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Abstract

This thesis examines the extent of the diffusion of baseball across the world. Tracing the diffusion of baseball, and the diverse receptions the game has encountered on foreign soils, holds out the prospect of offering many insights into the global spread of sport and our understanding of the processes of globalization in general. By examining different responses to baseball, and developing our empirical knowledge on the extent of its diffusion, we will be in a position to draw more reliable and valid conclusions than have, thus far, been offered in relation to the global diffusion of baseball specifically, and globalization processes more generally. The thesis endeavours to determine the extent to which baseball can be regarded as a global sport. This objective will involve charting the development of baseball in America, its diffusion to other countries and the different receptions the game has received on foreign soil, via a series of national case studies.

Given the magnitude of global diffusion processes, it is hardly surprising that its study has attracted the attention of academics from a number of disciplines and orientations. This particular thesis tests the figurational approach, assessing the adequacy of this approach in being able to make sense of the global baseball figuration. It does this by first providing an outline for the incipient modernization, and subsequent sportization, of baseball in America. Then a cross-sectional analysis of the diffusion and development of baseball in various countries throughout the world is presented, for the most part via a critical analysis of secondary source material. In order to supplement the secondary source material, questionnaires were sent to all national governing bodies for baseball across the world (109 in total). The principal focus of the empirical aspects of this thesis is on the development of baseball in England. Extensive documentary analysis of archival newspaper sources was carried out in the National Newspaper Library, Colindale, London. Alongside this, several oral history interviews were conducted with baseball players who had played in this country before the 1950s. Furthermore, interviews were conducted with administrators involved in the running and promotion of the game in this country. Analysing the diffusion of baseball around the world, and the different responses to attempts to develop the game, and subsequently analysing in much greater depth the developments and responses to baseball in England, enables us to engage in more informed comparative analysis.

On the basis of this thesis it is concluded that the argument that baseball is a 'global sport', is a highly exaggerated view of baseball’s global profile. The fact of the matter is baseball has only enjoyed sustained periods of success in a handful of countries in Asia and Latin America. Furthermore, it is argued that the theoretical premises of figurational sociology are both sensitising and illuminating; and provide a more object-adequate analysis of the global baseball figuration than other theoretical approaches allow. In this respect, the central figurational concept of dynamic and differential power relationships is key to developing our understanding of the global baseball figuration, and globalization more generally. The concept of lengthening chains of interdependency is a far more illuminating, and therefore more useful, way of conceptualising the process by which baseball has undergone diffusion, than concepts such as Americanization, American cultural hegemony, imperialism, or, indeed, globalization.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

The phrase 'global village' has become part of common parlance. Its use is intended to convey not so much the intimacy of village relationships, but rather the increasing extent to which the activities of physically distant human beings impact upon one another. The phrase is intended to summon up an image of a world in which no one is insulated from the effects of these processes. The transportation systems, which facilitated the earlier phases of this process, have been supplemented by new and increasingly sophisticated modes of communication: phone, fax, electronic mail, and satellite television. The substantive forms taken by these processes of diffusion may be classified as cultural, economic, military and political. All of them find partial expression in the associated spread of a range of organizational forms and administrative principles. While the process of diffusion has deep historical roots, it has accelerated over the last one hundred and fifty years and has become particularly marked since the Second World War. The specific focus of this thesis will be on sport, and baseball in particular, as an aspect of the process of diffusion.

The study of sport offers us an excellent window onto processes of globalization. Sport has come to be extremely important to vast numbers of people across the world. International tournaments, such as the Olympic Games and the Association Football World Cup, attract huge global television audiences, the like of which is not mirrored in other aspects of culture. Indeed, as Dunning (1999, p.1) argues, "no activities have ever served so regularly as foci of simultaneous common interest and concern to so many people all over the world". Why is sport such a prime example of global diffusion? Jacques, writing in The Observer (13 July, 1998, p.19) newspaper, argues that "sport is a peculiarly mobile culture. Most cultural forms are
limited in their ability to travel, most obviously by language, but sport has an extraordinary ability to communicate”. Hence, sport is, primarily at least, an aspect of culture that is visual – that is to say, it does not suffer from a linguistic barrier to the same extent that modern music, or movies do. It is possible to watch, and understand, a game of football, or baseball, for example, without necessarily understanding the language being used by the competitors. Indeed, it is quite possible to play against, and even with, people who have little ability to communicate verbally with one another. As Maguire (1999) has pointed out, sport was the first truly global idiom.

1.1 The global baseball figuration

In this study, I intend to examine the extent of the diffusion of baseball across the world. I first became interested in baseball when visiting Canada and the United States of America (USA) in 1991. I was struck, initially, by the popularity of the game in Toronto, especially because the team based in the city, the Toronto Blue Jays, did not have a single Canadian player in its ranks. I brought this enthusiasm for baseball back with me and became puzzled as to why a sport that had become so successful in the USA was largely ignored in England, a country with strong ties to America. As an undergraduate, I embarked upon a small newspaper based project into the history of baseball in England. Much to my surprise, I discovered that the game was played in this country as long ago as 1874 and the first professional league was established in 1890. And yet, despite these deep roots, the game has never taken off in England. These discoveries, and my subsequent reflections, simply served to whet my appetite. Tracing the diffusion of baseball, the most quintessential of American sports, and the diverse receptions the game has encountered on foreign soils holds out the prospect of offering many insights into the global spread of sport and our understanding of the
processes of globalization in general. When I began to read some of the theoretical literature in the broader field of globalization, I was struck by the tendency of some writers to view globalization as synonymous with Americanization. With specific reference to baseball, many authors (Echevarria, 2000; Fidler, 2000; Gould, 2000; Marcano & Fidler, 1999; Rosentraub, 2000; Vargas, 2000) have concluded that we are presently witnessing an acceleration in the globalization of that sport. Vargas (2000, p.21) takes the view that “the global reach of Major League Baseball (MLB) has never been more evident”. Rosentraub (2000, p.126) is of a similar mind, and contends that MLB’s organizational reach is “the most striking example of ... transnational power” in sport, whilst Gould (2000, p.85) predicts that, “the twenty-first century will witness an acceleration in the globalization of America’s pastime”. According to Echevarria, (2000, p.145), “the causes of this expansion are no secret”. He continues, “baseball spread to various parts of the world as the United States became a world economic and military power ... Now that the United States is the only major power, it should not be surprising that baseball is expanding further and at a faster rate” (Echevarria, 2000, p.145). However, the unanimity of these writers should not be allowed to conceal the fact that their arguments tend to have two things in common. Firstly, they are fundamentally ethnocentric. For example, Rosentraub’s pronouncements take no account of the superior global profile of the Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA), the International Olympic Committee (IOC) and the International Association of Athletics Federations (IAAF), for example. Secondly, their generalizations lack any substantive empirical support. It is hoped that by examining different responses to baseball, and developing our empirical knowledge on the extent of its diffusion, we will be in a position to draw more reliable
and valid conclusions. At the same time, it is hoped we will be able to make greater sense of globalization processes more generally.

1.2 The central premises of the study

If we are to make sense of “cross-cultural-civilizational processes”, as Maguire (1999, p.56) refers to the various global flows associated with global diffusion, then we must ask a number of questions. To this end, Maguire (1999) suggests that several key questions that should form the basis for any empirical research into global diffusion. These include:

Is there a ‘monopoly mechanism’ at work within the global sport process? ... Are cross-cultural-civilizational exchanges a feature of the sport process? Can phases of colonization and repulsion be witnessed in the development of sport? Has sport been used as a sign of cultural status, exclusivity and power? What has been the role of Western and non-Western people in the established/outsider relations that arguably characterize the global sportization process? What is the nature of the power networks that characterize the global sport process? (Maguire, 1999, p.56).

This thesis will address these general questions. More specifically, it will also endeavour to determine the extent to which baseball can be regarded as a global sport. This objective will involve charting the development of baseball in America, its diffusion to other countries and the different receptions the game has received on foreign soil, via a series of national ‘case studies’.

In order to address the kinds of questions raised above, it is vital that we engage in empirically grounded theoretical research. This may seem like an unnecessary statement, however, much of the debate on globalization is characterized by a patent dearth of empirical evidence. Indeed, Robertson (1990, p.16) has astutely observed that there “is considerable danger that ‘globalization’ will become an
intellectual ‘play zone’ – a site for the expression of residual social-theoretical interests, interpretive indulgence, or the display of world-ideological preferences”.

Wilcox’s (1993, p.131) appraisal of the literature in the area leads him to the conclusion that:

The reader can be excused for developing a deep sense of frustration and confusion, as sociological jargon flows freely, with such central terms as Americanization, commodification, cultural colonialism, cultural hegemony, cultural homogenization, cultural imperialism, globalization, and modernization, lacking clear and precise definition, as well as being frequently used interchangeably.

As might be expected, the explanations presently on offer are expressions and confirmations of the conceptual and paradigmatic diversity that characterize the debate. In this regard, a major point of contention has arisen over whether the diffusion process is more appropriately conceived of in terms of dependency or interdependency. Similar polarization has occurred between those who argue that this process has had homogenising consequences and those who claim there has been greater diversity. This thesis will attempt to unravel some of these complexities and avoid the prevailing tendency to erect what are held to be false dichotomies.

1.3 Overview of the study

Notwithstanding the tendentious nature of the debate, there does seem to be a general consensus on the fact we are witnessing a process of globalization. Perhaps it is the very intensity of the controversy that drives the contributors to be primarily concerned with sustaining their respective ideological prejudices. In my view the ideological heat needs to be taken out of the debate. What is needed is theoretically informed, rigorous and balanced empirical research. This thesis will be guided by a desire to advance understanding rather than a wish to sustain some ideological
predilection. In other words, I will strive to achieve and maintain a substantial degree of detachment, and by such means I aim to provide an analysis that is, itself, characterized by a relative high degree of object-adequacy. These broad comments on the state of the current debate do not, of course, in any way detract from the need for a more detailed engagement with it. Such a review of the literature will form the substance of chapter two. This will involve a preliminary attempt at critically assessing the theoretical, empirical and methodological adequacy of the various competing schools of thought. In chapter three, I will outline the theoretical perspective that I intend to apply, and whose adequacy I aim to test, in the context of this thesis. The perspective in question is the figurational approach, first developed by Norbert Elias. In this context, I will outline how I propose to apply this approach to an understanding of processes of globalization in general, and the diffusion of baseball in particular. It would be less than honest if I did not concede that the reason I have chosen to adopt this approach is because of my initial attraction to it. To use the language of Elias, I see it as having the potential to generate more object-adequate explanations. However, notwithstanding this predilection, I will endeavour to be as detached in my appraisal of its relative explanatory power as I aim to be in my approach to the empirical research. Of course, it will be for the reader to judge to what extent this thesis measures up to the standards I have set for myself. Chapter four provides an outline of the proposed methodological approach taken within this thesis. This dimension assumes greater importance in view of my comments on what I judge to be the empirical shortcomings of much of the globalization debate. Therefore, there is a need to be transparent about the methods used to gather the empirical data that are the basis for the conclusions drawn within this thesis. In chapter five, I provide an overview of the emergence and development of baseball as a 'modern sport'. It is
clear that baseball emerged in its modern form from numerous bat-and-ball games played in the USA during the middle of the nineteenth century. Attention will be paid as to how baseball achieved ascendancy over cricket. Cricket had been, for the early part of the nineteenth century, the most popular summer sport in the country. On the basis of the success of baseball’s development within the USA, some of its proponents attempted to develop a following for the game abroad. Chapter six provides a detailed account of the spread of baseball across the world. Within this chapter, I aim to account for its differential global popularity. I will provide an initial assessment of how baseball developed extensively in some countries, and barely registered with the population in others. This empirically detailed analysis is key to our understanding of globalization processes. As Maguire (1999, p.38) points out, there is a “need to conduct comparative civilizational analysis”. This is complimented by a more in-depth case study of the baseball figuration in England. To this end, chapter seven presents a comprehensive account for the development of baseball in England, from the very first attempts made to introduce the game in 1874, up until the present day. This case study is important because the less detailed analyses of the other countries in chapter six are primarily based on secondary sources and while it is possible, to some degree, to assess the consistency of these accounts and identify when ideology is clearly informing the analyses, it is not so easy to determine how the predispositions of the authors have influenced their selection of the evidence. With the case study of England, I am able to exert more control over data gathering and be more confident when drawing upon its findings and implications for an understanding of the global picture. In my view, being sensitive to the interplay between insights derived from local figurations and reflections on the global figuration is a potentially productive way of proceeding. Analysing the diffusion of baseball around the world,
and the different responses to attempts to develop the game, and subsequently analysing, in much greater depth, the developments and responses to baseball in England, enables us to engage in more informed comparative analysis. Having adopted a developmental approach to all the ‘case studies’, in chapter eight I will endeavour to compensate for the resultant fragmentation of this national approach by drawing them together in order to present a developmental account of the global figuration. As Kilminster (1997, p.271) argues:

The interdependencies between groups within nations and between nations across the globe, which has to be investigated much more on the empirical level, have properties which are the result of the unplanned consequences of those compelling relations, which exceed the scope of individual actions but are nevertheless only the result of those actions and the cumulative effect of historical order of their development. My point is that their existence and concrete effects are empirically demonstrable.

In my final chapter, I will engage in some critical reflections on the relative explanatory power of the figurational approach. I will also offer an appraisal of how the present thesis might have benefited if I had had more time and resources at my disposal, and if I had known what I know now. Finally, I will offer suggestions on some of the directions that future research into sport and processes of globalization might fruitfully go.
Chapter 2: Reviewing the Literature: Theorizing Global Processes

2.1 Introduction

Given the magnitude of global diffusion processes, it is hardly surprising that its study has attracted the attention of academics from a number of disciplines and orientations. In fact, the sheer volume of publications in the broad area of globalization means that it is simply impossible to cover each and every one of them within this review. As a result, what follows is a review of the specifically sociological literature published in the area. The review will cover both broader sociological approaches and those with a more specific focus from the sociology of sport sub-discipline. Even so, it will be impossible to cover the work of all sociological contributions to the debate on globalization. Therefore, the focus will be on key texts.

Not surprisingly the multitude of approaches taken to globalization have found expression in definitional and explanatory diversity. This will become clearer as this review unfolds. With regard to the definitional issue, certain terms are often used interchangeably in the literature. For example, without drawing any distinction between them, some authors refer to these processes of diffusion as 'globalization' and 'cultural imperialism'. By implication, this would seem to suggest that these 'terms' have the same meaning. In response, other writers maintain the need to distinguish between them, because they are held to have distinctive conceptual and explanatory implications. The different positions may be identified and distinguished along the following lines:

- Modernization theorists, who have argued that globalization processes have homogenising tendencies;
• Dependency theorists, and advocates of the “Cultural Imperialism” thesis, who also focus solely on homogenization processes;

• Pluralists, who argue that cultural diversity, and as such, heterogenising tendencies, are an expression of global processes;

• Cultural hegemonists, who argue that dominant groups meet with some resistance and this finds expression in both homogenization and heterogenization;

• Writers from a ‘multi-causal’ dimension. In many respects, this is a residual category, since this group of authors cannot be grouped as a ‘school’; nevertheless they have sufficient in common to be distinguished from other writers. It is clear that, though they share much in common with cultural hegemonists, they are not ‘cultural hegemony’ theorists. They do argue that homogenization and heterogenization occurs, but they also argue that numerous factors contribute to globalization processes, and that it is too restrictive to concentrate analysis on dominant groups;

• Figurational sociologists, who argue along similar lines to the ‘multi-causal’ group. However, they adhere to an explicit theoretical approach, which focuses on the complex dynamics of human figurations, the interdependency ties and power relationships involved. Unlike other approaches, particular emphasis is placed upon the unplanned outcomes of dynamic figurations.

The position taken here is that while one requires some initial orientation to the subject matter, clarifying definitions are more likely to form part of the conclusion than the introduction. Rather than begin the research process with a rigid conception of ‘how things are’, a more constructive approach is to establish a provisional
framework that is open to modification in light of the evidence. Although, in reviewing the literature it seems appropriate to structure this chapter around the broad dividing lines established above. I will present the central elements of the approaches taken by these authors before concluding with a preliminary assessment of their relative theoretical, empirical and methodological adequacy.

2.2 Explication of the literature

2.2.1 Modernization theorist

Wagner (1984; 1988; 1989; 1990) highlights the significant contribution of former ‘colonial powers’ with regard to the diffusion of forms of sport. Nevertheless, his argument is not that cultural diffusion is a dimension of cultural imperialism. Rather, he proposes a modernization thesis. This modernization approach is functionalist in character and is concerned with how societies have reached ‘modernity’. The modernization approach presupposes that global diffusion processes are contributing to homogenization because different societies throughout the world will eventually follow the ‘modern’, western ideal of development. Wagner (1989, p.5) points out, however, that “those who argue that virtually all modern sports diffused from Europe … are likely to have to modify their stand with respect to Asian sports”. In this regard, Wagner argues that certain ‘sports’ indigenous to parts of Asia – for example, many martial arts, sumo wrestling, ssirum, and takraw – remain comparatively popular. Ssirum and takraw are popular only in Asia, although some martial arts and sumo wrestling have diffused beyond Asia, and are more or less global in their diffusion. As such, he argues, “our Europcentric view of sport history must be modified and broadened” (Wagner, 1989, p.5). Instead, Wagner (1989, p.5) maintains that the “total world sports heritage is vastly more complex”. He argues that
international migration has been a central component of the diffusion of cultural forms and, because of this, the "global sports culture will develop in ways that are in harmony with the likes, desires, and values of diverse peoples all over the world" (Wagner, 1990, p.402). Further to this, Wagner (1990, p.402) argues that the diffusion process has largely reflected, and will continue to reflect, the "will of the people". Therefore, Wagner (1990, p.402) prefers to consider cultural diffusion as best characterized by "international modernization". In this respect, he holds that "the larger international processes of development and modernization ... are fundamentally responsible for changes in the world of sport" (Wagner, 1990, p.401). These processes, he argues, are "ultimately ... likely to lead to a global sports culture" and "toward greater homogenization" (Wagner, 1990, p.402). As with the functionalist approach in sociology more generally, most people writing in the field today have largely rejected the modernization thesis in global diffusion, as is explained below.

2.2.2 Cultural imperialism/dependency theory

Cultural imperialists, and those advocating a dependency theory approach, reject several assumptions in Wagner's modernization theory. However, cultural imperialists share in common with Wagner the notion that we are witnessing homogenising processes. Most authors who hold that cultural diffusion is characterized by cultural imperialism also argue that the USA is dominant. As a result, 'Americanization' is a term frequently used to characterize these homogenising propensities. This is exemplified in the work of Wilcox (1993; 1994). Although he has suggested that the USA should not be viewed as the only force in the diffusion of
sports, his work emphasizes America’s contribution. For example, Wilcox (1993, p.37; emphasis in the original) argues that:

The incomparable influence of American sport on contemporary European culture is undeniable and, if regional/national sports culture is not destroyed from within (in the cause of European unity), it is altogether likely that the formulation of public policy will be necessary to ensure a condition of cultural isolation or resistance, thus guaranteeing the state’s protection of culture by regulating American sporting enterprise and subsidizing traditional European sport.

In other words, Wilcox considers the transfer of American sports and sports images to Europe to be so powerful, that it will be necessary to formulate state legislation in order to protect indigenous European cultures. Such a view is indicative of someone who adopts an Americanization stance and is underscored by reference to a statement he made on an American baseball tour of the world that took place in 1889. Wilcox (1993, p.31) argues that this tour represented:

A significant turning point in the utility of sport, as distinct economic motive began to supersede political expansion during the twentieth century, and America replaced Britain ‘as the prime mover in the diffusion of modern sports throughout the world’ (Guttmann, 1978, p.185).

In summary, he predicts that these developments are part of an “on-going universal homogenization of culture” (Wilcox, 1994, p.95).

Stoddart (1994) argues that economic motive is the essential aspect governing the diffusion process. He supports this position with a case study of the spread of golf around the world. He argues that there are a number of facets that signify its ‘globalism’. These include the global scientific search to hit the ball further, the fact that there are courses throughout the world, the increasing global market of the golfing manufacturers, and the global market place for golf clothing and shoes. The trans-national media, advances in technology and manufacturing of golf equipment,
the standardized global architecture of courses, and tourism all contribute to the
"principle of globalism" (Stoddart, 1994, p.25). All of these, Stoddart (1994) argues,
have been an integral part of profit maximization in the golf industry. He holds that
the "globalization story" includes "historical, spatial, intellectual, economic and
cultural aspects of sport" (Stoddart, 1994, p.21). As such, he maintains that the
"globalization of sport" is more than just the "prerogative of the West" (Stoddart,
1994, p.28). He points out that the Japanese and Taiwanese influence in the marketing
of golf across the globe is substantial. There are a limited number of multi-national
corporations (MNCs), based in a limited number of countries, which are dominant in
the diffusion process. In this regard, Stoddart (1994, p.33) argues that the
globalization of golf is a "great economic machine". The common theme, then, is an
economic, rather than a cultural or political motive, and, as such, Stoddart argues that
the economic aspects of sports diffusion are at the fore. By implication, distinctly
economic motives have contributed to a homogenization of the game throughout the
world. Although Stoddart (1994) never labels himself as a 'cultural imperialist', it is
clear that he sympathizes with this particular view of diffusion processes, since he
argues, "if Marx and Engels had written a century later than they did, they might well
have regarded golf as the purest form of capitalism" (Stoddart, 1994, p.32).

Galtung (1971; 1984; 1991) argues that a structural domination exists in the
relationship between societies. Galtung (1971) puts forth the idea that spheres of
culture, economics, politics, military matters and communications all contribute to
this domination. Galtung uses the term 'cultural imperialism' to outline the cultural
diffusion between states in the 'centre' and those in the 'periphery'. This, he
maintains, encapsulates the broader 'structural domination' that exists.
Galtung suggests that the development of global culture is highly contested. He maintains that the 'motor' of globalization is a combination of various developments. These include the development of a worldwide media system, and the spread of capitalism and western cultural imperialism, \textit{per se}. He states that, "only imperfect, amateurish imperialism needs weapons: professional imperialism is based on structure rather than direct violence" (Galtung, 1971, p.90). In other words, culture is an additional area through which an imperialist relationship is maintained. He holds that modern-day imperialism is based more on structure, as opposed to just a crude military dominance.

Galtung (1984; 1991) has also written more specifically on the diffusion of modern sports. Sport, he argues, is an important element in cultural diffusion. This is, principally, because sport is based on body language, which "transcends linguistic borders having no need for translators" (Galtung, 1991, p.150). This, he argues, has contributed to wider aspects of cultural imperialism. In this respect, he posits that sports:

\begin{quote}
Carry a message, the message of Western social cosmology. Each competitive sport is a reinforcement of that message. It is an almost ideal-typical presentation of what the West is about. As such it is very hard to believe that it does not serve a major socio-psychological and psycho-political function: that of reinforcing and legitimising the West as an ongoing enterprise (Galtung, 1984, p.15)
\end{quote}

He suggests that 'universal' products, such as 'human rights' and 'sports', are only universal because "the Center has managed to get Periphery acceptance" (Galtung, 1991, p.150). In other words, universalism is justified by the powerful nations at the core of the capitalist world system. Furthermore, he argues that, "we
still live in a world where \textit{universal} = \textit{Western}” (Galtung, 1991, p.150; emphasis in the original).

In terms of the capitalist world economy, Wallerstein has arguably produced the most comprehensive work of this nature, in this particular field. He developed a theory from a sympathetic stance to ‘cultural imperialism’ theorists, which he labelled ‘World Systems Theory’ in 1974. He has developed this theory since then in several books and articles (1983/1995; 1990; 1991; 2000). Wallerstein outlines the importance of studying the diffusion of culture from a long-term perspective. In fact, he argues that “globalization is a misleading concept”, as many authors tend to argue that it is a new phenomenon, but “what is described as globalization has been happening for 500 years” (Wallerstein, 2000, p.249). He suggests that, since the fifteenth century, there has been a continual reduction of the number of ‘sovereign units’. By ‘sovereign units’ he means areas with “clear territorial boundaries and with national laws, assemblies, languages, passports, flags, money, and above all citizens” (Wallerstein, 1990, p.42). Part of the problem facing individuals in societies, he argues, has been, and continues to be, dealing with the issues that this reduction of sovereign units has engendered. Wallerstein argues that we should view sovereignty in the context of the process of ‘universalism’. This universalism is what Wallerstein refers to as the ‘Capitalist World System’. He argues that:

The successive expansions that have occurred (from the European capitalist system to a World one) have been a conscious process, utilizing military, political, and economic pressures of multiple kinds, and of course involving the overcoming of political resistance’s in the zones into which the geographic expansion was taking place. We call this process ‘incorporation’ (Wallerstein, 1990, p.36).
Thus, he advocates that the spread of cultures around the world is very much dominated by the intentions of groups of individuals. In relation to this, Wallerstein holds that, nation-states at the ‘core’ (what he defines as ‘developed capitalist states’) make those at the ‘periphery’ (‘underdeveloped states’) dependent upon them. To this more traditional dependency theory approach, Wallerstein adds the concept of ‘semi-periphery’ states. This is in an attempt to account for the increasing ‘development’, or at least industrialization, of certain ‘underdeveloped’ states. Albeit, he argues, these semi-peripheral states are not sufficiently developed to undermine the authority of the core nations.

The ‘principle of universalism’, Wallerstein argues, is proclaimed by core states across the world. He specifies that, “each state is proclaiming the universality of the equality of citizens ... as a sort of universal moral law” (Wallerstein, 1990, p.43). However, in emphasising this point, Wallerstein (1990, p.43) argues that:

It is precisely because there is in reality a hierarchy of states within the interstate system and a hierarchy of citizens within each sovereign state that the ideology of universalism matters. It serves on the one hand as a palliative and a deception and on the other as a political counter-weight which the weak can use and do use against the strong.

As such, he argues that the capitalist world system is a western conceptualization. He argues that, “western culture is in fact universal culture” (Wallerstein, 1990, p.45), because it is western states that are predominantly at the core of the world-system, and therefore are the most powerful. Notwithstanding this, he argues that there has also been a tendency, at least for some people, to emphasize the ‘virtue of difference’, but the ultimate goal for the core nation-states has been assimilation, by any method. As such, he holds, “a universalist message of cultural multiplicity could serve as a justification of educating various groups in their separate ‘cultures’ and hence
preparing them for different tasks in the single economy” (Wallerstein, 1990, p.45).
Indeed, Wallerstein (1983/1995, p.81) posits that, “the belief in universalism has been
the keystone of the ideological arch of historical capitalism”.

Wallerstein (1983/1995) argues that commodity chains have been created
across the world-system, and these have led to vertical integration – with the core
nations dominant over the semi-periphery and subsequently the periphery nations. In
other words, he argues, “they have been centripetal in form” (Wallerstein, 1983/1995,
p.30). Over time, these commodity chains “have become more and more functionally
and geographically extensive, and simultaneously more and more hierarchical. This
hierarchization”, Wallerstein (1983/1995, p.30) argues, “has led to an ever greater
polarization between the core and peripheral zones of the world-economy”. In this
respect, he holds that “what was remarkable about capitalism as a historical system
was the way in which this unequal exchange could be hidden” (Wallerstein,
unquestionably operated, in the sense that the ‘market’ set constraints on individual
behaviour”.

Wallerstein (1983/1995, p.39) argues that the capitalist world-system grows as
it seeks out new “low-cost labour forces”. This is because, he maintains, “virtually
every new zone incorporated into the world-economy established levels of real
remuneration which were at the bottom of the world-system’s hierarchy of wage-
levels” (Wallerstein, 1983/1995, p.39). He argues that the world-system arose largely
to “achieve this end” (Wallerstein, 1983/1995, p.40-1). That is to say, Wallerstein
considers that the production of capital lead to the creation of a world-system in order
to maintain the position of core ‘entrepreneurial classes’. In relation to this, he asks: “What could be more plausible than a line of reasoning which argues that the explanation of the origin of a system was to achieve an end that has in fact been achieved”?

It is clear from the summary of the four authors in this section that they share considerable ground in terms of explaining diffusion processes. To differing degrees they all argue that the capitalist world economy is driving diffusion processes and that this is leading to greater homogenization. However, several authors disagree. I now want to move on to discuss those who argue that the prevailing characteristic of globalization is greater heterogeneity.

### 2.2.3 Global Diffusion as Cultural Diversity

Nederveen Pieterse (1994; 2001) argues that it is more fruitful to view “globalisation as hybridisation” (Nederveen Pieterse, 1994, p.161). Hybridization processes are “as old as history” (Nederveen Pieterse, 2001, p.222), and as such, Nederveen Pieterse takes a long-term approach to understanding global diffusion processes. This is especially the case, he argues, when compared with the traditional view of globalization as something that is either tied up with the west, or modernity – or more likely, the interrelation of the two. His argument “takes issue with both these interpretations as narrow assessments of globalisation and instead argues for viewing globalisation as a process of hybridisation which gives rise to a global mélange” (Nederveen Pieterse, 1994, p.161). This “global mélange” is a consequence of “increasing global density and interdependence” (Nederveen Pieterse, 1994, p.168). This, concomitantly, leads to a process of “pluralisation” of forms of co-operation and
competition. As such, because "there are multiple globalisation processes at work", it "is hardly adequate" to view this as a process of homogenization (Nederveen Pieterse, 1994, p.161). Furthermore, Nederveen Pieterse (1994, p.162) argues, it is "less-likely that globalisations can be one-directional processes". Instead, he proposes that the process of globalization is characterized by an increase in the available modes of organization at 'trans', 'inter', 'macro-regional', 'national', 'micro-regional', 'municipal' and 'local' levels. "This ladder of administrative levels", he maintains, "is being criss-crossed by functional networks of corporations, international organisations, non-governmental organisations as well as professionals and computer users" (Nederveen Pieterse, 1994, p.166; emphasis in the original). Nederveen Pieterse (1994) concludes by arguing that state power has been an important element in the strategy within this 'functional network'. Nevertheless, state power:

Is no longer the only game in town. The tide of globalisation reduces states' room for manoeuvre, while international institutions, transnational transactions, regional cooperation, subnational dynamics and non-governmental organisations expand in impact and scope (Nederveen Pieterse, 1994, p.179).

Hannerz (1990a & b) argues that cultural diffusion has led to the development of a generic 'world-culture'. But, he maintains, this does not mean that this is the only 'culture'. He also identifies sub-cultures that still exist, which are continually developed alongside the wider whole. As such, for Hannerz, it would be impossible to conceive of the diffusion process as resulting simply in homogenization. Even when people may 'adopt' a previously 'alien' culture they often, subsequently, make this 'way of life' their own. Hannerz refers to this process as 'creolization'. As such, he places considerable emphasis on 'local' interpretation. Thus, despite the development of a world-culture, this 'culture' can be interpreted in a variety of ways. Hence, for
Hannerz, cultural diffusion is not based on dependency, and is not uniform. Instead he argues that:

There is now a world culture ... marked by an organization of diversity rather than by a replication of uniformity. No total homogenization of systems of meaning and expression has occurred, nor does it appear likely that there will be one any time soon. But the world has become one network of social relationships and between its different regions there is a flow of meanings as well as of people and goods (Hannerz, 1990a, p.237).

Hannerz (1990a & b) argues that two different kinds of individual can be identified in the world today. On the one hand there are ‘locals’, and on the other there are ‘cosmopolitans’. Some people, Hannerz (1990a & b) posits, will always be ‘locals’ no matter where they work, or go on holiday, for example. In other words, these people seek out aspects of culture that remind them of ‘home’ wherever they are. For instance many immigrants in certain countries attempt to create their own cultural background elsewhere. This is what he refers to as “home-plus security” (Hannerz, 1990a, p.241). Some people, for example some ‘British-exiles’ in the south of Spain, seek to establish a kind of “home-plus-sunshine” (Hannerz, 1990a, p.241). ‘Locals’ will look to create a ‘Home from Home’ no matter where they are. Nevertheless, he argues, “if there were only locals in the world, world culture would be no more than the sum of its separate parts” (Hannerz, 1990a, p.249). There are also ‘cosmopolitan’ people. These individuals actively, or otherwise, Hannerz (1990a, p.239; emphasis in the original) argues, “search for contrasts rather than uniformity. To become acquainted with more cultures is to turn into an aficionado, to view them as art works”. As such, cosmopolitans are people who thrive on learning and developing a range of cultural aspects of life. This might include a desire to learn a plethora of languages, or maybe to enjoy the ‘cuisine’ of various different cultures, as well as visit regions of the world and immerse oneself in ‘their’ culture, and in ‘their
way of life'. Although, Hannerz maintains that this does not constitute a homogenous culture for cosmopolitans. Instead they add to the diversity of world culture. Furthermore, Hannerz (1990a&b) maintains that there is a large degree of interaction between ‘locals’ and ‘cosmopolitans’. In this respect, he argues, “today’s cosmopolitans and locals have common interests in the survival of cultural diversity” (Hannerz, 1990a, p.249-50). To this end, it would be impossible to conceive this relationship developing along homogenous lines.

Whilst offering a counter-argument to the notion that cultural diffusion is best conceived as a result of increasing homogenization, some hold that the arguments presented by Nederveen Pieterse and Hannerz somewhat overplay the notion of cultural diversity. Instead, the following authors argue that globalization is more adequately conceived as involving a blend of homogeneity and heterogeneity.

2.2.4 Cultural Hegemony: Cultural Studies Approach

Authors who advocate a ‘cultural hegemony’ stance share much in common with those who advocate a cultural imperialism perspective, and, as will become apparent, they share considerable ground with Wallerstein’s world system theory. The significant difference is that those who adopt a cultural hegemony stance on global diffusion processes argue that the cultural imperialist view is “an overdetermined view” (Donnelly, 1996, p.243). “A more subtle approach”, Donnelly (1996, p.243) argues, “is to regard Americanization in terms of cultural hegemony”. Thus, for Donnelly (1996, p.243), “Americanization” is still his preferred term to illustrate global diffusion processes but he considers that the “transfer of cultural products is not just one-way”.

Donnelly (1996) recognizes that of the four most significant American sports, only basketball and ice hockey are played on anything approaching a global basis (American football and baseball are only played to a comparatively high level in a handful of nations outside the USA). This fact does not deter Donnelly from preferring Americanization as a conceptual tool. In relation to this, he argues:

What is important is that the American style of sport has become the international benchmark for corporate sport – ‘show-biz’, spectacular, high-scoring, or record-setting superstar athletes; the ability to attract sponsors by providing desired audiences; and having the characteristics necessary for good television coverage (Donnelly, 1996, p.246).

In other words, instead of actual ‘American sports’ being significantly disseminated, it is the characteristics of these American sports that have become more pervasive. Hence, many sports are increasingly marketed along American lines. The media representation of sports, he argues, has been increasingly influenced by the ‘American style’. As a result, he considers that global sport is an example of a “monoculture” (Donnelly, 1996, p.248).

If we were to accept the term “globalization” as a satisfactory explanation for the diffusion of sports, Donnelly (1996, p.248; emphasis in the original) argues:

We would have to accept that various countries had contributed in relatively equal ways to the observed changes in sport, that such changes did not have a similar source but were so blended that we have lost sight of any specific national origins, and that there was evidence of interdependency rather than evident and specific hegemonic interests involved in asserting a particular set of meanings and a particular way of playing and presenting sport as the only true meanings and the only way of playing and presenting sport.

With this in mind he holds that ‘globalization’ is an adequate term if only limited to the economic and environmental relationships between societies throughout the world. This is because, he argues, there are a variety of sources of capital, debt, and
pollution. Furthermore, various countries have contributed in “relatively equal ways” to the “globalization” of corporate sport as “an economic entity” (Donnelly, 1996, p.248). However, as a “cultural entity, corporate sport is not globalized, nor is it Europeanized, Japanized, or Hispanicized; it is clearly Americanized” (Donnelly, 1996, p.248). Americanization, he argues, is only the most appropriate epithet if “it is defined in cultural hegemonic terms as a two way process in which the recipients have interpretive and resistant powers” (Donnelly, 1996, p.248).

Kidd (1991) cites numerous examples that, he argues, emphasize the dependency of Canadians on the USA. For instance, he points out that the influx of American television programmes has impacted upon the amount of ‘air-time’ provided for Canadian made shows. So clear is this increased dependency on the USA, Kidd (1991) argues, that attempts have been made to reassert Canadian nationalism through sporting contests. This has been further enhanced by the establishment of a central government policy on the development of Canadian sport. Even this has still broadly mirrored what has happened in the USA. As such, he stipulates that “beyond the red and white uniform and the flag, there is little in such an approach that is distinctly Canadian” (Kidd, 1991, p.183). This is why, he argues, “the term Americanization has considerable usefulness, certainly far more than ‘globalization’ or ‘internationalization’” (Kidd, 1991, p.179). According to Kidd these latter terms are not specific enough. He regards the initial development of what others have referred to as a commodification process “as an explicitly American set of practices” (Kidd, 1991, p.179). This is because the “centre”, in this case, the USA, continues to “profoundly influence” the “periphery” within a “sphere of culture”
Kidd, 1991, p.179-80). He argues that a few MNCs based almost entirely in the USA largely control this "sphere of culture".

Kidd concludes that whilst Americanization is a more appropriate term to describe the process of cultural diffusion, it is also limited. The apparent unevenness of development in sports has led him to this conclusion. To this end, he maintains that the term ‘Americanization’ is too simplistic. Kidd (1991, p.180) holds that class, gender and ethnic tensions within Canada mean that the “terrain of assertion and resistance is much more crowded and confused” than the term Americanization would imply. As such, he prefers the term “American capitalist hegemony”, with its “Gramscian connotations consciously chosen” (Kidd, 1991, p.180). This is because, he argues, American capitalist hegemony implies that there is some degree of resistance to, nonetheless, increasing American dominance.

Klein also argues that cultural hegemony is a more useful concept when trying to understand Americanization. Klein (1989; 1991a & b; 1994; 1997) has conducted extensive research into the development of baseball in the Dominican Republic and what he refers to as the Americanization of that country. Klein considers that a crucial element of Americanization, in general, is that it is tantamount to “neo-colonialism” (Klein, 1991a, p.79). He emphasizes the ‘political-economic’ relationships that characterize cultural diffusion and contribute to structural domination, which, by implication, is a subordination of ‘weaker’ societies and ‘their’ indigenous culture. In other words, the USA is the hegemonial power. Although he does not dwell further on this point, Klein (1991a & b) also maintains that to some extent this neo-colonialism has Eurocentric links as well. His critique concentrates on the Americanization of the
Caribbean. He provides an analysis of the spread of baseball to the Caribbean, principally to the Dominican Republic (1991b). Since the 1970s, Klein (1989; 1991b) argues, the development of Major League ‘baseball camps’ in the Dominican Republic demonstrates the increasingly powerful influence of American culture. This is because within the Dominican Republic “the dream shines brightly for the individual ensnared in poverty, but it blinds the society by deflecting the energies of youth, energies better spent in other pursuits” (Klein, 1989, p.108). In this respect, he argues, the “structural domination” enjoyed by the USA is gradually “eroding” the “cultural autonomy” of individual nation states in the Caribbean (Klein, 1991a, p.80-81). Be that as it may, Klein (1991a, p.80) argues that the situation of “exploitation is never complete”. Instead, he holds that:

Cultural resistance to colonial powers and to forces such as Americanization may take a variety of forms, and all aspects of culture may lend themselves to interpretation and reinterpretation as aspects of resistance. Thus, sport may easily be seen as contested cultural terrain (Klein, 1991a, p.80).

In other words, Klein argues that American cultural values have not entirely engulfed the Dominican Republic. For example, the fact that Dominicans have succeeded in Major League Baseball (MLB) has been a point highlighted by several Dominican journalists (Klein 1989; 1991a&b). National pride is expressed by various journalists at the successes enjoyed by Dominican natives, often at the expense of any wider coverage of MLB, frequently to the extent where performances by Dominicans are lauded above their American counterparts. Klein (1989, p.109) holds that this has become “synonymous with resisting American cultural colonialism”. However, he argues that this cultural resistance is still comparatively “weak relative to the hegemonic opposite” (Klein, 1989, p.109).
Jackson and Andrews (1999) argue that it is not appropriate to consider simply the 'global', we must also consider the 'local'. That is to say “both the global and the local can only be understood in relation to each other” (Jackson & Andrews, 1999, p.32). On this basis, Jackson and Andrews (1999, p.32) emphasize the need to focus on globalization as being “constitutive of, and constituted by, multiple processes which are engaged to differing degrees, at differing intensities, and in differing spatial locations”. They express caution, then, in “both overstating and understating the effects of globalization” (Jackson & Andrews, 1999, p.33). They argue that frequently authors pay too much attention to the ‘victory’ of capitalism or American imperialism, and others to the resistance of the local, which are often a reaction to the overblown claims of the former. Andrews elaborates further on his consideration of the debate in a separate and more recent article with Silk. Silk and Andrews (2001) argue that transnational corporations (TNCs) have increasingly begun to realise that they must engage with the local in order to promote their products across the globe. They argue that before the 1980s, such TNCs sought to homogenize the world by presenting a single, uniform image of their company or product across the international marketplace. More recently, Silk and Andrews (2001, p.180) argue, “many corporations have acknowledged that securing a profitable global presence necessitates negotiating within the language of the local”. That is to say, for them, TNCs must market their products in a manner that reflects a local, national focus – rather than a single global image. This amounts to a subtler means of pursuing their interests and extending their dominance.

Silk and Andrews (2001) utilize examples from advertising campaigns that have focussed on sport and sports products to bolster the main thrust of their
argument. For instance, they provide the example of a Coca-Cola campaign in India that, amongst other things, linked the colour red of a cricket ball with the brand colour of Coca-Cola. This, they argue, is an illustration that "the commercial brazenly synthesizes India's passion for cricket (red ball) with a desired passion for Coca-Cola (red logo)" (Silk & Andrews, 2001, p.193). This is an example, they hold, of Coca-Cola "thrusting" itself "into the mainstream of Indian culture by providing itself with a seemingly natural place within local culture and experience" (Silk & Andrews, 2001, p.193). This advert represents, in their opinion, a "vivid example" of what they term "cultural Toyotism" (Silk & Andrews, 2001, p.193). "Cultural Toyotism" for them is an extension of Castells' (1996; cited in Silk & Andrews, 2001, p.189) concept of Toyotism. Toyotism refers to a "new and flexible management system that organized material production in a manner that allowed it to respond effortlessly to the inherent (yet unpredictable) dynamism of advanced economics" (Silk & Andrews, 2001, p.189). Thus, for Silk and Andrews (2001), "cultural Toyotism" is the extension of this notion into the cultural sphere, by way of the marketing of cultural products in the international marketplace in a flexible manner that reflects the local as well as the global. They consider the Coca-Cola advert referred to above as being an example of what they call "acting globally/thinking locally". According to these authors, this is one of two identifiable forms of cultural Toyotism within advertising, the other being "global anthems/local sensibilities". They argue that sport is a particularly valuable commodity with regard to the issue of 'global anthems/local sensibilities' because "within the logic of cultural Toyotism, sport is mobilized as a major cultural signifier of a nation that can engage national sensibilities, identities, and experiences" (Silk & Andrews, 2001, p.191). This is because "sport is seen [by TNCs] as a globally present cultural form, but one that is heavily accented by local dialects" (Silk & Andrews,
They refer to adverts by Nike and Adidas in which the companies used a range of elite sports performers with different nationalities to promote their product in adverts that could, effectively, be shown the world over. This, they argue, is an example of Nike and Adidas being able to "promote their brands transnationally, effectively engaging and invoking national sensibilities within a multitude of markets at one and the same time" (Silk & Andrews, 2001, p.197). Silk and Andrews (2001, p.189) argue that:

What we appear to be witnessing is the capitalization on and redefinition of national belongingness by the promotional and marketing agents of transnational corporations intent on inserting their products into the diffuse and diverse markets they seek to penetrate.

Miller, Lawrence, McKay and Rowe have produced various publications together in the area of 'globalization and sport'. McKay and Miller (1991) provide a case study of the development of Australian sport. On this basis, they argue that British influences were most dominant on Australian culture right up until the early twentieth century. However, since the Second World War, they argue, influences from the USA and Japan have been of greater importance. So much so, that the Union Jack might be better replaced on the Australian flag by "the Stars and Stripes, or more recently the Rising Sun" (McKay, Lawrence, Miller & Rowe, 1993, p.11). Nevertheless, they place greater importance on the notion that "sport in Australia has been Americanized" (McKay & Miller, 1991, p.90). They offer several examples to support this thesis. For instance, there has been an influx of American sports television programmes, including the 'Wide World of Sport', a show with "a considerable amount of American content" on the Channel Nine network (McKay & Miller, 1991, p.89), and American football and basketball games are broadcast extensively on Australian television. In addition, Australian sports, they argue, have
adopted "the showbiz format" and American sponsors are prominent in Australian sports (McKay & Miller, 1991, p.89).

More recently, Miller, Lawrence, McKay and Rowe (2001) have published a more comprehensive account of their approach. The central tenet of their argument is that MNCs have played a fundamental part in the sustained global spread of sports. The fact that such MNCs are largely American based "is crucial" (Miller et al, 2001, p.14). As such, Miller et al (2001, p.14) are supportive, in the main, of the "Americanization thesis". Americanization, though, especially within global sports, "is extremely uneven" (Miller et al, 2001, p.18). Hence, they argue that it is too simplistic to consider that Americanization is tantamount to cultural imperialism. Instead, they also prefer to consider the process as cultural hegemony. As such, they state that "sport undermines any claim that globalization is a totality" (Miller et al, 2001, p.22). Alternatively, they claim, "globalizing tendencies must always be viewed as mediated by local structures including the nation-state" (Miller et al, 2001, p.24). Thus, they argue that the globalization of sports has not led solely to homogenization. This is in an attempt to underscore the fact that ‘resistance’ is an aspect of globalization. In this respect, McKay and Miller (1991, p.90) argue that:

Australia has a semiperipheral position in the capitalist world economy, so American economic and cultural influences are obvious. However, Australia’s marginal status in the global market means that other countries also shape Australian popular culture.

They also point out that an Australianization process may be witnessed, with the promotion of Australian Rules Football beyond Australia, and the spread of Rugby League to Canada and the USA. Australian companies have also sponsored sports beyond their native country. As such, they argue that the analysis must go
"beyond the unidirectional logic of notions of straightforward cultural domination" (McKay & Miller, 1991, p.92). Instead, they argue that the influence of MNCs are more fruitfully viewed as part of the wider "capitalist world system" (McKay & Miller, 1991, p.92; emphasis in the original).

Compared with cultural imperialists, cultural hegemonists place greater weight on local interpretation and resistance to the dominant cultural flow of diffusion processes and consider it an oversimplification to place emphasis solely on homogenization. They instead argue that processes of homogenization and heterogenization are taking place, although they still subordinate the latter to the former. There are numerous other authors who agree that globalization is more adequately viewed as an expression of homogenization and heterogenization; but disagreement arises regarding the weight placed on the intended actions of dominant groups. I will now discuss this latter group of authors within this review.

2.2.5 Globalization as multi-causal

Guttmann (1988; 1991; 1993; 1994) has written extensively on sports diffusion. He outlines several factors that are important in the diffusion of sports:

While a number of factors determine the process of ludic diffusion, the most important of them is the relative political, economic, and cultural power of the nations involved ... The distinctions among the forms of power are certainly not arcane. There is no need to define them here. What is important is to recognize that the power vectors are usually but by no means invariably aligned. A nation that exercises political and/or economic power usually exercises cultural power as well (Guttmann, 1991, p.186).

Hence, Guttmann argues that it is possible to identify 'prime-movers' in the diffusion process. In this respect, he holds that the language of a sport provides a good measure as to the originators of diffusion. English is the language of modern sports, with only
a handful of exceptions (Guttmann, 1988). He maintains that this is reflective of the
dominant role that has been played in the diffusion process by English speaking
people; firstly by people from England, and more recently, by people from the USA.
Despite this, Guttmann does not advocate a cultural imperialism or cultural hegemony
stance. Indeed, he argues that, “cultural hegemony and cultural imperialism, imply
intentionality, which is unfortunate because those who adopt a sport are often the
eager initiators of a transaction of which the ‘donors’ are scarcely aware” (Guttmann,
conceptualization is an improvement”. This is because, Guttmann (1991, p.187)
holds, that Wagner “is correct to insist that we are witnessing a ‘homogenization of
world sports’”. As such, Guttmann prefers the term ‘modernization’ to describe
diffusion processes. The term modernization, Guttmann (1991, p.188) argues, “is
preferable because it implies something about the nature of the global
transformation”. Nevertheless, he also states that, “if the tendency to confuse
modernization with progress is one hazard, the assumption that modernization is an
inevitable and all-inclusive process is another” (Guttmann 1991, p.188). Thus,
modernization, Guttmann argues, is also an unsatisfactory term for explaining
diffusion processes.

Throughout his publications, Guttmann maintains that diffusion processes can
in no way be regarded as uni-directional. Furthermore, he places great emphasis on
the ‘interpretations’ that various groups of individuals have made of ‘alien’ sports. In
other words, he argues, analysis should not be restricted merely to the role of the
‘diffusers’ of sports. People who have ‘adopted’ sports from others often, consciously
and otherwise, place significant emphasis of their own on to them. In turn, they may
feel that the game is more reflective of their own characteristics and culture, and thus it is seen as 'their own' game. He also argues that many less developed nations regard defeating the mother nation at their own game as a vital step in the cultural process. Thus, he is attempting to avoid using any term to describe diffusion processes that might imply mono-causality. This is partly because “the motivations involved in the diffusion of sports have been diverse” (Guttmann, 1994, p.174). Ultimately in attempting to avoid mono-causal language, Guttmann (1994, p.187) prefers the term “standardized universality”. However, he does stress that this has not replaced diversity.

Houlihan (1994a & b; 2003) is also critical of many of the authors whose work has been outlined above, because, he maintains, they do not place sufficient emphasis on an analysis of the response of recipient cultures. He argues that:

While the literature on globalization and cultural imperialism is already large and rapidly increasing only a portion of it attempts to establish the consequences of engagement with the global culture for the recipient local cultures. Much closer attention is frequently paid to cataloging the quantity and range of cultural products transferred from the rich, mainly western states. At worst this results in sweeping conclusions usually based on little more than an eclectic accumulation of anecdotes often underpinned by the patronizing assumption that no members of a local culture would embrace western global culture except under duress or as a consequence of trickery (Houlihan, 1994a, p.360).

Houlihan (1994a&b) identifies four key elements that he argues are crucial to any thorough discussion on the diffusion of sports. First, we must identify the key attributes of global culture. Secondly, it is necessary to determine whether the direction of diffusion is top-down, or more diverse. Thirdly, and related to the previous point, it is necessary to identify whether the ‘prime mover’ is, for example, a particular state, a set of states, capitalism or another source. Fourthly, we must
understand whether the role of the people in the "recipient/target group" is that of "passive acceptance" or "cooperative/contested participation" (Houlihan, 1994b, p.179). Therefore, we must determine both the 'reach' of cultural diffusion and the 'response' of recipient societies. Houlihan (1994a, p.370) argues that, "reach refers to the depth of penetration by the global culture of the local culture whereas response refers to the reaction of the recipient culture". Reach could manifest itself in a variety of ways, for example influence through the media, or perhaps the bureaucratic organization of sports, or even the every day practices of life. Total reach would imply complete penetration across all of these aspects. Partial reach implies that the impact of globalization could be confined to one particular element of culture. A "passive response", Houlihan (1994a, p.370-1) argues, "implies either an enthusiasm for the external culture ... or an inability to challenge the global culture". A 'participative response' suggests "a process of negotiation, bargaining and accommodation" between local and global cultures (Houlihan, 1994a, p.371). A conflictual response "indicates not only the possession of sufficient resources to enable resistance but also a set of values that leads to rejection or attempted rejection of the global culture" (Houlihan, 1994a, p.371).

Houlihan (2003, p.361) argues that "the significance of economic power" in relation to the globalization of sport "must be acknowledged". Nevertheless, he holds that, "simply to treat global sport as a cipher for, or tool of, economic interests is an overextension of the limited evidence available" (Houlihan, 2003, p.361). Thus, the significance of military and political power must also be acknowledged. As such, Houlihan (2003, p.361) emphasizes the role of the state in the globalization process because the "state plays a key role in shaping" the "pace, character and trajectory" of
global sport processes. As such, he concludes, "the language of sport may be universal but the meaning it carries is as much determined locally as it is in the boardrooms of multinational sports corporations" (Houlihan, 2003, p.361).

Robertson (1992, p.10) argues that globalization is "a very long, uneven and complicated process". He argues, globalization cannot be "equated with or seen as a direct consequence of an amorphously conceived modernity" (Robertson, 1992, p.8). In order to attempt to clarify his position, Robertson (1990, p.26-7) identifies five skeletal phases of globalization. Phase one is the 'germinal phase', which involved an increase of the number of nation-states between the fifteenth and the mid-eighteenth centuries. The 'incipient phase' represents Robertson's second stage of globalization between the mid-eighteenth century approximately up to the 1870s. During this period, he argues, there was a shift towards homogenous – in terms of structural organizations – unitary states, and conceptions of formalized international relations began to occur. Phase three is the 'take off phase', which Robertson approximates between the 1870s and the 1920s. Increasing global conceptions of 'acceptable' national societies were becoming more and more apparent. Instead of the growth in 'nationalism' being an impediment toward globalization, Robertson (1990) holds that this, too, was globalized. Furthermore, even beyond Europe there were increasing forms of global communications technology. Likewise, global competitions were increasingly established culminating in the global conflict – World War I. "The struggle for hegemony phase" is what Robertson (1990, p.27) calls his fourth stage which he dates between the 1920s and 1960s. Robertson (1990) argues that the Second World War, and the subsequent 'Cold War', illustrates the significance of differentiating this period. Finally, the fifth phase is the 'uncertainty phase', from the
1960s to the present day.\(^1\) This period, Robertson (1990) holds, is largely characterized by increasing 'polyethnicity', international civil rights movements, and a truly global media system.

Robertson (1992, p.183; emphasis in the original) contends that:

Globalization does not simply refer to the objectiveness of increasing interconnectedness ... In very simple terms, we are thus talking about issues surrounding the idea of the world being 'for-itself'. The world is not literally 'for-itself' but the problem of being 'for-itself' has become increasingly significant, in particular because of the thematization of humankind in a number of respects.

In arguing this, Robertson (1992, p.183) is not suggesting that the world is becoming increasingly "a single place". Rather, it is the perception that the world is "an 'imagined community' (Anderson, 1983)" (Robertson, 1992, p.183) that conveys this impression. Thus, although Robertson (1992, p.135) considers that globalization, "in its most general sense", is a "process whereby the world becomes a single place"; he is not convinced that this has resulted in homogenization. As such, he maintains that diffusion processes cannot be restricted to certain 'trajectories', like westernization. Robertson argues that it is more appropriate to consider processes such as homogeneity and heterogeneity as interwoven. In arguing this, Robertson (1995) refers to a process of "glocalization", which has seen the diffusion of a diverse range of local cultures across the world. Thus, he views globalization as the "particularization of universalism (the rendering of the world as a single place) and the universalization of particularism (the globalized expectation that societies ... should have distinct identities)" (Robertson, 1987, p.38).

\(^1\) It is not clear in his work whether this uncertainty refers to the characteristics of the phase or more to the fact that it is the most recent period and, therefore, it is too early to make an assessment.
Featherstone (1990; 1995) expresses misgivings about some of the research conducted by others into globalization because many have failed to acknowledge that it is impossible:

To talk about a common culture in the fuller sense without talking about who is defining it, within which set of interdependencies and power balances, for what purposes, and with reference to which outside culture(s) have to be discarded, rejected or demonified in order to generate the sense of cultural identity (Featherstone, 1990, p.11).

In other words, Featherstone highlights several empirical problems concerning research conducted in this area. He argues that the lack of clarity regarding terms such as ‘culture’, ‘nation’, ‘nationalism’, as well as ‘globalization’, have all hindered much of the work elsewhere. He holds that in order to conduct a more adequate analysis of the diffusion process, it is necessary to pay attention to the many diverse responses that there have been. As such, the response “within a variety of cultural contexts and practices” will not be “anything like uniform” (Featherstone, 1990, p.10). Although we may witness processes that contribute to growing homogenization and cultural integration, Featherstone (1995, p.6) maintains, “it is clear that they are by no means uncontested”. In this respect, he argues, “the paradoxical consequence of the process of globalization ... is not to produce homogeneity but to familiarize us with greater diversity” (Featherstone, 1995, p.86). In other words, the process of globalization is an expression of the complex interweaving of the spread of global cultures with increasing recognition and development of local cultures. In relation to this, Featherstone (1995, p.103) argues that “it is not helpful to regard the global and local as dichotomies separated in space or time; it would seem that the processes of globalization and localization are inextricably bound together”. Featherstone (1995, p.118), like Robertson, refers to a process of glocalization, insofar as increasing
numbers of transnational corporations are tailoring their products "to specific differentiated audiences and markets".

Featherstone (1990, p.1) does not consider that the spread of 'global cultures' involves a "weakening of the sovereignty of nation-states". He also argues that the 'response' of any group of individuals to the diffusion of culture is in no way uniform. Instead, he sees this process "more in terms of the diversity, variety and richness of popular and local discourses, codes and practices" (Featherstone, 1990, p.2). As such, "individual nation-states may attempt to promote, channel or block flows with varying degrees of success depending upon the power resources they possess and the constraints of the configuration of interdependencies they are locked into" (Featherstone, 1995, p.118). In this sense, "the intensity and rapidity of today's global cultural flows", Featherstone (1990, p.10-11) argues:

Have contributed to the sense that the world is a singular place which entails the proliferation of new cultural forms for encounters. While this increasingly dense web of cosmopolitan-local encounters and interdependencies can give rise to third cultures and increasing tolerance, it can also result in negative reactions and intolerance.

By 'third cultures', Featherstone means the rise of 'cultural forms' beyond 'the nation'. Inasmuch as these third cultures "themselves are conduits for all sorts of diverse cultural flows which cannot be merely understood as the product of bilateral exchanges between nation-states" (Featherstone, 1990, p.1). He prefers to consider that the process of globalization is a consequence of "being drawn together into a progressively tighter figuration through the increasing volume and rapidity of the flows of money, goods, people, information, technology and images" (Featherstone, 1995, p.81).
2.2.6 Figurational sociology

It is clear that some aspects of Robertson and Featherstone’s work fits quite well with a figurational approach. They both utilize Elias’s work in their analyses. Maguire, however, offers an explicitly figurational centred approach. Maguire (1991a&b; 1993a,b&c; 1994a&b; 1999; Maguire & Bale, 1993; Jarvie & Maguire, 1994) has been the most prolific publisher of material that can broadly be identified as dealing with ‘sports diffusion’. Maguire argues that the processes of sports diffusion are integrally related to phases in the sportization of pastimes. He outlines a number of points of departure in his analysis of global sports diffusion. The first point of departure “is that an understanding of the global sportization formation is bound up in inter-civilizational exchanges” (Maguire, 1999, p.62). That is to say, it is not appropriate to separate the globalization of sports from a broader understanding of globalization processes. In this respect, Maguire (1999, p.63) argues that a second point of departure is the need to adopt a “very long-term perspective in exploring globalization processes”. He stresses that processes of globalization have no zero-starting point. Diffusion processes can be traced to several different periods of time in several different regions. As such, a third point of departure for Maguire (1999, p.63) is that the “longer-term links of non-occidental ancient civilizations with the making of modern sport should not be overlooked”. Nevertheless, in relation to ‘modern sports’, Maguire argues that certain individuals and groups from the UK were initially very influential in the diffusion process toward the end of the nineteenth century. In this sense, diffusion occurred from more complex and powerful to less complex and less powerful societies. A fourth point of departure is the need to understand the “competing centrifugal and centripetal forces that characterize the new geographical arena” (Maguire, 1999, p.64). This, Maguire (1999, p.64) argues, “relates to the
local/global debate, and refers to the internal dynamics at work within any specific society”.

Maguire (1999, p.65) argues that “in conducting this long-term, inter-civilizational analysis of global sport processes it is also important to be clear about what the term ‘modern sport’ refers to”. As such, he outlines the initial two phases of “sportization” (Elias, 1986a) that saw the development of numerous sports in their ‘modern’ forms. The first sportization phase occurred in the eighteenth century and was emphasized by the emergence of rules and regulations in conjunction with the development of boxing and fox-hunting, for example, as ‘modern’ sports. The second was emphasized by the emergence of Association Football, and Rugby, for example, in their modern, codified forms. Maguire adds three further phases of sportization. This is because, he argues, “Elias did not fully develop his analysis of the export of these sport forms” (Maguire, 1999, p.81). Maguire (1999) argues that a third, ‘global sportization phase’, from the 1870s to the early 1920s, is characterized by the international diffusion of elite-level male sport, in particular. During this time, westerners, and the English in particular, were dominant players in the diffusion of sport. He argues that the increasing prevalence of American sport forms across the globe in the 1920s and 1930s might be seen as signs of a fourth global sportization phase. The west remained dominant in the international diffusion of sport, but increasingly the struggle for world sporting hegemony occurred within the west itself. During this time, and beyond, “it was an American version of the achievement sport ethos that had gained ascendancy” (Maguire, 1999, p.84). This period, Maguire (1999, p.85) claims, saw the increasing influence of “management, administration and marketing of sport ... along American lines”. The fifth global sportization phase,
Maguire (1999) argues, can be traced from the 1960s. During this period there has been an “accelerating commingling process between sport cultures” (Maguire, 1999, p.86). This has seen non-western nations increasingly prominent in terms of success on-the-field, so to speak, and an increasing influence of non-western people within international sports organizations off-the-field. Increasing varieties of sports have become evident during this phase of sportization. Although, Maguire (1999, p.211) argues that “despite these new varieties of sport cultures, a series of structured processes indicate that a reduction in the contrasts between sport cultures has also occurred”.

In attempting to summarize Maguire’s work, it is important to note that he insists that the process of cultural diffusion cannot be seen as uni-directional. This is because global processes are multi-directional, involving a series of dynamic power balances; and, on a more general level, because the focus needs to be on relationships. He points to a number of global flows that must be considered if we are to understand globalization processes more adequately. Rather like Featherstone, Maguire argues that the global figuration is structured along the global flows of people, finance, technology, mediated images and ideologies. He holds that “the speed, scale and volume of sports development is interwoven with the[se] broader global flows” (Maguire, 1999, p.93). Therefore, he considers that it is more adequate to view diffusion as constituting a balance and blend of inter-related processes that are expressions of people in action. The complex interweaving of the various global flows contributes, “over the long term”, to “outcomes that were neither planned nor intended by the more and less powerful groups involved” (Maguire, 1999, p.211). As such, it is implausible, Maguire argues, to accept mono-causal explanations that
reduce global processes solely to an understanding of political economy structures. Although, "to argue this is not to overlook or downplay the shorter-term impact that issues of political economy have on sports" (Maguire, 1999, p.211). Maguire (1994a, p.453) maintains that, "the current development of sport is itself being powered by a whole series of intended and unintended interdependency chains that characterize globalization". Hence, he argues, there is no hidden hand of 'progress' or some overarching conspiracy guiding processes of diffusion. Maguire maintains that globalization is most adequately understood in terms of the Elisian concepts of 'diminishing contrasts and increasing varieties'. This developed through growing interdependencies and power struggles, as there occurred, in its course, a reduction in the contrasts within societies. This has not, and is unlikely to, produce a homogenous culture. In relation to this point, Maguire (1999) argues that even global-marketing companies are unlikely to seek homogeneity. In this respect, he argues, transnational corporations "celebrate difference. That is, the cultural industries constantly seek out new varieties of ethnic wares. These ethnic wares are targeted at specific 'niches' within a local culture. This targeting can lead to strengthening of 'local' ethnic identities" (Maguire, 1993a, p.310).

In concluding, Maguire (1999, p.213) argues that "globalization is accordingly best understood as a balance and blend between diminishing contrasts and increasing varieties, a commingling of cultures and attempts by more established groups to control and regulate access to global flows". Furthermore, "the local-global struggle for relative ascendancy in power networks is also located within the unintended and unforeseen consequences of earlier intended actions" (Maguire, 1999, p.215).
In summary, there is a great deal of overlap between Maguire’s work and that of those authors whose work is outlined in section 2.2.5. It is clear that none of them advocate a ‘homogenization thesis’. This is not to say they argue that heterogenization best characterizes cultural diffusion. It is important to avoid such “binary logic” (Featherstone, 1990, p.2). Most of these authors are of the view that due recognition has not been given to the power balances that exist between, to use Wallerstein’s phraseology, the so-called ‘core’ and ‘periphery’ cultures. They all highlight what they see as the importance of the reaction, or response, of ‘local’ people to ‘alien’ cultures. Hence, even if a sport, or another aspect of culture, seems thoroughly diffuse it would be inappropriate to suggest that this therefore represents homogenization. Perhaps, more crucially, it does not have to imply dependence either. This is because interpretation of cultural products, for example, is likely to differ from person to person, and group to group. It is more accurate to conceive of this relationship as being characterized by levels of interdependency, resulting in a blend of increasing homogeneity and heterogeneity, or, to use an Eliasian concept, diminishing contrasts and increasing varieties. Guttmann, Houlihan, Robertson, Featherstone and Maguire all hold that it is more adequate to view processes of global diffusion as a balance and blend of a whole host of inter-related processes. For example, this may result from the direct intention of diffusing sports, such as worldwide marketing techniques, and may also have occurred as an indirect result of the actions of individuals, the results of which they would have scarcely been able to predict. Importance is placed on avoiding characterizing social relationships as being entirely based on dependency per se. The approach is fundamentally relational, which is expressed in terms of interdependencies of power relationships. Moreover, these are usually differential in character. What differentiates Guttmann, Houlihan, Featherstone and Robertson from
Maguire is that the latter places more explicit emphasis on differential interdependency and the unplanned dimension, and locates his analysis within an overt theoretical framework.

2.3 Critical appraisal

Certain criticisms can be labelled at most, if not all, of the writers whose work has been expounded upon above. For example, much of the ‘evidence’ that several authors have provided is lacking in empirical substance. Indeed, much of the work is largely abstract and theoretical. To the extent that empirical material is drawn upon, it is frequently used to support rather than rigorously test the respective theories. This is a significant problem since this limits our understanding of the very processes we are seeking to gain more knowledge about. A major criticism of several authors is the tendency to reify processes above the level of human interaction. Reification is an obstacle for understanding. Indeed, the debate is awash with reification – as will be outlined more specifically below.

Another criticism, which can be levelled at a number of authors, is that meanings and definitions of words used to describe and explain the process of cultural diffusion lack clarity. A number of authors use a host of terms interchangeably and attribute different meanings to them. Some authors make no distinction between terms like ‘globalization’ and ‘cultural imperialism’. As is established above, several authors prefer the term ‘cultural hegemony’ to ‘cultural imperialism’ because the former supposedly implies interdependency. Strictly speaking, however, there is little obvious difference in the choice of phrases. There is little in the phrase ‘cultural imperialism’ that necessarily prevents one from using this to imply that dynamic,
differential power relationships are involved. Indeed, to acknowledge the imperialistic intentions and consequences does not necessarily lead one to embrace absolutism. A perspective based on differential interdependency can accommodate these imperialistic and/or hegemonic dimensions. Yet, those who characterize global diffusion processes by dependency theory have, almost exclusively, used the phrase "cultural imperialism". The term globalization has even been used (by Houlihan, for example) as an explanatory tool that, it is claimed, avoids the mono-causal implications associated with cultural imperialism or hegemony. Again, this is not entirely satisfactory, since the term globalization, without explanatory implications, is merely a descriptive word. Such discrepancies in the terms used – and, more particularly, in the meanings attached to them – leads to considerable confusion for the reader. Therefore, greater definitional clarity is required if we are to advance our understanding.

