Culture: the Glocal Game, Cosmopolitanism and Americanization

Introduction

The cultural domain of globalization is highly debated within social science, primarily with reference to the question of agency and determination. Much debate concerns the analytical and empirical degrees of freedom that may be discerned in how local cultures engage with ‘the global’. The arising arguments are often predicated upon conventional binary oppositions – notably between the local and the global, or the particular and the universal – and are flavoured by a critical preference for one perspective over the other. On one side, ‘cultural imperialism’ arguments emphasize the determinant potency of global culture, particularly as manifested by Western (primarily American) institutions, which effectively circumscribes the critical agency of social actors at everyday level (see, for example, Barber 1996; Latouche 1996; Ritzer 2004). Conversely, sociocultural and anthropological positions spotlight the creativity of social actors, including ways in which forms of local identity are purposively constructed ‘in resistance’ to perceived global processes (see, for example, Hannerz 1996; Pieterse 2007; Tomlinson 1999; Watson 1997). We argue here that the most plausible perspectives on cultural globalization involve the integration of both of these standpoints. That is to say, social scientists need to appreciate the intensive analytical and empirical interdependencies of the global and the local, or the universal and the particular, when seeking to account for the complexity of cultural globalization.

Culture has been, for social scientists, the most substantially examined of all the aspects of football’s globalization. Some analyses in the late 1960s and early 1970s implied that instrumental rationalization, coupled with monopoly capitalism and militaristic nationalism, had come to dominate sports culture, creating an oppressive and alienating environment for all participants (cf. Rigauer 1981; Brohm 1978; Vinnai 1973). However, from the late 1980s onwards, much academic enquiry on the international aspects of football adopted a comparatively Herderian approach in exploring the distinctiveness of national football cultures, initially in Europe and Latin America, and
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12 We appreciate that the concepts of the local and the global, and the particular and the universal, are not identical binary oppositions.
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subsequently at a more global level. Particular transnational themes in football – such as the civic identities of clubs, or spectator-related violence – have provided highly fecund fields for comparative contrast and inquiry. The spread of academic interest in football’s international dimensions reflects a wider process of transnational exchange across the game, involving competitions, players and finance. Most notably here, growing public and media interest in different football cultures has mushroomed, and has been reflected further in the transnational ‘hybridization’ of young supporter fashions.

Our discussion of football’s cultural globalization requires us to address analytical and substantive questions. Universalism-particularism, ‘relativization’, and ‘homogenization-heterogenization’ represent our initial analytical concerns, and enable us to develop our theorization of ‘glocalization’ and ‘duality of glocality’ (cf. Giulianotti and Robertson 2007b). Through this analytical prism we consider more contemporary or substantive football themes, including Americanization, cosmopolitanism, postmodernization and nostalgia. Throughout, in broad terms, we seek to sustain the argument that, in cultural terms, the football/globalization nexus is a highly varied one in which multipolar influences are at play.

The Universal and the Particular

The interrelationships of the ‘universal’ and the ‘particular’ are central to football’s cultural dimensions and, more generally, may be understood as ‘the elemental forms of global life’ (Robertson 1992: 103; 1995). Any particular experience, identity or social process is only comprehensible with reference to universal phenomena, and vice versa.

The ‘globewide nexus’ of the particular and the universal gives rise to two interrelationships: the ‘universalization of particularism’ and the ‘particularization of universalism’ (Robertson 1990a, 1992). First, the universalization of particularism ‘involves the extensive diffusion of the idea that there is virtually no limit to particularity, to uniqueness, to difference, and to otherness’ (1992: 102). A ‘global valorization of particular identities’ has intensified since the late nineteenth century, notably through principles of national identification that are underpinned by the international system. Major international football tournaments provide lively cultural arenas for the (re)production and interplay of national–societal particularities. Different national supporter groups converge and commingle, displaying their particularistic dresses, songs, and patterns of social behaviour.

Second, the ‘particularization of universalism’ involves the growing ‘concreteness’ of the world in socio-political or ‘global-human’ terms. This process is characterized by forms of global standardization and integration that differentiate societies along objective lines (Robertson 1990a: 51–2). For
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example, nations are positioned within global systems of time (or time-zones) or communication (such as through international telephone codes or internet suffixes) (Robertson 1992: 102). International time-space categories were defined particularly during the take-off phase of globalization. In recent times, intensified social interconnectedness has accelerated the particularization of universalism, creating cultures of speed and immediacy wherein, for example, global communication networks enable financial markets or media TNCs to transmit information instantaneously (Tomlinson 2007).

In football, the particularization of universalism features the engagement of all institutions and actors within a pyramidal world system. FIFA (and the IFAB) sits at the apex, followed by the continental governing bodies, then national associations, regional and local associations, the various football clubs, and fans at the base, who literally ‘support’ the entire edifice. Global standardization is secured through FIFA-endorsed football associations that have jurisdiction over national teams and implement the game’s rules and procedures. Each nation is also located within, and helps to authorize, a world calendar of tournaments and fixtures.

These preliminary comments enable us to focus critically on commonplace assumptions regarding globalization. For example, public and academic discourses typically present ‘the local’ and ‘the global’ as fundamental binary opposites, as a kind of alpha and omega in the ontology of globalization (cf. Rowe 2003). Anxieties commonly arise when this binary opposition is blithely accepted, over whether the ‘global’ is abolishing or subverting the ‘local’ (Robertson 1992, 1995: 35). Conversely, more nuanced standpoints highlight the complex interdependencies between the local and the global.

Certainly, it might be argued that football, as a global cultural force that has been backed by potent colonial or corporate interests, has served to obliterate many local, indigenous games. In Africa, for example, Western sports were purposefully inculcated among local peoples, to the chagrin of many elders (Bale and Sang 1996; Haruna and Abdullahi 1991). Similarly, in Latin American nations such as Peru, football’s social spread often coincided with the decline of traditional games such as bochas (Escobar 1969: 75).

Nevertheless, within football, cultural exchanges between the local and the global are not unidirectional. Host societies are not passive recipients of global cultural content. As we noted in Chapter 1, football’s initial diffusion and subsequent popularization depended upon positive reception by young males in diverse contexts. Indeed, football’s ‘humankind’ conflicts have typically featured excluded people struggling for opportunities and resources to engage in the game. Football has also enabled ‘local’ cultures to explore fresh forms of particularity, for example through founding community clubs and developing specific styles of play.

Additionally, local cultures are not ‘fixed’ in time and space. Rather, we need to explore the routes and roots of any culture; its mobility and its
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14 Also, in Turkey, football’s urban appeal has weakened traditional wrestling (Stokes 1996: 26–7).
senses of ‘dwelling fixity’ (cf. Clifford 1997), where, to borrow from John Cale, *homo sapiens* meets *hobo sapiens*. Over time, local cultures undergo processes of deterritorialization and reterritorialization. Deterritorialization relates particularly to the weakening spatial connections of cultural practices, identities, products and communities. Strongly influenced by transnational migration and mediatization, deterritorialization processes are exemplified by Asians in Canada or Chicanos along the US-Mexico border (Appadurai 1998; Canclini 1995). Deterritorialization is accelerated in dromomaniac developed nations, where national and transnational mobility is deeply entrenched. Yet, deterritorialized individuals and groups do not submerge themselves in a meaningless cultural mélange, but instead manufacture new ‘homes’ and senses of located cultural identity: in other words, reterritorialization occurs, abetted by the crucial resources of electronic media.

In football, deterritorialization is historically problematic. Leading clubs are historically *rooted* in communities (through stadium location, civic engagement and regional symbolism), but the *routes* of team lore and allegiance are spread through migration and mediatization. For example, Liverpool football club is anchored in the eponymous city, with a cultural identity that claims to retain strong local ‘structures of feeling’, in deliberate contrast to more globalist rivals, Manchester United (cf. Williams, Hopkins and Long 2001). However, deterritorialization processes are evidenced by Liverpool’s national and worldwide following since the 1970s, the dominance of mainland European players and coaches from the late 1990s, and the club’s ownership by two American sports entrepreneurs.

The increasingly complex and uncertain contours of support for national teams further reveal deterritorialization processes. Nations with large migrant populations inspire internationally diffuse support for their football teams; thus, Irish President, Mary Robinson, claimed in 1994 that she and the national football team represented ‘the modern Ireland’ which included Irish citizens and the children of the diaspora (Giulianotti 1996: 339). Similarly, among players, post-colonial and diasporic movements can highlight the complex ties between residency, nationality and ethno-national identity. For example, in Paris, a friendly in late 2001 between France and Algeria reportedly saw the erstwhile ‘visiting team’ field more French-born players than the home nation.

The deterritorializing of national symbols is advanced by international televising of some fixtures, and by football’s interpenetration with other popular cultural fields. International tournaments attract wide interest across external nations and regions: for example, UEFA claimed that Euro 2004 was viewed by cumulative audiences of nearly 450 million in North America, 1 billion in
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15 While Manchester United have developed a potent mythology surrounding the club’s history and its local connections (notably in regard to the 1958 Munich disaster, which killed eight players), supporters of local rivals, Manchester City, tend to claim a closer attachment to the city *per se.*
Africa and 1.1 billion in Asia. Contemporary consumerism promotes diverse forms of national identification, such as through the transnational retail of replica shirts and kits. Since the late 1990s, UK fashion chains have produced many styles that imitate ‘classic’ national football attire, with ‘Italia’, ‘USSR’, ‘Brasil’ and other national signifiers emblazoned across clothing.

