

2008

The logo for h-diplo, featuring the text 'h-diplo' in a stylized, lowercase, cursive font.

H-Diplo Roundtable Reviews

www.h-net.org/~diplo/roundtables

Volume IX, No. 1 (2008)

27 January 2008

Barbara J. Keys. *Globalizing Sport: National Rivalry and International Community in the 1930s.* Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, October 2006. \$49.95 (hardcover). ISBN: 978-0-674-02326-0.

Roundtable Editor: Thomas Zeiler

Reviewers: Heather L. Dichter, Sayuri Guthrie-Shimizu, and Steven W. Pope

Stable URL: <http://www.h-net.org/~diplo/roundtables/PDF/GlobalizingSport-roundtable.pdf>

Contents

Introduction by Thomas Zeiler, University of Colorado at Boulder.....	2
Review by Heather L. Dichter, University of Toronto.....	4
Review by Sayuri Guthrie-Shimizu, Department of History, Michigan State University.....	8
Review by Steven W. Pope, University of Lincoln.....	13
Author's Response by Barbara Keys, University of Melbourne.....	17

Copyright © 2008 H-Net: Humanities and Social Sciences Online.

H-Net permits the redistribution and reprinting of this work for non-profit, educational purposes, with full and accurate attribution to the author(s), web location, date of publication, H-Diplo, and H-Net: Humanities & Social Sciences Online. For other uses, contact the H-Diplo editorial staff at h-diplo@h-net.msu.edu.

Introduction by Thomas Zeiler, University of Colorado at Boulder

“I see great things in baseball.” Although we cannot confirm that poet Walt Whitman actually authored this famous quote back in the 1840s, we do know that he later believed the sport to be a shaper of American character that reflected the country’s democratic institutions, striving disposition, and rising geo-political and economic greatness. In the middle of the next century, intellectual historian Jacques Barzun also viewed the sport as a mirror of national traits. In *God’s Country and Mine: A Declaration of Love Spiced with a Few Harsh Words* (1954), he offered the oft-quoted words, “Whoever wants to know the heart and mind of America had better learn baseball.” A half century after this publication, we come to Barbara Keys’ masterful work on how sports revealed international contact zones as well as distinctive qualities of nationhood. Arriving in the age of globalization, her study properly situates sports as a transnational movement amidst and between the national of Whitman and Barzun and the vast global arena.

Thomas W. Zeiler, a professor of history and international affairs at the University of Colorado at Boulder, has published widely on American foreign relations. He is the executive editor of the journal Diplomatic History and editor of American Foreign Relations: A Guide to the Literature. His current projects include a global history of World War II, a study of globalization and sports, and an overview of the world economy since 1945. His most recent book is Ambassadors in Pinstripes: The Spalding World Baseball Tour and the Birth of the American Empire (2006).

Of course, as readers will discover, Keys’ focus is not on baseball, but she does examine the primary influence of nationalism on sporting events, particularly the Olympics movement and also other aspects such as athleticism and soccer. Among many others, the main contribution of this book to the literature on diplomacy, sports, and culture regards Keys’ analysis of the tension between the manipulation of sports as an expression of national identity and sports’ position as a transnational carrier of culture abroad. This is the central theme explored by the three participants in this H-Diplo forum. Heather Dichter, Sayuri Guthrie-Shimizu, and Steven Pope bring fresh eyes and a critical gaze to this book, and they do so, quite appropriately, from international angles that transcend American exceptionalism. Clearly, like Keys, they are engaged in internationalizing and globalizing the historiography of sports, and thus are well-positioned (literally, in the United States of America, Canada, and Great Britain) to address this book.

While there may be points of issue with her analysis, all the commentators recognize the ways in which Keys exhibits the interconnectedness of the national and international. Much work remains to be done on this subject and methodology, but like any expertly cast and important study, this one opens up avenues of research opportunity and raises questions about the nature of such critical, and oftentimes loosely conveyed terms (I rightly stand accused!) as globalization and imperialism, and even culture and democracy. In any case, the H-Diplo forum contributors agree that Keys has enhanced our understanding of nations by the very process of lifting them out of their boundaries and placing them in an international context. Barbara Keys has, therefore, further bolstered scholars seeking not

only new trends in the study of international affairs but a welcome lift to the neglected study of sports as a cultural, political, and economic phenomenon.

Review by Heather L. Dichter, University of Toronto

Globalization in the 1930s?

There has been an explosion of research on globalization and sport over the last five years, most of which concentrates on the expansion of sport since the middle of the Twentieth century. Barbara Keys' book on sport's role in globalization, however, examines the decade of the 1930s as the "critical period in the expansion of sport" (2). Even after the worldwide depression that could have led to the demise of international sport, the 1930s nonetheless saw the solidification of the importance of the Olympic Games and the creation of soccer's World Cup. Keys concentrates on the dominant position of the United States in particular as the host of the 1932 Olympics in Los Angeles; Nazi Germany and the impact of the Berlin Olympics in 1936; and the internal battle in the Soviet Union between athletic isolation and participation in international competition. With these three countries and their roles in developing what Keys calls "the imagined world of international sport during the 1930s" (2), *Globalizing Sport* offers a cohesive comparative element often lacking in sport history. Representing three vastly different political ideologies, the three countries Keys examines not only played a large role in shaping the world of international sport within the 1930s and throughout the rest of the century, but they were also highly isolationist in their general stance towards foreign policy (5). Even with this tension between internationalism and isolation, Keys nonetheless argues that three generally influential countries combined to shape modern sport.

Heather Dichter is currently a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of History at the University of Toronto. She is finishing her dissertation, entitled *Sporting Democracy: The Western Allies' Reconstruction of Germany Through Sport, 1944-1952*. Dichter received her B.A. in history with high honors from the University of Michigan and her M.A. in history from the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill.