For the remainder of this section, critical reflection will be broken down in the same way as the above exposition of the different approaches. In some cases critical appraisal will concentrate on the work of specific authors. However, it is simply not possible, or necessary – within the confines of this chapter – to attempt to develop a specific critique of each author, or to take issue with every contentious point. Frequently, similar criticisms could be levelled at a number of authors. In such cases a more general approach will avoid repetition.

2.3.1 Modernization critique

Wagner makes a valuable point when he argues that we should not ignore the impact of Asia and other regions outside of the west in general. If we allowed our
focus to concentrate solely on the impact of the west, this would provide only a narrow account of global flows. Nonetheless, there is more to criticize than to commend in Wagner’s modernization perspective. The work of modernization theorists in general has been roundly criticized for being functionalist and, therefore, for not being able to deal adequately with conflict and exploitation within societies (Hargreaves, 2001; Maguire, 1999). Wagner is but one proponent of this approach. By suggesting, as he does, that global flows reflect the “will of the people” he has a naïve appreciation of power differentials and their consequences. To argue that human relationships are best characterized by a simple analysis of the ‘choice’ of individual human beings cannot stand up to sociological scrutiny. It seems inconsistent with his argument that homogenization is an expression of global processes, since he recognizes that people are diverse, it would seem to follow that their responses to the diffusion of different sports will also be diverse. In addition, with the focus on “free will”, he cannot handle the unplanned dimension.

Wagner’s argument that we are witnessing growing homogenization is sound enough. It is obvious that certain aspects of culture, economics, politics are becoming increasingly alike the world over. But, to argue that this is the only discernable process is too narrow and partial a view. This is a criticism that can equally be related to the work of those authors who fall within the ‘cultural imperialism’ thesis.

2.3.2 Cultural imperialism critique

These authors hold that the diffusion process is characterized by interpersonal relationships based significantly, if not entirely, on dependency. On these grounds, like Wagner, they argue that this is resulting in a homogenous, global culture. In other
words, while their framework and analysis is distinctively different from Wagner’s, they still reach the same conclusion. Indeed, a dependency approach has to lead to homogenization because there is no capacity to resist.

The arguments offered by Galtung, Stoddart and Wilcox are all monocausal, based almost entirely on an economic explanation of global relationships. In other words, they all argue that economic factors are fundamentally governing the process of diffusion. Moreover, they deem this to be the case in advance of the research. Therefore, the cultural imperialism thesis is open to the charge of ‘economic-determinism’. Economic determinism has been a consistent criticism of those working under a Marxist umbrella. It is not necessary to delve deeper at this stage. What is important to note is that Galtung, Stoddart, and Wilcox largely ignore the complexities of global diffusion. It is simply not adequate to reduce the entire process to a form of economic determinism. At the very least, this significantly downplays the clear cultural, political and social implications for the diffusion of certain sports.

The cultural imperialism argument is too simplistic in relation to the concept of power. Authors in this area seem to place little, if any, emphasis on resistance to the dominant groups. To recognize this shortcoming is not to deny the importance of American, western or capitalist influences, but the proposition that we are witnessing a homogenising, Americanization process driven by MNCs, pure and simple, is inadequate. For example, to suggest, as Wilcox does, that the USA ‘replaced’ Britain as the ‘prime’ mover in the diffusion of sports is too sweeping. In relation to this, Wilcox refers to Americanization processes to such an extent – to the exclusion of all

---

2 Dunning (1992) has provided a substantial critique of this debate.
others – that he might as well use the term ‘sole mover’. Wilcox offers only limited, and clearly selective, empirical basis for his conclusions. For example, he argues that ‘traditional European sport’ is under threat, and that the influence of the USA in Europe is ‘incomparable’. His response to this supposed threat – that public policy should be formulated to protect European culture – amounts to little more than social policy. This is a further shortcoming, since he is offering his preferred outcome, to the detriment of trying to discover how things have come to be. Such dominance of ideology is a criticism that can be levelled more generally at those advocating the cultural imperialism stance. In addition, Wilcox makes no attempt to qualify or support his argument with a balanced empirical analysis, which takes into account countervailing evidence. After all, Association Football is a ‘traditional European sport’, and it remains the most popular sport in the world.

Stoddart does, at least, offer an empirical analysis to support his theoretical conclusions. However, his empirical data is restricted to a case study of golf. In this respect, a case study approach, on its own, will simply pre-empt the question. That is to say, anyone can present a case study that demonstrates the influence of the economic dimension of human activity. It cannot demonstrate that always, and everywhere, \textit{a priori}, the economic motive is the essential aspect governing the diffusion process. This kind of criticism can be levelled at any isolated ‘case study’ approach that does not seek to make comparisons on a cross-sectional basis as well.

There are two separate issues here: (i) the fact that a case study cannot on its own form the basis for wider generalizations, and (ii) the problematic adequacy of economic determinism. If research is limited to a single case study, it is important to be rather more circumspect than Stoddart seems to be in the conclusions drawn.
Like so many of the writers in this field, Galtung is guilty of reification. His chosen terminology of "structural domination" is but one example of this, and only serves to obscure the problem. Galtung implies that the centre, the periphery and 'structure' exist, somehow, separately from human relations. Such a position totally negates an understanding that it is human beings that are the process. That is to say, without human interaction no such process exists. Furthermore, his argument that 'cultural imperialism' is based on structure, rather than, say, military dominance, implies that the military dimensions are not part of the 'social structure'.

Although Galtung argues that 'spheres' of culture, economics, politics, military matters, and communications are all important in the diffusion process, his analysis is limited to the notion that a hidden, economic agenda exists. He remains tied to a Marxist notion of dependence, although this is not to deny that some of Marx's empirical studies are fundamentally relational. Galtung limits the source of the diffusion of sport to the west. In doing so, he undermines the part played by people from beyond these areas. In addition, Galtung implies that individuals cannot consciously choose to adopt or reject sports that originated elsewhere; rather they are merely foisted upon them. In summary, these characteristics combine to impose considerable limitations on the extent to which his approach can illuminate our understanding of these processes.

Those who advocate the cultural imperialism stance seem unable to account for the fact that different dimensions of power of a particular party can increase and decline simultaneously. In other words, they fail to account for the fact that power is multi-dimensional. Their argument that western domination, in particular, is
reinforced and legitimized through sporting practices, seems to ignore the fact that non-western countries frequently beat western countries at certain sports. Given their characterization of the power relationships involved, how can this occur? An acknowledgement that power is multi-dimensional, accounts for the fact that non-western nations are playing western sports, but can, and regularly do, beat the west at their own game, so to speak.

Wallerstein should be commended for his attempt to account for global diffusion processes by way of a more explicit long-term developmental approach. However, his work is still dogged by the notion that a handful of dominant, 'core' nations exist that are responsible for the diffusion process. Furthermore, his central concept, the 'World System', is indicative of his reified approach. In fact, his work in general is replete with examples of reification. To cite but one example: the world system has “been functioning for 500 years, in search of the ceaseless accumulation of capital” (Wallerstein, 1991, p.15). This is illustrative both of his reifying and teleological tendencies. It is a stark example of the kind of economic-determinism he, and other, more conventional dependency theorists, are guilty of. That is to say, these theorists propose an economic logic to capital accumulation that determines cultural and political processes.

Wallerstein’s work is also inconsistent in some respects. He seems to want it both ways. The concept ‘semi-periphery’ is indicative of Wallerstein genuflecting in the direction of empirical reality, while, at the same time, clinging to his central concepts – core and periphery – and the absolutism implicit in them. At one level he argues that the weaker groups at the periphery, and semi-periphery, do resist and fight
against the centre, but, at another level, he refers to the process as solely centripetal in direction. He argues that "the unequal exchange" between central and peripheral countries has been "hidden". This raises two points: (1) How can the periphery possibly 'resist' if the process is unbeknownst to them?; and (2) If the centre is so dominant, how is it that Wallerstein is able to recognize the 'hidden' aspects of domination? That is to say, how can he observe his own reification from outside?

2.3.3 Cultural diversity critique

Several authors reject the argument that global flows are characterized by homogenization. For example, Hannerz and Nederveen Pieterse maintain that it is more appropriate to conceive of global flows as leading to heterogenization. I would argue that this is equally one-sided. Pluralist notions of interdependency like that offered by Nederveen Pieterse make it less surprising that dependency theorists reject the notion of interdependency in general. Furthermore, Nederveen Pieterse really does not provide an explanation of how such processes develop. His work is largely descriptive and ahistorical. Hannerz, at least, does provide a good deal of empirical evidence to support his arguments. Nevertheless, his formulation that the world is made up of 'cosmopolitan' and 'local' human beings is a crude dichotomy, and limits our understanding of the processes involved.

2.3.4 Cultural hegemony critique

Cultural hegemonists argue that neither a homogenization nor a heterogenization approach is sufficiently adequate. Instead, they argue that although dominant groups do play a more significant role in diffusing culture, these attempts are met with local resistance. Cultural hegemony theorists do, therefore, take a
differential view of power. This is something to be commended, and is something they share in common with, for example, figurational sociologists. However, cultural hegemony theorists tend to over-emphasize dominating forces, such as Americanization – and have a continuing, more covert attachment to economic determinism. For example, Donnelly, Kidd and Klein in particular, argue that the USA has been largely ‘responsible’ for the diffusion process. The work of all three of these authors is characterized by reification. Each of them implicitly conceptualize the USA as a single, cultural entity. Hence, this implies that ‘American values’ and ‘American culture’ are uncontested themes. Given the cultural diversity of influences characterising the USA, one might ask: “What is distinctively American”? Donnelly, for example, argues that Americanization processes have contributed to the American style of sport becoming dominant throughout the world. This includes such characteristics as the “show-biz” style of approach. Donnelly offers no empirical analysis in support of his conclusions. Thus, he provides no specific reason to support the notion that such a ‘show-biz’ style is exclusively American. For but one example, the amateurism/professionalism struggle has its deeper roots in England. Thus, he neglects the part Europeans, Japanese and Australians, for example, have played in the production of sports as ‘show-biz entertainment’. Donnelly’s view of sports fails to grasp their truly ‘global’ presence. One must recognize that many cultures, and a number of sports, remain largely unaffected by American ‘influences’. For example, this line of argument seems to ignore the un-American organizational forms, such as league systems involving promotion and relegation, that are still very much an aspect of much of European sports competition.
Donnelly also seems to want it both ways, insofar as he argues that Americanization processes have contributed to a global ‘monoculture’, yet he also argues that a differential view of power and resistance is possible. This kind of jumping between a simpler, more mono-causal explanation to a more complex, multi-causal one detracts from the search for a clearer explanation of the processes under consideration. As well as this, Donnelly’s argument that the “cultural entity” of globalization can be viewed from both the standpoint of economic and environmental relations is far too abstract. It is not clear what this distinction means, or why he thinks it is useful to distinguish between economics and the environment in this way. They are both expressions of human interactions.

Klein’s work in this area is extensively researched, and this sets it apart from numerous authors in this debate. He provides the reader with critical insight into the contested terrain of global sports. However, in promoting a cultural hegemony approach, he tends to “romanticise the oppressed” (Houlihan, 1994b, p.190). His view that the Dominican people are blinded to their lowly position by the riches on offer from Major League Baseball (MLB) is mere assertion. By arguing that Dominicans are duped into searching for the promise of the riches on offer seems inconsistent with his own argument that these processes have generated considerable cultural resistance. In addition, the fact that Klein, by his own admission, glosses over the Eurocentric influences in the Caribbean implies that he looked only for evidence that sustained his concerns.

Andrews, Jackson and Silk place emphasis on the global-local nexus. Although, their preferred term for this nexus, “Cultural Toyotism”, is particularly
jarring, and not especially helpful. They conceive of it as a crude dichotomy between “acting globally/thinking locally” and “global anthems/local sensibilities”. To argue that the diffusion process can be characterized as such is an over-simplification. Silk and Andrews also reify processes, arguing, as they do, that there is a “dynamism of advanced economics”. They are highly selective in the evidence they discuss. A further, crucial element to their argument is the extent to which they attempt to generalize on the basis of such narrow research. Indeed, there is a tendency within the cultural studies approach, in general, to place considerable importance on analysing the “discourse” of one-off adverts, or television programmes. The work by Andrews and co-authors, and Miller et al are particularly guilty in this respect. Andrews and Silk, for example, on the basis of one commercial shown on Indian television, argue that an aspect of American culture (in this case Coca-Cola) is thrust into mainstream Indian culture by “brazenly” marrying cricket with Coca-Cola. Such a sweeping conclusion surely requires a greater depth of empirical analysis, as well as an assessment of how successful this attempt was. It may well be the case that the intention of Nike, and others, is to ensure their products appeal to global cultures, however, greater attention needs to be paid to analysing the ‘response’ of ‘receiving cultures’ and the unforeseen outcomes of these strategies.

Miller et al are similarly guilty of being highly selective with their presented material. In order to support their argument, they tend to favour drawing their empirical examples from sources with inherent biases (such as specifically selected newspaper articles and even comedians). The selection and interpretation of their empirical material is geared to supporting their thesis rather than testing it. While they attempt to distance their work from the tendency to reduce cultural diffusion to some
form of 'economic determinism', they still succumb to it. For example, even though the authors' recognize that the commodification process is "a condition ... that is almost unrealisable in absolute terms given the necessary precondition of absolute economic determinism" (Miller et al, 2001, p.84), they often make reference to athletes and whole sports as 'commodities'. Their statement that, "what began as a cultural exchange based on empire has turned into one based on capital" (Miller et al, 2001, p.10), hardly does justice to a multi-faceted appreciation of globalization that involves a recognition that there are cultural, military, political, as well as economic dimensions to this process. While these authors point to what they term the 'dominant triad' – the USA, Japan and Western Europe – which continues to dominate the global spread of sports and sports goods, they remain preoccupied with the part played by the USA in this process.

McKay and Miller (1991, p.93; emphasis in the original) argue that even though the "globalization of consumerism" transcends "the confines of the United States; culturally, we view the form and content of Australian sport as exemplifying the 'cultural logic of late capitalism' (James, 1984)". This is clearly another example of abstract theoretical thinking and reification. They, again, seem to want it both ways. They argue that it is appropriate to avoid tendencies to view processes as totalities, but categorically state "sport in Australia has been Americanised".

As has been established, a general criticism of the cultural hegemony approach is that its proponents still exhibit a tendency to regress to economic determinism and reification. The discourse is littered with references to the 'logic of capital'. Indeed, as Dunning (1992, p.228; emphasis in the original) states, despite hegemony theorists: 

Avowal of economic reductionism ... a commitment to some form of economic determinism, to the belief that a society's mode of production is the fundamental, if not the only, determinant of its principal structural and cultural contours, remains one of the chief defining characteristics of this as of all forms of Marxist sociology.

The primary emphasis placed on the intentional aspects of global diffusion is a further flaw in the work of cultural hegemonists – and it sits very uncomfortably alongside the tendency to reify. This is not to deny that aspects of diffusion are intended. However, the outcome is rarely, if ever, pre-determined. If it could be, then any one group must have complete control of a given situation. This is never the case. Unforeseen consequences are not abstract forces or other such reifications, but a consequence of the complexity of the preceding human figurations.

It is clear that, on the surface, there is considerable overlap between cultural hegemony theorists and those authors who form the basis for my final two groupings: authors taking a 'multi-causal' stance and figurational sociology. The authors' share a common perception that global flows are best understood in terms of a differential interdependency framework, although, more explicit attention is paid to this theme by the latter two groups. All three groups argue that we are witnessing a blend of the global and the local – or, to put it another way, global flows are both homogenising and heterogenising. Although, in the 'final analysis', the differences between the authors seem to outweigh the similarities, given the propensities of cultural hegemonists to: (i) regress to economic determinism, which undoes their earlier attempts to be more relational; and (ii) engage in reification. On the whole, cultural hegemonists tend to view more powerful groups within these relationships as always

---

3 In a sense, the so-called inherent logic of the structure of capitalism is almost their equivalent of unplanned processes. But, of course, the latter is not a reification.
being able to realize their intended outcomes. Such an approach is not relational. It involves an absolutist view of power. A more adequate view of ‘power’ would involve recognizing that power differentials are continually in flux. This is where a significant distinction can be drawn between cultural hegemonists and those who advocate a more multi-causal approach.

2.3.5 Multi-causal critique

There is much to commend about the work of Guttmann. He has engaged in a diverse range of comparative research. He discounts the notion that there exists a hidden hand that somehow guides the process of diffusion. In addition, he states that this process is in no way uni-directional. However, Guttmann’s argument is a little confusing at times. Not least because he, like many others, is rather unclear regarding the terminology used. For example, Guttmann has used modernization, cultural imperialism and standardized universality as terms to refer to the globalization of sports. As such, it is easy to mistake Guttmann for someone who advocates a modernization perspective or even a cultural imperialism perspective (Maguire, 1999). A closer reading of his work reveals that he advocates neither approach. Instead, he considers that a more multi-directional and multi-dimensional understanding to be more persuasive. Clarity is imperative and the fact that Guttmann’s work is rather confusing at times detracts from the sophistication of the general analysis. Guttmann’s apparent unwillingness to locate his work alongside any particular theory adds to the confusion. In this respect, his preferred phrase of ‘standardized universality’ as an expression of global processes is rather ambiguous, insofar as it is not clear how this phrase is an advance on other terms he rejects.
Houlihan also places considerable emphasis on the need to conceive of the problem in terms of differential interdependency and avoids any simplistic notions of uni-directionality. Houlihan is correct to look for ways to assess reach and response in terms of diffusion processes. But, reducing his ‘model’ of diffusion to a ‘boxed’ catalogue of possible outcomes is restrictive and static. For example, he allows the ‘recipient cultures’ only three kinds of ‘response’. One of these ‘responses’ is a ‘passive acceptance’ of culture, which is, in many respects, erroneous. Under what conditions can any human being, or group of human beings, ever be truly ‘passive’? To some extent, Houlihan accepts many of these problems. Nevertheless, he is of the view that this approach is a way of overcoming the limitations in the work of several other authors. In other words, there has been a general failure to recognize the capacity of the ‘recipients’ to respond adaptively or resist these processes. Nonetheless, Robertson, Featherstone, and Maguire, for example, all manage to criticize this weakness without recourse to such crude models. Therefore, this must be seen as a flaw in Houlihan’s analysis. In addition, although Houlihan provides this model for empirical investigation, he does not provide a rigorous empirical analysis of his own. This detracts from the adequacy of any conclusions he is able to draw.

Robertson and Featherstone provide generally excellent analyses of global flows. They are both highly critical of much of the work that has been produced in the field of ‘globalization’. They both highlight numerous empirical problems in much of what has been published in the field. Both of them recognize that such processes cannot be understood in terms of economic determinism or, solely, in terms of any specific ‘trajectories’ such as westernization.
The concept 'glocalization', coined by Robertson and also used by Featherstone, is a little jarring, but it appears to be a useful corrective to the polarization of the debate that diffusion processes either contribute to homogenization or heterogenization. One of the problems with the globalization debate is that it is often structured along either/or lines. It is plausible to argue that a differential interdependency framework exists. Recognition of this avoids the pitfalls of a dichotomized approach since such a framework entails an understanding of processes as balances and blends, and not either one extreme or the other. This does not stop one from acknowledging that the process of increasing global interdependency, albeit highly differentiated interdependency, has shifted the balance from heterogeneity to homogeneity. Again, this position allows one to recognize that the attempts of certain groups to homogenize, and, in effect assimilate, other cultures, have stimulated different and new forms of heterogeneity.

Though there is much to commend in both Robertson and Featherstone's arguments, their attempts to illustrate and support their theoretical arguments are, evidentially, selective and narrowly based. Neither has engaged in particularly rigorous examinations of their theoretical stances. Furthermore, Featherstone, in particular, is guilty of reification. For example, his work treats nation-states as entities that can 'act'. He also seems to imply that flows of money, goods, information, technology and images are not the expressions of human figurations.

2.3.6 Figurational critique

Finally, it is necessary to turn to the work of Maguire. His work is generally excellent, and avoids many of the conceptual, empirical and theoretical traps that
ensnare others. He has conducted considerable empirical analysis covering a wide range of pertinent issues. Maguire’s work provides a good illustration of how one can appropriately use the term ‘Americanization’, for example, whilst rejecting the absolutist notions associated with the term when used by cultural imperialists. In this respect, Maguire more appropriately considers Americanization as a sub-process, albeit the most significant sub-process involved in globalization.

Notwithstanding Maguire’s background in figurational sociology, on occasions he, too, is guilty of reification. For example, he argues that “political, economic, and cultural practices … do not of themselves aim at global integration, but they nonetheless produce it” (Maguire, 1993b, p.30; emphasis added). Such formulations run the risk of being interpreted as meaning that these processes are in some way independent of human beings and help to legitimize these tendencies in the work of others. In addition, the term “aim” implies intention. Maguire also accepts that the marketing of sport has been conducted along “specific, that is American lines” (Maguire & Bale, 1993, p.6). This statement implies that ‘American lines’ are uncontested with all the limitations that this entails. Similarly to Featherstone, Maguire argues that we must examine global flows of people, technology, capital, images and ideologies. Such formulations, again, imply that global flows of technology, for example, are not expressions of human beings. To formulate his argument in this manner is a hostage to fortune, especially since he is critical of others’ reified abstractions. However, these are fairly minor criticisms in the broader scheme of analysis within his work. He seems to provide us with a more adequate, and substantial empirical grounding for his theoretical understanding of the processes of diffusion than other contributors to the debate.
In summary, in much of the literature outlined above, there are some major shortcomings. Most particularly, the globalization debate is littered with abstract, reified commentary. In order to advance our understanding of the globalization of sport, and thus globalization processes in general, we need to take a long-term, empirically rigorous analysis as our starting point. To this end, an in-depth account of the development of baseball in England will serve as a case study from which we can extrapolate the general from the specific. Given the criticism, above, of the tendency to use case studies to bolster a particular ideological position, it is also necessary to supplement this case study with a broader analysis on a more general level. This is why I will also examine the wider diffusion of baseball across the world. Given the shortcomings of the ideologically driven work of many outlined above, it is vital, within this thesis, that I conduct this thorough empirical analysis in order to rigorously test theory. Such an approach is outlined below in the methodology. In this respect, it is proposed that a figurational interpretation holds out the prospect of offering a greater understanding of global processes. Therefore, the next step is to elaborate upon what a figurational approach would entail. Given some of the above criticisms of Maguire's work, it is especially important to return to the work of Norbert Elias, and other recognized figurational sociologists. Hence, it is necessary to establish what a figurational analysis of global flows would involve. The following chapter, then, will provide a more explicit outline of the major premises of figurational sociology.
Chapter 3: Figurational Sociology and the Sociology of Globalization

3.1 Introduction

As outlined in the review of literature, it seems that the most adequate account of globalization processes that has been forwarded thus far is from a figurational perspective. It would seem, therefore, that this is the most attractive theory to help us explain the diffusion, and reaction to this diffusion, of baseball around the world. The aim of this chapter is two-fold: to outline figurational sociology at a general level and then to take a more specific figurational 'look' at the sociology of globalization. Initially it will be necessary to identify more explicitly than in the review of literature, the major premises of figurational sociology, so that we are in a position to test the theoretical perspective more rigorously. Following on from this, I will discuss more specifically how figurational sociology might be applied to an understanding of globalization processes. This discussion is further to the outline of the figurational analysis of globalization processes by Maguire discussed in the previous chapter.

Figurational sociology originated in the work of Norbert Elias. As Mennell and Goudsblom (1998, p.1) observe, Elias made several major innovative contributions to sociological study, “building further upon the basic insights into the nature of social processes first developed in The Civilizing Process”. Several attempts have been made to collate the ideas Elias developed in explicating the ‘figurational approach’. Perhaps the most illuminating and succinct is the outline provided by Goudsblom (1977) in his book, Sociology in the Balance. Therein, Goudsblom identifies a number of ‘points of departure’ for the sociological process, which are more usually referred to as the ‘domain assumptions’ of figurational sociology. These are:
(1) [That] human beings are interdependent, in a variety of ways; their lives evolve in, and are significantly shaped by, the social figurations they form with each other. (2) These figurations are continually in flux, undergoing changes of different orders - some quick and ephemeral, others slower but perhaps more lasting. (3) The long-term developments taking place in human social figurations have been and continue to be largely unplanned and unforeseen. (4) The development of human knowledge takes place within human figurations, and forms one important aspect of the over-all development (Gousblom, 1977, p.6).

In order to throw additional light on these 'points of departure', it is perhaps worthwhile to provide an outline of the main aspects of figurational sociology under the following sub-headings: figurations; networks of interdependency and habitus; blind social processes; power balances.

3.2 Figurations

As Murphy, Sheard and Waddington (2000, p.92) state, "the central organizing concept of figurational sociology is, unsurprisingly, the concept of 'figuration' itself'. People in interaction with one another form figurations. All human beings are inevitably born into figurations. From the outset, through to the end of life, people are always and everywhere locked into interdependency ties with other human beings. The notion of figuration is constructed to position human interdependencies at the heart of the sociological debate. As such, Elias (1978, p.127) argued, "we can never think of people singly and alone [Homo clausus]; we must always think of them as people in figurations [Homine aperti]". People are always mutually oriented. We must appreciate, therefore, that the distinction often made between society (the 'structure') and the individual (the 'agent') in more orthodox sociological writings is a false dichotomy. As Goudsblom (1977, p.131) states:

Societies are pluralities of interdependent people. The 'constraints' allegedly exerted by 'social institutions', are in fact exerted by people. The very same persons who may feel terribly 'constrained' are at the same time actively 'constraining': they exercise pressures on other people, and on themselves.
Elias used the term figuration to refer to, and emphasize, the processual character of societies. The concept of figuration, he argues, "makes it possible to resist the socially conditioned pressure to split and polarize our conception of mankind [sic], which has repeatedly prevented us from thinking of people as individuals at the same time as thinking of them as societies" (Elias, 1978, p.129). For Elias, and figurationalists generally, viewing human beings as self-contained and separate individuals impacted upon by omnipotent social structures is to misconstrue the sociological perspective from the outset. Elias stresses the importance of avoiding reification. Social structures do not exist over and above people. This is a pitfall that frequently characterizes much of the writing in the field of globalization theory. Globalization processes are human figurations, nothing more and nothing less. Such processes do not exist as separate from human beings. In this regard, Elias (1978, p.72) argues that, "one can understand many aspects of the behaviour or actions of individual people only if one sets out from the study of the pattern of their interdependence, the structure of their societies, in short from the figurations they form with each other".

Individual people only exist because of the mutual dependencies they form with one another. In other words, figurations consist of interdependent people. As such, as Mennell and Goudsblom (1998, p.22) observe, "in order to understand the feelings, thoughts, and action of any group of people, we have always to consider the many social needs by which these people are bonded to each other and to other people". However, people are not only bonded by social needs. For example, they can be bonded because of the unplanned outcome of previous human figurations. Figurational sociologists, therefore, conceptualize individuals as interdependent people in the singular, and society as interdependent people in the plural. According
to Elias (1978, p.131), “there is no one who is not and has never been interwoven into a network of people” and “it was in order to capture the idea of such networks that he coined the concept of ‘figurations’” (Dunning, 1999, p.19). The significance of this point is that it challenges any attempt to mystify these processes by reifying concepts or explanations. This brings us to the next domain assumption of figurational sociology: ‘networks of interdependency’ and ‘habitus’.

3.3 Networks of Interdependency and Habitus

We often hear the expression ‘in a world of his/her own’ mentioned in relation to individual people. Such an expression, whilst making sense as a figure of speech, tends to distort the situation that all human beings find themselves in. However ‘alone’ one individual may feel – at a psychological level – at any one time, they remain interconnected to and interdependent with other people. Indeed, such people feel alone because of the nature of their past interdependency ties. No one is independent in the sense of being in isolation from other people in anything other than a physical sense – and even then, one might argue that they remain genetically dependent. Moreover, their socialization shapes aspects of their physical being, for example the language they speak tends to shape and limit their mouth and the movements of their tongue. People cannot take care of themselves; at best they can ensure that others will take care of them. In fact, they rely on numerous other people to produce the conditions in which they exist. Dunning (1999, p.16) holds that, “interdependence per se is a social universal, one of the principal building blocks of social life”. Thus, people are always more-or-less dependent on each other: “humans are ineradicably interdependent as a species. Without interdependency ties they could neither be born nor survive. Individuals and figurations complement each other” (Dunning, 1999, p.19). A newborn baby is almost entirely dependent on the
immediate family around them. As he or she grows up, they become more interdependent with a greater number of people, but also more physically self-sufficient in most cases. Nevertheless, this self-sufficiency is still an expression of habitus, and hence a further manifestation of interdependency.

The child entering school soon forms networks of interdependencies with his or her classmates. Like all figurations, a class of students is a dynamic network. Members of this network may or may not have contact with one another outside of the class. Nevertheless, each individual in some way contributes to the network, and is impacted upon by the network. To simplify matters, just crossing the road and navigating walking in to town are illustrations of this interdependency. We are dependent on people driving motor vehicles to obey the Highway Code, to stop at red lights or pelican crossings. Equally, we must be aware of other pedestrians walking on the streets. On a more macro scale, once in town, we are interdependent on numerous people, sometimes from all over the world, to produce the goods, whether food, clothing or luxury items, that we seek to buy.

In addition to these examples of ‘externalized constraints’, one can add internalized constraints. As Van Krieken (1998, p.6) points out, “Elias argued that we are social to our very core, and only exist in and through our relations with others, developing a socially constructed ‘habitus’ or ‘second nature’”. The organization of the psychological make-up of an individual into a habitus is a process that begins at birth and continues throughout a person’s life, although Elias argued that the greatest impact on one’s habitus is during childhood and youth (Van Krieken, 1998). That is to say, through the network of interdependencies we find ourselves inevitably involved in, we develop, sub-consciously and consciously, internalized constraints relating to
behaviour. Hence, not only are we constrained by the more obvious ‘external’ world, so to speak, but also internalized taste and habits. In relation to this, Elias (1987/2001, p.182) argues that:

The social habitus of individuals, forms, as it were, the soil from which grow the personal characteristics through which an individual differs from other members of his [sic] society. In this way something grows out of the common language which the individual shares with others and which is certainly a component of the social habitus – a more or less individual style, what might be called an unmistakable individual handwriting that grows out of the social script.

This, it seems to me, is a useful corrective to the problem of studying local responses to globalization processes. That is to say, as was evident in the review of literature, numerous authors are guilty of reifying the notion of a ‘national character’. Numerous comments relating to ‘national responses’, to Americanization and the like, are more fruitfully explored through the concept of habitus. As Elias (1987/2001, p.182-3) argues:

The concept of the social habitus enables us to bring social phenomena within the field of scientific investigation previously inaccessible to them. Consider, for example, the problem that is communicated in a pre-scientific way by the concept of national character. This is a habitus problem par excellence. The idea that the individual bears in himself or herself the habitus of a group, and that it is this habitus that he or she individualizes to a greater or lesser extent, can be somewhat more precisely defined.

Dynamic networks of human interdependencies are not restricted to face-to-face relationships; rather they are linked to wider networks, which the participants in the former network may have little or no knowledge of. Conceptualising such interdependencies is often difficult for many students of sociology. However, the complexity of the problem should not lead us to shy away from it and simply reduce our concepts to ‘manageable’ notions of individuals being affected by ‘society’ as a whole. In this respect, figurational sociologists argue that this approach enables us to
do, arguably the hitherto unmanageable, i.e. bridge the dichotomy between individual and society by reconceptualising the relationship.

As an individual goes through life s/he is always part of a dynamic/shifting network of human beings: they are interdependent. The groups of people they are most immediately connected to within this network are likely to change over time. As such, “Elias explicitly conceptualized figurations as historically produced and reproduced networks of interdependence” (Murphy et al., 2000, p.92). From going to nursery, to going to school, to going to university and eventually getting a job ‘we’ – as part of a human figuration – are constantly producing and reproducing (even reconstituting) networks of interdependency. Some people may rarely, if ever, leave the confines of the area in which they were born. Nevertheless, the network of interdependencies that they are part of will still change over time, as people grow to become more or less influential, as other people move away from and into the same area, and as people are born and others die. The balance of dependence shifts over time. As such, figurationalists point out that we must appreciate the developmental aspects of society. This brings us on to the third broad aspect for discussion here, namely ‘blind social processes’

3.4 Blind social processes

The importance of understanding social developments processually is underlined by Elias’s use of the term figuration. “By figuration”, he points out, “we mean the changing pattern created by the players as a whole – not only by their intellects but by their whole selves, the totality of their dealings in their relationships
with each other” (Elias, 1978, p.13). Goudsblom (1977, p.132) argues that, “one of the difficult semantic problems sociologists have to face is the problem of conceptualizing development ... Our whole vocabulary is attuned to a static conception of the social world”. Indeed, Elias was critical of many sociological conceptions that essentially characterized social phenomena in a static manner, or as he called it, ‘process reduction’. Thus, as Van Krieken (1998, p.69) observes:

Instead of speaking of static ‘states’ or phenomena such as capitalism, rationality, bureaucracy, modernity, postmodernity, Elias would always wish to identify their processual character, so that he would think in terms of rationalization, modernization, bureaucratization, and so on.

Furthermore, Elias stated that social processes have no particular beginning or ‘zero-starting point’. They also have no end. Hence, Elias observes that all social relationships are processes. Thus, we should avoid treating ‘process’ as an abstraction. Processes, for example, urbanization, secularization, globalization, are people in action, nothing more and nothing less. We are only who we are because of what has occurred in the past. As Elias (1978, p.94) puts it: ‘the potential people we are born would never develop into the actual people we become if we were never subjected to any of the constraints of interdependence’. It is impossible to make sense of why one person goes to university, for example, and another person leaves school with no qualifications, without knowing something of their past and the characteristics of the networks they have been a part of. Equally, it would impossible to appreciate why cricket is the most popular summer team sport in England, whereas baseball enjoys that status in the USA, without knowing something about the human figurations that generated this. Any sociological enquiry, therefore, necessarily needs to be developmental. Hence, the study of the diffusion of baseball, in relation to this thesis,

---

1 However, even this phrase does not really capture the fact that the actions of people impact upon many other people of whose existence the former are often oblivious. That is to say, the term ‘dealings’ conveys the impression of conscious and intended consequences.
must contain a socio-historical account of the development and spread of the game – the development of the human figurations involved.

The complexity of the processual aspects of social development is not limited to the outlined discussion above. As Murphy et al (2000, p.92-93) argue, “the very complexity and dynamic character of the interweaving of the actions of large numbers of people continuously give rise to outcomes that no one has chosen and no one has designed”. In other words, not only do we have to be aware of the developmental aspects of social relationships, but we must also appreciate that people will never find themselves in situations of their own making and/or planning. The complex interweaving of numerous individuals going about their business, pursuing their own or their group interests, generates a range of unforeseen/unanticipated consequences. Elias stressed that this notion of unintended and unplanned outcomes are usual aspects of social life. He referred to these as ‘blind’ social processes. By way of an example, today children are frequently taught to use a knife and fork at the dinner table. When the child questions the authority of his or her parents regarding the use of the knife and fork, the answer to the question ‘Why must I?’ will rarely, if ever, be object-adequate. That is to say, a parent’s reply is likely to be along the lines: ‘Because it is rude not to’, or ‘because I say so’. Even the parent in question has little comprehension regarding why eating with a knife and fork is considered as a ‘social norm’. Few people would give any thought to the notion that we eat with a knife and fork today because of power struggles in medieval courts. The fact that we are often oblivious to such long-term processes does not prevent them from impacting on us. Dunning (1999, p.16) summarizes this point as follows:

The dynamics of long-term social processes derive from the interweaving of aggregates of individual acts. Each of these acts involves a measure of intentionality but the collective outcome, the direction of the long-term social process, is not planned.
Hence, from a figurational perspective, an adequate understanding of globalization processes must appreciate that they are never ‘designed’, so to speak, and are the unintended result of intended individual actions. Elias (1978, p.94-5) holds that “unintentional human interdependencies lie at the root of every intentional interaction” and every intended act has unintended consequences. He considered this to be central to his theories about society and inter-societal relations. In relation to this, Elias (1978, p.100-101) argued that, “it becomes impossible for individual people who make up a network of interrelationships to comprehend it and see their way through it, let alone to control it”. This statement leads us towards the central area of debate for figurational sociologists; that is the concept of power balances.

3.5 Power ratios

Power is all-important to a figurational understanding, in the sense that power “is a structural characteristic of human relationships – of all human relationships” (Elias, 1978, p.74; emphasis in the original). The civilising process, for example, is part of a broader power struggle. It is important to address the balances of power within socially constructed figurations. Figurational sociologists would argue that no single group or individual is able to exercise anything approaching complete control, and thus, have complete power over others. This is an important point because it distinguishes figurational sociologists from those who have an explicitly absolutist conception of power or tend to slip into this mode of thought. Furthermore, their recognition of the unequal nature of power relationships distinguishes them from pluralists. The balance of power is continually fluctuating, and is a central aspect of the development of every figuration. Power cannot be conceptualized as a substance or property possessed by particular individuals and groups. As Elias (1978, p.74) states “power is not an amulet possessed by one person and not by another”. We may
only speak of people being in a position of power, rather than possessing power. In other words, people do not ‘possess’ power because power is not an object; it is a property of social relationships. Even then, Murphy et al (2000, p.93) argue:

Power is always a question of relative balances, never of absolute possession or absolute deprivation, for no one is ever absolutely powerful or absolutely powerless. Neither is the balance of power between groups in a society permanent, for power balances are dynamic and continuously in flux.

These points are inextricably related to the understanding Elias developed regarding blind social processes. Intended actions never result in intended outcomes over a long period of time. Goudsblom (1977, p.141) is worth quoting at some length on this theme:

One reason why social processes in the long run take an uncontrolled and blind course lies in the unintended interdependence of human beings. Superior control over certain natural forces may enable some groups to dominate others for a time, while they themselves live in relative security. Thus, in 1945, possession of the atomic bomb seemed to confirm the position of the United States as the leading world power. In a few decades, however, a proliferation of nuclear arms all over the world has taken place which is most unlikely to have been intended by Presidents Roosevelt and Truman and their advisers. The threat of nuclear disaster is, like the uneven and irrational use of natural resources and the prodigious growth of population (Heilbroner, 1974), the result of dynamics at work in a world figuration which is still largely beyond human control.

Elias sought to conceptualize his understanding of power relations in a "simplified form" (Elias, 1978, p.74) in his ‘game models’ theory. As Mennell and Goudsblom (1998, p.22) argue, “some of the most explicit statements about the centrality of power are to be found … [in] ‘Game Models’” Indeed, Elias’ concept of ‘Game Models’ provides a compelling and useful overview of many aspects of the figurational approach.

---

2 Or, rather, major power groupings within the USA.
3.5.1 ‘Game models’ and power

Game models are an illustration of the relational disposition of power in a simplified form. Elias recognized the complexities associated with attempting to understand patterns of interdependencies and figurations. As such, he developed what he referred to as a “mental experiment”, demonstrating “the way in which human aims and actions intertwine … by means of a series of models” (Elias, 1978, p.73). In conceptualising his thoughts in this way, Elias (1978, p.74) considered that “the models may help towards a better understanding of … power balances, not as extraordinary but as everyday occurrences”. He argued that game models were of additional use in addressing the problem of static concepts of society, as the characteristics of a game are always developmental.\(^3\) That is to say, games, like social phenomena, cannot be satisfactorily analysed from a single point in time. As mentioned above, if we wish to understand social phenomena then we must assess how we have reached the point that we are at now, by making socio-historical enquiries.

Game models, according to Elias (1978, p.92), utilize “the image of people playing a game as a metaphor for people forming societies together”, and, consequently, “serve to make certain problems about social life more accessible to scientific reflection”. By utilising this approach, Elias (1978, p.80-1) holds:

It is possible to bring out more graphically the processual character of relationships between interdependent people. At the same time, they [game models] show how the web of human relations changes when the distribution of power changes. One of the ways in which simplification has been brought about is by substituting a series of assumptions about players’ relative strength in the game for differences in relative power potentials of interdependent people or groups in their relations with each other.

\(^3\) Although, it should be noted that because of their simplified nature, they do not take account of the wider and more deeply rooted figuration.
Elias (1978) provides a series of game scenarios, moving from relatively simple games, involving just two competitors, to more complex networks within team games. In all games, he argued, as the power differentials decrease, the ability of any single player to 'control' the game diminishes. In other words, the more evenly matched the opposing players, then the more difficult it becomes for one of them to exert such influence over the game that they can dictate the shape of play. However, the chances of being able to control a game involving only two players is significantly higher than where there are numerous people involved. Nevertheless, even in the context of, for example, a singles tennis match, no matter how much stronger one player is than his/her opponent, the control of one over the other, and, thus, over the game as such, can never be absolute. The players remain interdependent with one another and need always to have in mind such things as the position of the other player as well as the ball. The more the power differential diminishes, the less power will either player have to determine the outcome of the game, and "the more the game comes to resemble a social process the less it comes to resemble the implementation of an individual plan" (Elias, 1978, p.82). In this respect, as the "inequality of the strengths of the two players diminishes, there will result from the interweaving of moves of two individual people a game process which neither of them has planned" (Elias, 1978, p.82; emphasis in the original). Obviously the larger number of people involved, and the more complex the nature of the game, for example a football match, the less likely will be the ability of any individual to control the game. Not only must they respond to their opponents' position on the pitch, but also their own team-mates'. In other words, as the chains of interdependency lengthen, the ability for any individual, or group of individuals, to control the figuration that is formed diminishes. This metaphor, Elias argues, can be usefully applied to an understanding of societies. In this respect, the more complex a society the more difficult it becomes for any
individual or group of individuals to dictate the shape of that society. Although, in relatively simple societies it is difficult for the participants to control outcomes for different reasons, for example, lack of knowledge, domination and the unpredictability of natural forces. The figuration that is formed takes on a shape that no individual or group of individuals has planned. Its emergent form is always the product of a combination of intended actions and unplanned outcomes of these and other actions. As with a game, although no one person may control the shape of the game, and it may even appear to take on a 'life of its own', the only reason for its existence is because of the involvement of individuals playing. As Elias (1978, p.85; emphasis in the original) argues:

If the number of interdependent players grows, the figuration, development and direction of the game will become more and more opaque to the individual player. However strong he [sic] may be he will become less and less able to control them. From the point of view of the individual player, therefore, an intertwining network of more and more players functions increasingly as though it had a life of its own ... he also gradually becomes aware of his inability to understand and control it. Both the figuration of the game and the individual player's picture of it – the way in which he perceives the game – change together in a specific direction. They change in functional interdependence, as two inseparable dimensions of the same process. They can be considered separately, but not as being separate.

By this means, it is possible to discern the development of globalising processes and to consider that they are somehow beyond human control. They appear to have taken on a life of their own. However, globalization is a manifestation of people in action. That is to say, no matter how helpless any individual might feel they are in relation to the 'force' of such trends, it is the actions of numerous individual human beings that constitute the processes of globalization.

3.5.2 Established and Outsiders and power

Another aspect of Elias's work that significantly contributes to our understanding of power balances is in the area he called 'Established–Outsider
relations' (Elias & Scotson, 1965/1994). He applied and developed his theories after researching the social dynamics of a small English town (referred to as *Winston Parva*). Whilst Elias acknowledged the "obvious limitations" of studying "aspects of a universal figuration within the compass of a small community", he argued that the study of such a community provided the opportunity to "serve as a kind of 'empirical paradigm'" (Elias, 1976/1994, p.xvii). "By applying it as a gauge to other more complex figurations of this type", he argues, "one can understand better the structural characteristics they have in common and the reasons why, under different conditions, they function and develop upon different lines" (Elias, 1976/1994, xvii). His work in this area provides another dimension to the sociological debate concerning 'power relations'. The established-outsiders concept is extremely useful, since it is not easily reduced into a discussion of power being solely related to economics, gender or ethnicity, for example. Indeed, as Van Krieken (1998, p.147) notes, "Elias preferred the contrast between established and outsiders to Marxist conceptualizations of class relations, because it seemed to capture more comprehensively the reality of day-to-day power relations and interdependencies within communities". Furthermore, Elias (1976/1994, xxx) argues, "what one calls 'race relations', in other words, are simply established-outsider relations of a particular type".

What makes Elias and Scotson's concept so interesting is that they observed that despite the fact that there were little, if any, differences between two of the communities they studied in terms of class, religion, ethnicity or education, the more 'established' group, in terms of time spent living in *Winston Parva*, stigmatized the group of relative newcomers to the area. There were status distinctions in relation to the time-spent in the area that contributed toward an uneven balance of power. The more established group demonstrated greater levels of social cohesion and were able
to exert greater control over the flows of communication. They tended to identify themselves through a shared, common sense of history. A powerful ‘we identity’ was built around the more established group. Reflections by people of their ‘we group’ were invariably positive, and Elias and Scotson (1965/1994) refer to this as ‘group charisma’. In addition, the established group tended to stigmatize the ‘outsiders’, who were assigned a ‘they identity’ in the form of ‘group stigmatization’. Elias and Scotson (1965/1994, p.104) argue that, “everywhere group charisma attributed to oneself and group disgrace attributed to outsiders are complementary phenomena”.

Many outsiders found it difficult to resist internalising such group stigmatization, and so felt rather negative toward their ‘own’ group. The established ‘we group’ often considered themselves as more ‘civilized’, and the outsiders as course. In this respect, Maguire (1999, p.93) argues that “globalization can therefore be understood in terms of the attempts by more established groups to control and regulate access to global flows and also in terms of how indigenous peoples both resist these processes and recycle their own cultural products”.

3.6 Figurational Sociology and the Sociology of Globalization

In order to test the figurational approach in the forthcoming examination of the globalization of baseball, a brief outline is now required in making some direct links between the figurational approach outlined already in this chapter and globalising trends. In doing this, we will re-visit some aspects of Maguire’s work outlined in the previous chapter. However, it is also important to examine what additional elements may need to be considered when testing the figurational approach, in order to assess the extent to which figurational sociology can be used as an explanatory tool for understanding globalization.
Norbert Elias was arguably writing about global diffusion processes a lot earlier than most. The civilising process is part of a broader trend of global diffusion. Furthermore, he was addressing issues such as growing western influence – articulated in a small section of the civilising process book – long before the current spate of publications concerning such trends. Indeed, the six pages he spent discussing ‘diminishing contrasts, increasing varieties’, has provided Maguire with theoretical material with which to base considerable amounts of his own work on globalization. In respect to “diminishing contrasts” with the spread of “Western culture”, Elias (1939/2000, p.384) argues that:

From Western society – as a kind of upper class – Western “civilized” patterns of conduct are today spreading over wide areas outside the West, whether through the settlement of Occidentals or through the assimilation of the upper strata of other nations, just as models of conduct earlier spread within the West itself from this or that upper stratum, from certain courtly or commercial centres. The course taken by all these expansions is determined only to a small degree by the plans or desires of those whose patterns of conduct were taken over. The classes supplying the models are even today not simply the free creators or originators of the expansion ... We find in the relation of the West to other parts of the world the beginnings of the reduction of contrasts which is peculiar to every major wave of the civilizing movement.

Despite these diminishing contrasts, Elias (1939/2000, p.385) holds that although “the contrasts in conduct between the upper and lower groups are reduced with the spread of civilization”; at the same time “the varieties or nuances of civilized conduct are increased”. For example, according to this argument, the spread of a sport, like baseball, around the world, may result in ‘diminishing contrasts’, but as the game is played in more and more countries, so too is the game played in different ways. Many would argue, for instance, that baseball, as played in much of Japan, has a different ‘style’ to the game played in the USA. This is something that will receive greater analysis during the course of this study.
Figurational sociologists argue that globalization processes are part of a long-term process of lengthening interdependency chains. Essentially people have become more and more interdependent with more and more people across wider areas of the world. As Elias (1987/2001, p.163) argues, “the network has become visibly more dense in the course of the twentieth century”. Figurational sociologists’ consider that globalization processes are an aspect of greater interdependency and this is a more object-adequate account than the idea that globalization is best characterized by growing dependency. Consistent with this, and as has already been mentioned, Elias argues that power is never absolute, and developments occur that no single person, or groups of people could have remotely planned. As such, not only must we consider relationships as being characterized by growing interdependency; we must also consider that it is differential interdependency. Power ratios fluctuate over time. In this respect, we must appreciate that no one group is all-powerful. So, we must acknowledge that it is impossible for any single group, or groups, however dominant they may be, to ‘control’ globalization processes. The conditions under which people pursue their objectives and defend and advance their interests are predominantly unplanned. Figurational sociologists argue that globalization processes, in the main, are the unintended consequences of intentional actions. In addition, over the longer term, fluctuations in power differentials will occur. As such, any short-term analysis – where power and relationships might be examined in a less dynamic manner – is likely to fall prey to reducing globalization processes to mono-causal explanations. That is to say, it may be the case that over the shorter-term, intended acts are potentially more momentous (such as the intentional diffusion of sporting goods by transnational corporations), but analysis of globalization processes, figurational sociologists argue, highlight the unplanned dimension as the dominant aspect of the diffusion of sport forms over the longer term. As such, a figurational approach would
identify multi-causal processes flowing multi-directionally. Hence, analysis must take into account a wide range of inter-related processes. In doing so, any understanding of globalization processes must appreciate that what is happening is the result of dynamic human figurations over a very long period of time. To reduce such developments to mono-causal, and absolutist accounts of, for example, Americanization, or the conscious spread of 'global capitalism', would be an inadequate analysis for the global spread of social phenomena, such as sports. In direct relation to these points, then, for figurational sociologists globalization processes have no zero-starting point. We can only explain such processes if we examine them developmentally. Mennell (1990, p.359) holds that “some of the processes which in this century have made the human world one have been at work in human societies as long as the species Homo sapiens has existed”. Any examination of the globalization of sports, therefore, must entail a socio-historical analysis, so as to avoid the charge Elias, amongst others, made of certain sociologists’ ‘retreat into the present’.

A figurational approach also contends that any examination of globalization processes must also deal with ‘local’ cultures and knowledgeability (Maguire, 1999) – and these are always carried by people. That is to say, if we are to understand globalization processes then it is not sufficient to measure, solely, the spread of a game-form, or cultural characteristics of sports, we must also examine responses from within indigenous populations. This ties in well with Elias’ concepts regarding established/outside relations. As social phenomena spread increasingly around the world, we can expect the established groups to consider ‘outsider cultures’ to be

---

4 This is not to suggest that the Americanization thesis need necessarily be viewed as mono-causal, rather, as has been outlined in the previous chapter, the way in which this thesis has predominantly been explained, has mono-causal undertones.
inferior. A figurational understanding of ‘established/outsider relations’ allows us to appreciate that in some cases, resistance is possible, because a certain group may be in an established position for reasons that have little to do with economics, for example. On this basis, we might begin to speculate that one contributing factor towards the lack of popularity of baseball in England – despite the increasing cultural, economic and political influence of the USA – is that supporters of the ‘established’ summer team sport, cricket, have been able to use their traditional, established position to restrict the development of baseball. The ‘American’ sport of baseball, and its promoters, therefore, might be regarded as outsiders. However, Elias did not pursue, at any length, the developments when power balances alter to such a degree that the established could be increasingly seen as the outsiders. Given that this study has, at the heart of the debate, discussion on the power relations between the once established, now outsider, England and the outsider, now established USA, this dimension needs further exploration. Especially since, it could be argued, the established/outsider terminology might even get in the way of better understanding, considering that my focus is, arguably, on two established groups locked in power relationships and partly a power struggle. As such, this is a concept that requires further examination within this thesis. Mennell (1989/1992, p.138) provides an excellent overview of how to ‘test’ the established-outsiders theory, and is worth quoting at some length on this issue:

In studying the relations between groups of people, look first for the ways in which they are interdependent with each other. That will lead directly to the central balance of power in the figuration the groups form together. In assessing how far power ratios are tilted towards one side or the other, how stable or how fluctuating they are, look at what goals and objectives, what human requirements are actually being pursued by each side. Ask to what extent one side is able to monopolize something the other side needs in pursuing these requirements. Then, if the balance of power is very uneven, be alert for the operation of group charisma and group disgrace, the process of

5 Although Elias was clearly aware of the general shift of power from the aristocracy to the bourgeoisie, as illustrated through, for example, his concept of parliamentarization.
stigmatization, the absorption of the established group's view of the outsiders within the very conscience and we-image of the outsiders, producing a high measure of resignation even though the tensions remain. Where the balance of power is becoming more equal, expect to find symptoms of rebellion, resistance, emancipation among the outsiders. In all this it will be relevant to look to the past, to how one group came to impinge on the other, to how the way they are bonded to each other makes them pursue the objectives and human requirements they actually do pursue. But for the purpose of ascertaining what is the prevailing balance of power, treat these objectives and assumptions as real consequences.

It is clear, then, from the outline above of the major premises of the figurational approach, and the subsequent, brief outline of how they might fit in with any attempts to explain globalization processes, that the figurational approach has a lot to offer any analysis of the globalization of sports. But it is still necessary to assess the adequacy of this approach in relation to comprehensive, empirical research. It is necessary, therefore, to examine to what extent figurational sociology may provide us with an explanatory tool to ascertain why, when American culture is evidently so pervasive around the globe, that the so-called quintessential sport of America, baseball, is played only on a relatively restrictive basis outside of that country. Before we begin to provide empirical analysis of the extent to which baseball has spread around the globe, and the responses that the game has met within a variety of countries, it is necessary to outline the methodology utilized within this thesis.
Silverman (2000, p.234; emphasis in the original) appropriately recognizes that, "the rule ... in writing your methods chapter, is simply: spell out your theoretical assumptions". This process also involves spelling out the "(sometimes contingent) factors that made you choose to work with your particular data" (Silverman, 2000, p.234; emphasis in the original). I have already provided a fairly comprehensive overview of the theoretical assumptions, and sensitising concepts related to a figurational approach, but it seems appropriate at this stage to discuss in greater depth the way in which this approach has guided my choice of research strategy, design and thus methods. Before I discuss further the research strategy adopted within this thesis, it seems appropriate to discuss the fundamental ways in which a figurational approach will guide my research.

4.1 Epistemology, Ontology and Research

It is conventional within social science methodologies to discuss the ontological and epistemological considerations guiding the study (Bryman, 2001). Ontology refers to the theory of the 'nature' of social entities; that is to say the 'nature of reality'. Epistemology refers to the methods of procedure leading to knowledge, or the 'nature of knowledge'. According to Bryman (2001, p.16) the "central point of orientation" regarding ontological considerations "is the question of whether social entities can and should be considered objective entities that have a reality external to social actors, or whether they can and should be considered social constructions built up from perceptions and actions of social actors". In relation to one's epistemological considerations, Bryman (2001, p.11) argues, "a particularly central issue ... is the question of whether the social world can and should be studied according to the same
principles, procedures, and ethos as the natural sciences”. Evidently, therefore, one’s ontological position governs one’s epistemological considerations, because those who advocate an objective ontological position, for example, will argue that the form in which we can acquire knowledge can follow the ethos of the natural sciences. Whilst these are important ways in which research issues are characterized, I will argue that this distorts the research issue from the outset. Figurationalists tend not to write about epistemology and ontology because, it is argued here, there are more object-adequate ways of understanding the focus of our study; human relationships. The notions of epistemology and ontology constitute a false dichotomy. Before I justify this position further, it is appropriate to outline the key sensitising concepts of figurational sociology that guide the research strategy.

4.1.1 Involvement and Detachment

In sociological research, Bryman (2001, p.22) argues, “there is a growing recognition that it is not feasible to keep the values that a researcher holds totally in check”. Figurational sociologists, however, argue that whilst researchers cannot be completely detached in their work, this does not mean that it is desirable, or possible, for them to be completely involved. Therefore, from a figurational standpoint, the research process should involve a combination of involvement and detachment. Elias rejected the orthodox consideration of subjectivity/objectivity as a means of understanding the social world. Instead, he preferred to think in terms of explanations as having greater or lesser degrees of adequacy (or reality-congruence). As Murphy, Sheard and Waddington (2000, p.94) note, “one important implication of Elias’s approach is that researchers can realistically only aspire to develop explanations that have a greater degree of adequacy than preceding explanations. Notions such as
‘ultimate truth’ and ‘complete detachment’ have no place in his approach". It is the figurational complexity that leads to the recognition that we can only aspire to develop explanations that have a degree of adequacy. In this respect, figurational sociologists reject notions of single causalities and instead view data as aspects of more complex developmental processes: multi-causalities. Put simply, causes have multiple effects and effects become partial causes.

Elias (1978, p.52) complained that “anyone who, under the pretext of saying what science is, is really saying what he [sic] thinks it should be, is deceiving both himself and other people”. As Murphy (1994, p.150-1) succinctly points out, “while facts cannot speak for themselves, this is not the same as saying that facts can mean anything we want them to mean”. As such, Elias, and figurational sociologists more generally, promote “a methodology of self-consciously distanc[ing] oneself from the object of study” (Rojek, 1992, p.17). However, the figurational position on this is not quite so straightforward as Rojek implies. A more adequate appreciation of the figurational approach, in this regard, involves the recognition that figurationalists strive for an appropriate blend between involvement and detachment (Murphy et al, 2000; Van Krieken, 1998). This approach is often caricatured by others (see, for example, Hargreaves, 1992; Horne and Jary, 1987), who have argued that Elias proposed complete objectivity. In fact, Elias clearly recognized that it is impossible for any sociologist to achieve complete objectivity or ‘detachment’ in their research. After all, it is evident that unlike the chemist studying chemical reactions in a test-tube, the sociologist is inescapably a part of the phenomena that they are researching: human relationships. That is to say, “social-scientific knowledge develops within the society it is part of, and not independently of it” (Van Krieken, 1998, p.7). In this
respect, a social scientific researcher is inevitably involved in their research. Although, this implies that natural scientists are capable of objectivity. The history of science demonstrates otherwise. Of course, it is possible to recognize that the nature of the phenomena that natural scientists are studying makes it easier for them to achieve higher levels of detachment. However, all science involves assumptions that may later be shown to be flawed; and such flaws may have some ideological roots. For instance, if natural scientists do not make different assumptions, what accounts for the debates and disagreements? Furthermore, involvement is a potential asset. Natural scientists do not know what it feels like, for instance, to be a dolphin.

The aim for figurational sociologists is to recognize this involvement, as far as is possible, and, in so doing, strive to distance oneself as far as is possible from one's values. This approach, it is argued, will facilitate a better, more reality-congruent understanding of the issues related to our area of research. In this respect, Maguire (1988, p.190) proposes that “the sociologist-as-participant must be able to stand back and become the sociologist-as-observer-and-interpreter”. This is, Dunning (1999, p.244) argues, “conducive to the reduction of the fantasy content of people’s thinking”, or people’s ideological preconceptions. It is through such an approach, figurational sociologists argue, that the researcher can maximize “the chances of obtaining secure knowledge” (Dunning, 1999, p.243).

Rojek (1986) has argued that Elias and other figurational sociologists have failed to outline the ground-rules, so to speak, for the researcher wishing to adopt the appropriate level of detachment in their writing. It is an extremely difficult journey to make – from greater levels of involvement to greater levels of detachment – and one
is consistently required to engage in self-analysis over one's own career as a sociologist. However, in stating this, this is not to avoid dealing with a complex issue, and striving for further understanding on the issues Rojek raises. In this respect, figurational sociologists have sought to address Rojek's criticism. Maguire (1988, p.190) plausibly argues that the "adoption of a long-term, developmental perspective" can, but does not necessarily, enable more detached levels of thinking. This is because, he argues, "more highly involved approaches tend to have a short-term time perspective" reflective of the concerns of the day (Maguire, 1988, p.190). Dunning (1992, p.252) agrees that we may achieve greater detachment from our work if we "avoid the 'retreat to the present'". In this respect, in the following two chapters on the development and subsequent diffusion of baseball across the world, I will conduct an extensive review of the socio-historical literature. Furthermore, through my own empirical work, I will attempt to gain knowledge regarding the longer-term history of the development of the game outside of the USA. In relation to my more extensive case study of the development of baseball in England, I have conducted a comprehensive review of archival newspaper articles. In addition, I added to my empirical knowledge by interviewing various individuals who have played baseball as long ago as the 1930s.

Dunning (1992, p.252) also contends that researchers need to relate their work "to the existing body of knowledge" in their field, and, by doing so, this may also enable greater levels of detachment. In this regard, I relate my work, where appropriate, to already existing research on the diffusion of baseball, and more widely to issues relating to globalization. Furthermore, Maguire (1988, p.191) argues that, "comparison of different "we" perspectives may help, but the employment of "they"
perspectives, which show the figuration from a greater distance, offers a more adequate view of how the intentions and actions of the various groups are interlocked". This is because, it is argued, 'we perspectives' are frequently too involved, and by offering a different angle on a perspective, from a position of greater detachment alongside the ‘we perspectives’, might present us with a more object-adequate explanation for the issues of concern. In my research, I combined the study of newspaper articles over 125 years, which offers insights from various ‘we perspectives’, with interviewing people who have been involved in playing and administering baseball in England, who clearly also offer insights from a ‘we perspective’. As the researcher, my aim is to offer insights from a ‘they perspective’, as someone who is sufficiently detached from the subject matter under consideration. Finally, with regard to the issue of involvement and detachment, Maguire (1988, p.192) argues that the approach proposed by figurational sociologists is not “a question simply of gathering facts”. Rather, he holds:

The task is to trace and analyse the significance which specific events have in time and their conjunction with other events. In so doing, the researcher must come to terms with both the particular events which he/she documents and interpret the place which such events have in the phenomena under investigation (Maguire, 1988, p.192; emphasis in the original).

This leads us on to the position of theory in the research process within figurational sociology.

4.1.2 Narrative and theory from a figurational perspective

Although Bryman (2001) argues that most qualitative researchers regard their work as the generation of theory (an inductive approach), Silverman (2000; 2001)

---

1 Although, ‘event’ is an inappropriate term because it has static connotations. As such, ‘figurations’ is a more accurate term, and thus, it is more consistent with a figurational approach.
considers that increasing numbers of researchers are using qualitative research designs in order to ‘test’ existing theories (a deductive approach). However, for Elias, such a conceptualization, that research has to be either inductive or deductive, constitutes a false dichotomy. Indeed, Elias (1978, p.58) argues that, “the separation of theory and method proves to be based on misconception”. That is to say, Elias recognized that human thought processes are an intricate and continuous combination of movements from the specific to different levels of generality and vice versa. The inductive/deductive approach is a formalistic, simplistic and distorting characterization of this process. As outlined above, theory is bound to influence and have implications for one’s choice of methods. In response to this, and in keeping with Elias’s concerns that we distance ourselves as much as is possible from our own values, Maguire (1988, p.192; emphasis in the original) plausibly argues that, if researchers aspire to generate explanations with a reasonable degree of adequacy, they “must conduct a dialogue between what Abrams (1982, p.10-11) terms the interwoven styles of narrative and theoretical writing”. With this in mind, Dunning (1992) argues that if our aim is to ‘test’ theory, rather than simply ‘apply’ it, we are likely to achieve greater levels of detachment. That is to say, if we approach research in a frame of mind that is more committed to a desire to understand more adequately, rather than a greater commitment to sustaining pre-formed views, then we are more likely to want to test, as opposed to confirm, theories. However, it is not so straightforward as suggesting that we must ‘test’ the figurational approach through empirical research. Research is also guided by the theory (Dunning, 1999). In this respect, figurational sociology “commits researchers to … work on the empirical without dominating it with theory and, at the same time, develop theoretical insights firmly informed by evidence (Abrams, 1982). An uninterrupted two-way traffic takes place (Elias, 1956)”
In other words, figurational sociologists advocate an ongoing relationship between theory and research in which both are refined in respect to one another through a "combination of reflection, experience and practice" (May, 2001, p.29). Theory should be treated as a sensitising agent, one that is open to modification if it is found to be relatively unproductive or too limiting. It is my intention within this thesis to use figurational sociology to help make sense of globalising processes, whilst at the same time testing the adequacy of the figurational approach in explaining these processes and perhaps even add further to the theoretical underpinnings of the approach. The aim here, then, is "to develop theoretically-grounded empirical work" (Dunning, Murphy & Williams, 1988, p.267).

In relation to epistemological and ontological considerations, I have argued that this is, in some way, a false dichotomy. It is not that the two considerations are diametrically opposed, in the way that objectivity–subjectivity is another example of a false dichotomy, rather epistemology and ontology are so integrally related, they are so interdependent, there seems little sense in discussing them separately. That is to say, knowledge and reality are not separate entities; they are part of the same process. This, it seems to me, is a justifiable reason for why figurational sociologists have not outlined their epistemological or ontological considerations in the orthodox manner. This is because, as with much of the language used in conventional sociology, it is an insufficiently adequate way to conceptualize human relationships.

As Silverman (2000, p.234) points out, "in writing up qualitative research, we need to recognize: The (contested) theoretical underpinnings of methodologies, the (often) contingent nature of the data chosen, the (likely) non-random character of
Having outlined the "theoretical underpinnings" of my research, it is now necessary to discuss the chosen data and the cases studied within my thesis. Denscombe (1998) argues that there are crucial distinctions between one's chosen 'research strategy', 'research design' and 'research methods'. The research strategy concerns whether the approach will be qualitative, quantitative or both. The research design, for example, relates to the framework for the collection and analysis of data, such as a research case study or cross-sectional design. Research method refers to the data generation tools, for example, interviewing, documentary analysis, questionnaires etc. Now I want to pay attention to the research strategy adopted within this thesis, before outlining my chosen design and methods.

**4.2 Research Strategy**

Figurationalists hold that the arguments presented for adopting a qualitative or a quantitative research strategy is also a false dichotomy. That is to say, since quantitative research rests on qualitative assumption at the initial and interpretative stages, it is inadequate to argue that one's strategy can be one or the other. It will necessarily entail both. Furthermore, figurationalists argue that the methodological framework flows from the nature of the problem to be investigated, and as such it is inappropriate to be limited on the basis of any particular individual strategy. Thus, figurationalists advocate the potential use of qualitative and quantitative approaches to most adequately address the sociological problem under investigation. In other words, the researcher must utilize the most appropriate research tool(s) to address their research question(s). So, the strategy that will be adopted here is to utilize, where appropriate, both qualitative and quantitative approaches to research.
At the very least, a figurational research strategy, *per se*, advocates a developmental understanding of society. Figurationalists argue that one needs to locate research findings in a broader developmental framework that adequately accounts for the processual nature of the phenomena under investigation. In order to make sense of what is happening in the present, we need to have an adequate understanding of how things have come to be. We are who we are only because of the influences in our past that have shaped us – consciously and otherwise. As Blok (1974/1988, p.xxviii-xxix) argues, “one way to disencumber oneself from the reified abstractions which still loom large in conventional sociological and anthropological analysis is to shift one’s focus from a short-term to a long-term perspective”. This is most appropriate given the problems outlined, in the review of literature, of several approaches taken regarding globalization. But, it must also be acknowledged that the review of literature also demonstrates that a developmental perspective, alone, is not sufficient to escape reifying tendencies.

Having briefly outlined what a figurational research strategy entails, I now wish to turn to the research design proposed for my study. In this respect, I have chosen to use a ‘case study’ design for my research on baseball in England, and a ‘cross-sectional’ design for my complimentary analysis of baseball around the world.

4.3 Research Design

4.3.1 Case Study Research: Baseball in England

My research design is based primarily on a ‘case study’ approach, taking an in-depth view of the development of baseball in England. Denscombe (1998, p.30) argues that the rationale “behind concentrating efforts on one case rather than many is
that there may be insights to be gained from looking at the individual case that can have wider implications and, importantly, that would not have come to light through the use of a research strategy that tried to cover a large number of instances”. Such a research design is consistent with figurationalists’ contention that employing a case study design offers much potential for extrapolation from the particular to the general. However, if I focused on one case study I would not be in a position to appreciate the wider applicability of the findings. As Blok (1974/1988, p.xxvii) argues, a case study is “appropriate as a locus for study”, but it must also be recognized that many of the identifiable characteristics of a case study “are dependent upon and a reflex of the larger society and can only be explained with reference to their specific connections with it”. As such, I have combined my case study research design with a cross-sectional research design. This was specifically in order to allow me to throw light on the extent to which the position of baseball in England is consistent, or otherwise, with the global baseball figuration.