In these circumstances, ‘reterritorializing’ processes acquire particular salience. Through reterritorialization, claims of cultural ownership are formulated so that even transient or migrant groups inscribe geographical marks upon their identities. On occasions when clubs ‘move home’, reterritorialization occurs as supporters give fresh and intimate meanings to their new stadiums. More potent reterritorializing occurs when supporters establish social clubs in distant settings. In southern Ontario, for example, leading English, Scottish and Italian clubs have strong presences, with Celtic and Rangers fans boasting their own plush social clubs and memberships of over 400 (Giulianotti 2005a; Giulianotti and Robertson 2005, 2007a). More generally, the spectator cultures at leading clubs undergo continuing relativization and revitalization, typically attracting more fluid or ‘cosmopolitan’ followers to fresh forms of sporting diversity (cf. Cowen 2002: 134). Additionally, complex de-/re-territorializing processes underpin the pride that many nations have in regard to their foreign players. For example, imported talents such as Henry, Viera, Ginola (all France) and Zola (Italy) became national celebrities in the UK, were prized for legitimizing and enhancing the domestic game within the global context, and were lauded for their general acculturation (for example, in adapting to playing styles or building particular relations with media corporations).

Clubs endeavour to reterritorialize by claiming spatial meaning for themselves in distant settings. Consider, for example, the Asian ‘club shops’ opened by Manchester United or the summer tours of Asia and North America that are undertaken by leading European sides. Crucially, reterritorialization is not uncontested. The established, ‘territorialized’ supporters may object to the privileges granted to outside followers. Thus, Manchester United fans based in North-West England differentiate themselves from southern-based supporters; and even among Scandinavian fans of English teams, there are distinctions between long-standing and more ‘touristic’ supporters (Brick 2001; Heinonen 2005). Thus, different social groups contest the meaning of the ‘local’.

Relativization

The concept of relativization illuminates further the local–global interrelationship, disclosing in particular the increasingly reflexive contrasts between
‘local’ cultures. Relativization reveals how globalization brings cultures into sharper reflexive and comparative focus, thereby compelling these cultures to respond to each other in an ever-amplifying manner across the universal domain. Indeed, in our view, it is comparison with others that makes reflexivity possible. Relativization also involves particular entities being shaped by the elemental reference points of individuals, national societies, international relations and humankind (Robertson and Chirico 1985). Thus, any ‘national’ football culture will acquire particular coherence, as a relativized entity, from interrelationships between individual citizens, the international football system, and themes of shared (or variegated) humanity.

We shall unpack the interrelations of elemental reference points with reference to Brazil’s football culture and the wider society. On individuals, we may connect Brazil’s individualistic styles of play (notably dribbling and deception) to the streetwise malandro (or artful rogue) who survives in Brazilian favelas (DaMatta 1991), or how the political power of cartolas (‘big hats’) inside football connects to Brazil’s dense patronage networks. In regard to international relations, we may tie Brazil’s status in football competitions and FIFA to greater political coherence across ‘Third World’ societies, and to transnational connectivity through the mass media and long-distance transport. With respect to humanity, we might explore how Brazilian football successes symbolized a sporting ‘pedagogy of the oppressed’, showcasing the struggles of marginalized groups to participate, to express themselves, to represent ‘the nation’ (cf. Freire 1970; Freyre 1963).

The particular Brazilian context was infused by diverse, often conflicting social forces. On one side stood a national history of brutal colonization, charismatic authoritarianism, and rigid ‘racial’ stratification. Beneath official discourses that have celebrated the ‘multi-racial democracy’ there lurks an elitist and statist commitment to ‘whitening’ the black population (Robertson 1998b). Yet, on the other side, a populist ideology remains, which venerates ‘racial hybridity’, social informality, and the vibrancy of mass participation in national events. When considering these three reference points, we gain a fuller understanding of Brazil as a nation, within football, as registered further by national styles of play and a fully national focus on the seleção (the Brazilian national team). The nation is further revealed by football’s role in constructing modern Brazilian identity, through mass media, education, language, and popular culture.

Reflection on Brazilian football also helps to challenge assumptions about uniformity and homogeneity in regard to national cultures. Brazilian football is instead a highly varied realm with complex, multidimensional relationships to the wider society. In terms of playing styles, significant vari-
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18Thus, leading football stars, notably Pele, were visibly integrated into elite/white society, while white players were notably more prominent in Brazil’s national team during the 1980s. On the subsequent attempts to ‘whiten’ leading black athletes in the United States, notably Michael Jordan, see Andrews (2001).
ations arise between major cities, while national debates occur over the expressive *futebol-arte* or the physical *futebol-força* methods. Additionally, Brazilian football does not passively reflect the national society, but represents an extraordinary domain of mass participation and global cultural success, in contrast to a painfully stratified and still-underdeveloped society.

Analysis of specific football episodes helps to reveal the complex forces that are at play between the various elemental reference points within and beyond the game. Consider, for example, the visit to violence-torn Haiti by the Brazilian national team to play an exhibition match in August 2004. The event was promoted by the CBF (national elemental reference point, football institution), Brazilian government (national, non-football), UN (international relations, non-football) and FIFA (international relations, football). The billed ‘Football for Peace’ visit helped to promote the game’s universalistic claims (international relations/humankind, football), carried a global humanitarian message (humanity, non-football), and advanced the standings of the Brazilian President, his government and the UN (individual/nation/international relations, non-football). Despite pressures from the President (individual, non-football) and governing bodies (nation/international relations, football), some European clubs (international relations, football) refused to release their Brazilian players (individuals, football) to participate. These players were then dropped from Brazil’s side for the next fixture (individual/nation, football). The Haiti visit fostered Brazilian pride in the team’s global status (nation/international relations, football), while enhancing Brazil’s status within the UN and specific pursuit of a permanent seat on the Security Council (international relations, non-football); yet, the visit also drew criticisms that the nation itself faced huge domestic problems (nation/international relations/humankind, non-football). All in all, this single match demonstrates the complex layers of relationship that arise between football and the wider social order.

The concept of relativization also facilitates clearer understanding of particular ‘defence of the local’ or anti-globalist discourses. These arguments are deployed, for example, to challenge global influences upon indigenous playing techniques, such as when European coaches impose their methods upon African players (*FIFA News*, February 2002). But as definite cultural responses to transnational processes, these discourses emerge from relativization processes and serve to advance particular understandings of ‘the local’ per se vis-à-vis alternative meanings.

More simplistic ‘defence of the local’ discourses assume that global flows are largely unidirectional, from international society into particular nations or continents. Yet, even in settings where local identities are strongly sustained, complex matrices of relativization serve to mould and refashion ‘the
local'. For example, to return to Brazil, it may seem initially that 'the local' (in this case, national) playing style is an uncontested concept, in being renowned globally as highly expressive, aesthetically pleasing, and indicative of a unique, 'Lusotropical' national society (cf. Freyre 1963). However, Brazilian football history reveals a rather more complex story, with the national team having long been influenced by European sides and tactical systems. In the 1970s, the Brazilians explored Dutch 'total football' (itself something of an invented concept), then switched to a 'native' style in the 1980s. Lack of competitive success then sparked a move to a cautious, quasi-Italian style in the 1990s; victories at the 1994 and 2002 World Cup finals thereby featured tactical caution, defensive solidity, and occasional improvisational brilliance. Thus, over three decades, the 'local' Brazilian style was recast and relativized in a variety of complex ways.

We should note too that relativization processes produce very different emphases on the assertion of the local, depending upon the particular societies or the social practices in question. In most nations, formidable relativization is apparent in the nationalistic rituals of football spectators, but is perhaps less apparent in regard to national styles of play. In South America, nations that understand themselves in terms of particular 'schools' of play include Argentina (criollo style), Brazil (balletic, spectacular), and Colombia (intricate short passing); conversely, Chile, Paraguay and Uruguay tend not to advance these local-making assertions, although they tend to compensate by advocating strongly competitive virtues (such as the brave combative methods of Paraguay’s guarani).

Homogenization–Heterogenization

We turn now to an axial problem in the sociology of globalization, namely the homogenization–heterogenization debate. Homogenization arguments generally posit that globalization is marked by growing cultural convergence at the transnational level. Conversely, heterogenization arguments contend that global processes maintain or facilitate cultural diversity or divergence. The rival ‘schools of thought’ tend not to strike absolutist poses – for example, most homogenization theorists recognize significant instances of cultural diversification – yet the broad differences between the two sides remain intact. In the following discussion, we consider homogenization theories before exploring the heterogenization position.

Homogenization

Homogenization theories posit that social actors and their local cultures are orchestrated into passively absorbing or otherwise reproducing the cultural products, practices and predilections of the world’s most powerful corporations and nations. Perhaps ironically, these theories of global cultural convergence have produced a diversity of keywords and theories, such as cultural imperialism, synchronization, Americanization, Westernization,

Early convergence arguments emerged in the preliminary analysis of global mass communications. McLuhan (1964) is widely credited with initially exploring the possible genesis of a ‘global village’ through heightened forms of media connectivity. However, we should recall that McLuhan did appreciate the complexity of contemporary international politics by noting the magnitude of global conflicts and East/West cultural differences (McLuhan and Fiore 1989).

However, other writers on global communications have argued that political – economic rather than cultural – technological factors lie behind global cultural convergence. Schiller (1976: 9), for example, contends that Western media corporations were rapacious, culturally imperialistic forces that dominated international markets, such that, in Wallersteinian language, ‘a largely one-directional flow of information from core to periphery represents the reality of power’ (1976: 6). Hamelink (1983, 1994, 1995) highlights the global diffusion of Americanized consumer lifestyles and products through corporations like McDonald’s and Disney (Hamelink 1995: 111). Thus, even in Mexican football, Hamelink reports the symbolic importance of Coca-Cola to pre-match rituals (noted in Tomlinson 1999: 109). Overall, he contends that Western corporations ‘reduce local cultural space’ by controlling negative information and obstructing indigenous initiatives.

Homogenization theorists argue that, when TNCs micro-market their products, little meaningful engagement occurs with local cultures. Thus, while Western media corporations translate their programmes into local languages, the substance remains alien to peripheral cultures, and must still ‘bear the ideological imprint of the main centers of the capitalist world economy’ (Schiller 1976: 10). Hamelink (1995: 113) argues that such adaptations merely ensnare ‘consumers, particularly young ones, to watch programmes and in the process influence their tastes, lifestyles, and moral values’.

