Power of Sports, and Globalization

Sports shape and stabilize social and even political identities around the globe; and, we are certain, that they do so today to an unprecedented extent. They mobilize collective emotions and often channel societal conflicts. Small wonder then that sports are also the subject of a vast array of popular literature on heroes, legends, club histories, championships, and games. Sports subjects appear in popular movies, television series, and various other narratives that captivate millions, even billions, of people around the world. Sports have evolved into an integral part of the global entertainment industry. In recent years, this formidable feature of our cultural landscape has attracted increasing interest and legitimacy as an important subject of intellectual inquiry.

Sporting events are far and away *the* most watched television programs in the world. The last World Cup Tournament—held in Germany in the summer of 2006—attracted approximately thirty billion viewers, with more than two billion of the world's population watching the final match alone.⁵ And one need only consider the record number that tuned in to watch at least some events of the most recent summer Olympics in Beijing. Billions watched the sensational feats of Michael Phelps in the pool and Usain Bolt on the track. While the global audience for the Beijing Olympics was enhanced by the Internet for the first time, thus boosting the global viewership well beyond its traditional television boundaries, this event, like all televised Olympics since the Rome Games in 1960, created a

⁴It is interesting, that Robert Putnam uses a sport metaphor for the title of his book, which arguably has been among the most important statements in the social sciences of the past two decades. And sure enough, his seminal book's main concern is central to all sports: that of creating a community in the context of competition, of fostering solidarity in the framework of contestation. See his *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2001).

⁵The 2006 World Cup in Germany drew a cumulative viewership of 26.29 billion across 214 countries. The final between Italy and France attracted 715.1 million television viewers; see <http://www.fifa.com/aboutfifa/marketingtv/news/newsid=111247.html>. Retrieved July 10, 2007. According to FIFA data of 2006, 265 million people (male and female) are actively playing soccer, an increase of 10 percent compared to 2000; see FIFA Communications Division, Information Services, May 31, 2007.

global village around sports like few other events ever have.⁶ Thus, for example, the National Football League's (NFL) annual Super Bowl reaches an estimated 160 million people across the globe, while the European Champions League final bests that number by almost fifty million. Add to that the hundreds of millions that watch the Rugby World Cup, the Cricket World Cup, and the NBA Finals on a regular basis, and it is clear that these sports have become global spectacles.

Sports' major protagonists have mutated into global icons. Soccer heroes such as David Beckham, Zinedine Zidane, Ronaldinho, Lionel Messi, and Thierry Henry are recognized and admired the world over.⁷ So are their basketball equivalents: Michael Jordan, Kobe Bryant, Yao Ming, Dirk Nowitzki, and LeBron James. And Tiger Woods is in a class all by himself. Many teams also exhibit this kind of global charisma: Real Madrid CF, FC Barcelona, Manchester United FC, Chelsea FC, Liverpool FC, Arsenal FC, FC Bayern München, Juventus Turin, AC Milan, and FC Internazionale Milano (Inter) in soccer; the Los Angeles Lakers, the Chicago Bulls, the Boston Celtics in basketball; the New York Yankees in baseball; the Dallas Cowboys in American football; and an array of teams from the National Hockey League (NHL) have attracted attention well beyond the immediate confines of their actual purview. Likewise for some team owners, sports embody symbolic, social and "cultural capital"⁸ at least as much as they fulfill monetary interests. In many cases, such teams are not even profitable and represent a financial burden. However, they invariably serve as sources of pride and social status for their owners.

⁶The 2008 Beijing Olympics beat all kinds of records. They reached a cumulative global audience of 4.7 billion viewers; see http://blog.nielsen.com/nielsenwire/media_entertainment/beijing-olympics-draw-largest-ever-global-tv-audience. Retrieved October 30, 2008. With 211 million American viewers in total, this was the most-watched U.S. television event of all time; China had 842 million viewers. One of this tournament's highlights was the first round China vs. U.S. men's basketball game, which was watched by more than a billion people, making it the most-watched basketball game of all time. See Mark Heisler, "US Men's Basketball routs China, 101–70, in Olympic opener," *Los Angeles Times*, August 11, 2008, <http://articles.latimes.com/2008/aug/11/sports/sp-olympmenhoop11> (retrieved December 12, 2008).

⁷See Peer Hull Kristensen and Jonathan Zeitlin, *Local Players in Global Games: The Strategic Constitution of a Multinational Corporation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); Fredr Soderbaum and Luk van Langenhove, eds., *The EU as a Global Player: The Politics of Interregionalism* (New York: Routledge, 2007). In political science, of course, influential rational choice and game theories also employ the "players" metaphor as a conceptual tool; see among many works, George Tsebelis, *Veto Players: How Political Institutions Work* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002).

⁸As "symbolic capital" and "cultural capital" we understand the symbolic (respectively cultural), nonmaterial value of goods and their nonmaterial benefits for individuals and collectives. They entail social recognition, public attention, and collective practices and identities.

There is sound evidence that sports teams are rarely profitable on either side of the Atlantic and yet they are hotly desired treasures. Abu Dhabi's ruling family purchased Manchester City from the former Thai prime minister and multibillionaire Thaksin Shinawatra in good part to outdo their rivals, the rulers of Dubai, who have succeeded in making their Persian Gulf spot among the premier sports venues of the world. It is indeed mainly for ornamental reasons that investors are so keen on owning prestigious sport teams. More than half of the English Premier League's twenty clubs are owned by foreign businessmen and virtually none of them purchased these clubs for profit.⁹ To be sure, the acquisition of professional sports teams is much easier in the franchise system dominating the North American sports scene as well as the increasingly corporate structure of top-level English football than the club-based system still common on the European continent where even the most prominent teams in such eminent leagues as Spain's *Primera Division* and Germany's *Bundesliga* are owned by the clubs' members. The German-speaking world's "Verein" which all of Austria's and Germany's soccer clubs are, constitutes a sort of pre- or extra-capitalist structure and culture where "regular" market-based exchange and property relations in terms of club ownership do not pertain. Yet despite the proliferation of foreign owners in the English Premier League, and the increasingly global appeal and multicultural value of these eminent sports entities, virtually all team owners are citizens of the countries in which these clubs are located. Thus, for example, in the big four American sports, all principal team owners continue to remain North American with the exception of Hiroshi Yamauchi, third president of the Japanese video game giant Nintendo, who, since 1992, has been the majority owner of Major League Baseball's (MLB) Seattle Mariners. At the time of this writing (fall of 2009), there is movement afoot to have Mikhail D. Prokhorov, widely considered the richest man in Russia, become the second non-North American principal owner of a major sports franchise, in this case the NBA's New Jersey (perhaps soon-to-be Brooklyn) Nets.¹⁰ So the local and national have far from disappeared from the ownership even of the most globalized entities in modern sports, let alone their local representatives.¹¹

⁹Rob Hughes and Landon Thomas, Jr. "English Soccer Club Sale Reveals Emirates' Rivalry," *New York Times*, September 3, 2008.

¹⁰Charles V. Bagli, "Richest Russian's Newest Toy: An N.B.A. Team," *New York Times*, September 24, 2009. In May 2008, Chinese investors purchased 15 percent of the NBA's Cleveland Cavaliers.

¹¹This persistence of the national pertains to the top management structure of virtually all major so-called "multinational" companies. Yes, there are the Carlos Ghosns (Nissan and

Sports bestow much social capital and ornamental prestige not only on such flamboyant men as Mark Cuban, owner of the NBA's Dallas Mavericks; Jerry Jones, owner of the NFL's Dallas Cowboys; Silvio Berlusconi, owner of Italian soccer's AC Milan; and George Steinbrenner in his early days as owner of the New York Yankees; but also on quiet, indeed quasi-stealthy, media-shy ones like the legendary, almost mythical Philip F. Anschutz. He still operates four Major League Soccer (MLS) franchises in the United States, and is arguably the sole reason that this fledgling league has existed and survived. It is thus not surprising that MLS's ultimate championship trophy be named the Philip F. Anschutz Cup, and that this man's efforts on soccer's behalf in the United States were rewarded by his subsequent induction into the United States Soccer Hall of Fame in Oneonta, New York. Tellingly, *SoccerAmerica*, the country's leading soccer publication, graced the cover of its thirty-fifth anniversary issue with a photograph of Anschutz and listed him as top choice among the thirty-five people (players, officials, journalists, coaches, managers, owners) deemed by the magazine as having had the greatest impact on American soccer.¹² Anschutz not only maintains the largest investment by anybody in American soccer, through his Anschutz Entertainment Group (AEG), but also owns the Los Angeles Kings of the NHL and the city's fabled Staples Center, the Berlin hockey team Eisbären and their O2 Arena, as well as the eponymous entertainment venue in London. Moreover, AEG—among its myriad sports and entertainment projects around the globe—is in the process of teaming up with the NBA to build many state-of-the-art basketball arenas in China. Even though it is unlikely that anybody can rival Anschutz as a major player in international sports, he refuses any and all interviews, eschews all publicity, and continues his pioneering work away from the glare that such sports can—and do—bestow on those that seek it.

And somewhere between the flamboyance of the Berlusconis, the Joneses, and the Cubans on the one hand, and the secretiveness of the Glazers (owners of the English Premier League's glamour club Manchester United and the NFL's Tampa Bay Buccaneers) and Anschutz's on the other, is

Renault), the Howard Stringers (Sony) and the Josef Ackermanns (Deutsche Bank) of this world, but on the whole Germany-based multinational companies are run by German CEOs, CFOs and top managers with very few, if any, foreigners having decisive agenda-setting and policy-making positions; and the same pertains to their Japanese, French, British, Russian, and American counterparts. So while today's multinational corporations act globally in terms of their market reach and the presence of their products, their management remains firmly in the realm of the local and national.

¹² *SoccerAmerica* (November 2006), cover; and pp. 16 and 17.

Lamar Hunt, legendary Texas oilman and member of the Professional Football Hall of Fame (inducted in 1972), the Soccer Hall of Fame (inducted in 1982), and the International Tennis Hall of Fame in Newport, Rhode Island (inducted in 1993). Hunt commenced his remarkable sports-team and -league-owning career as a cofounder of the old American Football League, which then mutated into the American Football Conference (AFC) of the NFL in 1970. Hunt's name continues to grace the trophy of the AFC's champion and his heirs (he died in 2006) still own the NFL's Kansas City Chiefs. Hunt was one of the true pioneers of major league professional soccer in the United States. He was a cofounder of the glamorous but short-lived North American Soccer League (NASL) and subsequently a major force behind the establishment of Major League Soccer in 1996. He owned (and his heirs continue to own) the Columbus Crew and FC Dallas. Indeed, the United States Open Cup in soccer, established in 1914 and the oldest annual team tournament in all of American sports, now bears Hunt's name in honor of his pioneering role in that sport.

Clearly, men like Hunt and Anschutz, as well as their counterparts in Europe and now increasingly Asia, represent "global players" first and foremost in the world of business, but also in the world of sports. Indeed, it is mainly by dint of the latter that they are known to a large public and garner much-deserved (and often also much-desired) cultural and social capital.

Yet, "global players" are not just public figures of politics or business and of multinational corporations competing on the world market, or powerful nations in international politics, or global institutions like the United Nations and supranational organizations like the European Union. While we regard the role and meaning of professional sports clubs, including their managers and owners, as multinational enterprises, and while we view supranational sports organizations like the *Fédération Internationale de Football Association* (FIFA), the Union of European Football Associations (UEFA), the International Olympic Committee (IOC) and *Fédération Internationale de Basketball* (FIBA) as influential principals and global players in society, this book features global players in a more literal sense: the actors on the sports fields in the global age, the symbolic and cultural capital they generate, the many millions they attract and mobilize, and the changing public spaces in which they operate.