In her introduction and first two chapters, Keys expands on sport's role as one of the most effective aspects of mass culture in driving globalization. Sport has the ability to bring together the far corners of the world, in this case, onto the same athletic field playing under the same rules. Thus, the national and the international mutually reinforce each other through sport as countries face one another at international meets, especially the Olympic Games (4, 9). Keys traces the early connections between sport and the state, demonstrating how modern sports (based on a codification of time, records, and rules) edged out more local or nationalist sports (in particular gymnastics) to become the basis of international sport based upon mutual understanding (39). With the creation of international sport governing bodies such as the International Olympic Committee in 1894 and the Fédération Internationale de Football Association in 1904, the ideas of national representation and rivalry became formally instituted within the world of sport as countries directly competed against one another. At the same time, however, these mega-events also promoted a universalist idea of sport for all with the creation of standardized rules (62-3).

Keys then uses the three countries to demonstrate that “the nationalism and internationalism of sport operated in tandem, as nationalist aspirations served to propel the internationalization of sport culture” (63). While baseball and football dominated the twentieth-century American sport landscape and the country has been largely unsuccessful in accepting for the world’s most popular game of soccer,¹ Keys argues that the idea of the American century does hold true for sport if one includes amateur sport and construes sport culture rather broadly (64-5). By participating in international sport the United States helped spread the “American way of life” and ideas of democracy to other countries. With these same events the Americans involved as both participants and spectators came to believe that sport exchanges “promoted peace and mutual understanding” (74). Americans routinely beat competitors from other countries on these sport tours, but their most significant contribution was in its commercialization or “Americanization” of sport. This is demonstrated most vividly with the hosting of the 1932 Summer Olympics by the city of Los Angeles. Keys’ research reinforces the work already done on the 1932 Games,² though she does place it within her wider argument regarding the intersection of nationalism and internationalism. The Olympics became an event for the masses with the commercialization of the Los Angeles Games, while the expansion of international sport, fueled by the Olympics, helped draw the United States out of its isolationism.

Turning to the next Olympic host, Germany, Keys then explores how National Socialism co-opted sport to achieve its goals, particularly in the realm of foreign relations. Again, Keys’ conclusion that Nazi Germany used sport in the most concerted effort to achieve foreign policy goals (132) reaffirms older literature.³ Keys does, however, show how the Nazis went from initially disregarding international sport to utilizing it to further their aims, though they never fully accepted sport because of the uncertainty of the outcome. Max Schmeling’s 1938 loss to Joe Louis and the dominating performances at the Berlin Olympics

¹Andrei Markovits and Steven Hellerman argue that soccer was crowded out from above (with football and, to an extent, basketball) and from below (with baseball) and has thus been unable to secure a place within the dominant sport culture in the United States. Markovits and Hellerman do acknowledge the prominence of basketball as the second-largest global game today, but in the first half of the twentieth century, when sports were securing their space in the American landscape, there was no room for soccer, a game also seen to represent the “old country” when many immigrants were attempting to adjust to life in the United States. Andrei S. Markovits and Steven L. Hellerman, *Offside: Soccer & American Exceptionalism* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2001).

²Mark Dryerson, “Marketing National Identity: The Olympic Games of 1932 and American Culture,” *Olympika* 4 (1995): 23-48; Jonathan Paul, “Boom or Bust: An Investigation of the Sponsorship and Funding Initiatives for the 1932 Olympic Winter Games and the Games of the IXth Olympiad,” *North American Society For Sport History Proceedings and Newsletter*, 2003, 83-4; D. Margaret Toohey, “The Los Angeles Challenge in 1932 and 1984,” *North American Society For Sport History Proceedings and Newsletter*, 1982, 39.

³The two standard works on the 1936 Olympics are Richard D. Mandell, *The Nazi Olympics* (New York: Macmillan, 1971) and Duff Hart-Davis, *Hitler’s Games: The 1936 Olympics* (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1986). Keys is not the only academic to publish recently on the Berlin Games, with recent works by Arnd Krüger, *The Nazi Olympics: Sport, Politics and Appeasement in the 1930s* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2003) and Guy Walters, *Berlin Games: How the Nazis Stole the Olympic Dream* (New York: William Morrow, 2006).

by Jesse Owens and other African-American athletes brought into question the legitimacy of the Nazi racial theories. For as much as the 1936 Olympics showcased the Third Reich, the concessions granted “the virtues of internationalism and the achievements of other races” a place within Nazi Germany, however briefly they might have lasted (157).

Lastly, in her most original chapter, Keys brings to light the tensions between the leaders of international sport and the Soviet Union in the 1930s, with repeated rapprochement and rebuke throughout the decade. The accepted view that the Soviet Union’s isolation after the October Revolution, reinforced within sport by the country’s withdrawal from the Olympic movement until 1952, is based from James Riordan’s pioneering work on communist sport.⁴ Yet the documents that Keys has uncovered in the archives concerning soccer and the Soviet Union’s attempts to join FIFA but on its own terms, demonstrate that the U.S.S.R. was not nearly as isolationist in sport as previously believed. Even with limited participation in international sport, Soviet sport culture nonetheless transformed from the Sportintern (the sport organization created as an adjunct to the Comintern) and its promotion of worker sport to the creation of leagues for soccer and other sports modeled on the western European structure.

While Keys expounds upon the interconnectedness of nationalism and internationalism in sport during the 1930s, she does not demonstrate as fully the globalizing nature of sport in the decade. Perhaps the publisher preferred “Globalizing” within the title to appeal to a broader audience than Keys’ dissertation title – “The Dictatorship of Sport”⁵ – which more accurately describes the nature of the leading countries in changing sport during the 1930s. The United States, though a democracy by political structure, pioneered many aspects of modern sport, including the commercialization of sport with Hollywood’s influence on the 1932 Summer Olympics and the necessity of running the Games without financial assistance as a result of the Great Depression. Its dominant position as the leading country in the furthering of training methods, the morality of sport, and the homogenization of sporting rules show the intent of the United States to assert its control over the international sporting community. In addition, the three countries on which Keys concentrates her study can all be considered part of the western world; Asian and, even less frequently, Latin American or African countries are hardly used to support the globalizing nature of sport in her work. Keys briefly discusses Japan with respect to its success at the 1932 Olympics and its selection as the host of the 1940 Games. However, a chapter or two devoted to Japan’s sporting success and its preparations for the 1940

⁴Russia last participated in the Olympic Games at the 1912 Games in Stockholm. The Soviet Union did not participate in any of the interwar Olympic Games, the 1948 Olympics, or the 1952 Winter Olympics in Oslo. The Soviet Union did, however, send observers to the 1948 London Olympics. On the IOC’s acceptance of and reservations regarding the Soviet Union, see James Riordan, “To Be Or Not To Be: Soviet Entry Into the Olympic Movement,” in *The Olympic Games Through the Ages: Greek Antiquity and its Impact on Modern Sport*, ed. Roland Renson, Manfred Lämmer, James Riordan, and Dimitrios Chassiotis (Athens: Hellenic Sports Research Institute, 1991), 371-81; James Riordan, *Sport, Politics and Communism* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1991); Alfred E. Senn, *Power, Politics, and the Olympic Games* (Champaign: Human Kinetics, 1999).

