

Introduction

American Sport History—Toward a New Paradigm

S. W. POPE

Sport has been described in literature and recorded in engravings, sculpture, and paintings for thousands of years by some of the world's greatest artists and writers. During the past century the task of interpreting the significance of sport has been the domain of journalists, cartoon artists, cultural critics, and filmmakers. The best popular works have been informative, entertaining, and occasionally sophisticated investigations of sport's connection to broader historical, cultural, and intellectual trends—like H. G. Bissinger's excellently done *Friday Night Lights* and Steve James's recent documentary *Hoop Dreams*.¹ This should be no surprise since, as the sport-studies scholar Stephen Hardy writes in a review of Stephen Fox's exemplary popular history of American sport, "Not only do sports rehearse fundamental human movements, passions and characters in recurring, unpredictable scripts," they also provide a dynamic, accessible window into politics, economics, gender, race, class formation, ideology, religion, and virtually any other topic.²

Curiously, scholars have only recently grasped this. Prior to the 1940s, most scholars ignored the history of sport because most of them considered it a frivolous, anecdotal research interest that added little to the coherent national (political) narratives. Sport history only became a bona fide field of intellectual inquiry during the past three decades. Ironically, sport languished as a physical, rather than a mental, activity—outside the traditions of classroom and intellectual discourse—in American academe for nearly a century, despite its prominence at the nation's leading universities. There were, however, several noteworthy attempts by early sport historians to situate their work within larger societal dialogues and paradigms.³

The first sixty years of American sport historiography generally followed the influential "frontier" paradigm. Frederick Paxson initiated this trend in a 1917 article for the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*. Paxson argued that as the frontier receded and new pressures arose from rapid industrialization,

sport as a new "safety valve" provided a needed release for a new generation of urban Americans. The new American urbanites created leisure activities to compensate for their lost traditional, rural recreations. The fact that "American society learned to give instead of crack" throughout a half-century of severe economic dislocations and class warfare, Paxson wrote, proved the success of safety valves like sport in mediating the tensions of a transforming society.⁴

In 1931 Jennie Holliman incorporated Paxson's thesis but recast the history of American sport to demonstrate its earlier, intimate developments along English and Native American lines. Americans' obsession with sports and games, in other words, *preceded* industrialization and the closing of the frontier by two centuries. Holliman's contemporary Lewis Mumford, however, suggested something quite different. Although sport was a tangential concern for his pioneering work on urban and technological history, Mumford argued that the rise of American sport was a direct reaction against the mechanization, division of labor, and standardization of life in a "machine civilization."⁵

During the politically charged World War II years, historians gave the sport-frontier paradigm a new ideological twist: the frontier experience was unique in the annals of human history, and thus Americans were an "exceptional" people. Historians emphasized how sport reflected America's superior institutions and preserved the nation's open, democratic character. During the pivotal transition from an agrarian to an urban-industrial society, "no other country and no other age," wrote Foster Rhea Dulles, "had ever had a wider choice of amusements open to the masses." Diligent in his use of primary sources, Dulles sketched a cogent chronicle of collegiate and professional sport, as well as the less formally organized games and pastimes of the first two-and-a-half centuries of America. The accessibility of sport and leisure signaled to Dulles that "[American] democracy had come into its heritage."⁶

The most distinguished sport historian of the 1950s and early 1960s, John Rickard Betts, fused the ideological assumptions of consensus historians with a savvy grasp of business and technological history. Betts argued that resourceful industrial capitalists expanded opportunities for mass sporting participation by building the necessary facilities, manufacturing standardized sporting goods, and providing cheaper, more efficient modes of transportation. Moreover, Betts established new standards for the study of nineteenth-century sport journalism, changing ideas about health and exercise and the impact of technology. To be fair, there were professionally trained historians who published books and articles on sport history prior to the mid-1960s—most notably Harold Seymour and David Voigt's histories of baseball—but

most of the academic interest in the subject inhered in physical-education departments, whose practitioners' lackluster efforts failed to attract the attention of historians, American studies scholars, or social scientists.⁷

American sport history emerged as a recognized subdiscipline in the early 1970s, a time when historical scholarship itself changed dramatically. The Vietnam War, the civil rights movement, and the women's movement undermined the prevailing atmosphere of consensus, belief in progress and prosperity, and self-righteousness in both academe and larger American society. A new generation of historians raised on a steady diet of commercialized mass culture, challenged many of the prevailing social and cultural assumptions in the craft. In particular, those who came of age in a society rife with social and political conflict rejected the notion that a history rooted in the ideas and actions of an elite group of politicians, lawyers, and intellectuals could speak for the rest of American society. Armed with new assumptions, questions, and topics, the "new" historians shifted their attention from political events and ideas to collective processes and the experiences of everyday life.⁸

The new American social history derived from two basic European intellectual trends. The first grew out of the influential French journal *Annales*, whose editors and contributors believed that historians should incorporate all of the human and social sciences in their studies so as to recreate the totality of the past. The other principal influence behind American social history came from the British Marxists, who also turned away from traditional political history to analyze the relationships between intellectual, economic, social, and cultural developments. They focused on social groups rather than individuals, and, most significantly, emphasized "human agency"—the ways in which ordinary people made their own history. Above all, they were concerned with the rise of global capitalism and the resulting class struggle as the primary engine of historical change. Complementing these two schools of thought was the important influence of anthropologists and sociologists, particularly Max Weber, Clifford Geertz, Norbert Elias, and Michel Foucault, who expanded historians' understanding of such concepts as society, community, modernization, culture, and power. Sport historians borrowed liberally from anthropology and sociology and examined the relationships between sport and social structures.

Between the mid-1970s and the mid-1980s, sport historians transformed their infant field beyond recognition. Investigations into the socially constructed ideas of racial, religious, regional, ethnic, class, and gender subcultures generated new areas of specialization within both social history and the

sport history subfield. Following historian Robert Wiebe's lead, sport scholars probed the importance of urban sport in Americans' search for "order" and "community." The most important work of the new American sport history was Allen Guttman's *From Ritual to Record*, which linked the older concerns about the consequences of sport in the transition from a rural, agrarian to an urban, industrial society with the newer emphasis on sport in Americans' search for community.⁹

Most sport historians worked within one of the dominant scholarly paradigms—modernization theory—to investigate the meanings of the transition from a rural and agrarian society to an urban and industrial one in different times and locales. Modernists elevated Weberian "traditional" and "modern" ideal social types. Traditional society was characterized by stability, localism, unspecialized social roles, and paternalistic social hierarchies—all of which demonstrated little variation over time. Modern society, theorists posited, is dynamic, cosmopolitan, technological, mobile, industrial, and constantly modified by rational thought. Societies "modernize" as they shed the former qualities and adopt the latter ones. Guttman synthesized the basic elements of this pivotal decade's literature into a modernist paradigm that brought global dimensions to the emerging field of sport history. Published two years after Richard D. Brown's influential work on pre-Civil War American history, Guttman's imaginative *From Ritual to Record* not only paralleled contemporary historiographical tendencies critical of class-conflict explanations but also contributed to the broader modernist literature by setting the "modern" mania for records within a historical context dating back to ancient ritual. Whereas "traditional" sport was unorganized, tied to local religious customs, and interwoven with agrarian rhythms, "modern" sport, according to Guttman, is marked by its secularity, bureaucratization, specialization, and quantification—all of which make it historically unique.¹⁰

Although ancient, medieval, and Renaissance societies had rich (and sometimes sophisticated) sporting cultures, the last three centuries contain the most important historical development—namely, the transformation of traditional agrarian pastimes into the commercial spectacles of urban-industrial societies. Rules, records, roles, facilities, and equipment have become much more formal, precise, and rational. For instance, the annual Shrovetide football matches in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century England had no real boundaries, formal rules, or limits on team size. By contrast, today's brand of football has established rules, standardized equipment and facilities, carefully plotted tactics, well-defined positions and roles, and myriad statistics and records to quantify and compare performance across time and space. These

developments illustrate Guttman's modernization-of-sport thesis, which continues to provide a framework for understanding the cultural, historical, and geographical development of sport.¹¹

Modernist syntheses, however, quickly drew trenchant criticism.¹² Although many critics failed to demonstrate the paradigm's systemic limitations, most convincingly exposed modernization as an ahistorical construct that distorted the past by emphasizing structure at the expense of human agency. By the 1980s, such arguments had become standard fare within the historical profession. Scholars were particularly critical of the modernist paradigm's failure to address why things did not change, how specific ideas and lifestyles became dominant while others were relegated to the dustbin of history as a result of social-class interaction—issues well-established in the field of social and cultural history by the early 1980s.¹³