We focus on sports primarily in relation to its cultural and political impact, that is, its symbolic capital, which clearly exceeds the often claimed and much-lamented commercial importance. As Andrew Zimbalist points out, the entire revenue of the Big Four team sports of football, baseball,

basketball, and hockey in a leading sports country like the United States does not exceed \$15 billion in an economy that surpasses \$11 trillion in size.¹³ In purely economic terms, these dominant sports are akin to smallish industries and even their marquee teams resemble run-of-the-mill, mid-sized firms in terms of their market capitalization.

Global “Cultural Capital” and the Politics of Sports

As sports have gone global they have become more embedded in politics, constituting an important display of political authority and even figuring into the most quotidian political matters. Throughout the twentieth century, dictatorships of various kinds utilized the charismatic power of sports for their own, often nefarious, causes. Examples abound, from Adolf Hitler’s harnessing the Berlin Olympics in 1936 for his regime’s propaganda purposes, to China’s rulers doing the same seventy-two years later¹⁴; from Benito Mussolini’s basking in his country’s winning the second World Cup in soccer with Fascist Italy playing host, to the Argentinian military junta’s gaining much-needed legitimacy by the national team’s triumph in 1978.¹⁵

¹³Zimbalist adds that, contrary to common expectations, independent economic research shows that sports teams and sports facilities do not have any positive economic impact on an area. A new stadium and arena does not increase the level of per-capita income or that of employment. Zimbalist, an eminent sports economist, adds that the special value of professional sports can be found in its identity-generating role for the community. Having a sports team in your community “galvanizes everyone to actually experience themselves as a community. It gives them an identity.” See Andrew Zimbalist, “Sports & Economics,” *Sports in America* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of State, 2007), pp. 51–55, here p. 52; also Andrew Zimbalist, *May the Best Team Win: Baseball Economics and Public Policy* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 2003). The wealthiest European soccer clubs, Manchester United and Real Madrid, are worth US\$1.453 billion and US\$1.036 billion respectively. These are values not even close to any significant multinational corporation in the economic world; see <http://www.infoniac.com/offbeat-news/forbes-list-of-25-most-valuable-soccer-teams.html>. Retrieved July 10, 2008.

¹⁴Minky Worden, ed., *China’s Great Leap: The Beijing Olympic Games and Human Rights Challenges* (New York: Seven Stories Press, 2008).

¹⁵Argentina’s famous national coach, Luis César Menotti, openly distanced himself from the regime and refused the rulers’ invitation. He could afford to do so precisely because Argentina’s national team won the World Cup at home and he was a national hero whose success shone over the regime and its state terror. See Simon Kuper, *Football Against the Enemy* (London: Orion Books, 1994), pp. 205–36; Alberto Ciria, “From Soccer to War in Argentina: Preliminary Notes on Sports-as-Politics under a Military Regime (1976–1982),” in Arch R. M. Ritter, ed., *Latin America and the Caribbean: Geopolitics, Development and Culture* (Ottawa: Canadian Association for Latin American and Caribbean Studies, 1984), pp. 80–95; Eduardo Archetti, “Argentina 1978: Military Nationalism, Football Essentialism, and Moral Ambivalence,” in Alan Tomlinson and Christopher Young, eds., *National Identity and Global Sports*

However, even for politicians in the liberal democracies of the advanced industrial world, it has become commonplace—a well-nigh necessity—at least to feign a deep interest in sports; though, we believe that for the most part such interest is actually genuine. Thus, it was completely natural for Tony Blair, then the British prime minister, to have stopped a crucial cabinet meeting upon receiving the news that David Beckham had broken his right foot and was thus unable to play for England in crucial games. Equally credible was Gerhard Schröder, his German counterpart, scheduling all his cabinet meetings so that they not coincide with the German team's games during the World Cup tournament held in Japan.¹⁶

It is, of course, de rigueur for every head of state and head of government in Europe (including Schröder's female successor, Angela Merkel) to attend all the important matches that her or his country's national soccer team contests even beyond the World Cup. Ms. Merkel's repeated visits in June 2008 to Austria and Switzerland to attend the German team's games during the European Championship has in the meantime become routine behavior for pretty much any head of state or government. The King of Spain, for example, joined her in watching their respective countries' teams contest the final game of the tournament. Silvio Berlusconi, Italian prime minister on multiple occasions, used his success as president and principal owner of AC Milan to convince the Italian public that he could govern the country with similar results, bringing to Italy the same fame and pride that his club "Milan" attained. Berlusconi's "soccer power" was crucial on his road to attaining the pinnacle of Italy's political power. In addition, Berlusconi's party *Forza Italia* was named after the national soccer slogan "Go Italy." With this slogan Berlusconi successfully used the appeal of Italian national soccer to gain political support for his populist one-man-party in a time of highly divisive and collapsing party politics.¹⁷

Events: Culture, Politics, and the Spectacle in the Olympics and the Football World Cup (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2006), pp. 133–48; B. L. Smith, "The Argentinian Junta and the Press in the Run-Up to the 1978 World Cup," *Soccer and Society* 3 (1), 2002, pp. 69–78.

¹⁶In recent years a German chancellor is also expected to be a member of a professional soccer club and thus demonstrate passion for soccer as well as one's local ties: Helmut Kohl became an honorary member of his regional club 1.FC Kaiserslautern in 1996; Gerhard Schröder became honorary member of his favorite club Borussia Dortmund in 2001; and Angela Merkel accepted honorary membership in the East German soccer club Energie Cottbus in 2008.

¹⁷See Michael E. Shin and John A. Agnew, *Berlusconi's Italy: Mapping Contemporary Italian Politics* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2008); Giuseppe Fiori, *Il venditore: Storia di Silvio Berlusconi e della Fininvest* (Milano: Garzanti, 1996); Alexander Stille, *The Sack of Rome* (London: Penguin, 2007); Mauro Grassi and Lars Rensmann 2005, "Die Forza Italia: Erfolgsmodell einer populistischen Regierungspartei oder temporäres Phänomen des ital-

At the time of this writing, serving a third term as prime minister after the 2008 election, Berlusconi continues to use his AC Milan capital directly as cultural capital in international politics: For instance, he trotted out “his” Brazilian stars Dida, Kaka, Ronaldinho, Emerson, and Pato for visiting Brazilian president Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva, who was deeply impressed by this surprise.¹⁸

Political campaigning, governing, and symbolic politics often entail references to sports. Using sports as “cultural capital” has become commonplace in many societies and is not limited to populist politicians like Berlusconi. Sport as an ornamental tool has turned into a globalized phenomenon, which is part of our ubiquitous and inescapable zeitgeist.¹⁹

In the United States, presidents have long been deeply involved with sports—their key events and champions. It was a shocked Theodore Roosevelt who, upon seeing the mangled bodies of players from a University of Pennsylvania vs. Swarthmore College football game, called for reforms that eventually led to the establishment of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), one of the mainstays of the American sports world. The sitting president has thrown the ceremonial first pitch of the MLB season since William Howard Taft started the tradition in 1910. One of the apocryphal stories used to explain the origins of the seventh inning stretch, an integral part of contemporary baseball culture, is that the same President Taft once got up to stretch his ailing back in the middle of the seventh inning of a game and the rest of the attendants felt obliged to do so as well. The public parading in the White House of every champion in American sport—from the winner of the Super Bowl, to that of the World Series and the NBA championship, as well as all NCAA champions in college sports—is a staple of American political life.

The central role that sports play in the lives of most American male politicians is significant: Richard Nixon regularly drew up plays for his beloved Washington Redskins and communicated them to the team’s head coach George Allen; Bill Clinton rushed to watch the Super Bowl with Bill Richardson in the hope of winning the latter’s endorsement of Hillary Clinton’s candidacy for president; George H.W. Bush captained the Yale baseball team and played first base; George W. Bush was deeply involved

ienischen Parteiensystems?“ in Susanne Frölich-Steffen and Lars Rensmann, eds., *Populisten an der Macht: Populistische Regierungsparteien in Ost- und Westeuropa* (Wien: Braumüller, 2005), pp. 121–46.

¹⁸“Berlusconi praises Brazil exports,” *International Herald Tribune*, November 11, 2008.

¹⁹On the populist “Zeitgeist” in politics, see Cas Mudde, “The Populist Zeitgeist,” *Government & Opposition* 39 (3), 2004, pp. 541–63.

with the game as part owner of the Texas Rangers, and was present at the 2008 Olympics in Beijing as a supporter of United States national teams; Gerald Ford's public career commenced as a star lineman for his much-loved University of Michigan's Wolverines football team, to which he remained loyal throughout his life; Barack Obama proudly displays his love of basketball, which he played regularly on many campaign stops. He also announced his picks for the 2009 NCAA Men's final tournament (ubiquitously known as the "Big Dance" or "March Madness") on national television, completing his brackets in front of millions. Obama correctly predicted on this program that the North Carolina Tar Heels would emerge as national champions. He scrimmaged with the team the morning of that state's crucial primary win which propelled him to defeat Hillary Clinton for his party's nomination and carried him to the White House nary a year later. And let us not forget Obama's visiting with the players of the American and National Leagues in their teams' respective club houses at MLB's All-Star Game in St. Louis in July 2009, where he threw out the ceremonial first pitch wearing tennis shoes, blue jeans, and the warm-up jacket of his beloved Chicago White Sox. A few innings later, many million Americans saw the president once again, this time perched in the broadcast booth between veteran announcers Tim McCarver and Joe Buck, just three regular guys sitting around "talking baseball." Barely ten days later, the nation once again was privy to Obama's enthusiasm for and knowledge of sports when he gave Mark Buehrle a congratulatory phone call; Buehrle had just completed a perfect game for a White Sox victory, an almost superhuman feat accomplished only 18 times in baseball's 134-year history and with more than 170,000 major league baseball games played between 1903 and 2009. President Obama exhorted Buehrle to buy his teammate DeWayne Wise a "large steak dinner" for the latter's monumental catch in the ninth inning that saved the perfect game, and has in the meantime emerged as one of the greatest catches ever in the history of baseball.

It is no secret that the NBA has harnessed Obama's love for the game of basketball to further its own global appeal. There is also little doubt that the NBA's global presence with stars such as Michael Jordan, Magic Johnson, LeBron James, and Kobe Bryant has helped solidify the legitimacy, attractiveness, and acceptance of African Americans—Barack Obama included—as public figures in the white-dominated societies and cultures of Europe and America. Alas, not even President Obama's immense global popularity, but also his legitimacy as a bona fide sports fan and connoisseur, were sufficient to bring the 2016 Olympic Games to his hometown Chicago. Even the president's last-minute lobbying trip to Copenhagen to

amplify his wife's and Oprah Winfrey's advocacy for Chicago's candidacy proved no match for the determination of the International Olympic Committee's delegates to award the games to Rio de Janeiro which, of course, had the Brazilian president Lula in attendance as the city's most prominent advocate. Prime Minister Tony Blair's all-out effort greatly aided London's bid for the 2012 summer games just as Russian President Vladimir Putin's trip to Guatemala in support of Sochi's candidacy for the 2014 winter Olympics helped that venue's cause. Obama's global appeal will surely help the United States' chances of landing another World Cup soccer tournament for 2018 or 2022. In short, sports have steadily increased their presence and importance in political life in the contemporary world.²⁰ No political leader can "exit" from the culturally and symbolically powerful world of sports, even if he or she would like to do so.²¹

In this book we also look at how sports have reshaped global politics in a much broader sense. We do not refer to the role of sports only in political campaigns, or to the world of diplomacy and international relations in the strict sense. Rather, we explore how sports and sports culture affect political and cultural inclusion, how they both deconstruct and construct national identity, and how, in what manner, and to which extent they facilitate a kind of "global citizenship" and global community.²² Thus, we conceive

²⁰The language and symbolism of the competitive world of sports—from the "slam dunk" to the "home run"—has long made its inroads into everyday usage and the language of politics, particularly in the vernacular of American English and the iconography of American culture. In recent decades, Europe has caught up a bit in this regard. Sports and sports language have long become effective vehicles for political mobilization and support both internationally and domestically.