The choice of England as the site for the case study research is both practical and suitable. On a simply pragmatic stance, it makes sense to study the development of baseball in England in greater depth. Not surprisingly, living in England, and only having sufficient command of the English language, limited the scope of my study of the globalization of baseball. Not only is the England case study convenient in a pragmatic sense, it is also “intrinsically interesting” (Denscombe, 1998, p.34). Clearly, baseball is not widely played in England, notwithstanding successive attempts to establish the sport in this country. Given the successful penetration of American culture into many other aspects of English life, a study of English resistance to baseball may help to illuminate our understanding of processes of resistance and
acceptance of American hegemony globally. That is to say, despite the evident growth in interdependency ties between the United States of America (USA) and England, in the shape of diplomatic and cultural ties, and the increasing diffusion of baseball in several parts of the world, the sport has not been particularly successfully diffused to England. Analysis of the shifting balance of power is likely to prove crucial in this respect. It is on the basis of this recognition that makes this a particularly interesting area of study.

Bryman (2001) argues that the case study design tends to contain longitudinal elements. As has already been discussed, this is particularly appropriate for a figurational understanding. In order to develop a more reality-congruent understanding of the position of baseball in England today – and to make sense of globalising processes more generally – we need to know something of the past. Hence, with this in mind, the present study traces the development of baseball in England over 125 years, utilising “archival information and by retrospective interviewing” (Bryman, 2001, p.51); which is discussed more fully, below. In this respect, within this case study, a wide range of research methods were utilized. This is something that Denscombe (1998, p.31) considers to be a major strength of the case study approach; although he does not make it clear why this should be a major strength of the case study approach per se. The multi-methods involved in what has frequently come to be referred to as ‘triangulation’ “allow findings to be corroborated or questioned by comparing the data produced by different methods” (Denscombe, 1998, p.85). This can enhance the validity of the data. For example, the qualitative analysis of newspapers will hopefully enable me to draw substantial conclusions on the status of baseball in England, but this could not be reliable on its own. I have
buttressed this research with semi-structured oral history interviews. This has enabled me to, at times, corroborate conclusions drawn from my newspaper research, but also fill in the gaps in this research (Bryman, 2001).

Denscombe (1998, p.31) argues that the case study approach enables a greater “tendency to emphasize the detailed workings of the relationships and social processes, rather than to restrict attention to the outcomes from these”. However, I would argue that unless these findings are located within the broader figuration, then the case study is of only limited use. As such, my research moves between the national case study and the global cross-sectional analysis. In the process, it is argued, this casts light on both these levels.

4.3.2 Cross-Sectional Research: Baseball around the world

It is through the desire to link my case study findings to global issues that I have combined a more in-depth case study approach, when analysing the development of baseball in England, with a broader, less in-depth, cross-sectional analysis of the wider global diffusion of baseball. This cross-sectional analysis is required in order to study the variations in the receptivity and responses to baseball in different countries. Perforce, my foreign language limitations mean that the cross-sectional research design is based, primarily, on secondary sources.

I have engaged in a qualitative analysis of socio-historical secondary sources regarding baseball in several parts of the world (most notably in Latin America, Asia, Oceania and continental Europe), to provide me with a processual understanding of the development of the sport. I have combined this with a questionnaire, which
provided me with some understanding of the origins of baseball in the respective countries and the current situation regarding baseball across the globe. I now intend to provide a more detailed overview of the research methods I have utilized in this thesis.

4.4 Research Methods

4.4.1 Documentary Analysis: Analysis of the press

In 1981, Platt (1981, p.31) indicated that, "discussions of the use of documents in the standard methodological literature are sparse and patchy". May (2001) indicates that, twenty years on, this remains the case. However, because of the largely socio-historical analysis that underpins this thesis – for reasons already outlined – documentary analysis, in the form of an extensive review of newspaper coverage of baseball in England, seemed the most appropriate research tool to address my research question. Although, of course, this does not mean that the research is tied to this particular method, it formed the primary basis for the case study aspect of the thesis. Extensive archival newspaper analysis can help us build a picture of the past – and subsequent developments. As Mann (1985, p.94) appropriately points out, "documents" are an aspect of "our (and other people's) history". As such, he argues, "to ignore documents is to cut off sociology from the whole process of social change, which is one of the fundamental concepts of the discipline itself" (Mann, 1985, p.95). Although this might be rather overstating the case, it does, nonetheless, indicate the importance of using documents in social research. In this respect, as May (2001, p.176) argues, documents may throw light on some of the "aspirations and intentions" of people during "the periods to which they refer and describe places and social relationships at a time when we may not have been born, or were simply not present".
Newspaper articles in this sense are particularly useful. We may consider the majority of articles written in newspapers to be ‘primary sources’, since more often than not we would expect the journalist responsible for them to have been present at the event they have written about (May, 2001). They represent knowledge by “acquaintance” (May, 2001, p.180). “It is therefore assumed”, May (2001, p.180) argues, “that they are more likely to be an accurate representation of occurrences in terms of both memory of the author (time) and their proximity (space)”. This is a rather sweeping assumption. This is not to say, of course, that we can assume that what is written in a newspaper is a more-or-less object-adequate account of the events referred to. There is likely to be an evident bias within the text – but this served to provide me with another use for the newspaper article to my research; namely the perceptions and attitudes of those in established positions to the attempts made to develop baseball in England. In other words, newspapers are a source for information and insight, but it is also necessary to try and identify any hidden agendas and ideological positions as well. After all, the vehicle for this source of data (the journalist) is part of the figuration being studied.

The research was undertaken within the National Newspaper Library at Colindale, and allowed comparative analysis of the balance and conjecture within different newspapers during different time periods. Furthermore, my content analysis of several different newspapers and their coverage, or not, of baseball in England allowed me to begin to make sense of what might be regarded as the ‘established’ groups’ mediated, via newspapers, attitudes toward baseball at various different times. Newspaper coverage can serve “both as the main source” for my conclusion’s “and to supplement information from other sources” (Finnegan, 1996, p.138) and *vice versa*. The newspaper coverage of baseball proved useful as both a direct and an indirect
source of information (Finnegan, 1996). That is to say, the information contained in various newspaper articles regarding baseball provided not only further, direct information regarding the periods when baseball was played, but also “the message can itself convey indirect information about, say, the ideals aimed at, the standard terminology used in a particular place or period, the kinds of subterfuges engaged in, or the sort of images likely to appeal to the intended market” (Finnegan, 1996, p.143). In addition to making sense of what ‘messages’ a particular journalist or editor may be trying to convey, and the importance of trying to understand this in order to throw light on the development of baseball in England, documents like newspapers “may be interesting for what they leave out, as well as what they contain” (May, 2001, p.183). Thus, a lack of coverage of baseball by some newspapers, at times when the game was more prominently and popularly played, may tell us something about the position of baseball in a journalist’s or editor’s opinion – especially when compared with coverage devoted to other sports. As May (2001, p.183) argues, “they do not simply reflect, but also construct social reality and versions of events”, and, as Fenton, Bryman, Deacon and Birmingham (1998, p.95) argue, journalists “necessarily exercise value judgements in selecting and filtering the information they receive and in directing their news gathering. They are active participants in the production process”. In this respect, as Dunning et al (1988, p.8) point out in relation to their research of the press reporting of football hooliganism, it must be recognized that the press are not “neutral agents which simply report events”. Therefore, my concern with researching the newspaper coverage of baseball in England was essentially two-fold: on the one hand, the press coverage of baseball threw more light on the extent to which the sport has been played in England since 1874. As Dunning et al (1988, p.11; emphasis in the original) illustrate “newspapers … are sometimes a useful source of
Descriptive information"; on the other hand, I wanted to analyse the ‘position’ of the press, so to speak, in relation to journalists’ impressions of baseball. Once again, Dunning et al (1988, p.10) argue that the media “help to shape the attitudes and perceptions of ... the general public”. In this respect, newspaper analysis may help us explain why some sports, for example, seemingly capture the public’s imagination and why others fail to achieve any sustained popularity. The dearth of official data regarding baseball in England - such as minutes of meetings or detailed historical data relating to participation rates - are a further constraint on my historical research.

Having established some of the potential strengths and weaknesses of documentary analysis, it could also be argued that a more general advantage to this approach is its “indefinite replicability” (May, 2001, p.184). The replicability of carrying out the same kind of newspaper analysis to test my results, so to speak, goes some way to addressing the problem of reliability (Bryman, 2001; Denscombe, 1998).

I utilized the Palmers Index to The Times and, from 1905, The Index to The Times, in order to review every indexed reference to baseball within that newspaper. In addition, so that I could ensure the reliability of these indexes, I reviewed copies of The Times, and also The Guardian, as another national newspaper, throughout every period baseball has been played. Furthermore, I selected local newspapers for review in places and times where baseball has been played - either during exhibition games or when leagues or cup competitions were set up. For example, baseball was played on a semi-professional basis in Birmingham, Derby, Preston and Stoke in 1890; therefore, I researched coverage of baseball in local newspapers in each of these four
regions. I also reviewed sports specialist newspapers that were popular, in particular, during the late-nineteenth, early-twentieth centuries (Holt, 1989).

4.4.2 Qualitative Interviews

In addition to the extensive analysis of newspapers, I conducted a number of semi-structured interviews. These were, for the most part, with people selected largely on the basis of their capacity to provide "privileged information" (Denscombe, 1998, p.111). As such, interviews were conducted with Robert Charles (Director of Sports Programming for Five television channel), Josh Chetwynd (Channel Five Major League Baseball (MLB) presenter and Great Britain baseball squad member), Kevin Macadam (Chairman of the British Baseball Federation) and Clive Russell (Director of MLB International for Europe, Middle East and Africa), who, specifically, were able to help me with my research on baseball in England and also other parts of the world. I also interviewed three individuals (A. Goodall, C. Withers, B. Marshall; the latter is still involved in the administration of the game today) who volunteered their expertise on the basis that they had played baseball in England prior to the 1950s. These volunteers responded to a letter I published in The Times newspaper requesting information from people who had come into contact with baseball in England prior to World War II.²

The semi-structured interview was deemed to be the most appropriate method in all instances, not least because I wanted to establish if data uncovered from the newspaper analysis was corroborated by the interviewees. However, for the most part, the interviews were used in order to acquire particular information that fill in gaps in

² I also received numerous responses to this letter from people who were not able to help me further by being interviewed, but who did, nonetheless, provide me with useful material in their letters to me.
my research, and therefore I wanted to seize upon any opportunity where the interviewee could elaborate on any points of interest without being restricted to the rigidity of a more structured interview. In this respect, as Bryman (2001, p.317) argues, what is crucial here is that the questioning allowed me to "glean the ways in which research participants view their social world". In the case of the "oral history interviews", subjects were "asked to reflect upon specific events or periods in the past" (Bryman, 2001, p.316); namely when they were involved as players – and in one case, as an administrator as well – of baseball. Not surprisingly, as Bryman (2001, p.316) points out, "the chief problem with the oral history interview ... is the possibility of bias introduced by memory lapses and distortions". I attempted to avoid distortions by means of triangulating the respondents' comments with documentary analysis – as is outlined above – and also, in the case of the cross-sectional analysis of the development of baseball across the world, with some basic questionnaires sent to all national governing bodies (NGBs) of baseball.

4.4.3 Questionnaires

The principal reason for surveying all NGB members of the International Baseball Federation (IBAF) is to attempt to build a broader picture of the diffusion of baseball, and the socio-historical development of the game on a global scale. Owing to the sheer geographical scale of such a survey, I decided to post out all surveys, and followed this, where possible, by sending surveys by fax and electronic mail. The purpose of the questionnaire, in this case, was not so much to glean 'views' but to generate data on the extent to which baseball is played (and for how long) and the number of Americans playing in a given country. Where questionnaires were not
returned, I tried to fill in the gaps by using the, unfortunately incomplete, IBAF database (IBAF, 2004).

Given that the questionnaire was sent to a variety of NGBs, whose employees’ first language is not English, the questionnaire needed to be fairly simple. The questionnaire, therefore, contained only basic questions, which required very short answers. The whole questionnaire was only one side long – and enough space was given for the respondents to reply on the same side of paper (see Appendix A). The advantages that can be drawn from the use of this questionnaire lie in the fact that a standard databank of information has been built up on each NGB that returned the questionnaire. This can then be used alongside information taken directly from the IBAF to develop a clearer picture concerning the development of baseball worldwide.

Having outlined the research strategy, design and methods employed within this thesis, I now want to move on and discuss the diffusion of baseball from the USA. However, before I discuss the results of my specific empirical research, it is appropriate to provide an outline of the incipient modernization of baseball in the USA. This seems appropriate because, of course, without such developments, baseball would not have developed at all.
Chapter 5: Incipient Modernization and Sportization of Baseball

5.1 The emergence of baseball as a modern sport

A brief analysis of the emergence of baseball as a modern sport is necessary before we can make sense of the manner in which baseball has diffused around the world. The development of this sport is made all the more interesting by the fact that baseball emerged from an array of bat-and-ball games; notable amongst them was the English game of rounders. In many respects, as is argued in chapter seven, this very connection has contributed, in part, to baseball’s lack of success in England. The English press often commented upon the similarity between baseball and rounders – and baseball was perceived negatively as a result.

Simple bat-and-ball games were played in the USA early in the nineteenth century. During the 1840s-1860s, three games, Philadelphia ‘townball’, New York ‘base’ or ‘roundball’ and cricket, competed for wider geographical ascendancy. Cricket, already codified and well established in England, waned in popularity while, concomitantly, baseball emerged in a developed and refined modern form. In 1907, a report was published stating that the origins of baseball could be entirely attributed to the innovation of a single American, Abner Doubleday, in 1839. These claimed origins have since been shown to be a fabrication. Nonetheless they constitute a powerful sporting myth, crystallized in the minds of succeeding generations of Americans, apparently predisposed to believe that ‘their’ national sport was entirely conceived within the USA. In this chapter, I will endeavour to explain the processes underlying the development of baseball and the processes involved in the creation of the ‘Doubleday myth’.
There are numerous accounts of the development of baseball but a significant shortcoming of this body of historical work is that many contributors to this debate provide simplistic, mono-causal explanations for the development of the game. Prominent among these explanations is the argument that baseball successfully emerged from the group of competing bat-and-ball games being played in the USA at that time because it was ‘naturally’ suited to the ‘American temperament’ (Story, 1989; Wittke, 1952). Others have suggested, with a rather higher degree of reality-congruence, that industrialization and urbanization processes contributed to the modernization of baseball (Kirsch, 1989; Seymour, 1956). One objective of this chapter is to demonstrate that in attempting to provide more adequate accounts of the development of baseball, one should seek to avoid these kinds of reductionist, de-humanized ‘explanations’. It will be argued that it is more appropriate to view baseball as developing from a combination of intended and unintended consequences, which emerged out of the interweaving of the actions of large numbers of people forming growing networks of interdependency. There is also, within conventional historical accounts, a tendency to write of the ‘evolution’ of baseball (Foster, 1995; Seymour, 1956; 1960; Voigt, 1966; 1987) as though this process were somehow inevitable or ‘natural’. This is a teleological argument. A figurational approach emphasizes that the outcomes of complex social processes – and the development of sport is a social process of some complexity – are neither predetermined nor ‘natural’.

5.2 Folk bat-and-ball games

Many discussions of the origins of baseball seem to be characterized by a desire to prove that the game has a longer history than the acceptance of the Doubleday myth permits. These attempts are often supported through the citation of
fragmented references to the game. Baseball, we are told, was mentioned as early as 1744. As Seymour (1960, p.5) points out:

Even the name baseball was known to both English and American boys long before Doubleday supposedly hit upon it. As early as 1744 John Newberry published in London *A Little Pretty Pocket-Book*, containing a rhymed description of baseball along with a small picture illustrating the game.

References to 'baseball' appear in numerous eighteenth-century sources, most notably, perhaps, in Jane Austen's *Northanger Abbey* written in 1798 (although it was not published until 1818, a year after her death). Although Joseph Strutt's (1801/1969) book, *The Sports and Pastimes of the People of England*, makes no mention of baseball (or rounders), *The Boy's Own Book* by William Clarke, first published in London in 1828 (cited in Seymour, 1956), does provide a set of rules for the game of 'rounders'. According to Seymour (1956, p.378), the "great significance of these rules" was that, just six years later, Robin Carver published *The Book of Sports* in the USA in which the rules were "reproduced ... practically verbatim changing only the title from 'Rounders' to 'Base, or Goal Ball'" because, Carver (1834, cited in Seymour, 1956, p.378) argues, those were "the names generally adopted in our country". By means of this simple title change, Seymour (1956, p.379) contends, "English rounders became American baseball". The development of baseball, in common with most modern sports, is more complex than is proposed by this account. Moreover, by reducing social processes to simple, mono-causal explanations, more interesting questions about the development of baseball are ignored. Elias (1986b, p.152-3) makes this point in relation to the development of football:

In studying the development of a sport, one is often guided by the wish to establish for it a long and respectable ancestry. And, in that case, one is apt to select as relevant for its history all data about games played in the past which bear some resemblance to the present form of the particular sport whose
history one is writing ... But, by thus treating the leisure activities of the fairly distant past as more or less identical with those of one's own time – the 'football' of the twelfth century with the football of the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries – one is prevented from placing at the centre of one's inquiry the questions of how and why playing with a large, leather ball [bat and ball with 'bases' in our scenario] grew into this particular form? One is prevented from asking how and why the particular rules and conventions developed which now determine the conduct of players when they play the game and without which the game would not be 'football' [or 'baseball'] in our sense of the word. Or how and why the particular forms of organization developed which provided the most immediate framework for the growth of such rules and without which they could not be maintained and controlled.

It is impossible to be as exact about the origins of baseball as, for instance, Seymour aspires to be; indeed to embark on a search for such precision is misguided. Rather, a more adequate explanation would suggest that baseball, in its 'modern' form, was derived from a number of interdependent sources and from an amalgamation of a number of different folk bat-and-ball games.

Rudimentary bat-and-ball games were played throughout much of the USA during the early decades of the nineteenth century. Folk games with slight regional variations in terms of name and regulations, such as 'Barn ball', 'Base ball', 'Cat ball', 'Goal ball', 'Round ball' and 'Town ball', were all played around this time (Foster, 1995; Guttmann, 1978; Henderson, 1947/2001; Kirsch, 1989; Riess, 1977; Seymour, 1956; 1960; Voigt, 1966; 1976; 1987). It is likely that these games, to varying degrees, had their origins in already existing simple bat-and-ball games played in the USA and beyond. As mentioned above, several commentators have noted the strong links that these games had with rounders (Guttmann, 1978; Henderson, 1947/2001; Riess, 1977; Salvatore, 1983; Seymour, 1956), a game played in Britain at this time. The influence which the emerging British sports forms had on the rest of the world in the eighteenth, nineteenth and early twentieth centuries is well
established (see, for example, Galtung, 1984; Guttmann, 1994; Houlihan, 1994; Maguire, 1999; Malcolm, 2001; Waddington & Roderick, 1996). Whilst the primacy of rounders in this process is not certain, it does seem likely that British people, developing closer ties with America on a broad range of fronts, introduced the game there, along with a variety of other, similar, bat-and-ball games. At this time, however, these bat-and-ball games remained very basic. Rules were not yet standardized or codified and, as Foster (1995, p.45) notes, "informality prevailed". Indeed, it was not until the 1830s that we see the emergence of more explicitly codified bat-and-ball games in America, particularly in the northeastern states; it is impossible to date the beginnings of this process more precisely. However, what we can say with some certainty is that during the 1830s, the rules for a variety of bat-and-ball games became more formalized, began to be committed to written form and the games themselves became more organized.

Prominent amongst this group of imported bat-and-ball games was cricket, a sport also introduced by the British (and most particularly, the English) residing in America at this time. Kirsch (1989, p.21) notes that, "several groups in the Albany (N.Y.) vicinity played earlier formal matches, but the St. George Cricket Club of Manhattan, founded in 1838, claimed to be the first regular outfit governed by rules and regulations". Those participating in cricket were largely first generation Englishmen living in the USA. In addition, folk bat-and-ball games like town- and cat-ball, which were already popular amongst the urban ‘naturalized’ working classes in New Jersey and New York, were increasingly taken up by the middle classes. According to Kirsch (1989, p.56), the “majority of these sportsmen were prosperous … middle-class merchants, bankers, doctors, lawyers, clerks, and other white-collar
workers”. In other words, these games had begun to undergo what Dunning (1975), amongst others, has described as a process of embourgeoisement. The introduction of organized cricket, together with the increasing numbers of middle-class Americans participating in various folk bat-and-ball games, were the first indicators of the increasing standardization of the rules and regulations in these games (Kirsch, 1989). Developments were most marked in the northeastern states, which were, concomitantly, experiencing a period of relatively rapid political and cultural unification. A more rule-bound game of ‘townball’, for example, became the established bat-and-ball game in the Boston and Philadelphia regions whilst, in New York, ‘base’ and ‘roundball’ were emerging as the most popular bat-and-ball games. Yet none of these games, in these forms, can be regarded as baseball as it is known today; rather baseball emerged in its modern form from the continuing development and refinement of each of these games over the succeeding decades.\(^1\)

5.3 The incipient modernization of baseball

By the 1840s, cricket was being played in various colleges and universities in the northeastern states. Graduates from the great American universities were influential in spreading the game as attempts were made to promote it throughout America. This was helped, Kirsch (1989, p.24) argues, by the “geographical mobility and the willingness of the English immigrants to teach cricket to younger and older Americans”. There was also a significant drive from those playing other bat-and-ball games to establish a single unified game that might compete with cricket for the affections of the American populace. In this respect, there is little doubt that Alexander Cartwright contributed significantly by developing a game he called

\(^1\) Rounders, as a term used to describe any of these bat-and-ball games, seems to have fallen out of favour much earlier in the century.
'baseball'. Cartwright belonged to a New York club called the *Knickerbockers*. Members of the club found inter-club matches difficult to arrange because of local discrepancies in the rules. Drawing on various existing game forms, Cartwright, and a committee of men from the *Knickerbockers* club, drew up a set of rules and helped develop a game, which more closely resemble baseball as it is known today. Guttmann (1994, p.72; emphasis in the original) argues that, in 1845, Cartwright:

Drew up a set of rules distinctive enough from those of earlier games for us to say that the activity ... was *baseball* and not rounders or town ball or 'cat' or any one of a number of other traditional bat-and-ball games whose origins can be traced back to medieval times.

Some historians go as far as to suggest that, through this endeavour, Cartwright invented baseball (McCulloch, 1995; Nemec, 1990; Salvatore, 1983). Nemec (1990, p.62) argues that, "Alexander Cartwright was the true inventor of baseball". Similarly McCulloch (1995, p.2), whilst correctly asserting, with reference to Abner Doubleday (more on this 'myth' will be said below), that "no one person invented baseball", continues in somewhat contradictory fashion to promote Alexander Cartwright as "truly the man who gave us baseball" (1995, p.141). McCulloch (1995, p.21) further eulogizes Cartwright by suggesting that he "should be regarded as one of the great American innovators of all time, ranked up there with Edison, Bell and the Wright Brothers; for just as their creations became a major part of our lives, so did baseball". However, whilst acknowledging the significance of individuals and groups as catalysts for change, their involvement is more adequately viewed as that of significant 'players' in a broader figuration of relationships. As Dunning (1975, p.119; emphasis in the original) has noted in relation to football:

Essentially what such individuals did was to systematize and unify modes of playing which had already proved themselves *in the crucible of the game itself* to be appropriate for modern conditions. In other words, they were *synthesizers* rather than *innovators* in the strictest sense.
As Elias has persuasively argued, the development of modern sports from their ancestral pastimes is a social process or, more precisely, it involves a number of interconnected social processes, which Elias (1986a) has called sportization. The sportization process involves, among other developments, identification of strict limitations on the number of those participating on each side, strict boundaries within which the game should be played and, of course, the development of written, set rules. These features can all be said to be fundamental to a sport with 'modern' characteristics.

The fact that the development of sport, or of particular sports, is a social process means that such developments can be explained almost by sole reference to the actions of real people. It is, however, important to recognize that while particular people, or groups of people, may be more or less influential in this process of development, even the most influential people do not – indeed cannot – act wholly independently of others or, to put it another way, independently of broader social processes; people in action. Nor, for that matter, is their intervention usually as dramatic as some historians are wont to portray. Although it might be argued that Cartwright made a greater contribution than any other single person in the development of baseball as a modern sport, this is not akin to claiming that Cartwright was the inventor of baseball. Some of the work of historians in this area does not properly locate Cartwright’s actions within the broader social context. Certain aspects of the debate, which are crucial to a more adequate understanding of the developments, of which Cartwright was a part, are often overlooked. For instance, what contributions did the various members of 'his committee' play? What were the

---

2 I use the word ‘almost’ because certain climatic/geographical conditions play a part in the development of some sports.
main points of debate within the committee? Who argued in favour of which particular rules and customs used in which of the antecedent games? It is clear that Cartwright and his committee acted as a significant catalyst in the development of a set of rules that made for the distinctive, modern form of baseball. However, it is not satisfactory, in explanatory terms, to suggest that Cartwright should thus be labelled as the ‘great inventor’ of baseball.

Foster (1995), Guttmann (1994), McCulloch (1995), Salvatore (1983) and Voigt (1966) all suggest that ‘Cartwright’s rules’ were distinctive enough for historians to accept that this was ‘baseball’; according to Voigt (1966, p.8), “a twentieth century observer ... would have recognised the game”. However, the game that Cartwright’s Knickerbockers club played still contained many features that, by and large, would be unfamiliar to today’s baseball fan. For example, under Cartwright’s rules the ball had to be pitched underhand, a batter could be given out if a ball was caught after the first bounce and the first team to twenty-one runs won the game. All these rules would be alien to today’s baseball players (Kirsch, 1989).

Indeed, as Tyrrell, (1979, p.210) points out, in reference to the development of baseball during the 1840s, “baseball’s early condition was chaotic” – insofar as there was still considerable local diversity regarding the rules of the game.3 Although still at an early stage of development (Adelman, 1986; Guttmann, 1978; Tyrrell, 1979), it is fair to state that the first remnants of organized baseball can be traced to 1840s America. In other words, this period, and this place, saw the ‘incipient modernization’ of the game. In relation to the incipient modernization of rugby, Dunning and Sheard (1979, p.65-6) argue that:

3 Even Voigt (1987, p.21) seems to contradict himself in more recently published work, when he suggests, in reference to developments that occurred only two decades on from Cartwright’s rules, that “old-time Knickerbockers of 1845 would hardly recognise the game as played in 1869”.
When written rules were produced for the first time in the 1840s, no attempt was made to legislate for the game as a whole; several aspects continued to be subject to customary controls. Similarly although the organization of football began in this period to grow more formal, it remained for some time a purely local game; i.e. national rules were still some distance in the future.

Baseball went through a similar period of transition. Local discrepancies in the interpretation of certain laws continued. The game played in the New York area under the Cartwright laws, for instance, was still quite different from that played in the Massachusetts area, which some simply referred to as Town Ball (that being the folk game to which it most directly owed its origins). But it was the game of ‘baseball’, as outlined by Cartwright’s committee at the Knickerbockers club, which was to diffuse most successfully during the next decade. In the late-1840s, Cartwright travelled across America teaching his ‘New York version’. His efforts were reinforced by the development of the kind of inter-city competition that, Kirsch (1989, p.59) argues, proved to be an effective “means of popularizing the ‘New York game’”. The Massachusetts form of baseball also grew in popularity, thriving during the late 1850s, but Kirsch (1989, p.56) has noted that “it faced a formidable rival” in the form of Cartwright’s ‘New York City version’ and, he argues, “modern baseball derives most immediately from the latter”.

During much of the 1850s, as in the decade before, cricket was still the most popular summer team game played in America (Kirsch, 1989; Reiss, 1999; Tyrrell, 1979). However, towards the end of the decade, baseball, and in particular the ‘New York’ version, began to challenge cricket’s ascendancy. Between 1857 and 1860 advocates of cricket and the various forms of baseball held a series of separate conventions, initially in an attempt to establish national organizations for their respective sports. The cricket conventions that were held dismissed the notion that a
power base separate from the Marylebone Cricket Club (M.C.C.) in England was necessary. The M.C.C. had been founded in 1787 and was regarded as the most important organization for the control of first-class cricket in England. Although the game was growing in popularity amongst ‘naturalized’ Americans, the most fervent proponents of the game remained exclusively ‘English’, and this may explain why most people playing cricket in America wished to maintain links with, rather than challenge or supersede, the M.C.C. By extension, it also helps us to appreciate why there was a marked reluctance to ‘Americanize’ cricket, for many people held that such a process would mean that the “game would cease to be cricket” (Porter’s Spirit, 9 May 1857, cited in Kirsch, 1989, p.30). This also helps us understand some of the grounds for resistance to cricket.

Since 1845, the New York Knickerbockers had attempted to “establish themselves as the social arbiters of baseball, after the manner of the Marylebone Cricket Club” (Voigt, 1966, p.8). In so doing, the game had been kept on strictly amateur lines. Whilst this had the potential to become problematic as the game became increasingly popular amongst the American lower and middle classes (Adelman, 1986; Kirsch, 1989; Reiss, 1999; Tyrrell, 1979), ‘baseball’ enthusiasts attending the annual conferences had rather more pressing issues to resolve. In particular, problems associated with the existence of different and competing forms of the game. In 1858, as a rival to the authority of the Knickerbockers club, advocates of the Massachusetts version of the game established the Massachusetts Association of Base Ball Players (MABBP). Perhaps in response, the National Association of Base Ball Players (NABBP) was established in 1859, and utilized the annual conventions to promote the ‘New York version’. Voigt (1966) considers that the NABBP was also
established as a rival to the *Knickerbockers* club; that is to say, by representatives of twenty-five clubs who contested the *Knickerbockers'* right to be arbiters of the game. In other words, there was competition between the different versions of the game and also within versions of the game. This demonstrates the complexity of the figuration. However, despite such internal divisions, the NABBP was certainly successful in promoting the New York game, which, by the Civil War, "was strong, growing, and known across the nation" (Kirsch 1989, p.63). The promotion of baseball had been so successful that "all of the New York City sporting weeklies regularly proclaimed baseball to be 'the national game of ball' before the Civil War" (Kirsch, 1989, p.63). Kirsch (1989, p.68) adds that the "geography of the sport before 1861 proves this judgement to be reasonably accurate". Adelman (1989, p.289) agrees, arguing that "while New York was the center of the sport, baseball was hardly confined to this area as teams were formed in numerous northeastern cities, a handful of Midwestern and southern ones, and by 1860 one club was established as far west as San Francisco". Indeed, so successful was the NABBP that baseball appeared to have overtaken cricket in popularity by 1861 (Tyrrell, 1979).

On the basis of his review of late nineteenth century American press reports of baseball, Furst (1990) stresses the considerable attempts made by the game’s administrators to create the image of baseball as the ‘national game’. Furst (1990, p.2) argues that:

It was vital that baseball disassociate itself from the image that cricket had established in the press as the pre-eminent bat-and-ball game in America. It was argued in the press that cricket required greater physical courage and more playing skill than baseball. But as baseball matured the press sought to negate the idea that baseball was a child’s game. It also sought to affirm that baseball was a ‘manly game’, as cricket was considered to be ... The press also began to focus on the skill of baseball players as a means to affirm its superiority over cricket and to represent baseball as the ‘National Game’.
In the years prior to the Civil War in America, baseball was proving more popular than cricket and developments during the war had a significant effect, directly and indirectly, on the fortunes of both sports. Cricket gradually declined during and after the Civil War, disappearing almost completely in the USA by the early 1870s.

Wittke (1952, p.115) has argued that the demise of cricket may be explained by the “instinctive aversion to cricket”, which is held to be part of the American make-up. Besides being an example of psychological reductionism, this argument is wholly implausible. In this context it should be noted that Tyrrell (1979) has provided a compelling argument that, contrary to assertions of a variety of historians, the demise of cricket could not have been simply because baseball was a faster game; indeed the two games were very similar in speed and duration of play throughout the 1850s and 1860s. Tyrrell also notes that the suggestions that the amateur stance adopted by cricket’s advocates did not sit well with the vast majority of Americans is a false notion, given that baseball at this time was also steeped in a similar amateur tradition. Guttmann (1994) and Tyrrell (1979) have argued that a major reason for the decline in the popularity of cricket was that the strongest proponents of the game in the USA were almost exclusively English immigrants. This association tarnished the game’s image in the eyes of the growing number of Irish-Americans and German-Americans, and there was an “increase in anti-English sentiments and the development of an American identity” (Van Bottenburg, 1994/2001, p.79). Indeed, given that many Irish emigrants were hostile to the English, following the potato famine, resistance to an openly English sport is understandable. Furthermore, Tyrrell (1979, p.210) holds:

Cricket proved more inflexible than baseball not simply because of its English origins, but also because the game had taken on an organized form before it
reached American shores ... When Englishmen refused to adapt the game in America, they were seeking to preserve a successful sport whose rules were already articulated.

Although, as Van Bottenburg (1994/2001, p.78) plausibly argues, cricket’s “problem was not its national origins”, since golf, tennis and boxing – all ‘English’ origin sports – remained popular in the USA, “but the fact that it [cricket] was controlled by an immigrant community that used it partly as a means of asserting and preserving their ethnic identity”.

The demise of cricket may, in part, have been a reflection of the increasing desire, within certain quarters, to promote post-Civil War America as a ‘modern’ nation. Cricket was a game regarded as symbolizing the ‘past’, the ‘Old World’. The events of the war dealt a fatal blow to cricket’s prospects because, as Kirsch argues (1989), the major proponents of cricket were removed from the sport, becoming heavily involved in military aspects of the war, whereas baseball had a significant popular base amongst those not old enough to serve in the military. In addition to this, Voigt (1966, p.12) holds that the Civil War was a “stimulating influence” that “triggered a veritable baseball ‘mania’ in eastern cities during the late 1860s”. He does not outline why the Civil War might be considered a stimulating influence but, according to Guttmann (1994, p.73), rather than hindering the diffusion of baseball, the Civil War “actually accelerated it … Thanks to the enforced geographical mobility of the war, soldiers and sailors from the Northeast were able to spread the good news far and wide”. An unintended consequence of the Civil War, then, was the fostering of conditions that enhanced the popularity of baseball across the USA. In 1867, two years after the war had ended, there were well over 300 baseball clubs located in seventeen different states (Adelman 1989, p.289). However, despite the growing
popularity of the game, baseball was still only loosely organized (Tyrrell, 1979), and hence we need to turn our attention to an examination of social processes that contributed to the sportization of baseball.

5.4 The sportization of baseball

Tyrrell (1979) is of the view that after the Civil War, middle-class entrepreneurs saw the prospects of baseball, more so than cricket, as a moneymaking enterprise. This was largely because cricket, as has been noted, was declining in popularity in the USA. Where it was still relatively popular – in the Philadelphia region – it was played from an entrenched amateur standpoint, something that middle-class entrepreneurs would have recognized as unlikely to be receptive to their commercially oriented advances. Tyrrell (1979) argues that amateurism held little appeal for the growing numbers of people playing baseball after the Civil War; few could afford to play baseball at an elite level without some form of payment. Thus, it is perhaps not particularly surprising that it was baseball that became increasingly commercialized and underwent a process of de-amateurization.

Baseball teams had begun to pay their players, though not openly, prior to the Civil War (Riess, 1999; Tyrrell, 1979; Voigt, 1966; 1976; 1987), and with games attracting increasing numbers of paying spectators this trend continued. Baseball entrepreneurs increasingly sought to use the growing influence of the press to promote ‘their’ game and, Voigt (1966, p.4) argues, “the promotional myth that baseball was the ‘national game’ had rooted itself into the culture” of American sports fans by the end of the 1860s. This, Van Bottenburg (1994/2001, p.80) plausibly argues, “had great appeal to poor immigrants, especially those from Ireland and Germany, who had
cast in their lot with their new country" – which further explains the demise in
popularity of cricket. Riess (1999, p.12) also locates the game's rapid development as
a commercialized spectacle within the context of “such modernizing external factors
as urbanization, economic prosperity, and transportation and communication
innovations”. As Kirsch (1989, p.16) points out, while all of these processes were well
underway in the USA by the 1850s, they were the preconditions for the continued rise
of baseball in the 1870s. Furthermore, modern communication and transport
facilitated both inter-club and inter-city competition, as well as the increasingly
widespread acceptance of standardized rules. In accounting for this stage of baseball's
modernization, Tyrrell (1979, p.216-7) argues that:

If industrialization helped to shape baseball into a faster game by restricting
leisure time and promoting the work ethic, the process of industrialization
certainly operated in other ways to promote commercialized baseball.
Especially critical were changes in technology which helped to create the
infrastructure of organized sports. A modern transportation system allowed the
fans to reach the games and it also facilitated the inter-city competition on
which commercial baseball in America has been built. Manufacturing industry
made possible standardized equipment, while telegraph and later telephone
provided a means for spreading the results of games and providing more
comprehensive publicity.

However, one must be careful when analysing the impact of these wider social
processes on the development of modern sports for, as Elias (1986b, p.151) argued, it
is a common fault of many authors who claim to “explain almost everything that
occurred in the nineteenth century as a result of the Industrial Revolution”. While
industrialization clearly played a significant part in the sportization of pastimes, Elias
(1986b, p.151) argues that this sportization process also rested, in part, on the fact that
people within “societies demanded of their individual members greater regularity and
differentiation of conduct” and that this process was also associated with the growing
length and differentiation of chains of interdependence. Although Elias was writing
specifically in relation to the situation in England, a similar caveat is appropriate in the context of explanations of the relationship between sport, industrialization and urbanization, and other processes, in the USA. It was a broad and deeply rooted figuration. This is not to deny that industrialization and urbanization, and the inter-related developments in transportation and communications technology, profoundly shaped the early development of baseball. However, it is important to avoid making sweeping, and often bland and mystifying, connections between industrialization and the modernization of sport, without identifying more precisely the structure of the interdependency ties that were both enabling and constraining individuals and groups of individuals at that time. For example, Dunning and Sheard (1979, p.66) argue, in relation to Britain, that “at the ‘societal’ level, industrialization” contributed to “a change in the balance of power between classes, more specifically to an increase in the power of the bourgeoisie – the urban-industrial middle classes – relative to the aristocracy and gentry”. The changing social dynamics that were an inter-related aspect of industrialization and urbanization processes – though quite different in the British and American contexts – contributed to baseball’s growing social significance. The sportization of baseball was, then, a broad-based social process.

In 1871 the first fully professional baseball league was established. The National Association of Professional Base Ball Players (NAPBBP) was created with little fuss, with few contentious changes to the rules and regulations of the former organization, the National Association of Base Ball Players (NABBP) (Voigt, 1966; 1987). Baseball was, at this time, still only loosely organized. Playing schedules frequently proved impossible to complete, and players moved between clubs with great frequency (a process referred to as ‘revolving’ in the contemporary press),
which some felt de-valued competitions. It is perhaps not surprising, therefore, that a
new body, the National Baseball League (often referred to simply as the National
League (NL)), replaced the NAPBBP in 1876. Albert Spalding – a prominent baseball
pitcher, who had left the Boston Red Stockings for the Chicago White Stockings in
1875 – played a significant part in the development of this League. Spalding had also
recently set up his own sports goods company (Voigt, 1966). Alongside Spalding was
William Hulbert. He became President at the Chicago White Stockings in 1876.
Spalding and Hulbert sought to unify baseball under a stronger administration. As
Voigt (1966, p.87) points out, “uniformity was a major goal and was evidenced in
such league decisions as employing a paid corps of umpires, adopting uniform playing
schedules, standardizing the division of receipts and making players purchase and
maintain standardized uniforms”. By 1879, the NL managed to introduce a ‘reserve
rule’ that effectively prohibited players from ‘revolving’. These developments laid the
foundation for the modern era of baseball (Reiss, 1999; Tyrrell, 1979; Voigt, 1966).
Of course, since then, baseball, like all sports – which are, as I have stressed, dynamic
social processes – has been subject to rule changes. Nevertheless, baseball, as played
in the 1880s, unmistakeably had modern sporting characteristics. By the end of this
decade, baseball “had come to resemble the contest with which we are now familiar”
(Voigt, 1966, p.208). The current Major League structure was established in 1903.
From the 1880s numerous attempts had been made to usurp the power of the NL
without much sustainable success. However, in 1903 the promoters of the NL finally
agreed to settle their differences with the most successful rival league, the American
League (AL), resulting in the end-of-season contest for the ‘World Series’ between
the champion team of each league.
Baseball was, by some way, the most popular sport in the USA for the best part of seventy years, from the 1860s up to the Second World War (Voigt, 1976). It is a sport that many hold to occupy a position of cultural centrality in the USA, partly perhaps as a result of the successful promotion it has received both in the past, and to this day, as the ‘national sport’ of the USA.

5.5 The ‘Doubleday Myth’

In the first decade of the twentieth century, Albert Spalding, amongst others, colluded in the fabrication of an ‘origin myth’ for baseball that further cemented its cultural centrality within the USA. Indeed, this myth making was an element in the Americanization process. For, Americanization is not just a process external to America. It is also an internal process, part of nation-state formation and the power struggles involved.

Spalding suggested in his Baseball Guide in 1878 that baseball owed its origins to rounders (Levine, 1985, p.112). However, Levine (1985, p.112) argues that, over time, Spalding “became convinced that a game so fundamentally representative of American values had to be American in origin”. Consequently, in his baseball guide for 1905 he “meticulously\(^4\) took apart, without a shred of evidence” the rounders theory (Levine, 1985, p.113). Undoubtedly, Spalding was an American chauvinist. His desire to promote a positive image of his country was often uppermost in his mind. That much is writ large in his 1911 publication, America’s National Game (Spalding, 1911/1992). In this book, Spalding (1911/1992, p.4) wrote that:

\(^4\) Although, of course, given the flimsy evidence upon which this was based, one could hardly regard it as a meticulous argument.
Base Ball owes its prestige as our National Game to the fact that as no other form of sport it is the exponent of American Courage, Confidence, Combativeness; American Dash, Discipline, Determination; American Energy, Eagerness, Enthusiasm; American Pluck, Persistency, Performance; American Spirit, Sagacity, Success; American Vim, Vigor, Virility.

In seeking to demonstrate that baseball was American in origin, Spalding, "acting on no authority but his own" (Levine 1985, p.113), established a commission to examine the origins of baseball.5 A.G. Mills (the fourth president of the NL) headed the Commission, and was supported by five other prominent baseball men (Spalding, 1911/1992). Although "rounders had been generally accepted as the ancestor of baseball", Seymour (1956, p.370) notes that:

After the Civil War, organized teams had attained importance, and baseball evolved from a simple, primitive game into a popular show business. It had gained prestige not unmixed with American pride in having a 'national game'. Consequently, its devotees found it increasingly difficult to countenance the notion that their favorite sport was of foreign origin. Pride and patriotism required that the game be native, unsullied by English ancestry.

Yet it is important to avoid mono-causal explanations for complex social processes, numerous other considerations were involved. Seymour (1956) himself highlights, inter alia, the commercial interests of those involved. Spalding's change in perspective, and his concern that the Commission establish his 'American theory' for the origins of the game, cannot be solely explained in terms of his chauvinism. It was a decision, Levine (1985, p.112) argues, also bound up in his desire to "provide good publicity for himself and his business". The promotion of baseball as America's national game, a game that unequivocally also had its origins in the USA, was seen as a useful marketing tool. However, if this version of baseball was to have credibility it

5 Again, as sociologists we might be well advised to be sceptical of explanations that portray human action in such individualistic, non-interdependent, terms.
had to have resonance for other individuals and groups. Thus, it was only a useful marketing tool because it was given credibility by others.

As Seymour points out, baseball had ‘evolved’ into a ‘popular show business’, and this process had a number of inter-related facets. Baseball, by this time, had long been established as the most popular spectator sport in the USA. It was also being played on a professional basis at the elite level. It became increasingly commercialized and marketed by entrepreneurs both within and outside the game. Entrepreneurs, like Spalding, had much to gain from the declaration of baseball as the American national game. His company was already the world’s biggest manufacturer of sporting goods by the time the Commission reported, and he undoubtedly believed that if baseball could be ‘officially’ promoted as the national game, then demand for baseball would increase (Rader, 1992). The commission gathered hundreds of pages of testimonies from across the USA, although, Levine (1985, p.113) argues, even the American press at the time considered that much of what was gathered was “pure fabrication”.

In December 1907, the Mills Commission published their report. The Commission claimed that baseball was ‘invented’ by a late American Civil War veteran, Abner Doubleday, in 1839. However, it is now well documented that the findings of the commission were fabricated and many baseball historians refer to these conclusions as the ‘Doubleday myth’ (Levine, 1985; Rader, 1992; Salvatore, 1983; Seymour, 1956; Voigt, 1966; 1976; 1987). From a sociological perspective, it is particularly worthy of note that the creation of myths around the origins of allegedly

---

6 Perhaps, as outlined above, rather than ‘evolved’, ‘developed’ would be a more adequate term to employ here, as it implies that social constructs are still within the realms of interdependent human beings rather than the inevitable consequences of the passing of time.
national pastimes is not a process unique to baseball. Similar attempts to provide individualistic and 'mythical' explanations for complex social processes have been made in relation to boxing (Sheard, 1997) and rugby football (Dunning & Sheard, 1979). However, as we have noted, sports are social products and it is not useful – or accurate – to see any sport simply as the creation of a single individual (see, for example, Rhinehart, 2000). Consistent with this position, it has been argued in this chapter that no one person ‘invented’ baseball. Rather, the development of the game was the outcome of a process of constant and continual refinement of existing rules and ways of playing traditional games, by many people, over many years.

It is germane to point out that, by the beginning of the twentieth century, the influence of the USA in world affairs, relative to Britain, was on the increase. Indeed, it is arguable that by the time of the Mills Commission report the power balance between the two societies had altered to such a degree that the USA had probably become the most powerful society in the world. By 1900, Jenkins (1997, p.147) argues, the USA was:

A continental empire, its cities and industries were already as large as those of the greatest European powers, and its political might was being projected overseas in the form of a new colonial empire. In a sense ‘the rest of the nations’ were already ‘in our rear’.

The manufacture and widespread acceptance of the Doubleday myth, therefore, could be interpreted as an attempt by some within the USA to reject any lingering feelings of inferiority in relation to their former mother country. Several authors (Guttmann, 1978; Reiss, 1977; Salvatore, 1983; Seymour, 1956; Tyrrell, 1979; Voigt, 1976) have argued that the Doubleday myth achieved a wide degree of legitimation and acceptance because many baseball fans, players and entrepreneurs could not accept
that 'their' national sport may have been derived from rounders. In this context, Chandler (1988, p.24) argues, "it told Americans what they wanted to hear; America’s national game was no immigrant upstart, but native-born, conceived and nourished only by peculiarly American ideals, and epitomizing peculiarly American values". It seems that the legitimising of this myth was a gradual process. When the commission was first charged with the task of ‘discovering’ the origins of baseball, much of the American press – and even most baseball enthusiasts – viewed rounders as its nascent form. It seems more plausible to suggest that gradually, on the back of the conclusions drawn by the Mills Commission, increasing numbers of Americans were happy to accept that baseball was indeed American in origin.

In 1939, the Doubleday myth was crystallized further in the USA with the opening of the National Baseball Hall of Fame in Cooperstown on the centenary of Doubleday’s alleged ‘invention’ of the sport. Stephen Clark⁷, a native Cooperstown resident, was largely responsible for the establishment and funding of the Hall of Fame (Salvatore, 1983). As both Salvatore (1983) and McCulloch (1995) point out, Clark had much to gain in terms of creating this unique tourist attraction in an otherwise quiet, isolated village. Thus, the myth was created and maintained over many years, notwithstanding overwhelming evidence to the contrary.

5.6 Concluding points

In summary, it is evident that several different but interconnected social developments contributed to the initial emergence of baseball as a modern sport, and its subsequent growth in popularity. The concept of sportization, it has been

---

⁷ Clark’s father was the partner of the sewing machine inventor Isaac Singer, and had left his son a substantial proportion of the $500 million fortune he had accumulated.
suggested, is a useful framework within which to organise and interpret the empirical data.

Baseball, like many modern sports, developed as a result of a number of planned (for example the deliberate promotion of the game as a single, codified variant of a number of already existing bat-and-ball games; copying various structural aspects of the game from cricket) and unplanned consequences (e.g. resulting from growing interdependency ties; the Civil War) over a long period of time.

The precursors of modern baseball were evident in 1840s America. In other words, the period from the 1840s witnessed the 'incipient modernization' of baseball. This incipient modernization was both a planned and an unplanned social process. It was an unintended consequence of the social changes shaped by industrialization, urbanization, developments in communication processes, and the American Civil War. Continued refinement of baseball took place over the next two decades and, by the 1880s, it had taken on many of the structural characteristics found in the game played in the USA today. Driven largely by the unplanned, but rapidly developing nationalism felt by many Americans during and following the Civil War, as well as the more deliberate promotion of the game by those entrepreneurs who saw its monetary potential as a newly established sport that was ripe for alterations, baseball developed into the mass participant and spectator sport which remains prominent on the American sporting landscape of today.

Voigt (1976) writes of an 'American myth' that relates to an apparent belief that many Americans have considered that 'American culture', amongst other things,
is so important that it is worthy of exporting the major elements of this culture to all peoples of the world. "An athletic expression of this myth", Voigt (1976, p.93) argues, "is reflected in the history of major league baseball" and it is to the diffusion of baseball outside of the USA that I will now turn.
Chapter 6: Cross-cultural comparison of baseball

Echevarria (2000, p.145) points out that baseball is played extensively across the globe, concluding that:

It seems apparent that baseball is well on its way to becoming global. While the popularity of the sport in North, Central, and parts of South America and the Caribbean is a given, baseball is now being seriously played in some very unlikely places, such as Australia, Taiwan, South Korea, the Netherlands, Italy, France, and Germany. Japan has been a baseball power for quite some time now, as everyone knows.

If taken literally, this statement creates the impression that baseball is close to being played in every village and every town in every country. I have already been critical of this tendency to think of ‘global’ as an absolute rather than globalization as a process and in terms of degrees. Likewise, one could also be forgiven for assuming that baseball was played extensively in the countries and regions named by Echevarria (2000). However, a more critical reading of Echevarria (2000) reveals that his conclusions are based on little more than anecdotal evidence. Nor does he qualify what he means by playing baseball “seriously”. As is shown below, it is highly misleading to group France and even, to some extent, Australia, Germany, Italy and the Netherlands in this category. By any yardstick, the extent of baseball’s popularity in all of these countries is entirely marginal. Echevarria (2000) is not the only writer in the field to exaggerate the extent of baseball’s diffusion. Several other authors are equally at fault. Rosentraub (2000, p.137) argues that “MLB ... exercises unfettered international power”. Due to the growth in baseball’s global presence, Marcano and Fidler (1999, p.531) argue that, “the globalization of baseball contributes to the creation of ... McWorld”. That is to say, they consider that the global spread of baseball, and “globalization” in general, “fosters the Americanization of national cultures, or more harshly that globalization is American cultural imperialism”
(Marcano & Fidler, 1999, p.531). To their credit, these authors do, at least, attempt to define what they mean by the “globalization of baseball”. They argue that, “this phenomenon contains two basic dynamics: the denationalisation of (1) the market for baseball consumers, and (2) the market for baseball labor. For most of its history”, they argue, Major League Baseball (MLB) “tapped into an overwhelmingly national market – the United States – for fans and players. Today, the markets for fans and players span many countries” (Marcano & Fidler, 1999, p.512-3). Nevertheless, they seem to ignore two important facts: firstly, that players playing within the MLB organization have long included foreigners and, more importantly, MLB has tried, and more or less failed, in their attempts to establish a following for the game in most countries in the world. Marcano and Fidler (1999, p.514) conclude by arguing that “the globalization of baseball has made baseball a global game and has given MLB not only global opportunities to make money but also global responsibilities that it must face if the future of baseball as a pastime and as a business is to be healthy and honourable”.

It has been argued that it is a common characteristic of many writers in the broad field of ‘globalization’ for them to base their arguments on limited evidence. The debate is littered with abstract pronouncements that merely serve to cloud, rather than advance our understanding. In attempting to make sense of the issue of globalization – with particular reference to the diffusion of baseball – I will seek to correct this imbalance in the literature by engaging in comprehensive research, as outlined in this and the following chapter. Having examined, in chapter five, the initial development of baseball in the USA, where the sportization of several bat-and-ball pastimes took place, we now need to turn our attention to the global diffusion of
the game – to the global sportization phases (Maguire, 1999). In order to examine the extent of this global diffusion, it is necessary to provide a socio-historical account of the development of the game in countries where it is played. The International Baseball Federation (IBAF) was first established in 1938. Today the organization has 109 member countries and has five affiliated continental federations: the African Baseball and Softball Association (ABSA), the Baseball Confederation of Oceania (BCO), the Baseball Federation of Asia (BFA), the Confédération Européene de Baseball (CEB), and the Confederación Panamericana de Béisbol (COPABE). I will structure the analysis for this chapter using the five continental regions as sub-sections. The discussion is based largely on a review of the available secondary source material, and also through the responses to the questionnaires sent to all 109 national federations (as outlined in the methodology chapter). It should be noted that some sections are more comprehensive than others, and this simply reflects the extent of secondary sources available and the response rate to the questionnaire. The regional sub-sections used within this chapter will provide greater presentational clarity, although I will draw out international connections when they are sociologically significant, with the obvious common denominator being the USA. This discussion will enable us to begin to examine the diverse responses to the diffusion of baseball within a variety of cultural contexts at different times. It would be inappropriate to try and draw conclusions on the basis solely of this cross-sectional chapter, before outlining the results uncovered for the in-depth case study analysis of the development of baseball in England. By first outlining the results at the ‘global’ setting, this will enable a better understanding of what is happening at the ‘local’, and vice versa, when we come to examine the development of baseball in England in the following chapter. Therefore, for the most part, I will reserve analysis and discussion
of the interdependency of the results until chapter eight. It is hoped that by explicating the development of baseball in different regions in this way will provide greater clarity for the assessment of the issue regarding the extent of the global baseball figuration that will form the discussion in chapter eight of this thesis.

6.1 Baseball in Pan Americana

Baseball is most widely popular in the countries closest, geographically, to the USA. Twenty-six nations are affiliated to the IBAF from within the ‘Pan Americana’ region. The history of the development of baseball outside of the USA stretches back further within this region than anywhere else. In 2001, of the 216 foreign-born registered players playing within Major League Baseball (MLB), 88% of them came from countries within Pan Americana (King, 2002a).

Only two out of the twenty-six national federations within this region responded to the questionnaire (Canada and Panama). So, much of the ‘results’ within this sub-section, are, inevitably, derived from secondary sources. This has not prevented a fairly comprehensive account of the development of baseball in this region, because arguably the secondary source material covering baseball here is the most comprehensive outside of baseball in the USA itself.

6.1.1 Baseball in Canada

In the early nineteenth century, similar bat-and-ball games were played in Canada and the USA (Bouchier & Barney, 1988; Barney, 1989). As British rule and influence in Canada slowly diminished towards the end of the nineteenth century, American influence became more prominent. These developments are emphasized by
the diminishing popularity of cricket in Canada, and the increasing popularity of
various codes of baseball. As in America, the ‘New York’ rules of baseball gradually
won favour with most Canadians, particularly in Ontario and Quebec. The
development of the railroads throughout much of Canada significantly contributed to
the spread of the game. Several Americans were involved in building the railroads and
they brought with them a desire to continue playing the ‘New York’ version of
baseball that they had grown increasingly accustomed to. By the late 1860s, baseball
competitions were a regular feature in many parts of Canada, but most notably in
Ontario (Barney, 1989). By the 1870s, the New York rules were widely accepted in
Canada and this “accelerated the international development of the game” (Hill, 2000,
p.38-9). The growing networks of interdependencies between people on the borders,
in particular, contributed to the growth and spread of baseball. In 1876, the first
Canadian Baseball League was set up and, in 1877, an ‘International Association’ was
created. This involved competition between American and Canadian teams. The
International Association was set up in an, eventually unsuccessful, attempt to
challenge the monopoly enjoyed over professional baseball by the National League
(NL) in the USA. When the London (Ontario) Tecumsehs won the inaugural
International Association competition they became the first Canadian team to win a
major league championship¹ – a feat that was not emulated for over a century (Hill,

Barney (1989) and Hill (2000) argue that during the last quarter of the
nineteenth century, the spread of baseball in Canada was mirrored by a growing

¹ Although, technically, as Barney (1989, p.9) points out, the International Association competition has
been recorded in history as the first ‘minor’ league. However, this is more to do with the overall control
that the rival National League enjoyed subsequently, rather than an aspersion on the quality of baseball
being played.
commercial element within the game – much like that seen in the USA. With the growing popularity of baseball in Canada, the supposedly Native American or Indian traditional sport of lacrosse and the English-imported sport of cricket waned in popularity. “Baseball had eclipsed cricket as the major summer game” by the time of the First World War (Cooper, 1999, p.74). It is not the intention here to provide a detailed account of the demise of cricket in Canada (for a fuller account of this see Cooper (1999)). Suffice to say that Cooper (1999) argues that a combination of growing Canadian independence from Britain – as the oldest and most advanced colony prior to the break up of the British Empire – and growing American influence were central features. This is evidence of the fluctuating power gradients of interdependent groups of people. The influence and power of the British in Canada was diminishing at the same time as influences from the USA were increasing.

The Canadian Professional Baseball Association was set up in 1911 (Barney, 1989, p.9). At “the start of World War I, at least eighteen Canadian cities had been home to professional teams” (Hill, 2000, p.46). After the War, baseball continued to grow in popularity. More and more Canadian-based teams were being established, and more were becoming involved within the American minor league system\(^2\). Indeed, three minor leagues were based entirely in Canada (Barney, 1989). The growing popularity of baseball was increasingly reflected in the amount of coverage it received in the Canadian press. The coverage included reports on American Major League teams, as well as Canadian teams (Barney, 1989). Baseball was also growing in popularity as an amateur sport and in 1919 the Canadian Amateur Baseball Association was established.

\(^2\) The minor leagues were generally regarded – and still are today – as ‘feeder’ leagues to the Majors.
In 1928, the *Montreal Royals* baseball team were formed, and joined the International League Syracuse minor league. This was a very prominent league and the *Royals* were seen as “the perfect launchpad for the international expansion of MLB” (Hill, 2000, p. 43). The MLB Commissioner at the time, Judge Kenesaw Mountain Landis, attended the *Royals’* opening game (Hill, 2000). Just a decade later, the *Brooklyn Dodgers* purchased the *Royals*, which “soon became the leading farm team of the Dodgers” (Hill, 2000, p. 43). Canadian interest in the American Major Leagues grew even more. The popularity of baseball grew during, and immediately after, the Second World War – very much in tandem with growing interdependence with and dominance by the USA. By the 1960s, there was pressure in the USA and Canada to extend the MLB. It was clear that the appeal in expanding the NL into Montreal was that this would open up an “untapped international market” (Hill, 2000, p. 48). In addition to this, the strong position of the *Montreal Royals* in the minor leagues had whetted the appetite of those involved in the NL. There was little surprise, therefore, when a delegation from Montreal successfully bid to become a NL franchise in 1968. The following year, the *Montreal Expos* made their debut in MLB, becoming the first team outside the USA to do so. According to Barney (1989, p. 12), the establishment of the *Expos* galvanized baseball in the area. Support for this view comes from the fact that the number of amateur clubs in Montreal nearly doubled, from 222 to 430, in the first year of the *Expos* existence (Barney, 1989).

The *Expos* generally had an “abysmal record” in the early 1970s (Hill, 2000, p. 49). However, by the turn of the decade, the team’s performances improved significantly, and attendances also increased (surpassing 2 million per season). The

---

3 Jackie Robinson represented the *Montreal Royals* in 1946, and was later promoted to the *Brooklyn Dodgers* Major League team, becoming the first black player in modern MLB history.
growing success of the Canadian franchise made the idea of a second franchise in Canada all the more appealing. In 1977, the American League (AL) agreed to expand by two teams. A bid for a franchise in Toronto was successful, and the *Toronto Blue Jays* became the second Canadian franchise in MLB. As with the *Expos* before them, the initial record of the *Blue Jays* was poor. They finished bottom of AL East in their first season. But, in 1985 they won their first Divisional title. The *Blue Jays* were also performing extremely well at the gate. Throughout the 1980s they drew significantly high crowds (consistently over 2 million per season). In 1989, when they moved to the Sky Dome stadium, the *Blue Jays* attracted nearly 3.4 million fans over the season. Such was their success at the gate, they became the first MLB franchise to break the 4 million barrier in 1991. They repeated the feat over the next three seasons (Hill, 2000). In 1992, the *Blue Jays* defeated the *Atlanta Braves* in the World Series, and became the first team outside of the USA to win the competition. They successfully defended their title the following season. The *Blue Jays* did not field a single Canadian player on either occasion. Nevertheless, Hill (2000) argues that the team were regarded by much of English-speaking Canada as “Canada’s team”, and the World Series victories were regarded as Canadian victories over the USA and sparked huge national celebrations.

The baseball players’ strike of 1994, which curtailed the season, occurred at a time when the *Expos* had the best record in MLB, and the *Blue Jays* were on course to sell out every home game they played. Since this disruption, neither team has fully recovered its momentum (Hill, 2000). Hill (2000, p.55-7) relates this to the unfavourable exchange rate between US and Canadian dollars, which, he holds, has discouraged American players from playing in Canada. Many players regard the
Canadian teams as being in the wilderness of MLB. Hill (2000) argues that whilst this is connected with the fact that they are the only non-US based MLB teams; it is not something unique to these teams. When it comes to persuading players to join their team, several clubs in the USA also find it hard to compete with the more glamorous clubs, most notably the Los Angeles Dodgers and the New York Yankees.

Over the past few years, both the Expos and Blue Jays have been suffering from spiralling declines in attendances. Despite their mixed fortunes over recent years, Hill (2000) points out that both the Blue Jays and the Expos still receive vast amounts of coverage on Canadian television stations. The requirements under Canadian law for television licenses are such that a significant proportion of a network’s airtime must be devoted to ‘Canadian content’. TV companies have found that by showing the baseball matches of Montreal or Toronto enable them to make up large parts of this quota comparatively cheaply. Furthermore, amateur baseball is still very popular in Canada, and Baseball Canada (personal correspondence), the national federation, indicate, on returning my questionnaire, that there are approximately 510,000 registered players.

6.1.2 Baseball in Cuba

"The origins of Cuban baseball," Echevarria, (1999, p.76) contends, occurred alongside formal political “independence from Spain and with the consolidation of a [Cuban] national identity”. A key group for the development of baseball in Cuba were wealthy middle- and upper-class Cubans (mostly ‘Creoles’) educated in the USA. Two such individuals, Nemesio and Ernesto Guilló, were prominent in the decision to
establish the *Habana Base Ball Club* in 1868. This club was the first of its kind in Cuba.

Baseball became a site of resistance against the Spanish-led authorities in Cuba. According to Echevarria (1999, p.81), Cubans were eager to embrace the "new", so baseball was increasingly chosen ahead of the Spanish sport of bullfighting. This development was also connected with the fact that Cuba was coming into increasing contact with the USA – particularly through the sugar industry. There was a growing American presence on the island. In relation to this, the Creole upper classes “looked to the United States for their sports as well as for political ideals and funds” (Guttmann, 1994, p.81). In 1868, Cuba was gripped by internal conflict, with Cuban nationalists waging guerrilla war – the Ten Years War – against the Spanish authorities. The USA were not directly involved in this war, but their economic and cultural influence on the Creoles within Cuba was growing. In an attempt to stem the tide of growing American influence, the Spanish authorities banned baseball in 1869. Nevertheless, Echevarria (1999, p.89) holds, baseball was “played in defiance of Spanish authorities”. Jamail (2000) goes further and argues that baseball’s popularity grew. *Habana* even became a ‘professional’ club in 1872. In the same year, a Cuban national, Estéban Bellán, became the first Latino to play in the Major Leagues – representing the *New York Mutuals*. At the end of the Ten Years War, and despite the fact that the Spanish authorities remained in Cuba, the first organized baseball championships took place in 1878. There was increasing professionalization of the game during the 1880s – a development indicative of growing American influence. In addition, the amateur game thrived, and the game became increasingly popular amongst the lower-classes in Cuba. Despite the continued presence of the Spanish,
their authority was on the wane. Therefore, it is perhaps not surprising that we find that the first sustained period of growth in the popularity of baseball in Cuba occurred during the 1880s.

In 1895, Cuba was once again in a period of revolution. The Americans had, on this occasion, more reason to intervene, since a great deal of American money was now invested in Cuba – particularly in land and sugar crops. In 1898, the US battleship, *Maine*, blew up in Havana harbour\(^4\), and the USA intervened, and decisively so. The Spanish-American War lasted only ten weeks, and in July 1898, the Cubans won their political independence from Spain. Arguably, however, Cuba moved from a subordinate relationship with Spain, to an even more subordinate relationship with the USA. In this respect, the USA reserved a naval base in Guantánamo Bay after the war – where they have been present ever since. Hence, whilst Cuba was now a sovereign state, in the political sense, the military presence of the USA, as well as growing cultural, economic, and political influence, was undeniable. In 1899, bullfighting was banned and “baseball (like North American economic investment) ‘took off’” (Guttmann, 1994, p.82). The Platt Amendment was signed in 1901, which gave the USA the “right to intervene as it wished to protect Cuba’s independence” (LaFeber, 1994, p.210), and in doing so ensured that Cuba stayed within the USA’s sphere of influence.

The USA occupied Cuba in 1906. Over the three years of occupation that followed, major changes occurred “to Cuban baseball, as it did” in aspects of “all Cuban life” (Echevarria, 1999, p.124). There was growing resentment toward the

\(^4\) It is unclear who was responsible for the sinking of the American battleship, and historians argue over whether the Cubans or Spanish were responsible, or perhaps even the USA, looking for a pretext to invade (Nevins & Commanger, 1986).
USA during the occupation. However, rather than rejecting the American sport – in much the same way as many Cubans had rejected bullfighting in protest against the Spanish authorities – baseball came to be used as a site of resistance. For example, the 1907 Cuban League championship was ultimately contested by two teams: Almendares (made up largely of Cuban nationals) and Fe (made up largely of imported American players). Despite the fact that Habana were traditionally the bitter rivals of Almendares, Echevarria (1999, p.127) argues, “the bulk of Habana’s followers … became rabid supporters” of the Almendares team. As Echevarria (1999, p.127) argues: “Nationalism overcame the … rivalry and showed the depths of Cuban resentment against the American occupation”.

In 1911, the recently crowned World Series champions, the Philadelphia Athletics, lost a series of games against Cuban select sides which, Echevarria (1999 134) argues, was “particularly embarrassing” for American baseball, and proved to be a “source of pride to Cuba”. Contests between Cuban and American teams contributed to the further growth of the game in Cuba. This is because, Echevarria (1999, p.133) argues:

Baseball, an American game, established itself as the national sport of Cuba during an American occupation of the island because Cuban teams defeated American ones. The conqueror’s mantle of superiority in economic and military power could not be denied, but it was removed in the mock battlefield of sports.