Several sport historians broached the issue of class and power as it applied to the struggle for "social control" in early twentieth-century America. The key works analyzed interactions between middle-class social reformers and urban working-class groups and debated whether reformers' efforts to use sport actually represented altruism or an insidious desire for social control to divert class-conscious impulses.¹⁴ Sociologist Richard Gruneau brought a more rigorous theoretical approach to this critique. Working within the British Marxist cultural-studies tradition, he analyzed sport within the objective historical conditions of capitalism, and granted sport a degree of autonomy for its ability to express and dramatize a wide variety of social-class aspirations. Gruneau's work suggested that sports are social practices based on the forces and relations of production, and are therefore susceptible to challenge and redefinition by workers, women, and ethnic and racial groups.¹⁵ Simultaneously, a new generation of social historians analyzed leisure as a medium of class domination and resistance.¹⁶ Despite such efforts, however, most American sport historians remained loyal to the legacy of modernization and conventional, functionalist historical approaches until the mid-1980s.¹⁷

Since then sport historians have been less concerned with conventional periodizations, institutional developments, and the effects of urbanization, technology, and modernization and have focused instead on the more inclusive themes of class, gender, race, and ethnicity that currently define the parameters of social and cultural history. Moreover, recent works in sport sociology challenge historians to synthesize theoretical issues of the new social and cultural history into a new framework that reconciles modernization with the Marxist and *Annales* traditions. In short, the field of American sport history

needs a new paradigm that does justice to the past decade's conceptual innovations. Many practitioners recognize this larger challenge, but only Stephen Hardy has attempted to articulate a comprehensive one.

Hardy suggests that although historians have primarily focused on sport *transformations*, one can discern "long residuals" from the past—continuities in forms and meanings that have crossed time and context.¹⁸ In an earlier work he discussed something called the "Sportgeist"—representing a kind of *longue durée* (i.e., slow-moving, persistent wave of historical time) in the *Annales* (particularly Fernand Braudel) tradition—which embodied a set of potential tensions: competition (victory vs. "fair play"), creativity (freedom vs. regimen), physicality (moderation vs. aggression), and achievement (community vs. individual). In brief, the Sportgeist represents the internal, transhistorical properties of sport. In Hardy's model the Sportgeist is surrounded by other structures: social-class relations, gender and race relations, economic systems, and geography. As individuals or cultures practice sport, according to his paradigm, they make choices and thereby animate a particular version of the Sportgeist.¹⁹

Most American sport historians find Hardy's theoretically rigorous Hegelian-Braudelian paradigm confusing and esoteric. Its innovative approach, however, in the words of Melvin Adelman, "mandates an escape from the vision of sport history as another variation of social history"—an important contribution, to be sure. Still, apparently unhappy with the Sportgeist, Hardy has recently refined his approach by emphasizing "long residuals"—practices that tie the present to the past—in modern sport history: craft and community; the persistence of gambling; the framing of games within festival, carnival, and spectacle; and the erotic appeals in athletic performance. As he explains, "Periodicity in historical analysis is terribly important in the analysis of sport's contents, forms and relations, for in any given period there will always be a dialectic of incorporation and resistance. Social transformation is not an unfolding, evolutionary process [e.g., "modernization"], but a process that takes place over contested terrain."²⁰ These basic theses need to be taken more seriously by sport historians in order to move the field toward a new, more dynamic paradigm. The following overview will address some of these concerns.

National Culture

The rise of an American sporting culture took shape in the booming eighteenth-century coastal cities of the middle colonies, which became early

centers of urban, commercialized spectacles. Horse racing, cockfighting, and rough-and-tumble brawling united men in a shared patriarchal culture and evoked particular visions of masculinity. Only in the mid-nineteenth century, however, did a coherent sporting ideology evolve, as a Victorian Protestant avant-garde reconciled a deeply rooted ambivalence toward traditional recreations with the prospects of using sport as a moral force. Linking athletic activity to the middle-class values of discipline, order, self-reliance, human perfectibility, and productivity, the emergent Muscular Christian defense of sport not only justified the explosion of sport around mid-century, it also popularized a new bourgeois, industrial morality and redefined "appropriate" male public behavior.²¹

As industrial capitalism increasingly segregated work from play, strenuous sport, according to Elliott Gorn, "helped men slough off defeatist attitudes, replicate the heroism of their fathers, and gear up for battle in new arenas" [e.g., the Spanish-American War]—reaffirming that "strength, aggressiveness, and the will to win were the fundamentals of life." It was within this context that Theodore Roosevelt articulated a distinctly Anglo-Saxon sporting ideology for a maturing industrial nation that elevated "the purposeful athleticism of modern sports," whereby "spectator sports became largely a private male space, filled with heroic competition and virile deeds." By the late 1890s, the structural and ideological framework for the national sporting culture was firmly ensconced in American society.²²

The invention of a sporting ideology, however important, was only part of the story. The pivotal nineteenth-century episodes were the development of specifically "American" sports. Baseball's rapid growth during the early 1860s enabled it to surpass cricket as the nation's leading ball game, and prompted journalists to insist that it was the national game, reflecting the American character and temperament. Initially played by middle-class gentlemen, baseball was quickly dominated by skilled urban workers, and by the Civil War had spread to a range of social groups. Challenging the orthodox view that early baseball was a "middle class" sport by persuasively documenting that the game was dominated by skilled urban craftsmen and small shopkeepers who had significant control over their own work processes, Melvin Adelman (as well as Steven Gelber and Warren Goldstein) has shown how the game flourished in a fraternal, artisanal culture in which players placed great importance on occupational, political, and ethnic associations. Adelman also attends to the importance of an emergent generation of sports journalists (most notably Henry Chadwick) who assured their countrymen that baseball was not only a manly pastime, but a bona fide American sport.²³

Between the 1870s and the 1920s, sport evolved from primarily localized activities to nationally organized, commercialized spectacles. Rooted in the material, social, and political realities of the age, sport dramatized fundamental ideas in American society. During a period of rapid social and political change, sport became a powerful medium for national self-identification as well as a metaphor for bourgeois values. Institutionalized sports and the discourses accompanying them were promoted by emergent social groups to rally social cohesiveness, sustain power structures, and legitimize nationalist sentiments.²⁴

The key forum for solidifying the national sporting culture around the turn of the century was collegiate football. Michael Oriard documents the critical series of rule changes that transformed English rugby into American football during the 1880s to illustrate how a handful of representatives from elite universities controlled and shaped the new sport at its moment of development. The early years of football, in Oriard's words, exposed "the messy relations and complicated distribution of power among 'producers' and 'consumers' of culture." Unlike the advocates of baseball, who propagated the Doubleday creation myth, the founding fathers of football apparently felt no need for mythic narratives of national identity, much less any hope that the game would provide them. Nevertheless, as Oriard demonstrates, after football's haphazard beginnings such narrative possibilities quickly emerged and effectively transformed a game to be played into a spectacle to be watched and read about. Focusing on the writings of the "father of American Football," Walter Camp, Oriard illustrates how football promoters exploited the narrative possibilities of the game to create a national audience. Reflecting the growing importance of the daily sports page, most Americans, he claims, learned this new game through newspaper narratives and not at the ballfield before the turn of the century.

Mark Dyreson analyzes the role played by Progressive Era middle-class spokesmen in articulating a new sports ideology that reconciled their class interests with the new imperatives of corporate capitalism and revitalized their ability to influence the larger body politic. Transmuting their particular class values into universal ones, bourgeois sport advocates posited the idea of "life as a game" as an organizing principle that suggested the connections between the well-ordered body and the well-ordered political culture.²⁵ The history of American sport consciousness cannot simply be a history of players and spectators. It must also scrutinize the role of what Italian theorist Antonio Gramsci termed "organic intellectuals"—those cultural experts whose duty it is to define what is "legitimate." Dyreson's sport protagonists are those intellectuals

who, in the words of cultural historian Andrew Ross, "patrol[ed] the ever-shifting border of popular and legitimate taste, supervise[d] the passports, the temporary visas, . . . and the deportation orders, and who occasionally made their own adventurous forays across the border." In other words, as Dyreson's essay suggests, at the heart of the story about intellectuals' relationship to sport is a structural connection between knowledge and power.²⁶

Gender and the Body

The historical study of gender is one of the most thriving research fields today.²⁷ The pioneering work of feminist historians Gerder Lerner, Natalie Zemon Davis, Joan Kelly, and others shifted attention away from the Great Women approach to a broader orientation that highlights the diversity of women's historical experience. While many feminists cling to essentialist notions, the field of gender studies has diversified to demonstrate how ideas about sexual difference are socially constructed and vary according to historical context.