²¹That also applies to political organizations, and often to even local terrorist groups. Think of Iraq, a country divided by religious, ethnic, and sectarian conflicts and suffering from war and terrorism. It is also a country in which soccer is a powerful unifying force that few would challenge. Soccer "is so beloved here that even Al Qaeda in Mesopotamia, which claims ties to Osama bin Laden's group, has not dared to emulate Mr. bin Laden's theologically based contempt for the game. Matches in Iraq are one of the few types of public gatherings that have never become a target for suicide bombers," who have bombed mosques, schools, funerals, hospitals, shops, bazaars. See Rod Nordland and Sa'ad Al-Izzi, "Soccer in Iraq: Another Field for Argument in a Divided Society," *New York Times*, November 25, 2009, p. A16.

²²We understand political globalization not only in terms of the increasing relevance of "post-Westphalian" international authorities and institutions, and changes in international law. Political globalization is also characterized and shaped by diverse new transnational publics, associations and communications—including those that are initially not "political" in the strict sense of the word. These publics help generate forms of "global civil society" (Mary Kaldor) or "global political culture" (David Jacobsen) and thus have significant political and cultural ramifications. See Mary Kaldor, *Global Civil Society* (Cambridge: Polity, 2003); David Jacobsen, "The Global Political Culture," in Mathias Albert, David Jacobsen, and Yosef

of sports as an independent variable: as a powerful force of political and cultural change around the globe.

Sports and Cultural Change

Only a very limited number of sports attain the heights of genuine popular culture and reach well beyond the niche of their immediate producers and consumers. Such sports comprise what we have come to call “hegemonic sports culture,”²³ defined by watching, following, worrying, debating, living, and speaking a sport rather than merely playing it. Of course the “following” and the “doing” are related, but only to an extent. This nexus does not necessarily apply to those rare hegemonic sports that comprise a country’s sports culture. One need never have kicked a soccer ball or played on any team in order to follow the *Squadra Azzurra* if one is Italian, the *Seleção* if one is Brazilian, or Barcelona if one is Catalan. A New Englander need not know much about baseball to be consumed by the Red Sox and be a rabid member of what has been so aptly called “Red Sox Nation.” The same pertains to football, basketball, and hockey. New Englanders follow the Patriots, the Celtics, and the Bruins regardless of when, where, how, and even *if* they ever participated in these sports. The very crux of all hegemonic sports cultures occurs off the playing field or court and centers on ancillary matters between the games or matches proper. The attention surrounding the annual drafts of the NFL and NBA comprise the core of hegemonic sports culture at its best.²⁴ The same pertains to sports talk

Lapid, eds., *Identities, Borders, Orders: Rethinking International Relations Theory* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2001), pp. 161–79.

²³ On hegemonic sports cultures, see Andrei S. Markovits and Steven Helleman, *Offside: Soccer and American Exceptionalism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), pp. 19–33; see also below.

²⁴ On the weekend of April 25 and 26, 2009, ESPN celebrated the silver anniversary of its telecast of the NFL draft in which all thirty-two teams of the NFL select college players for their rosters. Whereas the original telecast in 1984 drew a 0.6 rating, its 2009 successor attained a higher than 4.0 rating. According to Nielsen Media Research, first-round coverage of the draft combined an average viewership of 6.3 million on ESPN and the NFL Network. The first telecast lasted ten hours with the latter version having ballooned to sixteen hours of prime time for sport events during the weekend. ESPN deems this event sufficiently worthy to have Chris Berman, arguably its best known and most highly regarded superstar, anchor all sixteen hours over two days. The network’s draft guru, Mel Kiper Jr., has become such a legend among American sports fans that he is known to millions of them merely by his first name (akin to Brazilian soccer stars). Additionally, this event is held at New York City’s Radio City Music Hall, as iconic in American culture as any building, which is packed by fans who purchased their tickets years in advance. Furthermore, thousands, if not millions, of fans

radio, where, as a rule, one “talks” passionately in minute detail 24/7 about what has already happened and/or what is about to happen in a game, to players, to teams, and to the culture of the sport above and beyond the game on the actual playing field.

Distinct hegemonic sports cultures participate in shaping local, regional, national, and transnational collective identities. Affections for a sport, and for a club or team, mark social differences and particular bonds, just as they establish shared languages in public spheres across borders.²⁵

gather in sports bars across the country, and near their team’s facilities to experience this event together, hoping that seven new players will radically alter their team’s fortunes for the better. Thus, for example, Markovits experienced the 2009 NFL draft with hundreds, perhaps thousands, of San Francisco 49ers fans in a large venue near the team’s facility and home in Santa Clara, California.

And lest we forget, not much actually happens during these sixteen hours over two days: in regular intervals of seven minutes in the first two rounds and five minutes in rounds three to seven, the NFL commissioner (replaced by one of the League’s other major officials for the later rounds) emerges to announce into a microphone at a podium that team X just drafted player Y with draft pick Z in each of the seven rounds. The player comes up to the podium, dons the team’s cap, holds its jersey aloft, shakes the official’s hand, poses for the cameras, and disappears behind the stage. That is it! No games, no runs, no passes, no tackles, no kicks, no scores—no activity at all. But, of course, all of this is accompanied by incessant analyses weeks before the event, obviously during it, and massively following it—all of which dissect in the most detailed minutiae whether the players picked and the teams picking made the correct choices leading to a good match for both. Few things underline the salience of following (as in viewing, discussing, living though not playing) to the maintenance of hegemonic sports culture and the relative marginality of participating in it than the annual NFL draft and—to a somewhat lesser, but also very prominent, extent—its NBA counterpart at the end of June every year.

To put the power of this aspect of sports following into proper perspective, the aforementioned 6.3 million viewers watching the first two rounds of the NFL draft that April weekend surpassed the average viewership for the Sunday night Yankees vs. Red Sox game on ESPN, the Saturday afternoon Yankees vs. Red Sox game on Fox and every NBA and NHL playoff game over the weekend. In all, a record 39 million viewers watched the draft. Draft viewership has increased 66 percent since 2003. For an event that does not highlight any games or contests and consists merely of talk to outdraw the television audience of Yankees vs. Red Sox, without a shadow of a doubt America’s foremost rivalry in baseball, arguably all of professional sports, twice on a weekend in prime time is nothing short of sensational and bespeaks football’s unique prominence among America’s Big Four.

The attention bestowed on these drafts also gives the NFL much cultural prominence and public attention when its season is actually dormant and its sport not performed. The draft thus maintains the NFL’s and professional football’s salience at a time when its actual absence on the playing fields might open up the sports space for potential rivals to emerge. The NBA draft in late June performs an identical function for professional basketball, though on a much more modest level due to the league’s lesser prominence among America’s Big Four and the draft’s temporal proximity to the end of the NBA season, which often ends in the latter half of June.

²⁵A wonderful example is provided by Kwame Anthony Appiah when he discusses the cultural relevance of soccer and European soccer competition in Ghana; see Kwame Anthony Appiah, *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers* (New York: W.W. Norton). As K. H.

In particular, professional team sports—in addition to high school and college sports in the United States, as we discuss in chapter 6—featuring some kind of ball-like contraption, have captured the imagination and passion of mainly the male half of the population in postindustrial societies and beyond. However, as we make clear in chapter 4, women have also participated in the course of the past three to four decades, precisely coinciding with the forces that we have come to call “second globalization.”

These few games that constitute hegemonic sports culture have by now evolved into independent social forces of hitherto unimagined importance, influencing the cultural consumption and daily habits of millions well beyond the actual producers of these games (that is, the players) or national borders. Asked about the significance of Association Football—better known as soccer—Bill Shankly, the long-time manager of Liverpool explained: “Some people think football is a matter of life or death. I don’t like that attitude. I can assure them it is much more important than that.”²⁶ Substitute baseball, football, and basketball for soccer in the context of the United States, hockey in Canada, Rugby Union in New Zealand, Rugby League in the state of New South Wales in Australia with Australian Rules Football assuming a comparable role in nearby Victoria, cricket’s cultural hegemony in India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, the West Indies, South Africa and Australia, and Shankly’s statement has its parallels in any of the hegemonic sports cultures the world over. The games in question vary from country to country and continent to continent, but the larger cultural phenomenon that each has come to embody in its respective countries or continents, does not.

Take the world of Association Football, known as “football” in much of the world, but—curiously and tellingly—by its Victorian English slang term of “soccer” in North America. Today this game may very well represent one of the very few “languages” that is understood on a global scale. There can be no question, and opinion surveys confirm this, that Ronaldinho in his heyday was the best-known and most popular Brazilian on the globe, Zidane the best-known and most popular Frenchman, and Franz “Kaiser” Beckenbauer the only German whose name recognition has come

Chen puts it: “The shaping of local people’s cultural subjectivity can no longer go back and look for origin, purity, authenticity; it must be connected to the here and now of everyday life.” See K. H. Chen, “Voices from the Outside: Toward a New Internationalist Localism,” *Cultural Studies* 6 (3), 1992, pp. 347–69. On the democratic and cultural impact of transnational publics, see James Bohman, *Democracy across Borders* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2007); for an earlier account see Jeremy Waldron, “Minority Cultures and the Cosmopolitan Alternatives,” *University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform* 25, 1992.

²⁶This famous quote by Shankly, stated in a television interview in 1981, was first published posthumously in the *Sunday Times*, October 4, 1981.

to equal Hitler's (surpassing Heidi Klum and Claudia Schiffer, as well as Johann Wolfgang von Goethe). David Beckham, now also among the prominent athletes in America, ranks among the top of all British celebrities and is a global superstar well beyond the game that he has come to master. All four of these men are now or were once soccer players, sharing in this international language of sports and becoming globalized cultural role models, symbols of an evolving sports culture and market that speaks increasingly to every distant corner of the world.

Their North American counterparts—superstars like Tiger Woods, Michael Jordan, Kobe Bryant, Alex Rodriguez (A-Rod), and Wayne Gretzky—have entered the global lexicon like few other Americans or Canadians, including most movie stars and politicians, as well as businessmen, academics, or scientists. None, quite tellingly, hail from the world of soccer but from those sports that comprise America's hegemonic sports culture. Nevertheless, while Ronaldinho and A-Rod are exquisite masters of different arenas of play, the overall character of their cultural production beyond the immediate playing field is almost identical.²⁷ These eminent sports figures are the best of the best at their game, which renders them truly global players or—to substitute the less pretentious vernacular of the American inner city for the Latin-based “global”—All World.²⁸

Local Identities and Cultural Resilience

This book looks at the interrelations between ongoing transformations in the sports world and the processes of the second or postindustrial globalization, which began more or less three decades ago. Our study illuminates the cosmopolitan role of sports within shifting cultures, identities, and politics, by example of Europe and America. This second globalization, however, can only be understood against the background of the first. The

²⁷And all are male. Until very recently, this world has been virtually the exclusive domain of men as consumers and as producers. Moreover, the main carriers of this male world reflected the less propertied and less privileged social strata, operating largely in the confines of a particular nation-state.

²⁸“All World” (sometimes even “All Planet”) denotes a level of exceptional excellence and rare exclusivity beyond the official assignation in American sports of being an “All American,” which, of course, is a rarity and high distinction in and of itself. Indeed, the Philadelphia 76ers shooting guard Lloyd B. Free was considered to be such a sensational shooter, such an amazing dunker, and such a flamboyant player that he was given the sobriquet “World” by his admiring peers on the playgrounds of Brooklyn, where he became a basketball legend. In 1980, Free proceeded to have his first name “Lloyd” changed legally to “World” thus officially becoming World B. Free.

first wave of capitalist globalization that engulfed the world from the second half of the nineteenth century to the beginning of World War I emanated from Britain, home of modern capitalism, and coursed through its empire. During the same period Britain also became the home of modern sports. Indeed, no other country comes close to Britain in its contributions to the contemporary world of sports. Britain's singular feat consisted of transforming its diverse and highly varied local games into modern sports through organization, rationalization, and institutionalization. The origins of the global emanate almost exclusively from the national and local, and the latter two levels continue to persist as crucial characteristics of sports culture.

