

Contents

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	viii
<i>Notes on Contributors</i>	ix
Introduction: Sport and Social Identities	1
<i>Andrew Parker and John Harris</i>	
1 Identity, Recognition or Redistribution through Sport?	15
<i>Grant Jarvie</i>	
2 The Paralympic Movement: Identity and (Dis)ability	29
<i>P. David Howe</i>	
3 Professional Identities and the Practice of Sport Medicine in Canada: A Comparative Analysis of Two Sporting Contexts	49
<i>Nancy Theberge</i>	
4 Shaping up to the Men: (Re)creating Identities in Women's Football	70
<i>John Harris</i>	
5 Split between Nations: Tracking the Transnational Identity of Sydney Maree	90
<i>Theresa Walton</i>	
6 Sport, Religion and Social Identity: Physical Education and Muslim Independent Schooling	109
<i>Samaya Farooq and Andrew Parker</i>	
7 Sport and Metrosexual Identity: Sports Media and Emergent Sexualities	132
<i>Ben Clayton and John Harris</i>	
8 Sport, Celebrity and Identity: A Socio-legal Analysis	150
<i>Andrew Parker</i>	
Afterword: Sport and Social Identities Reconsidered	168
<i>John Harris and Andrew Parker</i>	
<i>Index</i>	178

1

Identity, Recognition or Redistribution through Sport?

Grant Jarvie

The concept of identity has had a long history in relation to sport. Formulaic constructions of identity have become a symptomatic feature of much of the present body of knowledge that informs our thinking about sport in society. Yet it is perhaps time to move on or at least think differently about a concept that has grown out of all proportion, is vaguely misrepresented and, at times, appears to be a signature phrase, or rationale in itself, for talking or writing about a wide range of topics. Subjects such as sport and nationalism, sport and religion, and sport and ethnicity, are but three areas where the term 'identity' is loosely used. While tending to assert a common essence to which special meanings are attached, the term identity is, in itself, weaker than terms such as 'recognition'. Is it not recognition in and through sport that so-called collective identities are seeking to establish, challenge and consolidate rather than just identity in itself?

There are numerous shades of the same basic argument about sport, namely that sport can provide the technical means for creating political and/or social identities and that these are thereby reflected or embedded within national and local cultural identities. This is often reinforced by suggesting that such political identities in sport can help to challenge a certain world order and allegedly prepare the way for democratization: cricket and the break from colonialism in the Caribbean during the 1960s; table tennis diplomacy in China in the early 1970s; rugby union and soccer in apartheid South Africa up until the early 1990s, and the significance of athletics and, in particular, middle-distance running in Kenya and Ethiopia today, are all illustrative of this line of thought that sport has helped to pave the way for forms of democratization or liberalism. The term 'identity through sport' is often evoked to depict a strong national identity but in reality it often obscures a wide range of questions

(e.g. scientific, political and sometimes religious). It is tempting to suggest that the concept of identity as it is used in writings about sport seems particularly well suited to function as an ostensive screen, camouflaging vagueness of content in a blaze of expression. If identity is a signifier that carries with it histories of sport or people or nation, then it is important not to conflate or camouflage the complexity of sport through the use of stereotypes or plastic words such as 'identity'. It certainly must not be confused with the struggle for recognition that is ongoing through sport.

Contemporary struggles for recognition in and through sport frequently take on the guise of particular forms of social identity. This is often aimed at championing the cause for a particular social difference or form of representation from disenfranchised or less powerful sections of sport. Such approaches to sport and identity might be viewed in the first instance to be misconceived on at least three accounts: (i) the failure to foster authentic collective identities across differences has tended to enforce separatism, conformism and intolerance; (ii) the struggle for identity in and through sport has tended to replace struggles for economic justice and the redistribution of wealth which often condemns different sporting groups to some grave injustices, and (iii) the failure to realize that, while levels of social inequality between and within certain groups maybe decreasing, levels of poverty in certain places remain on the increase. Is not the primary motivation for many Kenyan and Ethiopian runners to run not for the sake of identity but rather to gain recognition and, in many cases, capitalize upon the opportunity to escape poverty? The notion of identity through sport for identity's sake is not enough on its own and alternative forms of social thinking about the relationship between sport and identity, therefore, are urgently required.

Sport in the age of identity politics

The rise of identity politics and identity history in sport forms a certain kind of logic that has been attractive to writers who have sought to comment upon changes in sport, culture and society in the post-1980s period, yet few writers have offered an analysis of sport during what Balakrishnan (2002) critically labels the age of identity, and what Woodward (2002) refers to as the crisis of identity. The march towards global sport has meant that the processes associated with globalization have placed questions of identity centre stage in terms of explaining the importance

of sport to those countries. The break-up of the former USSR and other European countries such as the former Yugoslavia have highlighted the importance of identity in and through sport. Many nationalist movements during the later part of the twentieth century fought to develop and sustain forms of identity, and sport has become one of the very visible forums for the expression of such imagined communities, whether they be nationalist in orientation or not.