⁵Barbara Jean Keys, “The Dictatorship of Sport: Nationalism, Internationalism, and Mass Culture in the 1930s” (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 2001).

Olympics (ultimately cancelled because of the World War) would have strengthened the argument of globalization and carried it through the end of the decade. While language limitations obviously prevent such a comparison, an in-depth examination of Japan would have furthered the ideas of both a dictatorship of sport as well as demonstrate the full impact of globalization of sport during the 1930s.

Overall, *Globalizing Sport* presents an interesting comparison of the sporting cultures within three politically opposite countries to demonstrate the pervasiveness of sport at both a societal and political level. While only the chapter on the Soviet Union presents ground-breaking work, Keys nonetheless brings together the sport history of three important countries that shaped the 1930s not only in the history of the world, but also the direction of modern sport. Yet sport cannot be studied on its own; it is a reflective aspect of society that demonstrates, in the case of the 1930s, the important relationship of international organizations and structures and national identity (189). By using sport in framing the discussion of a larger issue confronting the interwar world, Keys has produced a worthwhile book for a wide variety of scholars with an interest in sport or simply the issues, ideas, or decade addressed within *Globalizing Sports*.

Barbara Keys has produced a meticulously researched and tightly argued study of a historical trajectory intertwining the dissemination of sport, the rise of an “imagined” global community, and transnational cultural formation in the early 20th century. The book is truly remarkable in its analytical sophistication, breathtaking in the depth and breadth of its multinational archival foundation, and eye-opening in its elucidation of previously overlooked connections between disparate historical forces breaching the boundaries of national history. It promises to spark a wide-ranging scholarly debate over such salient historical questions as consumerism, the nature of the modern administrative state, and the role of recreation and spectatorship in the production of political legitimacy in mass society. Needless to say, it is a much-awaited integration of sports history, international history, and studies of transnational institution-building. Drawing on previously underutilized documentary collections and conducted in novel research venues not only in the United States but also in Germany, Russia, and Switzerland, the archival heavy lifting that supports this amalgamated inquiry is a model of multilingual research and scholarship.

Sayuri Guthrie-Shimizu is an associate professor of history at Michigan State University. She received her Ph. D. in U.S. diplomatic history from Cornell University and is the author of Creating People of Plenty: the United States and Japan's Economic Alternatives, 1950-1960 (Kent State University Press, 2001). She has published articles on a wide range of subjects, including baseball in U.S.-Japanese relations, "For Love of the Game: Baseball in Early U.S.-Japan Encounters and the Making of a Transnational Sporting Fraternity," which appeared in Diplomatic History, November 2004. One of the book projects she is currently working on is the history of U.S.-Japan baseball exchange between 1870s and the end of US occupation of Japan in 1952.

Among Keys' interpretive genius is her nuanced and astute analysis of the reciprocal and mutually reinforcing relationship between nationalism and transnationalism manifested through sport. Or, to quote her own words, Keys highlights “sport’s peculiar potency as a means of mediating between national and international identities” (p. 3), and examines “the intersection of the national and the transnational in the realm of sport culture ...[and] the relationship between transnational influences, globalizing processes, and foreign cultural products, on the one hand, and countervailing pressures to assert national, local, and particularist identities, on the other” (p. 9). By charting the concomitant growth of nationalist rivalry and international community in sport in the decades before World War II, Keys shows that sport provided a new venue for nationalist rivalry and expression, while ethnocentric impulses and nationalistic policy imperatives augmented its border-penetrating power and universal appeal.

To illuminate this duality, Keys focuses particularly on the rise of the modern Olympic Games and major international competitions such as the World Cup in soccer and how they came to be regarded as a requisite marker of modern nationhood. Entry into the International Olympic Committee (IOC) and international sport federations such as FIFA (Fédération Internationale de Football Association) became an important avenue through

which countries sought recognition and established legitimacy in the international community. On the other hand, achievements in international sporting competition came to be tallied and showcased as evidence of the superiority of a particular political and ideological system. No wonder, then, that boycotts of high-profile international sport competitions, most notably the Olympics, evolved in the period after World War II into quasi-international sanctions against a hosting country's militarism or racial practices.

Keys' skillful entwining of the rise of the international sports organizations in the early 20th century and the parallel consolidation of single national associations overseeing a particular sport within a nation-state does much to buttress her argument for the bounded reciprocity between the international and the national. FIFA is an illustrative example. Having originated in Europe, the umbrella soccer organization of "the world" fulfilled its monopolistic design in the national sphere by requiring that international matches be played only between constituent "national" associations. This inherently outsider-unfriendly structure was fortified in 1908 when the organization prohibited any games against nonmembers, whether deemed international or not. FIFA thus "ensured that any country aspiring to play top-level football had to become a member or languish in isolation" (p. 51).

This exclusionary process at the international level had domestic ramifications as well. National associations, anointed by FIFA as the nation's singular representative to the international governing body, became the sole arbiter of rules and regulations regarding the sport within their territorial boundaries. A standardization of rules and increased uniformity of playing techniques and styles resulted from this holy alliance between the international federation and its designated national subsidiaries. Players with aspirations for public recognition in the sport, domestic and international, thus became tethered to membership requirements, player eligibility, and other dictates of the international decision-making authorities via their national enforcement arms. Further, once the principle of national representation became sanctified in the Olympics and other competitive venues, no athlete could expect to achieve fame, recognition, and an international following without first securing accreditation by the sport's national association, thus reinforcing the legitimacy of the nation as the basic organizing unit of sports administration and, by extension, international civil society mediated through sport.