In addition to giving these entities mutually intelligible rules that henceforth defined their very essences as sports, Britain's modern capitalism—with its accompanying bourgeois institutional order—codified the former local dialects of games into portable sports languages, also confirming the mold for the rigid separation of work and leisure.²⁹ This separation established the temporal and spatial dimensions of social and cultural life in which modern sport assumed its place. As a major player in the global game of imperialism, Britain exported this model around the globe. And in the process of this first globalization, all of these newly codified sports with their particular rules and regulations became universally intelligible sports languages. Maarten Van Bottenburg, in expanding Norbert Elias's original term "sportization," has best characterized the process as providing the singularly most important aspect of making sports uniform, thus precisely understood by all participants (both players and followers) regardless of time and space—that is, rendering sports profoundly modern.³⁰ The proliferation and acceptance of English soccer by textile engineers, electrical work-

²⁹It is perfectly clear to us that to many linguists our usage of the term "languages" to denote different sports is nothing short of blasphemous and, from their professional vantage point, completely erroneous. We could, of course, opt to call sports "semiotic systems" or "systems of communication," both of which would be more appropriate in a technical sense. Still, we think that for our purposes, using the term "language" as a metaphor conveys what we are trying to say: namely that sports are communicative forms with clearly delineated rules and regulations that have a bevy of meaning, nuances, and levels that are used by those that know them to articulate their emotions and knowledge to others conversant with these forms. To us, each sport has a distinctive symbolic and normative framework comprised of formal rules and informal codes, which in turn generate a penumbra of meaningful practices, symbols, and evaluations. We see these analogous to languages or idioms. In no way do we mean to imply that each sport is a language. Rather, we see each sport as having a distinctive (normative, symbolic, conceptual, and terminological) language associated with it, which constitutes part of that sport's singular culture.

³⁰Norbert Elias, "The Genesis of Sport as a Sociological Problem" in Eric Dunning, ed., *The Sociology of Sport: A Selection of Readings* (London: Frank Cass, 1971), pp. 88–115; and

ers, accountants, merchants, and businessmen around the world, but particularly in Latin America and the European continent, characterized the might of Britain's economic model more than its political power. Much less prominently than Britain—and behooving its (self-proclaimed) posture of “splendid isolation”—the North American continent, too, developed crucial sports languages parallel to Britain's in the latter part of the nineteenth century, namely the Big Four of baseball, football, basketball, and hockey.³¹

All of these languages, soccer included, are related and share many common characteristics. Thus, for example, they are all centered on a ball-like contraption of varying shape and size (if we are permitted the indulgence of calling a hockey puck a ball); they are all team sports; they are all modern variants of ancient sports. So, in a sense, they all share an Ur-language as it were, a Latin.

Yet, to some extent they have become and still are mutually incomprehensible, just as today's French is from Portuguese and Romanian. One can make out meanings in the other language, see related patterns in it, sense some parallels with it, but one cannot quite speak or understand it without a long process of acculturation and learning. Just like with languages, the early socialization process is hereby decisive; the earlier one learns to speak baseball, soccer, or basketball, the more proficient one is in all their respective complexities and nuances. Later learning is possible, but since it will in some ways always be accented, it remains an empirical question whether the native speakers will fully accept the newcomer as “authentic.”

Though by no means tied to nation-states, these individual sports languages have proven to be immensely resilient over an entire century, from the mid to late nineteenth century until today. America developed its own languages that—in many cases—were related to their British counterparts but emerged in due course as entities all their own. We will devote much attention later to the celebrated presence of college sports as an integral part of American culture way beyond sports, a phenomenon unique to that country.

There are many other examples of this “linguistic” difference between the United States and the rest of the sports world, but at this juncture we

Maarten Van Bottenburg, *Global Games* (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 2001). This will be discussed in greater detail throughout the book.

³¹With the exception of American football, all of the North American sports spread to other countries and cultures in the process of this first globalization. But their success in establishing a lasting cultural prominence in these countries proved to be much more muted and geographically confined than soccer's.

will restrict ourselves to merely four: first, the prevalence of multisport performers at the very top level of American team sports, such as Dave DeBusschere and Danny Ainge in baseball and basketball, Deion Sanders and Bo Jackson in baseball and football, and others such as Charlie Ward who won the Heisman Trophy as the country's very best collegiate football player and seamlessly proceeded to pursue a respectable career as a starting point guard in the NBA.³² Such two- or even three-sport stars are much more prominent at the college level than among the professional ranks, and are quite common in high schools where many top athletes participate at the varsity level in all three of the American sports languages.³³ This does not exist elsewhere precisely because no other country has the same proliferation of different sports languages that dominate general culture. Despite "His Airness's" inability to hit a curveball, Michael Jordan's failed attempt to become a major league baseball player attests to the uniquely American phenomenon of athletic skill linked with cultural capital that informs the three-pronged (potentially four) nature of America's hegemonic sports culture. The very fact that Jordan played Triple-A ball for two years still bespeaks an inordinate proficiency in two sports. To our knowledge, no comparable European or Latin American soccer star ever attempted to apply his athletic skills or cultural knowledge to another sport. For example, David Beckham never took a leave of absence from Manchester United to try his hand at playing passable professional cricket or rugby, nor did Thierry Henry spend any of his springs or summers on a bicycle participating in that sport's elite events such as the Giro d'Italia,

³²By all accounts, the Hall-of-Fame baseball players Tony Gwynn and Dave Winfield could have played basketball in the NBA had they chosen to do so (Gwynn as a point guard, Winfield as a power forward); and let us not forget the Cy Young Award and 300-games winning pitcher Tom Glavine who was drafted by the National Hockey League's Los Angeles Kings in 1984 in the fourth round, two rounds ahead of 2009 Hockey Hall of Fame inductees Brett Hull and Luc Robitaille, but chose to join MLB's Atlanta Braves who also drafted him in 1984. The most prominent non-American two-sport star on the top professional level was arguably Denis Compton, the face of Brylcreem, who played cricket for Middlesex and performed in seventy-eight test matches for England while playing football for Arsenal.

³³Just think of athletes like Drew Henson, who played quarterback for the University of Michigan and was then drafted to play third base for the New York Yankees. Or Jeff Samardzija, a star pitcher for the Notre Dame baseball team, who became one of the very best receivers for its football team and of Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS)—formerly Division I-A—college football as a whole, and was a first-round draft pick for the National Football League, but then chose to become a relief pitcher for the Chicago Cubs (and became a star). And we would be remiss not to mention Stanford University's Toby Gerhart who shattered all the Cardinal's rushing records in his stellar four-year college career, was a serious candidate for the Heisman Trophy in 2009, but also starred on Stanford's baseball team and was poised to commence a fine career either in the NFL or MLB.

the Tour de France, or any of the “classiques”; and we know of no top-level German, Swiss, Austrian, Dutch, or Scandinavian soccer player who also became a well-respected star in any of these countries’ diverse winter sports that comprise their respective hegemonic sports cultures.³⁴ Moreover, in no other country are educational institutions, starting well before high school and culminating in college, so intricately involved in creating expert users, indeed well-nigh masters, of these sports languages. America’s hegemonic sports culture has been multilingual as it were, with most countries’ cultural equivalence being at most bilingual, with soccer a predominant first among equals.³⁵

³⁴Václav Nedomanský, the great Czechoslovak hockey star for the national team and for his club Slovan Bratislava, was the closest European whom we could locate as a two-sport star. He performed at the highest levels in hockey and was also an excellent soccer player, and played one match for Slovan Bratislava’s soccer club in the Czechoslovak first division. Tellingly, just like in the American cases, soccer and hockey are the two hegemonic languages of Czechoslovak sports culture, thus played by boys and men from an early age. Other European cases do not really constitute a change of sports language: An interesting and in many ways exceptional case is the German soccer star Manfred Burgsmüller, who played for Borussia Dortmund. The fourth all-time leading scorer in the Bundesliga (with an amazing 213 goals) retired from professional soccer in 1990. But he turned to professional football in 1996, starting a second career as the kicker for Rhein Fire, Düsseldorf’s American football team. When he ended his career in 2002, Burgsmüller had turned into the most successful kicker in NFL Europe. He won two “World Bowls.” Playing at age fifty-two, he was the oldest professional football player of all time. Similarly, Toni Fritsch (“Wembley Toni”), an Austrian soccer player—a regular for SK Rapid Wien, who made it to six caps in the Austrian national team and scored two legendary goals in 1965 in Austria’s only win against England at Wembley (without achieving much further fame in that sport thereafter)—emigrated to the United States and became a successful place kicker for the Dallas Cowboys. Both Fritsch’s and Burgsmüller’s transitions from one football to another were much less dramatic than playing sports as diverse as football, baseball, and basketball on the world’s highest levels of each sport.

³⁵Australia presents the closest approximation to the Big Four languages of the American sports space. Here, too, one can detect four important sports cultures but the prominence of Australia’s main team sports are geographically segmented, in notable contrast to the situation in the United States where only hockey remains regional. Thus, while Rugby League is immensely popular in New South Wales, Queensland, and the Australian Capital Territory, it is hardly followed in Victoria, South Australia, Western Australia, Tasmania, and the Northern Territory, where Australian Rules Football comprises the core of hegemonic sports culture. Cricket has a truly national following and ditto with Rugby Union though the latter’s popularity is much stronger in the Rugby League states than in those beholden to Australian Rules Football—with the exception of Western Australia, which has strong Union grass roots due to large numbers of South African and British immigrants. Soccer’s Australian profile is not dissimilar to the sport’s American counterpart: a rather weak domestic presence but an increasing interest in the national team’s international successes. The “Socceroos,” rather than the sport of soccer per se, have received major support and interest in Australia since the late 1990s confirming yet again the power of nationalism in creating attraction to an aspiring entrant into a country’s sports space and hegemonic sports culture. While the Australian domestic league, the Hyundai A-League, which commenced playing in the 2005–6 season, has

Second, even in the ubiquitous and profoundly modern motor sports, America is different from the rest of the world, speaking a slightly different language as it were. Whereas Formula One has become a global phenomenon, literally contested in races on every continent, there is the marked absence of the United States of America, the world's largest producer and consumer of cars throughout the twentieth century.³⁶ Of course, Americans did participate in Formula One, and sure enough Phil Hill and Mario Andretti won Formula One's coveted world championship, Dan Gurney emerged as one of its bona fide stars, and races were held at places like Watkins Glen and in the streets of Detroit and Las Vegas. However, Americans have never come close to speaking and truly enjoying the language of Formula One the way they have their own two indigenously produced vernaculars: The National Association for Stock Car Auto Racing (NASCAR), whose product has been catapulted to the second spot—behind only the NFL—as the most watched sport on American television; and open-wheel car (Indy Car) racing, featuring such American classics as the Indianapolis 500 held on Memorial Day every year. But here, too, we observe an increased American engagement with the world of global sports, in that at the time of this writing the first U.S.-based Formula One team since the late 1960s first U.S.-based Formula One team since the late 1960s had just been established with José María López of Argentina as its first driver.³⁷

Third, there are those unique North American temples and shrines to sports called “Halls of Fame,” which celebrate the respective sport's best players, most important coaches and managers, and its most meritorious officials, owners, and broadcasters—in short, that embody the sport's most coveted history and honor the particular language's most original practitioners, its most prolific masters, and its most accomplished users. It is not at all by chance that the French term for the Hockey Hall of Fame has an explicitly religious nomenclature in *Temple de la Renommée du Hockey*. Expressions such as somebody being a “first-ballot-Hall-of-Famer,” which denotes singular excellence in the person's *métier*, are purely part of the American vernacular and unknown to other sports cultures and language-

certainly gained in prominence precisely on the coattails of the Socceros' success, many of the country's soccer fans tend to quench their quotidian thirst for the game by following their favorite teams of the English Premier League.