The rise of identity politics in sport is a mode of logic, a badge of belonging, and a claim to insurgency. It operates across states but also through the personal in the sense that the calls for identity have come from a myriad of traditionally marginalized groups. Identity politics presents itself as a way of escaping anonymity in an individualized, impersonal world in that groups, countries and individuals are searching for answers to a cluster of questions such as: Who am I? Who is like me? Whom can I trust and where do I belong? Identity politics in sport slides toward an uncritical acceptance of the premise that social groups have essential identities which, if enforced, have the potential to forge divisions, separation, and fragmentation. In essence all identity politics involves a search for community, a quest for belonging and recognition. The problem with this, and the point I wish to emphasize, is that the thickening of identity politics through sport is inseparable from the fragmentation of sport as different groups assert their identity. In large measure the hypothetical challenge to sport is that while being the focus for a myriad of identities, personal politics as well as national identities, something at the centre needs to hold sport together. The idea of commonality or social sport and the quest for community runs the risk of being replaced by separate assertions of fundamental identities that can only lead to fragmentation.

Very rarely does one find carefully crafted accounts of identity politics in sport which empirically substantiate different forms of identity construction while, at the same time, confirming what Naomi Klein (2001) has called 'reclaiming the commons'. What this means is the formulation of a political framework that can take on corporate power and control and empower local organization in sport while continuing to value human diversity and recognition. There are concerns about all kinds of prosaic issues in sport in the twenty-first century to the extent that sport at times is taken out of its own hands and into the law courts or the boardrooms of the major global companies. There is little space here for local decisions or concerns about human diversity. The women's marathon at the 2004 Olympic Games in Athens was run at a time to suit American television, not the athletes or the local organizers of the

games. The goal for sport should not be better far-away rules or forms of governance by faceless rulers, but close-up democracy on the ground.

One of the few carefully crafted studies of human diversity and identities in sport which respects the common ground is Jennifer Hargreaves's (2000) account of the politics of difference and identity among sporting heroines. This text does not lose sight of the common ground of social relations, different social divisions and women's sporting experiences across the globe. At the same time, the stories of sport that are told illuminate exclusion, difference and identity in sport as experienced by black women in South Africa, Muslim women in the Middle East, Aboriginal women in Australia and Canada, and lesbian and disabled women. All of these accounts of heroines in sport have contributed to knowing more about the lives of ordinary women (many of whom are on the margins of mainstream sport) and how their own personal and group identities tell us something about who they are and those to whom they belong and whom they trust. Hargreaves's account is all the more powerful because it avoids the danger of presenting a fragmented list of identity politics in sport which are unconnected and separated from the common ground of social relations, power and human diversity in sport. It is very much a social account of sport that champions the cause of the public intellectual making a difference, struggling for a new world order, and recognizing that identities in sport are not fixed but are subject to continuous interpretation and reinterpretation. This account of the identities of sporting heroines avoids the temptation of so many 1970s and 1980s feminist accounts of sport which proclaimed and promoted the alter ego of white middle-class women.

The usual contemporary approach to identity politics in sport tends to start from the idea that identity is constructed dialogically (Fraser, 2000). The proposition is that identity is forged by virtue of the fact that one becomes an individual subject only by recognizing, and being recognized by, another subject or group. Recognition is seen as being essential to developing a sense of self, and being misrecognized involves suffering a sense of distortion of one's relation to one's self and consequently feeling an injured sense of identity. This logic is transferred on to the cultural and political terrain. As a result of repeated encounters with the stigmatizing gaze and as a consequence of the internalizing of negative self-images or group images, the development of a healthy cultural identity is affected. Within this perspective, the politics of recognition through sport is mobilized as a potential strategy in the repair of self-dislocation or group dislocation by affirmative action that challenges derogatory or demeaning pictures of the group. The argument

is that members of misrecognized groups, or groups suffering from a lack of identity, can jettison such images in favour of self-representations of their own making and collectively produce a self-affirming culture of recognition. Add to this public assertion and the gaining of respect and esteem from society at large and a culture of distorted misrecognition changes to being one of positive recognition.

This model of how identity politics in sport may operate contains some genuine insights into the effects and practice of racism, sexism, colonization, nationalism, imperialism and other forms of identity politics. Yet the model is theoretically and politically problematic in that such an approach leads to both the reification of group identity and the displacement of resource distribution. The problems of displacement and the reification of social and political identities in sport are serious insofar as the politics of recognition displaces the politics of redistribution and may actually promote inequality. In the 1970s and 1980s the identity politics of sport was imbued with emancipatory promise and potential, and yet at the turn of the century it has been transformed into a reified school of thought that recognizes identity as an end in itself rather than recognition accompanied by resource redistribution. Those who promote identity politics in sport, as opposed to the politics of recognition, run the risk of encouraging separatism, intolerance, chauvinism, authoritarianism and forms of fundamentalism. This then is the problem of reification, which will be discussed further in this chapter. What is being argued here is the need to develop accounts of recognition which can accommodate the full complexity of social identities instead of promoting reification and separatism. This means developing accounts of recognition in sport that allow for issues of redistribution rather than displacing or undermining such concerns in relation to sport, culture and society.

By way of summary, it might be suggested that some or all of the following arguments have been utilized in an examination of identity politics in sport: (i) essentialist arguments view identity in sport as fixed and unchanging; (ii) sporting identities are linked to claims about culture, self and/or nature; (iii) sporting identity is relational and differences are established by symbolic marking in and around sport, i.e. sport contributes to both the social and the symbolic process involved in the forging of identities; (iv) sport simply reflects the changes that have accompanied the age of identity and, in this sense, identity in sport may refer to a phase or period in history; (v) identity politics in sport is reproduced or maintained through changing social and material conditions; (vi) identity in sport involves classifying people into different

permutations of us and them; (vii) identity in sport involves both the promotion and obscuring of certain differences; (viii) identities in sport are not unified and contradictions within them involve negotiation; (ix) identity politics in sport, when reified, may lead to forms of fundamentalism, and (x) the quest for identity through sport involves the quest for recognition.