Just as enlightening as her exegesis of this synergistic relationship of the international and the national is Keys' examination of sport systems vying for worldwide hegemony in the interwar period. In the book's middle chapters, Keys deftly surveys the competing systems of physical culture and athletic practices of the United States, Germany, and the Soviet Union, with a due consideration to the ideologies and political agendas underpinning these alternatives. What clearly emerges from this three-way comparison is competing visions of social organization articulated and pursued by these relatively new centers of gravity in the international sports arena, and the ultimate triumph of the American model of international sports competition by the eve of World War II.

In contrast to their incorrigible diffidence about binding foreign entanglements, Americans in the 1920s and 1930s were eager internationalists and, some may even argue, self-

assured empire builders in the realm of cultural activity, including sport. They found in the popularization of sport an effective way to spread their own values and ideas, and believed that sport constituted a key component of what they saw as an “American way of life,” embodying the best of qualities that distinguished the United States from other nations--democracy, fairness, and honesty foremost among them. As a reflection of this newfound assertiveness and self-identity, Americans athletes, coaches, trainers, and sports administrators increased their visibility and clout in the international sports scene. The government largely remained in the background in such enterprises, and two privately run organizations, the Amateur Athletic Union (AAU) and the American Olympic Committee (AOC), became the key clearinghouses for international competitions and sports exchanges.

One of the alternative systems of sport was espoused by Germany, a nation with an indigenous tradition of physical culture known as *Turnen*. After assuming power in 1933, the Nazi regime sought to control culture for the sake of mass mobilization and tried, not entirely successfully, to insulate the country from the corrosive effects of transnational cultural influences, particularly the inflow of American-style commercial mass culture. In the realm of physical culture, however, the Nazis abandoned with relative aplomb the project of elevating *Turnen* as the centerpiece of a uniquely Germany cultural program and made Germany a willing member of the international sports community, inexorably conforming to the American model of individualistic, achievement-oriented sport. Lingering discomfort about the American model notwithstanding, Nazi officials actively promoted international sports contacts because they saw sport as a valuable foreign policy instrument, particularly as a way to impress upon the world the Third Reich’s superiority and prestige.

The other alternative vision of physical culture emanated from the Soviet Union, where Bolshevik policy toward Western sport entailed an ideology-driven rejection of “bourgeois” culture. In the 1920s, Soviet leaders sought to eliminate the vestigial remains of “decadent” capitalist culture and to engineer cultural forms befitting the new proletarian state and its international mission. In physical culture, as in other realms of cultural activity, the Soviet state searched for an appropriate concoction of practices to increase “labor productivity, ready workers for defense, and inculcate habits of collectivism, good hygiene, and discipline” (p. 161). In this endeavor, soccer and boxing were singled out as sports particularly detrimental to these proletarian objectives. But even the socialist regime eventually came to recognize Western international sport as a useful way to advertise to foreign workers and governments Soviet strength and to bolster its fragile legitimacy at home. The result was the top-down drive, gathering force by the mid-1930s and continuing into the postwar period, to join and surpass capitalists in capitalist sport, and the Sportintern (Red Sport International), formed in 1921 as an adjunct to the Comintern to oversee an international “proletarian sport” culture, receded into irrelevance.

Participation in international sports competitions necessitated the acceptance of federation requirements and submission to rules largely dictated by Western Europeans and, increasingly by the late 1930s, by Americans. Despite continued profession of an alternative system of physical culture, ideological antagonism towards increasing commercialism and elements of individual hero worship in Western sport, and exclusion

from the bulk of international sport federations, the Soviet Union thus became inexorably exposed to an increasingly transnational cultural form called sport.

One of Keys' intellectual feats -- and they are many -- is that she persuasively demonstrates this link between the gradual displacement of two alternative systems of physical culture and the parallel ascent of the Western capitalist model of sport and international athletic competition promoted by the International Olympic Committee and various international sport federations by the outbreak of World War II. In doing so, she also successfully portrays this conjoined historical development as another facet of globalization in the interwar period, when the world's most self-conscious aspirants to cultural autonomy and alternative modes of social organization were subsumed into a transnational cultural regimen infused with an increasingly American -- as opposed to European -- flavor.

Flowing from this last point is an intriguing question of periodization that speaks to an audience beyond Keys' immediate constituencies -- sports historians and international historians. Using sport and international athletic competition, most notably the Olympic Games in Los Angeles and Berlin, Keys points to another angle from which we can view the amazing degree of continuity between the prewar and postwar years and suggests a new way to conceptualize the middle decades of the 20th century as an integrated historical period. The "era" bridges the pre- and post-World War II divide, and is characterized by the growing appeal of, and subscription to, internationalized forms of mass culture in the industrialized world. Keys argues, correctly in my opinion, that "[t]he spread of modern Western sport was propelled in part by its demonstrated popularity among the masses" (p. 170). The lure of American-style mass consumerism, with its attendant commercialism, vulgarity, individualism, and particular notions of modernity, held powerful sway in societies such as Germany and the Soviet Union, where government became progressively hostile to, or remained conflicted about, American diplomatic agendas and missions in the world. With Keys' shepherding hand, we now understand that sport offered yet another field of consumerist practices.

Although outside the scope of Keys' study, the cases of Japan and Italy, the other pillars of the 1930s version of the Axis of Evil, eminently fall into this larger pattern. As Victoria De Grazia has testified, the Italian Fascist state understood the importance of an expansive, consumer-oriented capitalism in its "rule by consent." Shunya Yoshimi's recent study of Japanese attraction to things American identifies the adoption of practices of mass consumer society as a theme that gives unifying coherence to the interwar, wartime, and postwar periods in Japanese history.¹ Indeed, Fascist and totalitarian states were fully cognizant of the value of consumption and recreational activity to their rule, and sport and athletic programs were a standard implement in the toolbox of their mobilization measures.² America's ascent as the world's predominant cultural influence owed much to

¹ Victoria De Grazia, *The Culture of Consent: Mass Organization of Leisure in Fascist Italy* (London and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981); Shunya Yoshimi, *Shinbei to Hanbei* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2007).