³⁶This is all the more surprising since 90 percent of Formula One's technology hails from the U.S. aerospace industry and trickles down to the Formula One teams based in Britain and Italy.

³⁷“U.S. Formula One Team Names Driver,” *New York Times*, January 26, 2010, p. B14.

es.³⁸ The fact that sports assume, at least to some degree, the cultures and language patterns of local customs that might otherwise not be part of their mainstream presence, is best demonstrated by the fact that soccer in the United States does indeed feature the National Soccer Hall of Fame and Museum, which was opened in 1979 in Oneonta, New York; it is just a few miles up the road from the National Baseball Hall of Fame and Museum in Cooperstown. There is nothing remotely similar in the global culture for soccer. And while legends such as Franz Beckenbauer and Pelé would surely be celebrated members of an edifice and shrine that encompassed world football, or even of their respective countries, Germany and Brazil, they are actually soccer Hall-of-Famers by dint of their induction in Oneonta—an honor that they attained by having played a leading role in American soccer arguably at the tail end of their respective stellar careers and not German and Brazilian football that propelled them to global stardom. We should mention in this context the International Cricket Council's (ICC) Hall of Fame, which was established on January 2, 2009 as part of the ICC's centenary celebrations. This Hall honors the greatest players of cricket from all over the world.

And fourth, the origins of American sports teams as businesses, leading to the system of franchises, is in stark contrast to their European counterparts hailing from the world of clubs. The former lead a mobile existence, moving from place to place following changing conditions in demography and markets. Yet, once in a league, they do not drop to its lower rungs by dint of having had a poor season, nor do they advance to its top tier as reward for good results. By contrast, European clubs remain geographically immutable, but they do get relegated to lower divisions for poor results and promoted for good ones.

Our metaphoric sports languages also exhibit major effects on real languages and their users. Take the term "football," for example. It denotes different sports in the United States, Canada, Australia, and England. Each

³⁸There are, of course, many halls of fame in the United States. Indeed, virtually every state has a hall of fame to which it inducts its most meritorious athletes and sports figures. But clearly, the most important are the halls of fame of the Big Four American team sports. Not by chance, the oldest and most distinguished of these is The National Baseball Hall of Fame and Museum, opened on June 12, 1939 in Cooperstown, New York—celebrating the centenary of baseball's alleged beginnings then and there. It was followed by The Hockey Hall of Fame (the above-mentioned Temple de la Renomé du Hockey), established in 1943 in Kingston, Ontario and subsequently moved to Toronto in 1958. The Professional Football Hall of Fame followed on September 7, 1963 in Canton, Ohio. Lastly, The Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame emerged on February 17, 1968 in Springfield, Massachusetts.

of these in turn creates its own nomenclatures and special terms. What the English call “nil,” “pitch,” “match” (also “fixture”), “supporter,” “(goal) keeper,” “manager,” “penalty,” “level” (also “draw”), “batsman,” and “bowler,” the Americans refer to as “zero” (or “nothing”), “field,” “game,” “fan,” goalie,” “coach” (though “manager” in baseball), “PK” (short for penalty kick), “tie(d),” “batter,” and “pitcher.” Making matters more confusing still is that the exact same terms mean completely different things to their respective speakers. “Pitch” means nothing to an American in terms of referring to a “field” but quite a lot as an integral part of baseball. Any insider perceives any erring in the proper usage of the language as a tell-tale sign of an outsider’s ignorance or worse. Indeed, we had to make choices as to what nomenclatures we were to use in this volume, cognizant of the fact that few things divide us more from our British and other English-speaking friends than our common language, particularly that of sports. Woe onto the person who transgresses linguistically by referring to an item by its “improper” name. Nothing carries a greater stigma and fiercer contempt for a “true” English football supporter than to have his game sullied by the usage of improper (i.e., alien and disdained) American terminology.³⁹ In turn, most American soccer aficionados have to assert their bona fide soccer identity by using the game’s English rather than American terminology, which, too, has its problems.⁴⁰

Sports languages shift and move; but they also prove immensely sticky

³⁹Indeed, one of us experienced a rare look of unmitigated contempt and hatred on the part of an English fan toward an American patron in an Ann Arbor sports bar when the latter jumped up in the opening minutes of the telecast of the 2006 Champions League Final between Arsenal and Barcelona and screamed at the top of his lungs “This is a PK,” when the Arsenal goalkeeper brought down a Barcelona attacker. “It’s a f—— penalty for you,” hissed the Englishman full of venom and anger.

⁴⁰One of America’s foremost soccer journalists and grey eminences of the game, the English-born Paul Gardner, constantly inveighs against what he calls the “Eurosnoobs,” who appear compelled to enhance their (and perhaps soccer’s) legitimacy in America by always using the game’s English rather than its American terminologies. Here is Gardner on the origins of the word “soccer” and some of the game’s American fans’ determination to use the English term “football,” which they perceive to be the “correct” nomenclature for the game: “A point about the word soccer: There seems to be a widespread impression that the word is an American invention. It is not. It is pure English, almost as old as the sport itself. Maybe the World Football Challenge people [the organizers of this tournament who insisted on using the word ‘football’ instead of ‘soccer,’ which will be discussed in chapter 3], having understood that the word has sturdy Brit Eurosnoob origins, will now be able to use it?” Paul Gardner, “Superclubs Tour USA: Pros and Cons,” *SoccerAmerica*, July 27, 2009. Even on this level, language in and about sports matters immensely because it bespeaks a deeper identity. Nothing is more upsetting to insiders than outsiders misusing the sport’s proper terminology, violating the language’s proper grammar as it were. Any and all transgressions in this area disqualify the user

and resilient. Still, the questions remain: How do these languages transform in the global context; How culturally inclusive and cosmopolitan are modern sports; and, What role do sports play in cultural and political change—especially in a world where “globalizations” clash with exclusive identity claims and counter-cosmopolitanism?

Sports are going global for the second time. We will examine the resilience and transformations of the cultural and sports spaces⁴¹ that formed in the first globalization and have remained relevant during our contemporary era, featuring what we call the second globalization. This entails an age of global capitalism and trade, new transnational migration, global communications networks, and cosmopolitan norms and institutions never previously imagined, let alone experienced. These massive shifts create a global culture wherein sports assume pride of place. New transnational identities, markets, events, agents, and communications have emerged. Yet,

as an imposter, an unwanted intruder or—in the best case—as a newcomer who needs a lot of seasoning in the particular sports language’s nuances.

⁴¹We use the term “sports space” analogous to what political scientists have come to call party space, meaning both actual physical space and its congruent cultural presence. According to Lipset and Rokkan’s ground-breaking theory, the beginning of the modern industrial age until the end of World War I witnessed some “critical junctures” that shaped political spaces and their future paths. Emerging dominant societal cleavages—the most significant between owners and workers—were by and large established by 1920. The party space emerging at that post–World War I juncture, became “frozen,” according to Lipset and Rokkan, and remained so until the late 1960s, making it difficult for newcomers to enter this space. The two spaces, party and sports, are actually related because they both hail from the world of industrialization. This process created a spatial and temporal separation between work and leisure; and it is in the latter that in the second half of the nineteenth century spaces arose in which modern sports became located. Thus sports space entails courts, fields, clubhouses—actual edifices and grounds—as well as human beings associated with these institutions, first as a matter of leisurely pursuit but subsequently as their vocations. It is by dint of the last development that very few ball-centered team sports came to attain an importance way beyond their immediate milieu and thus became hegemonic culture in a society’s sports space. Analogous to the topography of party systems, this space, created more or less between 1860 and 1920, has become occupied by hegemonic sports, rendering the barrier of entry for newcomers quite difficult. On the concept of party space and its occupation, see Seymour Martin Lipset and Stein Rokkan, “Cleavage Structures, Party Systems and Voter Alignments: An Introduction,” in Seymour Martin Lipset and Stein Rokkan, eds., *Party Systems and Voter Alignments* (New York: Free Press, 1967), pp. 1–64; see Ira Katznelson, “Structure and Configuration in Comparative Politics,” in Mark Irving Lichbach and Alan S. Zuckerman, eds., *Comparative Politics: Rationality, Culture, and Structure* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 81–112. For some of the many revisions, defenses, and critiques of the contemporary relevance of this argument see also Peter Mair, *Party System Change: Approaches and Interpretations* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997); Paul Pennings and Jan-Erik Lane, eds., *Comparing Party System Change* (New York: Routledge, 1998). For the analogy in sports see Markovits and Hellerman, *Offside*, pp.19–30.

these appear to transform, rather than replace, local spaces and ties within the global topography of sports. This second globalization creates new inroads for various global players and professional games, as it further expands the cultural territory of one sport into the hitherto guarded domain of another. Witness the penetration of basketball into Europe's sports space and the reciprocal presence of soccer in America's. Globalizing sports and interests—illustrated, for example, by the fact that for millions in China, Tanzania, or Australia the results of Manchester United's weekend games have become a major concern—overlay new areas of culture onto established sports spaces that do not leave the local unaffected. However, players, teams, and games that have become global do not simply discard their local importance and national salience; rather, to a considerable extent, their newly acquired global stature often reinforces those dimensions.

This happens in two opposed directions. On the one hand, those who adhere to the identity of a local or national sports culture may cling to it all the more trenchantly in the face of absorption into the global. On the other hand, the local or national dimensions of a sports community may constitute one of the points of appeal that these sports have on the global level. "You never walk alone," the famous chant reverently intoned by Liverpool fans, bespeaks most powerfully the essence of being scouse, a native of Liverpool and a member of its local sports culture. Indeed, Liverpool supporters often invoke their scouse identity in explicit opposition to identifying themselves as English, let alone British or belonging to any other national or ethnic category. However, as a trapping of Liverpool's global presence, along with the color red, the legend of Anfield—the team's home stadium with its iconic "This is Anfield" sign that graces the tunnel leading to the pitch, and which every Liverpool player touches with reverence—and "scouse-ness" now may include fans in China, Africa, or anywhere in the world. As teams like Liverpool become global, which community does a motto like, "You never walk alone" embody? Identities that until recently remained strictly local have attained, by virtue of global teams, a reach far beyond their immediate boundaries. In fact, these teams have developed multiple cosmopolitan attachments, from their multiethnic international lineup to dedicated fan communities across the globe. Nevertheless, the local has been far from replaced and it may well continue to resist the global, while it also cannot help but be radically transformed into something new when a sport culture is marketed and communicated around the globe.

The Second Globalization and its Cosmopolitan Turns

We argue that the hegemonic sports cultures that were established between 1860 and 1914 in the United States, Europe, and by extension much of the world, continue to flourish unabated, yet far from unchanged and unchallenged. In postindustrial societies today, professional team sports are not just a crucial part of (global) popular culture but also significant agents of cultural change and global communication. “Globalization” has become an overused catch-word in the social sciences and beyond. However, we think that it points to some striking developments in the postindustrial age. Moreover, we argue that the concept we call the second or postindustrial globalization, starting roughly in the 1970s, embodies causal factors for the aforementioned cosmopolitan changes and the reshaping of sports cultures.

Although the new, post-industrial globalization might be primarily economically induced, it cannot be reduced to the expansion of markets and the increase of social inequalities.⁴² This process is instead multicausal and multilayered, entailing a transformation of global communications, the decline of the “television age” and a concomitant prominence of the Internet, globalized publics and cosmopolitan expectations, new transnational identities and migration, as well as the rise of supranational entities and organizations. Cultural interactions are also affected. Even distant local events or deliberate “localisms” are today enmeshed in global relations. Here we adopt the diagnostic definition offered by David Held and his collaborators: globalization is a complex and multidimensional process that “embodies a transformation in the spatial organization of social relations and transactions—exerted in terms of their extensity, intensity, velocity and impact—generating transcontinental or interregional flows and networks of activity, interaction, and the exercise of power.”⁴³ However, we conceptualize this process more specifically as a second, postindustrial globalization. Just like the first, “industrial” globalization, so does

⁴² On globalization and global inequality see Kate Vyborny and Nancy Birdsall, “Does Free Trade Promote Economic Equality?,” in Peter M. Haas, John A. Hird, and Beth McBratney, eds., *Controversies in Globalization: Contending Approaches to International Relations* (Washington, DC: CQ Press, 2010) pp. 55–67.