Bodies, identities and differences

The study of the body is a further area of work that offers endless possibilities and points of entry and exit from historical, geographical and contemporary examinations of sporting identities and differences. Even the most cursory glance at the critical academic literature on sport and related activities such as exercise, physical culture and health provides the reader with an array of bodies: the athletic body, the sporting body, the fascist body, the racialized body, the black body, the oriental body, the engendered body, the civilized body, the body-builder, the female body, the male body, gay and lesbian bodies, disabled bodies, the body habitus and the African body, all of which have been invested in as a basis for telling stories about different identities, differences and representations. The rise of identity politics, and the place of the body and sport within what Balakrishnan (2002) refers to as the age of identity, may have increased our understanding of embodiment in some societies but such an approach also contains certain risks.

The remainder of this chapter limits itself to commenting upon three central ideas in this field, hence the discussions that follow are necessarily succinct. The first of these is the notion of identities in relation to the body and sport. Although the term 'identity' has a long history deriving from the Latin root *idem* implying sameness and continuity, it was not until the twentieth century that the term came into popular usage. The use of the term in relation to body, sport and society has taken many forms, all of which have attempted to reinforce and challenge *essentialist* understandings of sport, body and society. Essentialism refers to that which is a core identity or identities after everything else has been peeled away and the extent to which sport and body cultures reproduce and reinforce essential identities. This historical contribution has highlighted the invented or constructed character of identity associated with many sporting traditions and body styles. The historical approach, as with other approaches, views identity as essentialist but also *contingent* in that the identities are associated with body change over time and are therefore contingent upon particular histories. The psychodynamic

approach to identity, body and sport has attempted to answer the question, 'Who am I and to what extent are the sporting and bodily practices I am involved in a reflection of self in a psychodynamic sense?' The sociological approach to identity also has links to a theory of self in that a sociological tradition of identity theory has been linked to the symbolic interactionism associated with George Herbert Mead, Erving Goffman and Peter Berger. In this sense, body identities have been explained through the process of socialization, communication and body language. This process has attempted to reconcile the inner, subjective, creative, bodily 'I' with the outer, partly determined and objective 'me'. With respect to the sporting context, discussions of national identity have drawn upon the notion of sport helping to construct an imagined community, while developmental or process sociologists have asserted that sport and the body are but vehicles for an overall quest for identity.

The notion of *identity crisis* has been evoked on a number of occasions to imply that identity only really becomes an issue when a particular culture, social group or nation is facing a crisis of identity. The idea of the body or sport reflecting an identity crisis is problematic in that it reduces discussions of body identity to being simply reactionary rather than enabling. More importantly, the framing of debates about the body and/or sport in this way is not sensitive to particular identity crises unique to sport or body culture at a particular point in time. Did the impact of football hooliganism in the 1980s and 1990s, and beyond, pose a particular crisis of identity for English football, or was English football simply reacting to broader social and cultural forces? On the other hand, if sport is viewed as a key component for the expression of national identity, then the fragmentation of different parts of the world may pose a particular crisis of identity for particular body cultures at local, national and international levels. The notion of identity in crisis can contribute to an understanding of sport and body cultures in different parts of the world experiencing large-scale political upheaval or in places where new social forces attempt to dilute, replace or marginalize national identities. For example, to what extent have body cultures helped to reassert a new European identity that threatens national identities, or to what extent has sport reflected or enabled forms of reconciliation or a hardened militancy amongst various ethnic identities who were part of the former Yugoslavia? Thus, identities that are forged through sport, body and society may matter more if there is a real or perceived crisis of identity, globally, locally, personally and politically.

The second concept that I wish to deal with here is that of *difference* in relation to the body and sport. The marking of difference is crucial to

the construction of identities in sport, body and society. Identities tend to be formed in relation to other identities and thus essential differences are used to signify or represent them. At its simplest this unsatisfactorily lends itself to binary forms of classification such as: 'us and them'; 'insider and outsider'; 'women and men'; 'black and white'; 'Arab and Jew'; 'Protestant and Catholic'; 'Serb and Croat'. All of the aforementioned depend upon differences marking particular forms of identity that, in turn, symbolize or represent forms of social exclusion and political difference. The notion of difference is integral to the understanding, the construction and, in some cases, the invention of identities, all of which tend to be used to legitimate a particular social order or ways of being. More positively, the recognition/acceptance of change and differences involving the body and sport may be seen as progressive in that it signifies an acceptance of a rich, diverse, perhaps previously excluded set of body cultures such as gay and lesbian sporting culture; a sporting Olympiad rather than the able and disabled Olympics; and a secure place for Muslim Pakistani women in sociological accounts of sport and body cultures rather than a predominance of white feminist accounts of sport and the body. In this sense differences in and between sport and body cultures and identities may be viewed as a celebration of bodily diversity, heterogeneity and hybridity. Yet the notion of identity is not the same as difference in that one helps in the construction and legitimation of the other.

The final concept that I wish to comment upon here is that of *representation* in relation to the body and sport. Representation refers to the ways in which images and texts such as articles, books and radio or television programmes reconstruct an account of sport, body and society. Thus, a painting, a photograph or a written text about sport and the body is never just about the actual sport or physical activity but is also about how the painting, the photograph or the written text has represented sport and the body. Writers about gender and the body argue that representation is continually creating, challenging, re-creating and endorsing stereotypical images, stories, and ideas about identity, sport and the body. The areas of historiography and representation are crucial to developing post-colonial accounts of the sporting body. The work of Bale (2000) and other geographers of sport, and Dimeo (2002) and other historians of sport, offer alternative epistemological systems or ways of thinking about the sporting body which dislocate Eurocentric or colonial sporting histories and geographies.