² For this point, I have drawn insight from Isamu Kuroda, *Rajio Taiso no Tanjo* (Tokyo: Seikyusha, 1999).

this willing participation by its ideological and diplomatic foes. Keys' study joins and enriches the literature that variously historicizes World War II as a temporary interlude in this extended cultural trajectory of the 20th century and sees the interwar period as the seedtime of mass consumer society that reached its full flowering in the postwar years.

Finally, Keys' transnational history of sport has also opened a conduit to a rich vein of recent scholarly accomplishments in diaspora and migration studies, although she does not make explicit reference to this historiography. Beginning with radio's debut in the Los Angeles Olympics, the advances in modern media technologies did much to enhance the stature of the Olympics in the cognitive universe of sport's followers around the world. The extended "wiring" network mediated through sport did not leave unaffected the Japanese Americans (and *Issei* condemned to the status of aliens ineligible for citizenship) in and around the host city. As Eriko Yamamoto has shown, the athletic prowess showcased by Japanese athletes against the physically more robust Westerners during the 1932 Olympics enabled *Isseis* to reaffirm their unchanging sense of belonging to their homeland while instilling the *Nisei* generation with a newfound ethnic pride and admiration towards the distant country their parents had come from.³ *Niseis* also strategically pointed to the Japanese achievements at the LA Olympics to claim their assimilability into mainstream American society.⁴ The increasing tendency, which was identified by Nina Glick Schiller and her intellectual collaborators, for migrants to have their feet in both home and receiving societies and to maintain a "unified social field" that linked the two, already existed within the Japanese American communities in the prewar era.⁵ Sport as an internationalized cultural form and the media-enhanced spectacles generated by it became an essential component of such unified social fields imagined by the world's other diasporatic communities as well. When Key discerns the "synergistic dynamic of nationalism and internationalism that underlay sport's expansion" (p. 89), it is perhaps another way of deconstructing the alchemy of such transnationalism shaping the everyday lives of migrating citizens of the world.

³ Eriko Yamamoto, "Cheers for Japanese Athletes: The 1932 Los Angeles Olympics and the Japanese American Community," *Pacific Historical Review* 69, no. 3 (August 2000), 399-430.

⁴ For the often seamless nature of such dual identities of Japanese America, see Eiichiro Azuma, *Between Two Empires: Race, History, and Transnationalism in Japanese America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005).

⁵ Nina Glick-Schiller, Linda Basch, and Chritstine Blanc-Szanton, "Towards a Definition of 'Transnationalism': Introductory Remarks and Research Questions," in *Towards a Transnational Perspective on Migration: Race, Class, Ethnicity, and Nationalism Reconsidered* (New York: New York Academy of Science, 1992).

Barbara Keys' marvelously incisive, multifaceted analysis of the internationalization of sport during the 1930s is a seminal contribution to the fields of international relations, diplomatic history, cultural history and sport history. Through her thorough research in English, Russian, and German archival sources, Keys has excavated some invaluable new insights and in so doing, has directed our attention to neglected avenues of historical enquiry. In particular, the book is a model for future cross-cultural, transnational studies. As such, I would rank *Globalizing Sport* amongst the finest books dealing with sport history in recent years (it was awarded the North American Society for Sport History's 2006 book prize).

S.W. Pope (PhD, University of Maine, 1993) is the author of *Patriotic Games: Sporting Traditions in the American Imagination, 1876-1926* (Oxford University Press, 1997; second edition published by the University of Tennessee Press, 2007); and editor of *The New American Sport History: Recent Approaches and Perspectives* (University of Illinois Press, 2007). He is co-editor (with J. Nauright) of the forthcoming *The Routledge Companion to Sports History* (Routledge, 2009) and author of the recently-published "Rethinking Sport, Empire and American Exceptionalism," *Sport History Review* 38 (2007), 92-120. He is currently a Senior Lecturer in History and Programme Leader of American Studies at the University of Lincoln in the United Kingdom.

Although I am knowledgeable of some of the literature in diplomatic history and international relations, I will leave the evaluation of the book's significance to scholars working in those fields. Further, given the space constraints, I will forgo a summary of the book's main arguments, and will, instead, consider Keys' contributions to sport historiography.

Keys provides a savvy overview of some established events, themes and processes within sport studies. Her discussion of sport's place within modern international politics — particularly the ways in which sporting practices are key carriers of nationalism as well as useful tools of the state — will be fairly well-known to specialists in the field. Her cogent overview of *Federation Internationale de Football Association* (FIFA) is well-known territory for Europeans or Latin Americans (for whom soccer is the dominant sport); similarly, the book's treatment of the rise of the International Olympic Committee (IOC) has been thoroughly investigated by scholars from around the world.

Despite well-crafted chapters on the American contribution to international sport (especially the gem of a chapter entitled "Democracy and International Sport: The United States"), the contours of this history during the early decades of the twentieth-century — including the Americanizing of the Olympics — has attracted the scrutiny of numerous fine historians, most notably the work of Mark Dyreson.¹ Nevertheless, Keys demonstrates

¹ See the following works by Dyreson: *Making the American Team: Sport, Culture and the Olympic Experience* (Urbana, 1998); "Icons of Liberty or Objects of Desire? American Women Olympians and the Politics of Consumption," *Journal of Contemporary History* 38 (July 2003): 435-460; "Globalizing the Nation-Making Process: Modern Sport in World History," *International Journal of the History of Sport* 20 (March 2003): 91-106;

convincingly how Americans sought to “mold international sport into forms consonant with the values and ideals of U.S.-style capitalism and democracy.” Americans were convinced that “the popularization of sport was an effective means of spreading their own values and ideas, and they framed their participation in international sport as a moral crusade to spread peace and democracy” (p. 5). This effort was not led by the state (as in Germany and USSR), but rather, by private groups that exploited sport to promote diplomatic relations with countries in Europe, Asia, and South America. Although Americans had only limited success in exporting their dominant team sports abroad, they did exert a profound influence on international sport by expanding its connections to the worlds of entertainment and mass culture. Moreover, at home, according to Keys, “U.S. sports victories helped affirm beliefs in the country’s benevolent role in the world and in the superiority of democracy as a political and social system” (pp. 5, 7, 15)² — notions central to an American imperial identity within the realm of sport (but unfortunately neglected in leading survey texts on the history of American sport).³