In spite of the fact that this a rather monocausal argument, it is plausible that baseball remained popular in Cuba despite growing anti-American feelings, because it was seen as enjoyable, but also, largely because it was used as an expression of rebellion and resistance, in ways that could not be expressed in other aspects of Cuban life.
Although the balance of power lay firmly with the USA economically, militarily, and politically, the growing Cuban and American interdependency contributed to the continuing two-way flow of traffic in the diffusion of baseball. Cuban baseball was “deeply affected by the close political, economic, and cultural relations between the island and the United States (close is something of a misnomer, since the politics and business of the United States and Cuba were sometimes really one and the same)” (Echevarria, 1999, p.112-3). In 1917, the first Cuban professional league was set up. Such was the growing relationship with the American leagues that competitive baseball was played mostly during the winter in Cuba. Many Americans took the opportunity to play ‘winter ball’ in Cuba to supplement their wages. In addition, Cuban’s were having a growing impact upon baseball in the USA. Increasing numbers of Cubans played within the American minor leagues and, most notably, within the Negro Leagues. Indeed, the Negro Leagues and Cuban Leagues became increasingly interdependent. Furthermore, the Cuban name began to shape aspects of American baseball. Several teams playing in the minor leagues and Negro Leagues were named after Cuba, and cities in Cuba, as they began to exploit the “commercial value of the word ‘Cuban’” (Echevarria, 1999, p.125). Cuban teams toured the USA, in order to play exhibition games and make money. The significance of these developments for our understanding is that it further underlines the need to appreciate global flows as multi-directional.

Increasing numbers of “white” Cubans were being recruited into the Major League teams as well. According to Regalado (2000, p.11), a significant reason for the American interest in Cuban players – as well as increasing interest in players from

5 “White” Cubans were, essentially, lighter-skinned – sufficiently so to pass as white for the segregated leagues in the USA. It is interesting to note that at this time in Cuba, baseball leagues were also segregated along similar lines.
other Latino countries – was “that nineteenth century laissez-faire business practices were still viable there”. This was important for the MLB teams, who were limited in their efforts to recruit new players in the USA because of the tighter restrictions on contractual obligations of Major League players. The Latin American market was a new and cheaper option.

Amateur baseball was also growing in popularity in Cuba. From 1939, the Cuban amateurs were able to test their skills against other nations. The amateur baseball world championships became a fixture in the baseball calendar in the Caribbean. Ruck (1991/1998, p.44) indicates that “the Mundiales”, as the Latino’s referred to the competition, “had a decidedly Latin flavour and became the most important sporting competition in which these nations competed”. Cuba hosted the tournament in five successive years from 1939 to 1943, and won four of those championships. Until 1944, the world championships were played under the auspices of the International Baseball Federation (IBF). In 1944, the federation title was changed and became the Federacion Internacional de Béisbol Amateur (FIBA), reflecting the growing Latin American influence.

In 1947, the MLB approached the Cuban League to set up a pact, which would effectively make the Cuban League part of the MLB system. This was in response to developments in Mexico in 1946, which saw administrators of the Mexican League attempt to break the dominance of professional baseball by MLB (see the section on baseball in Mexico, below). “It is not surprising”, Echevarria (1999, p.47) argues,

---

6 The world championships were first held in England in 1938, but only Britain and the USA took part. See the next chapter for further details.
"that the Cuban League eventually caved in to pressure from Organized Baseball\textsuperscript{7}".

The pact was signed on 10 June, 1947. The Cuban League effectively became a "minor circuit intended to develop talent for major-league teams" (Echevarria, 1999, p.48). The pact restricted the players allowed on the rosters of the Cuban teams to those "players with limited or no major-league experience" (Echevarria, 1999, p.48).

The breaking down of the racial barriers in American baseball – when Jackie Robinson became the first black player to play in the Major Leagues in 1947 – extended further the interdependency chains (and the scope for exploitation) between Cuba and the USA, and now black, as well as white, Cuban players became a fixture within MLB.

On 1 January 1959, Fidel Castro overthrew the Cuban dictatorship and two years later the USA broke off diplomatic ties with Cuba. The revolution, and related developments, did not prompt the end for baseball in Cuba. Indeed, it served to reinforce the status of baseball as Cuba's 'national sport'. Castro's regime made baseball an amateur sport and "Fidel labeled professional baseball as la pelota esclava (slave baseball), as opposed to the new baseball in Cuba, which would be la pelota libre (free baseball)" (Jamail, 2000, p.134). Thus, Cuba, although "fuelled by intense anti-Americanism", continued "to embrace the most American of games as its own" (Echevarria, 1999, p.5).

The growing politicization of sports after World War II contributed to sports becoming increasingly a site for resistance and rebellion. Indeed, "to the

\textsuperscript{7} The term 'Organized Baseball' is frequently used as a reference, solely, to Major League Baseball. Indeed, according to Klein (1997, p. 82), during the 1940s, "in a typical display of cultural arrogance, the major and minor leagues in the United States labeled themselves "organized baseball", implying that baseball outside of white America was disorganized, chaotic, and of poorer qualify [sic]".

revolutionaries”, Echevarria (1999, p.354) argues, “the notion of beating the United States at its own game became a cherished dream, even if it meant perpetuating an undeniable American influence”. This is emphasized in a speech by Castro in 1974, in which he stated that: “One day, when the Yankees accept peaceful coexistence with our own country ... we shall beat them at baseball too and then the advantages of revolutionary over capitalist sport will be shown” (cited in Jamail, 2000, p.28).

Unsurprisingly, the model for Cuban sport was drawn from the Soviet system, and the nurturing of baseball talent in Cuba became highly regimented (Jamail, 2000; Wagner, 1984). This illustrates, once again, the weakness of attempting to reduce global flows to a simplistic Americanization thesis.

The Cuban national side – or equipo Cuba, as they became known – continued to dominate the world amateur championships in the post-Revolutionary era, winning nine out of ten championships entered between 1961 and 1980. Despite the growing international reputation of the Cuban national side, the flow of baseball talent to the USA dried up completely after Castro came to power. Cuban baseball contacts with another staunchly capitalist nation, Japan, grew substantially during this period. A professional Japanese team, the Hiroshima Carp, played an exhibition game in Cuba in 1988 – and relations between Cuban and Japanese baseball administrators warmed significantly thereafter.

---

8 Problems with the administration of baseball within the international governing body, FIBA, restricted the number of times that the competition was held – with equipo Cuba winning two out of three championships during the 1960s. The Cuban team then won four in succession between 1970 and 1973. The administrative problems resurfaced in 1973, which led to the setting up of a breakaway international federation (The Federacion Mundial de Beisbol Amateur – FEMBA). Cuba were not involved in two competitions won by the USA in 1973 and 1974 under the auspices of FEMBA. In 1976, the rival international federations resolved their differences and the two merged to form the International Baseball Association (AINBA). The world championships under AINBA were to be held every two years, and equipo Cuba won the first three tournaments in 1976, 1978 and 1980.
During the 1990s, the Cuban regime was "struggling to survive ... in the wake of the Soviet Union's collapse" (Jamail, 2000, p.5). The Soviet Union had bought Cuban produce (particularly sugar) at above world prices. The interdependency with communist eastern European countries had contributed significantly to Cuba's ability to survive the potential economic hardships of being cut off from their nearest, and richest, neighbour. In July 1991, soon after the collapse of the Soviet Union, René Arocha became the first Cuban player to defect from the national team, whilst playing in a tournament in Miami. The timing of this might suggest that the collapse of the Soviet Union was a contributory factor. Baseball players in Cuba were not immune from the increasing economic hardships being faced now that the special relationship formed with the Soviet Union was over. Prospects in the USA became decidedly more appealing. Arocha played for the *St. Louis Cardinals* and was soon followed by a handful of other defectors. For the most part these initial defectors made little impact in the USA, on the baseball diamond at least. There were fears within Cuba that higher profile players would soon defect to MLB. In direct response to these fears, the strict laws governing the movement of Cuban nationals were relaxed in relation to countries other than the USA. In 1992, retired players were allowed "to work [as coaches] overseas and bring home a portion of their salary" (Jamail, 2000, p.69). Many of these players worked in Japan and Italy, although this did little to assuage Cuba's top younger players.

The first really successful, top-class Cuban player to defect was Liván Hernández in September 1995. According to Jamail (2000, p.87), "the implications of Hernández's defection are stunning. He is the best of Cuba's well-organized baseball system, and his success with the [Florida] Marlins is a symptom of that system's
disarray". Since Hernández, a handful of other defectors have made the successful transition to MLB - including Hernández's brother Orlando. In 1996, no doubt in response to the defection of such top-class players, the Cuban government relaxed laws even further, permitting players who were thirty and older to 'retire' and play overseas. An unplanned consequence of this retirement policy "decimated" some of the domestic Cuban teams (Jamail, 2000, p.70). So much so that Jamail (2000) concludes that the retirement policy has contributed to a decline in Cuban baseball.

The economic turmoil that Cuba underwent following the collapse of the Soviet Union was, not surprisingly, having a direct effect on baseball in Cuba. The strengthening of the USA embargo in 1997 contributed to further economic downturns.\footnote{The passing of the Helms-Burton Law in the USA effectively meant a tightening of the Cuban embargo in 1997, at a time when most nations in the world now traded with Cuba - including, Jamail (2000, p.10) points out, the USA's "two closest neighbours, Canada and Mexico". The decision taken by the Clinton administration was, according to Jamail (2000), based more on domestic politics rather than foreign policy. The move to strengthen the Cuba embargo was taken in the hope that this would win over the large Cuban-American vote available in the key states of Florida and New Jersey for the 2000 presidential elections.} The national side were defeated in international competition for the first time in a decade when they lost to Japan in 1997. In response to this, Jamail (2000, p.103) argues, "the Cuban baseball program underwent a major overhaul". In March 1998, for example, the Cuban authorities announced that several players, who had been banned for numerous indiscretions related, for the most part, to accusations of receiving pay or seeking US agents, were reinstated in Cuban baseball. Cuba’s baseball ties with Japan were strengthened. A large delegation from the Japanese amateur baseball federation was in attendance at the 1998 Cuban All-Star game, and the Cuban national team became "a frequent visitor to Japan" (Jamail, 2000, p.110).

In 1999, Jamail (2000, p.69) notes that approximately 200 Cuban baseball coaches were working abroad "including many former members of equipo Cuba".
In 1999, the *Baltimore Orioles* became the first MLB team to play in Cuba since the revolution. A two game series between the *Orioles* and *equipo Cuba* – one in Havana and the return in Baltimore – was played, with each side winning their ‘away’ games. The success of the Cuban team in Baltimore was heralded, at least in Cuba, as a clear sign that Cuba could still beat the USA at their ‘own game’. Despite the apparent crisis in Cuban baseball, following the defeat to Japan and falling crowds at domestic games, *equipo Cuba* has now won eight world championship titles in a row – stretching back to 1984. Thus, notwithstanding other high profile defeats, to the Netherlands, and then to Team USA in the final of the 2000 Olympic Games tournament, it seems the apparent demise of Cuban baseball has been exaggerated. This is further reinforced by the fact that the Cubans regained their Olympic crown in 2004.

### 6.1.3 Baseball in Dominican Republic

In 1865, the Dominicans expelled their Spanish rulers and declared the Dominican Republic sovereign. Over the next decade, the Ten Year War in Cuba contributed to “several thousand Cubans” (Ruck, 1991/1998, p.4) leaving to settle in Hispaniola (the island on which the Dominican Republic, along with Haiti, is located). Ruck (1991/1998, p.4) indicates that “these exiles brought the know-how and capital to create a modern sugar industry on the island. And they brought baseball”. During the last few decades of the nineteenth century, American presence and influence in the Dominican Republic increased. The USA began to exert considerable influence over the expanding sugar industry in particular. In addition, growing numbers of affluent Dominicans were studying in the USA, and they played an increasingly important part in sustaining the development of baseball in the Dominican Republic upon their
The spread of baseball is an expression of the growing interdependency chains between Caribbean islands and the USA. As Klein (1991b, p.16) points out:

The game was first brought to the Dominican Republic in the final months of 1891 by the Aloma brothers, two Cubans who worked there ... It was easy for the Dominicans to adopt the game in part because they were culturally close to the Cubans, and in part because baseball was the game invented and played by the Americans, the symbols of power who were increasingly present.

By the turn of the century, the Dominican government was in considerable debt, which contributed to an increasing American presence interested in the welfare of their investments. During the same period, baseball very quickly overtook soccer as the most popular sport (Ruck, 1991/1998, p.7). Although the first professional baseball club in the Dominican Republic, Licey, was established in 1907, baseball remained rather disorganized for the first few decades of the twentieth century (Klein, 1991b). In 1914, the first contest between a team from the USA, representing the US Navy cruiser Washington, played a select team from the Dominican Republic. Enrique Hernández, a pitcher with Licey, pitched a perfect no-hit, no-run game which “later gained importance as a symbol of Dominican resistance when the country was invaded by the U.S. Marines” in 1916 (Klein, 1991b, p.17). The Dominican Republic’s poor economic situation contributed to the occupation of the country by American marines “on the pretext of securing the collection of customs revenues due to the American government” (Klein, 1991b, p.12). This was in line with the US government’s wider foreign policy objectives of maintaining ‘stability’ in the Caribbean. The ‘invasion’ lasted for eight years, during which time Dominicans waged guerrilla war against their occupiers. Despite the guerrilla resistance, this period, Ruck (1991/1998, p.23) argues, contributed to the “Americanizing” of the Dominican economy, “as well as aspects of Dominican culture”. Largely because of
this, Klein (1991b, p.12) argues, “to this day [the occupation] remains a source of resentment among many Dominican nationalists”.

The 1920s “saw the beginning of intra-Caribbean competition” (Klein, 1991b, p.17). The number of visiting teams playing in the Dominican Republic increased substantially. Arguably this is related to the growing interconnectedness of the Caribbean, as well as the burgeoning reputation of Dominican baseball following successive victories over American navy teams. The flow of players from the Dominican Republic to other countries increased. Dominican players “were increasingly found on the rosters of teams in Puerto Rico, Cuba and Venezuela ... At the same time foreign players were becoming increasingly common in Dominican baseball” (Klein, 1991b, p.20). Nevertheless, Klein (1991b, p.18) argues, political and economic instability within the Dominican Republic “militated against sustained progress” of baseball.

By the end of the US occupation, in 1924, the American government imposed a massive ‘stabilization loan’ on the Dominican Republic, and “U.S. interests owned more than 80 percent of the cane fields and most of the key mills” (Ruck, 1991/1998, p.119). The American occupation paved the way for the US marine-trained Rafael Leónidas Trujillo Molina to become dictator of the Dominican Republic in 1930. Trujillo was well funded by the USA, and the American presence was effectively greater than it had ever been. The US government generally supported Trujillo’s strong-arm tactics, because they brought stability to the Dominican Republic. Stability also facilitated the growing organization of baseball and the increasing international movement of people associated with the game. In 1937, Trujillo’s government heavily
funded baseball, and several teams spent large sums of money recruiting the most
talented foreign players available – several of whom were playing in the Negro
Leagues. However, the massive expenditure involved could not be sustained and
effectively crippled baseball in the Republic. With no further funds forthcoming from
Trujillo, professional baseball came to an abrupt halt at the end of the season.
Nevertheless, amateur baseball continued to flourish, albeit on a fairly *ad hoc* basis.
The lack of professional or even highly organized baseball led to greater numbers of
Dominican players seeking employment overseas.

In 1944, the Dominican Republic national baseball team defeated Cuba in a
seven game series, which, Klein (1991b, p.28) argues, “served notice to the rest of
Latin America that the Dominicans would be heard from again”. Four years later, the
Dominican Republic team managed to win the amateur world championships for the
first (and, up until now, only) time.¹⁰ This, according to Ruck (1991/1998, p.102), was
“the pivotal year in Dominican baseball’s renaissance”. For Ruck (1991/1998, p.46),
this growing international success was a signal that, once again, “professional ball
was not long in the offing”. Up until this time, perhaps because of the obvious
differential interdependency of the Dominican Republic and the USA, Klein (1991b,
p.30) holds that Americans had largely “ignored Dominican baseball”. The racial
segregation in MLB had meant that this was largely inaccessible to most Dominican
players. As a result, Klein (1991b, p.30) argues, baseball “was able to develop its
distinctively Dominican character” in the Republic. After 1947, Major League teams
signed black Dominicans. There was a growing multi-directional flow of players, and
no doubt this contributed to baseball’s increasingly professional organization in the

¹⁰ Although Ruck (1991/1998) suggests that the Dominican Republic successfully defended their title
in 1950, the IBAF website indicates that Cuba won that year (IBAF, 2004).
Republic. Klein (1991b, p.31) argues that “with the return of professional baseball to the Dominican Republic came the return of foreigners to Dominican teams ... Similarly, Dominicans joined professional baseball teams from nearby countries in increasing numbers”.

For the most part, organized baseball in the Dominican Republic had been played in the summer. In 1956, however, the Dominican leagues switched to winter play and developed increasing ties with MLB.\(^{11}\) Klein (1991b, p.35) offers two main reasons for the increasing interdependency: (1) the “working relationships” between North American and Dominican teams which allowed for the ‘sharing’, on American terms, of players and expertise, and (2) the move of the Dominican baseball season from summer to winter meant that it could be subordinate to MLB “rather than a competitor with it”. These ties strengthened as a result of the revolution in Cuba. The unintended consequences of this revolution, and the subsequent American embargo, effectively dried up MLB’s most consistent pool of talent outside of the USA, and the principal focus for the recruitment of overseas players shifted, primarily, to Puerto Rico and the Dominican Republic.

Trujillo was assassinated in May 1961 and was succeeded by Jouquín Balaguer – an “underling of Trujillo” (Klein, 1991b, p.13). In the national elections in 1963, the “mildly left-of-center candidate, Juan Bosch” defeated Balaguer (Klein, 1991b, p.13). Bosch was ousted in a coup led by Col. Elías Wessín y Wessín in September 1963, after fears that the Republic would follow in the footsteps of Cuba. Undoubtedly, “the United States played a much more open role in this conflict than it

\(^{11}\) In the same year Ozzie Virgil became the first Dominican to play in the Major Leagues.
did elsewhere. It not only agitated to oust Bosch but sent Marines into the country to make sure Bosch’s supporters would not succeed in their efforts to regain power” (Klein, 1991b, p.13). The US marines occupied the country for two years, which contributed to a growth in “anti-Americanism” (Klein, 1991b, p.13). As in Cuba, baseball provided opportunities for Dominicans to demonstrate their resentment of their economically and politically dominating neighbour. Despite the tensions that increasingly characterized the growing Dominican subordination to the USA, during the 1960s and 1970s the winter leagues “flourished” (Ruck, 1991/1998, p.78-9). Several MLB players were making money during the winter by playing in the Dominican leagues. As Ruck (1991/1998, p.102) points out, “the flow of talent was hardly a one-way phenomenon. For almost every Latin American who travelled to the United States to play, a North American trekked southward during the winter”.

In 1976, the Free Agency law in MLB was passed. This effectively allowed players to break free from being ‘owned’ by their MLB team, which enabled them to negotiate higher salaries (Rader, 2002). This meant that Dominican players, already seen as a cheaper source of labour, became even more desirable. The numbers of MLB teams actively scouting Dominican baseball for talent increased dramatically after 1976. Before this time, only a handful of MLB teams “had been interested” (Klein, 1991b, p.42). Numerous clubs started their own baseball academies on the island. Klein (1991b, p.42) argues that:

The academy is the baseball counterpart of the colonial outpost, the physical embodiment overseas of the parent franchise. It operates more or less like the subsidiary of any other foreign company: it finds raw materials (talented athletes), refines them (trains the athletes), and ships abroad finished products (baseball players).
However, as Klein (1991b, p.59) later points out, the suggestion that the academies are solely exploitative is inadequate because it “overlooks a fundamental reality of Dominican life”: that those attending the academies get paid considerably more than the vast majority in the Republic. Nevertheless, the balance of power was very firmly with the MLB teams. The ‘working relationships’ agreement between MLB and Dominican teams means that the vast majority of the best players are expected to forgo playing in the Republic. As Klein (1991b) points out the financial risk of injury is too great for the individual and the MLB club paying the wages. The academies had, Klein (1991b, p.152) argues, “the unforeseen effect of discouraging Dominican stars from taking part in winter play”. It seems likely that this contributed to a downturn in the standard of play in the Dominican leagues. This, in turn, contributed to declining attendances throughout the 1980s (Ruck, 1991/1998). This situation was not helped by the economic collapse within the Dominican Republic during this period. While it is unclear whether there is any evidence to support his claim, Ruck (1991/1998) adds that in this period baseball’s supremacy on the island was being challenged by basketball’s growing popularity.

In 1985, the Dominican Summer League (DSL) was initiated, Ruck (1991/1998, p.196) argues, to allow MLB teams to “develop players for whom they cannot obtain visas to play in the United States”. Ruck (1991/1998, p.196) describes this development as “the most visible and important result of major league baseball’s expanded Dominican presence”. As is the case with Cuba, there is increasing Japanese interest in baseball in the Republic. The Hiroshima Carp baseball club, for example, developed an academy there in the early 1990s (Klein, 1991b).
During the 1980s, mediated images of baseball in the Dominican Republic were still dominated by MLB. For Klein (1991b, p.126), the coverage of baseball in the Dominican Republic had long had a "nationalistic bent" and, what is more, he argues, "the flames of nationalist resentment are not difficult to fan considering the history of American intervention in the country" (Klein, 1991b, p.156). This nationalistic bent to the coverage arguably increased, as increasing numbers of Dominicans began to play within MLB during and after the 1980s. Dominican players became increasingly central to the coverage; so much so that Klein (1991) argues that one could be forgiven, when reading the Dominican press, for thinking that most baseball players in MLB were Dominican. The Dominican press lauds the performances of 'their' players over and above all others – especially Americans. Indeed, the North American players are often "the victims of invidious comparisons" (Klein, 1991b, p.124). The development of a we-group identity within the Dominican press contributed to the associated development of 'group charisma' in relation to baseball, in terms of the successful Dominicans playing in MLB. Paradoxically, there was an increase in what may be called 'blame-gossip' and 'group disgrace' in relation to American wrongdoings regarding the pilfering of talent from the Dominican Republic. Klein (1991b, p.117) is of the view that this is an example of symbolic resistance to the American dominance, in baseball "they have contradicted the notion that economic domination automatically results in cultural domination and cultural inferiority". Indeed, Klein (1991b, p.119) argues, "baseball is in effect the Dominican vehicle for resistance to American cultural domination". Despite the general decline in the Dominican economy "there was little outrage directed against North America in the front pages" (Klein, 1991b, p.120). Thus, it seems to me, given the newspapers' reluctance to attack the USA on the political front, the hostility in the context of
baseball seems to be a sublimated form of resistance, a veiled form of more general resistance. That this resistance finds expression most particularly through sport, illustrates, once again, that it is a less ‘dangerous’ area in which to express such resistance. That is to say, it is less likely that Dominican’s are in a position to resist American economic and political advances. Klein (1991b) argues that an apparent paradox exists in the relationship between the Dominican Republic and MLB. Although one might examine this relationship as being based solely on exploitation, he maintains, it cannot be denied that for the most talented Dominican players, America was the source of considerable riches. Despite this, Klein (1991b) argues that the likelihood of success is negligible. Today, nearly 10% of MLB players are from the Dominican Republic (King, 2002a, p.36), and the fact that their country contributes more than twice as many players than any other overseas country to the MLB is a source of pride to many Dominicans.

6.1.4 Baseball in Mexico

The initial development of baseball in Mexico mirrored closely the development of the game in the Dominican Republic. A blend of Cuban and American influences contributed to baseball supplanting cricket as the most popular summer team sport. Many Cubans fleeing their country during the Ten Years War (1868-78) arrived in Mexico and, in the words of Olesak & Olesak (1996, p.5), “the Cubans became baseball ambassadors”. After the American-Mexican War (1846-48), and the subsequent resolutions regarding the Rio-Grande border, American

---

12 Mexico was at war with the USA in 1846. According to Klein (1997, p. 25) many agree that this war “was engineered to satiate US thirst for territory”. Immediately following the war, the Treaty of Gualupe Hidalgo was signed in 1848. The treaty essentially outlined that the border between the countries was to be the Rio Grande – and in so doing, this separated the area of Laredo into two different countries. After the treaty, “the unequal economies of border communities grew sharply”, so that, “by the mid-1850s, the American cities had the benefit of low-tariffs, free internal trade, and a
influence in Mexico steadily grew. Klein (1997) argues that in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, Mexican nationalism grew out of political-economic expansion programmes developed during the reign of the Mexican President, Porfirio Díaz. The desire to build an extensive railroad network was part of these expansion programmes. This led to Americans working in Mexico from the late 1870s. Not surprisingly, the increased American presence contributed to the further development of baseball.

Joseph (1988, p.30) argues that “initially the sport was appropriated by an exclusive urban-based regional oligarchy that prided itself on imitating the latest *fin d’siècle* trends in foreign recreation and leisure”. Indeed, Klein (1997, p.33) points out that a series of American exhibition games were played in Mexico in 1882, in front of largely “Anglo crowds”. During most of the 1880s, the development of the sport was “haphazard”, but in 1887 “a three-team circuit (including one all-Mexican club) was formed. By 1888 baseball was established in Mexico City” (Klein, 1997, p.33). However, “baseball struggled to survive” as a viable business (Schell, 1993, p.272). Schell (1993, p.272) argues that the trend of importing professionals from the USA by the turn of the century “wrecked the teams’ finances”. In 1900, the organized “league disintegrated and games were irregular for several seasons” (Schell, 1993, p.272).

Under the Díaz regime, “in collusion with Mexico’s ‘progressive’ ruling elite”, Schell (1993, p.259) argues, “American investors created” what he refers to as “economic ‘underdevelopment’ by exporting profits instead of reinvesting them, and impoverished the populace both economically, by squeezing out local entrepreneurs, and culturally, by displacing tradition”. The Mexican authorities started to eliminate rapidly expanding capitalist economy, compared to a generally under-developing Mexican economy (Klein, 1997, p.26).
numerous traditional festival pastimes, which were increasingly deemed ‘uncivilized’. Porfirio Díaz actively encouraged the adoption of American activities in particular – a hallmark that certain historians have referred to as the “Porfirian persuasion” (Guttmann, 1994, p.84). Of course, it is not so straightforward to suggest that all traditional pastimes were eradicated. Schell (1993, p.260) argues that, “Americans were as likely to absorb Mexican culture (Mexicanization or creolization) as Mexicans were to absorb that of Americans (Americanization).” This rather overstates the case, given the obvious differential interdependency ties; nevertheless, it does underline the importance of a multi-directional understanding of the flow of cultural diffusion. There was a growing sense of Mexican national identity too. Klein (1997, p.30) holds that, “while the price paid for this expansion (e.g. the dispossessing of most of Mexico’s small farmers, and wholesale encouragement of foreign colonialism) ultimately led to his demise, Díaz’s presidency most certainly fostered Mexican nationalism”. Baseball became an increasing aspect of this sense of Mexican identity.

In 1904, the Mexican Baseball Association was formed and a national competition started. In 1907, the Chicago White Sox played a series of exhibition games in Mexico (Schell, 1993) and subsequently developed a training headquarters there. In so doing they became the first MLB club to set up such a facility outside of the USA (Olesak & Olesak, 1996). The flow of baseball traffic was not all one-way. In 1910 a Mexican team, the Laredo Bermudas, started to compete in the professional Southwest Texas (minor) League (Klein, 1997).
The American presence in Mexico had grown substantially during the Díaz years. By 1910, LaFeber (1994, p.278) indicates that “U.S. investment in Mexico had skyrocketed to $2 billion … Americans owned 43 percent of all the property values in Mexico – 10 percent more than the Mexicans owned themselves”. These American investments were thrown into turmoil when Díaz was overthrown in 1911. This was followed by a further six years of revolution. During the Mexican Revolution, baseball was suspended in many parts of the country. The end of the revolution facilitated a period of sustained baseball development. Indeed, baseball was strongly promoted, along with other sports, under the ideology of the socialist revolutionary leaders in Mexico during the 1920s. During “President Alvaro Obregón’s regime of reconstruction (1920-1924)”, Joseph (1988, p.42) holds, “baseball began to gain a foothold among Mexico’s popular classes”. The Mexican Baseball League was established in 1925. For the first decade or so, schedules, and the organization of the league in general, were characterized by instability. The better-organized teams were based in Mexico City – and many of the teams fielded foreign players, particularly Cubans.

The interrelationship between baseball in the USA and Mexico grew considerably throughout the next twenty years. Increasing numbers of Mexicans were playing in the USA. In addition, some Americans – largely from the Negro Leagues – were playing in the Mexican League. Toward the end of the 1930s, Klein (1997, p.67) argues that the Mexican League was far more organized than it had been, and “the caliber of baseball was good and getting better”. This organized era for baseball was helped by the financial involvement of the wealthy Pasquel brothers. With their financial, political and social influence in Mexico, they sought and found “owners
who were more committed to regularly fielding established teams that would be
profitable" (Klein, 1997, p.68). The search for better players increasingly spread to
the USA. By 1946, this push for American players reached significant proportions.
Backed primarily by Jorge Pasquel, Mexican League clubs were actively seeking to
sign Major League talent in what has “become known as the “baseball war” of 1946”
(Klein, 1997, p.67). We have already very briefly discussed the impact of the
manoeuvrings of Pasquel on baseball in Cuba. However, the impact on the
relationship between Mexico and the USA was even greater. In this regard, Klein
(1997, p.69) argues, “the entire season took on an aura of international conflict”.

Baseball in the USA had been characterized by a number of internal conflicts.
But the 1946 season witnessed the first, and arguably the only, significant attempt to
usurp the American monopoly on so-called ‘organized baseball’ from outside the
USA. Club owners within the Mexican League were urged on by Pasquel to entice
players already contracted to MLB clubs in time for the 1946 season. The nature of
player contracts within MLB was extremely restrictive. An individual player would be
contracted to a particular franchise, and would play for any farm club – home or
abroad – owned by that franchise. Beyond that, the player’s movements and
availability for other clubs were governed by the organization that ‘owned’ their
contract. So, when Mexican League clubs started to offer players large sums of money
to break their contracts, MLB administrators regarded it as an attack on their
authority.

Pasquel received overwhelming support in Mexico. For some time American
teams had been ‘raiding’ Mexican teams, as well as teams in Cuba, for their best
players. Klein (1997, p.78) argues that for Mexican “nationalists and beisbolistas this was as naked a form of imperialism as the Marine invasions; and it was this that built up the reservoir of anger and resentment that Pasquel could tap into at any time”. Pasquel was not simply motivated by his own resentment toward the USA. Rather, this desire was blended with his aspirations to make the Mexican League the only viable baseball organization in Mexico (Klein, 1997). A rival organization, the Mexican National League, had been vying for recognition as part of the minor league circuit since 1944 (Klein, 1997). In this respect, Pasquel’s efforts paid off because the rival league folded midway through the 1946 season.

Numerous players were attracted to Mexico and broke their MLB contracts (Guttmann, 1994). The Mexican League’s challenge to MLB, however, was short-lived. By the following season normal service had been resumed. The Mexican clubs were not able to generate sufficient funds at the gate to sustain the huge expenditure, and the flow of top players, specifically, came to an abrupt halt. An unintended consequence of this development was that, in many respects, the MLB tightened their grip on baseball in other Latino countries. They reacted to Pasquel’s threat by signing numerous ‘agreements’ regarding the movement of players between the minor and Major Leagues in the USA, and the growing number of winter leagues in Caribbean countries. It would be an exaggeration, however, to argue that MLB were all-powerful and were simply unaffected by the Mexican challenge. The challenge, as Klein (1997, p.90) argues, acted as a “catalyst” for the development of a players union within the USA – a lasting legacy. As Klein (1997, p.90) states, “one of the most poignant criticisms leveled against major league baseball by Pasquel had to do with the collective inability of players to get salary increases from owners”. With significant
players already jumping ship, a Boston-based lawyer, Robert Murphy, seized the chance to establish the American Baseball Guild in April 1946 (Klein, 1997). Murphy took the baseball establishment in the USA to court and, by mid-season, the National and American Leagues agreed to consult players on the drafting of new contracts. "While the concession was miniscule by comparison to the post-reserve conditions of today's players", Klein (1997, p.93) is of the view that "it marked the first time that these major league owners had had to make any concessions [to players] at all".

The Mexican League continued, but no further cross-border raids were attempted. Pasquel remained at the head of the league until his death in 1955, when Alejo Peralta took over his position. According to LaFrance (1995, p.113), "Peralta, along with other private-sector owners ... reshaped the circuit, increasing its prestige and power. They gained its affiliation with the United States AAA-level, minor league baseball". The formation of a bi-national Mexican League club, in 1985, is an expression of the growing interdependency between Mexico and the USA. Klein (1997) argues that this was an unprecedented step, and marked the first time that any sports club would be based in two different countries. The Telecotes de los dos Laredos, or 'Tecos' as they were also known (Klein, 1997), played approximately half their games in Nuevo Laredo, Mexico and half in Laredo, Texas.

There has long been a quota on the number of imported players allowed at any one club in the Mexican Leagues – though the number allowed has fluctuated considerably over time. Imports are clearly coveted by owners of the Mexican teams, because they have generally proved to be of a very high standard. Imports tend to get better pay than their domestic colleagues and quite often travel separately, with better
facilities (especially if they are players ‘owned’ by an MLB club). Klein (1997) contends that the issue of imports in the Mexican game evokes strong feeling from Mexican fans and players alike. This is unsurprising, when considering the resentment generated by their “somewhat privileged” position is compounded by the perception that some of them show “intolerance and disrespect for Mexican customs” (Klein, 1997, p.146). Furthermore, Klein (1997, p.146) argues, “the Imports’ presence highlights the perceived inferior status of Mexican baseball – that it must retain these reprehensible individuals in order to succeed. To many this smacks of cultural imperialism”. Although Klein (1997) does not suggest who the ‘many’ people are that he is referring to here.

Despite the growing interdependency of Americans and Mexicans – particularly around the Rio Grande cities of Laredo (USA) and Nuevo Laredo (Mexico) – today, the Mexican Summer League (MSL) has greater autonomy from MLB than most other Latino leagues. Players involved with the MSL are contracted to the league, and any MLB team wanting to offer one of these players a contract must buy them out of their existing contract. Hence, many MLB clubs look elsewhere for cheaper talent. Despite this, MLB still play an active part in the Mexican baseball market. The decision by MLB to stage the 1999 season’s opening games in Monterrey is an expression of the desire to break into the Mexican market.

6.1.5 Baseball in other parts of Pan Americana

Baseball is also played extensively in other parts of Latin America. It is a popular sport in Venezuela, Nicaragua, Panama and Puerto Rico, for example. However, very little information is available about the development of baseball in
these countries that has been published in English. The development of baseball in Venezuela, it seems, mirrored that in other parts of Latin America. Olesak & Olesak (1996, p.7) maintain that it was a Cuban, Emilio Cramer who, with his “travelling “All-Star” team”, first brought baseball to Venezuela. It remained an amateur sport here for the first decades of the twentieth century. Olesak & Olesak (1996, p.49) argue that Venezuela’s success in winning the Mundiales in 1941, and again in 1944 and 1945, “laid the foundation for the formation of the Venezuelan winter league”, which was a professional league.

According to Vargas (2000, p.25) today, the “intensity of MLB recruitment in Venezuela is … undermining the criollitos – youth league baseball”. This is because there is a tendency for MLB teams to recruit large swathes of Venezuelan youths, in a largely unregulated manner. Like with other Latin Americans, MLB teams can recruit many more Venezuelans for their money than Americans and, as such, tend to “oversign” the Latino players – “most of whom they release within two years” (Vargas, 2000, p.27). Regalado (2000, p.18) has labelled this process “the “quality in quantity” principle”. This, not surprisingly, has an adverse effect on the development of these players within Venezuela. Today, 28 out of the 30 MLB franchises have academies in Venezuela (Vargas, 2000, p.28). Furthermore, MLB International has held annual festivals here since 1998 in order to promote the MLB product more fully.

In 1838, Nicaragua was declared independent from Spain. This merely led to greater influence, economically and culturally, from Great Britain and then the USA (Kennedy, 1988/1990); cricket and baseball were both played in Nicaragua by the end of the nineteenth century. According to Wagner (1988, p.117), “sometime prior to the
1890s ... baseball was introduced and took hold” in Nicaragua. It is difficult to be anymore accurate, but Wagner (1988, p.119) argues that, “by the 1890s baseball leagues were well organized in Nicaragua, and results were reported regularly in the newspapers”.

US troops occupied Nicaragua for almost two decades from 1912. Wagner (1988, p.114) argues that this was “in an attempt to bring about pro-US stability”. The American troops withdrew in 1933, after six years of guerrilla warfare with the natives. Anastasio Somoza Garcia “seized control of the government and established a family dictatorship, which lasted until 1979” (Wagner, 1988, p.114). Under these conditions, baseball remained the most popular sport in Nicaragua. Indeed, “by the middle of the twentieth century”, Wagner (1984, p.119) argues, “baseball was played everywhere in Nicaragua”. After many years of unrest, the Sandanistas finally overthrew the Somoza government in 1979. Sport, as was the case in other revolutionary societies, was systematically organized under the Sandanista regime. Baseball remains the most popular sport in Nicaragua (Wagner, 1988) to this day.

On 3 November 1903, the Panamanians declared themselves independent from Colombia. In a move designed to preserve their independence – and no doubt extend American influence – American ships immediately moved into the area. “Within two weeks, the United States had been granted use and occupation of the Canal Zone” (Olesak & Olesak, 1996, p.11). As had been the case elsewhere where American forces had been present, baseball was introduced to Panama, and “by 1912 Panama had its own league” (Olesak & Olesak, 1996, p.11). According to the Federación Panameña de Béisbol Aficionado, in their response to my questionnaire, the first
national federation for baseball was set up in 1944. Baseball became a professional sport in Panama from 1946; and has remained closely linked with MLB ever since.

Cubans also took baseball to Puerto Rico. Both were Spanish colonies – and the ties between the two also involved a flow of people. In 1897, Puerto Rico gained independence from Spain, and in that same year, Olesak and Olesak (1996, p.6) argue, “local newspapers first reported on Puerto Rican baseball”. The first organized game did not take place until January 1898. From this time, until the late 1930s, Olesak and Olesak (1996, p. 47) argue, “life in Puerto Rico … was an economic roller coaster. As a commonwealth of the United States, the island nation had at first benefited from US-led development of the sugar and tobacco industries, but that stream of economic aid was reduced to a trickle during the [American] Depression”. Baseball was played during this time, albeit sporadically, but in 1938, the Puerto Rico baseball league was founded, and the game became more organized.

Today, baseball remains extremely popular in Puerto Rico. This is, Olesak & Olesak (1996, p.155) argue, largely because of “the continuing support the game receives in the schools. Most of the other Latin countries’ school systems cannot afford organized sports – they barely have enough money for a few books. Not so in Puerto Rico, where the school system benefits from US support”.

Very little available information on baseball in other parts of Pan Americana makes it is impossible to comment on the state of development of baseball anywhere else within the region. Table 6.1 gives some, albeit incomplete, information when
countries within the region first set up a national federation, and the current number of
people registered to their national federations where those figures were available.

Table 6.1: Pan Americana countries affiliated to the IBAF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>First Federation</th>
<th>Current membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aruba</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahamas</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Virgin Islands</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada#</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>510,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>8,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>119,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>4,535,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherland Antilles</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>5,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>15,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>123,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Virgin Islands</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA+</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>20,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Registered in Pan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americana</td>
<td><strong>Approx: 25,333,683</strong>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Personal correspondence with Federations where bold; all other information from the IBAF website (IBAF, 2004).

#A national federation existed in Canada long before this time, but this was the date provided by Baseball Canada for when their particular organisation was established.

+ This is the date provided on the IBAF website. However, clearly it is not the first organization of a national federation for baseball in the USA, but when the current organization responsible for governing amateur baseball in the USA, USA Baseball, was set up. Furthermore, the IBAF website indicates that there are less than 5 million registered players in the USA, which seems rather cautious. The figure provided in the table, then, is taken from the official website for USA Baseball (USA Baseball, 2004).

* This total is likely to be higher because there is no available data for registered players in the Dominican Republic, which is likely to add thousands to the list. Furthermore, the number of registered players in the USA seems to be rather cautious.
6.2 Baseball in Asia

Outside North, Central and South America, baseball is most popular in Asia. Nineteen nations are affiliated to the IBAF from Asia. Baseball in Japan and South Korea, especially, is extremely well organized, and both these nations have well-established professional leagues. Baseball is regarded as the number one sport in Japan, and Asia is definitely the most significant continent for the development of baseball outside of the Americas. Only 5 out of the 19 national federations within this region responded to the questionnaire (Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, the Philippines and Singapore). So, once again, many of the 'results' within this sub-section are inevitably, derived from secondary sources. Again, however, this has not prevented a fairly comprehensive account of the development of baseball in parts of this region, because there are some extensive secondary source materials covering baseball in Asia, but most notably, Japan.

6.2.1 Baseball in Japan

Historically, successive Japanese rulers had pursued a policy of isolation, when in the nineteenth century, and most noticeably after the arrival of Perry's Ships in 1853, those in power embarked on a 'modernization' process (Kennedy, 1988/1990). The new policy was, more than likely, both a defensive and aggressive response to the increasing global penetration of other world powers in an increasingly interdependent world. The Meiji Restoration of 1867 soon followed, and Saeki (1989, p.53) asserts that "Japanese society actively embraced the advanced civilization of the West and began to modernize". Traditional Japanese pastimes such as *kemari*, *dakyu* and *yabusame* declined in favour of 'modern', western sports (Saeki, 1989). In the last quarter of the nineteenth century, baseball became one of several aspects of
western culture adopted within large parts of Japanese society. It was first developed in Japan by a combination of Americans, teaching English there, and Japanese nationals, who had seen the game played whilst studying in the USA (Guttmann, 1994; Ikei, 2000; Whiting, 1990). The game became popular amongst the upper classes in Japan, and "the Ministry of Education deemed it good for the national character" (Whiting, 1990, p.28). The inclusion of baseball within the educational system was a crucial element in its sustained development (Ikei, 2000). It also meant that it initially remained more or less the realm of the "educational elite in Japan" (Mullan, 1999, p.85).

Significantly, when baseball was first played in Japan, there are clear indications that the indigenous population started to modify the game in line with more traditional Japanese practices. This process is almost inevitable, albeit to different degrees, and in many respects inadvertent. Those amongst the indigenous population teaching baseball applied martial arts philosophy to their coaching methods (Ikei, 2000; Whiting, 1990). It was regarded by many "as a moral discipline" (Whiting, 1990, p.29) and required a "spiritual approach" (Ikei, 2000, p.75). According to Ikei (2000, p.75), "the expression 'way of baseball' was even coined". In contrast to this, the Americans teaching baseball in Japan, not surprisingly, approached the game in the way they were brought up to play it in the USA (Whiting, 1990).

In the early 1890s, 'The First Higher School of Tokyo', Ichiko School baseball team, were the epitome of the 'Japanese approach' of hard training and discipline. Their team developed a great rivalry with Meiji Gakuin School - which was founded
by Christian missionaries from the USA. The Meiji school team were taught to
approach baseball from a more American style. By the middle of the decade, it was
Ichiko that had become the finest proponents of the game in Japan (Whiting, 1990).
This, combined with the fact that they defeated a team of American members of the
Yokohoma Country Athletic Club in 1896, was a major catalyst for the growth of
‘Japanese style’ baseball (Mullan, 1999). The defeat of the ‘Yokohoma nine’ made
“newspaper headlines across the land” (Whiting, 1990, p.33). Graduates from Ichiko
became widely sought after at other educational institutions as baseball’s popularity
spread throughout the Japanese school system. Thus, it was the Japanese approach to
baseball that was in the ascendancy.

Whiting (1990, p.34) argues that during the first decades of the twentieth
century “intercollegiate baseball was the country’s major sport. It had become a
symbol of the nation’s progress in its efforts to catch the West”. In so doing,
following an initial foray to the USA by Waseda University in 1905, many of Japan’s
leading universities started to tour abroad (Maitland, 1991; Whiting, 1990). For
example, upon “returning to Japan, Waseda helped develop and popularize baseball
… incorporating ideas the players and coaches had learned on the US tour” (Maitland,
1991, p.23). In addition, more and more Japanese nationals, in general, were
emigrating to the USA, and, by the end of the 1890s, they were already beginning to
make an impression on amateur baseball league competitions there (Mullan, 1999;
Shea, 2002).

In 1905, a debate regarding the merits of the growing popularity of baseball
was conducted between rival local and national newspapers in Japan. Many
considered that the game bred a desire to win and encouraged poor habits seen as antithetical to Japanese culture (Whiting, 1990). Nevertheless, “baseball survived the assault”, partly due to overwhelming support of other newspapers (Whiting, 1990, p.35). In many respects, the war of words generated in the press served to promote baseball, and the Japanese style in particular, and it continued to grow apace (Whiting, 1990). In 1908, a team of professional players from the USA toured Japan. The *Reach All-Stars* were a team of Major League reserves and players from the minor Pacific Coast League (PCL) “sponsored by the Reach Sporting Goods Company, which had taken an interest in the growing Japanese market” (Whiting, 1990, p.39). In 1913, a world baseball exhibition tour, led by Charles Comiskey and John McGraw, played three matches in Japan, including one match against a Japanese nine from *Keio University*. Crowds of several thousand attended each game, and the matches were “intensely covered by the Japanese media” (Elfers, 2003, p.111). At this time, Elfers (2003, p.108) argues, “Japan was every bit as mad about baseball as was the United States”.

In 1914, “the two oldest private universities in Tokyo”, *Waseda* and *Keio*, organized a “regular schedule of contests” (Andreano, 1973, p.131). In 1915, the first National Secondary School Championship meeting was held. This soon became an annual event that few other sporting events in Japan could rival for popularity. The *Asahi Shimbun* newspaper sponsored it, generating considerable publicity for the competition. During the 1920s, yet more American teams – more often than not made up of minor league players – toured to Japan and played matches against their hosts.

---

13 There is some discrepancy over the actual starting date for this tournament. Saeki (1989) and Whiting (1990) state that it began in 1915, whereas Maitland (1991) and *Transworld Sport* (2001) suggest that it started in 1924. It would seem that the tournament began in 1915, but in 1924 it was played for the first time at the newly built Koshien Stadium in Nishinomiya, where it has been played ever since and has become known as the ‘Koshien tournament’. 
In 1922, the *Mita Club*, from Shibaura, became the first Japanese team to beat a professional American team (Whiting, 1990, p.40). In 1925, the first Tokyo Six University Baseball League competition was organized, a competition that is still held today. In 1931, Herb Hunter, who had arranged tours during the 1920s, enlisted star name attractions, including Lou Gehrig, to play matches in Japan. The *Yomiuri Shimbun* newspaper sponsored the tour (Whiting, 1990). The newspaper sponsored another tour in 1934, which featured the most prestigious name in baseball, Babe Ruth. The owner of the *Yomiuri Shimbun*, Matsutaro Shoriki, had a vested interest in developing baseball in Japan. He had aspirations to establish a professional league. In December 1934, he established the first professional team, the *Dai Nippon Tokyo Yakyu Kurabu* (the Great Japan Tokyo Baseball Club) (Whiting, 1990). The team toured the USA in 1935, playing over one hundred matches against several minor league sides (Whiting, 1990). During this tour, Shoriki changed the name of his team to the *Tokyo Giants*, after the *New York Giants*, because so many American correspondents had difficulties with the long name (Whiting, 1990). The new name was retained after the team returned to Japan.

Before the establishment of the *Tokyo Giants*, baseball in Japan was strictly amateur. The “focus”, Whiting (1990, p.39) argues, was “on purity” and the “idea of playing for money struck many Japanese as somehow profane”. However, the success of the *Tokyo Giants*, and the increasing influence of Japanese entrepreneurs like Shoriki, contributed to the development of a professional league in 1936. Seven Japanese firms established teams alongside the *Tokyo Giants*. Bucky Harris (born Andrew Harris McGaillard), having had no MLB experience, became the first imported player from the USA when he was signed as catcher for *Nagoya* in 1936. He
later switched to the Eagles and won a Most Valuable Player (MVP) award in the 1937 season. After the comparative success of Harris, numerous other Americans were imported too – with mixed success. The league, as a whole, also enjoyed mixed success, with only the Giants really excelling on the field and off of it, in terms of income generation and gate attendance (Whiting, 1990).

The professional league continued until the 1941 bombing of Pearl Harbour by the Japanese air force. Soon after this, the militarists controlling Japan disbanded the league. Following the war, despite the devastation in Japan, the “Allied High Command officials”, Whiting (1990, p.48) argues, “recognized baseball’s potential for boosting morale and allowed it to resume”. Baseball became increasingly popular with the lower-classes (Andreano, 1973). Americans were also increasingly prominent in Japanese baseball teams. Indeed, Japan was flooded with American aspects of culture, so much so that Whiting (1990, p.273) refers to a post-war process of the “Americanization of Japan”, “symbolized” most notably, he argues, by “Coca-Cola and jazz” (Whiting, 1990, p.48).

By 1950, the status of professional baseball was sufficiently strong to encourage the establishment of two leagues (the Central and the Pacific) – with the winners of each meeting in a final ‘Japan Series’. The competition structure was clearly modelled on MLB. After some tinkering, the structure of the leagues resembled the way they are today, when in 1953 the Central League became comprised of six clubs, and the Pacific League followed suit in 1958. The professional game took off with the growth of television in the 1950s (Whiting, 1990). Japanese teams started to import players from abroad, although league rules restricted the number of gaijins (the term used by the Japanese for foreign players) permissible in each team. The amateur game also...
remained popular after the war. Japanese administrators were amongst those who were instrumental in establishing the Asian Baseball Federation in 1953.15

In 1956, Japanese companies started to export baseball and softball gloves to the USA. By 1963, “Japan controlled 60% of the US market for these products” (Fielding and Miller 1996, p.76). In addition to this growing influence in the USA, Japanese teams were in an increasingly strong financial position because of the growing revenue from television. Several clubs began to employ ex-MLB players. In response, in 1963 the protectionist policy of three gaijins per team was tightened and the number of overseas players per club was reduced to two (Whiting, 1990).

In 1964, the first Japanese player to feature in MLB was a further expression of this growing interdependency between Japan and the USA (MLB, 2001; Nishihara, 2002). Masanori Murakami was playing in the USA in 1964 as a result of an agreement between his Japanese club, the Nankai Hawks, and the San Francisco Giants. The agreement enabled Hawks’ players to gain experience within the Giants’ ‘farm system’. Murakami’s pitching had so impressed the Giants that he was selected for the first team toward the end of the regular season, and he made his debut on 1st September. The Giants exercised a clause in the agreement that meant that the pitcher would be contracted to them in the 1965 season. Despite initial resistance from the Hawks — and a “bitter war of words” (Albright, 2002) — Murakami played for the San Francisco Giants in 1965. However, as Albright (2002) points out, this was only after the intervention of the US State Department. Albright (2002) perceptively suggests that the Vietnam War and the growing Cold War contributed to the State

---

15 Although, the first time a Japanese national side competed in the amateur world championships was not until 1972.
Department's involvement, because they did not want this matter to affect the increasingly warm relations between the Japanese and Americans. An agreement was reached, which meant that Murakami could play in the USA in 1965, and would then be free to make his own decision whether to stay or return to Japan. Murakami had a reasonably successful year, but at the end of the season he elected to return home. After the problems associated with the "Murakami affair" (Albright, 2002), the Japanese League resisted further attempts to lure their players to the USA. Indeed, this resistance was maintained for a period of thirty years.

Even the limited number of foreign players allowed in each Japanese team brought with it problems. The indigenous players often expressed indignation that the *gaijins* received better pay, and American players, in particular, tended to struggle with Japanese culture and the disciplinary style of Japanese baseball. These problems contributed to the fact that, by the late 1970s, teams started to become far "more selective in signing Americans" (Whiting, 1990, p.93). Japanese clubs started to do character checks, as well as the more standard checks for baseball ability. Related to this, some Japanese teams looked elsewhere for potential talent. For example, the *Yomiuri Giants* set up training camps in Guam, some teams train in Australia and others in Saipan (Maitland, 1991). Nevertheless, the appeal of the American market was not entirely dismissed, of course. As Maitland (1991, p.30) indicates, "since 1978 the Yakult Swallows have set up camp in Yuma, Arizona". This has generated considerable interest in the state of Arizona, which, as Maitland (1991, p.30) points out, now "hosts the largest annual Japanese business and cultural festival in the US". In addition to the presence of the *Swallows* on American soil, the *Yomiuri Giants* have sent teams to play in the winter instructional league in Arizona (Maitland, 1991). The
situation back in Japan, however, reached significant proportions when three American *gaijin* walked out on their teams in the middle of the 1984 season, and the “sports press roundly decried the foreign devils” (Whiting, 1990, p.100). Whiting (1990, p.100) asserts that there was a “growing wave of anti-American sentiment” in baseball. Indeed, “feelings ran so high that the pro baseball team owners voted to expurgate the foreigners completely from Japanese baseball within the next five years” (Whiting, 1990, p.100). This decision was never actually implemented, but Whiting (1990, p.100) argues that this represented the “lowest ebb in the history of U.S.-Japan baseball relations”. In 1985, a reserve Major League player called Randy Bass briefly redeemed the reputation of American players. He was successful on-the-field and was considered to be very respectful to his Japanese hosts. “For a time”, Whiting (1990, p.106) argues, “Bass came as close to being a bona fide national hero as any *gaijin* ballplayer ever has”. The problems associated with numerous *gaijin* did little to diminish the popularity of baseball. Indeed, Saeki (1989, p.51-2) argues, in the mid-1980s, in terms of “telecasting hours and audience ratings”, high school baseball was second only to professional baseball as the most popular televised sport. Furthermore, throughout the 1980s, attendances at professional games increased by “about 50 percent” on the level set in the 1970s (Whiting, 1990, p.119).

In 1987, according to Maitland (1991) and Whiting (1990), J. Bob Horner was regarded as the first MLB player still at the top of his game to play in Japan. Whiting (1990, p.6) asserts that, “after decades of bench-warmers and faded stars, here, finally, was an American product worth paying for”. In 1986, Horner was in the final year of his contract with the *Atlanta Braves*, and he had a particularly good season. As a free

---

16 Japan won the demonstration baseball event at the Los Angeles Olympics that same year – defeating a “strong American side composed of college stars” (Maitland, 1991, p.34).
agent, he demanded a salary that no team in MLB was prepared to pay. Not so the *Yakult Swallows* from Japan. Indeed, they paid him more than twice the salary of the next highest paid player in Japan (Whiting, 1990). So, it would seem that at this time the monopolistic power of MLB teams over the most talented players (outside of Cuba, of course) was being challenged. Horner proved to be a success on the field, but moved back to MLB the following year, and less than a decade later the MLB were demonstrating their pull once more. In 1995, despite considerable public pressure for him to stay, the Los Angeles Dodgers signed Hideo Nomo, Japan’s most famous player of the time. In so doing, Nomo became only the second ever Japanese-born player to feature in MLB. His first season for the *Dodgers* was extremely successful. He was nominated “Rookie of the Year”. As a result of his success, more American teams began to look towards Japan for talent. Nomo’s success also generated considerable interest back in Japan. Through his success, Albright (2002) argues, Nomo “was no longer a traitor in the eyes of the Japanese public but a bona fide Japanese conquering hero”. This, undoubtedly, contributed to increasing sales of *Los Angeles Dodgers* merchandise, in particular, in Japan. This further encouraged MLB teams to look to Japan for players, because of the potential revenue generated from having a successful Japanese player on the team roster. Many Japanese teams formed working relationships with MLB franchises. Despite these agreements, Albright (2002) maintains that the “Japanese baseball establishment still has a reasonable degree of control [over players movements to the USA, in particular], and will not yield it quickly or easily”.

Such is the present level of inter-connectedness between MLB and Japanese baseball that, following the success of opening the MLB season in Mexico in 1999,
the 2000 MLB season officially opened in Tokyo. A year later, Ichiro Suzuki (popularly known as just Ichiro) became the first Japanese-born ‘position player’ (i.e. not a pitcher), to play in the American Major Leagues when he joined the Seattle Mariners. In his first season, he won the American League (AL) batting title and the Most Valuable Player (MVP) award for the AL. The success that Ichiro enjoyed added further appeal to the Japanese market.

Baseball’s popularity in Japan has led to Whiting (1990) arguing that there has been a growing Americanization of Japan. Nevertheless, he also argues that “baseball’s grip on Japan’s collective psyche is due, ultimately [sic], to the fact that it suits the national character” (Whiting, 1990, p.49). Whiting (1990, p.25) undermines his Americanization thesis elsewhere in his book, stating that baseball in Japan is a “totally different world with its own set of assumptions and values”. Thus, on the one hand he argues that Japan is Americanized, and on the other hand that Japan can be regarded as being so isolated that it is in a ‘world of its own’. The development of baseball in Japan is more adequately understood in terms of a blend of wider processes and influences and of growing interdependency chains more generally. In summary, while Cubans and Dominicans appear to approach baseball in a different manner to the Americans, in Japan the differences are even more striking. Maitland (1991, p. 7) argues that “baseball in Japan is played at a different pace, in a different style, and with different strategies” than the game played in the USA. A Japanese player’s attitude is often assessed alongside his baseball ability as being a measure of his likelihood for overall success. The doryoku, or ‘effort’, of those playing within Japan is seen as a major contribution to the differences between the approaches taken in the two countries. In Japan, pre-season training is more than a month longer – and
Pitchers, for example, are encouraged to practice throwing pitches every day. This is a practice frowned upon in the USA, because it is considered more appropriate for pitchers to 'save' their arms (Whiting, 1990). For Whiting (1990, p. 70), "the concept and practice of group harmony, or wa, is what most dramatically differentiates Japanese baseball from the American game". The American game is characterized far more by great individual moments of skill – whereas the Japanese spend a great deal more time practising, and place much greater stress on teamwork (Horowitz, 1995; Whiting, 1990). Whiting (1990, p. 49) argues that, "it has been the team aspects of the game, the sacrifice bunt, the squeeze, the hit-and-run, that have come to characterize Japanese baseball". Maitland (1991) points out that the time limit on the Japanese game (it is restricted to four hours, or a maximum of 12 innings in the Pacific League; and is restricted to a maximum of 12 innings in the Central League) renders certain aspects of the tactical side of baseball more appropriate. That is to say, there is a "play-for-one-run approach to baseball" and, thus, big hitting and home runs are less important to the Japanese game than they are to the American game (Maitland, 1991, p. 26).

Despite falling attendances at the turn of the century, Japanese baseball is growing in popularity again, with attendances increasing for the 2002 season (Garland, 2002). Alongside the continuing popularity of professional baseball in Japan, the amateur game remains popular. Indeed, the national Koshien school tournament, mentioned above, regularly attracts nearly one million spectators during the two-week period it is played (Maitland, 1991; Transworld Sport, 2001; Whiting, 1990). All 47 of Japan's "prefecture" schools take part, in what Maitland (1991, p. 22; emphasis in the original) refers to as "the baseball event in Japan". In most schools,
“players are expected to practice every single day, before and after school” (Whiting, 1990, p.247). The “Tokyo Six University League” continues to bolster the amateur game in Japan. As Maitland (1991, p.23) states, it remains the “flowerbed of college talent”. There is “extensive media coverage” of the major school and college tournaments which “fuels the popularity of baseball” (Ikei, 2000, p.74) even further.

6.2.2 Baseball in the rest of Asia

Although baseball is extremely popular in other parts of Asia (most noticeably Indonesia, the Philippines, South Korea and Taiwan17), very little has been published in English on the development of the game in this region. Reaves’ (2002) book, *Taking in a Game. A History of Baseball in Asia*, is a notable exception. However, even though Reaves (2002, p.2) argues that Japan is given only a “cursory glimpse” within his book, more space is devoted to the development of baseball here than in any other country in Asia. Reaves (2002) does justify this on the basis that it is the Japanese that have been as influential, if not more so, in developing baseball in Asia than the USA. This is the only source available, in English, regarding baseball in other parts of Asia, and this, together with the low response from Asian federations to my questionnaire, imposes limitations on this section.

Reaves argues that the history of baseball in China stretches back further than in any other Asian country. Baseball matches were played in China during the 1870s, helped largely by an education exchange programme set up by a Chinese man, Rong Hong, who became a naturalized American citizen in 1852 (Reaves, 2002). However, as Reaves (2002, p.27) concedes, “in truth, baseball never gained widespread

---

17 Under the terms of the International Olympic Committee (IOC), Taiwan is referred to as Chinese Taipei, by the IBAF – although, as a political entity it is called Taiwan; as such, I will refer to this country as Taiwan.
acceptance in China during the nineteenth or twentieth centuries. But the game did
have a small following”. In the 1990s, renewed attempts were made to introduce
baseball in China with only limited success. Reaves (2002, p.47) holds that, “Japan
showed signs of using baseball as a tool of diplomacy in its dealings with China in the
late 1990s. Baseball exchanges were frequent”. Nevertheless, baseball is not remotely
popular on mainland China today. Baseball is relatively popular in the, now Chinese
ruled, Hong Kong, however. The development of baseball in the Philippines, Korea
and Taiwan, is far more substantial. In this respect, Reaves (2002) argues, the
different levels of influence enjoyed by Japan and the USA in these countries is
strongly related to the fortunes of baseball.

Elfers (2003, p.137) argues that, “as in the Dominican Republic, Cuba, Puerto
Rico, Panama, and other nations, baseball arrived in the Philippines with America’s
argues, effectively led to the Philippines being a “sort of Asiatic colonial power” of
the USA. Not long after the war, the “first game of baseball in the Philippines was
played in May 1898” between American sailors and marines who had “served under
Commodore George Dewey during his recent victory at the Battle of Manila Bay”
(Reaves, 2002, p.91). The US military maintained control of the islands, and baseball
was played sporadically in the Philippines, and the Manila Baseball League was
created. Despite the “animosity” that the American presence in the Philippines
“stirred up”, Elfers (2003, p.137) argues, “the native Filipinos had heartily embraced
baseball”. At first, baseball was only really popular with the Filipinos as a spectator
sport; they tended to watch games featuring American naval teams (Reaves, 2002).
“By the early twentieth century”, Reaves (2002, p.93) argues, “the Filipinos clamored
to get out of the stands and out on the fields themselves”. The Reach All-Star team played exhibition matches in the Philippines in 1908, as they had done in Japan. The tour, Reaves (2002, p.96) holds, “heightened what by then was a growing passion for baseball among school-age Filipinos”. The development of baseball in the Philippines was boosted further by the visit of the Chicago White Sox and the New York Giants in December 1913, as part of a world tour of baseball. At the same time, an all-Filipino baseball team toured the USA (Reaves, 2002).

“Baseball continued to thrive in the Philippines until World War II with Japan and the Philippines developing a particularly healthy baseball rivalry” (Reaves, 2002, p.103). Despite the continued American military presence in the Philippines immediately after the Second World War, Reaves (2002, p.104) argues, “baseball never again captivated the youth of the country as it had during the first three decades of the century”. Furthermore, Reaves (2002) suggests that the diminishing popularity of baseball has coincided with an increasing popularity of basketball, though he provides only tenuous grounds for suggesting that this was a major reason for the demise of baseball. One reason, he argues, is that “it is cheaper, easier, and more exciting to play basketball in the Philippines” (Reaves, 2002, p.108). This is a far too simplistic and mono-causal argument. It clearly ignores the fact that baseball was already popular in the Philippines, and the infrastructure was already in place for the game to remain popular. Without further research, it is not possible to offer an alternative, more plausible argument in the present context. Baseball is still played in the Philippines, and the current national federation was set up in 1990, and, according to the Philippine Amateur Baseball Association, in my response to my questionnaire, approximately 2,000 players are registered to that organisation.
Japanese influence in Korea had heightened after they had successfully defeated the Chinese army during clashes in 1894-5. Soon after this, a series of educational and cultural reforms were introduced into Korea, “similar to the cultural reforms that took root in Japan during the Meiji Restoration” (Reaves, 2002, p.117). The first organized baseball game in Korea was played a little over a decade later (Reaves, 2002). Basketball and soccer had already proved quite popular in Korea (Reaves, 2002), but the growing Japanese influence following their occupation of the Korean Peninsula from 1905 to 1945, contributed to the significant growth in popularity of baseball. In 1905, a treaty was signed that made Korea a Japanese protectorate. “While baseball clearly was beginning to enjoy a strong measure of popularity by 1909”, Reaves (2002, p.117) argues, “most accounts agree the game came into its own in 1910 – the year Japan annexed Korea”. There were some influences in the initial development of the game from Americans based in Korea, but, on the whole, Reaves holds (2002, p.119), most “Koreans perceived baseball to be a Japanese game”. Baseball contests were regularly played between Korean and Japanese teams, at venues in both countries. In much the same way that several people in Latin American countries had used baseball as a site of resistance and rebellion against growing American influence, so too did Koreans use baseball as a site of resistance against Japanese military rule. As Reaves (2002, p.119) argues, baseball “became a way for them to appease and at the same time challenge their occupiers”.

By 1919, after a series of protests in Korea, the Japanese modified their political rule and introduced a policy of ‘harmony’ for Japan and Korea. “Baseball was”, Reaves (2002, p.121) contends, “a convenient medium for amelioration and cultural conciliation”. Such developments served to bolster the position of baseball in
In 1922, Herb Hunter’s *All-American* team played some exhibition matches in Seoul and this further strengthened the popularity of the game. In 1934, the *Reach All-Stars*, including Babe Ruth within their numbers, played matches in Korea – as well as Japan. As in Japan, the Second World War contributed to the downturn in baseball’s fortunes in Korea. However, “once peace came ... the game was resurrected quickly” (Reaves, 2002, p.123). Indeed, baseball took off after the Second World War, though on this occasion it was largely influenced by American military presence in the south. The Korean War (1950-53) also brought an abrupt halt to the continued development of baseball, but the continuing American influence within South Korea after that war, has, perhaps unsurprisingly, coincided with continued popularity for the game.

Political instability in South Korea had largely reduced baseball to only sporadic development, but with political stability from the 1980s has come growing organization of baseball in that country. Indeed, the Korean Baseball Organization was established in 1981, and, less than a year later, there was a professional baseball league in South Korea. Much like the Japanese professional leagues, the Korean league has attracted its fair share of lesser-rated American and Latin American players; and, much like in Japan, the foreign players are both derided and celebrated in different measures. The flow of baseball talent has also seen the better Korean players playing in Japan, and even the Major Leagues. Indeed, in 1993, the *Los Angeles Dodgers* “created a minor sensation ... when they paid $1.2 million to sign Park Chan Ho, an economics major and star pitcher at Han Yang University” (Reaves, 2002, p.129). Park was a success, and remained a national hero in Korea because he was competing in MLB. Other Korean players followed Park to the USA, but the only
other Korean “who actually made it to the Major Leagues at the end of the 1990s and into the first year of the twenty-first century was Byung-hyun Kim” (Reaves, 2002, p.131), who signed with the Arizona Diamondbacks.

According to Reaves (2002, p.132), “professional baseball continues to have a strong following in Korea”. However, the economic downturn in Asia has played a part in waning attendances. It is the amateur game that “still dominates” (Reaves, 2002, p.134). The national team has been successful on the world stage and the Korean equivalent of the Japanese Koshien tournament for school teams “continues to attract a staggering nationwide following every spring” (Reaves, 2002, p.134).