In turn, these theorists celebrate episodes and strategies of cultural resistance towards media imperialism. France and the European Commission have sought to protect indigenous film and cultural industries from the worldwide ‘flood’ of cheap, low-grade American media products (Hamelink 1995: 114; 1994: 180–1). Schiller (1976: 106–9) advocates popular public participation in alternative forms of mass communication, which Hamelink (1994) understands as a contemporary human right.

Sport broadcasting provides some evidence for this strand of homogenization theory. Most obviously, television TNCs and powerful European football systems (such as Serie A, the EPL, UEFA) ensure that images of major continental tournaments are beamed remorselessly into developing

---

21 Elsewhere, Canada has endeavoured to counteract perceived Americanization at economic, political and cultural levels (Smith 1994).
societies, notably Africa, East Asia and even South America. The core-to-periphery flow of media content is very rarely reversed, for example through live UK screening of Latin American fixtures. In turn, TNCs advertise their standardized products, and the generalized Western consumerist lifestyle, to football audiences across developing nations (cf. Sklair 2002).

However, staunch applications of homogenization theory can stretch the cultural evidence. Importantly, some reverse flows do occur across global and ‘mini-global’ plains. For example, Argentinian and Brazilian leagues attract international interest, particularly across Iberia for obvious ethno-historical reasons. In non-core football nations, television stations add crucial contextualization and ‘vernacularization’ to their coverage of leading European or South American fixtures (cf. Appadurai 1998). Thus, for example, in South Korea, local television stations have their own studio discussions and commentators to interpret English Premier League matches; special attention is paid, wherever possible, to the performances of Korean players.

Some homogenization arguments might borrow from Wallerstein (1974, 2000) to differentiate ‘core’ (high-income), ‘peripheral’ (low-income) and ‘semi-peripheral’ (middle-income) societies, but it is problematic to translate these categories directly into world football. For example, core global nations like the United States and Japan have semi-peripheral football systems that rarely grace European television screens. Similar hazards surround the core/semi-peripheral classification of small Western European national league systems.

Where football does fit Wallerstein’s categories, the vitality of ‘peripheral’ nations is still evidenced, for example by state subsidizing of national teams or airing of local sports events on television. In football as in the wider context, national groups are more focused on the challenge from neighbouring or historically significant ‘others’, rather than ‘core’ nations as a whole. For Argentinians, fixtures against Brazil germinate the strongest sentiments; for the Dutch, it is the German game; for the Chinese or South Koreans, it is the Japanese; and for the Scots, it is the English. Moreover, core nations have themselves become at least partly ‘peripheralized’ through the mass entry and settlement of peoples from developing nations. Thus, in football, we find Zimbabwean sides in England, or North African teams in France, playing friendly fixtures before thousands of local and migrant spectators.

We may ask too, when elite European leagues are being watched by African or Asian populations, whether the homogenization thesis provides the most plausible explanation? To those with little football engagement it may appear so. However, if we appreciate that viewers critically engage with television content, and that many will be inured in football’s cultural complexities, then an alternative judgement is fairer: that these audiences have, quite rationally, chosen to view and to appreciate the world’s most aesthetic, technically sophisticated displays of football skill. Indeed, young players actively seek to imitate and emulate these global talents, thus football’s
diverse aesthetic and technical qualities hold a stronger currency than its simple consumerist adjuncts.

Finally, the homogenization thesis is far less controversial when explaining aspects of the ‘particularization of universalism’ which, in short, gives rise to global similarities that structure national differences. Some insightful convergence arguments identify a transnational social isomorphism across nation-states whereby national identities, practices and structures are constructed according to universal standards and procedures (Robertson 1995: 30–1; Meyer et al. 1997). In football, such convergence is evidenced in the standardized structures of particular national football associations, league systems, and calendars of competition.

**Heterogenization**

Theories of cultural heterogenization pivot on a variety of keywords, notably ‘creolization’, ‘indigenization’ and ‘vernacularization’. To begin considering these, the concept of ‘creolization’ describes the ‘creative interplays’ between cultural cores and peripheries, creating creole cultural forms and rhizomic identities, such as in language, cuisine, and film (Hannerz 1992: 264–6; Vergès 2001: 179). For Hannerz, creolization enables the periphery to ‘talk back’ to the centre, for example as Third World music becomes ‘world music’, or ‘ghetto’ phrases enter mainstream society.

In football, cross-civilizational exchanges fire intensive creolization processes. For example, Western observers are often struck by Asian football cultural values and practices that, in contrast to Europe and South America, emphasize consensus, orderliness and politeness (see Moffett 2003). In Africa, Levi-Strauss (1966: 31) noted that the Gahuku-Gama people of New Guinea ritualized football in accordance with indigenous values, wherein the social humiliation of defeat was purposively alleviated by staging fixtures on consecutive days, thereby providing losers with further chances to win (Bromberger 1995: 299). Football’s popular history has many wider instances whereby the periphery ‘talks back’ to the centre, for example when South Americans developed particular technical skills (for instance the chilena or ‘bicycle kick’, or the swerving free-kick) that were then mimicked in ‘core’ European nations.

Problematically, creolization implies that, prior to the making of creole cultural forms, there existed authentic and sharply distinctive ‘core’ and ‘peripheral’ phenomena. Alternatively, creolization features the interplay of already creolized cultural forms. Thus in football, for example, it is impossible to trace the histories of playing styles back to particular, autonomously generated national techniques and philosophies.

For Friedman (1999), the alternative concept of ‘indigenization’ portrays centre–periphery relationships in more cultural political terms. Particularly for developed societies, indigenization registers ‘an increasing fragmentation of identities, the break-up of larger identity units, the emergence of cultural politics among indigenous, regional, immigrant and even national
populations’ (Friedman 1999: 391). In football, indigenization is evidenced in the strategic resistance of Western Europe’s ethnic minorities towards their racial abuse, and in their intensification of ethno-nationalist or regionalist identities at clubs in southern Europe and Australia.

The idea of ‘vernacularization’ is deployed by Appadurai (1998) to explain the discursive ‘domestication’ that occurs within general cultural forms, including sport. Appadurai explores how Indians have ‘vernacularized’ cricket, ‘hijacking’ the quintessential English imperial sport, notably through television commentaries; meanwhile, ‘the game is inscribed in particular ways upon local male bodies’ to become ‘an emblem of Indian nationhood’ (1998: 103, 112). This conception of local–global processes has notable continuities with the Japanese concept of dochakuka (or ‘glocalization’), discussed later in this chapter.

Similar observations may be advanced regarding football, notably in explaining how television has served to narrate and to popularize distinctive playing styles across nations, especially in South America.

For Pieterse (1995), ‘hybridization’ describes the mixing of cultures and the move towards translocal cultural forms that range from diasporic communities to cyborg beings and virtual reality. Cultural hybridity is identifiable in particular in the ‘global mélange’, for example through ‘fusion food’ or cross-cultural artistic ventures, and helps to foreground the shift from anti-colonial to post-colonial social orders (Pieterse 2007: 142–3). By way of criticism, we may note that the concept of hybridization harbours some potentially risky biological metaphors (Beck 2004: 26), and may promote the false assumption that phenomena which are ‘hybridized’ had been initially in a state of distinctive cultural purity. However, the concept of hybridization has been deployed most effectively by Archetti (1998a) to explain the construction of cultural identities in the New World, particularly in relation to football in Argentina, wherein the vibrancy of a hybrid society receives translucent expression in sport.

Evidently, each concept is persuasively founded upon substantial research, particularly in peripheral contexts, and encapsulates the agency of quotidian social actors in critically engaging with and transforming global cultural phenomena. However, we forward four caveats for utilization of these terms.

First, noteworthy differences in emphasis and position exist between these keywords – for example, indigenization foregrounds the centrifugal nature of cultural politics in developed societies, while vernacularization illuminates the linguistic and (by extension) corporeal aspects of cultural appropriation.

Second, we should dispute the assumption that societies which ground football are themselves homogeneous entities. Alternatively, for example, Latin American societies are highly variegated, mobile and dynamic social formations that, in turn, formulate diverse and contested kinds of football-centred practices and beliefs (cf. Leite Lopes 2000: 89–90).

Third, emphasis upon processes of improvisation and heterogenization does not preclude consideration of socio-economic influences and themes. In football, for example, some commentators have interpreted the dribbling skills of lower-class Brazilian players to be both a sporting extension of the
street-wise habitus, and a crucial component of public theatre within a highly stratified society, wherein the oppressed defeat their oppressors and so are acclaimed as heroes (World Soccer, June 2004). Similarly, albeit somewhat reductively, some European coaches attribute the individualism of African players to wider problems of daily survival in the poorest locales (Sunday Herald, 30 January 2000).

Finally, there are important regional and indeed ‘civilizational’ differences in the way in which these processes come into play. In historical terms, multiple modernities or multiple globalizations may be said to have occurred (see Arnason 1991, 2001; Wagner 2000). Therborn (1995), for example, has argued that modernity developed relatively autonomously in four major sites: in Europe, where revolution or reform involved ‘endogenous change’; in the New World, where transcontinental migration, genocide, and independence occurred; in large parts of the Middle and Far East, where much modernization was viewed as an external threat or fit for selective importation; and, in most of Africa, southern and south-east Asia, where modernization brought conquest, subjugation and colonialism. Thus, football’s spread throughout Europe was symptomatic of the continent’s endogenous modern development; the game’s limited entry to the New World (specifically, North America) reflected the cultural differentiation of settler populations; its uneven penetration of the Middle and Far East reflected selective cultural importation strategies; and its highly localized relevance in Africa and southern Asia reflected the subjugated position of the indigenous peoples. Thus, at least in the early twentieth century, creolization, vernacularization, and indigenization functioned in different ways within these contexts: for example, with little impact in the Middle and Far East, but with rich vitality in Europe and in South America.