⁴³ David Held, Anthony McGrew, David Goldblatt, and Jonathan Perraton, “Rethinking Globalization,” in David Held and Anthony McGrew, eds., *The Global Transformations Reader* (Cambridge: Polity, 2000), p. 55. Globalization, hence, primarily denotes “the expanding scale, growing magnitude, speeding up and deepening impact of transcontinental flows and patterns of interaction.” David Held and Anthony McGrew, *Globalization/Antiglobalization* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2002), p. 1.

its second, postindustrial variant exert in its own unique way multiple pressures on existing political orders, collective identities, cultural bonds, and societal structures.⁴⁴

First, the postindustrial transformation of technology and emergence of global media have facilitated unprecedented communication between individuals and groups in far-away places. Thus, sports connoisseurs around the world can be part of the most distant sports events. Second, this coincides with new global migration and mobility that has inevitably altered the cultural composition, increasing the diversity of postindustrial societies and, in particular, of sports consumers and producers. Third, funda-

⁴⁴Our claim that this second globalization is multilayered and multicausal is backed by major advances in contemporary scholarship on the subject. We view the second globalization as a set of *processes* that have begun to generate new, complex webs of interdependencies, sprawling networks, and global publics operating far beyond the economic realm. Globalization does not refer to a single (economic) dynamic but a “set of processes that operate simultaneously and unevenly on several levels and in various dimensions.” See Steger, *Globalization* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), p. 36. Moreover, globalization is hardly a unified phenomenon but rather, as James Mittelman claims, a syndrome of changes of social relations that also produces deep tensions. Although globalization entails intensified global exchanges and events (including global sports events) that induce an increased human awareness of interdependence and receding boundaries, the emerging global networks are disparate and fragmented. While globalization refers to the multiplication, expansion and acceleration of activities across political and territorial boundaries, much of contemporary scholarship also insists that globalization is never just a one-way street. It is equally misguided to view globalization only in terms of “cultural imperialism”—as new Western superhighways that pave over local roads and villages. For all the pressures that globalization forces exert on individual cultures, diversity typically increases within society, as Tyler Cohen points out. While globalization relativizes particularisms, political or cultural differences do not simply disappear; they are also recreated. As we will show in chapter 2, this mutual penetration of the universal and the particular, the global and the local is arguably best captured by Roland Robertson’s concept of “glocalization.” In this process of hybridization of differences neither the global nor the local stay the same. Transnational, national, and local groups are agents in this context: For instance, local cultures and groups may absorb, transform, and reject certain dimensions of globalization. In turn, local politics and cultures (and sports cultures for that matter) may have global impact. Thus, conceptions that view globalization simply as cultural homogenization (“McWorld”) fail to grasp the proliferating complexity of global relationships among individuals, institutions, cultures, and organizations. Globalization unfolds a “non-linear dialectical process in which the universal and the particular, the similar and the dissimilar, the global and the local are to be conceived, not as cultural polarities, but as interconnected and reciprocally interpenetrating principles.” Ulrich Beck, *The Cosmopolitan Vision* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2006), pp. 72–73. See also Arjun Appadurai, *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996); Tyler Cohen, *Creative Destruction: How Globalization Is Changing the World’s Cultures* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004); James H. Mittelman, *The Globalization Syndrome: Transformation and Resistance* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000); Roland Robertson, *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture* (London: Sage, 1992); James N. Rosenau, *Distant Proximities: Dynamics Beyond Globalization* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003).

mental postindustrial changes in the workplace—the decline of the traditional industrial working class—have also profoundly influenced the audience for sports events. Fourth, we are faced with the globalization of political arrangements, that is, the expansion and increasing relevance of global institutions in the world of sports as well. And, fifth, the globalization of the economy has led to an intensified global outreach on the part of clubs and corporations that invest in sports. Challenging societies to change their ways, this second globalization has thus facilitated the “cosmopolitanization” of global players and arenas, reshaping the sports cultures that we examine.

In particular, we explore the fascinating similarities and differences that inform the sports spaces in America and Europe and analyze the factors and variables that influence continuity and change in them: We observe the resilience (“stickiness”) of old habits on both continents that comprise the backbone of all hegemonic sports cultures: the much-maligned (or praised) “couch potato” forms the core of sports consumption. But *his* (sic) world, too, has experienced mighty changes in the course of the second globalization. We witness what one could label the “Europeanization” of America’s sports culture and, conversely, the “Americanization” of Europe’s. While it is commonplace to talk about the latter and to view globalization more or less as synonymous with Americanization, we demonstrate that Europe, far from being a victim of America’s might, very much plays a leading (perhaps *the* leading) role in what arguably has evolved into *the* hegemonic sports culture par excellence on a global level—the world of soccer. Indeed, Europe’s massive domination of two of international sport’s leading federations, FIFA and the IOC, are well known and beyond dispute. Simply put, while baseball, football, basketball, and hockey—the old mainstays of North America’s sports culture for well over one century—continue to comprise the world’s undisputed core in these respective sports, it is Western Europe’s soccer, with its four leading professional leagues (the English Premier League, *Serie A* in Italy, the *Primera Division*, commonly known as *La Liga* in Spain, and Germany’s *Bundesliga*) that furnishes this sport’s uncontested core. But Europe’s added prominence hails from the fact that the game over which it lords embodies a much wider global product than any of its North American competitors; their global reach, though growing massively since the advent of the second globalization, still remains way behind soccer’s, which seems to have built its insurmountable lead during the time of its nineteenth-century predecessor.

How Sports Are Reshaping Global Politics and Culture

Our argument for this study is three-fold.

(1) We submit that hegemonic sports cultures, like political cultures and political party systems, represent “frozen” spaces that resist change and offer newcomers few opportunities for entry. Tradition, collective identity, and socialization matter immensely and continue to define *frozen sports spaces* rooted at the local, regional, and national level. Not surprisingly, these sports spaces have generally created even stronger emotional attachments and more powerful collective identifications than have political parties and ideologies. As such, we argue that these localized sports cultures continue to harbor a strong—and frequently quite successful—resistance to the pressures exerted by contemporary globalization. The relevance of these sports cultures, their languages, affective ties, and narratives of collective identity—even their putative resistance—should not be underestimated. The mostly locally anchored love for these sports and their institutions (such as teams, rules, players, colors, smells, legends, myths, narratives, and pubs or bars) often last a lifetime, at least for men. Sports, in this important sense, will remain, just like politics, perennially local.

(2) At the same time we also suggest that postindustrial globalization puts these frozen spaces under new, unprecedented pressures. It is challenging well-established cultural spaces and national, regional, and local identities on multiple levels. Traditional collective patterns and allegiances, constituting the established cleavages in the frozen landscape of sports and politics, begin to melt around the edges. They face a partial defrosting. There are several indicators that hegemonic sports cultures are becoming increasingly prolific across the Atlantic, well at pace with the development of the whole range of global interdependencies, media, and pop cultures that propagate global spaces.

More importantly, as a crucial part of popular culture globally, sports offer a key medium for cosmopolitan cultural change.⁴⁵ In several respects, hegemonic sports—especially but not exclusively contemporary soccer—are *the* vanguard of sociocultural globalization and cosmopolitan turns.

⁴⁵ Like other new global media and public arenas, sports are often a vehicle for communicating cosmopolitanism and facilitating diversity rather than simply producing cultural homogeneity; on the cosmopolitan impact of global media, see Pippa Norris and Ronald Inglehart, *Cosmopolitan Communications: Cultural Diversity in a Globalized World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

Global players on the field, who draw admiration from locals but also from across the world, are both representatives and facilitators of more inclusive cultural self-understandings in today's diverse societies. Sports are often the first cultural space in which migrants gain social recognition. Sports' universalistic focus on individual merit rather than exclusive cultural difference corresponds with, and helps generate, the rise of those egalitarian and inclusive sets of beliefs in postindustrial societies that Ronald Inglehart and Christian Welzel conceptualize as "self-expression values." Such values emphasize individuality, human choice, freedom of expression, liberty, autonomy, and diversity. According to Inglehart and Welzel, they emerge with long-term value change in civil society. Although they are "shaped by economic resources, they have a significant independent impact on democracy."⁴⁶

Accounts that paint a thoroughly grim picture of global sports as mere propaganda for dictatorships, mimicking warfare or as hotbeds of nationalism, are at the very least one-sided.⁴⁷ They do not grasp that in a nation like China, which is ruled by an authoritarian regime, a new frenzy for the NBA, international soccer, and global players evade the control of the Communist elite. NBA star Kobe Bryant is arguably more popular in China than any other person in the world. He is now "the hometown favorite."⁴⁸ We argue that especially sports—and maybe only sports—render possible a new, totally unprecedented but "actually existing cosmopolitanism."⁴⁹ Sports cut across all national and cultural boundaries and transform identities. Sports also have a critical political impact. The increasing popular demands connected to soccer and basketball may in the long run topple the Chinese regime "from below," as Guoqi Xu, an expert on Chinese sport and society, persuasively argues.⁵⁰ Thus, far from viewing sports as the opiate of the masses, we regard their contemporary global presence as antinomian forces that challenge encrusted sources of domination.

An emerging cosmopolitan consciousness is in part caused by the sec-

⁴⁶ See Ronald Inglehart and Christian Welzel, *Modernization, Cultural Change, and Democracy: The Human Development Sequence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), p. 182; see also Christian Haerpfer, Patrick Bernhagen, Ronald Inglehart, and Christian Welzel, eds., *Democratization* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009).

⁴⁷ See Jonathan Kay, "War in Lycra," *National Post*, August 12, 2008, p. A14.

⁴⁸ David Barboza, "China's Promise Excites the Sports Stars," *New York Times*, August 27, 2008, p. C8.

⁴⁹ See Bruce Robbins, *Feeling Global: Internationalism in Distress* (New York: New York University Press, 1999).

⁵⁰ See Xu Guoqi, *Olympic Dreams: China and Sports, 1895–2008* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008).

ond globalization of sports, in particular by the evolution of global sports arenas and broadcasts and the new global migration of players and spectators. Even if one's attachments remain local and specific to a hegemonic sport, one still develops an identity as a participant in an increasingly globalizing sports world that is by necessity culturally inclusive, antiessentialist, and universalistic—racist hooligans in European soccer stadiums and other forms of counter-cosmopolitan exclusions notwithstanding. People love good players, especially ones on “their” team, no matter their origins, the color of their skin, or their religion. And such players are international migrants who woo global audiences with their skillful performances, gaining interest and affection wherever they play.⁵¹ Indeed, if professional teams lack international diversity, they risk being less competitive; this rule applies to other areas of society as well.⁵²

Today's sports induce a broad cultural cosmopolitanism to a degree that we do not find anywhere else in a “global society” still divided along social cleavages, national borders, and other conflicts. Nationalism, dictatorship, exclusive identities, power, and money continue to remain important in sports and society. Yet this does not erase the new inclusive attachments, multiple allegiances, and the increasing relevance of new forms of cosmopolitan identity that sports cultures clearly provide. The cosmopolitanism of sports not only facilitates the universal admiration of the very best—thus generating an everyday sense of global commonality⁵³ and community of sports connoisseurs—but it also *transforms* persistently relevant collective identities. For instance, Germans—who have, until recently, adhered to an exclusive and ethnicity-based interpretation of citizenship, perhaps longer than other advanced capitalist countries⁵⁴—now cheer for

⁵¹ See Daniel A. Nathan, “Travelling: Notes on Basketball and Globalization; or, Why the San Antonio Spurs are the Future,” *International Journal for the History of Sport* 25 (6), 2008, pp. 737–50, for a critical account of basketball's global impact in the context of global capitalism. In light of the Michael Jordan phenomenon other authors argue that “when products, images, and services are exported to other societies from some simulated American homeland, to some extent they become indigenized according to the cultural specificities of the local culture in which consumption takes place.” See David L. Andrews, Ben Carrington, Steven J. Jackson, and Zbigniew Mazur, “Jordanscapes: A Preliminary Analysis of the Global Popular,” *Sociology of Sport Journal* 13, 1996, pp. 428–57, here p. 453.