In my view, the book’s most incisive ‘findings’ are to be found in Keys’ analysis of Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union. There has been no shortage of attention to the ways in which the Nazis ‘exploited’ the 1936 Olympics for political capital. This, like the broader history of Nazism, is one of the most popular stories in popular (and sport) history. According to the dean of sport history, Allen Guttman, the Nazis and Soviets — unlike their liberal-democratic counterparts who allegedly “remained indifferent to the success or failure of their athletes in international competition” — embraced “instrumentalized sports” whereby these authoritarian regimes “demonstrated national revitalization and to symbolize ideological superiority . . . [and] subordinated individual athletes to the state.”⁴ In my opinion, this view that liberal-democratic nations held a benign, if not passive view of Olympic competition in stark contrast to the Nazis and Soviets (which merely adopted international sport to manipulate global public opinion) requires both empirical and ideological special pleading.

The Nazis’ and Soviets’ relationship with the international sport system was not as one-sided as popularly imagined. The dominant view that the Nazis callously “played politics” in hosting the 1936 Games ignores both the way in which spectator sport represented contested terrain within Germany prior to the 1930s, as well as the ways in which elite sport both supported and subverted Nazi ideology. In her deft overview of the history of

“Selling American Civilization: The Olympic Games of 1920 and American Culture,” *Olympika: The International Journal of Olympic Studies* 8 (1999): 1-41.

² See chapter three, *passim*.

³ For an extended treatment of this issue, see S. W. Pope, “Rethinking Sport, Empire and American Exceptionalism,” *Sport History Review* 38 (2007), 91-119. For examples of how these issues have received short shrift within key survey texts, see, for example, B. Rader, *American Sports: From the Age of Folk Games to the Era of Televised Sports* (New York, 2004, fifth ed.); and E. Gorn and W. Goldstein, *A Brief History of American Sports* (Urbana, 2004, second ed.).

⁴ A. Guttman, *Sport: The First Five Millennia* (Amherst, 2004), 292.

modern sport in Germany prior to the emergence of the Nazi regime, Keys documents the longer tradition of suspicion and resistance to competitive sport (and the widespread support for the indigenous *Turnen* gymnastic tradition as well as the legacy of workers' sport).

In a similar fashion, the Soviet regime promoted "proletarian" sport during the 1920s for the sake of mass health, hygiene and physical preparedness, but increasing gravitated toward global sport (in spite of its distrust of its deep distrust of Western culture) and thereby developed a professionalized spectator sports culture. By the early 1930s, the Soviets dropped their opposition to "bourgeois" sport and integrated with the very Western-dominated sport system that had been previously denounced. In the end, as Keys argues, "proletarian *fizkultura* lost to capitalist soccer." (p. 158)

In sum (and to make a long, complicated story short) the growth of competitive, international sport, according to Keys, effectively overcame the ingrained hostilities toward cultural internationalism in Nazi Germany and the USSR. Both ultimately turned their attention to global, competitive sport and in so doing, were effectively co-opted in the process. Not only did the international sport system impose constraints on the expression of racist ideology, but both regimes were effectively forced to "play by the rules" in the process.⁵

Beyond such revisionist, interpretive contributions to sport historiography, Keys calls for greater cross-fertilization between scholars of diplomacy and international relations (who have devoted little attention to sport) and sport historians (who rarely engage with the literature on foreign policy) to situate their subject within the context of international politics.⁶ The study of sport, she maintains, "has implications for how we conceive of the role of non-state actors, cultural transfer, perceptions, mega-events in the construction of a world community, ideologies of race and gender, and the incorporation of the developing world into the international system" (pp. 10-11)—all of which have much in common with the new subjects of international history.⁷

Similarly, the transnational elements of modern sport deserve more detailed, comparative analysis with other international institutions and structures. To date, the most ambitious effort to grapple with such issues within sport historiography is a 1995 article written by

⁵ R. Mandell's *The Nazi Olympics* (Urbana, 1987), despite being hailed as a classic work based upon extensive research in German documents, misses completely this crucial whole point of how Nazi sport was transformed by its participation in the international sport system.

⁶ A promising, recent example in this vein is G. Gems, *Athletic Crusade: Sport and American Cultural Imperialism* (Lincoln, 2006).

⁷ This gap in the scholarly literature will be broached and addressed in *The Routledge Companion to Sports History*, edited by S. W. Pope and J. R. Nauright (forthcoming, 2009). The book—the first ever attempt to document the global development of sport historiography—will feature the contributions of fifty distinguished scholars from around the world addressing such topics as politics, diplomacy, diffusion of sport, globalization, and imperialism.

John Hoberman. His concept of “idealistic internationalisms” was based upon comparisons of the Red Cross, the Boy Scout movement, Esperanto movement, and the Wagnerian and Olympic movements. These movements maintained a “core repertory of behaviors and orientations” that made them “cohere as a distinct category of thematically interrelated organizations.” In addition to ideological opposition to Marxist internationalism, the principal values of these movements included gender segregation, “a rhetoric of universal membership,” “an insistence on political neutrality,” “aristocratic affiliations,” “a professed interest in peacemaking or pacifism,” “the use of visual symbols such as flags and anthems,” “anxieties about war,” and a code of chivalry and a shared enthusiasm for a masculinity inspired by physical and outdoor pursuits explained the “willingness” of many idealistic internationalisms (e.g. IOC) to do “cultural business” with the Nazis during the age of fascism.⁸ This is precisely the kind of comparative analysis that Keys suggests (and, of course, she cites Hoberman’s essay in her book).