Glocalization

Ritzer: the grobal and the glocal

The homogenization–heterogenization debate has made a significant advance through the work of Ritzer (2003, 2004) on the globalization of culture. Ritzer’s thesis is largely built around his binary opposition of the keywords ‘grobalization’ and ‘glocalization’. ‘Grobalization’ describes a sweeping process of homogenization, wherein the powerful subprocesses of ‘capitalism, Americanization and McDonaldization’ overwhelm the indigenous cultures of local individuals and social groups (2004: 73). Conversely, the idea of ‘glocalization’, for Ritzer, encaptures an increasingly heterogeneous world, wherein individuals and social groups are intensively innovative and creative in their dealings with global culture.22 Ritzer’s binary

22Cohen and Kennedy (2000: 377) adopt a similar stance, defining glocalization in terms of the selective and adaptive capacities of local actors in relation to global culture. They contrast directly this definition with the machinations of powerful companies in ‘customizing’ products to suit local markets.
opposition has significant continuities with earlier theories, notably the Jihad/McWorld couplet advanced by Barber (1992, 1996).

Ritzer’s global/glocal binary represents the two extreme poles on an ideal-typical continuum; in reality, most cultural commodities fall somewhere between the two ends. He concludes pessimistically, that local cultures typically fail to resist globalization processes. He accepts too that his standpoint is ‘both elitist and incurably romantic, nostalgic about the past’ in its veneration of particular local cultural commodities (2004: 213).

Ritzer’s analysis does benefit from its succinct case studies of cultural production and consumption, and its critical empathy for struggles against dehumanizing rationalization processes. However, we identify four particular differences between his position and our own. First, while his global/glocal continuum has significant continuities with our position on universalism/particularism, we adopt a longer-term view of globalization’s impact upon, and construction of, ‘the local’.

Second, Ritzer’s analysis may underplay the highly varied ways in which McDonald’s restaurants, or other paragons of rationalization, have originated or been introduced within different historical and cultural contexts. The modus operandi of McDonald’s restaurants was in significant part inspired by the White Castle fast-food chain founded in 1921 (Steel 2008: 233–236). Moreover, different social practices and cultural impacts obtain in McDonald’s restaurants in Asia compared to North America; for example, in terms of unseated customers ‘hovering’ at tables, or promoting hygiene standards across all local restaurants (cf. Watson 1997).

Third, Ritzer’s analysis is restricted to cultural commodities, and so omits to explore fully cultural meanings and institutions. Indeed, we might argue that his emphasis on cultural commodities may itself be understood as a distinctively American interpretation (or ‘glocalization’) of the homogenization/heterogenization debate. Football highlights some of the analytical limitations to this focus on commodities. As we have noted, any football-playing social grouping will produce varied cultural innovations – most obviously in playing styles – that reflect its particular ‘ethos’, and which are more generally indicative of the multidimensionality of globalization.

To substantiate this criticism, we may begin by noting that club football reveals a continuing cross-cultural diversity of institutional frameworks and practices. For example, traditional match-days fall on Sundays in much of southern Europe, but on Saturdays in the north. In Spain, football matches frequently kick-off far later in the evening than would be permissible in
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23 Ritzer could clarify more precisely his conception concerning the ‘nothingness’ of globalization. In our context, it would seem to imply that ‘grolbal’ football is simply ‘nothing’; a point that is difficult to sustain given the political and economic impact of the professional, commercial game.

24 For Cowen (2003: 48), an ethos refers to the ‘special feel or flavour of a culture’, providing ‘the background network of world views, styles, and inspirations found in a society, or a framework for cultural interpretation. Ethos therefore is part of an implicit language for creating or viewing art.’
northern Europe. Since the late 1990s, many South and Central American nations feature two league championships inside one season, usually with play-offs to determine the overall champions. Conversely, in Europe, the standard one-championship season remains intact, although nations differ significantly over their format (for example, teams may play two, three, or four times each season) and calendar (for example, many European nations have winter breaks of varying length). In Europe, the team coach is responsible for training senior players, team selection and tactics, while the general manager conducts player negotiations and other organizational business. In the UK, by contrast, both roles have traditionally fallen to the team manager, although assistant managers and coaches provide back-up. In southern Europe and Latin America, autocratic club presidents can produce extremely high turnovers of managers and players, whereas in northern Europe managers have tended to be more secure.25 UK and South American players (most obviously Brazilians) are more renowned for significant drinking or party cultures, unlike Scandinavian or southern European talents. In Italy and Latin America the entire team typically spends the eve of fixtures together, in practices known as ritiro or la concentración, but in northern Europe players only tend to congregate on match-day. These and numerous other diverging institutional frameworks and practices are integral to football’s culture, but would be overlooked if analysis were restricted to commercial issues.

Fourth, crucially, we differ with Ritzer on the meaning of glocalization. Whereas Ritzer associates glocalization with processes of heterogenization and critical social agency, we understand the term as featuring the possibility of both homogeneity and heterogeneity, as we explain below.

Glocalization and the ‘duality of glocality’

It is useful to consider the historical and social scientific development of the concept of glocalization. The word glocalization itself may be traced to the Japanese term dochakuka, meaning ‘global localization’ or ‘localized globalization’, which was widely used in business circles in the late 1980s to describe the micro-marketing techniques of Sony and other companies, whereby generic products and industrial practices are adapted to suit local conditions (cf. Dicken and Miyamachi 1998: 73; Rothacher 2004: 185, 189).26 Subsequently established as ‘one of the main marketing buzzwords of the beginning of the nineties’, glocalization appeared in recent times to underpin the advertising discourses of TNCs like HSBC, which projected itself as ‘the world’s local bank’ (Oxford Dictionary of New Words 1991: 134, quoted in Robertson 1992: 174; cf. Gertler 1992: 268).

25 For example, during his 17-year presidential reign at Atlético Madrid, the mercurial Jesus Gil disposed of 39 coaches and recruited 141 players (World Soccer, July 2004).
26 Morita understood this as involving the meeting of ‘local needs with local operations while developing common global concepts and technologies’. See www.sony.net/Fun/SH/1-29/h1.html.
In football, this original form of glocalization is evident in club and league marketing. For example, some European clubs recruit players from the United States or East Asia in part to build consumer/fan bases in these regions. In the United States, Major League Soccer (MLS), which controls the professional club system, has sought to boost crowds by micro-marketing to Latinos in California, notably by having the popular Mexican club Guadalajara open a US ‘franchise’ (The Economist, 30 April 2005).

The social scientists Robertson and Swyngedouw developed the concept of glocalization at around the same time in separate and different ways in the early 1990s. For urban political economists, glocalization has come to describe the rescaling and intensified complexity of networks and systems, notably in the interrelationships between institutional actors at subnational, national and supranational levels (Swyngedouw 1992, 2004; Brenner 1998, 2004). Despite complaints that glocalization is inconsistently defined and applied within this field, the ‘scalar’ approach certainly chimes with related arguments on the ‘cascading’ and ‘turbulence’ of global politics (Rosenau 1990; Jessop and Sum 2000). We consider these points more fully in chapter four.

In socio-cultural theory, Robertson (1992, 1994, 1995, 2007c) introduced the concept of glocalization in part to update the old anthropological theory of cultural diffusion by allowing for the intensification of social connectivity and stronger forms of global consciousness. Capturing the broad interplay of the universal and the particular, glocalization registers the ‘real world’ endeavours of individuals and social groups to ground or to recontextualize global phenomena or macroscopic processes with respect to local cultures (Robertson 1992: 173–4; 1994, 1995). Thus, ‘glocalization projects’, as practiced by different cultures, represent ‘the constitutive features of contemporary globalization’ (Robertson 1995: 41). Long-running processes of transnational commingling and interpenetration have resulted in a profusion of ‘glocal’ cultures, such that the old binary distinction between ‘here-it-is’ local and ‘out-there’ global cultures becomes increasingly untenable.

Both socio-cultural and urban political economic theories of glocalization have significant continuities with Rosenau’s (2003) concept of ‘fragmegration’, which notes the simultaneously fragmenting and integrating forces of globalization. Moreover, our interpretation of glocalization has strong elective affinities to the theorization of relativization set out above (see Robertson 1992; 1995; and White 2004).

In some contrast to Ritzer, our socio-cultural reading of glocalization allows for the production of both cultural divergence and convergence, or homogenization and heterogenization (Robertson 1995; cf. Ritzer 2004: 73). In other words, a duality of glocality is apparent, which foregrounds the societal co-presence of sameness and difference, and the ‘mutually implicative’ relationships between homogenizing and heterogenizing tendencies (Robertson and White 2003: 4; Giulianotti and Robertson 2007a, 2007b). Notably, Ritzer (2004: 73) himself recognized that, in earlier
work, Robertson ‘is certainly interested in both sides of the local–global, homogenization–heterogenization continua’. We recognize, of course, that much social scientific discussion on glocalization has focused hitherto on the heterogenization side, partly to rebut more reductive arguments regarding cultural homogenization. Yet, as Miller et al. (1999: 19) put it, glocalization is an important term ‘because global forces do not override locality, and because homogenization and heterogenization are equally crucial’. Hence, we concur with Cowen’s (2002: 16, 129) observation that ‘Cultural homogenization and heterogenization are not alternatives or substitutes; rather, they tend to come together’ and frequently produce cultures that are ‘commonly diverse’.

Duality of glocality and football

Football provides a rich substantive field for exploring the complex ‘duality of glocality’ in regard to convergence and divergence. If we examine the game historically in regard to the five phases, we may identify how football’s global diffusion has been underpinned by different interrelationships between the universal and the particular.

During football’s *germinal* and *incipient* phases, football’s initial diffusion was facilitated through social contacts with the British and its cultural appeal to Anglophile local elites. In more extreme circumstances, some cultures marginalized football to develop alternative national sports.

During the *take-off* phase (1870s to mid-1920s), upon its favourable cultural reception, football was glocalized through a universalization of particularism. Specific local cultures worked inside the game’s universal rules to establish their own football ‘traditions’, as illustrated by distinctive corporeal techniques, playing styles, aesthetic codes, administrative structures and interpretative vocabularies.

During the *struggle-for-hegemony* phase (1920s to late 1960s), football’s glocalization also featured a particularization of universalism, as international tournaments and governing bodies were established, and as standardized national football institutions were created across the world, notably through affiliation to FIFA.