Representing accounts of sport identities and the body can never be a neutral activity. Critical representations of sport and the body attempt to

wrestle with and provide answers to questions such as: Who am I? What could I be? Who am I like and who do I want to be? Writers such as Bale and Dimeo could do a lot worse than take their lead from Edward Said (1993) who argued in *Culture and Imperialism* that studying the relationship between the West and its dominated cultural other is not just a way of understanding an unequal relationship between unequal stories but also a point of entry into studying the formation and meaning of Western cultural practices themselves. Thus, Said implied that the discrepancy of power between Western and Non-Western sport necessitates that any analysis of global, international or local sport must take such a disparity into account if we are accurately to understand sport, body and society in its totality rather than having an illusion of totality. It is worthwhile exploring the issue of other sporting bodies in more detail if for no other reason than that they have made a profound contribution to the story of sport, body and society. The politics of representation are such that all accounts of sport and the body that are promoted as authentic, valid and true need to be closely questioned in order to ascertain just exactly where the authority and coherence for such claims may be located.

From identity politics to recognition through sport

I have suggested here that those exploring identity politics in sport need to avoid decoupling the politics of identity in sport from social issues relating to the redistribution of wealth and power in sport. Identity in sport should not be viewed as an end in itself and, by the same token, it is not being suggested that recognition in sport can be remedied by the redistribution of resources. Properly conceived struggles for recognition in sport can assist in the redistribution of power and wealth and should be aimed not at a promotion of essential fundamentalism but at interaction and co-operation across gulfs of difference.

There is no neat theoretical model that can be used to resolve the dilemma of identity and recognition in sport. However, this dilemma can be softened in various ways by acknowledging in part that the status model at least continues to recognize that social justice and a redistribution of wealth provides a social framework for thinking about sport, culture and society. The status model recognizes that not all distributive injustices in sport can be overcome by recognition alone, but it at least leaves the door open for a politics of redistribution. Unlike the identity model in sport, the status model continues to strive to understand recognition alongside distribution. The status model of identity politics in sport works against tendencies to displace struggles for redistribution. It

recognizes that status subordination is often linked to distributive injustice and therefore notions of identity in sport would be closely aligned with notions of injustice and social change. The model also avoids the problem of reification of group identities because the status of individuals and subgroups within groups is part of the total pattern of recognition and social interaction. Thus, identity in sport can invoke notions of social and political solidarity without masking forms of authority and power within such a collective form of identity.

It is not unrealistic to see such issues being played out in the world of sport. Following the collapse of apartheid in South Africa in 1992, the chief executive of the country's newly formed Department of Sport and Recreation argued that sport and recreation in the new South Africa had to meet the needs of the people and the nation. Identity through sport in the new South Africa was not enough. Another question facing the Department of Sport and Recreation and the Government of South Africa was how to compensate their black athletes for the decades of injustice inflicted upon them as a result of apartheid policies. Speaking in Edinburgh in 1997, the department's chief executive asserted, 'From that premise of recognition of past injustices, we should be able to move forward to say: how then can we address and redress this legacy of denial and deprivation in sport for the majority of athletes in South Africa?' (Department of Sport and Recreation, 1997, p. 4). At the same time, it was suggested that sport in South Africa should be the concern not just of the Department of Sport and Recreation but also of the Supreme Council for Sport in Africa and the South Africa Truth and Reconciliation Commission. In this way sport in South Africa may be able to contribute to the renaissance of sport in Africa. It was this notion of sport in Africa that was behind Cape Town's (ultimately unsuccessful) bid to host the 2004 Olympic Games and the 2010 Football World Cup. Thus, as argued above, such an example can be viewed as being illustrative of the fact that identity in sport can invoke notions of social and political solidarity without masking forms of authority and power within such a collective form of identity. Clearly the initial phase of policy development in post-apartheid sport in South Africa practically illustrates that recognition in sport in the new South Africa was a collective effort but also that the international community should compensate South Africa for past injustices in some way, shape or form.

Today's struggles for recognition often assume the disguise of identity politics in sport. These are usually aimed at countering demeaning cultural representations of social, cultural, national or local groups in sport. The result of misrecognition in sport is that by emphasizing

differences the struggle for identity has enforced forms of separatism, conformism and intolerance and displaced struggles for economic justice with the formation of reified identities. What is required is not the rejection of the politics of recognition in sport but rather an alternative politics of recognition that can remedy misrecognition without fostering displacement and separatism or reification. The forgotten notion of status can provide a possible basis for examining recognition and struggles for redistribution with the help of sport. The status model of sport tends to reject the view that misrecognition is free-standing and accepts instead that status subordination is often linked to distributive justice. Identity in sport cannot be understood in isolation nor can recognition be abstracted from distribution.

Cultural recognition, then, should not displace socio-economic redistribution as the remedy for injustice in sport even in a post-socialist age (Mair, 2006; Therborn, 2007). It is possible to think of one world of sport with many worlds inside of that world of sport. The goal for sport should not be identity as the end game but a framework that is not fearful of close-up local democracy in sport and on the ground. Even the academic left in sport, the traditional guardians of social inequality, have lost interest in the commonalities that underpin differences and identities as if the logic of global sport has arrived in every corner of the globe. It has not, but to talk of identity in sport as if nothing else matters is to accept a zero-sum game that only serves to recognize and consolidate separatism and injustice in global sport.