“Like Korea”, Reaves (2002, p.138) argues, “Taiwan traces much of its baseball heritage to Japanese occupation”. Indeed, Whiting (1990, p.309) holds that, “Japan had introduced baseball to Taiwan on a high school and college level when Taiwan was part of the imperial Japanese empire”. Much like there had been a dominant cultural attempt to ‘Japanize’ Korea, the Japanese occupiers in Taiwan attempted to exert considerable cultural, as well as political, influence there too. As Reaves (2002, p.138) plausibly argues, baseball, as part of the Japanization of Taiwanese culture, “provided an avenue for young Taiwanese both to appease and challenge their colonizers”. Following the Second World War – and Taiwan’s independence from Japan – “things Japanese fell into disfavor … and baseball fell from popularity” (Whiting, 1990, p.309). Baseball was still played sporadically, but anti-Japanese feelings were running high amongst the Chinese population in Taiwan, and “Japanese terms like sutoraikku (strike) and boru (ball) were banned” (Reaves, 2002, p.140). Developments during the Cold War, and the rise of communism in
China, contributed to an increasing American presence in parts of the Pacific Rim—and, as with in Japan, Korea and the Philippines, American influence and economic support increased in Taiwan in the 1950s (Kennedy, 1988/1990). In relation to this, post-war baseball in Taiwan was more heavily influenced by the American style of play, than the original Japanese influences. This is, no doubt, because of the “large American military presence in Taiwan” (Whiting, 1990, p.309). Interest in baseball grew again, sufficiently so that a Taiwanese team won the Little League World Series\textsuperscript{18} in 1969 (Whiting, 1990). Teams from Taiwan won the tournament three more times over the next 5 years (Whiting, 1990). Reaves (2002) indicates that the frequent reaction of many involved in the game in the USA was to regard the Taiwanese success dubiously— that if these teams could beat their American counterparts, they must somehow be breaking Little League rules regarding the strict age limit of players, for example. This even went so far as the American authorities banning all foreign teams from involvement in the Little League World Series in the mid-1970s.

In 1989, the \textit{Chinese Professional Baseball Organization} was set up in Taiwan, and the first professional league matches were played in 1990. The league consisted of four teams; “each, as in Korea and Japan, owned by a major corporation” (Reaves, 2002, p.149). Links between this league and those in Japan and Korea were strong (Reaves, 2002). A school tournament, modelled on the successful counterparts in Japan and Korea, was established in 1995 and remains successful today.

As with the state of baseball in Pan Americana, very little information is available for other parts of Asia, which make it difficult to comment much on the state

\textsuperscript{18} Little League was founded in 1939 as a foundation game of baseball for children. Little League World Series have been held since 1947.
of development of baseball anywhere else in the region. Table 6.2 gives, once again, incomplete information regarding when each country in the region first set up a national federation, and the current number of people affiliated to these federations.

Table 6.2: Asian countries affiliated to the IBAF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>First Federation</th>
<th>Current membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brunei</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong China</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia*</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan#</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>4,407,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea DPR</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>6,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Registered in Asia</strong></td>
<td>Approx: 4,445,720</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Personal correspondence with Federations where bold; All other information from the IBAF website (IBAF, 2004).

* The figure provided by the Indonesia Amateur Baseball and Softball Federation in response to my questionnaire is considerably at odds with the figure of 900 registered players, on the IBAF website. The figure provided by the Baseball Federation of Asia (BFA) (Asia Baseball, 2003) is 500 registered players. The Indonesia case alone highlights the considerable problems associated with trying to accurately outline the extent of baseball’s popularity throughout the world.

# Furthermore, the IBAF rather inconceivably, list the number of registered players in Japan as 160,000 – which is obviously at considerable variance with the number provided by the BFA, which is the figure listed in the table above.
6.3 Baseball in Oceania

Baseball has been played for over a century in Australia, and for a time, became quite popular – sufficiently so for professional teams with affiliations to MLB clubs to be set up. Elsewhere in Oceania, baseball has never been especially popular. In the two most prominent – economically, politically and culturally – countries in the region, Australia and New Zealand, cricket is substantially more popular than baseball. Four out of the ten national federations within this region responded to the questionnaire (Australia, Cook Islands, Guam and New Zealand). Very little has been published on the development of baseball in this region, except in Australia, so it is almost entirely an analysis of the development of baseball there that forms the basis for this sub-section.

6.3.1 Baseball in Australia

Various bat-and-ball games similar to baseball, like rounders, were played in some parts of Australia in the middle of the nineteenth century (Clark, 2003). Elfers (2003, p.152) holds that “baseball had come to Australia through American expatriates”, who had largely arrived in Australia during the 1870s gold rush. Clark (2003, p.5) indicates that the first “recorded match” of baseball was played in Sydney in July 1878, whereas Mitchell (1992, p.289) claims that “the first documented account is of games in Sydney in July 1882 between groups of Americans”. Regardless of the differing accounts, what is clear is that baseball was played only on a fairly informal basis. Though it was obviously sufficiently organized in New South Wales for the New South Wales Baseball Association to be set up in 1886 (Clark, 2003).
It was not until Albert Spalding organized a world exhibition tour of baseball, which began in Australia in 1888, that the game really began to take root (Clark, 2003; Dabscheck, 1991; Mitchell, 1990; 1992). Writing in Australia just prior to the tourists’ arrival, Harry Palmer (1888, p.158) asserts that:

Hitherto baseball has never been introduced in Australia in such a form as Americans know. Some few of the American residents in the larger cities have played it in amateur fashion, but never have two professional teams, such as these comprising the National League, crossed upon Australian soil.

The vast majority of Palmer’s article is given over to explaining how the game was played, which further suggests that, at least as far as Palmer was concerned, most Australian’s were unfamiliar with baseball. Although there was growing American influence in Australia more generally (Clark, 2003), the British, unsurprisingly, were still very influential. Therefore, “it was going to be difficult”, Clark (2003, p.8) persuasively argues, “for Spalding and his tour to supplant British cricket in Australia”. Spalding acknowledged this, at least in public, and he “promoted American baseball as a complement … [to] Australian/British cricket” (Clark, 2003, p.8) from the outset of the tour. Indeed, whilst in Australia, Spalding stated that he wished to “disavow any intention of interfering with cricket” and that “the objects of the tour … are to gain a knowledge of Australia and Australians, and to show the game as it is played in America” (cited in Moore, 1994, p.432). This was, of course, Spalding’s public declaration, but it is difficult to believe that he did not have higher aspirations.

Spalding meticulously arranged the tour and went to great lengths to ensure that members of the Australian press followed the tourists around on their stops in Sydney, Melbourne, Adelaide and Ballarat (Mitchell, 1992). The Australian press
gave extensive coverage to the games and large crowds attended (Mitchell, 1990; 1992). Some Australian newspapers derided baseball; and several journalists made comparisons between baseball and rounders, and considered the former in rather a negative light as a result (Mitchell, 1990). In addition, several commentators were critical of the commercial aspects of the game, and Spalding’s “millionaire” status (Mitchell, 1990, p.10). Despite the derision in some quarters, Mitchell (1990) argues that the tour was a catalyst in the establishment of organized baseball in Australia.\footnote{Mitchell’s (1992, p.290) further assertion that following the world tour, “Australia was the only place covered ... where baseball did take root and grow” does insufficient justice to the development of organized baseball in England in the 1890s – more on this in the following chapter.} In 1889, competitive baseball was played in Adelaide, Melbourne and Sydney. The fact that Spalding did have higher aspirations for the development of baseball in Australia is clear, when one considers that he “left behind” a “baseball ambassador”, Harry H. Simpson (Clark, 2003, p.16). Indeed, Clark (2003, p.18) argues that, “Simpson was to become the first development officer of baseball in Australia”. Simpson helped stimulate the growth of baseball and was instrumental in the creation of the Victorian Baseball League and the South Australian Baseball League in 1889.

Although baseball was being played more widely, it was still only played by “small bands of enthusiasts” (Mitchell, 1990, p.16). Where the game was played, it was primarily used as a supplement to cricket. To this end, so as not to clash with cricket, baseball was played in the Australian winter. The skills required in baseball were regarded as complementary to cricket, and baseball was also used as a means of keeping fit over the winter period. According to Clark (2003, p.16), some members of the Australian press considered “baseball as being in direct competition with cricket and thus as challenging Australian nationalism”.
In 1897, despite the fact that baseball was not extensively popular in Australia, an Australian select-team embarked on a baseball tour of the USA. Clark (2003, p.24) plausibly argues that, the Australian cricket tour of England in 1896, and their:

Surprise Ashes victory (in the traditional series of matches between Australia and England), had given Australia greater respectability as a sporting nation. Baseballers were eager to tour the home of baseball as their colleagues had successfully toured the home of cricket.

The tourists arrived in the USA for a series of games in April 1897. However, Mitchell (1992, p.291) concludes that the tour was a “disaster from all points of view. The Australians … did not play well enough to interest the American crowds, the tour was badly organized and not publicized”. Contrary to the missionary zeal with which Spalding had tried to export baseball, Mitchell (1990; 1992) asserts, most Americans did not particularly care that baseball was being played outside of the USA. In spite of the fact that “Spalding’s sympathy was strong”, Mitchell (1990, p.19) points out that “Spalding was not asked to use his influence” or his money to help the tourists.

From 1900, organized competitions in Australia became more regular (Dabscheck, 1991). The first interstate match, between Victoria and New South Wales, was played in Sydney in 1900. This interstate series became an annual event, and the game grew in popularity during the first decade of the twentieth century. In 1908, a team from the American Pacific Fleet played matches against Australian teams and this, Mitchell (1992, p.292) argues, “helped to consolidate the growth of the game … Great publicity was given to what were called the first ‘international’ matches in Australia”. In 1912, the first Australian Baseball Council (ABC) was formed (Dabscheck, 1995). In that same year, the first junior interstate contest was held (Clark, 2003). The game was becoming more popular amongst the youth of
Australia, and Clark (2003) is of the view that these developments were particularly important because this meant that more youngsters were playing baseball as their first sport and not simply as a ‘warm up’ for cricket. Nevertheless, cricket was considerably more popular across Australia than baseball. As such, it seems unlikely, as Elfers (2003, p.165) claims, that “Australia was in the midst of the very same debate that had raged in the USA around 1870, ‘Baseball or cricket, which will it be?’ Some Australians”, he argues, “were convinced that baseball was destined to win out”.

In 1914, baseball was given a boost by the visit of the New York Giants and the Chicago White Sox as part of their world tour of exhibition games. The tourists mostly played exhibition games between themselves, but they also played the odd match against local Australian select teams (Elfers, 2003). Baseball was played during World War I, although the annual interstate contests were brought to a halt. It was also played during the Australian summer at this time. In some quarters, particularly because this was a time of conflict, this was considered “disloyal” to cricket and, as such, to the mother nation (Mitchell, 1992, p.293). Baseball continued to grow during the 1920s, but, for the most part, reverted to winter play. The development of the game was sustained by numerous tours, by both American and Japanese teams. In 1926, “the Australian Baseball Council was again formed” (Clark, 2003, p.50). It was hoped that this might foster better communication and competition between baseball clubs throughout Australia (Clark, 2003).

---

20 Although, by 1931, according to Mitchell (1992, p.295), “games against Japan seem to have ceased, probably following a cooling of relations after Japan’s 1931 military aggression”.

21 Clark gives no indication when the ABC, originally formed in 1912, disbanded, but one might assume that this took place during the First World War.
In 1933, the ABC disbanded once again, because of the problems associated with administering a national competition (Clark, 2003). In the same year, “Norman (Norrie) Claxton, one of South Australia’s leading all round sportsmen, donated a shield for an annual competition between state teams” (Dabscheck, 1991, p.14). After the first ‘Claxton Shield’ in 1934, it became the pinnacle competition for baseball in Australia over the next half a century. In 1936, only three years after the ABC disbanded, it reformed (Clark, 2003). By the time of the Second World War, organized baseball was being played throughout much of Australia. However, baseball’s status as a winter supplement to cricket remained. Indeed, Clark (2003) argues that it was considered as “cricket’s poor relation”. Nevertheless, Clark (2003, p.54) also points out that by the eve of the Second World War, the Claxton Shield competition “received extensive press coverage and patronage from the sporting community”.

The Claxton Shield was suspended after the outbreak of World War II, but local competition continued. Exhibition games were also played between Australian teams and US representative teams attracting several thousand spectators at a time (Clark, 2003). In addition, several American servicemen joined the local teams still in operation. Entire American teams also registered with the existing local leagues. Following the Second World War, the Claxton Shield resumed on a more limited scale, but by the early 1950s it was “fully restored” as a national competition (Clark, 2003, p.62). Baseball, however, remained a marginal, winter affair (Mitchell, 1992). During the 1960s baseball did begin to grow. Mitchell (1992) argues that the game’s cause was helped by the sudden influx of European immigrants, who had not been brought up on cricket, although he does not offer support in the shape of
comprehensive details regarding the names of players involved. Proponents of baseball were sufficiently encouraged by its apparent growth in popularity, that in several parts of Australia it was once again pitted against cricket during the summer months. Summer leagues were established “in Western Australia in 1963, in Canberra in 1967 and in South Australia in 1968” (Mitchell, 1992, p.296). By 1973, the ABC “was confident enough of the sport’s appeals to switch to summer play – a direct challenge to cricket” (Guttmann, 1994, p.94).

In 1978, the ABC changed their name to the Australian Baseball Federation (ABF) (Dabscheck, 1995). In that same year, an Australian national team competed for the first time at the Baseball World Championships, held in Italy. They finished ninth out of eleven teams. In 1980, the ABF received Federal funding to appoint a National Director of Coaching. They appointed an American coach, Mike Young. Young also played in the Claxton Shield, as well as taking on numerous other baseball roles – such as television announcer, team manager and general “national league advocate” – during his time in Australia (Clark, 2003, p.78).

In 1987, Craig Shipley became the first Australian to play in the Major Leagues when he represented the Los Angeles Dodgers. Shipley had played his way up through the Australian development system before moving to the USA, and he “paved the way for numerous other Australians in the American professional leagues” (Clark, 2003, p.131). MLB teams signed a spate of Australian players over the next decade, and a further twelve actually played in the Major Leagues. Clark (2003)

---

22 In addition, in 1967 the first international class, purpose-built baseball stadium was erected in Auburn.

23 Several Australian players had been involved within the MLB system during the 1960s and 1970s, but none had actually gone on to play in the Majors (Clark, 2003).
argues that there are significant advantages to MLB clubs recruiting Australian talent: the fact that English is the first language in each country, the Australian knowledge of American culture, and the important fact that, as with other foreigners, Australian players are exempt from the draft system. Nevertheless, the lack of quality Australian ballplayers is evident, given that, despite these ‘advantages’, the number of Australians who have made it to MLB is negligible compared to the number of non-English speaking Latinos and Asians.

After the 1988 season, the Claxton Shield was abandoned. Problems with the administration of the game made the competition untenable. In 1989, in an attempt to resurrect a national competition, the ABF created the Australian Baseball League (ABL), consisting of eight clubs. Yet, in the inaugural year of the ABL, “players received little or no payment for playing” (Dabscheck, 1995, p.74) and, significantly in this first season, “all clubs ran at a loss” (Dabscheck, 1991, p.16). The ABL also suffered from numerous organizational problems and many clubs were struggling to survive. National competitions were evidently proving difficult to sustain as this required extensive and expensive travel from one end of Australia to the other.

In the second season of the ABL, three clubs had changed their names and owners – and one, the Gold Coast Clippers, received sponsorship from a Japanese company, Daikyo, and became the Daikyo Dolphins. Apart from the Japanese investment, these developments were characterized by a strong American influence. For example, a A$500,000 per year, three-year sponsorship deal was agreed with Pepsi-Cola (Clark, 2003; Dabscheck, 1991) and, more significantly, agreements were reached with MLB clubs that linked each Australian team to an MLB franchise. The
Australian team would “receive coaching help and four “A” league players from the farm systems of their sister clubs in the United States of America” (Dabscheck, 1991, p.16). Players began to receive regular payments, but they were “little more than out-of-pocket expenses” (Dabscheck, 1995, p.94) with the exception of the American players, who, “in all probability”, were paid by their MLB franchise (Dabscheck, 1991, p.17). Mitchell (1992) argues that this growing “Americanization” of baseball was sparked, in particular, by the growing commercialization of cricket in Australia. Indeed, he asserts that “when cricket was dragged into the commercial world of international sport, the last handicap to American-style baseball in Australia was removed” (Mitchell, 1992, p.298). These developments also prompted Guttmann (1994, p.96) to argue that, “in short, baseball’s most important advantage, one that cricket can never hope to overcome, is quite simply that baseball is an American game”. Upon deeper reflection one might more plausibly argue that the fact baseball is an American game – and therefore, the apparent American ideology that it carries – has proved to be more of a disadvantage in terms of proving popular to the Australian public. As Clark (2003, p.118) points out, the “first years of the ABL held many problems for most teams, including poor venues and financial worries”. In 1992, Daikyo, the most prominent team sponsor within the ABL, pulled out of their sponsorship having sustained significant losses from their involvement (Clark, 2003). Pepsi Cola stopped sponsoring the League after the 1994 season, and the 1995 season “started without television coverage or a naming sponsor” (Clark, 2003, p.119). Despite brokering new deals, the ABL was in significant amounts of debt, and doubts were raised that the league could continue (Clark, 2003). Indeed, the 1999 season proved to be the last in the ABL’s short history.
In 2000, after ten years of competition, the ABL was replaced with the International Baseball League of Australia (IBLA). The Australian MLB star, Dave Nilsson, "saved" the ABL from "certain liquidation" (Clark, 2003, p.121).\textsuperscript{24} Nilsson invested A$5 million and set up the IBLA, inviting teams from Taiwan, Japan, Korea and Hawaii to join the League. In addition, the Claxton Shield was re-established. The Australian national team hosted and won the 1999 Intercontinental Cup, defeating Cuba in the final, and hopes were high for the chances of the IBLA (Clark, 2003). Nonetheless, in the first season of competition, Clark (2003, p.123) argues that attendances at games in Australia were "shockingly low". In addition, media coverage was virtually non-existent, even for the final series. Despite Australian baseball's obvious internal turmoil, the Sydney Olympics baseball tournament was regarded as a major success. Indeed, the IBAF (2002) report that attendances were at "97.44 percent of capacity ... over an average of 32 games". Notwithstanding the success of the baseball tournament at the Sydney Olympics, the 2000-2001 IBLA season did not get off to an auspicious start. The Claxton Shield was cancelled and there was no national competition that year. Clark (2003, p.145) states that "political differences, bungling, self-interest, and lack of funds" were the major reasons why the league was cancelled. The following season the IBLA national competition was cancelled again, this time in the wake of the terrorist attacks on the USA on 11\textsuperscript{th} September, 2001. According to an ILBA press release, the "uncertainty" created by the attacks "forced the cancellation" (IBLA, 2002a), although it seems fair to suggest that this was really a pretext. The roots of the cancellation lay primarily in the domestic problems the game was encountering.

\textsuperscript{24} Nilsson is arguably the most successful Australian to have played MLB. He was signed by the Milwaukee Brewers organization in 1987, and eventually made his debut for the Major League team in 1992, and has been an All Star team representative. In addition, he continued to return to play for numerous teams in the ABL.
In summary, despite Guttmann’s claims over the apparent advantages baseball has over cricket in Australia, it is more plausible to argue, as Dabscheck (1991, p.14) does, that, “as a result of cricket’s popularity in Australia, baseball has assumed the role of a minor sport, attracting little attention from the media”. This point is underscored by Mitchell (1990, p.22), who argues that:

Baseball began as, and has largely remained, a supplement to cricket. Attempts to break this link by playing baseball in the summer cricket season have always been difficult to sustain. Perhaps because of its subordinate and associated quality, Australian baseball has never been able to attract extensive press coverage or popular following.

Indeed, Clark (2003, p.135) claims that a key issue for “many Australians” is that they “still see baseball as an All-American sport attempting to make unwelcome inroads into a land already satisfied with its bat-and-ball game”. The status baseball enjoys is, more often than not, as a handmaiden to cricket. Attempts to establish baseball as a direct competitor to cricket have always failed and baseball has rarely enjoyed anything like sustained progress.

Despite the obvious problems in sustaining a national competition, according to the IBLA, “the sport of T-Ball [which is a modified version of baseball for young children] is the most popular primary school sport in the Aussie Sport Program” (IBLA, 2002b). In 2001, MLB held their first ever Baseball Academy in Australia, which was “run in cooperation with the Australian Baseball Federation” (MLBI, 2001, p.5). Today 34,500 adult players are registered to the ABF (Active Australia, 2002).
6.3.2 Baseball in the rest of Oceania

The sporting cultures of Australia and New Zealand have both largely been dominated by English sports. As we have seen, baseball has had periods of some success in Australia, and still has a small following today. In New Zealand, very little, if anything, has been written about the development of baseball. According to the New Zealand Baseball Federation's response to my questionnaire, there have approximately 650 registered participants. Van Bottenburg (1994/2001, p.169) argues that New Zealand has "long been known as the 'Britain of the South' because of its affectionate attachment to British culture". This may explain a more resolute stance on the resistance to baseball here compared with Australia. So, even though one match was played in Auckland as part of Spalding's world tour, in 1888, in front of a crowd of 4,500 spectators (Mitchell, 1990, p.5), baseball was never sufficiently organized in New Zealand for the creation of a national federation until over a century later. In 1989, the New Zealand Baseball Federation was set up. Today, five senior teams compete in a national league, though the game is predominantly played in just two areas, Auckland and Waikato.

Baseball is far more popular in the small island of Guam. Guam was ceded to the USA by Spain in 1898. It was captured during the Second World War by the Japanese in 1941, but was retaken by the USA three years later. To this day, the American influence on the island is considerable, and they still have military personnel based there. The Guam Baseball Federation was first set up in 1987, and, in their response to my questionnaire, they indicate that there are over 1,500 registered players. Little, if anything, has been published regarding the development of baseball on the island.
Table 6.3 outlines some information, though incomplete, regarding when each country in the region first set up a national federation, and the current number of people registered to these national federations.

### Table 6.3: Oceania countries affiliated to the IBAF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>First Federation</th>
<th>Current membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia*</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>34,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook Islands#</td>
<td>Softball only</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji Islands</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micronesia</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palau</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Samoa</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Registered in Oceania</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approx: 36,650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Personal correspondence with Federations where bold; All other information from the IBAF website (IBAF, 2004).

* Although the Australian Baseball Federation replied to my questionnaire, they were unable to provide these details. The response read: “It is a major point of contention for us that we do not have accurate details about the number of participants and registered players”. The figure provided is taken from Active Australia, although this figure is at odds with the number provided on the IBAF database, which indicates that there are 57,000 registered players.

# According to the Baseball and Softball Cook Islands Association, in their response to my questionnaire, only softball is played on the islands, and the Association “only joined baseball because the game is an Olympic sport”. This makes little sense, since softball, too, is an Olympic sport!
6.4 Baseball in Continental Europe

Baseball has met with a mixed reaction in Europe. As will be examined in
greater detail in the following chapter, the first time organized baseball was played in
Europe was when two touring American teams exhibited the game in various places in
Britain in 1874. In continental Europe, it is quite difficult to plot the development of
baseball. Very little has been published on the development of the game in any
individual country. Baseball was played in a handful of continental European
countries prior to World War I – such as France, the Netherlands, and Sweden. The
Confédération Européenne de Baseball Amateur (CEBA) (1978, p.12-13) state that
baseball was first played in the Netherlands in 1910, when it “was introduced by
J.C.G. Grassé who, during a trip to the USA, discovered the number one American
sport”. The Dutch translated baseball into Honkbal, and a national federation, the
Nederlandse Honkbal Bond, was established in 1912. Baseball was also introduced in
Sweden around this time. Again, the CEBA (1978, p.16) relate this largely to the
work of a native – rather than American proselytising. More specifically, it was said
to be “the work of the director of the world famous Swedish Adea [sic] Company, Mr.
Sigfrid Edström”. Edström established the Västeras Bäsbal team and a game “was
played in 1912 during the Olympic games in Stockholm” between Västeras and a

---

25 In Finland at the beginning of the twentieth century a game, not dissimilar to baseball, was quite
popular. Furthermore, according to Silvennoinen (1989, p.168), after 1907 the game was altered,
structurally, so that it became more similar to baseball – and now is often referred to as “Finnish
baseball”. It is still, however, markedly different to American baseball, and there is not the scope, nor
the need, in this chapter to go into depth on these developments – see Meinander (1992) and
Silvennoinen (1989) for more details.

26 The actual name of the company was ASEA – it was an electrical engineering company. It still exists
today as ABB, after a merger with another electrical engineering company in 1981. Although there is
some evidence that exists (see Chalmers, 1998) to suggest that this Sigfrid Edström may well be the
same J. Sigfrid Edström that was a principal figure in founding the International Amateur Athletics
Federation after the Stockholm Olympics, and was first President of the IAAF and eventually became
President of the IOC in 1946, there is little other corroborating evidence to substantiate this claim.
team made up from the “American track and field team” (CEBA, 1978, p.16). After the First World War, baseball all but died out in Sweden. Records suggest that baseball was also played in France just prior to the war (CEBA, 1978). Various clubs existed in and around Paris, but there is little, or no, information available – in English, at least – to indicate how they took root. Elfers (2003, p.219) argues that “Spalding funded a small league there for years”, although I have found no evidence to corroborate this. Spalding (1911/1992) makes no mention of this in his book, and the CEBA (1978) make no mention of these developments in their records.

As part of the 1913-14 world baseball tour, the two American teams were scheduled to play matches in Italy in February 1914. The game was, Elfers (2003, p.198) argues, “essentially unknown” in Italy – and the weather actually prevented any exhibition matches from taking place. The tourists moved onto France, where adverse weather conditions again meant that four scheduled matches in Paris were all rained off. One match was played in Nice and the game was very well received, but Elfers (2003, p.218) holds this was principally because the crowd was made up largely of “vacationing American millionaires”.

For much of the rest of Europe, it seems that baseball developed in the aftermath of the First World War. This, no doubt, was connected with the greater American military – and cultural, economic and political – presence in Europe during and immediately after the war. For example, American (and Canadian) troops based in Europe played exhibition matches in numerous locations during the war. Although,

---

27 Soon after this, in 1919, Edström was one of the founders of the Sverige-Amerika Stiftelsen (The Sweden-America Foundation). This organization was founded primarily to promote the “exchange of scientific, cultural, and practical experiences” for Swedish individuals to attend universities in the USA and Canada (Sweden America Foundation, 2002).
the limited development of the game that did take place was not solely because of this growing American presence. For example, the CEBA (1978) points out that, in Belgium, Japanese merchant sailors first introduced baseball, via the port at Antwerp, and in 1934 the Belgische Baseball Federatie was established. Organized baseball was also played in Spain in the 1920s, and the Federación Española de Béisbol was established in 1944 (CEBA, 1978). Elsewhere on the continent, baseball was played – but nowhere was it particularly popular or highly organized.  

During the Second World War, several baseball exhibitions were played in Allied countries where American and Canadian forces were based. After the war, organized baseball competitions were inaugurated in several areas. As in the years following World War I, one can attribute this to the growing influence and presence of the USA. As Van Bottenburg (1994/2001, p.143) argues, “U.S. power and prestige grew to unprecedented heights” in Europe in this period. This facilitated the growing popularity of American sports. Baseball continued in Belgium and Holland, was revived in Sweden and other countries where the game had been played to a certain extent before the war, and other countries established organized baseball contests for the first time. For example, after the Italians surrendered, the American occupation troops contributed to organized baseball contests taking place in some of the larger Italian cities (CEBA, 1978). The interest in baseball had grown sufficiently in Italy, even amongst the native population, for the creation of the Federazione Italiana Palla Base in 1950. Soon after this time, interest in baseball was growing sufficiently in Europe, generally, for discussions to take place regarding the possible creation of a European federation.

28 Although 125,000 spectators attended an exhibition game of baseball held during the Berlin Olympics in 1936, which the IBAF (2002) claim is “still a record attendance at a baseball game”.
The history of what the CEBA (1978, p.21) call "organized European Baseball" began in 1951. At this time, Luis Barrio and J. Alvarez, President and Secretary, respectively, of the Spanish federation, toured Europe to gauge support for "the establishment of a European Federation" (CEBA, 1978, p.21). The two men held meetings with their counterparts in Belgium, England, France, Germany, Italy and the Netherlands (CEBA, 1978). These discussions continued at various times over the next 18 months with little success. At the beginning of 1953, Roger C. Panaye, President of the Belgische Baseball Federatie, took over the project, and proposed a meeting of European delegates in Paris. At this meeting, held in April, "baseball delegates from Belgium, France, Germany, Italy and Spain met and founded the "Fédération Européenne de Baseball – FEB – European Baseball Federation" (CEBA, 1978, p.23). In addition to the creation of the FEB, a European competition for national teams affiliated to the Federation was proposed. The first European Championships were held in Antwerp in 1954, with teams representing Belgium, Germany, Italy and Spain. Baseball was not particularly profitable in Europe, and national federations were poorly funded. This explains the absence of France from the competition; they could not afford to send a team (CEBA, 1978). Italy ran out the eventual winners of the inaugural championships. The same four nations, with the addition of the French national team, contested the second European championships, held in Barcelona the following year. The Spanish team won, and by doing so gained the right to represent Europe at the first "Global World Series" held in Milwaukee, USA, later that year.29 This was the first time that a European team had been involved.

---

29 The National Baseball Congress (NBC), which had been created in the USA in 1931, established the competition. This was a different, and not quite so prestigious, competition as the baseball World Championships, first played in 1938. The NBC were concerned with the promotion of amateur baseball in the USA, and had a particular mission to establish baseball as an Olympic sport (IBAF, 2002).
in an international competition outside of Europe. The Spanish side lost both their matches, losing to Hawaii and Japan.

In 1956, the Netherlands joined the FEB. This was a significant move for the continued development of the game in Europe, because it was widely recognized that the Dutch had “the strongest European baseball organization” (CEBA, 1978, p.35). The Dutch team duly won the next European championships held in Rome in that same year. The following year, the Dutch hosted and won the championships, which for the first time featured six teams (Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands and Spain). Although this tournament was the largest in the competition’s history, no championships were held in 1959, because it was decided that the “financial obligations” were too onerous to expect the competition to be held on an annual basis (CEBA, 1978, p.38). Hence, even though baseball was becoming more organized in more and more countries in Europe, it was still small-scale compared to other, much more popular sports played throughout the continent (Van Bottenburg, 1994/2001).

The Netherlands retained their title over the next two competitions in 1960 and 1962. In 1970, Italy and the Netherlands both competed in the baseball World Championships, held in Colombia. By doing so, they became the first European teams to play in the final stages of this competition since the very first one in England in 1938 (as mentioned above; this will be examined in more detail in the following chapter). Neither European team were able to register a victory against the other nations, made up mostly from countries in the Americas. In Europe, however, it was quite evident that Italy and the Netherlands were much stronger than all other
countries. The game had developed significantly in these two countries in comparison with the rest of Europe, where its development was extremely slow.

Baseball continued to develop in various parts of Europe during the 1970s. By the twenty-fifth anniversary of the European federation in 1978, the CEBA\(^{30}\) had ten nation members (Belgium, France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, San Marino, Spain and Sweden). In that year, the World Championships were held in Italy. This was the largest international baseball competition that had ever been held in Europe. Belgium, Italy and the Netherlands qualified as the European representatives. Such was the growing strength of baseball in Italy and the Netherlands, the two teams finished sixth and seventh, respectively, out of 11 teams (Belgium were last). Mexico, Australia and Canada — where baseball was considerably more organized and popular in comparison to Europe — all finished below Italy and the Netherlands. According to statistics supplied by the CEBA (1978) at that time, the total number of players throughout Europe (including senior and junior registered players) was 41,518. This figure was more than double the number playing in 1970 (18,133) (CEBA, 1978, p.83). Baseball was steadily growing in popularity as a participant sport in several countries in Europe. By the 1980s, the CEBA (1993, p.19) noted that the number of registered players had exceeded 70,000.

The growth of the game in Europe is illustrated by the fact that the European Championships were split into an A-pool and a B-pool in 1984 — with four teams competing in each section, and with further qualifying competitions required to reach

\(^{30}\) In 1972, a decision was made to change the name of the FEB to the *Confederation Européene de Baseball Amateur* / *European Amateur Baseball Federation* (CEBA). This was to bring the European Federation in line with the *Federación Internacional de Béisbol Amateur* (FIBA) in an attempt to promote a united front in the pursuit of gaining baseball's recognition as an Olympic sport (CEBA, 1978).
those stages of the championships. Later that year, an Italian team featured in the Los Angeles Olympic Games, where baseball was a demonstration sport for the seventh time. The 1986 World Championships were held in the Netherlands. A significant feature of these championships was that a European player, Roberto Bianchi from Italy, was nominated as catcher in the ‘All-Star team’ (the list of players elected as the best of the tournament). This was the first time that a European had achieved such an accolade.

Baseball in Europe continued to expand during the 1990s. In 1993, the CEBA (1993, p.90) reported that thirty-two nations were affiliated to their organization. However, the number of players across Europe had not grown substantially, and there were still just over 70,000 registered. In 1994, the word ‘amateur’ was deleted from the title of the European federation, so that the new name was the Confederation Européenne de Baseball/ European Baseball Confederation (CEB). Aldo Notari, President of the CEB and the IBAF, advocated the inclusion of professionals to make baseball more attractive as an Olympic sport. Although Gaston Panaye (personal communication, 23 July, 2002), the Secretary General of the CEB, states that there are “no professional teams” in Europe, according to several respondents to my questionnaire there are, in fact, clubs in the Czech Republic, Croatia, Germany, Italy, Sweden and the Ukraine that have started to pay towards the costs of some of their better players. In some cases this includes foreign players, mostly from Cuba and the USA. Indeed, “the seventy Cuban trainers and coaches in Italy were reported by the

31 Although, it should be acknowledged that these figures relate only to twenty-three out of the thirty-two nations. It might be assumed that in the other nine countries the number playing was sufficiently negligible that it would not make too significant an impact on the overall figures.
32 Under the leading influence of President Juan Antonio Samaranch, the International Olympic Committee had, over the previous decade, more actively welcomed professional athletes into Olympic competition. In 1996, the IBAF also voted to allow professionals to compete in their tournaments.
Cuban press as having “Cubanized” Italian baseball” (Jamail, 2000, p.69). These developments are a clear indication of the part played by nations other than the USA in the diffusion of the sport.

In the 2000 Olympic Games, the Netherlands became the first team to beat Cuba in the competition for 21 matches. Arguably, the standard of baseball being played in Europe has improved, and the numbers playing has also grown. As can be seen from Table 6.4 below, the number of European national federations belonging to the IBAF today, stands at thirty-eight (and, out of these, twenty-one responded to my questionnaire). The approximate number of registered playing members across Europe exceeds 100,000. This is a substantial increase on the 70,000 playing baseball in 1993, but it is still significantly smaller than for traditional European sports (Van Bottenburg, 1994/2001), and baseball remains a marginal sport in Europe. In addition, the statistics may, in some places, include playing members of softball clubs. Baseball and softball are very much intertwined throughout much of Europe, and some federations include the number of registered softball players in their statistics. As Clive Russell (personal communication, 1 May, 2002), Director of MLB International for Europe, the Middle East and Africa, points out: “baseball and softball are considered to be one entity in ... Europe”. This is frequently the case, he argues, “in lesser developed countries in terms of baseball”. In fact, softball tends to be the more popular of the two, so this, clearly, distorts the picture to an as yet unknown degree.
Table 6.4: European countries affiliated to the IBAF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>First Federation</th>
<th>Current membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>5,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>30,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy*</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>23,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>1,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>2,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marino</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Registered in Europe: Approx: 104,020

Source: Personal correspondence with Federations where bold; All other information from the IBAF website (IBAF, 2004).

* The registered players indicated by the Federazione Italiana Palla Base, in their response to my questionnaire, is at odds with the figure that appears on the IBAF (2004) website, which suggests there are 65,000 registered players. Once again, this highlights the problems associated with ensuring the accuracy of all of the figures.
6.5 Baseball in Africa

Very little has been published on the development of baseball in Africa. There are sixteen national federations for baseball in Africa affiliated to the IBAF (only three of these responded to the questionnaire). For the most part, baseball was introduced to most African nations in the early 1990s. The first time a baseball competition was included in the All Africa Games was in 1999. According to the IBAF (2004) database, baseball is most popular in South Africa and Zimbabwe, although, the figures given, 72,000 and 15,000 registered participants, respectively, seem rather over-stated. The South African national team became the first African nation to compete in the Olympic baseball tournament in Sydney 2000. They even recorded a victory over the same Dutch team that had, earlier in the tournament, beaten the Cubans. The development of baseball in Africa is obviously too recent, and the growth too insignificant, for the game to have made much impact there. Table 6.5 provides only the basic data currently available on baseball in Africa.
Table 6.5: African countries affiliated to the IBAF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>First Federation</th>
<th>Current membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivory coast</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>72,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Registered in Africa</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Approx: 89,154</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Personal correspondence with Federations where bold; All other information from the IBAF website (IBAF, 2004).

6.6 Concluding remarks

It is clear that baseball is played widely around the world. However, the differential popularity of the sport is evident. It is an examination of the reasons behind why it is considerably more popular in some parts of the world, and not others, that will be of most interest to us in attempting to understand more about globalization processes. Having summarized the development of the game across the world, it is now necessary to turn our attention towards the ‘local’, more in-depth, case study analysis of the development of the game in England. This, it is hoped, combined with the broader cross-sectional analysis conducted in this chapter, will enable us to make more sense of the global development of the game; and to make some assessment of the differential interdependency chains, fluctuating power relationships, and to examine the significance of figurations at different times, and their conjunction with
other developments. To this end, I will now turn to the development of baseball in England.
Chapter 7: Analysis of the Development of Baseball in England

7.1 Introduction and overview

Having outlined the global diffusion of baseball in chapter six, it is evident that it has successfully diffused to many countries. It seems appropriate to place this 'global' understanding alongside a more in-depth understanding of what is happening at a 'local' level. To this end, it is appropriate to explain the local with reference to specific connections with the global, in order to throw light on the extent to which the position of baseball in England is consistent, or otherwise, with the global baseball figuration. As with the previous chapter on the global diffusion of baseball, this chapter will not be dominated by theory. The specific connections that can be drawn between the development of baseball in England, alongside global developments of the game, will be explored more fully in chapter eight.

As has already been explained in the methodology, the results acquired for this chapter were largely derived from a comprehensive documentary analysis of newspaper coverage of baseball, combined with 'oral history' interviews, and semi-structured interviews with people selected largely on the basis of their capacity to provide privileged information.

The more in-depth case-study analysis of the development of baseball in England is particularly interesting. In the light of the increasingly broad and interdependent ties between England and the USA, evident throughout the twentieth century, the relative failure of baseball to establish roots in English sporting culture appears, ostensibly at least, difficult to explain. To paraphrase Waddington and Roderick (1996), it may appear surprising that a country that has so many linguistic
and cultural ties with the USA should have proved so unreceptive to America’s national sport. The failure of baseball to catch on becomes all the more interesting when one considers that the first tour of professional baseball players to England took place as long ago as 1874. Over the course of the half-century that followed, professional teams played exhibition matches in England on three more occasions: in 1889, 1914, and 1924. Over the years, numerous other attempts have been made to popularize baseball in England on an amateur basis and as a professional game. Despite these attempts, baseball cannot be said to have made a lasting, significant impact on the sporting diet of England.

It is important that we understand the development of the game in this country, not only for the valuable light it throws on the past, but also to develop a more adequate understanding of the present-day situation. This will also contribute to a greater understanding of the wider social dynamics of the relationship formed by England and the USA over the last century or so. The chapter will be broken down into eight sub-sections highlighting the ‘defining phases’ of baseball in England. The phases are as follows:

Phase one: The inaugural, 1874 tour by American professionals. This had no real success in establishing the game;

Phase two: Following another American tour in 1889, baseball was established on a relatively minor scale for the final decade of the nineteenth century;

Phase three: During the period 1906 to 1911 a baseball league was set up in London. This league was suspended after 1911;

Phase four: Another world tour by professional American teams culminated with a match in London in February 1914. The success of the tour was limited, although baseball was soon played in England again when American servicemen were
stationed in this country for the latter part of the First World War. The game enjoyed moderate success in various pockets of the country during the next decade or so. In this time, professional American teams staged more exhibition matches in 1924;

Phase five: Arguably the most successful period in baseball’s history in England occurred during the 1930s. An amateur league was set up in 1933. This proved to be the precursor for an attempt to develop the game on a professional basis. The professional league, set up in 1935, proved quite popular with spectators in the north of England, in particular, until the Second World War brought the organization to an abrupt end;

Phase six: In 1942 American troops stationed in various parts of England organized baseball matches. It was another false dawn for baseball in England.

Phase seven: Sporadic attempts have been made to establish baseball ever since World War II, though the game has never been anything but a very minor sport in England;

Phase eight: Major League Baseball (MLB) have initiated a campaign to develop baseball, and particularly merchandise sales, in England since the mid-1990s. Today, baseball is still played in England on a minor scale.

7.2 The first baseball tour to England

In 1874, Harry Wright played a significant part in the decision to provide exhibition games of baseball in Britain. He was a leading professional with the Boston Red Stockings. Wright was born in England, but had moved to the USA as a young child. His father, Sam Wright, was the first professional cricketer employed by the St. George Cricket Club in New York. Harry Wright was one of several sportsmen who played both cricket and the nascent baseball in the 1850s and 1860s. It was partly because Wright was so “impressed by the ease with which the new game replaced
cricket in America” that he was “led … to think that British sportsmen would, if they saw baseball played at its best, undergo the same conversion” (Voigt, 1976, p.93).

Wright brought on board Albert Spalding1 to help with arrangements for the tour. In this capacity, Spalding visited England in advance of the proposed tour. During his stay, Spalding gained the approval of the Marylebone Cricket Club (M.C.C.) for two teams – the Boston Red Stockings and the Philadelphia Athletics – to play a number of baseball exhibition games on various cricket pitches in England. These venues also included Lords, the home of the M.C.C. In his own account of the meeting with the M.C.C., Spalding (1911/1992) states that he mentioned that several of the baseball players also had experience of playing cricket. Perhaps he thought that this might have helped to persuade the M.C.C. to allow baseball to be played on cricket grounds under their control. In retrospect, he felt that this contributed to the M.C.C.’s acceptance of the tour proposals (Spalding, 1911/1992). It is not entirely clear what the M.C.C. hoped to gain from allowing another sport to be played on grounds under its jurisdiction. It would seem that they had little or no concern about the American tourists arriving to showcase baseball in England, despite cricket’s rapid decline in popularity in favour of baseball in the USA. Cricket was, in their eyes, the established sport in England and they seemed to have little to fear of this ‘outsider’ sport.

A possible explanation for why the M.C.C. sanctioned the tour might have been because they saw this as an opportunity to demonstrate the superiority of cricket. Acceptance of the baseball exhibitions came with the additional requirement that the

1 Spalding was one of the best pitchers of the era, but, as has already been discussed, he became a very successful businessman, and even at this time he was starting to build his sports goods business.
American ball players play a cricket match against their hosts at the various cricket grounds. This, ultimately, proved to be a limiting factor of the tour. Spalding had realized that these games would do much to deflect the English public’s interest from baseball. He stated that “when I began to ‘work’ the newspapers [in England], in my capacity as press agent, I found that the cricket end was altogether most attractive from their viewpoint” (Spalding, 1911/1992, p.179). The reports that did appear in the English press concentrated, for the most part, on the cricket games. During the tour, an English reporter suggested that the “mixed entertainment” – of playing both baseball and cricket – “seems a mistake” (The Daily News (London), 4 August 1874, p.7). It was indicative of the power of the M.C.C. that Spalding felt constrained to agree to their demand that cricket matches be included in the tour (Levine, 1985; Spalding, 1911/1992). It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the M.C.C. outflanked Spalding.

The tour made an inauspicious start at Liverpool where the tourists arrived from the USA in July 1874. The Liverpool Daily Albion (31 July 1874, p.5) reported that: “There were not many spectators to witness the introduction of the new game … Because the public do not seem to have been properly informed that the game was coming off”. According to Spalding (1911/1992, p.179) he “depended most” on “Mr. Charles Allcock, the recognized cricket authority of England” for advanced publicity of the tour. Unsurprisingly, Allcock “was especially enthusiastic about the cricket” (Spalding, 1911/1992, p.179). Thus, when the baseball teams arrived in England they “found the British public thoroughly advised of the forthcoming cricket matches and only slightly informed about the exhibition ball games” (Spalding, 1911/1992, p.179). Although this does not necessarily account for the small attendance at the first game, it was clearly another strategic error by Spalding. Yet, despite the initial poor
publicity, many thousand spectators attended most of the other games played at various cricket venues in Liverpool, London, Manchester, and Sheffield; and also the Crystal Palace grounds in London.²

Voigt (1966, p.48) claims that the English response had regarded the American demonstration of baseball as being antithetical to English notions of sportsmanship and fair play, and that this “explains why the trip was a financial failure”. However, there is no evidence that the English – at least in the shape of the English press – reacted in this way. Instead, it would seem that they just ignored baseball. Their preference was to report on the cricket matches between the Americans and their hosts. The Times – which was the most prestigious newspaper publication in England – gave only scant attention to the tour. The Sportsman, a major London based publication covering all popular sports of the day, only provided brief coverage. The limited coverage concentrated more on the cricket matches between the American ball players and their hosts, and relatively little was afforded to the baseball part of the programme. The American teams won all of the cricket ‘contests’ – probably due in no small measure to their being allowed to field eighteen or twenty-two players compared to the English team’s eleven. Little was made in the English press of the numerical advantage of the American teams, and the reporting of these games was largely descriptive.

The limited coverage that was given to baseball included comparison between it and the old English pastime of rounders. The Liverpool Daily Albion (31 July 1874, p.5) noted, for example, that “baseball must already be familiar to everyone who knows the game of rounders”. The Daily News (London) (11 August, 1874, p.2) also

² One match was also played in Dublin, Ireland.
considered that “it is the old game of ‘rounders’ considerably elaborated”. Letters
were published from readers of the Daily News who suggested that the ‘new’ game
the Americans were exhibiting was not new at all. For example, one correspondent
wrote that the descriptions provided in the paper at an earlier date “lead me strongly to
suspect it is my old friend ‘Rounders’ under another name” (The Daily News, 17
August 1874, p.6). Another reader claimed that “the so-called American game of Base
Ball is merely a modification of the game of ‘Rounders’, which is played in every
village in Scotland at the present time” (The Daily News, 17 August 1874, p.6). It is
worth noting that around this time, rounders was played in Gloucester, Merseyside,
Scotland and South Wales in particular. But according to Benyon and Evans’ (1962,
p.3) history of rounders “there was little of an organised nature about the game”
played in these locations.

Even observers in the USA at this time subscribed to the view that the roots of
baseball lay firmly in the older pastime of rounders (Kirsch, 1989; Seymour, 1956).
This is a matter of particular interest in the light of the subsequent shift, discussed in
chapter five, in public perception in the USA surrounding the roots of baseball. The
Sportsman (London) (1 August 1874, p.8), however, stated that although “the popular
voice associated it in some way with our old sport of rounders” this was “on the
testimony of inexperienced judges”. Nevertheless – as will become apparent – in the
years that followed, the tendency to describe baseball in patronising terms (as
rounders in disguise, as it were) became even more marked in the English press’
coverage of baseball matches. Such views appear to depict attempts by established
representatives of an established sport (in this case, cricket) to denigrate an ‘outsider’
sport. For, as Elias (cited in Goudsblom & Mennell, 1998, p.107) notes ‘blame
gossip’ may occur at national social levels in the form of “stereotypes of collective
self-praise and the collective abuse of nations on an international level”. This will be elaborated on below.

At the beginning of the tour, the *Liverpool Daily Albion* (31 July 1874, p.5) suggested that although “it is extremely improbable that base ball is going to supplant cricket amongst us ... the game is one that is now pretty sure to be introduced in England”. The *Manchester Guardian* (3 August 1874, p.9) shared this view, stating that “we shall be surprised if it does not speedily become naturalised amongst us”. Some in the American press went further, suggesting that “several baseball clubs have formed in the north of England” (*The Boston Post* (USA), 19 August 1874, p.2). However, evidence of the formation of these clubs cannot be found in the English press. The exhibition matches had no direct success in stimulating competitive matches amongst the native population. An article written in *The Sportsman* in 1889 provides further evidence of this lack of success. According to the newspaper “the impression created [by the tour] was a very fleeting one, and although in Lancashire, where rounders has always found a home, their skill gave a new impetus to *that* game, no hold was obtained” (*The Sportsman*, 3 January 1889, p.3; emphasis added).³

The comparison between rounders and baseball and the issue of the latter’s failure to ‘catch on’ was addressed in an article entitled, “Baseball, and how to play it”, which appeared in *The Boys Own Paper* in 1887. It was stated that baseball “betrays no sign of taking root” in England. According to the ‘Boys Own’, this was because baseball “is too like rounders”. The article continued: “It has been described as “rounders made wearisome”, and the description, though unjust, hits off its weak

³ It must also be stated that even the claim that rounders was developed further is difficult to substantiate because, according to Benyon and Evans (1962), rounders was played only on an unorganized basis until the 1880s.
point fairly well, as its laws are certainly not easy for a beginner to grasp all at once" (28 May 1887, p.555-6). Of course, cricket could not be regarded as an easy game for the beginner to grasp, but it was already well established throughout much of England and was regularly played in the public schools. It is important to bear in mind that the English public at large were newcomers to the game of baseball and, given the absence of detailed press coverage afforded to the game, it is understandable that baseball remained difficult for much of the public to grasp. Holt (1989, p.307) notes the significance of the press in “popularizing spectator sport and sustaining interest in it”. Press coverage may have had a deleterious affect on American attempts to popularize baseball in England. The Boys Own Paper points to another issue, which acted as a thorn in the side of those attempting to promote the game in England; namely, that some in the English press likened the game to rounders.

7.3 The 1889 tour and the establishment of baseball in England in the 1890s

Despite this unpromising state of affairs, baseball enthusiasts from the USA were still keen to try to develop the game in England. Fourteen years after the first tour, Spalding decided to organize a world tour of exhibition matches, as has already been outlined in chapter six. The teams involved in this tour were the Chicago White Stockings, the team Spalding managed, and an ‘All America’ team, consisting of professionals from a variety of teams in the USA, other than the White Stockings.

The tourists left the USA in November 1888, returning in March 1889. Undoubtedly, the timing of the tour was in order to avoid a clash with the domestic baseball season. Spalding could not afford to disrupt the National League (NL) season, as had been possible in the tour of 1874, when the game was not so well established in the USA. The tourists played matches in Australia, Egypt, Japan and
France (as already discussed in the previous chapter), finishing with various matches in Britain in the early part of 1889.

As he did in the Australian leg of the tour, Spalding invited an English journalist to tour with the teams in England. The journalist was from *The Sportsman* (see *The Sportsman*, 3 January 1889), which was by now regularly “selling over 300,000 copies a day” (Holt, 1989, p.181). In addition, full-page adverts for several of the games were displayed in copies of the same paper. Spalding was obviously attempting to guarantee more substantial press coverage than was afforded to the 1874 tour. The journalist from *The Sportsman* travelled with the entourage of American press, ball players and promoters on a special train commissioned by Spalding.

Baseball, like cricket, is a game played during the warmer months of summer. By the time the tourists were in England it was toward the end of winter, which meant that exhibition matches were played in a climate not conducive to the game or spectatorship. This led some editorials to “regret that sport-loving Englishmen have not been able to see the game under more favourable conditions” (*The Evening Standard*, 14 March 1889, p.5). Of course, this was an obstacle Spalding could only have overcome if conditions in England were a priority. Perhaps as a result of the previous failure they were not. In addition, there was a distinct desire not to disrupt the domestic season in the USA, suggesting that the stability of the game at home was of greater importance than its global diffusion.

For the most part, matches were played on county cricket grounds. Once again, therefore, the tour must have received backing from the M.C.C. However, no cricket matches were arranged as part of this tour. Matches were played at Edgbaston
(Birmingham), the County Ground (Gloucester), Old Trafford (Manchester), Lords, and the Oval (Surrey). Some exhibitions were also given on football grounds at Bramall Lane (Sheffield) and Goodison Park (Liverpool). It is likely that this was done with the aim of trying to attract crowds of a different social composition. Association Football was extremely popular amongst the urban working classes – whereas cricket was still seen to have more appeal for the middle- and upper classes. In addition, the Football League was enjoying a successful inaugural season in 1888-89, proving to be a major economic success story in terms of attracting paying spectators (Holt, 1989). All of the exhibition games attracted several thousand spectators (see various copies of The Times, March 1889).

Notwithstanding the efforts of its promoters, the English press gave the tour minimal coverage. Not surprisingly, The Sportsman covered the tour. Even so, it did not begin to compare with the coverage it devoted to horse racing, Association Football and even cricket – which was out of season. The Times also gave greater coverage to other sports, but it did provide a brief report on each exhibition match played in England, as well as one ‘lead’ article that discussed the merits of the game. This article was written in the context of the tourists’ having played in London on four separate occasions. As a result, it declared, “everybody is now asking his friend in a doubtful kind of way what he thinks of baseball. Londoners are, or ought to be, now in a position to give their verdict upon this important question” (The Times, 18 March 1889, p.9). The author proceeded to give his opinion on the likely place of baseball in the sporting diet of the English:

We are not prepared to say that it is altogether possible to judge without prejudice a game which the Americans have presumptuously preferred to cricket ... As for the essentials of the game, it would be singular if they did not strike some chords of sympathy in the English breast, considering that
they are the same as those of ‘rounders’ … Consequently, we must have latent affinities for baseball (*The Times*, 18 March 1889, p.9).

Apart from this article, *The Sportsman* provided the only significant coverage of the tour in the London based press. *The Evening Standard* (London), for example, gave only small paragraph accounts of a handful of the matches played. The local press in the north of England provided more comprehensive coverage. The same themes that appeared in *The Times* – that baseball was a form of rounders and that the Americans had dared to prefer baseball to cricket – were echoed in much of the local, northern coverage of the tour. The press here were also concerned at the apparent audacity of the American ball players in promoting baseball in contrast to the more established and ‘superior’ cricket. *The Lancashire Evening Post* (14 March 1889, p.1), for example, provided an ethnocentric and prejudiced comparison of baseball and cricket:

Although American enthusiasts consider it [baseball] decidedly superior to the English game [cricket], it is not very likely that people in this country will share the opinion … to compare it with cricket is a piece of audacity of which only an American can be guilty … In cricket there is vastly more variety, a great deal more science, ever so much more of the picturesque; in short, language fails to describe its superiority.

In highlighting the differences between the two games, this journalist was not prepared to concede that baseball possessed any advantages over cricket. National pride and anti-American feeling lay not far beneath the surface of commentaries such as these. Nationalistic sentiments of this kind were quite commonplace in coverage of the exhibition games in the northern press. References would often be made to the apparent ‘inferiority’ of the USA, *per se*. The *Lancashire Evening Post* (14 March 1889, p.2), once again, provided a good illustration of this, stating that, “enough has been said to intimate to Brother Jonathan⁴ that we regard baseball as a very creditable

---

⁴ ‘Brother Jonathan’ was a common form of reference to the people of the USA at this time, to be ‘replaced by Uncle Sam’ some time later (Brewers Dictionary of Phrase and Fable, 2001).
pastime for a very young people, but as much out of place in England as a nursery frolic in the House of Commons”. This condescending reference to the ‘young people’ of the USA is an example of the press adopting a ‘we-they’ ideology. After all, as Van Krieken (1998, p.151) notes, “it is the shared identity of the established group and the perception that this group identity may be threatened by newcomers which sets the whole mechanism of established-outsider relations in motion”. The American baseball players were regarded as outsiders, and the English press were rather disdainful of baseball.

*The Manchester Guardian* (13 March 1889, p.8) considered the chances of baseball taking root in England to be non-existent: “the baseballers have come; we have seen, and we are not yet conquered … Will it ever supersede cricket or become a formidable rival to it?”, the reporter asks. His answer was emphatic:

I have not the slightest doubt that it will do nothing of the kind, and I even hesitate to believe that it will obtain any sort of footing in this country. It is too monotonous … The game does not visibly progress, and indeed the more skilful the players are the more the game stands still (*Manchester Guardian*, 13 March, 1889, p.8).

Furthermore, the reporter considered the game “a sort of glorified rounders, but it is obviously more scientific” (*Manchester Guardian*, 13 March, 1889, p.8). The *Lancashire Evening Post* (23 March 1889, p.3) was even more damning in their assessment, claiming that baseball was “nothing but a pitiful fraud”, because the game was simply rounders under another name. Perhaps the response from this particular newspaper can be explained, in part, because rounders was still played and was growing in popularity in and around the Lancashire region at this time. The tourists were invited to play a game of rounders against the best players in the National Rounders Association (NRA). It was perhaps an obvious development to challenge
the Americans to a game of rounders, since several in the English press were adamant that the two games had highly transferable skills. Adrian ‘Cap’ Anson, captain of the Chicago White Sox, argued that “not only will we beat you at our game of baseball, but we intend to completely thrash you at rounders as well” (cited in the Liverpool Echo, 25 March 1889, p.3). Both challenge matches (of baseball and rounders) were played at Goodison Park, Liverpool – the home of Everton Football Club. The Americans won the baseball match convincingly. To their undoubted surprise, however, they lost the rounders game, an indication that the skills were not so easily transferable. According to The Sportsman (23 March 1889, p.1), “it was evident they were all abroad” in their attempts to play it. As might have been expected, the following day the local press exacted retribution. After the Americans’ defeat at rounders, a reporter in the Liverpool Echo gave the following assessment of baseball:

I take it for granted that you are seeking to know what we Englishmen think of your national game as played by its best exponents ... First and foremost we will suppose that we saw on Saturday afternoon about as complete an exhibition we are likely to get on these shores, saving, of course, that we take it up ourselves. See that sly hint, stranger? ... Baseball will never make cricket or football ‘after pieces’ in England. It doesn’t fit the bill at all ... Of course, there is national prejudice to be considered. You don’t seem to take to our cricket, and we – well, we won’t say much about your baseball (The Liverpool Echo, 25 March 1889, p.3).

The reference to American’s as ‘strangers’ once again emphasizes the emergence of an “us” and “them”, common-sense perception symptomatic of established nationalist ideologies.

As has already been indicated, the power-base of cricket, the M.C.C., did not regard baseball as a significant threat to their game, after all exhibition games were played on cricket grounds, which they still largely controlled. So, why did much of the English press ignore the tour or, on occasion, provide a quite xenophobic defence
of cricket and attack on baseball? Perhaps this is best explained in terms of an ‘axis’ of imperialism and vestiges of a gentlemanly-amateur ethos. LaFeber (1993, p.21) argues that, at this time, “fearful Europeans warned of an ‘American invasion’ (an overwhelming offensive of US-made goods and multinationals)”. Fourteen years on from the 1874 tour, the cricket supporting English press may have seen baseball, at least, as one of those ‘American-made goods’. Especially since, as Birley (1989, p.3) points out, in England “by the turn of the century cricket had come to assume profound political significance”. Many journalists were certainly inclined to believe that the baseball tourists were attempting to impose ‘their’ game on ‘our’ national summertime sport, and this accounts for much of the negative comment. Although, these fears do not seem to sit comfortably alongside the lack of concern displayed by the M.C.C. In addition to the invidious comparisons made with cricket, more specific criticisms of the way baseball was played and administered were quite commonplace in the English press. Underlying many of these criticisms was an adherence to an ‘amateur ideology’. This was particularly the case with the English middle- and upper classes in the late nineteenth century. Dunning (1986), Dunning and Sheard (1979) and Holt (1989) have pointed out that certain English sports establishments retained an amateur ideology, which had consequences for their approach to the financing and organising of sport until the late 1960s (and beyond, in some sports). The result of this was that English sports exhibited “lower levels” and, “in many ways, different forms of commercialization than that exhibited in American sports” (Maguire, 1993c, p.226). Furthermore, the press, and many of those involved in cricket, considered that adopting what was deemed an appropriate attitude – ‘playing the game’ – was very much to the fore in cricket. Holt (1989, p.98-9) provides clarification of this point when stating that “‘Not playing the game’, which like so many other sporting expressions came quickly into general usage, referred not so much to the rules of play
as to the manner in which the game was to be played”. Hence, it is no surprise to encounter general criticism in the English press of the way in which baseball was administered and played. A sceptical (but, nonetheless broadly accurate) view of the financial motives of the touring teams, for example, was a recurrent theme with certain reporters. For instance, one correspondent suggested that the tourists should “go home with it [baseball] … Gather up what dollars you can before you go, but if you are not satisfied with the pile come next time with the same skill and dexterity in some livelier game” (The Liverpool Echo, 25 March 1889, p.3).

Criticism was also levelled at the inability of the baseball players, when batting, to even hit the ball because the odds were apparently so loaded against the batter. Indeed, one reporter made the following, somewhat sarcastic, comment: “If the striker can’t hit the ball with a club that size he ought to be provided with a bigger one to stir the game a little bit” (The Liverpool Echo, 25 March 1889, p.3). An ignorance, deliberate or otherwise, of the nuances of the game is apparent. Most journalists writing in the English press considered that cricket was a far more sophisticated and scientific game than baseball. Those people commenting that baseball lacked ‘science’, were, in no small measure, choosing to ignore such dimensions of the game of baseball in order to maintain their preferred stance and repel the outsider. Such criticism may also be strongly related to the fact that in cricket the ‘art’ of batting was more strongly associated with the gentlemen players in the teams. Bowling in cricket, the equivalent to pitching in baseball, was very much the ‘job’ of the professional ‘player’ (Malcolm, 2001). It was regarded as more workmanlike. For the advantage to have been with the bowler in cricket, to the extent that it favoured the pitcher in baseball, does not seem to have been regarded as ‘playing the game’. In spite of the criticisms about the unscientific nature of baseball, several English newspapers
marvelled at the fine fielding ability of the baseball players. This was a point that George Wright (brother of Harry) commented upon during the tour. He suggested that a fundamental difference between cricket and baseball is that in cricket, "fielding is lost sight of, while in baseball this department is considered the most important" (cited in The Sportsman, 23 March 1889, p.1). This may also have something to do with the 'work' involved in fielding and the practice required by the Americans to enable them to become so proficient.

Much of the English press covering baseball, therefore, considered that it could never succeed cricket, in part because it was not played in the right English 'gentlemanly-amateur' spirit. This response may have been exacerbated by the fact that many people from the middle- and upper classes were highly active in diffusing their own culture and sports. The strict code of conduct associated with the middle- and upper-class 'gentlemanly-amateur' approach, particularly evident on the sports field (see, for example, Mangan, 1988: Mangan, 1992; Perkin, 1989), was a significant aspect of this dominant 'English culture'.

It is undeniably the case that the English press considered cricket to be the 'national sport' of England. It was played by members of all social classes, in most regions. However, the class divisions in Victorian England were stark, and even though cricket was the 'national game', class divisions were very apparent within it. As Holt (1989, p.175-6) points out, "county cricket ... never made any concessions to the requirements of the working-class". In addition, he argues, "county cricket in the north was not quite 'cricket' in the south" and "nor did the northern working-class invest the game with the same kind of Englishness that took hold in the south" (Holt, 1989, p.266). Therefore, a we/they distinction was particularly prominent within
English society. What many in the English press were purporting to be an 'English response' to baseball, was almost certainly a middle- and upper class interpretation of how the 'English' responded to the game. This was even apparent in the northern-based press, despite, according to Holt, the different attitudes held toward cricket there.

After the tourists left England, local people arranged a handful of baseball matches. For example, matches were played during August in Leyton and Richmond in the south of England (see *The Sportsman*, 2 August 1889, p.3; 8 August 1889, p.4). In October 1889, a meeting was set up that sought to establish a national governing body for baseball. It seems that Spalding played some part in setting this up. *The Times* (6 September 1889, p.8) noted that he, and a "Mr. Crane", were "in England on business" just prior to the meeting. It seems likely that this was Newton Crane, who was the American Consul to Manchester, and whom Spalding had met during the professional tour earlier that year (Spalding, 1911/1992). It is probable that the 'business' referred to in the report was the establishment of a national association for baseball in England – although, no further detail is provided by The Times. Barely a month after this report, Newton Crane proposed that a "meeting proceed to organise an association for the promotion and fostering of the game of baseball ... to be known as the National League of Baseball in Great Britain" (*The Sportsman*, 10 October 1889, p.4). According to *The Sportsman* (10 October 1889, p.4), Crane "had always taken a keen interest in the game, and had noticed the want of such a sport in various large centres of this country". Crane chaired the meeting. Others in attendance included representatives from football clubs (Mr. W.J. Suddell, Preston North End F.C.; Mr. T.C. Slaney, Stoke F.C.; and Mr. G. Ramsey, Aston Villa F.C.), cricket clubs (Mr. P. Betts, Essex C.C.C and Edwin Ash, Richmond Town C.C.) and the
National Rounders Association (NRA) (W.H. Hivey). Hivey was the Honorary Secretary of the NRA and his attendance and support for this development is somewhat surprising, given the hostilities that existed between the supporters of baseball and rounders. All of these individuals were elected officers in one capacity or another, Crane was elected Chairman of the League. Francis Ley, a factory owner from Derby who, having seen the game played in the USA, established a baseball club for his workers, also attended the meeting. According to the Derby Mercury, Ley, in conjunction with Spalding, was a prominent figure in the establishment of the league. As the reporter recounted:

> It may be suitable here to detail how baseball became established in this country. Mr. Ley having a place of business in America, and hearing that Messrs. Spalding Bros. were going to form a League in England, started the Derby Club and entered the League. Messrs. Spalding however, met with considerable difficulty in getting clubs to take the matter in hand, but three clubs … financed by Messrs. Spalding, were formed and players were imported (from America) (Derby Mercury, 6 August 1890, p.2).

In addition to his financial commitment to the game in England, Spalding provided copies of his ‘Baseball Guide’ – by now a seasonal best seller in the USA – for sale in the UK. Spalding makes no mention of his involvement in the establishment of this League in his book. Perhaps this is because the League, ultimately, was not as successful as Spalding might have hoped. Be that as it may, an indisputable fact, underestimated in other accounts (Spalding, 1911/1992; Voigt, 1976), is that baseball was established in England, albeit on a relatively minor scale, by the final decade of the nineteenth century.

The National Baseball League of Great Britain (NBLGB) wanted to establish a competitive league for baseball for the summer season of 1890. One of the first tasks that the League sought to achieve was the promotion of the game at football clubs.
The *Sportsman* (3 May 1890, p.3) noted that “a number of instructors have been located in the principal football centres of Great Britain, and so well have their instructions been followed that at the present time there are quite a number of clubs all but ready to begin matches”. Perhaps this desire to link with football clubs was partly a result of the recent success in establishing the Football League, and partly because of the deleterious comparisons made between baseball and cricket. In addition, the football grounds would otherwise be lying dormant over the summer season.

The three baseball clubs that Spalding had helped finance (see also the *Birmingham Daily Post*, 11 August 1890, 5) were already part of the Football League. *Aston Villa*, *Preston North End* (the champion team of the Football League) and *Stoke* all established baseball teams. This was primarily in order to generate an income during the summer months, whilst at the same time keeping their football players ‘in trim’ during the close season. The fourth and final team to take part was *Derby Baseball Club*. This club was formed from Francis Ley’s factory team. Derby played on Ley’s Recreation Ground, which was later developed into the football ground of *Derby County F.C.*: ‘The Baseball Ground’. Most of the players in this league, other than those at *Derby*, were professional footballers, although each of the three football clubs had one or two American players who were responsible for coaching and management (see *The Sportsman*, 3 May 1890, p.3). *Derby* also imported experienced players from the USA, enticing them with the offer of work, on a limited scale, in Ley’s factory (*Derby Mercury*, 6 August 1890, p.2). As such, the league was regarded as ‘professional’ and the competition was known as the “National League for Professional Baseball Players in Great Britain”.