The field of sport history has paralleled this larger field of women's studies. Sport historians initially characterized the development of women's sporting practices as a simple reflection of timeless patriarchal dominance, with only marginal consideration of class, racial, and ethnic differences. During the past decade, however, the once-dominant "separate spheres" paradigm has shifted to an interactive view of social processes and gender relations that illuminates class, ethnicity, and race along with gender and sexual orientation. No longer is the focus predominantly on exceptional women who participated in the male-dominated public arena or on the ways in which women uniformly conformed to the ideological dictates of public and private spheres; rather, as Patricia Vertinsky has written, the new emphasis is on the extent to which women's lives actually corresponded to idealized versions of womanhood prescribed for them, and on women's culture rather than women's "place."²⁸

The most important early theoretical contribution to this debate came from Jennifer Hargreaves, whose neo-Marxist, Gramscian orientation led her to conclude that although sport has historically been a male preserve, male domination has never been static or complete. Rather, "Some men and women support, accommodate to, or collude in existing patterns of discrimination in sport that are specific to capitalism and to male domination, while other men and women oppose them and struggle for change." This focus on the importance of hegemony directs attention to social class as a primary

determinant of women's involvement in sport—and away from “women” as a unified, unproblematical category.²⁹

Nancy Struna pioneered the study of women's involvement in colonial sport and leisure. The broader literature of the eighteenth century suggests that sport was connected to an early consumer revolution as Americans began to produce and consume far more leisure practices than their predecessors. Although sporting practice was largely a privileged-white-male phenomenon, Struna's research in estate inventories and probate records demonstrates that colonial women participated in a variety of recreations that extended beyond the confines of home and domestic production. Men owned most sporting goods and dominated sporting activities, but middle- and upper-class women were clearly essential to the use of those goods and the construction of male sporting culture—though they continued to be relegated to subordinate positions in nineteenth-century upper-class sports culture.³⁰

Women became more active in sport by the end of the nineteenth century. While sport served as an arena in which the social place of women could be delineated, it was also partly formed by those women who spurned the stereotype of the “swooning damsel,” donned the habit of the sportswoman, and, gifted with a distinct consciousness, had an impact as a separate constituency of sport. Nevertheless, sportswomen were only a minority among American women, since some shied away from sport by preference and others were effectively banned from it for lack of money and time. The fragmentation among women generally carried over into their sport, and diversity reigned. The growing interest in sport among many women did not produce a unified and simple modification of their identity in American culture, except in the general shift toward a comparatively broader scope of activities and toward the embrace of action itself that was part of the emancipation of women. Women's pleasure in action formed the common ground for the diverse expressions of women's sport, as well as the shared base from which women of sometimes-opposing views lent their endorsement to sport.³¹

Women's unequal sports participation throughout the nineteenth century derived from male fears that they might be challenged in governance of the social order. Steven Riess argues that as concerns about the effeminacy of American culture surfaced and urban reform movements grappled with perplexing social problems, many middle-class men came to embrace sport as a moral character builder and a mechanism to redefine and achieve a transformed masculinity during the late nineteenth century. Beginning in the 1890s women bicycled and played croquet, tennis, golf, and basketball, and shortly thereafter readied themselves for “socially acceptable” regional, national, and

international competition.³² Yet, as some women challenged the “separate spheres” ideology through sport, they encountered the long residual of institutionalized male cultural hegemony. As Donald Mrozek demonstrates, male physicians continued to see themselves as guardians of the moral and physical well-being of women, and used their privileged status to perpetuate traditional assumptions about female physical “propriety.” Middle-class men insisted that women's entry into the public sphere to be therapeutic rather than self-expressive. Women who challenged this boundary risked being considered freakish Amazons. As Mrozek argues, public excellence in women's sport lay uncomfortably on the edge of middle-class respectability—women could be more energetic, but the actual opportunities for sportswomen depended on the battles outside the sport arena and inside the minds of men and women where sport was justified.³³

Allen Guttman's essay broaches the currently popular subject of body culture—how human beings conceive of themselves physically. Sport sociologists have led the way in showing how physical skill, body images, and body culture are special forms of “capital” and power. As Guttman notes, scholars have only recently begun to uncover the taboo associations between sport and the erotic. Guttman suggests that scholars should pay more attention to the ways in which participants and spectators enjoy the eroticism of athletic activity. Contemporary consumer capitalism has profitably exploited the eroticism of modern sport and, as a result, has brought many of these taboos out of the closet. In so doing, the marketers of contemporary sport have effectively changed traditional notions of the ideal male and female bodies. Feminists often condemn such practices as men using female athletes for their own voyeuristic fantasies, and maintain that female athletes merely collaborate with patriarchal capitalism. Such criticisms fail, however, to deal with the fact that erotic sporting images proliferate in women's magazines, that women are attracted to male sport stars, or that everything is “objectified” in capitalist society.³⁴

Class, Race, and Ethnicity

Since the early 1980s, sport historians have debated the relationship of social class to industrialization, urbanization, and modernization. Unlike their British peers, American sport historians' use of class has had a distinctly functionalist hue. The ghost of the Weberian modernizationist approach has precluded serious consideration of class as a social relationship rather than another “category.” Sport historian Steven Riess reinforces this tendency in his

recent survey of class in sport history. Pronouncing the "death" and marginality of Marxian class analysis to the field, Riess in a functionalist manner dismisses the important theoretical work of Richard Gruneau and John Hargreaves for its "lack" of empirical data and overreliance on "secondary" sources. Although focused on developments outside the United States, Gruneau and Hargreaves incorporated the theoretical insights of Marxists Raymond Williams and Antonio Gramsci to suggest how sport reflected the power relations of capitalism. Both argued that institutionalized sport tended to unify dominant groups and their supporters while disorganizing and fragmenting subordinate ones, whose sporting activities were ultimately subsumed under bourgeois auspices. Despite Riess's denial, these assumptions have become mainstream in the new approaches to the field. Moreover, without refuting this basic thesis, Riess reviews the literature on class and selectively offers praise for Alan Metcalfe, Richard Holt, Hardy, Elliott Gorn, and Roy Rosenzweig—all of whom openly acknowledged their debt to Marxian and neo-Marxian versions of class analysis.³⁵

Despite current announcements of the death of "grand theories" like Marxism and postmodernism, most scholars continue to work within such larger paradigms. The relative paucity of theoretically informed work in American sport history speaks more to its practitioners' neglect of scholarly debates than to the inadequacy of such theoretical frameworks. Gorn and Oriard have recently encouraged sport historians to integrate concepts and approaches from the booming field of cultural studies. The fact that most have not is ironic, since cultural studies—the interdisciplinary analysis of history, cultural expression, and power—is exactly where the study of sport is most needed.³⁶

Riess gives credit to the influential work of E. P. Thompson, Eric Hobsbawm, Herbert Gutman, and David Montgomery—all Marxist historians—for recognizing the importance of working-class involvement in American sports culture. He also acknowledges that "scholars have gone a long way in the past decade to recover the history, resiliency, and continuity of traditional sport, a sphere over which workers exercised nearly total agency."³⁷ In fact, Riess's statement—with references to resistance and human agency—could not have been conceptualized without the lingering influence of the "dead" Marxian grand theorists, nor could his admonition that scholars engage Hobsbawm's notion of "invented tradition" and the yet-to-be-explored issues of power and hegemony. Again, Riess simultaneously discounts the utility of Marxian theories of class analysis and elevates the concepts and issues derived from that ap-

proach as fruitful areas for future research.³⁸ This collection embraces his call for more explicit consideration of such topics.

The essays by Gorn, William Baker, and Gerald Gems have a decidedly working-class orientation. The history of middle- and upper-class sport has been ably documented, as Riess's article attests, yet the history of sport and the American working class remains a sideline venture.³⁹ Future accounts of workers and sport must address not only "bottom-up" perspectives but also workers' interactions with political structures and civil society.⁴⁰ For instance, to what extent did dominant political and cultural institutions promote anti-working-class sporting traditions? Did workers' acceptance of sport traditions, imbued with state or bourgeois ideologies, imply working-class acceptance and assimilation? Under what conditions did workers reject the preferred sport forms and ideas? When, if ever, did new sport forms emerge from the negotiation or struggle between working-class factions, or between workers and middle-class socialists?

Gorn explains how prizefighting began as a working-class ritual that dramatized toughness, prowess, and honor—principal features of an underclass masculine identity. Yet, as corporations and bureaucracies engulfed American social life, and immigration, the women's movement, and routinized, alienated labor eroded American male identities during the late nineteenth century, boxing was no longer a distinctly working-class sport; it was absorbed into the hegemonic culture and dramatized the dominant ideas of meritocracy, social mobility, and capitalist rationality. The transformation of boxing depended on the emerging widespread acceptance of "manly" sport by middle-class men. Gorn's essay comes closest to integrating the entire anthology's fundamental concepts. Drawing on folklore, anthropology, sociology, American studies, labor and social history, and gender studies, Gorn seeks to capture the layered and changing meanings that prizefighting had for its practitioners, fans, and opponents.