From recognition to redistribution and social justice

It is perhaps necessary to leave sport for just a moment to emphasize the understanding and link between recognition, redistribution and social justice as a basis for thinking more widely about aspects of sport in society. Three different understandings of recognition are worth mentioning. The first of these is a holistic conception of culture in which recognition means a commitment to redistributive ambitions, which are often subsumed beneath weak forms of social democracy and social liberalism. The consequence for sport would be the need to embrace cultural diversity and identity as an authentic, liberal, moral imperative. The second understanding regards recognition as an on-going process and one that is integral to developing relations of political inclusiveness and a more democratic polity. The implications for sport are that recognition and the democratization of sport do not imply an end-game but are in fact part of the process that may contribute to a greater/lesser degree of recognition,

which may have the unpredictable effect of benefiting or disadvantaging rival groups in unforeseen ways. A final notion of recognition, and the one advocated in this chapter, is to view recognition as but one important dimension in the broader struggle for justice. It is not charity that is the hallmark of any resource that is redistributive but justice. Thus, recognition is closely tied to a relationship with recognition and justice.

Current normative understandings of what constitutes the politics of identity have their roots in earlier periods or debates. The national tradition in sports research is at times all-too-pervading and needs to be balanced by a more transnational or international approach to the importance of social identity, the belonging of individuals, freedoms and rights in and through sport. Today the relationship between identity, recognition and redistribution cries out for examination. The struggles over gender, religion and nationality that are embedded in sport makes the question of recognition impossible to ignore. References to difference and representation are often so intensely political that the question is likely to remain with sport for some time. At the same time the need for redistributive justice and sporting injustice has not disappeared. Economic inequalities in sport continue to grow, and neo-liberal forces promoting corporate globalization continue to brush aside the question of distributive justice in sport.

It is precisely this notion of the relationship between recognition, redistribution and justice that needs to be placed at the heart of the normative debate about social identity. That is to say, the tendency to date, and this is certainly true of much of the sports research in this area, has been to place too much of an emphasis on the notion of identity at the expense of the social. Research and teaching into identity and sport that reifies sporting identity (or identities) does little to determine or redress the cultural harm that is caused by reified models of identity. It is crucial that such representations promulgated as authentic or true accounts of identity in sport be questioned, their authority and coherence closely examined, and alternative and altogether more socially orientated models of intervention provided.

Conclusion: the challenge to global sport

The real challenge to global notions of sport in the twenty-first century is to take on board issues of recognition, redistribution and calls for social justice. Global sport, if nothing else, needs to be framed in terms of democracy, accountability, transparency, trust and justice. At first glance the notion of global sport would seem to provide possibilities and

opportunities for regulating sporting governance and finance to ensure a more equitable redistribution of sporting wealth. Any clear template for how sport in the world should be governed has not accompanied the transition towards a more global notion of sport. The governance of global sport is multilayered, complex, national, local and international but, amidst all of this, states, sporting agencies, the sports market, civil societies and governing bodies of sport, have suffered from shortfalls with respect to popular participation and access rates, consultation and debate, inclusion and representation, transparency and accountability. Forms of global sporting governance through market-driven channels would seem to imply deep inequalities and the rule of efficiency overriding democracy. Supra-state sports organizations would appear to suffer from severe democratic deficiencies. At the moment it is unclear whether and how democracy can be adequately realized in a more global sporting world. Above all, Western sport embedded within national and increasingly European sporting governance, as well as the continuing dominance of American sporting capital, seems incapable of showing the historical imagination needed to grasp the radical challenges facing world sport. If global sport means recognizing common situations, sharing a single world of sport, then the gaps between West and non-West, rich and poor, democratic and democratizing will need a different kind of consciousness.

Global sport cannot make a significant difference to globalization, but it can make a contribution. The enduring deep challenge for forms of global sporting democracy might involve some or all of the following ideas: (i) global sport must advocate a distinctive social agenda for sport; (ii) social democracy must become a distinctive feature of global sporting reform; (iii) global sporting organizations need to recognize that they have limited but significant powers to redistribute resource and wealth to where it is most needed; (iv) global sport should institutionalize a framework for mobility and migration and monitor child labour and the production of sporting merchandise; and (v) global sport should recognize that the national identity model of sport can be dangerous if it leads to forms of reification.

Perhaps the emergence of a more socially committed approach to sport has to start from actively acknowledging the huge differences in opportunities, wealth, democracy, sporting tastes and models of professional sport that divide the world. The deep challenge facing sport is to outline the mechanisms by which it can actively be seen to contribute to social and economic welfare on an international scale. At the international level, the more powerful sporting nations would seem to have the power

to enforce many of the rules and decisions affecting world sport and yet there are perhaps unprecedented opportunities in the twenty-first century in that sport is free from the Cold War politics of the past. Perhaps the most obvious and disturbing concern is the extent to which the core institutions of sport are trusted and sensitive to ways of addressing the interests of the majority in the non-Western world. The chief causes of inequality in sport remain two-fold: the transformation of global sport by financial capital and the displacement of democratic political power in sport by unaccountable market power. As has been argued throughout this chapter, identity or recognition through sport is enough. If the point of recognition is going to be a meaningful power for social good in the world of sport then those interested in covering the politics of identity in sport need to acknowledge that a redistribution of wealth is an important, if not crucial, aspect of any quest for recognition at any level. This is the challenge not just for sport but for those public intellectuals who also see sport as a power for social good.