---

*5 No developments appear to have taken place in the south of England despite the initial involvement of representatives from Essex and Richmond cricket clubs.*
Upwards of a thousand spectators was not uncommon at the league games. The home matches of Derby occasionally attracted over 5,000 spectators. As much as four times that number, however, would watch a professional football match. Despite the reasonable success at the gate, *The Times* made no mention of baseball during this period at all. *The Sportsman* did provide some coverage, but it was irregular, and sparse in comparison with the space devoted to other sports. Surprisingly, given the involvement of the local club, the *Preston Chronicle and Lancashire Advertiser* made virtually no mention of baseball. The local press in the three other regions represented in the league, provided the most extensive coverage. Coverage in *The Sentinel* (Stoke-on-Trent) was essentially descriptive, regularly publishing results and small reports of the games. The *Birmingham Daily Post* and the *Derby Mercury* provided the most comprehensive coverage of baseball. This may have been because these two teams were, initially, the most successful – both on the pitch and in terms of attracting crowds. The *Derby Mercury* provided largely uncritical coverage of the baseball matches, and a comprehensive breakdown of the scores, including an array of statistical information similar to coverage of baseball in the USA. This 'positive' coverage for baseball might be connected with the fact that Francis Ley was an extremely influential businessman in the region, and probably exercised considerable sway over the local press. The *Birmingham Daily Post* was much more critical of the attempts being made to establish the game. It was not long into baseball's inaugural season when the paper published an article suggesting that:

The baseball business is being 'boomed' with a vigour which is a little too obviously artificial for the average Englishman. Out-door games, like nearly everything else, have to gradually grow into popular favour. The phlegmatic Briton does not care to have a pastime which has a considerable amount of the advertising element about it foisted upon him; and it is more than probable that the baseball people will regret somewhat the rash expenditure of cash which is at present going on ... As a scientific game of 'rounders' it is pleasant to witness, and the fielding is a part of the show which cricketers will appreciate, the frequent 'ins' and 'outs', and the very large element of luck
there is in hitting the ball when it is being thrown at the striker with all the velocity and viciousness of a small cannon-ball, are the reverse of pleasant to an on-looker ... To compare the game with cricket would be odious, and the followers of the statelier and older game need have no qualms that the Yankee usurper will ever have any appreciable effect on its present popularity. To the lovers of rattle, boisterousness and hysterical excitement, baseball may have attractions; but as a spectacular game it is incomparably inferior to cricket and football (Birmingham Daily Post, 16 June 1890, p.5).

Many of these criticisms draw comparisons with those made by much of the English press during the American tour the previous year. Once again, these comments are expressive of middle/upper class values. They sit rather uncomfortably with Association Football and its ‘fans’, for example. As Holt (1989, p.281-2) points out, “the historical hostility to commercialism among the ruling bodies of sport is indisputable. Yet there were areas of commercial penetration ... Professional football is the obvious case”. Notwithstanding this rather negative report on baseball, the game was proving to be fairly popular. Several amateur clubs had been set up and started to organize fixtures. On 9 July, 1890, these developments resulted in the formation of a “representative governing body for both amateur and professional clubs throughout Great Britain” called the Baseball Association of Great Britain and Ireland (BAGBI) (Derby Mercury, 16 July 1890, p.7). The Spalding company provided a challenge cup to be “competed for by all amateur clubs joining the association” (Derby Mercury, 16 July 1890, p.7). Barely a month later the professional league faced a crisis. Derby, the most successful club in the competition, was thrown out of the League for alleged breaches of the rules. Their offence was that they continued to play their exceptional American pitcher, Reidenbach, after giving their word that they would withdraw him against the weaker sides of Stoke and Preston North End for the remainder of the season (The Sportsman, 11 August 1890, p.1). The consequence of importing better players from the USA, therefore, was that it undermined the competitive balance of the professional league. The resulting inequality of competition, in such a small
league, helped to precipitate its decline. Ley’s desire to run a winning team helped to undermine his desire to establish professional baseball on a viable basis in England. It was the unintended outcome of two divergent goals. The importance of Derby’s withdrawal was not lost on those reporting on baseball. For example, *The Sportsman* considered that, the timing of the “hitch, … during the first season the game has been played in this country is to be regretted, for it requires perfect unanimity to ensure the success of the American game in this country” (*The Sportsman*, 11 August 1890, p.1).

Spalding also recognized the impact of Derby’s withdrawal, because he sent Ley “several telegrams … asking him to play out the remaining matches” (*The Birmingham Daily Post*, 5 August 1890, p.3). Ley remained steadfast in his decision, but offered Spalding the chance to continue to fund the Derby team. Spalding declined the offer. In the event, Ley withdrew his team and declared his venture a success because Derby had left as ‘Champions’ (*Derby Mercury*, 6 August 1890, p.2). He clearly prioritized his own team’s success over his more general goal of establishing baseball. His decision may also have been influenced by the fact that under the rules of the professional league, visiting clubs were entitled to half of the money received at the gate. Derby regularly attracted far greater numbers of spectators than the other three clubs. As a result, the *Birmingham Daily Post* (11 August 1890, p.5) suggested that it was “no wonder that the Derby manager came to the conclusion that baseball was not a paying pastime”, because “Derby have received in their league matches from home £9. 15s. 5d, while they have paid £56. 1s. 10 1/2d”. The report also made a scathing assessment of the conditions leading to the withdrawal of Derby:

The small and unimportant body with the pretentious title of the National Baseball League are just passing through a crisis … The idea of making the games longer and more interesting by allowing an inferior pitcher to take
Reidenbach's place against Stoke and Preston North End shows the hollowness of the struggle for the 'championship' and was certainly detrimental instead of beneficial to the game ... There has been a disposition in some quarters to glorify the game at the expense of cricket ... As an occasional attraction, among other sports baseball might be worth keeping; but the idea that it will ever stand by itself as a staple pastime of the country is an utter delusion (Birmingham Daily Post, 11 August 1890, p.5).

Despite the fact that the three remaining professional teams continued the competition, with Aston Villa running out the eventual winners, the league only lasted for this one season. Nevertheless, the Sporting Life (London) (27 September 1890, p.22) considered that "the experiment was a success not only as far as awakening an interest in the play of the professionals was concerned but in drawing the attention of amateurs to it". Numerous amateur baseball clubs were already established in conjunction with the baseball authorities. Almost immediately after the expulsion of Derby from the League, Ley organized a committee for "managing the [amateur] baseball contests" for a "50 guinea challenge cup", which he provided for a local knockout competition (Derby Mercury, 13 August 1890, p.8). At the same meeting, Derby Baseball Club was re-established as an amateur team. The Sportsman (18 August 1890, p.1) reported that "there were some forty amateur baseball teams in England". With the problems associated with the professional league, the administrators of the game obviously saw amateur baseball as the way forward. Competitions were set up for amateur baseball in three main districts – northeast England, Lancashire and the midlands. Baseball was played throughout the following summer on a regional, amateur basis under the auspices of the National Baseball Association (NBA). This organization replaced BAGBI in May 1891 (see English Sports (London), 21 May 1892, No.1 Vol.1, p.11), and catered only for amateur clubs, since there were no longer any professional teams. No substantial coverage was given
to baseball in 1891 – even the *Derby Mercury* provided only scant reference to a handful of ‘challenge matches’.

In 1892, the NBA developed a more ambitious plan to bring the winners of the regional leagues together to play a knockout competition for the title of ‘National Champions’. Four regional leagues existed: ‘Newcastle and Cleveland’, ‘Derby and the Midlands’, ‘South Wales’, and ‘West Lancashire’. Spalding’s company provided the “Spalding trophy” for this national amateur competition (Levine, 1985, p.88). Baseball enjoyed moderate success at the gate, with games attended by hundreds of people, and on some occasions, a few thousand spectators would pay to watch.

The ‘South Wales’ league disappeared soon after the 1892 season. Baseball was becoming more established, however, in the other three, English, regions. The *Northern Echo* (23 August 1892, p.4) noted, in 1892, that “there can no longer be any doubt that the American summer pastime is rapidly becoming acclimatized in England. Already there are some hundreds of people in Middlesborough who take a keen interest in the game”. This was a fairly rare example of the *Northern Echo* providing coverage of baseball. Several other local newspapers published results of games fairly regularly, as did *The Sportsman*. In general, however, the coverage was extremely scarce. The sole exception was *English Sports*, which was first published in May 1892. Adverts were placed in its rival sporting publication, *The Sportsman*, stating that *English Sports* provided coverage to “all worthwhile sports” played in this country – “including baseball” (see numerous copies of *The Sportsman*). No evidence can be found regarding the circulation of *English Sports*. It did go out of circulation just over two years later, suggesting that it was not particularly popular. Nonetheless, it was almost the sole supporter of baseball over the two seasons of its existence.
If judged on coverage given in *English Sports*, it seems that people still considered baseball as a glorified form of rounders, because it was noted that baseball enthusiasts "are very sensitive to the imputation that baseball is 'only rounders'. They [baseball enthusiasts] have a contempt for the latter game and assert that it is for women and children only, and not fit for a moment to be compared with baseball" (*English Sports*, 21 May 1892, Vol.1, No.1, p.11). The comparisons between the two games undoubtedly spurred "the chief executive of the National Rounders Association", Mr. Hivey, to lay down a challenge to the baseball enthusiasts. *English Sports* (21 May 1892, Vol.1, No.1, p.11) stated that he "publicly announced some time ago that ... the Liverpool Rounders Club would beat any baseball team in England" at American baseball. A challenge match eventually took place in July, which *English Sports* (2 July 1892, Vol.1, No.7, 84) suggested was "of exceptional interest in baseball circles". Derby Baseball Club won the match 27 runs to 6. As such, *English Sports* (2 July 1892, Vol.1, No.7, p.84) speculated, "the superiority of the regular rules [American baseball] was generally recognized, and it is probable that

---

6 An interesting and paradoxical development occurred in Liverpool at this time. Rounders had been played in the Liverpool region for several years, and thirty-five clubs competed in rounders matches in the area. Before the 1892 summer season started, the Annual General Meeting of the Liverpool Rounders Association (LRA) "took the revolutionary step of changing officially the name 'Rounders' to 'Baseball' as being more appropriate to the skilful style of play being developed" (Benyon & Evans, 1962, p.4). Benyon and Evans do not expand on what is meant by this final comment. However, what is important to note is that a sport called 'English baseball' (as it was often referred to in the Liverpool press hereafter), was now played in Liverpool. Rounders was also popular at this time in Cardiff and Newport in South Wales. Benyon and Evans (1962, p.4), who have written a basic history of what they call 'British baseball', note that the organization responsible for rounders in South Wales, "upon hearing of the change at Merseyside, changed their title from 'Rounders' to 'Baseball' as well". This version of baseball was still essentially the 'rounders' of that day. The change in name was the only adjustment made to the game. English baseball remained different from American baseball in that, amongst other things, the game, like rounders, still consisted of two innings. As with rounders the pitcher threw underhand in 'English baseball', and runs were scored for reaching any of the bases. Players did not have to complete a circuit as in the American 'version' (see Benyon and Evans, 1962, for more detail). In this context, it is not necessary to discuss 'English baseball' in any detail. Apart from the name alteration it is not a game that emerged as a result of the introduction of American baseball in this country. It is a reformulated version of rounders, which was already being played in Liverpool before any of the American tours took place. As such, it was not a 'spin-off' of the American game.

7 No mention is made to Hivey's involvement in setting up the inaugural national governing body for baseball in England just 3 years earlier.
next year there will be only one kind of baseball in England, and that the genuine one".8

Despite American baseball’s growing popularity in the midlands and the north, it was not played to any great extent in the south. The NBA were keen to establish the game in London. London obviously had a bigger population from which to draw spectators and participants, and if baseball was to have a foothold in the capital the game would have genuine credence as a national sport. In 1893, the development of a London-based team, The Thespians, consisting of a group of American actors, was most welcome by the NBA. The Thespians won the national cup in their inaugural season. One reporter noted that during the 1893 season “the growth of baseball in England” was now “very rapid” (English Sports, 5 August 1893, Vol.2 No.64, p.141). Much of this growth was attributed to the growing appeal of the game in London. Indeed, English Sports (24 February 1894, Vol.2, No.93, p.488) reported before the start of the 1894 season that:

The patrons of baseball were so gratified by the great stride in popularity made by the game last year that they have already begun preparations for the coming season. Last year when the summer season opened there was but one club, the Thespians, in the metropolitan district. There are now five clubs ready to begin the baseball season as soon as the football season is over.

Three of the five teams in London were works teams: the Remingtons (an American based company), Clapham Post Office and a team called the Electrics. The fifth team, the J’s, were made up of American “theatrical people” (English Sports, 24 February 1894, Vol.2, No.93, p.488). The game was sufficiently in demand in London for the establishment of a London Baseball Association (LBA). The LBA acquired grounds at Balham for their exclusive use. The grounds could “accommodate several games at

---

8 This did not prove to be the case, and ‘English baseball’ remained popular in Liverpool for several years to come. In fact, it has been played in Liverpool, and more particularly south Wales, ever since.
the same time”, and “a pavilion and grandstand were erected” (English Sports, 5 May 1894, Vol.2 No. 103, p.608). Elsewhere, baseball still had significant links with professional and semi-professional football clubs. According to English Sports, the national amateur competition was enjoying unprecedented success by only the third season of its existence. It reported that:

It is hardly four years since the attempt was first [sic] made to introduce baseball into England. The initial efforts were attended to with ridicule. Notwithstanding these objections, the admirers of baseball kept plugging away at their object and refused to be discouraged. Success has already been achieved, and in a manner and to a degree far in excess of the anticipations of the promoters of the game. This statement that ‘success has been assured’ is not merely an assertion, but it is conclusively proved by the results of the matches in several parts of the country every week (English Sports, 11 July 1894, Vol.3, No.113, p.113).

Upwards of a thousand spectators were fairly common at matches, and baseball was being played on an organized basis in more regions of England than ever before. English Sports (4 July 1894, Vol.3, no.112, p.98) reported that the 3,000 spectators who watched the north-east district final was a larger gate “than was attracted all last winter by a football match in this district”. Numbers playing the game were growing as well. However, the coverage afforded to baseball by the majority of newspapers was still sparse to non-existent; much to the disdain of English Sports (15 August 1894, Vol.3, No.118, p.190), which argued, “lots of good baseball goes unreported up North. A single game that draws more spectators than all the cricket matches put together over a wide district, is ignored, or dealt with in a couple of lines, while other affairs seen by two men and a boy take up half a column. Rich; isn’t it?”

It is likely that the majority of the press regarded baseball as a sport played by ‘outsiders’; that the most proficient exponents of the game were American, undoubtedly helped to foster this view. Those people in established positions, whose
main interest was in cricket, had greater control over the flows of communication. Even *English Sports* paid greater attention to cricket matches than to baseball. Nevertheless, this lack of coverage did not deter numerous football clubs from setting up teams. The money generated at the gate, by some clubs, acted as an incentive to other clubs to cater for baseball. *English Sports* provided an insight into its income generating powers. At the end of the 1894 season it reports that: “The gross takings of the Stockton F.C. at baseball matches this season is £142.3s.6d. It is not wondered at, in view of this practical illustration of the popularity of baseball, that a good many football clubs are enquiring about the game and asking for information” (*English Sports*, 12 September 1894, Vol.3, No.122, p.251). Stockton had been defeated in the final that year by *The Thespians*. Despite this second win in a row for the all-American team, *English Sports* (1 August 1894, Vol.3, No.116, p.153) noted that the “progress” amongst the native English was sure to see a “purely English team” win the national competition soon. This proved to be the last baseball season covered by *English Sports*. The newspaper went out of circulation early in 1895.

In spite of the loss of *English Sports*, baseball continued to grow in popularity. In 1895, *The Sportsman* even began to cover games played in the London region on a fairly regular basis. *The Sportsman* (6 May 1895, p.4) noted that, “the spread of the game in the face of cricket, lawn-tennis, aquatics, and cycling may be but gradual, yet the business-like manner in which the LBA have set to work is proof that they mean it not only to stay but to take a firm root”. Toward the end of the 1895, season the same newspaper judged baseball to have made “rapid strides” (17 August 1895, p.7). *Derby Baseball Club* was enjoying its most successful season as an amateur team, winning the national cup competition in front of a crowd of between 3,000 (*Derby Mercury*, 21 August 1895, p.7) and 5,000 spectators (*The Sportsman*, 19 August 1895, p.3). The
prediction, made by *English Sports*, that a team of Englishmen would soon win the national competition was borne out by the fact that the "Derby club consisted entirely of local men" (*Derby Mercury*, 21 August 1895, p.7). Soon after this success, *Derby* played two challenge matches against an amateur club from Boston, USA. Nearly 10,000 spectators attended each match. Derby narrowly lost on both occasions, but, given the closeness of the results, several local newspapers regarded this as a good measure of how far the sport had come in England. Even *The Times* (22 August 1895, p.4), a paper that virtually ignored baseball in this period, made brief mention of these games.

Coverage in 1896 remained sparse – with *The Sportsman* returning to sporadic publication of just the results of games. Even the local, northeast press devoted little space to baseball, despite the fact that *Wallsend-on-Tyne* won the national cup. The *Northern Echo* only gave two lines of coverage to the final, a game that attracted a crowd of 4,000 to the Victoria Ground, Stockton (*Northern Echo*, 17 August 1896, p.4). Even though several thousands of people paid to watch games in many regions, the development of baseball could not have been helped by the sporadic newspaper coverage.

The 1897 season was also characterized by limited newspaper coverage – although once again, it was not uncommon to see references to crowds of two or three thousand attending matches. Over 4,000 spectators attended the 1897 final. In an attempt to boost the publicity for the game, Spalding travelled to England to present *Derby Baseball Club* with the "Spalding trophy" (Levine, 1985, p.88)\(^9\). Once again,

\(^9\) Although, the *Derby Mercury* (1 September 1897, p.7) makes no mention of Spalding, and holds that Ley donated the cup and medals.
Spalding does not mention this in his book. The undoubted influence he enjoyed in the USA was far from mirrored in England, and his visit made little impact. In 1898, the NBA, according to Wilson (1898, p.188), sought to re-structure the organization of baseball. He suggested that “the game is decidedly going ahead, although not so fast as it was three years ago, and in the last year its position has remained stationary. This year it is being reorganized entirely” (Wilson, 1898, p.188). No reference was made to this reorganization in any of the newspapers researched for this thesis. In any case, regardless of whether or not such a reorganization did occur, the game went into decline and, to all intents and purposes, disappeared some time after the 1900 season. 10 The fact that not a word – not even a gloating word – was written on the ‘disappearance’ is indicative of a lack of concern by the English press. No reports on baseball are to be found in the English press until another attempt was made to establish the game in London in 1906.

7.4 The London Baseball League, 1906-1911

On 9 April 1906, the British Baseball Association (BBA) was set up at a meeting at the Charterhouse Hotel, London. The Times (10 April 1906, p.12), reporting on baseball for the first time in over a decade, reported that the development of the BBA “was supported by delegates from the Millwall, Crystal Palace, Tottenham Hotspur, Clapton Orient, Woolwich Arsenal, Fulham, Leyton, West Ham, and Chelsea [football] Clubs”. At this meeting, it was proposed that a league, based in London, should be formed. 11 The drive from these football clubs mirrored that of

---

10 This was in spite of the fact that in June 1900, in a season that Nottingham Forest won the national cup, a reporter in that region suggested that “there can be little doubt that the great American game is surely, if slowly, increasing in popularity in Nottingham” (Nottingham Daily Guardian, 11 June 1900, p.6).

11 No mention is made in this report, or that of a local newspaper covering the meeting (Evening Standard and St. James’s Gazette (London), 10 April 1906, p.16), of the fact that baseball had been played in London just six years earlier.
those who were responsible for developing baseball in the 1890s. Again clubs were seeking to generate income in the close season. For instance, the Directors' Report for *Woolwich Arsenal Football Club* (cited in *The Woolwich Herald* (London), 22 June 1906, p.5) expresses this concern: "The directors have long felt that your football ground should be utilized as far as possible during the 'close season', and an endeavour is being made this summer, in conjunction with other football clubs in London, to introduce the game of baseball as a summer attraction".

Only *Clapton Orient, Fulham, Leyton, Tottenham Hotspur* and *Woolwich Arsenal* actually took part in the first season. *Brentford* and *Millwall* football clubs also had teams – though they were not organized in time to play league matches. It is not known why, but *Chelsea* and *West Ham* appear not to have established baseball teams. The *Nondescripts* baseball club, who played in Canning Town, was also created "as a result of the attempt to popularise baseball in London" (*The Sportsman*, 5 May 1906, p.3). This team did not appear to have any specific connection with football.

Press coverage devoted to baseball during the early stages of development in 1906 was limited. While *The Times* did cover the establishment of the BBA, thereafter only a handful of references were made to BBA matches. Coverage in the local London press was more frequent and more comprehensive. However, there was rarely any consistency in the regularity of coverage devoted to baseball. Some weeks a newspaper might provide a small report on a game, on other occasions it would just have the results, and, at other times, one could even be forgiven for thinking that baseball was not played in London. The newspapers that did provide some coverage were, on the whole, relatively polite in their reflections on the game. It was not
introduced on a large scale and perhaps, together with the unsuccessful venture of the 1890s, this helps explain why little concern was expressed from any of the established quarters of the potential threat from baseball. The initial years of the new century had seen growing interdependency and warming diplomatic relations between the USA and Britain. This may go some way to explaining the more receptive approach toward the American game.

In light of the fact that the Mills Commission was still researching into the origins of baseball, it is interesting to note that those responsible for promoting the game of baseball in London promoted it as “a kind of glorified rounders” (The Eastern Mercury (London), 19 June 1906, p.5). Despite these promotional efforts, The Woolwich Herald (London) (15 June 1906, p.4) suggested, “the renewed attempt which is being made to popularise baseball in England does not appear to be succeeding any better than the former effort” in the 1890s. Despite this assessment, attendances at many of the games reached several hundreds of paying spectators, and occasionally crowds of over 3,000 were reported. In fact, by the end of the first season, The Eastern Mercury (London) (28 August 1906, p.6) was reflecting on the success of the organizers:

Looking back at the difficulties which had to be overcome, we must marvel at their pluck and perseverance. The only exchequer behind them was that of their own private purse. There was not a baseball outfit to be found in London. They had not a blade of grass on which they could play the game. They had not a club, nor ground, nor a single player, and yet they tackled the problem of making something out of nothing with the conviction that they were going to succeed (sic). And the prophets of evil, what shall we say of them? ‘The movement was doomed to failure’. ‘Baseball will never go in Britain’. ‘The game was tried before and did not catch on’. Those were the verdicts recorded by pressmen and others before the game was given a trial. Players are turning

12 The British form of baseball was still popular in South Wales and Liverpool, and it is interesting to note that The Sportsman (28 May 1906, p.3) suggested that it might be possible to “arrange fixtures with the London sides if the matter of different styles could be got over”. But it appears that no such fixtures were ever arranged.
up in shoals, new clubs are knocking for admission at the door of the Association.

In addition to the London League, a handful of less prominent cup competitions were established for “novice teams” and the reserve teams of the major clubs involved in the London League (The Eastern Mercury, 7 August 1906, p.6). A British Baseball Cup was also established in 1906, although this was still based entirely in London. Prior to the start of the 1907 season, The Woolwich Herald (London) (24 May 1907, p.5) still held out little hope that baseball would be a success:

Judging by the scarcity of attendance at the games which the British and London Baseball Leagues supply, the public are not yet educated up to the attractions of the game, and there is plenty of evidence that the present movement will go the same way as that which originally produced the famous baseball ground at Derby.

Although the final of the British Baseball Cup drew a crowd of approximately 3,000 (see, for example, Leytonstone Express and Independent and Essex County Record, 24 August 1907, p.8), hardly any of the regular season matches could attract more than a handful of spectators. By the 1908 season, perhaps in an attempt to deal with what The Woolwich Herald (London) (10 May 1907, p.3) had referred to as “wooden-legged teams”, playing baseball the year before, several clubs started to bring in “expert” American players. The willingness of teams to import players from the USA seemed to hinder baseball’s progress. We have already seen how a similar process contributed to the downfall of the inaugural baseball league in England in 1890. The problem this time related to the availability of the American players, and not necessarily their superior ability, as was the case in 1890. Several American players would leave England three-quarters of the way into the season. As one

---

13 I have found no evidence of a ‘British Baseball League’, and assume that this is a reference to the British Baseball Cup competition.
A journalist pointed out: "the disadvantages attached to a Yankee team were exposed on Saturday. Half of the team's best men have gone back to the States after their cup-tie" (The Eastern Mercury (London), 11 August 1908, p.5). Thus, there was concern that the American players were unreliable, and leaving their clubs before the season finished had a negative impact on the game.

Newspaper coverage of baseball was still sporadic. This is best exemplified by reports that appeared toward the end of the 1908 season. Prior to the final of the cup, between Leyton and Tottenham, an enthusiastic reporter for The Eastern Mercury (London) (18 August 1908, p.5), a Leyton based newspaper, wrote:

In seasons to come the [baseball] cup winners of 1908 will be respected as much as we nowadays respect the old winners of the English [football] cup, viz: the Wanderers, Royal Engineers, Old Etonians and other ancient organizations ... Turn up in your thousands and make a din and we [Leyton] will win. So au revoir till next Tuesday and then buy the only paper fully dealing with baseball, viz., the 'Eastern Mercury'.

Despite this enthusiasm, no mention was made of baseball at all in the same publication the following week! Tottenham defeated Leyton in the final but it is rather surprising, despite the defeat of 'their' team, that no acknowledgement that the final even took place appears within the newspaper. The next mention was not until September when a small reference was made to baseball within a report about the Annual General Meeting of Leyton Football Club (The Eastern Mercury, 1 September 1908, p.5). Once again, it is likely that the sparse coverage is connected with the greater control that the cricket supporting established groups undoubtedly had over flows of communication. Cricket matches were frequently covered in detail within the local London press. This prejudice toward the 'outsider' sport of baseball may have been exacerbated by the evident disapproval, amongst those writing about the game, toward imported, American players.
In the following season, coverage was still highly erratic. Those writing about the game remained concerned that teams were utilising unreliable, ‘outsider’ Americans. There was marked criticism in the press of the attitudes of those Americans who returned to the USA before the season was over. *The Eastern Mercury* (London) (8 June 1909, p.5) argued that more of the American players needed to follow the example of a small minority of other Americans who chose to “sacrifice their holiday”. Only with the “same co-operation and personal sacrifice”, the reporter suggested, could “baseball progress” (*The Eastern Mercury*, 8 June 1909, p.5). The behaviour of American players who chose to leave their clubs before the season ended, it was noted, “provided those enemies of the sport with an opportunity to further degrade baseball” (*The Eastern Mercury*, 8 June 1909, p.5). Despite the criticisms aimed at the American players in the local press, teams still continued with this practice. Presumably the club boards viewed this policy as, on balance, advantageous. Contrary to this, the *Eastern Mercury* (London) (6 July 1909, p.5) had this advice for the BBA:

> The British Baseball Association would do well to follow the example of the Associations in the colonies – Australia and Cape Colony\(^\text{14}\) – where local and native talent is encouraged in preference to an abundance of Yankee talent.... Yankees are not welcomed [at Leyton baseball club] and they have frequently proved to account for a club’s downfall by their departure for the States at the end of July. Many of the defunct clubs have pursued the policy of securing Americans to their own detriment.

Baseball in England was fast in decline, some clubs had ceased playing, and the venture no longer appeared to be a financial success for the football clubs. For example, by the 1909 season it was reported that *Leyton Football Club*’s baseball operation worked on a “net deficit” over the season (*The Eastern Mercury*, 15 June 1909, p.8). This was only one season after showing “a profit of £87” (*The Eastern Mercury*, 8 June 1909, p.5).

\(^{14}\) As indicated in the previous chapter, I can find no coverage relating to baseball in South Africa prior to the 1990s. This would be an interesting lead to follow up at another time.
The sharp downfall in profits was, in part, a reflection of the fact that only four clubs were competing in the 1909 season — Clapton Orient, Leyton, the Nonedescripts and Woolwich Arsenal. Although Brentford joined the above-mentioned teams in 1910 — and actually won the league — it is likely that the other clubs were in a similar financial predicament to Leyton because league baseball collapsed only two years later. After 1911, no reports appeared in the numerous local papers in London.

Although baseball was played in the fairly remote Oxfordshire village of Chipping Norton (Oxfordshire) “from 1912 to 1914 … as a Scout game”, it was “not under strict rules and not with full playing equipment” (Oxfordshire Weekly News, 25 July 1923, p.5). Fred Lewis introduced the game of baseball to his scout troop, in part, because he wanted to resolve the apparent issue of having boys of “different sizes and ages, and of different social classes” (C. Withers, personal communication, April 6, 1995) playing a game together. According to Charlie Withers (personal communication, April 6, 1995), who played baseball in Chipping Norton during the 1930s, Lewis produced a “three page pamphlet” on baseball that was “issued by the Scout Headquarters”. Baseball was played in Chipping Norton for several years, on a much more organized basis than this (as will be made clear below). As such, Lewis was somewhat romantically regarded by many in Chipping Norton as the “father of British baseball” (C. Withers, personal communication, April 6, 1995; Chipping Norton Advertiser, 24 November 1960, p.1). Following the demise of the London League, the next time that baseball received any substantial coverage in the English press was when a third tour of American professionals played one exhibition match in England in 1914.
7.5 The 1914 Tour and baseball during and after World War I

No professional American tour has taken place when baseball has been set up seriously as an organized sport in England. This seems strange given the impact that the tour of 1889 actually had in contributing to the development of baseball in England during the final decade of the 19th century. No professional tours were made to further solidify the organizations that existed in England during the 1890s or the brief period of development from 1906. Instead, the next tour was made 3 years after the London league actually disappeared.

As we have seen, in 1913-14 a ‘World Tour’, led by John McGraw and Charles Comiskey and financed by Spalding Bros., held exhibitions in Japan, the Philippines, Australia, Egypt, and then France. It ended with what the players considered to be a suitably “fitting climax” (New York Times, Sports Section, 28 February 1914, p.1) – one exhibition game played at Stamford Bridge, London on 26th February 1914. The tour, therefore, was far more limited in England than the previous two. The timing of the match in England is of particular interest. The USA was developing significantly as a nation and Britain was in steep decline as a world power. Under these conditions, one might anticipate that the response to this latest attempt to export ‘America’s national game’ to England would be less than welcoming. However, there was also growing instability within Europe, and the British government was concerned with the need to develop a stronger alliance with the powerful American government.

As the tourists were welcomed to London, John McGraw (cited in Daily News and Leader (London), 25 February 1914, p.10) announced that "baseball can be made a success in England if the public will realize that the game offers the same healthy
interest to athletes and sportsmen as either football or cricket”. He argued that baseball’s lack of development in England had been to the “loss” of the “English sporting public”. He was, however, still optimistic that baseball “would eventually arouse great enthusiasm” in England (cited in Daily News and Leader (London), 25 February 1914, p.10). The English press, as an entity, never shared this optimism. Although, Elfers (2003, p.227) argues, “the tourists would garner more interest from the press and general public in England than in any other place, save perhaps Australia”. He also holds that in England “interest in these games had been brewing for months” (Elfers, 2003, p.227). Rossi (1991, p.247) similarly argues that baseball “had been given … an extensive build-up in the country”. Neither Elfers nor Rossi provide any evidence to support their claims, and they are at odds with a report in The Times (23 February 1914, p.13) at the time, which indicated that, as far as the English press were concerned, the decision to even play one game in England was made only days before the tourists arrival.

Elfers (2003, p.228) holds that “a large contingent of fans met the two teams” on their arrival in London, including “large delegations from the British press and representatives from English club teams”. Elfers, once again, provides no evidence to support his claims, and I have found no evidence that English club teams even existed at this time. Both Elfers (2003) and Rossi (1991) indicate that prior to the tourists’ arrival in London, McGraw had been publicly comparing cricket unfavourably with baseball. Indeed, Elfers (2003, p.230) refers to an interview McGraw gave to the Pall Mall Gazette (London) in which McGraw stated: “American soldiers are superior to the British because of the athletic discipline in the United States and because every 13 This rather contradicts Elfers’ own view that the Japanese, in particular, had demonstrated considerable interest in the tour. Indeed, he argues that “nothing, absolutely nothing, prepared the tourists for the reception they received in Japan” (Elfers, 2003, p.108; emphasis added).
American soldier has learned to play baseball and through that game has benefited his mind as well as his body”. Not surprisingly, this comment brought condemnation from the Pall Mall Gazette (cited in Elfers, 2003, p.230), which referred to McGraw as “impertinent”, and called “for a boycott of the game to protest McGraw’s statements”. Despite this, the match went ahead, and the day before the exhibition match was due to take place, it was announced that King George V was to attend. This is likely to have been a government inspired initiative, relating to alliance formation. Despite the initial furore surrounding McGraw’s earlier comments, some people in the press also wished to cultivate alliances by making the American tourists feel welcome. In this context, The Sportsman (26 February 1914, p.6) claimed that, “never was the feeling of friendship between Englishmen and Americans stronger than it is today. And their [the Americans] visit, in emphasising the camaraderie among sportsmen, might do much to strengthen that feeling”. There was a significantly higher gate than the tourists had achieved on any of the previous tours. Gate attendance during the 1874 and 1889 tours ranged from between a few hundred and seven or eight thousand. The reported gate for the game at Stamford Bridge was between seventeen and thirty thousand spectators. The New York Times (27 February 1914, p.1) reported that “30,000 Britons see American baseball”, which, the reporter argues, “was a flattering recognition of our great American game”. Although, The Sportsman (27 February 1914, p.6) suggested that “there were between seventeen and eighteen thousand present – some of the estimates were greatly exaggerated”. It is likely that this author was accusing the American press of inflating the gate numbers. Although, given the British government’s wider concerns, they probably would have been quite happy that the attendance figure was exaggerated in the American press.
There was much greater press coverage of the baseball in the English newspapers, although, much of the coverage of the game itself was still disparaging. For example, in an article entitled “The Invasion of Baseball”, *The Daily News and Leader* (27 February 1914, p.10) argued that:

> At such time when our political relations are so friendly with America it seems almost an unfriendly act to allege that their great national pastime leaves us cold ... and I can never see it raising an English audience to paroxysms of delight. It is, I think, a game for a warm climate and a people temperamentally more excitable than ours.

While February was not the most appropriate month in which to hold an exhibition game, the newspaper seemed to overlook the fact that the same climatic reservations could also be applied to cricket. *The Standard* (London) (28 February 1914, p.10) was even more emphatic in its dismissal of baseball:

> They [the Americans] are not satisfied, it is not compatible with their new-world pride ... to make use of anything that comes from the Old World. If they do condescend to adopt a thing of foreign origin it must first be Americanised, distorted out of all semblance to its native form. The English language is a case in point! The national game of baseball is a shining example of these methods of adaptation. It was once rounders ... It is unlikely that baseball will catch on in England, certainly it will never diminish the popularity of any of our national games.

Notwithstanding the obvious need to garner good relations with the USA, the perceived growing cultural threat from America appears to have informed or conditioned the response of some writers in the English press. Evident in *The Standard’s* report is a very clear distinction between ‘them’ and ‘us’. Emphasis is placed on origins and tradition in relation to established English sports. In this context, *The Sportsman* (27 February 1914, p.6) noted that as with the “many previous attempts [that] have been made to introduce the great American game into this country ... it is not at all likely that cricket’s supremacy is in any material danger”. The newspaper attributed this, in part, to “the truly American methods of the
coaches”, which “received a share of comment not always favourable” (The
Sportsman, 27 February 1914, p.6). This is a reference to the rather zealous
collection that the coaches made during the game; shouting advice, and often
insults, from the side of the pitch. According to several journalists, the ‘style’ of play
that the baseball players and coaches evoked in their game was ‘just not cricket’ and,
thus, not suited to the English – or rather, it could be argued, the English middle- and
upper classes.

As on the previous tour in 1889, more often than not, English journalists were
dismissive of what they considered to be the ‘unscientific’ aspects of batting in
baseball. For example, The Times (27 February 1914, p.8) noted that “in batting, in
spite of all the gorgeous smiting that was seen, baseball does not compare with
cricket”. Such an attitude, as has been previously discussed, is resonant with the
‘established’ views regarding the different parts played by the gentlemen (the
‘amateur’ batsmen) and the ‘players’ (the artisan bowlers). The author went on to
suggest that baseball “was not cricket. It cannot be said that the crowd showed any
evidence of thinking that baseball is ever likely to supersede our national game” (The
Times, 27 February 1914, p.8). This statement is, in itself, indicative of prejudice
rather than a judgement informed by evidence.

The difference in the length of play was at the heart of several reports
comparing baseball with cricket. For example, J.L.Griffiths, the American Consular
General in London, speaking at a luncheon held for the players and members of the
press, is reported to have commented that:

The respective merits of baseball and cricket were to him an interesting study.
It would be impossible for an American at the most exciting point of a
baseball match to take afternoon tea, discuss the latest prices or the latest
plays. He would be incapable of it. But an Englishman could do it, and the fact that it took but two hours to play a baseball match, and two or three days to play a cricket match was sufficient evidence for the difference temperamentally of Americans and Englishmen (The Sportsman, 26 February 1914, p.6).

This account does not acknowledge that Association Football is over in less than two hours, and extremely popular in England. It is more a testimony to the fact that the dominant English culture was still imbued with upper/middle class values of the gentleman-amateur, as exemplified through cricket. Cricket remained an upper/middle class game holding sway, in the south of England especially, with the new upper-middle class businessman (Holt 1989). Griffiths clearly regarded these dominant groups as the personification of Englishness.

The response to baseball in the English press was still an expression of middle- and upper class values. In this respect, The Daily News and Leader (27 February 1914, p.1) suggested that, because baseball was a “peculiarly American sport”, it was unsuited to the “English people” and that “baseball still remains, and will remain, as exclusively and peculiarly a Transatlantic dish as clams and crackers and canvasback”. It would not be adequate, however, to explain the English rejection of baseball merely in terms of it being ‘peculiarly American’. The fact that the English had been at the forefront of the ‘modernization’ of sport process partly explains the generally negative response from the English press. This is something that is fundamentally connected with the power struggles between dominant groups within the two nations.

After the tourists left, McGraw was in a rather more diplomatic mode than he had been prior to their arrival, stating that the purpose behind the match “was the
promotion of better understanding and spirit between the lovers of every sport” (cited in *The Sportsman*, 2 March 1914, p.3). Nevertheless, baseball certainly does not appear to have been re-established following this exhibition match.16 The only place, it seems, where American baseball was played was in Chipping Norton, Oxfordshire. From 1914, baseball was played there by “older boys and Girl Guides … under strict rules and with full playing equipment” (*Oxfordshire Weekly News*, 25 July 1923, p.5). Whether the exhibition games in London contributed to the developments for greater organization of the game in Oxfordshire could not be substantiated.

It was barely two years on from the 1914 tour, and the beginning of the war in Europe, when the USA declared war on Germany and joined the Allied forces. As a direct result of this, significant numbers of American servicemen were stationed in England. Whilst the primary intention of the American’s was to contribute to the war effort, their arrival brought another attempt to establish baseball. *The Times* (30 August 1918, p.9) considered that:

The United States Forces have crossed the Atlantic to help win the war. They have no secondary object. But if, on their return, with victory enthroned in the colours, they could claim also to have converted Great Britain to baseball, the delight of America would be the more complete. Our visitors dream of a future in which British teams shall go to the States, and American teams come to England, to play for the baseball championship.

Undoubtedly the American and Canadian forces that were stationed throughout England would have engaged in spontaneous matches of baseball within

---

16 Although one reporter did suggest that baseball “is still played, especially in the north of England” (*The Daily Mail*, 27 February 1914, p.7), there appear to be no grounds for this assertion. It might simply be that this was in actual fact a mistaken reference to ‘English baseball’, which was still played. No match reports on American baseball were revealed by research conducted on local newspapers in the region. In addition, in Hull – where the game was to become fairly popular in the 1930s, and on a very minor scale is still played today – a report contained in the *Sports Mail* (Hull) (27 June 1914, p.1) suggested that baseball would never develop there: “Whether the appearance before the King in London in February last of the American baseball players will have the effect of arousing a liking for the game here [in Hull] or not I cannot say, but I am very much inclined to think not”.

their barracks. Organized matches, aimed at drawing paying spectators, were also arranged as fund-raising events for injured soldiers and families who had lost men during the war. The games were occasionally played in front of royalty. For example, Prince Albert, Prince Christian and Princess Marie Louise were among the spectators at a game at Sunningdale (The Times, 23 August 1917, p.9). The Times (30 July 1917, p.9) noted that “baseball is growing in popularity in this country”. However, there does not appear to be any evidence that baseball was attracting the indigenous population, at least in a playing capacity. Although, baseball was still played in Chipping Norton. In fact,

In 1917 the first organised baseball competition [in this area] was held at Churchill about three miles from Chipping Norton. Here eight Scout teams from the district played three innings games and competed for the Spalding Cup, which was that year put up for baseball in Chipping Norton (Oxfordshire Weekly News, 25 July 1923, p.5).

It is unclear if this was the same trophy that was played for by English clubs in the 1890s. Spalding himself had died two years earlier in 1915. Nevertheless, his company, it seems, continued to play a very minor part in trying to establish the game in England.

Besides Chipping Norton, baseball was played fairly regularly in London toward the end of World War I. An ‘Anglo-American League’ was set up in the summer of 1918. Initially, all of the teams were drawn from American and Canadian forces. According to The Times (20 May 1918, p.3), the “baseball season in England was opened on the Arsenal football ground, Highbury” on the 18th of May. Matches were also played at Hounslow, Northolt, Stamford Bridge and Sunningdale (see various copies of The Times, June and July 1918). Moreover, baseball was still played outside the metropolis for charitable purposes. “Another objective”, according to the
Eastern Evening News (Norwich) (27 May 1918, p.4), “was to bring American soldiers into closer touch with the people of East Anglia, and to quicken the feeling of comradeship so that our visitors should feel themselves at home in this country”.

Given the wartime alliance between the British and Americans, it is perhaps not surprising that newspaper reports on baseball took a more polite form. However, some considered that the verbal abuse directed at the batter, by fielders, was inappropriate. Once again such behaviour was regarded as ‘just not cricket’. The Eastern Evening News (Norwich) (27 May 1918, p.4) argued that such activity “is not considered nice at a cricket match, but it is the correct thing at baseball”. The same reporter expressed surprise that the Americans in the crowd also “went for the umpire … [and] sought to repeatedly kill him with their mouths and to rattle either the pitcher or the striker when the game was at a critical stage” (Eastern Evening News (Norwich), 27 May 1918, p.4). The criticism levelled at this verbal baiting (or barracking) of players by their opponents, and the abuse hurled at players and umpires by the crowd, became a feature in later reports on baseball in the English press (as will be discussed below).

Preparations for Fourth of July celebrations by American soldiers in England in 1918, involved several exhibitions of baseball up and down the country. This brought with it greater coverage in the press and further analysis of the game. References that baseball was simply glorified rounders were still commonplace. For example, the Evening Standard (London) (4 July 1918, p.8) argued that “the game, in brief, is glorified rounders”. A report contained in The Times (3 July 1918, p.9) suggested that English people who were “new” to the game should find “it is easy enough to understand the strategy of baseball. Strategically, it is a glorified form of
rounders". The same author argued that "baseball is as different from cricket as poker is from chess, and it is sheer insularity to think comparisons can be drawn between such vividly contrasted games" (The Times, 3 July 1918, p.9). However, he still could not resist the temptation to offer a pro-cricket analysis: "As a nation we shall of course, stick to cricket. Cricket is our game of games, a vital part of our national life and character. But we can be open-minded enough to admire the varied and vivacious pastime in which American personality playfully expresses itself" (The Times, 3 July 1918, p.9). This report clearly highlights that the author held close to his heart a particular notion of England as a community, albeit one involving an established hierarchy, and the part that cricket played in 'our national life and character'. His expressed desire to have an open-mind about baseball suggests that these American 'outsiders' were, at least, welcome. A match in celebration of American Independence Day between the US Army and the US Navy was held at Stamford Bridge. The King, Queen and Princess Mary attended the game, which was a further expression of the more welcoming response. Following this match, The Times (5 July 1918, p.7) held that "the superiority of cricket, when believed in as an article of faith, was most courteously suppressed". Over 50,000 spectators, the largest ever reported gate at a baseball game in England, were in attendance. The King threw the first pitch (by now a custom for dignitaries in the USA to start the 'World Series'), and autographed a ball that was eventually presented to President Wilson (Eastern Evening News (Norwich), 5 July 1918, p.3).

In addition to the exhibition games and the Anglo-American League, baseball matches were played regularly on Saturday afternoons in Hyde Park. These matches included, according to The Times (23 September 1918, p.11), "to everybody's
surprise”, some teams of English soldiers. None of these English teams ever graced the ‘Anglo-American League’.

The increasingly powerful position of the USA after the First World War is indisputable. This period, Iriye (1993, p.122) argues, witnessed the “pervasive impact of American popular and material culture” around the world. He holds that:

What was notable after 1919 was that these developments accelerated and that American influence now became undisputed because of the decline of European prestige ... Because of the war-related devastations ... the Europeans felt themselves to be on the defensive, no longer the unquestioned center of civilization or foundation of wisdom ... America, virtually unscathed by the war, was more than ever before the symbol of the new material and popular culture (Iriye, 1993, p.112).

It is important to recognize, however, that power can never be absolute and the fact that there is a history of resistance from English people to attempts to diffuse baseball, at the very least, suggests that Iriye is incorrect to state that American influence was ‘undisputed’. It is, rather, a question of degrees.

Baseball was still played on a minor scale after the war, but the English press tended to ignore it. The games were hardly significant in terms of the numbers playing or watching; and those that did were usually American and Canadian servicemen. The English population had been, by and large, indifferent toward baseball. The diminishing position of England, as an established power, and the growing influence of the USA undoubtedly served to exacerbate this we/they relationship. Perhaps the fact that the majority of sports played across the globe were essentially ‘modernized’ in England, contributed to strong feelings of ‘we’ identity amongst the English. By rejecting baseball, an outsider sport from a former colony, and retaining ‘their own’
Baseball was now more organized in Chipping Norton and *Chipping Norton Baseball Club* was established in 1920 (C. Withers, personal communication, April 6, 1995). Sufficient interest was generated amongst the indigenous population for enthusiasts to play a number of full, competitive matches in Oxfordshire. A handful of matches were played against Americans studying at Oxford University. Elsewhere in England, baseball teams were largely, if not entirely, made up from American and Canadian troops. For example, in 1919, *The Times* (5 June 1919, p.7) reported that matches were played in "the following Canadian areas ... Ashford, Seaford, London, Rhyl, Buxton, Witley and Ripon". These matches do not appear to have been particularly well organized, and there is no evidence to suggest that league or cup competitions developed from these foundations. There is no mention of the 'Anglo-American League' that had been set up during the War. No other reference to baseball appeared in *The Times* (26 April 1922, p.7) until April 1922, when it was stated that "a Baseball League is being formed in London ... As there are some thousands of people interested in the game in London alone, it is hoped that four strong teams may be formed". One 'English' team competed against three teams made up entirely of Americans and Canadians. Matches were played at Stamford Bridge, under the title of the 'International Baseball League'. The four teams were the *London Americans, London Canadians, U.S. Shipping Board* and *All England* (*The Times*, 22 May 1922, p.21). *All England, The Times* (13 May 1922, p.12) stated, was "organized in an attempt to popularize the game in England". By July, the only four teams playing league games were the *US Shipping Board*, the *London Canadians*, the *American University Club* and the *YMCA*. No mention was made as to why, and when, *All..."
England or the London Americans were replaced. Very little, if any, mention was given to these baseball matches in the local London press. The Times only sporadically published results for matches that were played that year. The Sportsman also published some results, and mentioned an Independence Day celebration baseball match, that attracted nearly 2,000 spectators (*The Sportsman*, 5 July 1922, p.2).

By the end of the summer, one reporter writing in *The Times* offered the following reasons for why baseball had not caught on, and why cricket remained the national summer sport in England:

One of the standing mysteries which perplex American summer visitors to this city is the curious devoting of the British public to the old-fashioned game of cricket ... The spectators [at baseball games] themselves, with their partisan cries of approval and ironical contempt, and their caustic comments on any mistakes on the part of the players, are far more actively concerned in the game than the orderly rows of onlookers that sit and stand round the Oval or Lord's. What Englishmen and Australians would call barracking is to them legitimate and laudable procedure, and adds enormously to their enjoyment. Without it the play would seem to them tame and insipid, and hardly worth watching. Perhaps this practice of gloating over the discomfiture of players who have tried and failed to do their best is one of the reasons why the missionary efforts which, from the seventies onwards, have been made to popularize baseball in Australia and this country have not met with more success. Though perfectly good-tempered and doubtless commendable in the land of its birth, it is not what on this side of the Atlantic would be called "cricket". But in any case, there is undoubtedly something in the English national game which is peculiarly suited to the genius of the English race. In the long summer days, the very fact that it is more leisurely than baseball endears it to players and spectators alike (*The Times*, 23 August 1922, p.13).

Once again, the report ignores the fact that crowds at football matches in England were active in their partisan support of 'their' team. From the early 1900s, Holt (1989, p.174) argues, football "supporters never accepted the notion that the contest should be confined to the pitch". Hence, the reporter in *The Times* makes general assumptions about the 'English race' from a very specific middle/upper class, gentlemanly-amateur perspective. This is perhaps not surprising because, as Holt
(1989, p.266) again argues, “Englishness was everything” for “cricket-writers”. This is more likely to come to the fore at a time when Britain’s position in the world was in relatively sharp decline. Furthermore, as Van Stolk and Wouters (1987, p.483) argue, “changes in the international balance of power ... can affect the self-respect of an entire nation”. The fact that the balance of power enjoyed by the USA was increasing significantly has already been discussed. It is clear that the reporter writing in The Times was keen to advance the self-respect of the ‘English nation’ in choosing cricket over baseball. Holt (1989, p.287) points out that cricket’s administrators deliberately refused to modernize their sport, and this may have been because of a resolute desire for cricket to remain characteristic of the era of the great English ‘gentleman-amateur’.

In 1923, a league run by the ‘American Legion’ replaced the International Baseball League. Once again, Stamford Bridge was used for the competition involving the following teams: the American Legion, Cambridge University Americans, London Americans, Oxford University Americans, US Destroyer Dale and the Wembley Canadians. Even though The Times (28 May 1923, p.6) reported that “3,000 spectators” saw “the first baseball match” of the 1923 season, coverage of these games was sparse, to say the least. This was in contrast to the relatively good press that baseball received in Oxfordshire. The Oxfordshire Weekly News regularly provided comprehensive coverage of local matches. In fact, it was the first English newspaper to provide as much coverage to baseball as football or cricket. The enthusiasm for the game in this part of Oxfordshire does not seem to have stimulated its spread much beyond the county.
It is interesting to note that the *Oxfordshire Weekly News* (22 August 1923, p.4) stated in August 1923 that:

Although now the national game of the United States, it is of British origin; indeed, one might almost say that Oxfordshire is its native county, for a certain Captain Doubleday, who about eighty-five years ago evolved the game from ‘rounders’, was born near Woodstock (Oxon.), but his parents settled in New York.

These assertions are ill founded, or problematic, given the earlier discussion (see chapter five) as to the insubstantial evidence on which the ‘Doubleday myth’ was grounded. Suffice to say, the author of this statement was attempting to derive kudos from Oxfordshire being involved in baseball’s emergence, rather than the country being a belated recipient of a game ‘invented’ elsewhere. As such, this article is as much a manifestation of nationalism, or perhaps more directly in this case regionalism, as articles that were derisive.

A higher profile attempt to develop baseball was made in 1924, when a fourth tour by American Major League teams took place. The tourists played matches in England, Ireland and France, in October and November. Durso (1969, p.187) described this tour as “a repeat of the barnstorming of a decade earlier, with Charles Comiskey again heading the American League contingent [*Chicago White Sox*] and McGraw heading the Nationals [*New York Giants*]”. The games in England were played at Goodison Park and Stamford Bridge football grounds.¹⁷ Before the tour commenced, it was announced that the proceeds from the games would be distributed to various English charities (*The Liverpool Echo*, 21 October 1924, p.122). This gesture was, in all probability, an attempt to cultivate good relations with the English

---

¹⁷ Although Durso (1969) suggests that matches were played in Manchester and London, matches were only played in Liverpool and London. Perhaps Liverpool was chosen because ‘English baseball’ was still popular there. The local Liverpool press referred to exhibition games of “Real American Baseball” (*The Liverpool Post*, 24 October 1924, p.12).
press and public in advance of the tour. A crowd of over 2,000 witnessed the game at Goodison Park on the 23rd October, and approximately 5,000 attended at Stamford Bridge the next day (The Sportsman, 25 October 1924, p.7).

The local press in Liverpool expressed surprise that baseball "stirs the American blood so amazingly" (The Liverpool Echo, 23 October 1924, p.12). On the whole, the local press here offered only basic descriptions of the game. Where reports did examine baseball in greater depth, a great deal of interest was shown in the amount of money generated by the sport in the USA. Attention was often drawn to the vast wages of the American players. In The Liverpool Echo (21 October 1924, p.12), for example, it was noted that the salaries of the top players "run to about 20,000 dollars a year which is about £5,000, or a Prime Minister's salary in England". The same paper suggested that "the finance of baseball in America is something which the sportsmen of this country can only dimly appreciate" (22 October 1924, p.5).\(^1\)

The southern-based press focused on the tour as an opportunity to analyse one aspect of the rapid expansion of 'American culture'. Perhaps this perception goes some way to explaining why George Bernard Shaw was asked to cover the tour for the London Evening Standard, despite the fact that he confessed to a dislike of sport, per se. He wrote, in an article entitled "This Baseball Madness":

> It was as a sociologist, not as a sportsman – I cannot endure the boredom of sport – that I seized the opportunity ... to witness for the first time a game of baseball. I found that it has the great advantage over cricket of being sooner ended ... As I left the ground one of my courteous hosts expressed a hope that I would come again. When a man asks you to come and see baseball played twice it sets you asking yourself why you went to see it played once. That is a

---

\(^1\) I found very little reference to the salaries of players in previous reports within the English press, although in 1918, a report in the Evening Standard (4 July 1918, p.8) noted that the players giving exhibition games would, back in the USA, draw "the salary of a Cabinet minister".
totally unanswerable question. It is a mad world (cited in The Evening Standard (London), 4 November 1924, p.7).

Shaw’s consideration, however tongue-in-cheek, that baseball had ‘advantages’ over cricket was something resolutely denied by most other reporters covering the games in England. For example, another reporter writing in the Evening Standard (25 October 1924, p.6) argued that:

If America is to inoculate us with this game, as apparently is the intention of the teams, who confess that theirs are propaganda efforts – it will have to be shown that there are feats in it that excel those of our first class cricketers. Stripped of formidable paraphernalia in the way of face shields, breast-pads, and huge gloves, and the shouting accompaniment known as “rooting”, yesterday’s game seemed infinitely less skilful than cricket.

The famous cricketer, P.G.H Fender, was also negative in his assessment of baseball. He argued that, “if there is one principle more than another on which cricket and football rest in England it is that there shall be no talking either by the players or by the spectators” (cited in The Evening Standard 25 October 1924, p.9). Once again, this seems to be a ‘principle’ rooted in a gentlemanly-amateur approach. Football players and crowds were very ‘vocal’ in their participation within the game. Even cricket, Birley (1989, p.3) argues, witnessed a growth in “remarkably effective professionalism” at this time. However, despite this, as Holt (1989, p.174) points out, the middle- and upper class amateur still “saw himself as someone who could hold his passions in check and for whom the enjoyment of the game was more important than the result”. The denigration of baseball is undoubtedly related to the fact that established groups in English society saw sport, and particularly cricket, as one of the bastions of traditional values. Once again, perhaps, the politically less dangerous arena of sport was an area in which the ‘established’ could muster a considerable defence of their position, in the face of the growing threat from an increasingly
powerful 'outsider'. Whilst it is clear that the power balance did increasingly favour the USA, this was not so strong as to suppress all expressions of protest.

As one writer for the *New York Times* (27 October 1924, p.18) recognized, the baseball “professionals somewhat too evidently [for the English press and public] are engaged in a business rather than a sport”. The same article contained an assessment of why the English appeared to have rejected baseball, and the Americans had rejected cricket:

So hard it is to imagine any definite reason why the English like cricket and think baseball a mysterious and rather foolish game, while Americans have about the same opinions, reversed, of cricket, that the temptation is strong to doubt the sincerity of these judgements, as judgements, and to explain them as the results of chance-acquired habits strengthened on both sides by national pride (*New York Times*, 27 October 1924, p.18).

These respective attachments relate to deeply internalized beliefs and values, and long-term power struggles. Such commitments do tend to generate justification ideologies. Some English newspapers still considered that baseball was little more than “glorified rounders” (*The Sportsman*, 25 October 1924, p.7). *The Times* (25 October 1924, p.6) even made reference to the fact that such an assessment served to alienate many Americans: “Many well-meaning Englishmen have severed promising friendships forever, or suffered severe personal injury, from Americans by casually remarking to enthusiastic baseball ‘fans’, ‘Oh, that’s your way of playing rounders, isn’t it?’”. John McGraw, most notably, was just one person stung by such comments. He openly defended baseball against this and other criticisms, arguing that:

I cannot understand how any one can run down baseball on the ground that it is glorified rounders. I am told none of your cricketers can throw like our boys, and as for double ‘barracking’ it is all good natured, though not an essential part of the game. We Americans could never sit in solemn silence all afternoon watching a game of cricket (cited in the *New York Times*, 3 November 1924, p.24).
The dilemma for McGraw, as it had been for Spalding, was that while he harboured feelings of hostility towards English critics of the game, he also sought their support. McGraw (cited in *The Evening Standard*, 24 October 1924, p.9) offered the view that baseball "will be taken up seriously on this side in the course of the next few years".

Following the opening two exhibition matches played in Liverpool and London, the tourists played exhibition games in Paris and Dublin. Before returning to the USA, they played the final game of their tour on 6 November at Stamford Bridge. King George, accompanied by the Queen, the Prince of Wales and Prince Henry attended the match. The game attracted over 10,000 spectators but, according to *The Sportsman* (7 November 1924, p.3), "the generality of the crowd were simply curious; they took but a placid interest in the display".

Back in the USA, McGraw (cited in *The New York Times*, 3 December 1924, p.17) pronounced that the "tour was a complete success". Although, he was of the view that "baseball will never gain a foothold there [England] until it is taught in the public schools". In fact, the tour did not prove to be a catalyst for growth in baseball’s popularity in England. Over the next few years, *The Times* regularly featured the scores – and little else – of matches played by a variety of teams including Cambridge University, Oxford University, London Americans, s.s. Leviathan, American Actors, U.S. Flagship Detroit, London Cubs, American Musicians and St. Joseph’s College. It seems, however, that the matches were not part of any league competition. According to A. Goodall (personal communication, April 4, 1995), who played baseball for Putney Baseball Club, an amateur team playing in the ‘Metropolitan League’ in the 1930s, matches were played “every Sunday morning … at Stamford Bridge”. The vast majority of the teams were made up of American or Canadian born players who had
remained in England following the war (A. Goodall, personal communication, April 4, 1995). The exception was St. Joseph’s College. This team consisted of students from the college, based in Beulah Hill, southeast London. Brother Alpert, one of the masters at the college, had set up a baseball team in the 1920s. No other school or college were represented.

Some of the indigenous population in Oxfordshire continued to play baseball. As well as playing matches in a small regional league, Chipping Norton Baseball Club played matches against London based teams (C. Withers, personal communication, April 6, 1995). There was very little, if any, coverage of the games provided in the national or local press (except in Oxfordshire). A reference to the minor baseball developments in Oxfordshire was made in the New York Times in 1925. The newspaper asked the rather hopeful question: “Can it be that baseball is getting a foothold in England?” The report makes reference to the style in which the English players played baseball:

Of the Englishmen who have now taken it up with the best intentions, critics say that at bat they have ‘the stance and the swing of the cricket player’ and that the pitchers use ‘the stiff overhand delivery of the cricket bowler’. The catchers ‘disdain to don the mask, considering that the wearing of the wire face-protector would be effeminate’. Gloves are worn but often thrown aside in the excitement of play (New York Times, 18 September 1925, p.22).

Unfortunately no reference is made as to who those ‘critics’ were. Therefore, it is not possible to determine whether or not this tendency to play baseball in a cricketing mode was a more widespread characteristic of English baseball players. Baseball was still very disorganized, even in Chipping Norton. Charlie Withers (personal communication, 6 April, 1995) indicates that before games were played there, frequently cows had to be cleared from the fields because “we were never able to fence our baseball diamond”.

In London, as a ‘spin-off’ from the regular matches being played there, a match between an ‘All-American’ team and an ‘All-British team’ was held annually from 1927, certainly until 1931. However, a number of the ‘All-British’ team played for the *London Americans*, among them, Max Joubert. Indeed, Joubert went on to represent the ‘All American’ team in 1931 (*The Times*, 8 June 1931, p.4). Therefore, at this distance it is not possible to determine the extent to which English citizens participated in these annual contests – or the more frequent matches. Nor is it clear whether the organized matches being played in London were attracting substantial numbers of spectators. The odd reference in *The Times* to a “large crowd” is not very revealing. What does seem certain, however, is that these matches were only played on a relatively unorganized basis. Despite the fact that the games were played at Stamford Bridge, there appears to be no evidence to suggest that a league was ever set up, or that a national governing body existed to oversee baseball. In 1933, a more concerted effort was made to establish the game in England. In that year John Moores, of the *Littlewoods Group*, became actively involved in the establishment of a new, national baseball association.

7.6 Baseball in the 1930s

Although attendances at county cricket matches were in steady decline in the 1920s and 1930s, Holt (1989, p.287) argues, the “lack of an alternative summer team sport protected cricket between the wars”. This does insufficient justice, however, to the efforts of John Moores and his Littlewoods group to encourage the development of baseball in the 1930s. Certainly, the initial reaction to these developments raised little concern regarding the potential impact on cricket, but, by 1937, concern was expressed in cricketing quarters about baseball’s increasing popularity. Thus, these developments deserve further explanation.
After 1933, baseball in England received a sudden and unprecedented injection of money. The source was John Moores. It is unclear what motivated him to provide these funds. Only brief mention is made to this venture in Barbara Clegg’s (1993) biography of the “Man who made Littlewoods”. She argues that he became interested in baseball having seen it played on his numerous trips to the USA, “where he had met John Heydler, President of the National Baseball League, and Babe Ruth, the famous player” (Clegg, 1993, p.74). Given his central involvement in gambling, through ‘football pools’, it is likely that his interest in baseball was partly motivated by the gambling dimension, although he could, of course, have exploited cricket (or even ‘English’ baseball) as a focus for summer gambling.

The financial backing provided, for the most part by Moores, undoubtedly contributed to greater media coverage of baseball, although this came almost exclusively from the local press. *The Times* made no reference to these developments. Moores first publicized his intentions of setting up an American baseball league in the Liverpool region in 1933. This development drew an interesting response from the local newspapers, because ‘English baseball’ was still popular in Liverpool. Criticism of the American game by supporters of ‘English baseball’ brought to the fore issues of belonging and identity, reminiscent of the earlier attempts made to establish American baseball. Distinction was made between the ‘outsider’ sport of American baseball and the ‘established’ sport – in this case, ‘English baseball’. For example, in July 1933, *The Liverpool Echo* (8 July 1933, p.7; emphasis added) stated that, “the mannerisms, the atmosphere, the banter, count for much in *their* games ... confidence in our own interpretation of the rules of baseball remains unshaken – that is a widespread local view. We bring out points of artistry that they miss”.
The renewed attempt to establish the American game encouraged those playing ‘English baseball’ to support ‘their’ game even more strongly. By way of response to “our American brethren”, The Liverpool Echo (29 July 1933, p.7) maintained that “there is no need to fear the importation of a new version”. Instead it could “provide the incentive to English baseball to win a place in the sun” (The Liverpool Echo, 29 July 1933, p.7). Notwithstanding this, it is no surprise, given the power of the Moores’ group in the Liverpool area, that the local press did provide reasonably comprehensive coverage of American, as well as English, baseball. On occasions it is difficult to assess which version of the game is under scrutiny. This point is corroborated by C. Withers (personal communication, April 6, 1995) who suggested that it “always used to be confusing” because the different baseball results were “published alongside” one another in the newspapers.

With reference to American baseball, the Liverpool Echo (29 July 1933, p.7) noted that “the suggestion to introduce the American form has been mooted before”, although Moores’ proposal was regarded “as the first serious attempt to do so”. The report also mentions an “Anglo-American Baseball Association” that was set up in London and “has completed its eleventh consecutive season”. The Liverpool Echo (27 July 1933, p.10) considered that the Association was “sponsored by a large number of professional and businessmen, who, recognising the necessity of creating friendly relationship between the two largest English-speaking nations, are always ready with financial support”. It might be that this is a reference to the matches that were played under the American Legion’s league, but there is little evidence to substantiate the claims, being made by the Liverpool Echo, that baseball was organized on this scale. A. Goodall (personal communication, April 4, 1995), for example, only indicates that baseball was played along informal lines until the NBA set up offices in London.
Furthermore, the *Evening Standard* – the largest local, London newspaper – made no mention of baseball in the 1930s until a very brief, one off report, on a game in 1933. The *West London Observer* also makes no mention of this ‘Anglo-American Baseball Association’.

Despite the fact that the American government was ostensibly practising a policy of isolationism at this time, it cannot be denied that the USA were becoming extremely influential in world economic affairs. As Jenkins (1997, p.208) observes, even by the 1920s “the US share of international trade grew to 15 per cent ... just ahead of Britain, while New York displaced London as the world’s financial metropolis”. Moores, and those promoting the game in London, were no doubt part of this process, and perhaps sought to cash in on it. Under significant influence from Moores, the National Baseball Association (NBA) was set up in 1933. Despite the resolve shown by those playing English baseball in Liverpool, *The Liverpool Echo* (12 August 1933, p.7) reported that there was “concrete support for an American League of twelve to fourteen clubs”, which was to “definitely run in Liverpool next summer”. These initial steps were advanced considerably some months later. The *Liverpool Echo* (9 November 1933, p.14) reported that:

> Those forwarding the American code of baseball in these parts have been very active during the close season, and held a very successful meeting this week. The National Association League are determined that the game will get every chance to capture the public imagination.

> Strictly American rules will be observed, and rule books have already been published. A coaching scheme by experts has been arranged to overcome initial difficulties, and the project has already won valuable support. It was pointed out that a football pitch is quite suitable as a playing space, and the difficulty of obtaining playing equipment locally has been solved.

This latter reference is to Moores’ gift of several bats, balls and clothing. In making these provisions, Moores and his supporters were laying the groundwork that had
been largely overlooked in earlier attempts to establish baseball in England. Indeed, it would appear that Moores provided equipment to clubs throughout the country. As C. Withers (personal communication, April 6, 1995) indicates, “the first thing that happened [after the NBA was formed] was that they supplied the Chipping Norton Baseball Club with ten sets of baseball kit ... It was proper kit too”.

By July 1934, it was noted that “London representatives have been surprised by Liverpool’s advance, and inter-city games are about to be arranged” (The Liverpool Echo, 28 July 1934, p.6). The same article reported that “it was helpful that the game had already germinated in Oxford and Birmingham” (The Liverpool Echo, 28 July 1934, p.6). Reference has already been made to the developments in Oxford. Developments in Birmingham seem to have started around the same time as Moores was trying to establish the game in Liverpool. For example, the Liverpool Echo (30 May 1934, p.14) pointed out that the “Durex Athletic Club, of Adderley Park, Birmingham”, who played “under 100 per cent American rules”, was set up at this time. Very little coverage was provided to these developments in Birmingham by its local press. The Birmingham Post, for example, offered minimal coverage of baseball, publishing the odd result of the “Durex Abrasives” team. A team from Liverpool, Hatfield, won the first national baseball cup competition in 1934.

Further developments occurred in the 1935 season. Increasing numbers of clubs were established in different regions in England, and even as far north as Edinburgh, Scotland. The Liverpool Echo (10 April 1935, p.14) outlined the growth of the American game:

In Birmingham there will be one League of eight clubs, in London two leagues, each of eight, in Oxford one of eight, in Manchester two divisions and a Service Section .... Inter-city games on a wider scale will be a feature,
linking up Edinburgh, Liverpool, Oxford, Birmingham, and London ... the Manchester Senior League will be distinctly interesting, being recruited from the football clubs – Swinton, Oldham, Salford, Hurst, Droylsden, Manchester North End, Belle Vue, and Hyde Grasshoppers.