William Baker demonstrates how the 1932 American Communist Party's "Counter-Olympics" promoted a unique, alternative vision of sport within the larger scheme of conflicting economic and political loyalties that many workers confronted during the Depression. Baker presents clues from rare Communist sources to illuminate how the Labor Sports Union of America's Popular Front drew on a rich tradition of European working-class sport activism to protest bourgeois sport's exploitative, imperialist nature; racial segregation in sport; and the Western sport blockade against the Soviet Union. Ultimately, Communist sport activism netted only marginal results, not only

because of the immigrant, "European" sport venue—track and field, gymnastics, and soccer—but also because of the hegemonic mainstream American sport culture.⁴¹

Immigrants' sporting experience differed from WASP Americans' due to their particular nationalities, social class, degree of acculturation, and concentration in large, crowded cities, where working-class people established ethnic subcommunities to sustain their cultural heritage amidst an alien environment. Despite the prominence of sport in nineteenth-century America, Gorn reminds us in the following chapter, most first-generation male immigrants were not terribly interested as spectators, and if they played a sport at all, it was more likely to be a game from their homeland. Second-generation young people, however, saw athletics as in his words a "powerful sense of belonging to the only culture they knew firsthand." Symbolically, sport provided a dual identity for millions of ethnic Americans. However, embracing the strenuous life was not without conflict; athletics pitted immigrants and their children against middle-class Americans who enlisted sport for urban social reform. Ethnic groups responded to capitalists' and social reformers' use of sport for assimilation by maintaining European sporting traditions that often challenged WASP conventions, such as Sunday sport and alcohol-accompanied athletic contests. Non-"American" sports like soccer, cricket, hurling, Gaelic football, and gymnastics preserved and reinforced ethnic cultural solidarity. German Turners, Czech Sokols, Polish Falcons, and other immigrant sport clubs maintained close ties to the nationalistic objectives of their parent countries, which often obstructed easy assimilation and sometimes clashed with the dominant social order.⁴²

Peter Levine astutely situates the Jewish sporting experience in a nuanced understanding of twentieth-century American culture. Sport emerged as a "middle ground"—a complex cultural activity shaped by "interactions between generations of Jews as well as between ethnic and majority cultures that involved both the adaptation of traditional practices to new American settings and the transformation of American experiences into ethnic ways." This is precisely what Hardy means by long residuals. And, although Levine does not explicitly identify this process in terms of the struggle for cultural hegemony, the essential dynamics are clearly identified. In an unmistakable revisionist tone, he writes that "sport [as] both actual experience and as symbol, encouraged the active participation of immigrants and their children in shaping their own identities as Americans and as Jews." Clearly, then, sport was neither a tool for manipulating immigrants into American conformity nor a vehicle for social harmony and self-expression. It intersected with both ten-

sions and resolved them in often-contradictory ways. Levine develops this thesis by documenting how boxing uniquely countered the dominant anti-Semitic stereotypes, defused ethnic tensions, and thereby validated Jewish athletes' American identity.⁴³

The relationship between organized religion and working-class sport has been asserted by historians but not subjected to careful scrutiny.⁴⁴ Gerald Gems analyzes the conservative role of religion in working-class sport through the career of Bishop Bernard J. Sheil and the Catholic Youth Organization. The CYO provided college scholarships, material goods, medical care, and travel adventures to promote social mobility, and yet its sport programs enabled workers to maintain a sense of class without provoking truculent class consciousness during a volatile period in American history. Sheil deftly brought working-class Catholic athletes closer to the mainstream by arguing that religious sport programs had greater influence than class, race, or ethnic alternatives.

With several noteworthy exceptions, the literature on African-Americans and sport is dominated by biographies (and collective biographies) of prominent black athletes. Despite the works' generally high quality, the biographical tone has overshadowed needed social and cultural analysis, as well as a more rigorous conceptualization of race and sport. In this sense, students of black sport history have been reticent in relating their work to the larger field of African-American studies. The general literature ably documents black exclusion from white sport but as yet fails to sufficiently analyze the negotiated struggles between blacks and whites, or the ways in which black athletes were differentiated from each other by color, class, religion, and political orientation. In other words, future explorations of the African-American sporting experience should transcend reliance on both race as an analytically sufficient concept and the contributions of extraordinary black athletes, and begin to think about how various other socially constructed categories have affected this important dimension of American sport history. Although he disputes my contention that biography has dominated the study of African-American athletes, the historian Jeffrey Sammons, whose partisan survey of the literature reviews the field in its entirety, admits that "books on blacks and sport have been overwhelmingly narrative, largely devoid of theory, rarely pathbreaking, and often behind the curve." Earlier in his essay, Sammons further confirms this basic point when he declares that "race is one of the most hotly debated topics among scholars and one which should be addressed openly, directly, and cautiously," and that any investigation of "race and sport" "that does not question the assumptions inherent in the term 'race' 'undermine[s] any attempt

to expand understanding of sport history and attract others to the field."⁴⁵ Such future research might usefully integrate the work of Lawrence Levine, Eugene Genovese, Leon Litwack, Herbert Gutman, Robin Kelley, and Roger Abrahams, among others.⁴⁶

The journalist Nelson George's study of "black" basketball style suggests some fruitful new directions along such lines. George examines the development of the game from its white, Muscular Christian origins to the racial integration of the National Basketball Association, the contributions of both star and unsung players, and basketball's place in their history of race relations. George argues that innovative passing and dribbling, one-on-one challenges, and slam dunks represent the same "black aesthetic" as jazz and blues music—"individual virtuosity in an ensemble." Unlike its regimented, methodical white counterpart, black basketball, he writes, resonated with a "fluid, no-sweat attitude everybody called 'cool.'"⁴⁷

Riess documents how, in the context of urbanization, blacks used sport along with the church, press, and politics to develop a sense of community in their neighborhoods and provide hopes for social mobility—however illusory—since most were unable to escape urban poverty and the ghetto.⁴⁸ Sport played a central role in this newfound black consciousness, but only at a time when political and social groups external to the community organized black sporting life with their own agendas in mind. Capitalists and social-settlement workers infused black-community sport with bourgeois notions of efficiency, worker loyalty, moral uplift, and civic responsibility, in direct opposition to indigent black street culture. This white-created sporting establishment for blacks was curtailed during the Depression due to financial exigencies, leaving a significant cadre of black sports activists with a structure within which they could create a legitimate black sporting establishment. Successful in such efforts, black Pittsburgh, for instance, was to sport what Harlem was to the black cultural renaissance.

Black athletes were forced to cautiously negotiate their inclusion into the white sports establishment. Prior to formal integration of professional and national amateur sport, blacks solidified cultural bonds between their communities and the American mainstream through athletic heroes. During the 1930s and 1940s, for instance, German fascism forced American whites to question their own moral integrity, leading them to elevate the accomplishments of Jesse Owens and Joe Louis as representatives of a tolerant society. Louis's appeal as a bona fide American sport hero ultimately reflected his ability to threaten neither race—thus, according to historians Dominic Capeci and Martha Wilkerson, pleasing various segments in American society who

played on his prestige as a means to manipulate public behavior. Like Jackie Robinson, whose negotiation with lily-white major leagues precluded vocal opposition to the status quo, Louis, in the words of Capeci and Wilkerson, "emerged more hero than leader." His historical significance "lay in the symbolism he represented for black and white societies, their ideologies, their struggles, and their assurances of success." In other words, although Louis achieved unprecedented progress for black athletes, his "multifarious hero" status rested on a tacit acceptance of the dominant society.⁴⁹

In addition to their capricious acceptance within white society, black athletes have always been subjected to racial theories of athletic superiority. Recognition of black foot speed runs throughout American sport history, as do questions about and explanations for why they are quicker than white athletes. As historian Stephen Fox has observed, given the power of black stereotypes to mold the thinking of both races, "the idea of black athletic superiority could offhandedly encourage the oldest, most harmful racial myths: the notions that black people were inherently stupid or lazy . . . [since] if blacks had inborn athletic advantages, then perhaps they won without training hard or thinking much, without truly earning their victories." Contemporary explanations provoke controversy, since the issue is framed simplistically: either blacks are inherently faster and springier, or they are spurred to athletic excellence by societal unfairness and the lack of options, or they work and think harder than lesser athletes. Surely all three are true to some degree, Fox concludes, "with the relative proportions varying so much as to render large generalizations impossible."⁵⁰

David Wiggins reviews the political, scientific, and ideological bases that have informed various theories of an alleged relationship between race and athletic ability. Debates about black athletic prowess date back to the early sports world of the nineteenth century. Although omnipresent throughout the first half of the twentieth century, such debates have surged to the forefront of public awareness since the 1960s in the context of outstanding black Olympic performances and African-Americans' increased prominence in professional sport.