References

- Balakrishnan, G. (2002) 'The age of identity'. *New Left Review*, 16, 130–142.
- Bale, J. (2000) 'The rhetoric of running: The representation of Kenyan body culture in the early twentieth century', in J. Hansen & N. Nielsen (eds) *Sports, Body and Health*. Odense: Odense University Press.
- Department of Sport and Recreation (1997) *Pulling it Together: Developing a Sport and Recreation Policy that Meets the Needs of the Nation*. Cape Town: South African Department of Sport and Recreation.
- Dimeo, P. (2002) 'Colonial bodies, colonial sport: "Martial" Punjabis, "effeminate" Bengalis and the development of Indian football'. *International Journal of the History of Sport*, 19, 72–90.
- Fraser, N. (2000) 'Re-thinking recognition?', *New Left Review*, 3, 107–120.
- Hargreaves, J. (2000) *Heroines of Sport: The Politics of Difference and Identity*. London: Routledge.
- Jarvie, G. (1997) 'Sport and social problems in unprincipled societies', in P. Nardis, A. Mussino & N. Porro (eds) *Sport, Social Problems, Social Movement*. Milan: Edizioni Seam.
- Klein, N. (2001) 'Reclaiming the commons', *New Left Review*, 19, 81–90.
- Mair, P. (2006) 'Ruling the void and the hollowing of Western democracy', *New Left Review*, 43, 25–51.
- Said, E. (1993) *Culture and Imperialism*. London: Chatto & Windus.
- Therborn, G. (2007) 'After dialectics – Radical social theory in a post-communist world', *New Left Review*, 43, 63–114.
- Woodward, K. (2002) *Identity and Difference*. London: Sage.

Index

- Abdelrahman, N., 112, 123
 Ahmed, A., 119, 172
 al-Qaradawy, Y., 110–12
 Amdur, M., 105
 Amin, A., 111
 Anderson, B., 94
 Anderson, E., 143
 Andrews, D., 36–7, 133, 151–2
 apartheid, and South Africa, 11, 15,
 24, 90–106, 171
 Appiah, A., 90–2, 94, 97–8, 103–4, 106
 Arnold, M., 97
- Back, L., 111
 Bagguley, P., 110
 Bale, J., 22–3, 39, 93
 Balakrishnan, G., 20
 Barnes, C., 33
 Barrett, L., 134
 Bauman, Z., 146
 Beck, R., 95
 Beckham, David, 132–3, 135, 138,
 141–5, 157, 173
 Bedford, David, 159–61
 Benn, T., 111
 Berila, B., 140
 Berger, P., 21
 Bernstein, A., 141
 Best, G., 82
 Bettig, R., 163
 Beverly-Smith, H., 161, 163
 Beynon, J., 139
 Biggs, C., 56
 Birrell, S., 90
 Bloom, M., 102
 Boorstin, D., 152
 Booth, D., 96, 98–9, 101, 171
 Bose, M., 171
 Botham, Ian, 159–61
 Bourdieu, P., 10, 29–32, 45
 Boyd, S., 153, 160
 Boyle, R., 151
 Braithwaite, J., 154
- Brohm, J-M., 161
 Burdsy, D., 172
 Burfoot, A., 96, 102, 105
 Burgess, R., 114
 Butler, J., 74–5, 140
 Butryn, T., 103–4
- Canada, 18, 49–68, 171
 and legal system, 155
 Canadian Academy of Sport Medicine
 (CASM), 54
 Carron, A., 125
 Carty, H., 153–5, 159, 163
 Cashmore, E., 5, 133, 138, 145, 151–2,
 161
 Castells, M., 72, 76
 cathexis, 139, 173
 Caudwell, J., 70–1, 74, 82
 celebrity, 83, 132–3, 142–57, 159–63,
 173
 Chappel, R., 34, 39
 Choi, P., 82
 Choudhuri, D., 140
 Church, Charlotte, 141, 147
 Clayton, B., 71, 81–4, 132–3, 135,
 137–8, 140–1, 143–6, 151
 Coad, D., 135, 146
 Coakley, J., 5
 Coburn, D., 56
 Cole, C., 36, 38
 Collins, D., 172
 Collins, S., 127
 Commonwealth, 100
 Commonwealth Games, 52, 66
 Connell, R., 76, 113, 123, 136–9, 146,
 173
 Cooley, C., 3
 Coombe, R., 161, 163
 Copyright, Designs and Patents Act
 (CPDA), 156
 Cornish, W., 154
 Coupland, J., 144–5
 Cox, B., 70–1, 82, 84