During the *uncertainty* phase (1970s to early 2000s), glocalization processes were accelerated by intensified transcultural flows of labour, information, capital and commodities, all of which may engender non-national forms of cultural identity. Glocalization registered stronger forms of global compression, thus the world appears as a kind of cultural switchboard, as different identity-forms come more frequently into mutual co-presence.

Football provides many specific case studies for unravelling the ‘duality of glocality’ in regard to homogenization and heterogenization. Here, we provide four illustrations of such interdependency in regard to laws, belief systems, media framing and interpretation of matches, and playing styles.

First, homogenization is evidenced in the global diffusion of football’s *laws*, and in FIFA’s endeavour to synchronize the interpretations of different
national referees, for example by running intensive courses for officials before each World Cup finals. As one English official concluded, ‘There is no such thing as an English, Italian or French football set of rules. There is one football and one set of rules’ (*FIFA Magazine*, June 1998). Similar convergence strategies have been evidenced by FIFA’s ‘Fair Play’ slogan, which appeals globally to the ethical consciousness of football participants. According to Sepp Blatter, the Fair Play ‘catchphrase’ is ‘a welcome intruder into all languages and cultures’, and has ‘succeeded in building bridges across communication and cultural gaps’ (*FIFA Magazine*, August 1997).

However, significant pressures towards cultural divergence remain intact. On rule interpretation, UK referees, for example, continue to permit robust challenges that central and southern European officials tend to penalize. FIFA’s own research revealed significant differences among European players over the parameters of ‘fair play’: German and French players disagreed over the moral status of ‘revenge fouls’ or ‘professional fouls’ that prevented goals being scored, while English players were particularly intolerant of players who faked injuries (*FIFA Magazine*, June 1997).

Second, *religious and supernatural belief systems* display significant forms of convergence and divergence. Players, teams and fans in many cultures utilize religious divination to help secure their goals, but there are obviously significant cultural differences on this matter. In Europe, many players have their own distinctive pre-match superstitions, such as eating particular meals, wearing lucky amulets, or being last onto the pitch. In Latin America, notably Brazil, the remarkable growth of evangelical and Pentecostal religious movements has directly impacted upon grassroots football culture. The ‘Athletes for Christ’ movement in Brazil has an estimated 7,000 members, most of them footballers, including *seleção* stars Kaka, Jorginho, Mazinho, Lucio, Edmilson, and Taffarel (Bellos 2002: 219). Members of this movement celebrate goals and victories with the display of proselytizing messages, such as ‘God Loves You’.

In some contrast, in sub-Saharan Africa, witchcraft or *juju* practices are more prominent, as teams seek to deflate the energies of opponents, or to ward off malignant spirits, for example by wearing certain amulets, carrying human or animal bones to games, casting spells on the pitch before kick-off (for example, by burying sacrificed animals or urinating on markings), and spreading *muti* (magic medicine) around the ground (Igbinovia 1985: 142–3; Leseth 1997). African football authorities sought to ‘modernize’ their international image by comparing these practices to cannibalism and banning ‘juju-men’ from fixtures, but with little success (the
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27 Nor do these observations require us to accept uncritically the lofty self-proclamations of particular nations regarding their football ethos. Brazilian football may be typologized as the ‘beautiful game’, but domestic fixtures are typically blighted by brutal and persistent fouling. For example, in one weekend, at the 2003 Paulista (São Paulo) championship final, there were three red cards, ten yellows, over fifty fouls, and assorted brawls; a day later, at the 2003 Carioca (Rio) championship final, there were 78 fouls, three red cards and a ten minute fight between players and coaches.
Observer, 10 February 2002). Thus, while the transnational existence of divination practices confirms cultural homogenization, the very varied forms and contents of these religious belief-systems point to heterogenization.

Third, media framing and interpretation of major football events harbour both cross-cultural convergence and divergence. At the game’s international mega-events, most nations share the same television images from fixtures, yet different national broadcasters employ their own journalists, commentators, summarizers and analysts to narrate and interpret the game in distinctive national ways (Hafez 2007: 26). Television audiences may show strong convergence in terms of the global teams and players that they prefer to watch (Brazil, for example, are particular global favourites); yet, like players, significant cultural differences remain in how viewers interpret the crucial incidents, such as free-kick and penalty decisions (cf. Katz and Liebes 1993).

Fourth, the convergence/divergence debate is especially lively in regard to football’s playing styles, techniques and tactics. Some pessimists lament the perceived worldwide influence of technocratic, instrumental coaches who impose standardized, sterile and disenchainting tactics upon games. As noted in Chapter 1, historical changes in playing formations have tended to be defensive and, through successful implementation, have spread internationally.

‘Football science’ too has undergone international diffusion since the 1980s. The world’s best teams are increasingly prepared and organized according to identical principles, while individual performances are measured according to performative criteria, such as pass completion or tackle rates, shots on- or off-target, and distances run during matches. Unpredictable clashes of playing style rarely occur at international tournaments since the world’s elite players now play in the same leagues, compete regularly against each other, and are drilled in similar tactical thinking (cf. Toronto Star, 10 July 2006).

On the heterogenization side, the very criticism of standardization in football points to its contestation by coaches, players and fans. Players who receive the greatest adulation and richest rewards are renowned for transcending standardized forms of play, for redefining the technical and geometric possibilities of football, for their stunning unpredictability. Some clubs – like Ajax, Real Madrid, Celtic, or Manchester United – have constructed potent ‘traditions’ of highly fluid, entertaining, even spectacular styles that resist regimentation. These discourses sometimes acquire a strong national inflection, for example, Spanish football followers dismiss the Italian penchant for cautious, inflexible tactical systems as ‘anti-football’.

Additionally, playing formations still continue to display much variation in form and implementation. Some nationally distinctive line-ups do appear, such as Argentina’s 3-3-1-3 formation in the early 2000s. More commonly, even where a standardized team formation like 4-4-2 is favoured, major cultural differences arise over its implementation, as illustrated by the titles of coaching videos and DVDs, such as Coaching the Dutch 4-3-3, Futbol! Coaching the Brazilian 4-4-2, The Italian 4-4-2, Coaching the English Premier League 4-4-2, and Coaching the European 3-5-2.
Team formations may be similar, but the national or regional flavour defines how the team actually plays.

However, we should avoid advancing an over-simplified version of the heterogenization thesis in two senses. First, it may be argued that we should beware slipping into a simple essentializing or ‘Orientalizing’ of cultural difference in terms of playing style. Although the theory of Orientalism needs to be considered with caution, we may consider how Orientalism is evident in the way that Europeans tend to classify African and Latin American playing styles in rather ethnocentric ways, as anti-modern, rhythmic, expressive, flamboyant, unpredictable, inconsistent, magical and irrational, in contradistinction to the self-congratulatory Western qualities of consistency, reliability and rationality (cf. Said 1995). Evidence of Orientalist discourses may also be identified in the media stereotyping of football regions and nations, and in the language of some leading football officials who have, for example, complained that the ‘natural juice’ of African football is being ‘squeezed out’ by European coaches (cf. O’Donnell 1994; FIFA News, February 2002).

Second, we should remind ourselves that heterogenization in peripheral contexts is typically marked by creolization processes, through diverse kinds of engagement between core and periphery. For example, African football has long been influenced by other football cultures through forms of colonial, post-colonial and media-centred social contact, thereby engendering different playing styles across the regions. East African nations such as Uganda and Kenya were weaned on British styles of play, emphasizing highly energetic, combative, long-ball methods. The recruitment of European coaches, such as Yugoslavs in west Africa, produced better passing games and stronger organization. Alternatively, some nations such as Zambia and Zaire were more directly influenced by fluid and artistic Brazilian styles, in large part through watching videos of great South American players.

The convergence–divergence debate on playing style acquires additional layers of complexity through the intensive reflexivity of different societies on this very subject. In Latin America, the playing style debates become particularly polarized over the extent to which nations should homogenize towards employing scientific, ‘European’ methods, or retain and advance their cultural diversity. Some analysts suggest that, when confronted with strong global competition, Brazil and Argentina have tended to adopt markedly different glocalization strategies. From the 1960s onwards, Brazil looked strongly to scientific rationalism and organization, emphasizing physical preparation and elaborate medical support. Conversely, Argentina emphasized cultural differentiation through a veneration of a highly technical, criollo style (World Soccer, Summer 2005). Yet in Argentina itself, a fundamental ideological division between convergence and divergence strategies is understood to be embodied by two World Cup-winning coaches: the pro-improvisational, leftist, divergent César Luis Menotti (in 1978); and the ultra-pragmatic, convergent Carlos Bilardo (in 1986) (Archetti 1998). Various Latino writers, coaches and football analysts have lent support to the divergent position, by castigating football’s over-theorization by ‘pseudo-scientists’. The renowned
Uruguayan writer Eduardo Galeano celebrates football as ‘the art of the unforeseeable’, while former Real Madrid and Argentina star Jorge Valdano insists that in popular football culture, a ‘seduction by the sphere’ occurs wherein ‘you can’t interrupt emotion’ (quoted in Arbena 2000: 88).

Overall, we might observe that, in regard to the homogenization–heterogenization debate, football games themselves serve to narrate or to dramatize the dilemmas of standardization and differentiation. In broad terms, matches continually pit the technical efficiency of homogenization against the mould-breaking divergence of improvisation and innovation. While standardization is more associated with defensive play, differentiation is more commonly identified in attack. As Guillermo Stábile, Argentina’s manager during the 1940s and 1950s, once insisted, ‘You can organize a defence, but you had better not try to organize your attack’ (Lodziak 1966: 13). In defence, organization is paramount, with players tutored to fulfil set roles and duties that usually correspond to global coaching manuals. In attack, while set plays (such as free-kicks and corners) may be studiously rehearsed, building attacks in open play is best achieved through creativity, improvisation and the outfoxing of opponents. In this way, in the shifting balance between calculated defence and improvisational attack, the football match itself becomes a potent and unresolved dramatization of the duality of glocality.

The US and Americanization: Succor for Soccer?