The discussion about how American historians might move beyond an exclusively nation-centered, American exceptionalist perspective has advanced in recent years toward a consideration of *transnationality* and the need of better situating American history within world history.⁹ Thomas Bender, one of the leading figures in this vanguard, argues that historians must integrate the stories of the American past with other “larger stories from which, [and] with a kind of continental self sufficiency, the United States has isolated itself . . . We must understand every dimension of American life as entangled in other histories [and that] other histories are implicated in American history, and the United States is implicated in . . . similar projects in other countries.”¹⁰

Barbara Keys has attempted such an analysis. She has situated her work within the wider debates about the international diffusion and globalization of sport as well as within the historiography on comparative and transnational approaches which push us beyond the insularity of the nation state in our analysis of sport and diplomacy. As she writes, the “relationship between transnational influences, globalizing processes, and foreign cultural products, on the one hand, and countervailing pressures to assert national, local, and particularist identities, on the other, is one of the central questions of our era.” (p. 9) As such, this well-crafted book deserves a careful, critical reception within a wide range of scholarly fields and discourses.

⁸ J. Hoberman, “Toward a Theory of Olympic Internationalism,” *Journal of Sport History* 22 (1995), 3,6,7, 9-12, 27. For an astute evaluation of the interpretive and historiographical contribution of this essay, see D. Booth, *The Field: Truth and Fiction in Sport History* (London, 2005), 47-8.

⁹ For an update of this literature, see “The Nation and Beyond” special issue of the *Journal of American History* 86 (December 1999), in particular, D. Thelen, “The Nation and Beyond: Transnational Perspectives on United States History,” pp. 965-78.

¹⁰ T. Bender, “Historians, the Nation, and the Plentitude of Narratives,” in Bender, ed., *Rethinking American History in a Global Age* (Berkeley, 2002), 3.

Author's Response by Barbara Keys, University of Melbourne

The connections between international sport and global affairs are hard to miss in the daily headlines. Human rights groups are using the upcoming Beijing Olympic Games to pressure China on Tibet, Darfur, free speech, and penal reform. Beijing authorities, anticipating the influx of foreign visitors for the Games, are trying to change the cultural habits of the city residents, urging them to stop spitting in public and to line up in orderly queues. This summer Russian President Vladimir Putin threw his weight behind Sochi's successful bid for the 2014 Winter Games, skiing down the slopes at the Black Sea resort and talking up the Games as a crucial sign of international respect for Russia. Hollywood was recently aflutter at the arrival of British superstar David Beckham, who came to add his celebrity luster to America's glamour capital (and, incidentally, to play soccer there, too). The United Nation's Environment Program is pushing the Olympic Games to think about green as well as gold, with the addition of environmental and sustainability criteria to the staging of events. Culture, politics, economics, the environment: sport is intimately and powerfully connected to all these elements at a global level.

Barbara Keys teaches U.S. history at the University of Melbourne. She received her Ph.D. in International History from Harvard University. She is currently working on two books, one on the origins of the human rights revolution of the 1970s, and one on the United States and torture in the 1970s. In the longer term she is planning a study of Soviet views of Henry Kissinger in the era of detente, using Russian archives and interviews. She has written extensively on sport and international relations both before and after the Second World War.

Despite sport's manifold connections to international affairs, until very recently historians of foreign affairs showed no interest in studying the subject. A handful of sport studies specialists wrote about sports and foreign affairs, but mainstream scholars paid little, if any, attention to their work. In the United States it was not until 1999 that diplomatic historian Walter LaFeber began to chip away at this intellectual barrier, with his study of basketball star Michael Jordan as both symbol and agent of the "new global capitalism."¹ For the first time, one of the pre-eminent figures in the field of U.S. foreign relations wrote a book-length study on a topic few before had even included in a footnote.

The number of historians of foreign relations who have followed LaFeber's intrepid footsteps suggests that sport may at last be receiving due attention in the field. Tom Zeiler, an esteemed diplomatic historian, has just published an innovative study of the 1888-1889 Spalding world baseball tour, connecting it to the roots of American empire. Guoqi Xu, trained at Harvard by Akira Iriye, has written a brilliant study of the ways China has used sport as a means of "internationalization" in the 20th century; it should be required reading for anyone who wants to understand the 2008 Beijing Olympics. Diplomatic historian Nick

¹ Walter LaFeber, *Michael Jordan and the New Global Capitalism* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1999). In the same year Peter Beck, a British diplomatic historian, also published a book on sport: *Scoring for Britain: International Football and International Politics, 1900-1939* (London: Frank Cass, 1999).

Sarantakes has completed a manuscript on the 1980 Olympic boycott. Uta Balbier's excellent new study of intra-German sport relations suggests that in Europe, too, sport's relationship to foreign affairs is now a respectable subject for historians outside of sport studies.²

International history's increasing emphasis on cultural relations, informal actors, international organizations, and transnational flows, all of which come together in the study of international sport, have helped to make sport more relevant. (It has also enhanced sport's academic respectability: studying organizations has an aura of seriousness that studying the playing of games lacks.) Newer studies of sport and foreign affairs share a broad view of sport not as an element of culture that occasionally gets manipulated in the political realm, but as a multifaceted phenomenon that wields power in itself.

My own book shares much with these new avenues of study. Conceived as a study in intercultural relations, it highlights sport's role in cultural globalization. I sought to explain the explosion of international sports competitions in the 1930s, to delineate the characteristics of the international community it produced, and to analyze how these developments reverberated in the cultural and political landscapes of nations that participated. International organizations and transnational networks are key actors in this story, and economics, ideology, tourism, consumerism, and gender play roles in it. I avoided the scholarly paradigm that sees sport as a "reflection" or "window" of other forces (either domestic or international), a much-worn formula that, in my view, begs the question of why one ought to study the reflection when one could study the real forces directly.