Wiggins's essay dramatizes the dangers of essentialist notions of race. "One of the most glaring aspects of the debate down through the years," he writes, has been "the divergent opinions and theories expressed not only between the black and white communities, but among the two groups themselves." The debate crescendoed during the 1980s when two well-known sport "authorities" dispensed orthodox (white) views on national television. In 1982 CBS sports commentator Jimmy "The Greek" Snyder sparked heated controversy when

he suggested that physical differences account for athletic performance and related such racial differences to the breeding practices of slave owners. Five years later on ABC's "Nightline" news program, Los Angeles Dodgers vice president Al Campanis acknowledged that blacks were "outstanding athletes," "very God-gifted, and they're wonderful people. . . . They are gifted with great musculature and various other things. They're fleet of foot. . . ." but "may not have some of the necessities to be, let's say, a field manager or perhaps a general manager" of a professional sports team.⁵¹ Future studies, however, require scholars to reconcile such comments, however inflammatory, with similar statements made by African-American athletes and intellectuals. Not only did the distinguished Harvard psychiatrist Alvin F. Poussaint argue in 1972 that black men, stripped of their social power, focused their energies on other symbols of masculinity, particularly physical power, but also *Time* magazine discovered a near-consensus among black athletes (most notably O. J. Simpson, Arthur Ashe, and Joe Morgan) in its 1977 survey that physiological differences account for superior black athletic performance.

Markets and Audiences

Contemporary Americans are inundated with visions of the strenuous life. Specialized footwear, chic athletic wear, sport personalities, chiseled male and female "hard bodies," and pulsating sound tracks have become all-consuming images in the nation's cultural landscape. Basketball superstar Michael Jordan has perhaps the most recognized face in the world, just as Muhammad Ali's was twenty years ago. Nike's advertising campaigns capitalized on Jordan's disarming smile and good-guy image to quadruple the company's annual sales of footwear and increase its profits by 900 percent in eight years. Such popular ad campaigns peddle not only sporting goods but also lifestyles and social ideals. Nike's call for America (and the world) to "Just Do It" and tennis player Andre Agassi's declaration for Canon that "Image Is Everything" are cultural statements that reverberate not only in the locker room but throughout society.

Benjamin Rader situates these developments within a historically prescribed context—post-World War II consumerism, alienated labor, rationalized society, corporate sponsorship of fitness and wellness programs, and changing notions of the ideal male and female. Whereas the traditional strenuous life had focused on community imperatives, the new physical orientation of the "me decade" privileged the individual self. As people sought greater control over their lives and personal satisfaction, many turned to strict diets and vigorous exercise to project new socially approved visions of fitness—

tanned, sleek, lean, and muscular bodies, exuding energy, and assertiveness. Bolstered by advertising, rock videos, and film, the new strenuous image has become associated with upward mobility and erotic, physical attraction.⁵²

"Today most sports depend on purchased commodities. This is essentially a twentieth-century phenomenon. Commercial leisure firms created a mass national market by developing products and images that appealed to many classes and social groups. From the 1890s on, American corporate leaders, co-operating with other elites tied to the growth of national markets, transformed American culture from a republican, Protestant, production-oriented society of thrift and self-denial to a culture preoccupied with consumption, comfort, luxury, and acquisition. This fundamental shift in values and habits derived partially from the "therapeutic ethos," whereby sport entrepreneurs created and legitimized meanings and value for products—what several scholars have termed "cultural and symbolic capital." Moreover, mass production, mass distribution, and an integrated national market—essential for this type of culture—were products of advanced capitalist development.

Beginning in the late 1870s, an American sporting-goods industry emerged and promoted new types of equipment, brand recognition, and a new cultural aesthetic—the consumption of leisure. Although Americans continued to create their own sport, the rising consumer culture idealized the purchase of mass-produced commodities as a great human privilege and goal. Sporting-goods entrepreneurs not only marketed their wares, they also shaped the demand for special game forms through their involvement with nascent sport-governing organizations.⁵³

Although the work was pioneered by John Rickard Betts, Stephen Hardy has undertaken more rigorous analysis of entrepreneurs and the sport marketplace. Hardy suggests that sport embodies game forms, services, and goods—and that these distinct components render simple definitions of "sport" hazardous. A handful of rules committees have historically controlled the game forms played by most people; a few manufacturers have supplied the goods at all levels of play; and a limited number of professional groups have established the guidelines for coaching, training, playing, and management techniques. Only by scrutinizing these basic production structures, Hardy argues, can we hope to understand how various sports developed along historically and culturally specific lines.

Allen Guttman explores the complex subject of sport spectatorship—an important, neglected dimension riddled with contradictory trends, tendencies, and patterns. The section included in this volume is part of a larger, trans-historical study that examines sport spectators' class and gender identities, the

actual and ideal motivations of spectatorship, and the types of behavior that have characterized spectators' role. Although we know a fair amount about the ways in which journalists created and reinforced spectatorship patterns, there is surprisingly little literature on the ways in which film and radio stirred visceral passions and extended audiences, and, by so doing, challenged the dominance of the print media during the 1920s and 1930s.⁵⁴ Television surpassed radio in the 1950s as the ultimate stage of mediated spectatorship. Televised sport not only elevated a new set of celebrities, it also supplied the action, suspense, and drama to market products, images, and lifestyles. The world's television networks recently paid a total of \$633 million to broadcast the 1992 Olympic Games at Barcelona; and thanks to an audience of 3.5 billion consumers, a dozen multinational corporations paid \$30 million each to secure worldwide rights for their products linked to the Olympics. International broadcasts via satellite, cable superstations, and pay-per-view television all thrive on sporting events. Yet, as Guttman maintains, at the dawn of television, owners of sports franchises, international sports officials, and television networks failed to realize what the new medium could do for sport as a worldwide cultural institution.⁵⁵

Pamela Cooper's case study of the New York City Marathon engages some of these crucial issues. She investigates how sport entrepreneur Fred Lebow single-handedly seized control of the emergent marathon event in the mid-1970s and transformed the race, while simultaneously securing widespread corporate sponsorship. Led by the New York Road Runners Club, the 1970s marathon movement incorporated all three of the components that Hardy identifies as constituting the "sport product"—reflecting the new managerial imperatives of advanced capitalism that united sport and economic production.⁵⁶ The marathon was marketed as a medically approved, clean-lifestyle activity to educated, upwardly mobile audiences, thus transforming the traditionally working-class sport. Cooper not only uncovers a new topic in American sport history, she connects its growth to the exigencies of self-presentation in contemporary culture, and, by so doing, documents how one particular type of marathoning became the dominant style.

Now in its late adolescence, American sport history has abundant reasons to take pride in its accomplishments. The following essays are representative of the recent scholarship on sport and American society. Not all topics, sports, and viewpoints are included in this collection. Although the contributors do

not collectively agree on theoretical and conceptual issues, their work suggests some common directions. Together they show the usefulness of casting the valuable and growing body of research into a new paradigm that emphasizes the relations and structures among class, culture, gender, race, ethnicity, and national identity in a more nuanced, dynamic fashion.

Notes

1. H. G. Bissinger, *Friday Night Lights: A Town, a Team, and a Dream* (New York, 1990). Both *Friday Night Lights* and *Hoop Dreams* are exceptions to the rule for most nostalgia-driven popular work—consequently, there continues to be a vast gap between what sport scholars do and what the larger public consumes and conceives of as "sport history."
2. Stephen Hardy, "Why We Can't Stop Watching the Boys Play Ball" (review of S. Fox, *Big Leagues: Professional Baseball, Football, and Basketball in National Memory*, 1994), *Boston Globe*, Oct. 30, 1994, B16.
3. See Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago, 1962); David Hollinger's review "T. S. Kuhn's Theory of Science and Its Implications for History," *American Historical Review* 78 (1973), 370–93; Gene Wise, *American Historical Explanations: A Strategy for Grounded Inquiry* (Minneapolis, 1980); Ian Tyrrell, *The Absent Marx: Class Analysis and Liberal History in Twentieth-Century America* (Westport, Conn., 1986); Peter Novick, *That Noble Dream: The "Objectivity Question" and the American Historical Profession* (New York, 1988); and Thomas Bender, *Intellect and Public Life: Essays on the Social History of Academic Intellectuals in the United States* (Baltimore, 1993).

Useful reviews of the "new" social and cultural history include Michael Kammen, ed., *The Past before Us: Contemporary Historical Writing in the United States* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1980); Oliver Zunz, ed., *Reliving the Past: The Worlds of Social History* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1985); Lynn Hunt, ed., *The New Cultural History* (Berkeley, 1989); and Eric Foner, ed., *The New American History* (Philadelphia, 1990). The most recent synthesis of American sport history is Elliott J. Gorn and Warren Goldstein, *A Brief History of American Sports* (New York, 1993).