The subject of ‘Americanization’ is an important, wide-ranging strand of the general homogenization–heterogenization debate. Theories of Americanization advance a particular kind of cultural imperialism thesis, in interpreting the United States as effectively globalizing and imposing its culture upon other societies (cf. Crothers 2007: 22–25). Cultural Americanization is understood to penetrate other regional, national or local cultures, and to be advanced particularly by American corporations such as McDonald’s, Disney, Coca-Cola, Nike, and Microsoft. Cultural Americanization may be understood as functioning at two levels of intensity: hard Americanization involves the destruction of local cultural practices and products, and their substitution by American alternatives (for instance US fast food); soft Americanization involves the everyday influence of specific Americanisms upon local cultural practices and products (e.g. cheerleading and majorette displays at local galas).

A prima facie consideration of football’s historical globalization seems to refute the hard Americanization thesis, pointing instead to separate spheres of sporting development between the US and most other nations or regions. First, the United States has played little role in football’s global diffusion and cross-cultural flows, such as administrative leadership, tournament successes, coaching techniques or player mobility. In turn, despite strong backing from US-based TNCs, the leading American sports have failed to dislodge football from its dominant global status (cf. Katz 1994; Kelly 2007).
Second, more substantively, US sport provides a prodigious illustration of the broad ‘American Exceptionalism’ thesis, of a national *sonderweg* (or ‘special path’) relative to cultural trends in other parts of the world (cf. Markovits and Hellerman 2001; Pieterse 2004). In the late nineteenth century, the old folk football games of Britain – with their highly localized and rather amorphous rules – were adapted in unique ways in the United States, to create the distinctive ‘American football’ code. Since that time, for most Americans, the word ‘football’ has referred to a particular, indigenous game, while the global game of ‘soccer’ connotes a rather ‘non-American’ pastime.

Moreover, American sportspeople sustained and advanced their own sporting models, in part by consciously rejecting modern European games redolent of the Old World’s colonialist, nationalist and socialist cultures. Whereas association football became the ‘national sport’ across Europe, Latin America and much of Africa, sports like American football or baseball received potent support throughout the United States’ civil society, notably the education system, mass media and consumer industries. For the tens of millions of migrants entering the United States through the twentieth century, the adoption of these American sports was an important symbolic means of abandoning the old Europe, and assimilating and showing patriotic commitment to the new society. To add everyday impact, American popular culture has tended to ignore association football or, particularly in local and regional media, to poke fun at major events such as the World Cup finals (cf. Foer 2004: 240–246).

It may be added that, somewhat remarkably, the globalization of sport is unlike other popular cultural forms (such as film, music and food) which, in contrast, have been heavily influenced or even inspired by the United States (Cvetkovich and Kellner 1997; Ritzer 2004). Sassoon (2002) argues that the globalization of US culture was facilitated in part by the multicultural diversity of the domestic market, which enabled American corporations to test their products at home before pursuing international consumers. However, unlike other cultural forms, US sport was never so geared towards international diffusion, but tended instead to satisfy itself with domestic engagement, in part through a ‘solipsistic’ celebration of the ‘American way’ (cf. Martin and Reeves 2001). Such cultural introspection ensured that, beyond North American shores, and unlike other popular forms such as pop music or film, football had a relatively clear and unchallenged run across the emerging global sports field.

Moving beyond these initial observations, we do warn that the keyword ‘Americanization’ itself has some inherently problematic aspects. On one hand, the term misleads us into viewing the United States as a homogeneous and unitary entity, particularly at a time when North America is becoming increasingly heterogeneous through the influences of migrant groups and new forms of identity differentiation (Robertson 2004: 261–263). Indicatively, across the United States, football is particularly popular among migrants born in Europe and Latin America, providing Latinos in particular with a rare cultural opportunity to celebrate publically and en masse a form
of distinctive identity, as manifested by the foundation of ‘ethnic’ teams, or by cheering for their ‘home’ national sides inside American stadiums or while viewing on television.

On the other hand, the term USAmericanization may be more accurate in denoting the intended meaning of the process in question, as it separates Canada, Mexico, central and South America from the United States (cf. Robertson 2004: 257). In football, it may be argued that the game has really undergone long-term SouthAmericanization processes, given the aesthetic, technical and political influences of Brazil and Argentina at global level. Here, we continue to use the term ‘Americanization’ to denote the perceived spread of US culture, but with these caveats firmly in mind.

If we turn to examine the specificities of US influence upon football, it is possible to identify some soft and selective types of Americanization as occurring at transnational levels. Reflecting the wider influence of ‘technical’ aspects of US culture, American marketing methods and television production techniques have been copied in European football, such as to ‘makeover’ the Champions League (cf. Marling 2006; the Guardian, 15 February 2007). Some economists identify a business shift in European professional football from the old sports model of ‘utility maximization’ (emphasizing club success and status over profit) towards the more Americanized model of ‘profit maximization’ (see Chapter 3). European football leagues also show various kinds of financial and juridical convergence with American sports, such as in the sharing of national revenues across teams, the linking of television revenues to market size, the retention of gate-money by home sides, the role of agents in player contract negotiations, the advent of free agency, and the massive rise in media involvement. Football may yet consider following the American path in establishing salary caps (Andreff and Staudohar 2000). Moreover, there has been a significant penetration of European football, notably in England, by American capital. By spring 2008, three of England’s top six sides (Manchester United, Liverpool, Aston Villa) were owned by US sports entrepreneurs.

One intriguing matter concerns the role of quantitative data in sport and its possible relationship to Americanization processes. Historically, there have been strong cultural differences: while US sports like baseball and American football are traditionally packed with statistical information for understanding performances, many football societies have long refused to reduce the game to number-crunching. However, since the mid-1990s, data analysis has been increasingly prominent in professional football across the world, for example through the ProZone system which tracks and measures the performance indicators of all players. Thus it is difficult to determine whether football’s quantification represents a diffusion of American sporting culture or a parallel development in sport’s rationalization.

28 For example, distinguished football journalists like Brian Glanville lambasted the statistics-based tactics of English coaching gurus Charles Reep and Charles Hughes, who insisted that most goals are scored from less than three passes and inside so-called ‘POMO’ areas (Positions of Maximum Opportunity).
We need to consider too the critical reflexivity of social actors in regard to perceived processes of Americanization. In some circumstances, resistance towards perceived Americanization may be framed as a sporting 'clash of civilizations' (cf. Huntington 1993), as European football cultures actively differentiate their sport ethos (expressed through senses of deep solidarity and belonging) to the perceived American emphasis on commerce (wherein clubs are mere 'franchises' that may be bought, sold and transferred regardless of community ties). These kinds of discourses were evident in England during and soon after the takeover of Manchester United by the Glazer family in 2005, and following Liverpool's purchase by two US sports entrepreneurs in 2006; indeed, Liverpool fans held demonstrations to demand the club's sale to a Dubai business group. Of course, this sporting clash of civilizations was overlain by the strengthening of anti-American political sentiments in Europe, particularly after the Iraq War.

Other forms of perceived Americanization in football are also criticized by many of the game's close followers. The entry of cheerleaders and pre-game 'razzmatazz' into football is mocked by some 'traditionalist' forces, including longstanding US-based followers of the game. Prior to the 1994 World Cup finals, intense criticisms were inspired by rumours that serious changes to the laws of football were being mooted – such as extending goal sizes or replacing halves with quarter periods – to attract US television stations and audiences. Even in the United States, American sports marketing techniques may fail to ignite public interest in football: for example, the short-lived women's national soccer league (WUSA) alienated many prospective spectators through promotional exercises that normalized middle-class family audiences and emphasized top-down strategies for stage-managing crowd 'atmosphere' (Jones 2007: 243–4).

However, we should note that, despite a reflex, critical association of Americanization with commodification in sport and beyond, the real influence of market principles is rather more complex and varied. It may be argued that, like the entry of quantification, football's wider commodification from the late 1980s onwards would have occurred without any mimicry of US sports marketing techniques (cf. Sklair 1995: 153). Moreover, European football is in many ways rather more free-market than US sports, where league 'cartels', salary caps and revenue-sharing are crucial economic features. Additionally, unlike the vast majority of elite football clubs, US sports teams do not carry sponsor logos on their shirts.

Football cultures across the world sustain major differences from the American sports model. Football typically generates more partisan atmospheres and rivalries in most US sports; most elite US sports fixtures have tiny representations of 'away' fans, unlike most top football games; and elite football players contest more vigorously the decisions by officials than do
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29 For example, in Germany, Bayern Munich are sometimes known, somewhat critically, as FC Hollywood, for their players' celebrity lifestyles.
their US sporting counterparts. Thus, rather than being sucked ineluctably into basic convergence with US sport, football continues to display strong forms of cross-cultural, cosmopolitan diversity. Some analysts have argued that American foreign policy should be more attuned to exploiting these cosmopolitan aspects of football. For example, US military commanders were deemed to have missed a major diplomatic opportunity to exercise ‘soft power’ when they failed to screen the 2006 World Cup finals during the disastrous occupation of Iraq.  

_Pace_ the Americanization thesis, football points to three kinds of ‘reverse colonization’ or _Americanization_, whereby the ‘global game’ penetrates the US. First, football does have a complex, submerged social history in the United States. In the late nineteenth century, soccer-style games were played at Yale while American teams contested representative fixtures (Gorn and Goldstein 1993: 130–1). Between the world wars, European immigrants developed local US football systems while many European and South American clubs regularly toured North America. In the post-war period, national soccer leagues were established. The North American Soccer League (NASL), founded in 1968, was laden with highly-paid senior world stars – such as Pelé, Beckenbauer, Neeskens, Chinaglia and Carlos Alberto at New York Cosmos – but the tournament expanded too rapidly, failed to sustain national interest, and collapsed in 1984 (Wangerin 2006). A modest but relatively successful indoor league system then maintained the national presence of professional football through the 1980s and 1990s. Plans for the foundation of a new national league system received a major boost when FIFA awarded the 1994 World Cup finals to the United States, and fixtures were played before very strong crowds, often in extremely hot conditions. The United States has also notched up some noteworthy football achievements, competing in all but one of the World Cup finals, defeating England in 1950, and reaching the later rounds for the first time in 2002.