- crisis, identity, 16, 21
 and Islam, 120, 124–5
 Critcher, C., 73–4
- Dagkas, S., 111
 Daiman, S., 111
 Davies, G., 164
 Davies, P., 73–4
 Deal, M., 33
 Debord, G., 163
 Dennison, J., 104
 Dent, M., 51, 66–7
 Department of Sport and Recreation
 (South Africa), 24
 DePauw, K., 36, 39, 40, 42
 Devereux, John, 142
 Dimeo, P., 22–3, 172
 Douglas, M., 33
 Drahos, P., 153–4
 Dulin, D., 164
 Dunn, R., 112
 Dwyer, C., 110–11, 119
 Dyer, R., 163
 Dyreson, M., 93
- Edwards, T., 139
 England
 legal issues in, 150–64
 women's football in, 70–87
 Entertainment and Sports
 Programming Network
 (ESPN), 134, 136–7
 Esposito, J., 111, 119, 172
 Evans, A., 163
 Evans, J., 155
- Farnsworth, D., 153, 160
 Farooq, S., 127
 Favre, Brett, 137
 Fédération Internationale
 de Football Associations
 (FIFA), 86
 feminine, 83–4, 86, 136–7, 139–40,
 142, 146
 femininity, 82–4, 139
 feminism, 79, 85, 140
 Fleming, S., 172
 Foner, E., 103
- football, 10, 121, 123, 132–3, 135,
 138, 142–3
 hooliganism, 21
 legal issues in, 155–7
 women's, 70–86, 170
 World Cup, 24, 66
 Football Association (FA), 72, 74,
 84, 86
 Foucault, M., 10, 29, 35–8
 Fraser, N., 8, 18
 Freud, S., 139
- Gagne, Eric, 137
 Gamson, J., 163
 Gardiner, S., 163
 Gascoigne, Paul, 157
 Gavron, S., 36, 39
 gay, 20, 22, 92, 134, 140, 143
 Gerbner, G., 103
 Gibb, F., 164
 Giggs, Ryan, 157
 Giles, D., 163
 Gill, R., 144
 Gillon, D., 97
 Gilroy, S., 79, 84
 Giulianotti, R., 5
 globalization, 16, 26–7, 106
 Goffman, E., 21, 32–3, 43–4
 Goodey, J., 110
 Gough, Darren, 142
 grand narratives, 4, 6, 175
 Guelke, A., 171
 Guttman, L., 39
- habitus, 20, 29–32, 34, 38–42, 44–5
 Hackett, G., 102
 Hahn, H., 43
 Hall, D., 112
 Hall, S., 7, 33, 40, 112, 174–5
 Hammersley, M., 114
 Hargreaves, J., 7–8, 18, 74, 79, 81,
 83–4, 86, 113
 Harrington, D., 157, 163
 Harris, J., 71, 76, 79, 81–5, 132–3, 135,
 137–8, 140–1, 143–6, 151, 174
 Haynes, R., 151, 153–5, 159–61, 163–4
 Hennigan, J., 159, 164
 Henson, Gavin, 133, 140–6, 173

- Henwood, K., 144
 Hill, Damon, 157
 Hogan, J., 103
 Holt, R., 112
 Hondagneu-Sotelo, P., 139
 Hopkins, P., 110
 Horne, J., 5
 Howe, P. D., 30, 32–3, 36–7, 39, 41–2, 44
 Huddy, I., 12
 Hughes, B., 29
 Hughes, Mark, 157
 Humberstone, B., 82, 133, 143
 Hussain, Y., 110
- ideology, 37, 51, 85
 and Islam, 110–12
- International Amateur Athletic Federation (IAAF), 99–100
 International Olympic Committee (IOC), 39, 99–100
 International Organizations of Sport for the Disabled (IOSD), 36, 42
 International Paralympic Committee (IPC), 35–6, 39, 42–3
 Irvine, Eddie, 158–61, 164
 Ismond, P., 172
- Jackson, S., 151–2
 James, Edgerin, 137
 Jansen, S., 141
 Jarvie, G., 5, 7–8, 93–4, 98, 113, 171
 Jenkins, R., 1–4, 29, 109, 113, 127, 150
 Jones, C., 32, 36, 39, 42
 Jordan, T., 91, 102
- Kane, M., 138
 Keir, A., 163
 Khan, Oliver, 156
 Kidd, B., 112
 Kimmel, M., 140
 Kirk, D., 112, 117
 Klein, Naomi, 17
 Kotarba, J., 50
 Kournikova, Anna, 141
 Kunene, M., 95
- Lafrance, M., 134, 144
 Lapchick, R., 171
 Lauterbach, T., 154, 164
 Learmonth, A., 159, 163
 Leavy, J., 97, 100
 LeGrande, D., 86
 Lenskyj, H., 138
 lesbian, 18, 20, 22, 83
 Lewis, A., 157–9, 163–4
 Lewis, P., 111, 120
 Lieberman, J., 127
 Ljunberg, Freddie, 135
 Lock, M., 37
 Lopez, S., 70
 Lupton, D., 67
 Lyle, S., 137
- MacAloon, J., 112
 Mac an Ghaill, M., 81, 113
 MacClancy, J., 6–7, 113
 MacDonald, D., 112
 Macey, M., 110
 Madow, M., 161, 163
 Maguire, B., 172
 Maguire, J., 1, 5–7, 103–4, 106, 113
 Mair, P., 25
 Malcolm, D., 49–51, 54–5, 64–5, 67
 Malone, Karl, 137
 Mangan, J., 112
 Maree, Sydney, 11, 90–107, 171–2
 Markula, P., 34–6, 104
 Marshall, P., 163
 Martino, W., 113
- masculinity
 hegemonic, 70–1, 137–8, 143–4, 170
 and metrosexual, 132–46, 173
 and religion, 112, 118, 124
 and sport, 11, 70–1, 82, 112–3, 134, 173
- Mason, F., 39
 Matathia, L., 136
 Mathabane, M., 95
 Mawdudi, A., 110–11
 McCann, B., 34
 McDonald, M., 90
 McIntosh, M., 112, 122
 McLean, C., 144