4. Frederick L. Paxson, "The Rise of Sport," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 4 (1917), 143–68. The other early major works are John A. Krout, *Annals of American Sport* (New Haven, Conn., 1929); and Jennie Holliman, *American Sports, 1785–1835* (1931; Philadelphia, 1975).

5. Lewis Mumford, *The Culture of Cities* (New York, 1938), 428–30. This interpretation was later refined by the influential avant-garde Frankfurt School and adopted by liberal commentators and scholars in the 1960s and 1970s—that sports and mass leisure were deceptive anodynes to counteract the boredom, oppressiveness, and meaninglessness of modern society. For the classic reviews of the Frankfurt School critique of mass culture, see Edward Shils, "Daydreams and

Nightmares: Reflections on the Criticism of Mass Culture," *Sewanee Review* 65 (1957), 587-608; Martin Jay, *The Dialectical Imagination* (New York, 1973); Christopher Lasch, *The Culture of Narcissism: American Life in an Age of Diminishing Expectations* (New York, 1979); and Frederic Jameson, "Reification and Utopia in Mass Culture," *Social Text* 1 (1979), 130-48.

6. Foster Rhea Dulles, *America Learns to Play: A History of Popular Recreation, 1607-1940* (New York, 1940); also see Frederick W. Cozens and Florence Scovell Streumpf, *Sports in American Life* (Chicago, 1953).

7. John Rickard Betts, "The Technological Revolution and the Rise of Sport, 1850-1900," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 40 (1953), 231-56. Betts's monograph, written during the 1950s-60s, was published posthumously as *America's Sporting Heritage, 1850-1950* (Reading, Mass., 1974). The state-of-the-art in business and technological history during the period was presented by Thomas C. Cochran and William Miller in *The Age of Enterprise: A Social History of Industrial America* (New York, 1942) and Samuel P. Hays in *The Response to Industrialism, 1885-1914* (Chicago, 1957). See John Higham's critique of consensus historiography in "The Cult of the 'American Consensus,'" *Commentary* 27 (1959), 93-100. For a succinct review of the early American Studies movement, see Gene Wise, "Paradigm Dramas' in American Studies," *American Quarterly* 31 (1979), 293-307.

8. For a review of early American social history, see Oliver Zunz, "The Synthesis of Social Change: Reflections on American Social History," in Zunz, ed., *Re-living the Past: The Worlds of Social History* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1985), 53-114.

9. Two other noteworthy contributions to American sport history during the 1960s were Harold Seymour, *Baseball: The Early Years* (New York, 1960); and David Q. Voigt, *Baseball: From Gentlemen's Sport to the Commissioner System* (Norman, Okla., 1966).

10. Allen Guttman, *From Ritual to Record: The Nature of Modern Sports* (New York, 1978); Richard D. Brown, *Modernization: The Transformation of American Life, 1600-1865* (New York, 1976). Thomas Bender explores the changing structure and meaning of community (in terms of the tensions between *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft*) in his elegant, concise *Community and Social Change in America* (Baltimore, 1978). For a valuable overview of Guttman's work, see William J. Baker, "Touching All the Bases: The Record and Ritual of Allen Guttman," *International Journal of the History of Sport* 8 (1991), 408-16. Melvin Adelman uses modernization theory to explain the structures of nineteenth-century sport in New York in his fine monograph *A Sporting Time: New York City and the Rise of Modern Athletics, 1820-1870* (Urbana, Ill., 1986). Moreover, the leading survey texts by Baker, Richard Mandell, and Benjamin Rader are written in this modernist vein.

11. See Hardy's entry on sport in Peter Stearns, ed., *Encyclopedia of Social History* (New York, 1994), 714.

12. Even during its early days of popularity, modernization theory was rejected by many critics for its inherent Western ethnocentric vision of rationality

and progress, and for the ways in which social scientists used it to legitimize cold-war ideology and imperialism. Valuable critiques of modernization in historical scholarship can be found in Tony Judt, "A Clown in Regal Purple," *History Workshop* 7 (1979), 66-94; James A. Henretta, "Modernization: Toward a False Synthesis," *Reviews in American History* 5 (1977), 1293-1322; Christopher Lasch, "Just What the Doctor Ordered," *New York Review of Books*, December 1975; and Daniel Rodgers, "Tradition, Modernity, and the American Industrial Worker: Reflections and Critique," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 7 (1977), 655-81. For more sympathetic treatment of modernization's critics, see Peter N. Stearns, "Modernization and Social History: Some Suggestions and a Muted Cheer," *Journal of Social History* 14 (1980), 189-209, and Adelman, "Modernization and Its Critics," in Mary Kupiec Cayton et al., *The Encyclopedia of American Social History* (New York, 1993), vol. 1, 347-58.

13. Although Adelman recognized some of these deficiencies in his "Academicians and American Athletics" article, sociologist Richard Gruneau initiated the critique of modernization from a neo-Marxist perspective in "Freedom and Constraint: The Paradoxes of Play, Game and Sports," *Journal of Sport History* 7 (1980), 68-86, and later, in more developed form, in his "Modernization or Hegemony: Two Views of Sport and Social Development," in Jean Harvey and Hart Cantelon, eds., *Not Just a Game: Essays in Canadian Sport Sociology* (Ottawa, 1988), 9-32. See also Richard Holt, *Sport and the British: A Modern History* (Oxford, 1989), 357-67.

14. The most influential and synthetic work in U.S. history is Paul Boyer, *Urban Masses and Moral Order in America, 1820-1920* (Cambridge, Mass., 1978). For a perceptive, trenchant critique of the "social control" thesis, see Gareth Stedman Jones, "Class Expression Versus Social Control: A Critique of Recent Trends in the Social History of Leisure," *History Workshop* 4 (1977), 162-70.

Key works in American sport history within this approach include Benjamin G. Rader, "The Quest for Subcommunities and the Rise of American Sport," *American Quarterly* 29 (1977), 355-69; Cary Goodman, *Choosing Sides: Playgrounds and Street Life on the Lower East Side* (New York, 1979); Steven A. Riess, *Touching Base: Professional Baseball and American Culture in the Progressive Period* (Westport, Conn., 1980); Dominick Cavallo, *Muscles and Morals: Organized Playgrounds and Urban Reform, 1880-1920* (Philadelphia, 1981); Rader, *American Sports: From the Age of Folk Games to the Age of Spectators* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1983); and Riess, *City Games: The Evolution of American Urban Society and the Rise of Sports* (Urbana, Ill., 1989). For critical reviews of this literature, see Stephen Hardy and Alan Ingham, "Games, Structures and Agency: Historians on the American Play Movement," *Journal of Social History* 17 (1983), 285-302, and Hardy, "Sport in Urbanizing America: An Historical Review," *Journal of Urban History* (1996), forthcoming.

15. The preliminary contours of this interpretation are sketched by Gruneau in "Power and Play in Canadian Social Development," *Working Papers in the Sociological Study of Sports and Leisure* (Kingston, Ont., 1979); Rob Beamish, "Sport and

the Logic of Capitalism," in Gruneau and Cantelon, eds., *Sport, Culture and the Modern State* (Toronto, 1982); and Gruneau, *Sport, Class and Social Development* (Amherst, Mass., 1983). For a perspective review of these early forays, see Hardy and Ingham, "Sport, Structuration and Hegemony," *Theory, Culture and Society* 2 (1984), esp. 86-88.

16. See Richard Butsch, ed., *For Fun and Profit: The Transformation of Leisure into Consumption* (Philadelphia, 1990), 3-27, for a review of this literature. Certainly Elliott Gorn's *The Marley Art: Bare-Knuckle Prize Fighting in America* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1986) and Warren Goldstein's *Playing for Keeps: An Early History of Baseball* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1989) are written with an eye on the cultural-studies approach—a point both authors make in their recent collaboration *A Brief History of American Sports*. British sociologist John Hargreaves has produced the only monograph-length study that synthesizes the new approaches to sport and leisure along with the classic Marxist works by Antonio Gramsci and Raymond Williams in *Sport, Power and Culture: A Social and Historical Analysis of Popular Sports in Britain* (New York, 1986).

17. This approach continues to dominate the field of sport sociology. David L. Andrews and John W. Loy document the intersection of sport and cultural studies in "British Cultural Studies and Sport: Past Encounters and Future Possibilities," *Quest* 45 (1993), 255-76.

18. Hardy, "Sport," in Stearns, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Social History*, 715.

19. Hardy, "Entrepreneurs, Structures, and the Sportgeist: Old Tensions in a Modern Industry," in Donald G. Kyle and Gary Stark, eds., *Essays in Sport History and Sport Mythology* (College Station, Tex., 1990).