Second, it is clear that US soccer has not usurped the financial and national-cultural power of the ‘Big 4’ sports – American football, baseball, basketball and ice hockey. However, US soccer has made massive international and grassroots progress since the early 1980s, becoming the most popular youth team sport with an estimated 17.6 million listed players, over 40 per cent of them female, and around two-thirds aged under-18. Football is particularly strong among white, middle-class suburban schoolchildren and college students, whose participation is often aided by family-oriented ‘soccer moms’, a distinctive
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30 As argued by Nicholas Cull, of the Center for Public Diplomacy at the University of Southern California (see _The Times_, 24 June 2007).
31 The Cosmos’ name, short of course for Cosmopolitans, was inspired in part by the New York Mets (short for Metropolitans) baseball team; the former title reflected the (for that time) exceptional international diversity of players in the team.
32 See www.ussoccerplayers.com/resource_center/for_parents/basic_info_for_youth_parents/447864.html
socio-political category dating from the early 1990s (cf. Andrews et al. 1997). The US women's soccer team won the FIFA World Cup (1991, 1999) and 1996 Olympic gold medal at the Atlanta Games before national television audiences of over 40 million. Star players like Mia Hamm, Michelle Akers and Brandi Chastain have received greater national accolades than their male counterparts.

Third, US soccer established a new professional league, the MLS, in 1996, with ten 'franchise' teams, growing to thirteen by 2007, following various expansions and contractions. MLS follows the US monopoly sport model, wherein a franchise league is controlled by a cartel of permanent members with no promotion or relegation. Television contracts were established with Univision/Telemundo and ESPN/ABC, and high profile TNC sponsorships with Honda, Budweiser, Kelloggs and Yahoo, followed by a $100 million, ten-year deal with adidas in 2004. Learning from NASL's disastrously rapid expansionism, the MLS has controlled growth strategies and restrictive salary caps (just over $2 million for each club's roster of players in 2005). The entry of a Toronto team in 2005 highlighted MLS's pan-continental possibilities, but the most ambitious measure saw the LA Galaxy team sign the world's most famous and commercially successful player, David Beckham, in 2007, in a five-year $250 million deal. Reports initially surfaced that Beckham's future team-mates– some of whom earned $12,900 annually– resented his salary, although this issue disappeared when the player landed in LA (Sport Illustrated, 4 May 2007).

While its survival and expansion points to the US game's underlying strengths, the full development of MLS has been hampered by financial, political and cultural problems. First, in its opening five years, MLS lost $250 million, and revenues from crowds and sponsors declined. By 2003, six of the ten teams were owned by one corporation (Phil Anschutz's AEG Group), confirming the limited football interests of other US corporations and sports behemoths. The salary cap – which saw over 80 players earning under $55,000 in 2004 – restricted MLS's competitiveness in international labour markets. In response, MLS introduced a 'designated player' rule in 2007, enabling each club to sign an elite player whose first $350,000 in wages would only count against the salary cap; the remainder would be covered by outside sponsors. At the same time, efforts to broaden club ownership had been successful, with ten different parties controlling the thirteen clubs.

Second, MLS struggled to appeal to the established football-supporting public, primarily first- and second-generation migrants from Europe and Latin America, who tend instead to maintain allegiances to clubs 'back home'. Many subscription television networks serve these migrant audiences, such as GolTV with Iberian and Latin American games, or Setanta Sports which covers Scottish fixtures. MLS is often a net loser when foreign clubs travel to play summer exhibition fixtures in the United States. For

33Similarly in Australia, each A-League club is allowed two 'marquee players', whose wages are privately financed and do not count against the annual salary cap (set at AU$1.8 million for 2007–8).
example, on the same day in 2004, the MLS’s All-Star game (with 21,000 spectators) was seriously overshadowed by the Manchester United–Milan friendly in New York (which drew 74,000 fans).

Third, MLS’s financial travails have been mirrored elsewhere in US soccer. The Championsworld corporation that organizes summer tours for foreign clubs filed for bankruptcy protection in 2005 after accruing £5 million debts. WUSA collapsed, in part due to large losses ($80 million over three years) and national television audiences of below 100,000.

Fourth, the Latino influence is met with some ambivalence by US soccer. Latinos comprise around half of all MLS followers and 40 million of all Americans (The Economist, 30 April 2005; cf. Jewell and Molina 2005). To capitalize, MLS awarded a franchise to the Mexican team Guadalajara, to be sited in LA, for 2005, while senior executives ruminated on a possible merger with the Mexican First Division. Yet MLS tends to repeat American corporate and media misunderstandings of Latinos as a homogeneous, ‘pan-ethnic’ community rather than as a diverse category in terms of nationality, language, age, class and gender (Delgado 1999). US soccer is still largely dominated by European-style rather than Latino coaches, and so tends to privilege white college players.

Overall, MLS and the strongest US sports continue to face analogous problems in different contexts, in attempting to dislodge more powerful competitors in the domestic or global marketplaces. US football faces a broader challenge in attempting to mould a popular national sporting identity from a relatively niche base across an increasingly diverse social landscape.

Cosmopolitanism

A further crucial debate on globalization and culture, and on the problem of homogenization/heterogenization, concerns the issue of cosmopolitanism (see, for example, Beck 2006; Breckenridge et al. 2002; Delanty 2006; Fine 2007; Rumford 2007; Vertovec and Cohen 2002). It is important to begin here by differentiating general and social scientific understandings of the cosmopolitan. Commonsensical, essentialist positions tend to imply that cosmopolitans hold an innate superiority or greater moral value – as relatively bourgeois, liberal and cultured global citizens – compared to the perceived chauvinism and parochialism of geographically fixed ‘locals’ (cf. Eagleton 2006; Hannerz 1990). Historically, at least in Anglophone societies, this latter division between cosmopolitans and locals may incline towards a dismissive view of ‘uncultured’ football players and other professional, usually ‘lower-class’ sports people. While this type of labeling has always been sociologically questionable, we might note in passing that in world football in recent years, increasing numbers of elite players, often aged in their early 20s, have become fluent in two or more languages, thus displaying an important form of cultural cultivation that remains rare among the professional classes, including academics, in the Anglophone world.

Conversely, we understand cosmopolitanism in more sociological terms in three broad senses. First, cosmopolitanism registers heightened degrees
of experience and awareness of cultural variety and interplay, as partial consequences of increasing transnational connectivity through telecommunications and travel. Second, cosmopolitanism does not necessarily involve a fundamentalist opposition to ‘the local’; indeed, without local cultures, the cosmopolitan is out of business. A ‘rooted’ or ‘patriotic’ cosmopolitanism may arise wherein social groups simultaneously engage with their ‘home’ society and other peoples, places and cultures (Appiah 1997: 618). Third, particular types of cosmopolitanism may also be understood in normative or ethical terms, as advocating greater recognition or openness towards other cultures.

In many ways, contemporary cosmopolitanism is a mundane or banal characteristic of everyday socio-cultural life. Billig (1994) employs the idea of ‘banal nationalism’ to describe how images, symbols and other references to national identity are routinely encountered in any nation. We consider that the concepts of ‘banal cosmopolitanism’34 or ‘banal relativization’ may also be advanced to register the quotidian, everyday experiences of cultural diversity, such as in food, language, nationality, dress and popular tastes.

In Western European football, banal cosmopolitanism is evidenced by the multiplicity of international players in local teams, and the array of foreign clubs and tournaments that may be watched on television. But, in some contrast to Billig’s original concept, we would add that football crystallizes periods of exceptional nationalism, as well as its banal variant. For example, it is increasingly the case that, for the duration of major international tournaments, symbols of national allegiance become suddenly ubiquitous in relatively unusual places, such as when flags adorn homes, offices, car windows, and major thoroughfares.

In regard to banal cosmopolitanism, broader knowledge of diverse football systems is facilitated by diasporic groups, satellite television, and the cultural valorization of fresh and diverse experiences. Leading European football divisions are presented in their distinctive national-cultural languages: initially, UK fans were familiarized with the Bundesliga (Germany), Serie A (Italy) and La Liga (Spain), but latterly we have Ligue 1 (France) and Eredivisie (Holland). In passing, we may note the considerable continuities here with the duality of glocalization: everyday cosmopolitan tastes are attuned to experience and to absorb different grassroots football cultures and league systems, while sporting competitions are formulated and sometimes rebranded to appeal to diverse audiences.

A further aspect of contemporary cosmopolitanism concerns the proliferation of sporting crossovers. Certainly, we appreciate that there have long been individual, group and institutional ties between football and other sports. For example, many leading football teams on the European mainland and in Latin America emerged from multi-sport clubs during the take-off phase of globalization. Several leading football clubs in Spain, Greece, Turkey and the wider Balkans region have elite professional basketball sides. Moreover, many individual players are embedded within the established sporting and body cultures of their wider society, hence the continuing links

34 Beck (2004: 21) also employs this concept.
between Brazilian players and capoeira, English players and sports like cricket or boxing, Irish players with ‘Gaelic football’, or Brazil’s supporter associations and the ‘samba schools’ that compete during carnaval.

However, as major football clubs and competitions become increasingly transnational, so more diverse kinds of sporting crossover start to emerge. In terms of club ownership, US sports entrepreneurs have bought several leading football teams, especially in England. In terms of training methods, team formations and tactics, football coaches have started to borrow more from US and other sports such as basketball and American football. In terms of technical skills, some elite players utilize their expertise in other disciplines on the football field; for example, the acrobatic Swedish star Zlatan Ibrahimovic is adept in taekwondo, a Korean martial art. Greater levels of transnational migration also contribute to this cosmopolitan complexity; for example, the Italian forward, Christian Vieri, is a renowned cricket fan, due to spending part of his childhood in Sydney, Australia.