On the whole, the ‘football’ clubs referred to here, were from Rugby League, although some Association Football clubs in the Salford and Manchester areas had also shown an interest in establishing baseball teams *(Salford City Reporter & Salford Chronicle, 1 March 1935, p.14)*. Indeed, as had been the case in the past, there was a dual objective for the different football clubs in establishing baseball teams: to generate summer income and keep players fit. As the *Salford City Reporter & Salford Chronicle* (1 March 1935, p.14) noted, “the teams will largely be recruited from the present members of the clubs”. However, the report also noted that “baseball specialists” would play alongside the footballers.

In general, the coverage devoted to baseball, even in the northern-based press, where Moores was most influential, still paled in comparison to that given to other sports. In addition, Moores’ influence, it seems, did not extend to the London or Birmingham based press. The coverage in these cities was sparse, to say the least. Neglect in the national press is even starker. This may suggest that baseball was very much of ‘regional’, rather than national, interest. A. Goodall (personal communication, April 4, 1995) recalls that the “Daily Express ... was the only national newspaper that took an interest” in baseball at this time. Indeed, the newspaper regularly published results of matches played in London (and little else, until they started to publish small weekly reports on baseball in London toward the end of the decade). Despite the lack of press coverage, baseball was starting to develop considerably, albeit on a less than secure foundation. In fact, one journalist in *The Liverpool Echo* raised concern. He suggested that, “if anything, progress has been
too rapid to allow consolidation, and that is the immediate problem. American baseball seems to have broken the well-known axiom of ‘walking before you can run’" (The Liverpool Echo, 4 May 1935, p.7). Ninety-five teams were by now affiliated to the NBA throughout England (The Liverpool Echo, 8 June 1935, p.6).

The game also “made an impressive debut in Leeds in July 1935” (Smyth, 1993, p.253), as part of the establishment of a Yorkshire League. The Yorkshire Sports and Cricket Argus (29 June 1935, p.6) suggested that “the game is likely to become pretty well established in some Yorkshire and Lancashire centres”. In Lancashire, baseball received mixed coverage in the local press. Readers of the Lancashire Daily Post and the Manchester Evening News could be forgiven for thinking that baseball was not played in the region, for it received no coverage at all in these newspapers. The Oldham Evening Chronicle and the Salford City Reporter & Salford Chronicle, in particular, however, covered the game extensively. The latter even had their regular Rugby League columnist, ‘Ajax’, frequently writing about baseball developments. Reports indicated that baseball was proving quite popular, since crowds of between 2,000 and 5,000 were not uncommon at the league matches. ‘Ajax’, in fact, provided considerable support for baseball:

Make no mistake about it, this game of baseball should become a popular summer attraction here in England. I freely admit that I have become an enthusiastic fan, yet I did not do so willingly. Like the majority I was somewhat biased against the game at first, probably because it is a foreign importation: but there can be no doubting that the game is far more skilful than most people think. “Glorified rounders” is how I heard one local sportsman refer to it but as he was judging it without ever having seen a game his judgement must be accepted as unreliable although typical of the great majority ... Baseball is packed with thrills (Salford City Reporter & Salford Chronicle, 7 June 1935, p.12).

There was one aspect of baseball that ‘Ajax’ was not won over by, however, and:

That is the habit some players have of arguing with the umpire. It might appeal to an American crowd but here in England despite the hard things we say on occasion about umpires and referees we do not like to see their authority
questioned by the players. Baseball authorities would be well advised to check this fault now before it becomes too firmly established (Salford City Reporter & Salford Chronicle, 7 June 1935, p.12).

Indeed, ‘barracking’ was an issue for virtually all of the reporters who covered the sport. The Liverpool Echo (3 September 1935, p10), for example, commented that barracking “would not coincide with English standards of sport, and might well hinder the progress” of baseball. The reporter blamed the adoption of these ‘standards’ on a “tendency to imitate American methods” (The Liverpool Echo, 3 September 1935, p.10). This point is clearly related to the now oft-mentioned middle/upper class notion that the ‘English sportsman’ should have far higher standards than his American counterpart – and that baseball was a game that could only be successful in England if such ‘Americanisms’ were avoided.

Another aspect of baseball that proved problematic, the Salford City Reporter & Salford Chronicle (16 August 1935, p.10) notes, was that “the finals [of the national baseball cup] should fall on dates already arranged for football matches”. Lance Todd, who was the Chairman of both Salford Rugby League and Salford Baseball Club, demonstrated where his priorities were: “we have our football commitments to think of primarily and we think that the baseball officials have not acted as they should have done” (cited in the Salford City Reporter & Salford Chronicle, 23 August 1935, p.10). Indeed, in the Salford City Reporter & Salford Chronicle’s (30 August 1935, p.10) review of the baseball season, the only “weaknesses” identified “relate to the legislation of the game rather than to its actual playing ... Baseball enthusiasts must remember that England is first and foremost a football-loving country and those teams connected with football clubs have prior obligations to the winter game”.

It was reported in *The Times* (31 October 1935, p.12) that Babe Ruth, having retired from MLB, was “seriously considering” an offer to help develop the game in “Britain and other countries”. Whether John Moores was behind this attempt to lure Ruth is unknown. No further mention is made of it in any of the other papers researched for this thesis. Indeed, *The Times* made no other references to baseball during this period. It seems strange that *The Times* provided coverage of baseball results and made occasional comments when the game was developing, with less success, in London during the 1920s, but made no mention of the developments in the 1930s. It cannot be because this time the matches were limited to the north of England, since baseball was also becoming more established in London. Perhaps it was because the maturation now occurring was significantly related to the professional Rugby League clubs, and also Moores’ involvement in gambling. *The Times* was a newspaper very much tied up with the gentleman-amateur approach to sport, and this may explain why they chose to ignore these developments. They also largely ignored Rugby League at this time as well – save for the publication of results. Although, the newspaper had long since covered professional football matches extensively.

Baseball, though, continued to develop apace. In 1936, three professional leagues were set up in London, Lancashire and Yorkshire respectively. The “London Major Baseball League”, for example, was set up under the auspices of the NBA. A local newspaper noted that:

Mr L.D. Wood, who is responsible for this very definite attempt to put baseball on the map as a summer sport event in this district, is an enthusiast of the game, he having played himself as an amateur in America ....

Seven clubs will compete and they will play each other on the basis of two home and two away games. All the seven clubs with the exception of one are professional, the Catford Saints, composed of missioners of the Latter Day
Saints, being the only amateur team. The professional clubs, besides West Ham are White City, Streatham & Mitcham, Hackney Royals, Harringey and Romford Wasps ... [In addition] ... There are two amateur leagues in existence in London, called the Metropolitan League and the East London League (The Boro’ of West Ham, East Ham and Stratford Express, 25 April 1936, p.10).

Wood sponsored the West Ham baseball team (The Boro’ of West Ham, East Ham and Stratford Express, 2 May 1936, p.12), but I can find no other reference to him in other newspapers, so it is unclear what further part he played in developing the game. Suffice to say, this represented a more serious attempt to develop baseball in London. Indeed, The Boro’ of West Ham, East Ham and Stratford Express (2 May 1936, p.12) predicted that, “the probability of baseball becoming a popular summer team game now that it is going to be run on properly organized League lines this year has encouraged a very large number of London youths to try their skill”. The importance of fostering baseball in schools was not lost on those promoting the game on behalf of the NBA. The 1936 season saw the introduction of junior leagues, for example, in Oxfordshire and Yorkshire. The Chipping Norton Advertiser (17 July 1936, p.4) stated that:

An anonymous donor is generously prepared to expend £1,500 this season in the organization of 24 junior baseball teams in England, and through the National Baseball Association the money will be spent in organising and equipping twelve teams in and around Hull, and 12 teams in Oxfordshire, the age limit being 17.

Prior to the start of the 1937 season, it was noted that baseball was “becoming popular in schools: in London alone there are 85 schools which have included baseball as a regular sport, and in Yorkshire 40 schools are already playing” (Beulahland, Summer 1937, p.40). At St. Joseph’s College, an ‘Old Boys’ Baseball Club was set up in

---

19 Beulahland was the school magazine for St. Joseph’s College, Beulah Hill, London. Someone who responded to the letter I published in The Times sent me numerous copies of the magazines, which contained several references to baseball.
1936 to compete in "the London Metropolitan Amateur League" (Beulahland, Summer 1936, p.37). Other teams playing in this League included Kodak, the Wembley Sox, Ford's Motors, Wembley Pirates, Hackney Greys, Briggs Brigands, Canning Town Glaziers, Philco, Putney, De Havilland Comets, and The Tigers. As A. Goodall (personal communication, April 4, 1995), who played for Putney, points out, some of the "company teams ... had the facilities, they had huge sports grounds [as part of the works area] ... and so were able to set out a permanent diamond". Many of these teams also had the opportunity to play against the professional teams, providing they qualified, in the newly established NBA Challenge Cup. The senior amateur teams still in existence in Birmingham and Oxfordshire also entered the qualifying stages of the NBA cup (C. Withers, personal communication, April 6, 1995; The Chipping Norton Advertiser, 17 July 1936, p.4).

Gates of well in advance of 5,000 were sometimes recorded at games in Lancashire, London and Yorkshire. Most of the teams, however, had more moderate gates of one or two thousand. White City, London, won the NBA's inaugural professional national championship. The teams based in London were still largely reliant on ex-patriots from the USA and Canada. For example, Roland Gladu – who the press nicknamed the "Canadian Babe Ruth" (see for example; The Boro' of West Ham, East Ham and Stratford Express, 9 May 1936, p.14; The Daily Mail (Hull), 13 May 1937, p.19) – was a member of the West Ham team. He later represented the Montreal Royals – who, as was discussed in the previous chapter, were a very successful minor league club – during the early 1940s, and then the Boston Braves Major League team in 1944. Other American and Canadian imports were already established with other clubs in London (A. Goodall, personal communication, April 4, 1995; also see The Boro' of West Ham, East Ham and Stratford Express, 13 June
1936, p.13). Some of the teams were obviously of a reasonable standard since West Ham beat the USA Olympic baseball team 5 runs to 3 in a warm-up game for the Berlin Olympics (The Boro’ of West Ham, East Ham and Stratford Express, 22 August 1936, p.12).

In the northern leagues, the majority of the players were English natives. For the most part, they were professional Rugby League players (The Sports Mail (Hull), 31 August 1936, p.6). For example, Eddie Waring, then the manager of Dewsbury Rugby League Club, and later a well-known commentator on Rugby League, played a part in establishing baseball at Dewsbury. He even provided commentary at baseball matches over a loudspeaker system. In 1937, Smyth (1993, p.255) argues, baseball developed “into a more serious sport”. This is because, he holds:

Yorkshire League teams were now importing Americans and Canadians to strengthen their squads ... Gone were the rugby league players and in came the experienced foreign players. In 1937 there was only one English player in the Leeds team. This situation appeared to be common throughout the League (Smyth, 1993, p.255).

Perhaps this influx of American and Canadian players was a direct response to the success of the London based teams in the season before. Undoubtedly, the prevailing perception of most of the professional clubs was that the way forward was to employ experienced players from North America. Another indication of the growing professionalism within the game, was the increasing number of “professional coaches operating” in England (Daily Mail (Hull), 18 May 1937, p.4).

Baseball, particularly in the northern and London regions, was gaining in popularity. In Hull, matches were regularly attracting crowds of around six thousand. The Hull Daily Mail (18 May 1937, p.4) noted that “with cricket striving to avoid a
further decline in popularity, the organizers of the American game of baseball in this
country are making strong preparations for a record English season”. Such was the
popularity of baseball in Yorkshire, that “Mr S.B. Hainsworth, president of the Hull
and district Cricket Association”, felt driven to criticize the baseball developments.
This led “Mr A.T. Grogan, secretary of the Yorkshire Baseball Association”, to reply
in the following terms:

I do not think Mr Hainsworth’s outburst will cause Hull baseball enthusiasts
any sleepless nights. Rather they will take it as a compliment that people are
sitting up and taking notice of the growing popularity of this sport … Mr
Hainsworth says he will be sorry if the game ever becomes popular in the city.
Is not his pious hope a little belated, in view of the springing up at Hull of
close upon 40 amateur baseball clubs during the close season?

Baseball has not been organised as a rival to cricket, or any other game. It has
been established in order to provide a healthy and clean open air pastime for
the youth of England who do not take part in any other sport during the
summer.

All the team takes part in the game, without some of them having to wait
around the pavilion doing nothing for a couple of hours. Baseball can be
played on football pitches which normally would be lying idle, and therefore
does not interfere with cricket pitches …. There is room for both baseball and
cricket, but if the majority prefer watching baseball then it is because they are
getting value for money (cited in The Daily Mail (Hull), 23 April 1937, p.9).

On the whole ‘club cricket’ matches in Yorkshire attracted fewer spectators
than baseball games. Nevertheless, coverage of club cricket in the Hull Daily Mail
was still more extensive than that afforded to baseball. The lesser coverage given to
baseball could not have helped its further development. In addition, the experiment of
importing North American players was, once again, proving counterproductive. The
top clubs were more interested in importing better players than developing ‘home-
grown’ talent. This meant that English people were not getting the opportunity to play
the game at higher levels within the country. In addition, the importing of better
players had contributed to relatively low scoring matches. Technically, low-scoring
matches in the USA are seen as better quality games. This is because they tend to
emphasize the skill of the pitcher and the fielders. Of course, this is very much a subjective assessment, not shared, according to the Hull _Daily Mail_, by the English crowds. It was suggested that "the pitchers were on top all the time and it is no great fun to English baseball crowds to see little else than almost unending progression of batsmen swiping thin air to earn immediate dismissal" (_The Daily Mail_ (Hull) 25 May 1937, p.4). A similar assessment was provided in the _Yorkshire Sport and Cricket Argus_ (22 May 1937, p.3):

> Pitching alone, however excellent, will not draw crowds to see merely a procession of batsmen struck out .... If the ball game is to enjoy and retain the popular enthusiasm which it has established in this country, it will do so by means of all-round displays in which all the arts and skill are fully exploited. This view is held not only by numerous supporters with whom I have discussed the matter but also by leading officials.

Most English commentators were in agreement that the art and science of cricket lay more often at the door of the batsmen, rather than the bowler. The batsmen were the main attractions for the crowds. The situation that had developed in baseball at this time, and on other occasions when English baseball clubs had sought to import American players, was that the imported players were most often pitchers. This was arguably because they were most likely to be the individuals who could make the swiftest impression on the fortunes of a team. In addition, maybe English players of the game, perhaps drawing on their cricketing experience, found it easier to bat than pitch. A consequence of this was that pitchers dominated many of the matches, which was something that the press, although not necessarily the paying spectators, considered less appealing. Paradoxically, the _Yorkshire Sports and Cricket Argus_ (17 July 1937, p.7) noted that "where the game has been successful [at the gate] is where the major position of a team is composed of imported Canadian or American players".
Another aspect of the game that met with criticism was the recurring theme of "rooting" (or barracking) from the crowd. Some in the English press still regarded the crowds' 'involvement' in this way as inappropriate. For example, the *Yorkshire Sports and Cricket Argus* (29 May 1937, p.3) held that, as well as the 'one-sided' aspects of baseball:

Another thing to be deprecated in the game is the "rooting" by spectators, particularly among the younger end. This form of participation in the game may commend itself in America and Canada, but fails in its appeal to our own sportsmen .... Destructive criticism during a game does harm to all concerned ... Baseball is a game worth seeing, and will become increasingly popular providing we have not too many of the American ideas of sportsmanship introduced into the game.

Once again, supposed 'English' qualities, in regard to sportsmanship, are taken for granted. This view was hardly commensurate with the behaviour of crowds at professional sport venues in England. It is likely they were bringing these habits, for example, from their attendance at football and Rugby League matches.

Despite the success, on the pitch and at the gate, of teams importing players from North America, the *Yorkshire Sports and Cricket Argus* (24 July 1937, p.6) noted the considerable problems this was having in generating sustained interest across the region:

Recent games in the Yorkshire League have had the tendency to be too one-sided to be attractive. For example, City Sox [Bradford] have a good all-round side as an all English team, but were hopelessly beaten by Hull, whose imported players of experience did pretty much as they liked ... Organisers and promoters of the game in Yorkshire will have to seriously consider the question of building teams with, say, only one imported professional to act as coach-trainer-player, and in which the remaining players are local lads of about equal merit so as to obviate that one-sidedness in games which is all too apparent under the present system.

In other words, those striving to develop the game in England were in something of a cleft stick. Clubs that were importing players attracted larger crowds. However, this
strategy weakened the competitive dimension of the game. If all clubs went down the route of importing players, the opportunities for homegrown talent would be reduced. If all clubs opted to rely on English players, many of the more able players would be eliminated and gates would tend to decline. The NBA was also concerned about the negative effects of importing North American players on the development of baseball.

A number of changes were introduced for the 1938 season. A Northern Major League was set up. This was an amalgamation of the existing top leagues in Lancashire and Yorkshire, respectively. Only two professional players were allowed at any one club. A restriction was also imposed on the number of imported players allowed. Not surprisingly, the imported North American players were generally the professionals. These restrictions were primarily in order "to cause more local interest, and also give enthusiasts the opportunity of taking an active part in the game" (cited in Burgess, 1938). This strategy seems to be geared more to the longer-term development of the game. In order to foster the development of a grass roots commitment to baseball in England, the organizers were prepared to accept, what they hoped would only be, short to medium term losses at the gates.

It is difficult to assess what impact these developments had on baseball's popularity. Smyth (1993, p.256) suggests that they caused "attendances to suffer". Furthermore, the Hull Daily Mail (20 August 1938, p.5) questioned:

Whether the policy of the NBA in placing a limit on the number of professional's and in barring the importations of Americans justified itself is a very debatable point. It may have been welcomed in less affluent centres which were struggling for their existence, and yet it was quickly evident in Hull that the early season standard of play was well below that to which crowds at local senior matches had been accustomed.

---

20 This source is actually a scrapbook of local newspaper cuttings from 1938 given to me by Burgess. It is impossible to denote from which newspapers the quotes are taken, as such whenever quoting from the articles within the scrapbook the reference provided will be Burgess (1938).
Nevertheless, it was noted elsewhere that baseball “has grown steadily, and now [the NBA] has nearly 800 clubs affiliated” (Liverpool Echo, 4 August 1938, p.9). In addition, baseball was “attracting the attention of sports promoters in all parts of the country, and the National Baseball Association are inundated with requests for exhibition games from football and Rugby clubs” (cited in Burgess, 1938). Such requests may indicate that the football and rugby clubs saw baseball as a means with which to generate income through ticket sales for baseball in their off-season.

Baseball matches in the ‘Northern Major League’ were still attracting crowds between two and eight thousand people throughout the 1938 season (cited in Burgess, 1938). There also seems to have been a greater demand to play the game in London. In all, approximately 750 teams were in operation in England in the summer of 1938, compared to approximately 450 the year before (Beulahland, Summer 1938, p.41).

The growing popularity of playing baseball may have had a greater impact on a decline in gate attendance’s at the professional matches, as amateur games would often clash with these. Nevertheless, according to A. Goodall (personal communication, April 4, 1995), at least, amateur “baseball was very, very low key, it was just a weekend pastime ... if you turned up you got a game ... We were always desperate to get a team together”.

A series of matches were arranged between a Great Britain team, made up, for the most part, of Canadian players playing in the NBA, against a visiting American team. According to the Hull Daily Mail (9 August 1938, p.9) “the trip of the Americans to England has been sponsored by the USA Baseball Congress [mentioned in the previous chapter]”. The American team was made up of University players or ‘great’ high school athletes (Daily Mail (Hull), 9 August 1938, p.9). As well as the involvement of the American Baseball Congress, it seems that John Moores
sponsored the tests and the trophy presented to the winners bore his name. Five matches were played in Liverpool, Hull, Rochdale, Halifax and Leeds. Great Britain won the series 4 games to 1. As a result, today Britain are regarded, by the IBAF, as the first ‘World Champions’. This title, however, was given retrospectively. At the time, the matches were simply referred to in the press as ‘test matches’. In fact, the *New York Times* provided no coverage of the matches whatsoever. The ‘test matches’ went off without much fuss in the English press too. The national press in England provided next to no coverage. Even the *Daily Express*, which had been regularly publishing the results of baseball matches played in London over the previous few years, provided only scant coverage – and that of only 3 out of the five matches played. Even the coverage in the local press was fairly minimal – the regular NBA season matches received more exposure. This was despite the ‘international’ dimension of the matches, and the fact that, according to the *Daily Express* (15 August, 1938, p.13), “seven thousand spectators” watched the “first test”.

Increasing numbers of people were playing baseball at an amateur level. Ironically, this meant that crowds attracted to professional games at the beginning of the 1939 season were levelling off, and even declining, after 3 or 4 years of relative growth. That is to say, more and more people were playing for amateur teams, rather than going to watch the professionals. This was a point not lost on *Hull Baseball Club*. They changed their schedule for the 1939 season to enable more mid-week matches. The Hull *Daily Mail* (27 May 1939, p.5) considered that this would “provide bigger attendances at Craven Park [Hull’s ground] than are drawn on Saturday afternoons”. Their “very simple explanation” for this was that more people were playing amateur games on Saturday’s (*The Daily Mail* (Hull), 27 May 1939, p.5).
It was noted in the *Liverpool Echo* (15 April 1939, p.3) that there was every reason to be optimistic about the prospects of baseball in the 1939 season: "the outlook for a record sixth NBA season is overwhelmingly bright". It was indicated that there were "snags and difficulties" but, the newspaper considered, these were "only as obstacles to be surmounted" and the season ahead could be "viewed with optimism" (*The Liverpool Echo*, 15 April 1939, p.3). The *Hull Daily Mail* (17 June 1939, p.6) states that there was also "great activity among the school-boy baseball players this season". *The Daily Mirror*, a national newspaper, sponsored a national knockout competition for schoolboys that year. It seems rather strange that the newspaper sponsored this competition, but made no noticeable reference to the senior professional leagues. In fact, the only reference even to the schoolboy competition that they had sponsored was after the final had taken place. It was noted that a "crowd of over 3,000 braved the torrential rain at Craven Park, Hull, to watch ... the final of the "Daily Mirror" National Juvenile Baseball Trophy" (*Daily Mirror*, 17 July 1939, p.26). Such a lack of national coverage of the games was an obstacle to baseball’s further development. Undeterred, the NBA continued in their attempts to develop the game at youth and senior level. It seems that those promoting baseball had a relatively sound foundation on which to develop. However, the outbreak of the Second World War, in September 1939, brought an end to the baseball leagues, as well as most other professional sports in the country. In the case of baseball, though, this was to be the last season of professional competition in England.

7.7 Baseball during the Second World War

Baseball was not played professionally in England after the outbreak of war, but several teams in Liverpool and London continued to play friendly exhibition games (see various copies of *The Boro’ of West Ham, East Ham and Stratford
After the USA joined the war effort in 1942, with many American forces joining the Canadian forces already stationed in England, baseball was played on a more regular basis. Exhibition matches were played on a similar scale to that witnessed in 1917 and 1918. The Eastern Evening News (25 July 1942, p.6) even suggested that baseball was now “making such an appeal in London”. Once again, the most notable matches were played at Stamford Bridge. There were no reports of matches played between the North American servicemen and the indigenous population.

The war effort had undoubtedly brought the USA and Britain closer together. Indeed, when addressing some American troops, Anthony Eden (Foreign Secretary in the British government at this time) suggested that: “We will even learn to play baseball if you will give us time” (cited in The Times, 11 September 1942, p.5). The Times, however, remained dubious about its appeal to the native English residents. Eden’s comment was the basis for a small article in The Times (11 September 1942, p.5) discussing the merits of baseball, in which some of the themes of old resurfaced:

It is a widespread belief among Englishmen that baseball is a simple game to understand and a simpler one to play [because it is so like rounders] ... So, in our ignorance, we are inclined to scoff at a game which actually has an intricate technique ... If either country ever challenged the other at its own game, it is improbable that the challengers would emulate the example of the Corinthians in beating the Barbarians at Rugby Football, although it is not merely insular prejudice which insists that the cricketers would have the better chance. First base, however, belongs to a different world from first slip and it would, perhaps, be better if the two nations, which are showing the world how the more difficult and important matters of life can be shared, should remain rugged individualists when it comes to a question of their games.

Perhaps such an assessment is indicative of the fact that the growing reliance on Americans in the war effort – and other related political and economic aspects – was not reflected in an embracing of American sporting culture. As has already been
highlighted, this may be because certain English people, and large parts of the English press in particular, wished to hold on to a feeling of superiority. Sport was one field where they could legitimately retain a strong sense of power. It was also an arena where protest, at growing American influence, could be expressed without interfering too greatly with the closeness of diplomatic ties built up between the two nations.

In addition to the customary exhibition charity games of baseball, league contests were set up. In the summer of 1943, a league was developed called the London International Baseball League (LIBL). The teams were, for the most part, drawn from the North American troops based in and around London. In general, the league was a fairly low-key affair. On 7 August 1943, a more prominent game, in aid of the British Red Cross, was played at Wembley stadium. More than 21,000 people attended the match, between what the press referred to as "professional" players made up from the United States Air Force and the United States Ground Forces (The Times, 9 August 1943, p.2; Evening Standard (London), 6 July 1943, p.7). The Evening Standard (6 July 1943, p.7) reported, a month in advance of the game, that the match would be "the first all-professional wartime match in this country". It was also indicated that participation was restricted to "only those who have played in American professional leagues in 1939 or later ... and there will be several from American major leagues" (Evening Standard, 6 July 1943, p.7). Several professional American and Canadian baseball players were stationed in Europe during the war, and numerous exhibition matches were played at Wembley thereafter (Bedingsfield, 1999) – often in front of large crowds.

The only coverage given to baseball in The Times in the summer of 1944 was in response to British troops based abroad taking up the game. According to The
"the first reaction" to this development “will be that of gladness over another point of friendly contact between the two armies [British and American]”. The report also considered, however, that:

There may be some prophets of evil to take another [view]. They may declare that this is the writing on the wall; that since the authorities at Lord’s resolutely refuse to have their game brightened by ‘stunts’, cricket will be weighed in the balance of public opinion and found wanting; that to a taste vitiated by ice hockey and greyhound racing the speed of baseball will make an appeal with which the leisureliness of cricket cannot compete. This is surely too gloomy a forecast; there is room for both games, and he is but a poorhearted lover of cricket who thinks that it needs a protective wall built round it. Moreover, it would be not merely ungenerous, it would be positively unpatriotic to grudge a welcome to a game which is but returning home, since it has its oldest roots [through the game of rounders] in this country .... In old days we have spread the gospel of games; our messengers have gone forth far and wide, and now, if we like, we are certainly entitled to ‘scrounge’ a game in return. It may be permissible, however, to hint at one hope as to the language of our own cricket. Shall we ever call the batsman the batter and the bowler the – no perish the thought! The friendliest line must be drawn somewhere (The Times, 15 May 1944, p.5).

This article is indicative of the undoubted desire of the reporter to offer the hand of friendship to the ‘outsider’ Americans. However, clear references are made here to the ‘fact’ that baseball owed its traditional origins to the people of England. Furthermore, whilst reference is made suggesting a welcome balance between the English sport of cricket and the Americanized sport of baseball, a very clear line is drawn at any contemplation that ‘our’ game of cricket would itself become Americanized.

7.8 Baseball in England after the Second World War

“The world at the end of World War II”, Iriye (1993, p.215), amongst others, argues, was one in which “America’s military power, economic resources, and cultural influence were more pronounced than ever before”. An exception to this, in England, at least, was with regard to the position of America’s so-called national sport. Even John Moores seemed to lose all interest in developing baseball. No
attempt was made to resurrect baseball on a professional basis by him or anyone else for that matter. In contrast to the lack of any developments regarding baseball, cricket, as Holt (1989) and Williams (1989) point out, enjoyed a boom period of popularity immediately after the war. Thus, in spite of growing American influence, most English people were still able to resist, or just ignore, the development of baseball.

The baseball that was played was very low key. A. Goodall (personal communication, April 4, 1995) speculates that "it might be because the structures were so informal that after the war there was nothing to bring people back together". Games were seemingly played in regions with strong baseball links prior to the war (Liverpool and Hull, for example), but they received next to no coverage in the local press. In Liverpool, the confusion regarding which 'code' of baseball was covered was even more apparent in the Liverpool Echo's post-war coverage — although neither code received much support. The occasional mention was given to 'NBA cup' games, and adverts were published in the local press for "NBA cup games" (see, for example, the Liverpool Echo, 20 July 1948, p.3). This is inconsistent with the basic baseball records that do exist, for example, the BBF records indicate that no national governing body existed for baseball after the war, until 1948. It seems that the NBA was, at the very least, a reference, used within the basic press coverage to 'American baseball'. In this respect, the Liverpool Echo occasionally used 'English' and 'National', as a distinction between the two codes.

In response to my letter in The Times, I received a basic outline of champion teams and the national organization involved for over a century of baseball in Britain. This was sent to me from the BBF offices at the time. Subsequently, of course, I managed to acquire an interview with Kevin Macadam, the President of the BBF, who indicated that no other, comprehensive records exist — apart from copies of minutes going back over just the last decade.
American baseball enjoyed something of a revival in 1948. Games were beginning to attract paying spectators once again. An “inter-league” game between representative teams from the Merseyside league and the Hull league played a match in front of a “gate of over 2,500” (Liverpool Echo, 26 July 1948, p.3). With the survival of teams in Liverpool, Hull and Manchester, and the announcement, by “NBA officials and club managers”, of plans to re-establish a baseball club in Halifax, the Liverpool Echo (3 August 1948, p.3) suggested that “virtually the Lancashire-Yorkshire League would be re-born on a friendly basis”. Indeed, it was announced that “the Yorkshire County Baseball Association is being re-formed” and clubs in Hull and Halifax were “developing youth [players] under the expert guidance of some of the former professional stars from London and the North” (Liverpool Echo, 3 August 1948, p.3). Furthermore, the Liverpool Echo (14 August 1948, p.3) noted that the gates at American baseball games had seen “an improvement ... and the National Association certainly seem to be travelling slowly but surely along the right road this time”. Such were the growing developments that, according to BBF records, a new national federation was established in 1948, called the ‘Baseball Association Limited’ (BAL). No reference is made to when the BAL was established in the press, but the Liverpool Echo (19 August 1948, p.3), at least, mentioned the “Baseball Association” challenge cup competition. The Liverpool Robins defeated the Thames Board Mills (London) in the final, and thus became the first national champions after the war. The Hornsey Red Sox (London) won it the following year, but no coverage of baseball matches was found in the local press in this region.

The attempts to revive baseball were given a boost by the number of American servicemen still stationed in England. The Burtonwood United States Air Force Bees, for example, played exhibition games against several of the established, English-
native dominated teams in 1949. However, the *Liverpool Echo* (13 August 1949, p.3) pointed to a significant hindrance to the continued development of ‘American’ baseball: “One of the major headaches of baseball clubs looks like being even more acute [in future] than in the current season, and the cause is a lack of baseball diamonds”. Where the game was played, limited numbers of spectators were attracted, but it was difficult to establish a growing participation base because of the lack of appropriate baseball facilities. This situation was compounded by the fact that American baseball games were not allowed in public parks (*Liverpool Echo*, 13 August 1949, p.3). The lack of suitable playing areas continued to prove a problem and, the following season, the *Liverpool Echo* (12 May 1950, p.7) announced that “some clubs have dropped out chiefly because of ground scarcity”. Furthermore, American baseball was not allowed in schools “because it was felt that there was more danger from the pitched ball as against the underhand [as the ball would be thrown in English baseball or rounders]” (*Liverpool Echo*, 13 May 1950, p.4). There also seem to have been problems within the executive committee of the national federation, and the *Liverpool Echo* (22 July 1950, p.3) reported on a “number of resignations in the baseball executives”. Despite these impediments it was reported that “the American code is fast gaining popularity on Merseyside” (*The Liverpool Echo*, 25 May 1950, p.3). The Burtonwood Bees’ introduction into competitive cup play did a “lot to increase the attractiveness of the Merseyside League”, and baseball was attracting “good crowds” (*Liverpool Echo*, 17 June 1950, p.3). Indeed, the Burtonwood Bees won the BAL national competition that year. In reflecting upon the 1950 season, the *Liverpool Echo* (19 August 1950, p.5) indicated that “there have been a few ups and downs in the post-war seasons”, but “despite its problems, [baseball] is gradually retrieving the position caused through the war-time stoppage”. 
At the end of the 1951 season, the *Liverpool Echo* (18 August 1951, p.4) suggested that “the baseball season can now virtually be written off as certainly the best post-war season, and prospects for next year are bright”. American baseball was still played in the Merseyside region in 1952, and still received small, if regular, coverage within the local press. However, according to BBF records, the last winner of the BAL national competition was the *Burtonwood Bees* in 1951. This is consistent with a report in the *Liverpool Echo* (17 May 1952, p.17), which indicated that “the Baseball Association, on the grounds of cost, have decided to suspend the National Challenge Cup this season”. This, it appears, was primarily due to the costs involved in travelling across the country, since baseball leagues remained popular at the local level (*Liverpool Echo*, 17 May 1952, p.4). An international match, between England and Holland, took place in June 1952 in celebration of the fortieth anniversary of the Dutch Baseball Association. The English representative side lost both matches (*Liverpool Echo*, 5 July 1952, p.4).

The game remained popular on a local level in Liverpool and Manchester. Indeed, during the 1953 season, local competitions were extended in both regions (*Oldham Evening Chronicle*, 30 May 1953, p.6). According to the *Liverpool Echo* (9 May 1953, p.1), a new national association, the British Baseball Association (BBA), was established in May. Sam Curtis, a Liverpool Councillor, was elected Chairman.\(^2\)\(^2\) The decision to establish the BBA met with some consternation, since the BAL still ran competitions on a purely local level. Indeed, the *Liverpool Echo* (16 May 1953, p.5) considered that “it is interesting to speculate whether there is really room for two American national organisations running pretty well on the same lines. The position may well be (as it is now on Merseyside and at Manchester) that each organisation

\(^{22}\) There is no record of the establishment of the BBA in the BBF records sent to me.
will triumph in one district to the detriment of the other”. The BBA developed a “five year plan of progressive development” *(Liverpool Echo, 16 May 1953, p.5)*, and this included an application for acceptance to the International Baseball Congress (IBC) (discussed in chapter six). The IBC accepted the application and “ordered a trophy to be presented … to the British association” *(Liverpool Echo, 18 June 1953, p.7)*. Soon after this, the BBA applied to join the newly formed *Fédération Européenne de Baseball* (FEB) *(Liverpool Echo, 4 July 1953, p.5)*. However, as outlined in the previous chapter, membership of the FEB did not materialize at this stage.

The 1954 season, according to the *Liverpool Echo* *(8 May 1954, p.7)*, saw “American baseball still struggling to become popular”. Indeed, coverage of the game in that newspaper, and the *Oldham Evening Chronicle*, was sparser than it had been even the season before. Baseball in England, during the latter parts of the decade, appears to have gone through a significant decline. The only occasion that *The Times* covered baseball, beyond just publishing the odd Major League Baseball result, was in 1956, when it published an article on the World Series final. The conclusions drawn mirrored much of what had been written before: “Most of it is, after all, rounders; gargantuan, even perhaps Homeric rounders, but still, at bottom, rounders, and the American enthusiast who doubts this must turn to the history of the game” *(The Times, 10 October 1956, p.15; emphasis in the original)*.

The next notable development in England occurred in 1959 when the British Baseball Federation (BBF)*\(^{23}\) was set up. Once again, it would seem that teams based in Hull, London and Merseyside were the most prominently involved. A team from

---

*\(^{23}\) It should be noted that today the British Baseball Federation is the title of the national governing body for baseball played in Britain, although it bears no relation – apart from governing baseball – to the BBF set up in 1959.*
London, the *Thames Board Mills Purfleet*, won the national cup competition in 1959 and 1960, although the competition received no coverage in the local press in that particular region of London (See the *Dartford, Crayford & Swanley Chronicle and Kentish Times*). The *Liverpool Echo* continued to provide coverage of baseball, but even this was confined to irregular, sparse reports. However, in the main, according to Barry Marshall (personal communication, September 4, 2001) – an ex-player who played in Hull during the 1960s up until the 1990s, and now coach in the region – “the inter-play between north and south was very few and far between”. This was largely because, he argues:

> When you go back to the 1950s and 1960s, north versus south, on the playing field, there was certainly a split, but that was basically because of the finances, and the logistics, it basically took us [travelling from Hull] about 6 hours to get to Birmingham, that was about the furthest we ever travelled ... The only time the north and south ever mixed was when it came to AGMs, which were nearly always held in the midlands for geographical reasons, and there was a lot of in-fighting, you know this north and south divide really was in baseball (B. Marshall, personal communication, September 4, 2001).

As a result, B. Marshall (personal communication, September 4, 2001) argues, “if we are talking about the national federations of the day, then they certainly didn’t really have any powers”. Not surprisingly, therefore, baseball remained fairly low-key in England throughout this time, despite the fact that B. Marshall (personal communication, September 4, 2001) indicates that in the “1950s and 1960s, baseball in terms of the number of clubs only, was probably in its healthiest position ever”.

In 1962, the first cross-Atlantic television broadcast occurred, via the ‘Telstar’ technology. The first actual broadcast showed a few minutes of live coverage of a MLB baseball game in Britain, and this was the cause of interest within the *Liverpool Echo*, where baseball was still played on a minor scale. Nevertheless, although the
newspaper did still publish results of local matches, one journalist writing in the paper
seemed to be unaware of this fact:

The coming of Telstar (and our first live view of baseball) suggests that our
tastes in sport may become even wider spread ... It is just possible that
baseball as played in the United States (one can imagine the influx here of
famous baseballing veterans as coaches if the game caught on) may yet
become our national summer game. Or at least a rival to cricket whose decay
can be discerned (Liverpool Echo, 27 July 1962, p.18).

The report also mentions that baseball games have, previously, been played at
Goodison Park – but the report fails to mention that baseball was still played in the
region. This suggests that baseball’s popularity, even in Liverpool, was so marginal it
barely merited a mention. Nevertheless, less than a month later a small report in the
same newspaper indicated that the Liverpool Tigers baseball team defeated the Hull
Aces in the “All England Cup” (18 August 1962, p.6). However, no competition was
held the following season, and such instability does seem to be indicative of
baseball’s weak foundations. This is in spite of the fact that cricket’s popularity
declined substantially from the 1950s. Holt (1989, p.287) even suggests that the
county game of cricket was faced with “imminent collapse” by 1963. This prompted
“the men of Lord’s towards a more business-like and consumer-conscious outlook”
(Holt, 1989, p.287). The advent of the one-day cricket match was seen as bowing to
the demands of supporters to have quicker, more exciting contests. In addition,
sponsorship of cricket largely took off as a result of the televising of one-day
internationals and county cup contests. Traditionally, sections of the English press had
been critical of the proponents of baseball for their emphasis on the virtues of speed
and commercialism. It seems, however, that by the time that many, though most
certainly not all, in the dominant upper/middle class of English society were ready to
accept the de-amateurization of cricket, baseball’s chances of becoming established
had diminished. In the face of the growing cultural, political and economic influence
of the USA, it might be anticipated that resistance found expression in other areas; namely with the continued rejection of baseball by the established groups in English society. This is undoubtedly because baseball was a sport seen by many as an intruder from an 'outsider' culture, and most English people, having declined from their established position economically and politically, sought to maintain 'their' self-respect by rejecting baseball, a politically less dangerous option.

Baseball was played throughout the 1960s, and Hull and Liverpool remained the two most prominent areas for the game. Nevertheless, newspaper coverage in both regions was sparse, to say the least. For example, despite the fact that a team from Hull, the East Hull Aces, became the first post-war champions of baseball from that region, the final (in which they defeated Bromsgrove, of London) received only two sentences in the Hull Daily Mail (20 August 1963, p.10). Such were the apparent problems in generating popular backing for the game, that by 1965, games were advertised as being free to admission (Daily Mail (Hull), 14 August 1965, p.6). Notwithstanding the pessimistic signs, the National Baseball League (NBL) was set up in 1966. Once again the main areas where baseball was played were Hull, London, Manchester and Merseyside. A team from Manchester – the Stretford Saints – won the inaugural national contest under the auspices of the NBL. However, the developments received no discernible coverage, even in the local press. The Times (16 May 1966, p.11) did announce that “the London baseball season opened at Hyde Park” in May 1966. Once again, it seems, Americans were the most prominent amongst those participating, with The Times (16 May 1966, p.11) noting that the participants were “fifty émigré Americans of all ages”.
A.A. Thompson, writing in *The Times* (17 April 1967, p.11), in reference to a charity game in Brighton “as part of Brighton’s Festival of the Arts”, noted that by the 1967 season some “35 towns” in England had clubs playing in the national competition. Thompson concluded, however, that “M.C.C. members may sleep peacefully in their beds” (cited in *The Times*, 17 April 1967, p.11). Baseball was played, therefore, but it was very low key. In 1972, two teams from Hull, the *Hull Royals* and the *Hull Aces* competed for the “national cup”, but still the Hull *Daily Mail* (4 August 1972, p.18) only provided two lines on the final.

The British Amateur Baseball Federation (BABF) replaced the NBL in 1973. The BABF, however, fared no better than the previous organizations established to govern and develop baseball played in England following the Second World War. Although the game was still played in Hull, London, Liverpool and Nottingham, at least, it received only minimal coverage in the local press, and none in the national press, save *The Sunday Times’* (20 September 1976, p.29) reference to “the latest attempt to turn us all on to baseball” in 1976. This “latest attempt” was a reference to matches that were played under floodlight in order to try and attract bigger crowds. The “four-team Twilight League” only attracted crowds of around 300 at Rosslyn Park rugby league ground in Roehampton (*The Sunday Times*, 26 September 1976, p.29). Even the local newspaper in that region carried no coverage of the competition (See the *Putney & Roehampton Herald*, 1976). According to B. Marshall (personal communication, September 4, 2001), this “was more than likely a southern-driven thing”. He had not even been aware of the developments, despite his intimate involvements in baseball. He argues that “there was a lot of factions in baseball, in those days you could, within reason, just go out and do your own thing anyway, with the authority of the day’s approval or non-approval”. 
In 1978, the BABF merged with the existing governing body of softball to form the British Amateur Baseball and Softball Federation (BABSF). This may be a reflection of the fact that softball was becoming increasingly popular in several schools in England at this time. According to B. Marshall (personal communication, September 4, 2001), “softball was only really in the title, they [softball] didn’t really do anything ... I don’t really know whether it had something to do with attracting money or sponsorship from external agencies”. The decision to merge the two governing bodies did not contribute to a substantial difference in the way that baseball was covered in the English press. When it did receive national coverage, in particular, it tended to be rather ‘tongue-in-cheek’, because of the rather ‘odd’ fact that such an American game was actually played in England. In covering a game between the Golders Green Sox and the Croydon Blue Jays in August 1978, for example, it was noted in The Sunday Times (6 August 1978, p.29) that the game was “all most American”. This was partly because “both teams spent the entire afternoon insulting each other”. The author is worth quoting at some length:

As one brought up on the polite world of English sport, I could hardly believe my ears when the first striker strolled up to the wicket armed with his Louisville Slugger bat, and was greeted by the Green Sox catcher standing a mere six inches behind his right ear, with a loud shout of: ‘Altogether gang, altogether now, whaddya say, whaddya say? We’ve got a turkey here, he’s no better man, a little man, a little stick, no better at all, whaddya say gang?’ This was delivered in a strong American accent .... But instead of replying, ‘I say sir, would you mind keeping quiet in the field there’ (or alternatively, ‘why don’t you lot _____ off’) the striker showed no emotion whatever .... For just a moment, I had the fantasy of what might happen if cricket went the same way. ‘Thank you Trevor ... well, Brearley has handed the ball to Willis and is telling him ‘Go, man, groovey boy, make those Kiwis eat dirt, man’, and Willis has replied, ‘Thank you skipper, I shall endeavour to do my best’ ....

But I couldn’t help feeling that some of the Americanisms were a bit artificial. The fact is that baseball is like hillbilly music – it’s got to be performed with an American accent (The Sunday Times, 6 August 1978, p.29).
This is, however, a highly inaccurate characterization of the way cricket was played by this time. As Williams (1989, p.125) notes, “higher financial rewards [in cricket] caused the spirit in which matches were played during the 1970s and 1980s to deteriorate”. Although this is a rather simplistic, mono-causal, economically-determined argument, it is clear that the reality of the way in which cricket was now played was far from the perception of the game offered in the above report. For example, Williams (1989, p.125) cites several illustrations of this deteriorating ‘spirit’, amongst which he includes the increase in “complaints about verbal abuse between players” – or ‘sledging’ as it has come to be referred to in cricketing circles. This seems to be a cricket term for what the American baseball players had long since referred to as ‘barracking’. However, this kind of report can best be understood as part of a construction of ‘wilful nostalgia’ (Maguire, 1999). The perception that the ethos of the English ‘gentleman-amateur’ was still at the forefront of cricket was a powerful image in constructing a “‘fantasy shield’ of peoples’ ‘imagined charisma’” (Maguire, 1999, p.182).

In another article that appeared in The Times, discussing an international match between Great Britain and France in 1980, reference was made to the origins of baseball. It was noted that ‘baseball’ had existed, as had rounders, well before the alleged invention of the game by Doubleday. “Nevertheless the Americans adopted and adapted the ancient game and made it their own” (The Times, 2 September 1980, p.9). In fact, in discussing previous attempts to develop baseball in England before and after World War Two, The Times (2 September 1980, p.9) noted that such attempts had “suffered, perhaps, from the caustic cynicism of those who regard it as little more than a superior game of rounders”. The nationalistic tone of the general reaction to baseball was underlined when the author noted that, “England, having got
rid of the mettlesome colonials in 1776, took the game of bat and ball in another
direction and produced cricket. Which is one good reason, perhaps, for being glad that
we lost the War of Independence” (The Times, 2 September 1980, p.9).

Baseball developed steadily, if unspectacularly, during the early 1980s under
the stewardship of the BABSF. Local coverage of games was minimal and sporadic,
and The Times developed a ‘tradition’ of covering baseball games played in England
from a rather ‘curious English person’s’ perspective. In 1983, for example, Simon
Barnes wrote an article entitled “Invective in striped pyjama’s: It’s just not cricket
with baseball as raucous rival” (The Times, 6 September 1983, p.20). The article is
another example of the general tendency of the English press to caricature baseball
over the numerous periods of its development in England. Barnes expressed a curious
concern, and often criticized, the way the baseballers “barracked” one another on the
field of play.

Ivo Tennant, writing in The Times in 1985, considered there to be a “British
baseball revival” (The Times, 8 June 1985, p.29). According to Tennant,
approximately 75 clubs were affiliated to the BABSF. Although, this claim is disputed
by B. Marshall (personal communication, September 4, 2001) who doubts “there was
a supposed revival in 1985”. Even Tennant (cited in The Times, 1985, p.29) goes on to
point out that:

The British Amateur Baseball and Softball Federation, like many other
organizations presiding over a minor sport in this country, waits for the day
when television will come to the rescue. What it did for American Football it
can do for baseball – at least that is the hope. Otherwise the game will
continue to run on a shoestring budget.
The British Baseball Federation (BBF) was established in 1987. The severing of links with softball was, according to Kevin Macadam (personal communication, September 4, 2001), current President of the BBF (a position he has held for a decade), largely because of the involvement of then President, Don Smallwood. The split may be a small measure of the growing popularity of baseball during the early 1980s. The BBF still presides over baseball in this country today. The BBF, like the BABSF before them, have never been able to secure a television deal. However, they did start off their administration by signing a sponsorship deal with the Scottish Amicable Insurance Company in 1987. As was noted in *The Times* (9 April 1987, p.40):

British Baseball was given its biggest boost since the war yesterday when the Scottish Amicable Insurance Company announced a £300,000 sponsorship over the next three years for the formation of a national league. Six teams will play in the Scottish Amicable League which begins next month.

B. Marshall (personal communication, September 4, 2001) is unaware how the sponsorship deal was secured. Despite the relatively high-profile sponsorship deal, baseball played in England fared no better in terms of attracting publicity in the English national press. Most broadsheet newspapers did publish the results of all Major League Baseball matches, but little else. On a local level, the Hull *Daily Mail* produced a weekly sports edition of the newspaper on Saturdays, and this regularly featured reports on baseball (see various copies of the Hull *Sports Mail*, 1987). Furthermore, according to K. Macadam (personal communication, September 4, 2001), baseball’s administrators at the time had not known what to do with the sudden injection of money into the game, and much of the income remained unaccounted for. Most baseball clubs did not get any of the benefits of the sponsorship. As B. Marshall (personal communication, September 4, 2001) points out:
Don Smallwood was left with a chequebook that just required his signature, and whenever he wanted paying, he’d just sign a cheque ... This was one of the first times that any real decent money came into baseball and it caught a few people out.

So, it would seem despite the sponsorship deal, baseball fared no better. In 1988, *The Times* (19 August 1988, p.32) noted that “baseball is still seen by most Briton’s as something of a cissy sport – rounders played by men in knickerbockers”. These kind of establishment attitudes constituted a major obstacle to the prospects of the game in England. Don Smallwood, the President of the BBF, was also of the view that the publicity that American Football was receiving in England was doing baseball no favours, because it was helping to foster the feeling that an American invasion was underway. His view was that the BBF were “not looking to transplant a bit of America over here in the way that American football has done but to build from the bottom, capitalizing on youngsters’ disenchantment with what’s on offer in the summer” (cited in *The Times*, 19 August 1988, p.32). Simon Barnes, writing in *The Times* (23 June 1989, p.38; emphasis in the original), obviously felt that the game had fared no better from this approach taken by the BBF, since, a year later he wrote that:

America is not England. Baseball never lets you forget that little fact ... A couple of years back, I was convinced that the beauties and the exoticism of baseball would spark another craze in Britain, hitching a ride on the juggernaut of American football. It has not happened. The World Series has been televised, certainly, but Britain has failed to ignite ... Partly this is because baseball does not reduce happily to a package of television highlights. No more does cricket: the Test match highlights only work because you want to see the ball that got Broad, or whatever.

Later on in the 1989 season, the BBF organized an international tournament with teams from Canada, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Spain and the USA all taking part (*The Times*, 30 September 1989, p.46). This event was held in celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of organized baseball in the UK. The tournament itself, however, received next to no coverage in the national, or local press.
7.9 Increasing MLB involvement in England

Baseball in England in the early 1980s remained a minority sport. The BBF was, according to B. Marshall (personal communication, September 4, 2001), “an animal with no teeth”, because the money from the Scottish Amicable deal had been “frittered away”, and the organization of baseball was “very much a shambles”. Kevin Macadam became involved in the administration of the game at the beginning of the 1990s. At this time, the BBF still operated from “Don Smallwood’s house, with his girlfriend, Rita Collington, basically running the BBF” (Macadam, personal communication, September 4, 2001).

In the early 1990s, MLB stepped up their campaign of selling the English public on baseball, after the success American football had enjoyed on British television. *The Times* (Section Two, 14 July 1991, p.15), for example, noted that:

> The Americans are convinced major league baseball will cross the Atlantic as surely as hamburgers and Coca-Cola did, and they are engaged in a marketing and promotional pitch to sell the televised version of their national summer game to one of the four main British channels.

*Channel 4* started to show occasional MLB games and televized the World Series.24 In 1993, an exhibition match was played at the Oval cricket ground between the reserve teams of the *Boston Red Sox* and the *New York Mets*. The match, according to Stuart Jones, writing in *The Times* (5 October 1993, p.39), “was billed as the most glamorous day in the history of British baseball”. A fairly large crowd was expected, so the BBF aimed to promote baseball played in Britain at the same time by holding the national cup final, between the *Hull Humberside Mets* and the *Bedford Chicksands Indians*, on the same day. This arrangement suggests a close level of co-operation

---

24 Despite contacting Channel 4, I have found no figures regarding the number of years that the World Series was shown, or, more specifically, what kind of audiences the broadcasts attracted.
between MLB and the BBF. However, with over 5,000 spectators having watched the exhibition game, rain then prevented the final from taking place. As a result, the two teams shared the national title. The venture could hardly have been regarded as a success. The match received very little coverage in the national or local press.

In 1995, Kevin Macadam, and his wife, Wendy, took over the BBF, becoming President and Secretary respectively. The organization was run from ‘a bedroom’ in their house for almost a decade after that (K. Macadam, personal communication, September 4, 2001). This, according to B. Marshall (personal communication, May 1, 2001), was a turning point for baseball. He argues that “I don’t think they [the BBF] were ever really organized prior to that”. Furthermore, the greater organization coincided with increased involvement from MLB. MLB’s involvement with baseball in the UK is, according to C. Russell (personal communication, May 1, 2002), Director of Major League Baseball International (MLBI) for Europe, Middle East and Africa, “about trying to support the core by developing the game, working with the amateur federations on providing schooling programmes, after school leagues, providing a full path from introduction of the sport through to national team participation”. K. Macadam (personal communication, September 4, 2001) points out that in 1995 “we started to get Major League Baseball’s money coming in ... and by 1996 and 1997 the whole operation was getting too big to run from our house”. In bringing the development of baseball in England up-to-date, it is worth quoting Macadam (personal communication, September 4, 2001) at some length:

In 1997, Major League Baseball negotiated a sponsorship deal with Coors [beers] which was a 3 year deal (£15,000 in year one, 20,000 in year two, 25,000 in year three) and, on the basis of that and money from Sport England, we set up a proper office in Hull ... In the third year of the sponsorship deal, two things happened that totally screwed it up for us: The English Sports Council, who were giving us £23,000 a year, said to us half way through, you’ve had £12,000, that’s all your getting and also Coors pulled out of their
deal with MLB, and didn’t give us the third year of money. In those two incidences we ended up being 26 grand in debt, so come two years ago a proposition came to us from Major League Baseball that said we’ve got 3 choices: Major League Baseball proposed baseball and softball working together (softball have far more members than we have) ... We looked at three things: one was the increased amount of money we’d be getting because of the softball income coming in, what we decided to do was set up with a managing agency for softball and baseball which was BaseballSoftball UK (BSUK). Pretty much baseball is run by a board of unpaid directors, like myself, and we still make the decisions on baseball on a daily basis, but the work gets done by BSUK, we instruct them and they do the work. The choice was to have the BSUK office in Hull, which was going to cost us rent, have it at Bob Fromer’s house, who was the Chief Executive of the British Softball Federation at the time, or maybe look at putting it in Major League Baseball’s office [MLBI’s office in London] ... MLB said if you base it here all sundry bills will be free of charge, and there will be no office rent. Financially wise, we were 26 grand in debt, so if we got involved with BSUK, our debt becomes their debt, so basically now the 26 grand we owed gradually got paid off. ... The relationship between baseball and softball has worked out well, and there have been no major disputes. And Major League Baseball are more inclined to help us, because we are a strong organization with softball, because they’ve then got two Olympic sports to go out and promote and try and get sponsorship for, rather than going out on your own as two small governing bodies that are bickering with each other.

In spring of 1997, a new terrestrial channel, channel Five, was launched, and one of the briefs the channel had for its sports programming was, according to Robert Charles (personal communication, September 2, 2003), Director of Sports Programming for Five, “to provide sport late night five nights a week ... [and] ... none of them could be expensive. Baseball was obviously identified as a sport that was becoming popular and it could come at a price that was acceptable to the channel”. Since the inception of the channel, MLB games have been shown live once or twice a week; and the channel has broadcast every game in each of the World Series since 1997. Viewing figures indicate that the programme has a core audience of approximately 200,000 (R. Charles, personal communication, September 2, 2003). Today, baseball in England is in a relatively stable position. It has been played consistently as a minority amateur sport in this country continuously for at least three decades. MLBI (2001, p.15) indicate that “more than 1,800 children, aged 9-12 played
in 20 Play Ball! leagues throughout England. Each team was named after a Major League team allowing the players to have a chance to learn not only about the game of baseball, but also the Major Leagues". Frubes, which is a brand of yoghurt aimed at children and part of wider company, Yoplait, now sponsor Play Ball! in the UK. According to the Baseball Softball UK (BSUK) press release, the deal, announced in April 2002, is worth £1 million over three-years, and it is hoped that it “will create unprecedented exposure for baseball and softball” (BSUK, 2002). The deal involves “major on-pack promotion ... supported by dedicated advertising on Cartoon Network” television station and “information on baseball and softball will also be included on the outer packaging of every box” (BSUK, 2002). Other companies sponsor baseball in the UK, in association with MLB. The Times newspaper is, according to MLBI (2001, p. 27), on the official MLB ‘Sponsor Roster’ in the UK for specific ‘World Series’ promotion. Coverage of recent World Series contests has certainly been far more prominent than in the past, but this is still extremely marginal in comparison to other, more established sports in England. Rawlings sponsor the British National League, Majestic and New Era supply apparel to BSUK. TGI Fridays and Continental Airlines are also promotional partners of MLB in the UK. BSUK have specific sponsorship deals with Louisville Slugger bats and Barnett, who supply fielding gloves. It should be noted that, with the exception of Frubes, the deals targeting the UK are not exactly high profile in terms of publicity and the amount of money involved. Even in the case of Frubes, the hoped for rising of baseball’s profile in England has not really materialized. Despite this, and Five’s coverage of MLB, the game shows no sign of breaking out of the ‘minority sport’ category. Due to the problems encountered administering the game, Macadam points out that the BBF can

---

25 According to BSUK (2002), “70 million units of the product sold last year”. The statement does not reveal anything concerning the reason behind Frubes’ involvement, and I have received no reply from numerous attempts to contact the company.
only provide estimates of the number of teams and players there are involved. They no longer insist on registering all players through the BBF, only those who play within the Senior Rawlings Leagues are registered. There are, according to Macadam (personal communication, September 4, 2001) “approximately 60 senior teams, 40-50 junior teams, and probably about 600 senior players”. He estimates there are about 2,000 players regularly playing baseball in the country.

Having presented this case-study of the development of baseball in England, and, in the previous chapter provided an overview of the diffusion and development of baseball across the world, we can now proceed to an analysis of the global flows associated with baseball with the aim of accounting for the variable diffusion patterns that have characterized the sport’s development.
Chapter 8: The Global Baseball Figuration

Consistent with the figurational approach that has informed this thesis, the outlines provided on the development of baseball in various countries were presented, in chapters six and seven, developmentally. An implication of tracing the development of baseball country by country is that it tends to convey a fragmented, non-developmental impression of the global diffusion of baseball. This is an unfortunate, but unavoidable side effect of this approach. At the same time, this consequence is difficult to avoid because of the sheer complexity of each ‘case study’ means that presenting their respective development within an integrated global framework was not considered to be a viable option. The analysis would have been immensely difficult to follow as the focus shifted constantly from country to country. Having presented the individual outlines, I am now in a much better position to offer the reader an account of the developmental diffusion of baseball across the world and to identify the salient phases. By such means, I hope to partially rectify any distortions caused by compartmentalization of national developments. I will then go on and address Major League Baseball’s (MLB) recent attempts to market its product abroad more aggressively, identify some of the obstacles encountered by this strategy and reflect upon some of the domestic pressures that might underlie this new expansionism. Finally, I will offer some thoughts on one of the central themes of this thesis, namely, the extent to which baseball can be held to be a global sport. The discussion within this chapter will be structured around Table 8.1 below, which provides a time-line of significant ‘events’, which are in fact ‘mini-processes’. They contribute to the broader globalization of baseball. To this end, this chapter will be divided into key phases, albeit overlapping phases, in the global diffusion of baseball. By this means, I aim to retain the developmental thrust of my figurational analysis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1860s</td>
<td>Regular competitions in Ontario (early 1860s) Habana Baseball Club established (1868)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870s</td>
<td>Habana first professional club outside of the USA; Esteban Bellan first Latino in MLB (1872) Baseball tour to England (1874) English press effectively ignore the baseball contests Baseball first played at Tokyo University (1875) First Canadian Baseball League (1876) International Association set up – with teams from Canada and USA competing (1877) First organized Canadian championship (1878) First recorded game in Australia (1878)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880s</td>
<td>Professionalization of baseball in Cuba and increasing diffusion of baseball by Cubans in Caribbean (1880s) Baseball exhibitions played in Mexico (1882) New South Wales Baseball Association set up (1886) First World Exhibition Tour led by Spalding (1888-89) Harry Simpson stays in Australia after the tour to develop the game (1889) Tourists arrive in England, and despite poor press a NGB is set up (1889) First Professional League in England (1890) followed by decade of amateur leagues Japanese ‘style’ of play becoming prominent in Japan (1890s) Baseball development in Dominican Republic under American and Cuban influences (1890s) Taiwan colonized by Japan (1895) Japanese influence demonstrated by increasing popularity of baseball Ichiko School defeats Yokohoma Nine (team of Americans), Japanese press laud victory for Japanese style (1896) Australian team makes unsuccessful tour of the United States (1897) Baseball played in the Philippines (late 1890s) First inter-state baseball match in Australia (1900) Leagues abandoned in England (1900) Platt Amendment signed in USA – increasing influence over Cuba (1901) Mexican Baseball Association formed (1904) Waseda University (Japan) tour USA (1905); London League formed (1906) Mills Commission concludes report into origins of baseball, claiming Abner Doubleday invented it (1907) Licey first pro. team in Dominican Republic (1907); Chicago White Sox play set up training HQ in Mexico Reach All Star team tours Asia (1908) Japanese influence encourages baseball games in Korea Japan annexes Korea and this contributes to further growth of baseball (1910) Baseball first played in Holland (1910) and clubs established in Paris (1910s) London League abandoned (1911) Canadian Pro. Baseball Association set up (1911) Phil. Athletics (World Series champs) lose series to Cuban teams First game in Sweden and Dutch baseball association established (1912) Australian Baseball Council formed 2nd World Tour led by McGraw (1913-14) Dominican Republic team defeats American Navy team (1914) Professional league established in Cuba (1917) – increasing exchange of players between USA and Cuba thereafter Intra-Caribbean competitions increase (1920s); Mexican Socialist Revolutionary leaders promote baseball Growing organisation of baseball in Dominican Republic (1920s) Steady increase in popularity of baseball in Australia (1920s) Mita Club (Japan) defeat professional American team (1922); American pro’s play exhibitions in Korea and French Baseball Federation formed (1924) Mexican Baseball League established, Tokyo Six University Baseball League organized (1925)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930s</td>
<td>Montreal Royals minor league baseball established (1928) Matsutaro Shoriki, owner of Yomiuri Shimbun newspaper (Japan), sponsors American tour of Japan (1931) National Baseball Association set up in England (1933) Yomiuri Shimbun sponsor American tour of Japan (1934) First Claxton Shield national competition in Australia Matsutaro Shoriki sponsors Japanese tour of USA (1935) Cincinnati Reds 1st ML.B team tour Dominican Republic Professional league established in Japan (1936); NBA set up professional league in England (1936) Dominican teams over-budget on recruiting players from other countries – cripples game for next few years (1937) Great Britain become first ‘world champions’ (1938) Cuba host and win world amateur championships (1939)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8.1 (cont.): Timeline of the diffusion of baseball

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Japanese military rulers disband baseball league</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japanese baseball resumes (1945); Taiwan independence from Japan, increasing American influence helps baseball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Dominican Republic defeat Cuban national team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Baseball pact signed by Cuba &amp; MLB; First black player in MLB increases recruitment of Latinos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Japanese league organized on MLB lines (1950) increases foreign recruitment, Claxton Shield restored in Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Japanese league organized on MLB lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>European baseball federation is set up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Dominican league switches to winter play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Japanese league organized on MLB lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>World Championships held in Italy (1978) on 25th anniversary of European federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Increasing Cuban and Mexican playing in Italian leagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Dominican Summer League increases ties with MLB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>First Australian in MLB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>First 'top' American MLB player lured to Japanese leagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Japanese Summer League increases ties with MLB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>World Championships held in Holland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>First Korean in MLB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Decreasing income within MLB after player-strike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Decreasing hits Canadian teams particularly hard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>European federation drops &quot;Amateur&quot; from title (1994), Pepsi Cola stop sponsoring Australian baseball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>MLB increasing focus in developing game in Germany and UK (late 1990s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Pittsburgh scout in Germany (1999); Baltimore play series against Cuba; MLB season 'opens' in Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>MLB season opens in Japan (2000); IHL A set up in Australia - administrative problems ripe within game Ichiro becomes first Japanese outfield player in MLB (2001), MLB supports Euro championships held in Germany MLB sign first licensee contract in Dominican Republic (2002), Pepsi launch MLB advert campaign in Japan Frubes sponsor youth Play Ball leagues in UK (2002)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:

- Asia – Red
- Europe – Purple
- General developments – Black
- Oceania – Orange
- Pan Americana – Blue
My qualitative assessment of this data is crucial to a greater understanding of the dynamic differential power relationships involved. There are clear periods of growth, first in the latter decades of the nineteenth century, where American influence was growing substantially in north and central America, as well as in parts of Asia. The table indicates growing American influence in Europe just prior to, and more especially, following the First World War. There is also evidence of increasing American influence in Latin American countries from the 1940s. The table also points up countervailing trends, such as rejection of baseball in England over different phases and growing Japanese influence on the international diffusion of baseball from the 1970s onwards. The table, though not comprehensive, does provide a corrective to the kind of present-centred approaches so characteristic of much of the field of globalization. It also illustrates the need to be aware of the multidirectional character of global diffusion, and of fluctuating periods of American influence. To this end, a figurational approach has helped me understand, as Kilminster (1997, p.275) argues, that “the augmentation of the power potential of the poorer nations cannot be grasped without considering the relations between interdependent people in the round, not just economically”. This is clearly something that those arguing from a cultural imperialism perspective, in particular, and also, to a lesser degree, cultural hegemony theorists, rarely grant much importance to. In so doing, they fail to appreciate, more fully, the “issues of reinterpretation, resistance and recycling by indigenous peoples located in various positions within the power geometry of the global sport system” (Maguire, 1999, p.76).
8.1 Early phase of baseball diffusion 1860-1880s

In the early 1860s, as the respective advocates of the slightly different variations of codified ‘baseball’ struggled for ascendancy in America, proponents of the New York version – the one that most closely resembles modern baseball (see chapter five) – made inroads into Canada. Their influence also extended to Cuba, where several Cubans who had been resident in America established baseball clubs in the capital Havana. Unsurprisingly, with no unified code, and unrest in America, which culminated in the Civil War, there was limited growth in baseball outside of the country. With the issue regarding rules largely resolved, and greater political stability in the country following the Civil War, more concerted efforts were made to diffuse baseball to other countries. The spread of baseball at this time was still largely confined to areas geographically close to the USA, and more subject to American economic and political influence. It continued to grow in Canada and Cuba, and was introduced with some success into Japan. An ambitious tour was arranged to exhibit baseball in England in 1874. As we have seen, in chapter seven, this tour was unsuccessful, and the English press largely ignored baseball. The English were in a stronger position to withstand growing American influences than, perhaps, was the case in Canada, Cuba and Japan. This emphasizes the need for a multi-dimensional consideration of power.

It was not just American influences that were contributing to the diffusion of baseball. Cubans were beginning to introduce the game into other Latin American countries during the last two decades of the nineteenth century. Toward the end of this short phase of baseball diffusion, its most established development was in the Pan
Americana region, though efforts were made to establish the game in Australia, England and Japan, with only the latter country seeing any significant developments.

8.2 Growth of American military, political and economic power: 1880s-1920

The first baseball 'World Tour' in 1888-89 stimulated the growth of the game in Japan, especially, but prompted organized baseball in Australia and England. In these latter two countries, however, baseball enthusiasts struggled to establish their sport in competition with cricket. Americans were employed, in part, to play baseball during the 1890s in Australia and England, but it was still a rarity for Americans to travel to these countries with the principal purpose of playing baseball. The flow of people in relation to baseball at this time was still largely confined to the Pan Americana region.