20. Adelman, *Journal of Sport History* 20 (1993), 197; Hardy, "Sport," 714; Hardy and Ingham, "Sports Studies Through the Lens of Raymond Williams," in Ingham and John W. Loy, eds., *Sport in Social Development: Traditions, Transitions, and Transformations* (Champaign, Ill., 1993), 15; and Richard Holt, *Sport and the British: A Modern History* (Oxford, 1989), 367.

21. This passage comes from my review of Gorn and Goldstein's *A Brief History of American Sports* in the *Canadian Journal of History of Sport* 25 (December 1994), 75.

22. Ibid.; Quotes are from Gorn and Goldstein, *A Brief History of American Sports*, 142, 145. See the second half of this book (written principally by Goldstein) for the twentieth-century developments.

23. See also Ted Vincent, *Mudville's Revenge: The Rise and Fall of American Sport* (New York, 1981); Adelman, *A Sporting Time*, 121-83; Steven M. Gelber, "Working at Playing: The Culture of the Work Place and the Rise of Baseball," *Journal of Social History* 16 (1983), 3-22; and Adelman, "Baseball, Business and the Workplace: Gelber's Thesis Reexamined," *Journal of Social History* 23 (1989), 285-300. The best synthesis of the literature pertaining to the 19th-century American workplace is Bruce Laurie, *Artisans into Workers: Labor in Nineteenth-Century America* (New York, 1989).

24. See Pope, *Patriotic Games: Sporting Traditions in the American Imagination, 1876-1926* (New York, 1996). For international perspectives on this process, see Eric Hobsbawm, "Introduction: Inventing Traditions" and "Mass Producing Traditions, 1870-1914," in Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, eds., *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge, 1983); Richard Holt, *Sport and the British: A Modern History* (Oxford, 1989), 203-79; and David L. Andrews and Jeremy W. Howell, "Transforming into a Tradition: Rugby and the Making of Imperial Wales, 1890-1914," in Ingham and Loy, eds., *Sport in Social Development*, 77-96.

25. See Dyreson, *Inventing the Sporting Republic: American Sport, Political Culture, and the Olympic Experience, 1877-1919* (Urbana, Ill., forthcoming); and Michael Oriard, *Sporting with the Gods: The Rhetoric of Play and Game in American Culture* (Cambridge, Mass., 1991).

26. Andrew Ross, *No Respect: Intellectuals and Popular Culture* (New York, 1989), 5. See also Gramsci's discussion of intellectuals in Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Smith, eds., *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci* (New York, 1971), esp. 3-23.

27. For the most comprehensive bibliography, see Patricia A. Vertinsky, comp., "Sport History and Gender Relations, 1883-1993: Bibliography," in *Journal of Sport History* 21 (1994), 25-58.

28. For an earlier review of the literature, see Nancy Struna, "Beyond Mapping Experience: The Need for Understanding in the History of American Sporting Women," *Journal of Sport History* 11 (1984), 120-33; and Vertinsky, "Gender Relations, Women's History and Sport History: A Decade of Changing Enquiry, 1983-1993," *Journal of Sport History* 21 (1994), 6.

29. Jennifer Hargreaves, "Gender on the Sports Agenda," *International Review of the Sociology of Sport* 25 (1990), 287-308; quote, 298. Most of the critical assessments of sport and feminism have resided among sociologists, not historians. See, for instance, M. Talbot, "Understanding the Relationships between Women and Sport: The Contributions of British Feminist Approaches in Leisure and Cultural Studies," *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 23 (1988), 31-40; Rosemary Deem, "Together We Stand, Divided We Fall: Social Criticism and the Sociology of Sport and Leisure," *Sociology of Sport Journal* 5 (1988), 341-54, and the useful contributions by Catriona Parratt, Margaret Costa, Sharon Guthrie, Susan Birrell, and Martha Therberge in Costa and Guthrie, eds., *Women and Sport: Interdisciplinary Perspectives* (Champaign, Ill., 1994).

With the exception of Susan Cahn's *Coming on Strong: Gender and Sexuality in 20th-Century Women's Sport* (New York, 1994), women sport historians have not published their work in monograph form. The best recent collection of essays can be found in J. A. Mangan and Roberta Park, eds., *From "Fair Sex" to Feminism: Sport and the Socialization of Women in the Industrial and Post-Industrial Eras* (London, 1987). Valuable insights can be found in Allen Guttmann's *Women's Sport: A*

History (New York, 1991), the only recent transcultural and historical overview; also see the historical essays by Struna, Vertinsky, and Joan Hult in Costa and Guthrie, eds., *Women and Sport*.

American historians might incorporate some of the methods, sources, and questions pursued by Kathleen McCrone in *Playing the Game: Sport and the Physical Emancipation of English Women, 1870-1914* (Lexington, Ky., 1988), which explores one of the key problems with much of the past decade's research—the almost-complete focus on middle-class women. Studies of working-class women are nearly nonexistent. See Gerald R. Gems, "Working-Class Women and Sport: An Untold Story," *Women in Sport & Physical Activity Journal* 2 (1993), 17-30.

30. For an overview of the social history of American masculinity, see Mark C. Carnes and Clyde Griffen, eds., *Meanings of Manhood: Constructions of Masculinity in Victorian America* (Chicago, 1990). See also Michael S. Kimmel, "Baseball and the Reconstitution of American Masculinity, 1880-1920," in Michael A. Messner and Donald Sabo, eds., *Sport, Men, and the Gender Order: Critical Feminist Perspectives* (Champaign, Ill., 1990), 55-65; and Bruce Kidd, "Sport and Masculinity," in Michael Kaufman, ed., *Beyond Patriarchy: Essays by Men on Pleasure, Power, and Change* (New York, 1987), 250-65.

31. Donald Mrozek, *Sport and American Mentality, 1880-1920* (Knoxville, Tenn., 1983), 136-38.

32. The most popular early team sport was basketball. See Vincent, *Mudville's Revenge*, 310-24; Joan S. Hult and Marianna Trekel, eds., *A Century of Women's Basketball: From Frailty to Final Four* (Reston, Va., 1991); Allison Heisch, "Ruling Women Out," *Women's Review of Books* 7 (1990), 23-24. Harold Seymour includes valuable documentation of women's baseball in Harold Seymour, *Baseball: The People's Game* (New York, 1991), 443-527.

33. In addition to his contribution in this volume, see Mrozek's chapter "From 'Swooning Damsel' to Sportswoman: The Role of Women as a Constituency in Sport," in *Sport and American Mentality*, 136-58.

34. Given the "new perspectives" theme of this volume, I agree with Adelman that the time has come for Guttmann to stop raising the specter of a now-questioned neo-Marxist vision to serve as his convenient foil. Guttmann must come to terms with the burgeoning, sophisticated leftist literature that derives from Marxism. See Adelman's review of Kyle and Stark, eds., *Essays on Sport History and Sport Mythology* in the *Journal of Sport History* 20 (1993), 192-97. For more on the importance of the body, see John W. Loy et al., "The Body in Culture and Sport," *Sport Science Review* 2 (1993), 69-91; M. Therberge, "Reflections on the Body in the Sociology of Sport," *Quest* 43 (1991), 123-34; and the contributions in Costa and Guthrie, eds., *Women and Sport*.

35. Steven A. Riess, "From Pitch to Putt: Sport and Class in Anglo-American Sport," *Journal of Sport History* 21 (1994), 138-84.

36. Elliott J. Gorn and Michael Oriard, "Taking Sports Seriously," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, March 24, 1995, A52. See also Raymond Williams, "The Uses of Cultural Theory," *New Left Review* 158 (1986), 19-31; Chandra Mukerji and Michael Schudson, eds., *Rethinking Popular Culture: Contemporary Perspectives in Cultural Studies* (Berkeley, 1991); and Michael Denning, "The Academic Left and the Rise of Cultural Studies," *Radical History Review* 54 (1992), 21-47. Gorn and Oriard wonder, for instance, "Where is there a cultural activity more freighted with constructions of masculinity than football, more deeply inscribed with race than boxing, more tied in the public mind to the hopes and hopelessness of inner-city youths than basketball?" For more on this evolving paradigm, see John Clarke and Chas Critcher, *The Devil Makes Work: Leisure in Capitalist Britain* (Urbana, Ill., 1985), 226-27; Deem, "Together We Stand, Divided We Fall"; and Steven W. Pope, "Negotiating the 'Folk Highway' of the Nation: Sport, Public Culture and American Identity, 1870-1940," *Journal of Social History* 27 (1993), 183-85. For a review of the cultural-studies approach as it has been integrated by mostly sociologists, see Andrews and Loy, "British Cultural Studies and Sport: Past Encounters and Future Possibilities," *Quest* 45 (1993), 255-76.