- Mead, G. H., 3, 21
 media, 2, 11
 and disability, 41–3
 and metrosexual, 132–47, 172–3
 popularization of sport, 151–4
 portrayals of Muslim males, 109–10,
 119–21, 172
 regulation, 160, 162, 173
 and Sydney Maree, 90–107
 scrutiny and sport medicine, 53,
 55–6, 66
 Merleau-Ponty, M., 31
 Messner, M., 71, 74, 81, 112, 138–40,
 143
 Midgley, C., 84
 Miller, P., 98
 Miller, T., 140
 Milligan, A., 164
 Mills, C.W., 6, 72, 174–5
 Mills, J., 172
 Modano, Mike, 134
 Modood, T., 110
 Monaco, J., 163
 Morford, W., 112, 122
 muscular Christianity, 112
 Muslim, 11, 18, 22, 109–28, 172

 Nagel, M., 86
 Nalapat, A., 163
 nationalism, 8, 15, 19
 Neddham, F., 112
 Nielsen, J., 115

 Obel, C., 174
 Ofcom, 160
 Oliver, M., 29, 33, 41, 160
 Olympic Games, 22, 24, 50–3, 55–8,
 66, 102, 174
 Athens (2004), 17
 Seoul (1988), 103
 Vancouver (winter 2010), 68
 Olympic movement, 42
 O'Reilly, A., 136
 Ouzgane, L., 112

 Pallotta-Chiarolli, M., 113
 Paralympics, 10, 29–45, 169, 174
 Park, R., 37

 Parker, A., 71, 81–2, 113, 133, 137–8,
 145, 151–2, 161, 163
 Parker, G., 50–1
 Parry, J., 117
 Patterson, K., 29
 Payne, A., 100
 Pearce, M., 160
 postmodern, 139, 146, 152
 poststructuralist thinking, 29, 175
 Presley, Elvis, 157, 159, 164
 Pringle, R., 34–6
 Pronger, B., 38, 143

 Rafter, Patrick, 134
 Rail, G., 36, 38, 134, 144
 Rein, R., 105
 Renold, E., 81
 Richter, K., 34, 39
 Rigaeur, B., 161
 Roderick, M., 50–1
 Rodman, Dennis, 134, 144
 Rojek, C., 151–2
 Rooney, Wayne, 135
 Rowe, D., 151
 rugby union, 15, 80
 and celebrity, 140–2, 145
 Grand Slam, 146
 and sport medicine, 49–50, 54–5,
 64–5
 and Wales, 133, 140–2, 146
 Rutherford, M., 164
 Ruthven, M., 110

 Sabo, D., 112, 141
 Safai, P., 49
 Said, E., 23
 Salzman, M., 136, 147
 Sarwar, G., 113, 116
 Scanlan, G., 164
 Schacht, S., 138
 Schepher-Hughes, N., 37
 Scraton, S., 70
 Scruton, J., 39
 Seaman, David, 157
 Seymour, W., 39–41, 44
 Shah, H., 119, 172
 Shearer, Alan, 157
 Sherrill, C., 33, 40, 43

- Shilling, C., 32, 113, 124
 Shogun, D., 37
 Shore, C., 171
 Simpson, M., 133–4, 137, 139, 145–6
 Smart, B., 133, 151–2
 Smith, G., 95–102, 105
 Smith, R., 105
 Smith, S., 153, 155
 Smith-Maguire, J., 34, 36–8
 socialization, 3, 21, 38, 44, 80
 South Africa, 11, 15, 18, 24, 90–106,
 171
 and sporting boycott, 91, 98–100,
 171
 South African Council on Sport
 (SACOS), 99
 South African Non-Racial Olympic
 Committee (SANROC), 99
 Southall, R., 86
 Steinberg, D., 163
 Stevenson, C., 112
 superstar, 133, 142, 152, 173
 Swain, J., 81, 113, 124
- Tajfel, H., 2
 Taylor, J., 157, 159, 163–4
 Tessensohn, J., 163
 Theberge, N., 50–1, 56
 Therborn, G., 25
 Thomas, C., 41
 Thompson, L., 95–6, 101
 Thompson, S., 70–1, 82, 84
 Thornley, G., 145
 Tomlinson, A., 5, 12, 136, 147
 Tozer, M., 112
 Tsang, T., 174
 Turner, B., 37
 Turner, G., 152
 Turner, J., 2
 Turner, V., 40, 43
 Tyne, A., 38
- Union of European Football
 Associations (UEFA), 73
 United States of America (USA), 5, 11,
 86, 91–4, 100, 104, 147, 171
 legal issues, 155, 160, 173
 Track and Field Hall of Fame, 102
 Ussher, J., 75
- Vahrenwald, A., 163
 Vanlandewijck, Y., 34, 39
 Vaver, D., 160
 Vertovec, S., 111, 119
 Villanova University, 97, 100–1,
 105
 Villeneuve, Jacques, 157
 Vincent, J., 82, 84, 141
- Wacquand, L., 31–2
 Waddington, I., 49–51
 Walk, S., 49, 52, 68
 Wall, D., 164
 Walseth, A., 111, 121
 Walton, T., 103–4
 Watson, N., 112
 Whannel, G., 5, 133, 138, 146,
 151
 Whitehead, S., 51, 66–7
 Williams, J., 70
 Williams, T., 33–4, 38, 43
 Willis, E., 56
 Woods, P., 114
 Woodward, K., 8, 16, 72, 113,
 174
 Wu, S., 34, 39
- Young, I., 74
 Young, K., 67
- Zaman, H., 111, 121
 Zaretsky, E., 7