⁵² For a pathbreaking work on the benefits of diversity in multiple areas of society, see Scott Page, *The Difference: How the Power of Diversity Creates Better Groups, Firms, Schools and Societies* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007).

⁵³ See Ulrich Beck, “The Cosmopolitan Society and its Enemies,” *Theory, Culture, and Society* 18 (6), 2001, pp. 17–44.

⁵⁴ See Ruud Koopmans and Hanspeter Kriesi, *Citizenship, National Identity and the Mobilisation of the Extreme Right: A Comparison of France, Germany, the Netherlands and Switzerland* (Berlin: Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung, 1997).

Olympians who were issued their German passports only a few weeks before the competition. NBA star Chris Kaman, does not even speak the language of his “home” country. In the German working-class city of Dortmund, a large proportion of the citizens are passionate about the black Brazilian soccer player Júlio César, a member of the most successful squad in the local team’s (Borussia) history and among the all-time fan favorites. He has arguably done more to undermine—and delegitimize—widely spread racial stereotypes and racist hatred in the stands and in town than most educational campaigns.

The cultural cosmopolitanism of global players and market-induced cosmopolitanism “from above” thereby meets an inclusive cosmopolitanism “from below.” In the long run, this might provide an important bulwark against racism and cultural exclusion, and offer a major challenge to inward-looking identity politics. In Europe, soccer is on its way to becoming a powerful medium for postnational political identity. As we will show, few other cultural factors are as successful in generating Europeanization and European identity as soccer, a long-shared grassroots phenomenon whose common language and passion has become further Europeanized through club competitions like the Champions League.⁵⁵

Furthermore, following many failures, the global culture of soccer has also reached the shores of America—often wrongly identified as the sole source and agent of globalization. The arrival of David Beckham at the L.A. Galaxy is only one example of this larger phenomenon. American professional basketball, in turn, has had a major impact in Europe, changing cultural perceptions since the appearance of Larry Bird, Earvin “Magic” Johnson, and most important of all Michael Jordan, as well as this trio’s participation in the legendary “Dream Team” at the Barcelona Olympic Games of 1992. European superstars such as Dirk Nowitzki and Tony Parker, who earn their living in America’s arenas but have become global icons, are direct descendants of these earlier global players who originated in America’s sports culture. All major professional clubs/actors in the contemporary world of sports, many with a global presence since the 1980s, are represented by international stars with whom fans identify way beyond the boundaries of these players’ actual performance in their respective sport. That this second sporting globalization had its roots in earlier developments is best attested to by the fact that it was the American professional soccer club New York Cosmos in the 1970s and early 1980s, that represented the first truly globalized sports club of the modern age, with the

⁵⁵ See Anthony King, *The European Ritual: Football in the New Europe* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), pp. 136–66. See also chapters 2 and 3 of this book.

soccer legends Pelé and Beckenbauer at its core. Not coincidentally, this was precisely the period that we regard as the beginning of the second globalization process.

(3) Finally, we realize that the global developments in which these hegemonic sports cultures play such a key role do not go unquestioned and unchallenged. In general, we find strong antimodern reactions that reflect generalized cultural opposition to globalization and cosmopolitanism, especially in traditionally ethnically exclusive societies. Adopting Kwame Anthony Appiah's notion of "counter-cosmopolitanism," which he attributes to religious neofundamentalists whom he portrays as intolerant "universalists," we identify all fundamental opponents to cosmopolitanism and all agents of exclusion on religious, ethnic, or cultural grounds as counter-cosmopolitans.⁵⁶ This, of course, also applies to the world of sports. Such reactions often correspond to antic cosmopolitan sentiments elsewhere in contemporary postindustrial democracies. Even the *potential* transformation of hegemonic sports culture evokes fears and defensive reactions on both sides of the Atlantic. On the one hand, we perceive resentment against the incursion of "un-American" soccer in the United States, while on the other hand we observe derision in Europe against the allegedly "un-European" "Americanization," "feminization," and "commercialization" of soccer.⁵⁷ At its most extreme—though, alas, far from uncom-

⁵⁶Appiah, *Cosmopolitanism*, pp. 137–53. Appiah primarily refers to a new kind of cosmopolitanism's noisiest foes: global Islamists and jihadists. They are by no means "localists" and reject traditional authorities, including religious ones. They also resist the "narrow nationalisms of the countries where they were born." And their outreach is in fact global: They "enlist in a campaign *against* any nation" that gets in the way of what they define as "universal justice." However, they vehemently oppose toleration of diversity and cosmopolitan inclusion regardless of belief or origin.

⁵⁷The purchase of Manchester United by the Glazer family in May and June of 2005 represents a fascinating case in point. The objections by many of United's supporters and much of the British media against this acquisition focused not only on the huge debt that this purchase heaped on the club, but also on the Glazers' being double outsiders to the world of football by dint of their being American: first, thus not being privy to the game's culture, not being fluent in its language and thus not being able to value the true cultural worth of their acquisition; and second, by being American the Glazers were ipso facto steamrolling and globalizing Manchester United. It was fascinating to observe how in the eyes of angry United supporters, this mighty entity—arguably *the* most globalized sports team in the world well before the Glazers' takeover—appeared as this small, local, innocent village club that was a helpless victim against the onslaught of this Yankee monster. To local fans of any club, the identity of their team remains anchored in the local forever, untouched by the club's standing in the rest of the world. That American purchases of European and English football clubs have been particularly anathema to their European fans can best be gauged by the fact that similar deals by others have invoked less ire. The buyers were perceived by the fans as being conversant with the language of football, thus not such blatant outsiders as Americans. Thus, for example, when the Russian billionaire Roman Abramovich acquired the pedigreed Lon-

mon—this backlash manifests itself in the violent, sometimes deadly, racist and ultranationalist fan cultures that inhabit European soccer stadiums. These are perhaps the last uncontested bastions in our advanced liberal democracies where men are “given” the legitimate space to behave badly, that is, to exhibit an unbridled maleness which in turn has to be interpreted as a defense mechanism in light of massive cultural changes and social shifts that have at least questioned, if not substantially challenged, the continued legitimacy of heterosexual male dominance in liberal democracies. And since hegemonic sports cultures have always been, and continue to remain, male domains, many aspects of maleness (including some less flattering ones) come to the fore in these venues.

Nevertheless, amidst the wave of the second globalization, the powerful forces of global communications, international stardom, and economic interests render the cosmopolitan current in sports irreversible. Supported by globalization from above, new culturally inclusive identities emerge from below, with global sports furnishing a major factor in this process. A widening of consciousness and altered cultural repertoires⁵⁸ find their most prominent expressions in the global players and cosmopolitan teams with which people identify on the local or national level. Such a new cosmopolitanism, which merges with local ties without replacing them, resonates across the globe.

The Remaining Structure of the Book

Chapter 2 offers an analysis of the history of the globalization of sports cultures—soccer in particular, but also basketball, football, baseball and hockey—and their impact in local, national, and global contexts to the present. Exploring how these games mutated into global languages and cultural systems in the course of the past one hundred and fifty years, we discuss how global arenas have been established and shaped by critical junctures of the first globalization at the end of the nineteenth century and were drastically expanded in the postindustrial, second globalization of the current age.

Showing the cultural relevance and power of sports, we then examine their potential as agents for cosmopolitanism, diversity, and inclusion on the one hand, and resilient politicocultural exclusionism and traditional-

don club Chelsea in 2003, there was no animosity comparable to the Glazers' purchase of Manchester United two years later.

⁵⁸ See Vertovec and Cohen, “Introduction: Conceiving Cosmopolitanism,” p. 4.

ism on the other. As examples for the latter case, soccer has served as a tool for dictators and a vehicle for chauvinism. Indeed, we find hypernationalism still extant, especially in World Cup and European Championship competitions when national soccer teams clash.

In formerly ethnically homogenous Europe, professional soccer has worked as a unique force for diversity, facilitating the democratic inclusion of immigrants since the 1980s. Similarly, Hank Greenberg's remarkable career as MLB's first Jewish superstar symbolized the struggle for the recognition and respect of America's Jews in the 1930s. When Jackie Robinson broke the color barrier in baseball, the effect was even more powerful in terms of opening the door to the overdue and still ongoing process of the formal integration of African Americans into the mainstream of American life. In no other contemporary social arena in Europe have immigrants become more socially accepted and more influential as role models than in the arena of sports and, in particular, soccer. Hence, there can be no question that sports have enhanced the social acceptance of diversity, while at the same time remaining a battleground of primordial identities, exclusive nationalism, and localism.

These inherent tensions are manifested in the inclusiveness of multi-ethnic and cosmopolitan professional soccer clubs on the one hand, and the exclusivity and particularism of national teams on the other. These dual—and rivaling—organizational principles have defined soccer's existence since the latter part of the nineteenth century. Above all, however, as a globalizing language, sports are among the major engines of actual cosmopolitanism. Especially, but not exclusively, on the top professional level (“from above”) and with its global institutions and transnational competitions, sports generate a global arena of cultural and political interaction that resonates with sports cosmopolitanism “from below.” With the help of new media such as the Internet, global sports arenas have evolved and set new viewership records. They are part of a global culture that goes beyond established territorial sports spaces. This global sports culture is more diversified and cosmopolitan than any other sphere of society—performance is what matters, not one's ethnic, national, or social background. We see instances of admiration for the world's “best of the best,” which clearly transcend nationalism in an unprecedented way. Indeed, even localism tends to become more cosmopolitan today. Supporters increasingly love *their* teams' best players; take note, the emphasis being on “their” with those on the opponents' representing a much more complicated proposition in that any “otherness” in an opponent usually provides a welcome occasion to express hostility and derision. But bespeaking the cosmopoli-

tan dimensions of skill and its proper appreciation by those conversant with the language in which it is being displayed, even opponents come to value—if not worship—a player regardless of her or his background merely by dint of her or his achievements on the field. The merit- and achievement-based dimension of sports has profoundly enlightening and inclusive qualities. Performance, output, and results are ultimately the only things that matter to all involved, sports producers and consumers. Note how Hines Ward, the Pittsburgh Steelers' fine receiver, addresses precisely this issue in describing his difficulties growing up in Georgia as the son of an African American father and a Korean mother: "It was hard for me to find my identity. The black kids didn't want to hang out with me because I had a Korean mom. The white kids didn't want to hang out with me because I was black. The Korean kids didn't want to hang out with me because I was black. It was hard to find friends growing up. And then once I got involved in sports, color didn't matter."⁵⁹

Chapter 3 examines how the globalization of sports affects transnational political cultures and identities across the Atlantic. With the help of an array of pertinent data, we examine whether and to what degree sports cultures have changed in the wake of the second globalization and how each continent's traditional sports space has been penetrated by the others' sports cultures. This chapter is influenced by the conceptually innovative work of Jeannette Colyvas and Stefan Jonsson, who differentiate between what they call "diffusion" and "institutionalization" of cultures and social phenomena across various structures ranging from countries to academic disciplines. We demonstrate how both of these factors have occurred in the course of the second globalization on both sides of the Atlantic, but how diffusion is so much easier—thus perhaps also more fleeting—than institutionalization.⁶⁰ Whereas we see diffusion confined to the realm of mimicry and imitation, we regard institutionalization as an anchoring of actual organizations in a new environment. Thus wearing a Yankees cap (diffusion) may have nothing to do with the much more involved institution of knowing baseball and its culture. Clearly these two have vastly different meanings in terms of identity. Still, we find such diffusions indicative of the growing significance of cultural transfers across continents. We mention, for that reason, such oddities as tattoos adorning athletes' bodies,

⁵⁹John Branch, "The Journey toward Acceptance," *New York Times*, November 9, 2009.