37. Riess, "From Pitch to Putt," 168.

38. *Ibid.*, 182.

39. Although several fine case studies exist, the literature pertaining to sport and working-class culture has not been adequately synthesized into a monograph-length study. Patrick B. Miller has recently reviewed several important issues and the corresponding literature in "Homo Faber-Homo Ludens: Sport History and the Working Class," *International Labor and Working-Class History* 44 (1993), 79-94. Other recent valuable contributions include Hiroko Tsuchiya, "The Making of Hard-Playing Americans: The Legitimation of Working-Class Leisure" (Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1986); Harold Seymour, *Baseball: The People's Game* (New York, 1990), 213-57; and Riess, "Professional Sports As an Avenue of Social Mobility in America: Some Myths and Realities," in Kyle and Stark, eds., *Essays on Sport History and Sport Mythology*, 83-117. Such a project might be fruitfully modeled along the lines of the essays in Richard Holt, ed., *Sport and the Working Class in Modern Britain* (Manchester, 1990); Richard Gruneau, ed., *Popular Cultures and Political Practices* (Toronto, 1988); Stephen G. Jones, *Sport, Politics and the Working Class: Organized Labour and Sport in Inter-War Britain* (Manchester, 1988); Alan Metcalfe, *Canada Learns to Play: The Emergence of Organized Sport, 1807-1914* (Toronto, 1987); and Gruneau, *Class, Sport and Social Development*.

40. For an interesting theoretical discussion see Pierre Bordieu, "Sport and Social Class," *Social Science Information* 17 (1978), 819-40.

41. Mark Naison, "Lefties & Righties: The Communist Party and Sports During the Great Depression," *Radical America* 13 (1979), 47-59. Workers' sport

movements existed throughout Europe during the 1920s and 1930s. See Robert F. Wheeler, "Organized Sport and Organized Labour," *Journal of Contemporary History* 13 (1978), 191–210; David A. Steinberg, "The Workers' Sport Internationalists, 1920–28," *Journal of Contemporary History* 13 (1978), 233–51; John Hoberman, *Sport and Political Ideology* (Austin, Tex., 1984), 177–89; and Jones, *Sport, Politics and the Working Class*.

42. Works on immigrants and sport include Gerald Gems, "Sport and Cultural Formation in Chicago, 1890–1940," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Maryland, 1989); Gems, "Not Just a Game," *Chicago History* 17 (1989), 4–21; Roy Rosenzweig, *Eight Hours for What We Will* (New York, 1983); Rader, "The Quest for Subcommunities"; Gerald Redmond, *The Caledonian Games in 19th-Century America* (Rutherford, N.J., 1971); Hardy, *How Boston Played*; Vincent, *Mudville's Revenge*; Michael T. Isenberg, *John L. Sullivan and His America* (Urbana, Ill., 1988); Roberta Park, "German Associational and Sporting Life in the Greater San Francisco Bay Area, 1850–1900," *Journal of the West* 26 (1987), 47–64; Ralf Wagner, "Turner Societies and the Socialist Tradition," in Harmut Keil, ed., *German Workers' Culture in the United States, 1850–1920* (Washington, D.C., 1988); Gary Ross Mormino, "The Playing Fields of St. Louis: Italian Immigrants and Sport, 1925–1941," *Journal of Sport History* 9 (1982), 5–16; and Richard Sorrell, "Sports and Franco-Americans in Woonsocket, 1870–1930," *Rhode Island History* 31 (1972), 117–26.

43. Levine's quote comes from the introduction to his *Ellis Island to Ebbets Field: Sport and the American Jewish Experience* (New York, 1992), 7, from which his contribution to this volume is excerpted. See also Riess, "The Jewish-American Boxing Experience, 1890–1940," *American Jewish History* 74 (1985), 223–54.

44. Nobody has yet given historical shape to the uneven pattern of conflict and accommodation that produced the marriage of religion and sport. See Michael Novak, *The Joy of Sports: End Zones, Bases, Baskets, Balls, and the Consecration of the American Spirit* (New York, 1976); Shirl Hoffman, ed., *Sport and Religion* (Champaign, Ill., 1992); and William J. Baker, *Washed in the Blood: Religion and the Rise of Sport* (New York, forthcoming).

45. Sammons, "'Race' and Sport: A Critical, Historical Examination," *Journal of Sport History* 21 (1994), 203–78; his critique of my review of John M. Carroll's *Fritz Pollard: Pioneer in Racial Advancement* (*Journal of Sport History* 19, 1992, 266–68) appears on pp. 253–54; his quotes included above are on pp. 254, 255 of that essay.

46. Lawrence Levine, *Black Culture and Black Consciousness: Afro-American Folk Thought from Slavery to Freedom* (New York, 1977); Eugene Genovese, *Roll, Jordan, Roll: The World the Slaves Made* (New York, 1974); Leon Litwack, *Been in the Storm So Long: The Aftermath of Slavery* (New York, 1979); Herbert Gutman, *The Black Family in Slavery and Freedom* (New York, 1976); Roger Abrahams, *Singing the Master: The Emergence of African-American Culture in the Plantation South* (New York, 1992); Robin Kelley, "'We Are Not What We Seem': Rethinking Black Working-

Class Opposition in the Jim Crow South," *Journal of American History* 80 (1993), 75–112; and Kelley, *Race Rebels: Culture, Politics, and the Black Working Class* (New York, 1994).

For recent surveys of the social history of African-Americans, see the Daniel C. Littlefield and Quintard Taylor contributions in Cayton et al., *Encyclopedia of American Social History*, 811–54; and Darlene Clark Hine, ed., *The State of Afro-American History: Past, Present, and Future* (Baton Rouge, 1986).

47. George, *Elevating the Game: Black Men and Basketball* (New York, 1992). Also see Jeff Grenfield, "The Black and White Truth About Basketball," *Esquire*, October, 1975, 170–71, 248; David Leviathan, "The Evolution and Commodification of Black Basketball Style," *Radical History Review* 55 (1993), 154–64; Ronald Rodano, "Jazz, Modernism, and the Black Creative Tradition," *Reviews in American History* 21 (1993), 671–78; and compare with Burton Perret's *The Creation of Jazz: Music, Race, and Culture in Urban America* (Urbana, Ill., 1992).

48. Riess, *City Games*, 93–123.

49. Dominic Capeci and Martha Wilkerson, "Multifarious Hero: Joe Louis, American Society and Race Relations During World Crisis, 1935–1945," *Journal of Sport History* 10 (Winter 1983), 5–25.

50. Fox, *Big Leagues*, 316, 347.

51. See Phillip M. Hoose, *Necessities: Racial Barriers in American Sports* (New York, 1989).

52. Harvey Green, *Fit for America: Health, Fitness, Sport and American Culture* (Baltimore, 1986); Dyreson, "The Emergence of Consumer Culture and the Transformation of Physical Culture: American Sport in the 1920s," *Journal of Sport History* 16 (1989); and Hardy, "'Adopted by All the Leading Clubs': Sporting Goods and the Shaping of Leisure, 1800–1900," in Butsch, ed., *For Fun and Profit*, 71–101.

53. On sports journalism, see Betts, *The American Sporting Heritage*; Oriard, *Reading Football*; and Baker, "Press Games: Sportswriters and the Making of American Football," *Reviews in American History* 22 (1994), 530–37. Patrick Trimble analyzes early sports films in "Babe Ruth: The Media Construction of a 1920s Personality," in Pope and R. Moss, eds., "Sport and Leisure in North America," *Colby Quarterly* (special issue), spring 1996, forthcoming.

54. On television and sport, see Benjamin Rader, *In Its Own Image: How Television Has Transformed Sports* (New York, 1984); Joan Chandler, *Television and National Sport: The United States and Britain* (Urbana, Ill., 1988); Ron Powers, *Supertube: The Rise of Television Sports* (New York, 1984); Jim Spence and Dave Diles, *Up Close and Personal: The Inside Story of Network Television Sports* (New York, 1988); and Randy Roberts and James Olson, *Winning Is the Only Thing: Sports in America Since 1945* (Baltimore, 1989), 95–131.

55. See Alfred Chandler, *The Visible Hand: The Managerial Revolution in American Business* (Cambridge, Mass., 1977).

56. The classic text of this development is Christopher Lasch, *The Culture of Narcissism: American Life in an Age of Diminishing Expectations* (New York, 1979); see also Jeremy Howell, "Meanings Go Mobile: Fitness, Health and the Quality of Life Debate in Contemporary America" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, 1990), and Howell, "A Revolution in Motion: Advertising and the Politics of Nostalgia," *Sociology of Sport Journal* 8 (1991), 258-71.

PART 1 NATIONAL CULTURE