I was particularly struck, when I began looking closely at the diffusion of modern Western sport, at how it had so rapidly taken over the global landscape, squeezing out so many alternative and radically different versions of "physical culture." The establishment of modern Western sport as a global culture has entailed a narrowing of our conception of physical culture, but the same process has also provided the world with its most visible evidence of global community. Though far from the airy ideals of harmony and mutual

² Thomas W. Zeiler, *Ambassadors in Pinstripes: The Spalding World Baseball Tour and the Birth of the American Empire* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2006); Guoqi Xu, *Olympic Dreams: China and Sports, 1895-2008* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, forthcoming April 2008); Nick Sarantakes, "Political Games: How the Battle Between Jimmy Carter and Lord Killanin Over the 1980 Olympics Restarted the Cold War" (unpublished book manuscript); Uta Andrea Balbier, *Kalter Krieg auf der Aschenbahn: Der deutsch-deutsche Sport 1950-1972; Eine politische Geschichte* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2007). See also the collection *Sport zwischen Ost und West*, eds. Arié Malz, Stefan Rohdewald, and Stefan Wiederkehr (Osnabrück: Fibre, 2007). The first serious scholarly examination of Soviet sport diplomacy to come out of the Russian archives has also appeared: M. Iu. Prozumenshchikov, *Bol'shoi sport, bol'shai politika* (Moscow: Rosspen, 2004). The Germanists may well be taking the lead in this area, as evidenced by the upcoming conference at the German Historical Institute titled "A Whole New Game: Expanding the Boundaries of the History of Sports," which promises "to examine international championship sports as a multifaceted form of global discourse." See the call for papers at http://www.ghi-dc.org/events/conferences/2008/sport/cfp_sport.html [accessed 12/12/07].

understanding its promoters proclaim, the world of international sport is founded on recognition of the common humanity of all participants. After a century of genocide, that acknowledgment is no small achievement.

It is a special honor to have my book reviewed by Steven Pope, whose excellent 1997 book *Patriotic Games: Sporting Traditions in the American Imagination*, provided both an early foundation for my understanding of sport's relationship to national identity and an inspiration for how to do sport history well. Sayuri Guthrie-Shimizu and I share the distinction of being the only historians who have breached the pages of *Diplomatic History* with articles on sport; her book on U.S.-Japanese baseball relations promises to be a path-breaking study of an important topic that has long cried out for serious treatment.³

I am grateful to both reviewers for the time and effort that went into their careful readings. They have been generous in their assessments of the book's merits. Both of them have sometimes explained my conclusions better than I remember doing myself. Both point to further avenues of research, in diaspora studies, comparative studies of international institutions, and the complex relationship between nationalism and internationalism. There is, indeed, much work that remains to be done: in many respects we have only begun to study the full dimensions of sport's connections to international affairs.

Pope rightly notes that excellent work has been produced on American sport in the first decades of the 20th century. The late 19th and early 20th centuries have been the subject of the finest studies of American sport history, including Pope's own work. The international dimensions of the story, however, have not been deeply explored—certainly not for the 1930s. The 1932 Los Angeles Olympic Games are notable for the paucity of work they have elicited, thanks in part to being overshadowed by the more dramatic 1936 Berlin Games. Unlike virtually all of the other “modern” Games, they have not been the subject of a serious book-length study. More generally, the parochialism of America's major team sports has reinforced a scholarly propensity to assume that in the 1930s, international cultural interactions were of little significance. As Guthrie-Shimizu notes, part of what I tried to show was that the oft-studied U.S. cultural expansionism of the 1920s continued, in sport, into the 1930s, and even accelerated. The 1930s, as she aptly puts it, were not a detour but a bridge to the globalized mass culture of the postwar years.

Heather Dichter's review, unfortunately, provides a deeply inaccurate portrayal of my book. Ms. Dichter seems to have misunderstood my book's subject and arguments at a fundamental level. She says that the book is a “comparison of the sporting cultures” in three countries and that its central argument is that these three countries “combined to shape modern sport.” She concludes that “overall [the book] demonstrate[s] the pervasiveness of sport at both a societal and political level.” The book is not comparative and is not about particular countries' sporting cultures; as Pope and Guthrie-Shimizu note, the book is a transnational study of the rise of an international sport community that

³ Sayuri Guthrie-Shimizu, “For Love of the Game: Baseball in Early U.S.-Japanese Encounters and the Rise of a Transnational Sporting Fraternity,” *Diplomatic History* 28, no. 5 (November 2004): 637-662.

covers international organizations and competitions, in addition to examining the relationship between three countries and international sport. I never argue for sport's "pervasiveness" in society or politics; to the contrary, I show at length that sport was peripheral to the main political concerns of the U.S. government and of Stalin's Soviet Union. Nowhere do I suggest that my three case-study countries "shape[d] modern sport"; the forces I chart are much broader, and Dichter's contention contravenes an entire chapter of the book, in which I show that the Soviet Union played almost no role at all in Western international sport.

In addition to misrepresenting the book's subject and central argument, Dichter's review contains so many inaccuracies on subsidiary matters that responding to each of them would be impractical in this context. It is important, however, to correct the record with regard to the most egregiously false contentions Dichter attributes to my book. I do not argue that American sports enthusiasts spread "ideas about democracy" during sport tours abroad; such claims represent rhetoric, not reality. I never assert that Americans were "the dominant" actors in the creation of an international sport community, and I certainly never suggest that they intended to "control" international sport, which for the most part was firmly in the grip of Europeans. Dichter further suggests that I describe modern sport as less "nationalist" than traditional gymnastics and see international sport as "based on mutual understanding." Nowhere in my book do I say that international sport is "based on mutual understanding," and I emphasize repeatedly that modern sport has been a highly potent vehicle for expressions of nationalism (indeed this is a proposition most casual observers of the Olympic Games would take for granted). Finally, I do not claim that sport "helped draw the United States out of its isolationism." Sport had no effect on the country's foreign policy. In short, readers seeking an accurate description of my book should rely on the other reviews.

Copyright © 2008 H-Net: Humanities and Social Sciences Online. H-Net permits the redistribution and reprinting of this work for nonprofit, educational purposes, with full and accurate attribution to the author, web location, date of publication, H-Diplo, and H-Net: Humanities & Social Sciences Online. For any other proposed use, contact the H-Diplo Editors at h-diplo@h-net.msu.edu.