⁶⁰Jeannette A. Colyvas and Stefan Jonsson, "Ubiquity and Legitimacy: Disentangling Diffusion and Institutionalization" (Working paper, Northwestern University, 2009; under review for publication in *Social Theory* at the time of our writing). We are grateful to Walter Powell.

melodies shared by fans, and similar “marginalities” that are *prima facie* ancillary, though far from marginal, to the sports themselves.

Also in this context, we analyze an array of “effects” that tell us much about the nature of these cultural penetrations on the part of various sports and their new locales. Thus, we discuss what we have termed the “Beckham effect,” which denotes the arrival of a foreign, bona fide, crossover, global superstar to help a struggling sport in a country where it has languished at the cultural margins. Then, we highlight what we have called the “Nowitzki effect,” which features almost the exact opposite of the “Beckham effect”: a local boy excels far away from home in a sport that is hugely popular in the country where he now resides but has been secondary in his native land. The sport, however, then grows in popularity in the “sending country,” almost solely by dint of the local boy’s brilliance and star-status in the sports culture of the “receiving” country and, of course, by virtue of the ever-powerful nature of localism and nationalism. We could just as easily have called this phenomenon the “Parker effect” or the “Petrovic effect” or the “Divac effect” or the “Yao effect,” all of whom established the analogous relations to their respective countries of France, Croatia, Serbia, and China. However, our calling this the “Nowitzki effect” goes beyond the fact that one of us is German and the other a professor of German politics. We view the effect as a superb case in point about the qualitatively different dimensions exacted by the second globalization and its shifts in the tectonics of sports cultures on both sides of the Atlantic. After all, Dirk Nowitzki was not the first German NBA star. That distinction will forever belong to Detlef Schrempf, who had a brilliant career playing for three teams. He was an NBA All-Star repeatedly and remains the only German other than Nowitzki to have played in an NBA All-Star game and the NBA finals. And yet, having entered the league in 1985—thus prior to its having become a major force in globalized sports cultures—and by being a superb player though not quite a superstar, Schrempf remained largely unknown to the German public beyond the country’s small basketball acolytes. In other words, the growth in basketball’s popularity in Germany and Nowitzki’s having become a recognizable personality every bit the equivalent of the country’s most prominent soccer stars could not have happened a decade earlier. The “Nowitzki effect’s” American analog would be an American soccer player’s star status abroad, which in turn helped the growth of the game at home. While there have been quite a few American players in Europe’s top leagues, and while some have attained solid respectability, such as goalkeepers Kasey Keller, Brad Friedel, and Tim Howard, we do not discern a “Keller,” “Friedel,” or “Howard”

effect back home in America. This is the case mainly on account of these superb players being goalkeepers, and thus engaged in the less glamorous job of their sport's defense rather than its offense, which, in soccer, like in all four major American sports, invariably accords greater attention beyond the sport's immediate core followers appealing to a larger and less knowledgeable public. The old adage about defense winning championships and accolades by those in the know, and offense wowing the casual fans and leading to a higher payday, pertains to soccer like it does to the North American Big Four. Enter David Beckham with his "effect" precisely to counter this lacuna and lend soccer an institutional anchor beyond the diffusion of its immediate sheen. Whether the Beckham "experiment" has thus far attained its intended "effect"—or whether it ever will—remains well beyond the temporal purview of this book, though we will present our informed conjectures on this matter.⁶¹

We analyze how "events" in these sports have grown on both sides of the Atlantic, welcoming lasting fans and admirers without, however, necessarily making them permanent fans of the sports as such—most certainly not on the local level, where the quality of teams and leagues is invariably far below what spectators have come to appreciate and admire in the top tier of these sports performed precisely in the context of these events that attracted these newcomers to the sport in the first place. We call this phenomenon "Olympianization," in that, just like with the Olympics, millions of people follow such sports but only as performed in their prime showcase tournaments—all special and major events—that occur every four years or in similar intervals. At the same time, local and quotidian leagues and games barely draw significant attention and remain well behind the established languages of the respective sports cultures in terms of passion and interest. After all, who but those involved in specialized niches follow most of the sports performed at the Olympics any other time! We offer an extended analysis of the "Olympianized" nature of soccer's progress in American sports culture, where the quadrennial World Cup tournaments have developed into significant sporting events with large followings in the United States over the past two decades almost to the point of having entered American sports culture, meaning that the World Cup has become water cooler talk since the early 1990s, which it had not been before. Soccer itself, however, still languishes in its cultural marginality. But in America, too, soccer's position has changed because American society and cul-

⁶¹ There can be no better account of the Beckham "experiment" than Grant Wahl's superb reportage in his *The Beckham Experiment: How the World's Most Famous Athlete Tried to Conquer America* (New York: Crown Books, 2009).

ture have changed in the course of the past two decades. In this framework, we shed light on America's premier soccer league, MLS, which has bestowed itself the gravitas of being the sole representative of top-level professional soccer in the United States by never using the definitive article "the" preceding its name (analogous to Major League Baseball's MLB). We will look at the growing influence of the Latino community in America's soccer world as well.

The impact of globalization in the context of the continued relevance of tradition and history is most strikingly displayed by the different trajectories of women's soccer in the United States and Europe. This difference serves as the subject of a comparative case study in chapter 4. It is more than a coincidence that the rise of women's soccer in America was accompanied by a massive change in gender politics and identity across the liberal democracies of the advanced industrial world. Women's soccer, at times with its own professional leagues, has been an overall American success story. Few things better exemplify its cultural significance than the popularity of the American player Mia Hamm, who was a major force in putting women's team sports on the cultural map. Indeed, Hamm has come to spawn some transatlantic counterparts such as the German player Birgit Prinz. However, the feminization of American soccer produces some ambivalent results, not least of which is the sport's denigration by male fans who, despite important shifts and changes, continue to constitute the most important clientele of these cultures. While soccer has a strong feminine presence in North America, the very opposite is true in Europe, where males try to defend their hegemony in soccer as the last resort of male supremacy and exclusiveness. In Europe, the globalized language of soccer coincides with its entrenched and local hegemonic sports culture, leaving women predominantly on the margins, even though women's interest in sports in general, including soccer, is rising on both continents, thus possibly becoming another vehicle of cosmopolitan inclusion.

Chapter 5 looks at nationalist, localist, and racist backlashes against globalization, which we conceptualize as forms of "counter-cosmopolitanism" that oppose cultural inclusion, universalism, and diversity. Here we analyze the ugliest manifestations of sports—a sort of "bonding capital" gone wild, literally⁶²; an exclusion of all things foreign, a rejection of equality, a disdain for the weak, a trust only in the self, home, and hearth. We explore racism and violence in sports and political cultures in a comparative perspective, taking into account the ways through which America has battled

⁶² Of course we use this term from Robert Putnam's work.

overt racism and violence in sports with much success. With racist violence and slander rather marginalized in contemporary American professional sports, our major focus will be the counter-cosmopolitan backlash against globalized—and Europeanized—sports, which has emerged with a vengeance across Europe. In contrast to the virtual absence of violence and marginalization of racism in American sports arenas, anti-Semitism and racism find expression in the mobilization of extreme right-wing movements, hooliganism, and cults of violence in many of Europe's sports arenas. Even superstars like the Cameroon forward Samuel Eto'o have been regularly exposed to racist slander in Spanish stadiums; and extreme right fans in Italy force their club leadership to abstain from signing contracts with foreign players. One of the few American star soccer players, the fine defender Oguchi Onyewu, of Nigerian descent, felt compelled to resort to legal action in his defense against the racist insults inflicted on him during his playing days in Belgium just prior to his transfer to AC Milan, one of the aforementioned pedigreed Italian clubs.

We elaborate in this chapter on the general and specific factors that foster this counter-cosmopolitanism that, to varying degrees, anchors itself in an exclusive hypernationalist identity and uses soccer as its vehicle of public expression. Highlighting examples from Italy, Germany, Spain, England, Austria, Hungary, and Poland, we argue that in Europe soccer arenas function as political battlefields over identities and cosmopolitan change in the age of postindustrial globalization, which is embodied in global players as highly visible minorities on the field. Moreover, anti-Semitic images of a “globalized Jew” have reappeared among fans in European soccer over the last twenty to thirty years, in which the vilest insults and hostilities against Israeli soccer players and professional soccer clubs like Tottenham Hotspurs, Ajax Amsterdam, MTK Hungária Budapest, FK Austria Wien, and Bayern Munich—Europe's so-called “Jew” clubs—have become commonplace. These invectives, often also used against any opponent not even vaguely connected to anything Jewish, demonstrate yet again that anti-Semitism has far from disappeared from Europe's public discourse. Still, we conclude this chapter on an optimistic note by demonstrating how institutional interventions can constrain such expressions of hatred, and how they have successfully done so in a number of places.

We illuminate the persistence of different European and American identities in their respective sports cultures in chapter 6, where we analyze the resilience and relevance of the uniquely American symbiosis of athletics and academics in the form of that “behemoth” called college sports. In order to understand the impact of this phenomenon, we reconstruct the

special path of college sports in the context of American history. In this chapter, American college sports are compared with other university-associated sports in Canada and Britain, only to conclude that they have no match anywhere and are truly unique and *sui generis*. They thus form the quintessential American “exception.” So do, of course, high school sports. Just think of the cultural power of high school football in Texas spawning such iconic nationally watched movies and television series as *Friday Night Lights*, or of high school basketball’s central identity to life in Indiana and Kentucky, indeed even the public passion surrounding high school wrestling in Iowa for that matter, as we know so well from Mark Kreidler’s fine book, *Four Days to Glory: Wrestling With the Soul of the American Heartland*. Alas, our not including high school sports in this book is solely due to the many limitations constraining our work and in no way suggests our lack of respect for this essential ingredient to the culture of sports in America and thus American culture as a whole. Just like its collegiate counterpart, high school sports as currently constituted in America have no counterparts anywhere in Europe, perhaps elsewhere in the world as well.

College sports also embody a serious counterargument against the globalization thesis. The uniquely American institutions of college sports play an especially important role in the variations at the local level that may stir curiosity on both sides of the Atlantic but remain largely untouched by many of the globalizing developments described above. Despite all the globalization that has occurred, the persistence of identity formations within the sports space of college football and basketball has, if anything, increased over recent decades. Put differently, while the NFL and the NBA have attained a global presence in the course of the second globalization, nothing remotely similar pertains to the world of college football and basketball. Whereas their importance in America’s sports space has increased markedly over the past thirty years, they remain parochial to the United States. March Madness (the NCAA division 1 college basketball championship)—though a ubiquitous and vastly growing phenomenon in American culture—remains largely unknown and not followed any place else in the world. We also discuss the enormous, identity-generating significance of college sports and their meaning for American society way beyond student life and the campus. This remains a sports world still completely alien to Europeans and non-Americans. Conversely, neither the system nor the logic of the wide array of local clubs and leagues that structure European amateur sports are really accessible to Americans, signifying the limits of globalization in the realm of sports and beyond. Yet, even in the local world of American college sports, we encounter increasingly

global and cosmopolitan features that barely existed twenty years ago, namely the continued growth of foreign athletes at America's universities who decide to hone their athletic skills by representing their college in the sport of their choice and specialty, as well as receive an education.

A brief conclusion recaps our argument and offers a coda to the book.