Returning to Appiah’s insights on ‘rooted cosmopolitanism’, football provides some of the strongest historical illustrations of this process on a mass scale, pitting teams and their representative communities against each other across national and transnational terrains. Most supporters are socialized into a cosmopolitan appreciation of the aesthetic possibilities of the game itself, even if these qualities are manifested by opponents during fixtures. In playing football, technical development and improvement are only possible through watching and learning from other cultures.

In more recent times, forms of ‘virtually rooted cosmopolitanism’ arise in football, through a movement beyond old ‘national’ forms of solidarity and into the creation of collectives that share preferences for particular world players, managers, clubs and playing styles. For example, among the millions watching the World Cup we find global ‘neo-tribes’ of cosmopolitans that identify with, for example, the counter-attacking guile of the 1982 Italians but not the ‘pressing’ Italians of 1992–4; or that scorn the ‘European’ Brazilians of 1974, but not the highly expressive 1982 Brazilians; or that admire the flamboyant 1978 Argentinians under Menotti, but not the 1986 or 1990 team under the dour Bilardo (notwithstanding Maradona’s brilliance) (cf. Maffesoli 1996). In this way, heightened cosmopolitanism engenders, not an indiscriminate universalism, but fresh modes of cultural differentiation and particularization.

Cosmopolitanism may carry significant forms of particularity that are, for example, rooted in social class, such as through the habitus of new middle class cosmopolitans (Giulianotti 1999a); cultural aesthetics, such as through favouring certain styles of play or sporting culture; and also ethno-cultural similitude, such as when Argentinians watch Spanish league fixtures. Even extreme forms of chauvinistic localism – such as the display of fascistic symbols inside stadiums – are only sociologically intelligible when contextualized with regard to universal or transcultural processes. We deal with these matters more fully in Chapter 5, but here our preliminary observation is that specific cultures tend to embrace more universalistic and humanistic forms of cosmopolitanism in rather uneven ways. For many cultures, the shock of banal cosmopolitanism
engenders cultural introspection and societal self-inquiry, setting in motion a
generalized ‘search for fundamentals’ which may at times be manifested
through forms of xenophobic behaviour (Robertson 1992: 164–166).

It is useful, therefore, to differentiate between thick and thin cosmopolitan-
ism. Thick cosmopolitanism features a relatively universalistic engagement
with or embracing of other cultures. Thin cosmopolitanism involves a more
pragmatic orientation towards other societies, adopting an ‘equal-but-
different’ stance while instrumentally borrowing aspects of the outside culture
in order to sustain the host culture. Thus, for example, thick cosmopolitanism
is evident in football magazines and newspapers that discuss and explain in
detail the game in different societies. Thin cosmopolitanism is more apparent
in newspaper stories that report only on foreign players or teams that local
clubs are set to encounter (cf. Giulianotti and Robertson 2007b). The relative
balance between thin and thick variants of cosmopolitanism provides a
broader mirror of the socio-cultural relationship between football and specific
societies. In general terms, without further embellishment, banal cosmopoli-
itanism is more closely connected to the thin variant. Both thick and thin vari-
ants are apparent in different kinds of rooted cosmopolitanism.

Finally, contemporary cosmopolitanism has been more generally impli-
cated within the ‘postmodern turn’ and the structural transformation of foot-
bald in Western Europe since the early 1990s. The postmodern, cosmopolitan
aspects of football are evidenced in the blurring or collapse of modern broad
categorical and aesthetic boundaries, such as in the de-differentiation of low
(football) and ‘higher’ cultural forms (the performing arts, literature). In the
UK, BBC television’s wider framing of major football tournaments has been
illustrative. In the 1980s, UK football had been derided by many as a ‘slum
sport for slum people’, yet the BBC added a strong cultural theme to the
1990 World Cup finals in Italy through the musical accompaniment of clas-
sical music, notably Pavarotti’s Nessun Dorma (cf. Taylor 1987). These forms
of de-differentiation continued, appealing particularly to thick cosmo-
opolitanism, and culminated in the 2004 European Championships, for which
BBC television ran a short trailer that visualized leading international players
in the style of their most celebrated national artists: hence, visual editing
enabled England’s Beckham to appear in the fleshy tones of Lucien Freud,
Holland’s Van Nistelroy in the vivid contrasts of Van Gogh, France’s Zidane
in the blurry lens of Monet, and Spain’s Raul through the cubist prism of
Picasso. In this way, the national icons of the world game are brought into
playful, postmodern correspondence with the national masters of global art.

Nostalgia

We noted earlier that, since the nineteenth century, nostalgia has been a
strong counterpoint of modernism. The ‘nostalgic paradigm’, according to
Stauth and Turner (1988: 47), has four main components: the imagining of
history in terms of decline; the sense of a loss of wholeness; the sense of loss
of expressivity and spontaneity; and the sense of loss of individual autonomy.
We noted in Chapter 1 that nostalgia has taken two historical forms. First, during the third, take-off stage of globalization, ‘wilful nostalgia’ enhanced the invention of diverse modern traditions and identities. Wilful nostalgia was apparent in the amateurist and aristocratic values of football’s British custodians, and among the overseas protagonists who forged close educational and commercial ties to ‘Home’.

Second, since the 1960s, a ‘somewhat different and diffuse kind of wilful, synthetic nostalgia’ has arisen which is ‘incorporated – for the most part capitalistically – into consumerist, image-conveyed nostalgia’ (Robertson 1990b: 53–5; cf. Appadurai 1998: 76). This ‘postmodernized nostalgia’ is highly transnational, ‘democratically’ cultural and highly simulated.35 In football, this postmodern nostalgia centres particularly upon the great players and teams of the recent past, and in the senses of loss that are expressed when contemporary international sides fail to match their predecessors’ exalted standards. Brazil’s World Cup-winning team from 1970 provides the example par excellence of such postmodern nostalgia. Burnished by brilliant individual talents, Brazil’s triumphs were filmed in colour for global audiences. The stunning last goal in the 4-1 final victory against Italy is constantly replayed by television stations across the world, to become deeply embedded in the collective memory of global football followers. Through replaying such global moments, the transnational mass media has played a crucial role in converting Brazil into the ‘second nation’ of millions of football fans across the world (cf. Ritzer 2004: 90).36 Moreover, it should be added that nostalgic constructions of this Brazilian team are typically counterpoised to representations of contemporary, modernist styles of play as functional and machine-like. Media discourses on football wax nostalgically on Brazil as the supreme exponents of futebol arte, therein conveniently forgetting some of the team’s more robust methods or unsuccessful moves. Contemporary consumerism is further evidenced in postmodern nostalgia, for example as retro versions of the Brazilian team shirt (notably Pelé’s number 10) and tracksuits became standard commodities in sports retailers across Europe in the early 2000s.

Other forms of nostalgia are evident in football. Football marketing constantly activates nostalgic themes. When England hosted the 1996 European Championship finals, national media constantly recalled the 1966 World Cup victory, and the song ‘Football’s Coming Home’ became a tournament anthem, although such nostalgia rather marginalized ‘other’ British nationals, such as the Scots, Welsh and Northern Irish, and those of direct immigrant descent (cf. Carrington 1998). Elsewhere, a vast market in football nostalgia has mushroomed, as old stadiums open museums and long-retired players publish their autobiographies.37

---

35 For an analogous differentiation of ‘primary’ and ‘ersatz’ nostalgia, see Appadurai (1998: 76–78).
36 Hence, when their opponents outplay Brazil but lose (as did Spain’s team at the under-17 world final), they may claim to be ‘the real Brazilians’, to claim the aesthetic high ground.
37 In the UK, we may consider the various biographies and autobiographies of Billy Meredith (who played during the 1900s), Raich Carter (1930s), Tommy Taylor (1940s), Wilf Mannion (1950s), Bobby Moore (1960s), Giorgio Chinaglia (1960s and 1970s) and Alan Hudson (1970s).
Nostalgic football television shows draw upon an enormous reservoir of film from the 1960s, but particularly the 1980s, onwards. The timespan for nostalgia is compressed, such that television shows ‘relive’ events from the previous year, month or week. Postmodern, instant nostalgia is precipitated by advanced digital technology and editing techniques that dissolve team histories, interweaving images of past and present players, to become teammates in some timeless simulated game. Past and present are ‘dedifferentiated’ in real ways too, as indoor football tournaments feature teams of players from yesteryear, to inspire the armchair reminiscences of satellite television viewers. In this way, contemporary mediatization processes are pivotal to the diverse ways in which postmodern nostalgia is underpinned by both local and transnational forms of identification and collective memory.

Concluding Comments

Evidently, the cultural globalization of football is not a straightforward process. Revealing its complex making and contemporary condition requires us to unravel the mutually implicating relationships within the old antonyms of global thinking.

The universalism–particularism problem interrelates with relativization processes, and underpins the worldwide normalization of identity–differentiation through football and other cultural forms. This process has become increasingly complex as diasporic groups undergo de- and re-territorialization in terms of football and wider cultural identification. Similarly, processes of homogenization and heterogenization are evidenced in the cultural globalization of football, for example as nations share similar league systems, but interpret the game in varied ways. The concept of glocalization, containing the ‘duality of glocality’, reflects the mutual interrelations of these tendencies. In turn, football provides a potent refutation of the more routine variant of the Americanization thesis, to the extent that some signs of reverse colonization are apparent. Themes of social and normative cosmopolitanism are also spotlighted, as football intensifies everyday forms of socio-cultural connectivity and varied kinds of engagement with ‘other’ social groups. Finally, the social construction of nostalgia has contributed significantly to the consecration of the ‘local’, and to the making of a global consciousness through postmodern ways of remembering within football.

Our arguments here have been underpinned by the introduction of new or modified concepts within the field of globalization studies. Relevant concepts here include duality of glocality, banal cosmopolitanism, exceptional nationalism, thin and thick cosmopolitanisms, hard and soft Americanization, and Americolonization. The utility of these fresh concepts extends well beyond football and into a host of other cultural domains. As we shall see, these concepts and other arguments should not simply be located in abstract isolation from other dimensions of global processes. Rather, they have a direct and highly complex impact upon the economic, political and social dimensions of globalization.