Press reaction to the attempts to establish baseball in both Australia and England were sceptical, uninterested or downright disparaging. Even in Japan, where baseball was continuing to grow, it was starting to develop more of a 'Japanese style' by the 1890s. Thus, it is also fair to say that the global flow of American baseball encountered some resistance, and there were early signs that the game was being modified to accommodate the prevailing culture.

Baseball was starting to diffuse more widely within the Pan Americana region. The game was developing slowly within the Dominican Republic. Once again, though, this was not solely attributable to American influence. Cubans were proving to be important disseminators of baseball in the Dominican Republic and the Caribbean more widely. The significant influence of Cuban nationals in the initial
spread of baseball throughout much of the Caribbean, undermines the claim that the
diffusion of baseball has merely been a consequence of the growing Americanization
of the world – or even of just Latin America. Similarly, Japan’s growing influence
within Asia contributed to a spread of baseball to Taiwan, the Philippines, and, early
in the new century, to Korea as well. The spread of baseball during this phase, then,
owed much to non-American influences. Furthermore, a Japanese college side
defeated a team made up of Americans, and this was widely celebrated as a victory
for the ‘Japanese style’ within the Japanese press.

By the turn of the new century, American political and economic influence
was increasing substantially within the Pan Americana region. Baseball became more
organized within Canada, Cuba, the Dominican Republic and Mexico in the first
decades of the twentieth century. In Cuba, baseball was clearly used as a site of
resistance to growing American influence. Baseball was used as a measure of Cuban
strength, and in many cases resentment of increasing American influence, especially
at times when Cuban teams defeated American’s at ‘their own game’.

At this time in the USA, as was discussed in chapter five, the struggle over
ideologies regarding the origins of baseball resulted in the Mills Commission
publishing their inquiry, and concluding that Abner Doubleday invented baseball.
Thus, supposedly, cementing the origins of the sport firmly within American history.
It is likely that this development was fuelled by a defensive reaction to claims made
by the English, especially, that the game is English in origin with its roots being
traceable to rounders.
Baseball was also starting to develop, on a minor scale, in some continental European countries just prior to the start of the First World War. A second baseball world tour was designed to stimulate further the growth of baseball in Asia, Australia and Europe in particular. These developments coincided with the growing economic power of the USA. This position was reinforced further during and after the war. Numerous Americans were stationed throughout Europe at this time, and baseball was played, though in many cases without developing a following amongst the indigenous populations. The game did not really develop a strong foothold in Europe or Australia, but baseball went from strength to strength in parts of Asia and Pan Americana.

8.3 Growing American influence and spread of baseball: 1920-1945

The USA emerged from the First World War as arguably the most powerful nation-state in the world. This shift in the balance of power found expression in the field of culture with American products and practices becoming increasingly pervasive (Marrouchi, 2002). As part of this process, in the 1920s and 1930s, baseball gained a stronger international presence. In regions such as Latin America, where the game already had a base, it became better organized and cross-national competitions began to develop. Baseball became more popular in Australia and Japan and also gained small followings in some European countries. However, while cultural influence from the USA expanded further within Europe, its extent was limited by the devastation wrought by the war and, more specifically, baseball's prospects were limited by the presence of a range of already well-entrenched sports. The level of cultural penetration was also probably further mitigated by isolationist tendencies in the USA.
By the 1930s, Japanese teams were touring the USA with some regularity, and professional leagues were set up. The Japanese press enthusiastically embraced baseball, in contrast, while there was a professional league in England, the English press still largely ignored baseball. In 1938, the first International Baseball Federation (IBF) was established. Although an American team competed in the first ‘World Championships’ in 1938\(^1\), and Leslie Mann, an American baseball entrepreneur who had played in the Major Leagues for 16 years, had helped set up the IBF, for the most part those involved with MLB played little or no part in establishing the Federation. Indeed, it could be argued, in much the same way that English sports people had reacted to the development of international federations for athletics and soccer, for example, with indifference, so too did many Americans involved in baseball in relation to the IBF. That is to say, like the English before them, Americans considered MLB to be the international arbiters of the game with no need for another organization. That said, the IBF was no real challenge to the authority of MLB, and nor were they trying to be. The IBF catered, broadly, for amateur baseball players across the world.

On the eve of the Second World War, the professional leagues in both England and Japan were disbanded, and in the case of the latter, their anti-America stance led the military rulers to ban baseball altogether. The 1940s saw a substantial increase in American influence in Latin American countries, and this, amongst other things, was characterized by a growing influence on baseball. Although, in this period, Latin American teams dominated the amateur world championships and the organization of the IBF to such an extent that in 1944 the title of the international federation was

---

\(^1\) The USA lost to a Great Britain team, though the title World Championship was only given some time after the event. The USA entered a team until 1943, and then, perhaps partly because of the growing Latin American influence within the organization, did not enter again until 1969.
changed to the *Internacional de Béisbol Amateur*. Around the same time, American troops introduced the game to several parts of Europe; but again, the game failed to make much of an impact on Europeans.

8.4 MLB increasingly influential in baseball playing countries: 1945-1980s

Following the end of conflict, the USA was in an even greater position of international dominance. By the end of the 1940s, American cultural influence had spread far and wide. MLB managed to fend off the threats from the Mexican League in 1946 (see chapter six), and subsequently sought to develop a stranglehold over baseball in Latin America. Pacts were signed with baseball organizers in several Caribbean countries, which saw the regular season move to winter play, so as to fit more readily into MLB’s summer season. Growing American influence in Japan was, in large measure, a consequence of the military defeat of Japan. Baseball was fully restored and, by 1950, the professional leagues had been re-established, this time along structural lines more or less identical to MLB.

The American occupation of Italy during the War, and subsequent growing influence, had contributed to the organization of baseball there – at first by the Americans, but increasingly by the 1950s, amongst the Italian population. Indeed, baseball was developing sufficiently in Europe, that a European federation was created in 1953. Even so, baseball remained a minority sport in Europe. Thus, notwithstanding the growing power of the USA, a power that found partial expression in greater cultural penetration, baseball’s prospects in Europe were still limited by the strength of the established sports.
Under the Baptista regime, Cuba was very much part of the American sphere of influence. However, the revolution of 1959 that brought Castro to power also brought with it an end to the link between MLB and the Cuban winter leagues. Yet, the general hostility that has characterized relationships between the two countries since the revolution has not prevented baseball continuing to thrive on the island. As Echevarria (1999, p.76) puts it:

The founding role of the sport accounts for the depth and durability of baseball as a part of modern Cuban culture. Baseball is so ingrained in Cuba that it has thrived as the “national sport” through forty years of a bitterly anti-American revolution. The coincidence of the birth of the nation and the inception of the game is a key in understanding that resiliency.

The significance of this for our understanding is that even where the power differentials favour the USA so strongly, as they do in the case of the relationship with Cuba, it is still not possible to identify a simple, unidirectional Americanization process. Under such conditions, baseball, as a symbol of national defiance and national ‘self-worth’, achieved an even higher degree of cultural centrality in Cuba.

Largely on the basis of their domination of the amateur game, Cubans also played an increasingly prominent part in the diffusion of baseball. Cuban teams toured around the Caribbean, especially, in an effort to take on all-comers and to spread baseball. From the mid-1950s, MLB’s dominant position in the global figuration was also challenged by Japanese sports good manufacturers who even penetrated the American domestic market. By 1963, they accounted for 60% of the American market for baseball and softball gloves, for example (Fielding & Miller, 1996).
In 1969, the first team from outside the USA, the *Montreal Expos*, began to compete in MLB. In 1970, European teams competed in the world amateur championships for the first time since the Great Britain team had become ‘World Champions’ in 1938. Baseball was undoubtedly being played on a more widespread basis during this period. During the 1970s and 1980s, Japanese influence on the global baseball figuration grew. Japanese teams started to hold pre-season training outside of Japan. This was partially related to the development of markets for Japanese baseball products abroad and also in order to scout for players.

From the 1980s, substantial numbers of players from the Dominican Republic played in MLB, as opposed to the Dominican leagues. Seemingly as a response to the pervasiveness of American power, baseball became a site for resistance. These anti-American sentiments remained confined to the back-pages of Dominican newspapers, with coverage of MLB focusing principally on the achievements of their compatriots. Thus, baseball constituted a ‘safe’ venue for a sublimated form of cultural resistance. The fact that Americans tended to ignore baseball in the Dominican Republic in the first half of the twentieth century, and the use of baseball by Dominicans as a site of resistance to the USA thereafter, leads Klein (1991b, p.149) to argue that baseball in the Dominican Republic has become “Dominicanized. The game remains American in structure, but its setting is Dominican and it has become infused with Dominican values”. Indeed, Klein (1991b, p.155) concludes his study by arguing that baseball, as played in the Dominican Republic, “is uniquely Dominican”. In all, then, even though baseball was becoming more globally diffuse, the position of the USA, and MLB specifically, in the global baseball figuration was being challenged during this phase.
8.5 From the late 1980s to the present, with particular reference to MLB expansionism

Perhaps partly in response to the growing influence of Japan, Cuba, Canada and other countries in the global baseball figuration, MLB made a more overt and concerted effort to market their product from the late 1990s. There have been increasing attempts, not only to manufacture baseball products overseas, but also to develop export markets. Marcano and Fidler (1999, p.525) argue that MLB is attempting to "follow in the footsteps of the NBA" by "pursuing a global strategy of selling licensed MLB merchandise overseas". Consistent with this, in 1987, Major League Baseball Properties (MLBP) was established "to further the global development of Major League baseball by obtaining overseas television audiences and the purchase of Major League products such as equipment, caps, T-shirts and baseball cards" (Dabscheck, 1995, p.66). In 1989, MLB set up an International division of their organization called ‘Major League Baseball International’ (MLBI). MLBI was set up to focus "on the worldwide growth of baseball through game development, broadcasting, special events, sponsorship and licensing" (MLBI, 2001, p.3-4). It remains to be seen whether, in the long run, this merchandising activity will help to foster indigenous developments in the targeted countries.

Sage (1994, p.43-4) points out how, in 1953, Rawlings – which manufactures the official MLB balls – was based in St. Louis, USA. In seeking to reduce costs, they moved their production line from the USA, first to Puerto Rico then to Haiti and more recently, in 1990, to Costa Rica. This was in order "to exploit cheaper labor" in countries where unions were non-existent (Sage, 1994, p.44). This, undoubtedly, contributed significantly to the global flow of baseball capital and technology. In
relation to this, Klein (1991b, p.57) observed that “baseballs are stitched in Haiti, aluminium bats are produced in Japan, mitts are made in Taiwan, and players are increasingly coming from Latin America. The internationalization of baseball contributes to the perception that the American pastime is moving offshore”.

A further example of MLB’s expansionist strategy is the “Envoy Program”, which began in 1991 with two coaches travelling to Holland (MLBI, 2001, p.4). Since then, the programme has been “expanded to include 44 coaches traveling to 21 countries in 2001” (MLBI, 2001, p.4). The “Envoy Program” was developed to create “a direct connection between Major League Baseball and developing baseball nations around the world” (MLBI, 2001, p.4). In making this connection, MLB were undoubtedly attempting to develop greater influence over baseball in these various countries. It is difficult to ascertain whether or not this was a direct attempt to challenge the global authority of the IBAF over the amateur game, but there appears to be few signs indicating that MLB and the IBAF take a coordinated approach to global developments.

The significance of the global spread of the game was further underlined when the Toronto Blue Jays won the World Series in 1992 and again in 1993. Whilst some argue that the development of MLB franchises in Montreal and Toronto amounts to an Americanization of Canada, the success enjoyed by the Blue Jays, in particular, contributed significantly to a ground swell of Canadian nationalism associated with beating the Americans at their own sport. Clearly, the two processes are not mutually exclusive. Although there were no Canadians in the successful Blue Jays’ line-ups in the World Series campaigns of either 1992 or 1993, the significance of the Blue Jays’
victories, Hayes (2001, p.161) argues, was that “for once America was watching ‘us’ [Canada] as we have so often been compelled to watch ‘them’”. In examining the advances of MLB into Canada, Hayes (2001) rightly questions the notion that it is simply a manifestation of the American domination of ‘Canadian culture’. If this were the case, he plausibly argues, one might assume that:

Any mention of nationalism or question of country would be downplayed and avoided by the Blue Jays – or that any emphasis would be placed on the city and not the country – but the exact opposite is true. The supposed ‘Canadianess’ of the team is precisely what is most prominently marketed and celebrated (Hayes 2001, p.173-4).

Furthermore, Hayes (2001, p.174) argues that:

Although it is impossible to imagine any other event, team or person contextualized in such an incredibly forceful, Canadian nationalistic framework than the 1992 Blue Jays, it is equally difficult to imagine a more potent symbol of popular Canadian capitulation to American cultural domination.

This is a good example of diminishing contrasts and increasing varieties as an aspect of the commingling of cultural forms. This reaffirms the need to understand that growing interdependency chains are both enabling and constraining. At the same time that Canadian culture was becoming more and more influenced – though dominated is rather stretching the point – by American culture, Canadians were using some aspects of it to promote Canadian nationalism. In this regard, it might be argued that MLB were happy to let them do this, as Maguire (1999) points out, it is crucial that we understand that global marketing strategies do often celebrate differences. As Hayes (2001, p.175) cogently argues, “by adapting and using American mass culture as a found resource, Canadians, like other groups, create their own shared pleasures with them. ‘Global media-sport products may be resisted, misunderstood and/or “recycled”, and thus be subject to a process of hybridization’ (Maguire, 1999)”.

In
much the same way that Klein characterizes the Dominican response to baseball as a blend of domination and resistance, Hayes (2001) holds the same to be true of the Canadian response to baseball.

Even in this period of attempted MLB expansionism, influences from other sources within the global baseball figuration are evident. In Cuba, baseball is still used as a political tool to show continued resistance to the USA, and as a source of national pride and identity. Echevarria (1999) and Jamail (2000) argue that baseball in Cuba has been "Cubanized", in much the same way, Dominican’s often consider baseball to be ‘their’ game. Jamail (2000) argues that during the early 1990s increasing numbers of Cubans were playing baseball in Italy, to such an extent that, he claims, Italian baseball has been “Cubanized” (Jamail, 2000, p.69).2 Japanese baseball provides us with further evidence that the global flow of baseball in this latter phase is not uniquely American. As Klein (1994, p.197) points out, “it is not simply the case that North American baseball” with greater “control over ... capital, marches unimpeded where it wants. The [counter] flow of economic power and capital, and its consequences, to the Far East has begun to show signs of happening in baseball as well”. As Klein (1994, p.199-200) argues, albeit in reified terms:

> Competition among industrial powers has also begun to show that the game and its structure will have to withstand competition from at least one other baseball-mad economic strong-hold (that is, Japan). This competition occurs in the arenas of searching the globe for talent as well as buying directly into North American professional baseball by foreign interests.

Similarly, Ikei (2000, p.79) holds, “Japan is a key player in the ongoing globalization of baseball”. Japanese companies have also continued to invest in baseball inside the

---

2 Although, according to Riccardo Schiroli (personal communication, 16 September, 2003) of the Italian Baseball Federation, today there are few if any Cubans playing in Italy.
USA, and, therefore, the idea that the USA is the sole influence on the diffusion of baseball is further undermined. It is not just Japanese companies that have challenged the relative dominance the USA has regarding the global flow of baseball. Although baseball is only a minority sport in Australia, Mitchell (1992, p.288) argues that Australia has been “an enthusiastic supporter of the international spread of baseball”. In this regard, Australians have played important roles within the IBAF, and, as J. Ostermeyer (personal communication, July 24, 2002), former Secretary General of the IBAF, states, “Tee Ball” – a game designed to introduce young children to baseball without the need for pitchers – “was a game devised in Australia and MLB was given permission by the ABF [Australian Baseball Federation] to use Tee Ball, and various adaptations of Tee Ball, to help internationalize the game”. In other words, as has already been highlighted, it is inappropriate to think of MLB, or people from the USA more generally, as the only innovators in the global diffusion of baseball.

There is a growing disparity between the financial state of MLB clubs. In recent years, the domestic economic situation in the USA has caused considerable concern with many administrators of baseball regarding the perilous financial state of many MLB outfits, particularly compared to a handful of the richest clubs. “The Report of the Independent Members of the Commissioner’s Blue Ribbon Panel on Baseball Economics”, by Levin, Mitchell, Volcker and Will (2000, p.5), suggests the situation is so serious that the current “economic structure” of baseball is “untenable in the long run”. The Report contains recommendations that are likely to have international ramifications. For example, Levin et al (2000, p.41) recommend the extension of the MLB draft to incorporate the growing international market for
players. A recommendation that might have an even greater impact is the suggestion that:

The opportunity for international events in baseball is tremendous. Moreover, because international revenues are currently funnelled through MLB's Central Fund, such revenues are equally shared by all clubs. Increases in revenues from international events should serve to moderate the level of revenue disparity in the industry (Levin et al, 2000, p.45).

Given the decline in income generated by the domestic game, and the growing influence from outside the USA, it is perhaps not surprising that MLB has pursued a more aggressive international marketing policy. At the turn of the century, Paul Archey, head of MLBI, predicted that "the future" of MLB is "going to be playing internationally" (2002, cited in King, 2002b, p.28). To this end, MLBI declared that the "cornerstone" of its marketing "initiatives was the playing of Major League Baseball games abroad" (MLBI, 2001, p.4). Indeed, in relation to this marketing ploy the MLB Commissioner, Allan H. (Bud) Selig (2000, cited in MLB, 2000) proclaimed that, "it just increases my belief our very aggressive internationalization policy is going to be a very exciting thing as we move into the 21st century". As Vargas (2000, p.21) states, "MLB has been engaging in high-profile efforts to globalize America's pastime by staging exhibition and regular season games in foreign nations, such as the Dominican Republic, Mexico, Venezuela, Cuba, and Japan". The MLB season 'opened' outside of the USA for three consecutive years between 1999 and 2001, and once again in 2004. In 1999, the MLB season started with a series of games in Mexico, in 2000 (and 2004) it opened in Japan, and in 2001 in Puerto Rico. The game in Puerto Rico "was the culmination of MLB's 2001 Month of the Americas. The Month of the Americas, which celebrated its third year in 2001, is part of baseball's initiative to honor its Latin heritage" (MLBI, 2001, p.10). As part of this programme, exhibition games were played in Mexico and Venezuela.
Smaller exhibition events, or ‘Road Shows’, as MLBI call them, have been held in Australia, the Czech Republic, England, Germany and the Netherlands. The Road Show “features batting machines, a pitching tunnel and a “discovery Zone” (an interactive tent highlighting MLB’s biggest stars)” (MLBI, 2001, p.17). MLBI (2001) claim that hundreds of thousands of people have attended the road shows. The longer-term impact of developing the presence of MLB through these events is too early to judge. What is clear is that marketing the MLB product is the primary objective, over the development of baseball as a participant sport. For example, J. Ostermeyer (personal communication, July 24, 2002) is of the view that MLB “is uncomfortable in the role of developing the game [as distinct from markets] at a grass roots level”. Ostermeyer instead argues that MLB has been more successful at, and more inclined, to promote its message and its products rather than the game. Recently, however, MLBI have developed a programme aimed at getting youths involved in baseball in certain parts of the world. For example, the youth baseball league competition, *Play Ball!*, has been played in Britain since 1998, and was expanded to South Africa and Germany in 2001 (MLBI, 2001, p.15). J. Chetwynd (personal communication, March 7, 2002), who works for MLBI in London, and has been a member of the Great Britain baseball team, explains that this programme is played out in a mini-format akin to the MLB season. Teams are provided with MLB kit in order to cultivate allegiance to the MLB team of choice. In attempting to develop the game with youngsters in specific target areas, therefore, it is still the MLB product that is largely to the fore, although this does not necessarily mean that disseminating the game is inconsequential. MLBI have numerous other programmes aimed at spreading the MLB product. The *Pitch, Hit and Run Program* is a mini-version of the game designed to introduce eight to twelve year olds to baseball and, according to MLBI
(2001, p.5), this "reached more than 600,000 children in six countries". The six countries are: Australia, Germany, Italy, Mexico, South Africa and the United Kingdom. According to Marcano and Fidler (1999, p.526), "one curious feature of the international Pitch, Hit and Run competitions is that they all have taken place in developed, or relatively developed, countries". This leads them to conclude that the "real objective" is not to produce MLB players from these countries, but to create a more affluent market for the sale of MLB licensed products (Marcano and Fidler, 1999, p.526). Though again, it might be more plausibly argued that it is a blend of promoting markets for MLB products and baseball as a sport that lie behind MLB’s objectives. The two objectives are not mutually exclusive.

A further example of MLB’s expansionist policy is their recent involvement in the administration of baseball in the UK. In January 2000, as outlined in chapter seven, the British Baseball Federation (BBF) and the British Softball Federation (BSF) developed a joint agency, called Baseball Softball UK (BSUK). The BBF and BSF remain in place as the national governing bodies of the respective sports, while BSUK has been charged with the task of overseeing the commercial developments of each game. The joint venture was developed in order to optimize the commercial clout of baseball and softball in the UK, and, perhaps in the first instance, to compensate for their present relative weakness. Significantly, though, it is MLB that is the major sponsor behind the venture, and MLBI share their offices in London with the staff of BSUK. Evidently, MLB are becoming more interventionist in terms of the development of baseball in England, and the UK as a whole. It is, however, too early to assess the impact of BSUK.
Over the last decade or so, MLBI and MLBP have sought licensing agreements with various companies to sell "MLB logo apparel" (MLBI, 2001, p.19) abroad. According to MLBI (2001, p.19), the "overall licensing revenue" for associated products within the international market place "grew 36% in 2001". The generally affluent Asian market is, according to C. Russell (personal communication, May 1, 2002), Director of MLBI for Europe, Africa and the Middle East, regarded as the top marketing priority for MLBI, and the total number of licensees of MLB products in Asia is now forty-eight. Thirty-nine companies were added in 2001 alone, after MLB licensed product sales doubled in Asia during 2000 (MLB, 2002). Sales of black market and fake MLB products have traditionally been quite widespread in many Latin American countries, in particular (Klein, 1991). More recently MLB have started to develop an 'official market' there despite widespread poverty. Indeed, C. Russell (personal communication, May 1, 2002) indicates that Latin America is MLBI's "second biggest marketplace". "In the Latin market", he argues, it is:

Much more about really pushing sponsors and broadcasters because it's the only way you can reach the disadvantaged, the people who don't have money or otherwise. And [it is about] trying to tailor your licensing programme and/or your sponsorship programme to delivering the goods that they can afford and that they can relate to. There's no point going in [to the Dominican Republic] and selling them a $200 authentic jersey of Pedro Martinez ... because very, very few people can buy it and no retailer is going to stock it. But it's linking up with huge brands in those markets whether it's Polar in Venezuela, or Pepsi Cola or Coors Beer, whoever those huge brands are in that marketplace and linking out to them and using their distribution networks to get to those fans (C. Russell, personal communication, May 1, 2002).

For example, MLB signed their first licensee contract with a company based in the Dominican Republic in time for the 2002 season (MLB, 2002).
Beyond the Asian and Latin American markets, MLB licensed products have not enjoyed any sustained market success. J. Ostermeyer (personal communication, July 24, 2002) suggests that in Australia:

At a time when Australian Baseball was trying to sell its own merchandise, it had to compete with Major League Baseball merchandise, which meant that the Australian product disappeared from the retailers shelves ... The public tired of the American merchandise, and there is nothing now of any real ongoing value in regard to merchandise in retail stores.

This suggests that sales in Australia are tied more to fashion than commitment to baseball or a specific team. Obviously this is likely to make it more difficult to sustain sales. Similar obstacles have been encountered in MLB’s efforts to break into the more affluent European market. C. Russell (personal communication, May 1, 2002) indicates that the marketing strategy in Europe is very different, because “you have the Japanese economic model [principally because of the relative wealth of the region], but very little understanding of the game and/or the athletes that are playing the game and those that have made it to the Major Leagues”. MLBI (2001, p.21) state that in the United Kingdom “sales were strong, with key retail partners all:sports and JD Sports” and “across Europe, sales were also strong with an expansion of the apparel range from Intersport in Austria to Stadium Sports in Sweden as well as in Foot Locker stores Europewide”. It is difficult to find any figures to substantiate these claims, and Gaston Panaye (personal communication, July 23, 2002), Secretary General of the Confédération Européene de Baseball (CEB), concedes that the sales tend to be limited to MLB-caps. Indeed, C. Russell (personal communication, May 1, 2002) admits that it is difficult to market MLB products in Europe, because there is only limited presence of the game. He affirms that marketing tends to focus on MLB
apparel as a "fashion brand with a sports authenticity ... it's not about selling authentic jerseys. It's the stuff that MTV rappers are wearing".

MLB have a range of partnership and sponsorship deals with national and international companies that are allowed to use the MLB logo and branding on their products, thereby exposing MLB to wider markets. In this respect "MLB have positioned their leagues as 'international' in an effort to attract global sponsors" (Cousens and Slack, 1996, p.57). Indeed, MLBI (2001, p.22) state that, "MLB International's sponsorships business continues to be one of the most important components to the global growth of the game". In 2002, for example, Pepsi launched an advertisement campaign associated with MLB in Japan. It is, as yet, too early to tell how the Japanese have responded to this campaign. According to MLB (2002, p.2), it is "the most comprehensive MLB-themed campaign ever in Japan". Furthermore, it marks the "fourth major market in which Pepsi is an Official Sponsor of MLB, joining the United States, Latin America and Canada". In addition to Pepsi, some Japanese companies have exclusive promotional deals with MLB to endorse their products. Sony has launched a Latin music compilation CD in conjunction with MLB in Latin America (MLB, 2002). Other multi-national companies (MNCs) involved in sponsoring MLB across Asia and Latin America are Adidas, Gillette, and Mastercard. For the most part, the companies involved are largely major companies in the domestic area where the sponsorship deal is located. Mizuno and Nintendo, for example, have sponsorship deals with MLB in Japan, as do other less globally known companies such as Kirin breweries and am/pm convenience stores. Directv has a sponsorship deal that targets a handful of Latin American countries; Maltin Polar breweries has a deal in Venezuela and Qantas in Australia, to name but a few
additional examples. C. Russell (personal communication, May 1, 2002) provides an insight into the philosophy behind this marketing strategy:

Because, in Venezuela, the beverage is Polar (an alcoholic malt), they have 98% exposure in the market place of the low percentage product. So, do we want to partner up with Bud[weiser] in Venezuela? Well, no, 'cos they are not getting much exposure, so do we sign up with Polar? Absolutely, then we get [exposure for] 98% of that core audience.

By virtue of their existing involvement with MLB in the USA, a handful of companies are in partnership with MLB in terms of promoting the game in Europe, such as Adidas, Motorola, and Foot Locker. There was increased support from MLBI sponsor roster partners (Franklin, Majestic, New Era, Rawlings and Wilson) in backing the European Championships held in Germany in 2001. It is clear that Germany and the UK, relatively affluent countries, fit into the model of markets that MLB wishes to enter. Notwithstanding this, generally, C. Russell (personal communication, May 1, 2002) admits, the profile of baseball is not strong enough in Europe to attract the major companies to invest large sums.

MLBI (2001, p.4) consider that “MLB International’s sponsorship business had a banner year in 2001. The list of sponsors grew to 40 and those sponsors ran 84 different promotions in 15 countries around the world”. However, it is again quite apparent that the MLB “sponsor roster” is primarily centred on Canada, Latin American countries, Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan, with marginal developments occurring in Australia and Europe (and virtually none in Africa). Thus, the flow of capital and/or technology associated with American baseball is still somewhat limited in global terms. It is unclear whether the money generated through such international sponsorship is being channelled into the expansion of the international strategy, or whether much of it is being used to subsidize the American domestic game.
The global flow of professional baseball players has also increased in the recent past, and this is tied in with MLB’s expansionist policy. As with numerous other professional team sports, the rosters of MLB clubs are not restricted to domestic ‘home-grown’ players. Marcano and Fidler (1999, p.529) argue that, “the globalization of baseball also features an increasingly global hunt for baseball talent”. In 2001, foreign-born players made up just over a quarter of the entire MLB roster, representing sixteen different nationalities. This figure has grown since 1997, when it stood at 19% (King, 2002a). As can be seen from Table 8.2 below, according to King (2002a, p.36), foreign-born players make up just over a quarter of the entire MLB roster.

3 Unfortunately, I have not been able to identify any equally comprehensive data from before this period to demonstrate the extent of this increase over a longer time frame.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aruba</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curacao</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Foreign-born</strong></td>
<td><strong>147</strong></td>
<td><strong>171</strong></td>
<td><strong>178</strong></td>
<td><strong>198</strong></td>
<td><strong>216</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total MLB</strong></td>
<td><strong>774</strong></td>
<td><strong>841</strong></td>
<td><strong>841</strong></td>
<td><strong>839</strong></td>
<td><strong>854</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage foreign-born</strong></td>
<td><strong>19.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>21.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>25.3%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: King (2002a, p.36).
For Gould (2000, p. 86-7), such figures may be explained by the:

Perceived dearth of qualified players in North America, an attempt to diminish escalating draft and free agency salary expenses through Latin American player recruitment, Japanese free-agency, the demise of the Cold War with its impact upon both Cuba's defectors and the relaxation of conscription in Korea.

It is only a handful of countries that make up the bulk of the numbers of foreign-born players employed by MLB clubs. Over two-thirds come from three Latin American countries (Dominican Republic, Puerto Rico, and Venezuela) and over 80 per cent are from the Pan American region (adding Canada and Mexico) specifically. Furthermore, the diverse range of nationalities represented may actually be a little misleading in terms of the global movement of players. For example, the one English-born player on the list, Lance Painter, who played for the Colorado Rockies in 1993, and went on to play for the St. Louis Cardinals, Toronto Blue Jays, and Milwaukee Brewers, until he left MLB in 2001, was brought up in the USA (J. Chetwynd, personal communication, October 17, 2002). He holds a British passport by place of birth, but can, in no way, be regarded as a product of the British baseball system.4

Although it does seem fairly clear that MLB franchises are increasingly prepared to look abroad for foreign talent, for the most part, the formal aspect of scouting and establishing academies does not extend beyond Asia and Pan Americana. This is not to deny Gould's (2000, p. 87) point that this "scramble abroad for ... recruits" has "accelerated the globalization of baseball". Rather, the argument is that the scope of this recruitment is narrower than some would have us believe.

4 Other MLB players of the recent past who were born in England are Tom Waddell (Cleveland Indians) and Danny Cox (St. Louis Cardinals). They were both also brought up in the USA, and therefore did not move from England for the promise of baseball employment. K. Macadam (personal communication, September 4, 2001) and J. Chetwynd (personal communication, October 17, 2002) both point out that, in recent years, some British people have won scholarships to American universities on the basis of their baseball potential, but the number is minimal.
Apart from those playing winter ball in the Caribbean, or in teams outside of the USA that have working relationships with MLB clubs (some clubs in Australia, Japan and South Korea, for example), the number of American's in paid employment through baseball abroad is still fairly negligible. So, Maguire’s (1999, p.125) claim that “American sports migrants would appear likely, for the time being, to be one of the dominant groups traversing the globe” does not seem to apply to baseball. The questionnaire results produced for this thesis indicate that few Americans are employed in any capacity within the game in foreign countries, save through the Envoy Programme, discussed above. This is in marked contrast to basketball, for example (Maguire, 1999).

MLBI (2001) acknowledge the importance of the international media in the promotion and attempted expansion of their sport on a global scale. They indicate that “the sale of broadcast products remains one of the most important initiatives for the company” (MLBI, 2001, p.6). To this end, “MLB International has agreements with more than 50 broadcasters, which transmit games to 224 countries and territories around the world” (MLBI, 2001, p.4). MLBI (2001, p.4) produce figures that indicate “total viewership of MLB International’s production of” the 2001 World Series “was more than 100 million, including nearly 27 million in Korea and 21 million in Japan”. These figures should be treated with caution in view of the tendency to inflate viewing figures because they are a major plank in the strategy of selling advertising space and attracting sponsors. Marcano and Fidler (1999, p.524) argue that, “MLB

---

5 In 2001, the Programme visited Argentina, Austria, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, China, Croatia, the Czech Republic, France, Germany, Great Britain, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Jamaica, Kenya, the Philippines, Poland, South Africa, Sweden, and the Ukraine. According to J. Chetwynd (personal communication, March 7, 2002), through the MLB coach-in-residence scheme, there is one “full-time coach based in the UK that works on developing the baseball teaching skills of British coaches”. There are also a handful of Americans who work for MLBI in their London offices.
International does over-hype its world broadcasting ... [M]any of the countries listed [in MLB’s figures] ... are simply served by ESPN, most likely only at four- and five-star international hotels catering to Western business executives”. Therefore, there are grounds for believing that the televised MLB product is not nearly as globally pervasive as MLB would have us believe.

MLB is, undoubtedly, extremely popular on television in certain regions of the world. The popularity of MLB in Japan, for example, is such that “the Japanese send their own production crews to the World Series, produce their own programmes, their own daily magazines, their own highlight shows because there is such a desire and knowledge base for the product” (C. Russell, personal communication, May 1, 2002). More often than not, where baseball is popular on television outside of the USA, MLB must tailor the product to the market. As C. Russell (personal communication, May 1, 2002) points out, it is a matter of “working with the broadcaster, making sure that the right teams are being focused on, that we [MLBI] are delivering the right games to them so that they can focus on their local stars”. For example, MLB’s international media strategy includes showing live games involving certain Japanese or Korean stars, for those respective countries. It is obviously hoped national interest will be higher because of the involvement of one of “‘their’ boys” (Marcano & Fidler, 1999, p.524). Indeed, MLBI (2001, p.6-7) point out:

Fuelled by the popularity of Ichiro, television exposure and ratings of MLB games in Japan skyrocketed in 2001. Every [Seattle] Mariners home and away game was broadcast on Japanese television ... In addition, games featuring Mets outfielder Tsuyoshi Shinjo and Red Sox pitcher Hideo Nomo received extensive coverage.

A similar strategy is used in the broadcasting of MLB games in Latin America with the focus on “country heroes” (MLBI, 2001, p.7). “By showcasing these players in
telecasts to their home markets", MLBI (2001, p.7) hope to “continue to grow the
game worldwide". MLB produce a weekly highlights package, called “A Week in
Baseball”, which is shown throughout the USA, but is also popular in several parts of
Latin America. Although the images of baseball that are seen in Latin American
countries are largely controlled by MLB, it is not simply a matter of showing a
sanitized American product. The shows are “entirely in Spanish with features about
Latin ballplayers that focus on both their on-field performance and lifestyle” (MLB,
2002). As King (2002c, p.26) indicates, “MLBI tries to build its programming around
the players with whom viewers connect. Customization has become a critical piece of
the league’s international strategy”. MLB, therefore, are fully aware of the need to
produce for cultural niche markets. In this respect, one might argue it is a more
sophisticated form of cultural penetration, one that demonstrates an awareness of the
existence of cultural resistance and seeks to outflank or circumvent it.

Mediated images of baseball, and more particularly, of MLB, are shown and
popularly subscribed to in several countries where baseball is already popular. But,
what of the popularity of baseball, and MLB in particular, in other parts of the world
where the game is less well established? In Australia, the only MLB games that are
televised are on private, pay-to-view television, and, as J. Ostermeyer (personal
communication, July 24, 2002) points out, “pay TV in Australia does not have a
strong market penetration around the country, and therefore the ratings, although
reasonable [in terms of pay TV], are fairly insignificant in relation to free-to-air TV”.
C. Russell (personal communication, May 1, 2002) argues that the expansion of
American television baseball programming into European countries has become
increasingly important to MLB – even when compared to their expansion in the Asian
markets. Nevertheless, although Dutch and German television companies sent their own production teams to broadcast the 2001 World Series, on the whole, the popularity of MLB on European television is negligible (C. Russell, personal communication, May 1, 2002). In Spain, for example, the MLB produced “This Week in Baseball” is shown, but there is no “in studio presence” (C. Russell, personal communication, May 1, 2002). In the UK, channel Five’s coverage of MLB incorporates in-studio presence, and games are shown live. C. Russell (personal communication, May 1, 2002) argues that this is important to MLBI because in the UK “most sports, or the predominant sports particularly, have live programming, [and] have in-studio presence”. That is to say, “if we [MLBI] were to allow channel Five to” show just the weekly highlights package “it would diminish the value of our sport” (C. Russell, personal communication, May 1, 2002). Robert Charles (personal communication, September 2, 2003), the Director for Sport Programming at Five, argues that “like all rights holders and broadcasters should have, there is a healthy relationship between the two parties [Five and MLB]”. R. Charles (personal communication, September 2, 2003) points out that his channel’s coverage of baseball involves live programming and an in-studio presence, where there is “an enthusiast who started off really not knowing too much about the sport, Johnny Gould, and an expert who sits next to him who knows everything and can hold his hand and guide him through exactly what is going on”. This, he argues, “is a very good way to present sport and is certainly something that our viewers enjoy. There’s a real sort of baseball community here of purists who have a very strong affinity with the shows” (R. Charles, personal communication, September 2, 2003). Although, he does acknowledge that, as a result of the live transmission:

It is very difficult when programmes are going out between midnight and 3.30 in the morning to identify who the people are [watching it]. We know there’s a
very committed audience to baseball. Obviously that type of hour it's not an especially huge size, but we do know that there's audiences of 200,000 people who are sitting there enjoying baseball for a period of time (R. Charles, personal communication, September 2, 2003).

Nevertheless, while baseball is shown on terrestrial British television, it attracts only minority interest.

According to the Central Intelligence Agency's (CIA) (2003) publication *The World Factbook*, there are 235 nation-states in the world today. There are 191 (which is 81% of all nation-states) member nations of the United Nations, 202 (86%) member nations of the International Olympic Committee (IOC) and 204 (87%) member nations of the Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA). There are 109 member nations of the International Baseball Federation (IBAF), which is 46 per cent of all nations listed by the CIA (2003). Although it has proved difficult to generate reliable data for the number of registered baseball players in each of the countries who have national membership of the IBAF (see chapter six), the basic quantitative data are still quite revealing (see Appendix B). Of the 61 countries that I have a basic statistic of registered participants for, only two of them (Japan and Mexico) have at least 50 per cent of the proportion of registered players per population of that found in the USA. Only a further four countries (Canada, Cuba, Guam, and Puerto Rico) have at least 10 per cent of the proportion of registered players per population of that found in the USA. All six of these countries are within the Asian and Pan Americana ‘stronghold’ for baseball. Nearly three-quarters (45 out of 61) of the countries for which the data are available have less than 1 per cent of the proportion of players to the country's population compared to the proportion in the USA. These quantitative data, though rather crude, underscore the general point that
baseball, as a participant sport, as played with a degree of seriousness, cannot remotely be characterized as a global phenomenon. This is illustrated quite strikingly in Figure 8.1, below, which converts these figures into a mapped image of the comparative ‘penetration’ of baseball across the world. Thus it can be stated quite categorically that those authors (Echevarria, 2000; Fidler, 2000; Gould, 2000; Marcano & Fidler, 1999; Rosentraub, 2000; Vargas, 2000) who have argued that baseball is a ‘global sport’, present a highly exaggerated view of baseball’s global profile. Their claims are found wanting on five counts: (1) they have exaggerated the extent to which baseball has diffused, (2) they have exaggerated the extent to which baseball has penetrated the sporting cultures of other nations, (3) they have neglected the way in which the people of receiving cultures have modified the sport to accommodate their own social mores and (4) as a variation on this theme, they have neglected the way in which such people have used baseball as a means of fostering and reinforcing national identity and as a vehicle for cultural resistance and, finally, (v) they have neglected the contribution made by people from other cultures to the diffusion of the sport. The extensive empirical research conducted for this thesis has been aimed at countering these tendencies. The hope is that this overview of the global flows associated with baseball has clarified the way in which the national ‘case studies’ intertwine and inter-penetrate. As outlined in the methodology section, moving from the global to the local, and vice versa, helps to illuminate our understanding of both levels. We are now in a position to draw more meaningful conclusions regarding the global baseball figuration, and globalization processes more generally, and it is to the conclusion chapter that I shall now turn.

---

6 The level of penetration, as identified by the legend on Figure 8.1, was generated as follows: ‘No penetration’ = no NGB affiliation to the IBAF; ‘Minimal penetration’ = NGB membership to IBAF, but less than 1% of the proportion of registered players per population of that found in the USA; ‘Some penetration’ = between 1% and 10% proportion; ‘Significant penetration’ — over 10% proportion.
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Figure 8.1
Chapter 9: Conclusion

The aims of this final chapter are as follows:

- To provide an overview of the study;
- To provide a summary of the strengths and weaknesses of the different perspectives that have been applied to an understanding of the process of globalization, and more specifically the globalization of sport;
- On this basis, I will endeavour to assess the extent to which the figurational approach that I have applied in this thesis has enabled me to overcome what I perceive to be some of the shortcomings of the former perspectives. This will involve me reflecting upon the theoretical and methodological dimensions of my thesis;
- Finally, I will offer some suggestions on areas where further research might be usefully conducted.

9.1 Overview of the study

It is apparent from my review of the main approaches to globalization in general, in chapter two, and also in relation to the globalization of sport, that major differences exist in terms of theoretical premises, methodologies and in the interpretation of evidence. To this end, chapter three provided an outline of the theoretical approach, namely figurational sociology, that I wanted to ‘test’ when exploring the globalization of baseball, and chapter four was an outline of the methods I was going to use to ‘test’ it. In chapter five, I provided an overview of the sportization of baseball in the United States of America (USA), in order to establish when, why and how the sport came to exist, before going on to explore its subsequent diffusion. It was established that baseball developed from a number of bat-and-ball
games played in the USA, many of which, in all likelihood, were taken there by European, and most particularly, English immigrants. Organized baseball, and therefore the incipient modernization of the sport, occurred along similar organizational lines to cricket, which had an established following in the northeastern states of the USA in the early nineteenth century. The fact that baseball challenged, and then eventually usurped, cricket’s popularity was an expression of the growing ‘independence’ of the USA by the mid-nineteenth century. Having outlined the sportization of baseball, chapter six examined the global diffusion of the sport. Undoubtedly baseball has become extremely popular in many diverse areas of the world. It has been most warmly embraced in the Asian Pacific Rim and parts of Latin America. Many of the countries where baseball has become popular are characterized by high levels of American cultural penetration, economic and/or political influence. In contrast, and in spite of American cultural, economic and political influence, the popularity of baseball in Oceania and Europe is minimal. Chapter seven provided a detailed case study of the development of baseball in England. Over several generations, baseball has generated only sporadic interest in this country. In chapter eight, I attempted to make sense of the cross-sectional analysis alongside the case study of England, in drawing the various global processes together to develop a better understanding of the global baseball figuration. It now seems fruitful to attempt to draw some broader conclusions.

9.2 Strengths and weaknesses of different sociological approaches to globalization

On the basis of the review of literature in chapter two, it was argued that it is necessary to move beyond the abstract, theory dominated approach that has, thus far,
characterized much of the debate in the area. A general limitation of most of the approaches taken so far is the relative weakness of—and sometimes total absence of—the empirical support for the claims made. These claims tend to take the form of overgeneralizations about the nature of globalization, and are often associated with the tendency to reify. Cultural imperialists and modernization theorists are prone to focus solely on the homogenising tendencies of globalization processes. Conversely, other writers are preoccupied with cultural diversity, and therefore tend to over-play the heterogenising dimensions of global diffusion. Even this latter group fail to engage with recipient groups of the diffusion processes, in what might be described as a rigorously empirical manner. This is bound to place severe limits on their ability to assess the impact of, and reaction to, the diffusion of sport by the recipient groups. Another major weakness of approaches in this field is the relative lack of detachment displayed. This finds expression in many writers’ highly selective approach to the evidence. That is to say, they tend to select and present evidence that supports their pre-conceptions and ignore, or are oblivious to, countervailing evidence. In other words, all too often contributors to the globalization debate seek to sustain their theoretical predilections by swooping down from their lofty perch and selecting morsels of evidence that support their predispositions. They are more concerned with sustaining their pre-conceptions, and perhaps their ideological pre-dispositions, than they are advancing general understanding.

This thesis has, in part, been a reaction to these perceived weaknesses. Throughout, I have endeavoured to focus on the following:

- Human relationships. That is the networks of interdependency ties in which human beings are embroiled.
• The dynamic and developmental nature of the power differentials that characterize these relationships.

• The multi-dimensional nature of these power differentials.

• The recognition that social processes are, in fact, expressions of human beings in action.

• The sheer complexity of these dynamic interdependencies.

• The recognition that human interactions are so complex that they invariably lead to a variety of unforeseen consequences. Some of these become apparent to some groups immediately, while others remain hidden, for various periods of time.

• The recognition of the enormous complexity and dynamic nature of human interdependency ties leads to the further recognition of other constraints on the nature of the explanations one can generate. Firstly, it leads one to give up the search for absolute explanations and acknowledge that one can only aspire to explanations that have a degree of adequacy. Secondly, it leads to an awareness of the limitations of trying to impose single-causal explanations on these complex human figurations. Thirdly, it leads one to appreciate the need to avoid crude dichotomies.

• While the above theoretical premises guide my approach, I view the resultant framework as the sensitising agent, rather than a straitjacket. That is to say, the diversity that characterizes the empirical world, can only be understood with any degree of adequacy by engaging in theory-guided empirically rigorous research.
Throughout, I have endeavoured to maintain a high degree of detachment, while, of course, retaining the insights that accrue from my involvement in sport in general, and baseball in particular.

I will now turn to an analysis of the empirical findings of this thesis, and the extent to which the figurational approach, outlined above, has helped me make sense of this evidence. It is not appropriate to deal with each point raised above in turn, or in isolation, because in many respects they are interdependent. On the basis of these concerted premises, I will now endeavour to draw certain broad conclusions.

In developing baseball from other, similar bat-and-ball games, most likely heralding from Europe, it could be argued, as Maguire (1999, p. 209) points out, that some Americans have “proved adept at adapting and reinterpreting” such pastimes. However, he argues, “although their subsequent diffusion is seen by some as ‘proof’ of Americanization, they are overlooking these European roots. Bearing this in mind it is necessary to recognize that, over the long term, globalization processes are multidirectional, not unidirectional” (Maguire, 1999, p. 209). In other words, the very fact that baseball was developed from bat-and-ball games that originated in Europe, and was modelled on the organizational structure already in place for cricket, is indicative of the multidirectionality of global flows. Furthermore, the subsequent desire of some Americans to spread baseball to other countries, maps well on to the Eliasian concept of the desire for status distinction. As Maguire (1999, p. 51) argues, “the global diffusion of sport was also bound up in the quest for status and distinction by representatives of different nations”. The attempts by some Americans to develop a distinctive sport is indicative of a desire for distinction, but the attempt to diffuse it is,
by implication, more inclusive. It has imperialistic connotations. Certain powerful American groupings had wanted to demonstrate that their sporting culture was superior, in much the same way that the British had done before them. In many respects, it was this desire to demonstrate the superiority of baseball, particularly over cricket, in England, and also, to a lesser extent, in Australia, that prompted such stiff resistance from the indigenous population in these countries.

Kilminster (1997, p.273) states that within a figurational approach to globalization:

The focus is on the figurational compulsion of the web of social interrelations at the national, regional and global levels. It is the particular nature of the relatedness and interdependence of groups within nations and between them, that exerts constraint over each one. Clearly, differing power ratios between the participants play an important part in structuring the options and possible outcomes of struggles.

That much is evident from the different periods of baseball’s development both within the USA and outside of it. Once baseball had undergone a process of sportization within America, the game first spread to countries within the American sphere of influence in the late nineteenth century. Later, in the 1920s, American influence extended to parts of Europe, and baseball gained an insecure foothold.

When the game has taken root elsewhere, it has been modified by the recipient cultures. In Japan, for example, baseball is extremely popular, but the style of play is distinctive from that of MLB. The game in Japan is largely an amalgam of American and Japanese influences. Similar blends of local and global influences characterize the development of the game in other countries where it is especially popular, such as Cuba and the Dominican Republic. Furthermore, Japanese and Cuban people,
especially, have participated in the further diffusion of baseball. As Maguire (1999, p.93) argues, “it is possible ... to overstate the extent to which the West has triumphed in terms of global sport structures, organizations, ideologies and performances”. That much is clear from the global baseball figuration. An equally important observation, often over-looked in the literature on globalization, is that it is also evident that researchers have understated the battle within the west. It is simply not fruitful to argue that processes of Westernization have occurred, without recognising that ‘the West’ is contested terrain. The in-depth case study on the development of baseball in England clearly highlights the fact that “Anglo-American interdependence is contoured and shaped by power differentials, but these differentials are by no means fixed” (Maguire, 1999, p.173). Indeed, despite the growing influence that the USA exerts over the British government, successive generations of English people have used sport, consciously and otherwise, as a site of resistance to growing American influence. As Maguire (1999, p.176) again cogently argues:

Sport remains an arena where processes of habitus/identity testing and formation are conducted ... and a key feature of the global sports process is that it is used by different groups – those which are more established, as well as emergent or outsider groups – to represent, maintain and/or challenge identities.

Furthermore, one must remember that aspects of these processes of adaptation are not necessarily on the conscious level. It could be argued that, to a considerable degree, people adapt received phenomena to their own circumstances and life experiences (habitus) with little or no reflection. Indeed, they are bound to engage in this process.

The research undertaken for this thesis helps to underscore the view that “members of ‘indigenous’ cultures are responsive and active in the interpretation of the global flow of people, ideas, images and technologies” (Maguire, 1999, p.213). In
England, cricket, for example, has been used by English people, most notably in media responses to baseball within the English press, as a means of affirming English superiority. This is despite the fact that, at various stages over the last 130 years, cricket’s popularity within English sporting culture has been on the wane; at no time has the English media turned on cricket in favour of baseball. Indeed, the unfavourable comparisons drawn between cricket and baseball, during the various attempts that have been made to establish the latter in England, is illustrative of Maguire’s (1999, p.178) point that “cricket is seen to represent what ‘England’ is and gives meaning to the identity of being ‘English’. The sport fixes ‘England’ as a focus of identification in English emotions”. Of course, this is an establishment view that finds expression in the attempts made to maintain aspects of status exclusivity over a long period. The English press overwhelmingly supported cricket, and extolled its superiority over baseball. As Maguire (1999, p.202) puts it: “sport media discourse of this kind performs the function [sic] that Elias detected regarding national identity politics and socialization practices more broadly. That is, such sport media discourse reinforced invented traditions but also national habitus”. One can make a connection here with the media response to baseball in Cuba, the Dominican Republic and Japan; three countries where the game is extremely popular. The response has not been that baseball is an inferior sport, rather that the Cuban, Dominican and Japanese ways of playing exemplify their respective cultures. Frequently this, too, has resulted in negative press coverage of the American style of play as compared to the indigenous styles. Thus, even where baseball has ‘taken off’, it is a mistake to assume that this is indicative of homogenization pure and simple. As Kilminster (1997, p.280) cogently argues:

1 Once again, though, it is appropriate to recognise that this view of cricket is generally an aristocratic/upper middle class view that, paradoxically, was also used to distance these groups from other Englishmen.
In the present phase and for the foreseeable future, the relative power potential of the USA is and will probably remain decisive\(^2\) in social developments on a world scale. The rise of newly industrializing countries (the so-called NICs) in what we in Europe call the Far East and the breakup of the former Soviet Union are symptoms of a shift in the global balance of power between nations, which involves the relative decline (but by no means total fall) of American global hegemony.

For example, Japanese based companies have been, for several decades, major competitors of American based companies in the global market for baseball products. Furthermore, Cuban and Japanese influence in spreading baseball to other parts of the world cannot be denied; nor can the strength of the playing abilities of numerous Cuban, Dominican and Japanese people. Indeed, beyond MLB, Cuba has dominated the global game since the 1940s.

The different responses to baseball across the world range from more or less complete rejection to the adoption of the sport as the ‘national pastime’. As already noted, the ‘style’ of the game, as played in different countries, illustrates these variable patterns. Thus, the global diffusion of baseball is characterized by ‘diminishing contrasts and increasing varieties’. That is to say, the process whereby baseball has become more globally diffused, has contributed to diminishing contrasts in global sports cultures. This is especially the case where baseball has made significant inroads into particular societies (such as in parts of Asia and Latin America), and has contributed to the marginalization of pre-existing sport forms.

\(^2\) In my view ‘decisive’ is an over-statement. I prefer ‘relative dominance’. Iraq provides an excellent example. On one level, it is indicative of the dominance of American power on the world stage. However, on another level, it offers a demonstration of the unforeseen consequences that can flow from the exercise of such power. And, by unforeseen, I mean unforeseen by the instigators of that war. My principal point is that while both the intended and unintended consequences flow from the same immediate source, it is only useful to conceive of the latter as indicative of the power of a right-wing Republican grouping. The resultant unforeseen consequences are surely an indication of the limits of power; in this case the limits of their power to make adequate knowledge based assessments. That is why I do not think the term decisive (which seems to me to imply conscious intent) quite captures the complexities of the process.
However, even where baseball is played extensively outside of the USA, it tends to be played in different styles, which exemplify increasing varieties of play, or heterogenising processes. Furthermore, the fact that the sport has not been adopted in all parts of the world where attempts have been made to develop it also emphasizes the need to be aware of countervailing trends to diminishing contrasts or homogenising processes.

The uneven development of baseball is an expression of differing power ratios and the dynamic characteristic of power relationships. An appreciation that power relationships are always in flux allows us to more fully comprehend the fact that less powerful groups may be in a sufficiently strong position to resist, and/or contest the agendas of more powerful groups. For example, whilst MLB undoubtedly enjoy considerable influence in the Dominican Republic, over the last few decades, Dominican's have used baseball as a form of cultural resistance. This kind of resistance has been largely ignored by cultural imperialism theorists, and, in some senses, has been over-simplified by cultural hegemony theorists. In respect of this latter point, resistance via sport may be the easier option and it may, or may not, lead to other forms of resistance. However, in itself, it is perhaps more an expression of frustration than co-ordinated political action. A figurational understanding of the dynamic differential power relationships and the different dimensions of power (not just economic power) that characterize these relationships avoids the tendency to pre-empt empirical inquiry and address the diversity of the social world. The relationship between the different dimensions of power is an empirical question and not one that can be determined on an a priori basis. For example, MLB's re-packaging of their product to suit the Latin American market is clearly a response to the problems they
have encountered in seeking to control the global baseball figuration. The very fact that they have done this is an expression of power differentials in the world. At the same time, this response is, itself, indicative of their power and their capacity to adapt when they encounter resistance. This example helps to illustrate the dynamic and multi-dimensional character of power relationships. Thus, a further strength of the figural approach is the way in which it sensitises one to differential power relationships in the dynamic global baseball figuration. The USA is central within this figuration, though by no means exclusively so. As we have seen, Japanese people have been extremely influential in the development of baseball in parts of Asia and Latin America (as well as, to a lesser extent, in Australia and Europe), and Cubans, in particular, have been extremely influential in the continued development of baseball in much of Latin America.

Many participants in this debate attempt to conceptualise the power relationships involved in terms of 'core' and 'periphery'. However, such conceptualizations are too abstract and static to grapple with the dynamic complexity of concrete power relationships. It is difficult to conceive of dynamic cores or dynamic peripheries. In some respects, Elias's concept of established and outsiders can be seen as an advance on these former concepts with its clearer reference to people. Nevertheless, it could be argued that the established-outsider conceptualization lacks a certain dynamism and flexibility. For example, it becomes a little unwieldy when one tries to transpose it onto an analysis of complex human networks, because the established in one relationship can be the subordinates in other relationships, and, similarly, outsiders in one relationship can be the dominant party in another relationship. It might also be argued that the established-outsider concept
lacks a certain flexibility in terms of its capacity to accommodate the changeful nature of human relationships. On this basis, rather than employ the terms ‘established’ and ‘outsiders’, it may prove to be more useful to think in terms of shifting degrees of domination and subordination. The case study of baseball in England may be used to illustrate this point. The periods covered spanned times during which England could have been regarded as the more dominant group, with the USA as the emergent world power. As one moves into the twentieth century, it is possible to argue that both England and the USA enjoyed more or less dominant positions within global economic, political and cultural spheres. By World War I, however, despite England’s dominant position throughout much of the world, the USA was in a stronger, and thus, more dominant position. Following the two world wars, English subordination to the USA increased in economic, military and political spheres. However, within this specific figuration, the dominant position enjoyed by the English in terms of sports played in England has, largely, been maintained. This argument has been given further credence within this thesis by the continued rejection of, and downright apathy shown toward, baseball. While the overall balance of power has shifted in the direction of the USA, this does not preclude, and may even heighten, the possibility that sport will be used as a kind of cultural enclave. Indeed, shifts in other dimensions of power in favour of the USA may encourage greater resistance to penetration on the cultural/sports level. In effect, what we are referring to are dynamic and interpenetrating networks of dominant and subordinate human beings. Of course, the struggle for supremacy was between specific groups within England and the USA and, for example, while the English establishment were convinced of the superiority of cricket over baseball, they were also intent on excluding the lower orders from aspects of the game, and keeping them in a subordinate position. As such, it is argued
here that whilst the established-outsider concept is an advance on those who attempt to limit our understanding of power ratios to class/economics, ethnicity, or gender, it, too, has its limitations. It is argued here that dynamic differential power relationships, of which established and outsider relations are a part, is perhaps a more broadly useful tool.

Although it is argued here that many writers have exaggerated the extent to which baseball has spread, the power of MLB, and the degree to which this is indicative of Americanization, this is not to deny that an American cultural hegemony exists. Nevertheless, it is important that we place the recent trends that have contributed to growing American power in a longer-term frame. As Maguire (1999, p.211) argues, “the interweaving of the flows produces, over the long term, outcomes that were neither planned nor intended by the more and less powerful groups involved. To argue this is not to overlook or downplay the shorter-term impact that issues of political economy have on sports”. Not forgetting that political economies are also a part of the interweaving of the flows of people. If it is argued that MLB has had a complete monopoly over global flows, then how are we to explain the rejection of the game in many regions, and the fact that even where it has been adopted, it has been subject to adaptation and, on occasions, been used as a site of resistance? From this point of view, the central figurational concept of dynamic and differential power relationships is key in developing our understanding of the global baseball figuration, and globalization more generally. It strikes me that the concept of lengthening chains of interdependency is a far more illuminating, and, therefore, more useful way of conceptualising the process by which baseball has undergone diffusion, than Americanization, American cultural hegemony, imperialism or, even, globalization.
Indeed, one might argue that the concept of globalization is simply a more abstract synonym for lengthening chains of interdependency. Although Kilminister (1997), Maguire (1999) and Mennell (1990) have all intimated as much in their works, it seems to me that nobody has made this point explicitly. The dynamic differential power relationships that are an expression of lengthening interdependency chains are further emphasized when one considers the different levels of response to baseball that have been an expression of the global diffusion of the game. In Cuba, in the context of the hostile atmosphere that has prevailed in American/Cuban relationships over the last four decades, the game has come to crystallize this conflict and the level of baseball's penetration has been considerable. However, resistance can also be present in countries such as England, where there has been a low level of penetration. Canadians have used American players – representing the Toronto Blue Jays – as a means of expressing their resistance to the American penetration of 'Canadian culture'. Conversely, in Africa there has been next to no penetration of the sports culture by baseball, and, therefore, the need for resistance is largely absent. The point being made is the need to appreciate that power differentials find expression in a wide variety of ways.

An analysis of the global diffusion of baseball can only be understood on the basis of growing interdependency of nation-states. Within this context, we have seen MLB attempt to exercise control over the development of 'organized baseball'. That these attempts have been relatively unsuccessful is indicative of the limited power of MLB and, more generally, testifies to the importance of appreciating the relational character of power. All individuals and groups, no matter how powerful they may be, are constrained by the network of relationships of which they are a part. As such,
while I have expressed certain reservations about the concept established-outsider relations, I have, nevertheless, found the theoretical premises of figurational sociology to be both sensitising and illuminating. It is to an analysis of my research methods that I now turn.

9.3 Reflections on the methodological approaches

Combining the cross-sectional research into the spread of baseball on a global scale, with the more intensive analysis of baseball development at the 'local' level within England, has proved particularly useful at making sense of both global and local issues within the global baseball figuration. Comparative analysis was a central plank of my research, and this has enabled me to develop an understanding of the baseball figuration in the round. This comparative approach has enabled me to highlight the enormous variation in the global baseball figuration. Even within the analyses of the various different countries, comparative analysis regarding the development of baseball alongside other sports, and at different times, was a crucial element in the research. To this end, I was somewhat restricted in my approach to the cross-sectional analysis outlined in chapter six. This was because I needed to rely heavily on secondary source material. It was not always entirely clear from the secondary sources analysed, what research methods were used to generate the data. In some cases, the evidence seemed to be rather questionable. Nevertheless, I attempted to derive data from various sources in order to triangulate the different sources. I did generate some of my own data for this particular section of my work through the questionnaire sent to all national governing bodies (NGBs) for baseball. The questionnaires yielded a fair response rate of 32%. This response rate might have been improved had the questionnaire been reproduced in the respective languages of the
potential respondents. However, I suspect that this approach would not have yielded a dramatically higher rate of return, principally because of the rudimentary nature of the NGBs for baseball in many, if not the majority, of countries surveyed.

The principal method I used to generate data for my thesis, of course, was the documentary analysis of newspapers for my case study of baseball in England. The problems associated with this kind of research relate to the manner in which I selected the material to be analysed. In order to try and minimize bias, as I outlined in my methodological chapter, I made use of the various indexes available for The Times. Early on in the research, I realized that these indexes were not always reliable, insofar as baseball was mentioned in copies of the newspaper that did not appear in the respective index. As such, I made sure that not only did I use the indexes available, but I always analysed The Times, and another national newspaper, The Guardian, at times when the basic BBF records, such as they exist, indicated that some kind of 'national competition' took place in England. Furthermore, I made sure that I analysed at least two local newspapers in regions at times when I knew baseball had been played. This enabled me to triangulate the data produced from a variety of different newspapers. In doing so, I was attempting to negotiate another problem, namely journalistic bias. I could not be sure that the accounts I was reading were always accurate, or to what degree the author biased their accounts. I also sought to triangulate the newspaper data by conducting a series of oral history interviews. Of course, this method is itself prone to bias, rationalization, selective recall and memory lapses. Nevertheless, these interviews did constitute another source of primary data that enabled me to crosscheck some of the data derived from the press. There is no
doubt that my research would have benefited from carrying out further interviews of this nature.

The interviews that proved to be most illuminating were those geared to the contemporary scene. They enabled me to make greater sense of recent developments in baseball in England, at a time when newspaper articles on the game were something of a rarity. Nevertheless, a problem associated with these interviews was that the interviewees were in positions of relative power. This made it difficult for me to illicit responses to particular questions, because they deemed them to be confidential. Thus, on certain issues, such as financial matters, merchandise sales and television audiences, my interviewees were guarded in their response. Notwithstanding this reluctance, on these matters I was in a position to make a pretty good guess at what is going on. In particular, MLB's more aggressive approach to the international market can be understood as a partial expression of concerns it has over the position of baseball in the USA.

9.4 Recommendations for further research

Whilst the value of comparing cross-sectional analysis across the globe with the in-depth case study of baseball in England proved useful, not surprisingly, even more meaningful conclusions could be drawn if more than one in-depth case study had been conducted. Although language is a limiting factor, certainly one could feasibly conduct in-depth newspaper analysis of reports on baseball in Australia, for example. A case-study of the Republic of Ireland might prove to be particularly revealing. Like the USA, it is an ex-colony of Britain. Long-term migration has contributed to the development of close cultural ties with the USA. Yet, despite the
fact it has no equivalent summer sport, baseball has failed to make an impression on Ireland’s sporting culture.

Comparative research into the development of different sports, using an in-depth case study much like the analysis I carried out for baseball in England, would also be likely to prove enlightening. An analysis of international competition between baseball and cricket could also prove to be illuminating. In this regard, the Caribbean, with its close proximity to the USA and its historical and continuing ties with Britain, could prove to be a rewarding area of study. There is also little, if any, research into the global spread of softball. Such research would be of interest in its own right and also because of the sport’s strong association with baseball. As this thesis has established, in some parts of the world softball has made more headway than baseball. A comparison of baseball with other American sports, such as basketball, American football and volleyball also holds out the prospect of some striking insights into the complexity and diversity of diffusion.

It may be that the relative failure of baseball to become a global sport has much to do with the absence of a strong international administration and, of course, this weakness has been, and still is, strongly connected with MLB’s reluctance to become involved and, thereby, run the risk of relinquishing some of its power. However, by pursuing this course, the likelihood is that MLB has played a major part in limiting the game’s global spread. In other words, the paradox is that its proprietorial approach to the game has hindered MLB’s own expansionary aspirations. If the IBAF had been an international organization that wielded similar power to, say, FIFA, the chances are that it would have been better able to keep
innovatory tendencies in check. In-depth comparisons with other global sports
figurations have already been highlighted as a potential area for further research, and
this IBAF/FIFA comparison helps to underline this point. This same issue could also
be approached from the bottom up. Research could be conducted into the range of
local variations in the game. This would shed light on the extent to which MLB and
the IBAF, respectively, are able to exercise control over the world game. What
happens when MLB makes rule changes? Does the IBAF comply automatically, and
to what extent do rule changes filter down to the local level?

My hope is that the strengths of this thesis outweigh its weaknesses. At the
very least, I hope that it sheds some light on the history of baseball in England. I also
hope that I have performed a service by pulling together a vast array of secondary
material on the global diffusion of baseball. On the theoretical level, I hope that the
analysis presented here has made a contribution to our understanding of the
globalization of baseball in particular, and also to the globalization debate as a whole.
More specifically, I hope that I have provided a demonstration of the importance of
blending the theoretical dimensions with rigorous empirical research. All too often,
researchers in the field have been primarily concerned to present and interpret their
evidence in ways that enable them to justify their preconceptions. It might be argued
that, in principle, I have engaged in a similar exercise. That is to say, I have sought to
select and interpret the evidence in such a way as to sustain the view that the
figurational approach is the most illuminating. That being the case, the only difference
between my research and the many studies I have reviewed in the course of this thesis
is that I have presented more empirical material. In response, I would claim that
throughout this thesis my primary concern has not been to sit in moral judgement on
individuals and groups involved in the diffusion of baseball. Rather my aim has been to advance understanding of these highly complex processes. I do not for one moment labour under the misconception that this thesis is in anyway a definitive account of the global baseball figuration. In my view, there is, and can be, no such animal. It is, of course, for the reader to form his/her own view on the extent to which I have achieved, what I take to be, these modest objectives.
National Governing Bodies of Baseball Questionnaire

Your national governing body name: _____________________________________

1) When was your organisation established?

2) If organised baseball (national or even local leagues and competitions) were being played in your country before this date – how long has it been played?

3) How many teams are currently affiliated to your organisation?

4) How many registered players are there in your country?

5) Is baseball in your country played on a professional or amateur basis, or both?

6) If baseball is played professionally, how many American citizens play (as professionals) within the teams affiliated to your organisation?

7) Do any of the teams affiliated to your organisation compete in international competitions? If so, which other countries are involved?

8) (i) Do you have a national baseball team? (ii) Which other nations do you compete against? (iii) In which competitions?

Daniel Bloyce,
Chester College,
Parkgate Road,
Chester, CH1 4BJ
United Kingdom
## Proportion of registered players per population compared to the proportion in the USA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Registered Baseball players</th>
<th>Population estimates</th>
<th>Registered players comparative to proportion in USA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>38,428,000</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>3,061,000</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>34,500</td>
<td>19,731,000</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>8,116,000</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>10,318,000</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>178,470,000</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunei</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>358,000</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>7,897,000</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>16,018,000</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>510,000</td>
<td>31,510,000</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>1,304,196,000</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>8672</td>
<td>44,222,000</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>4,173,000</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>4,428,000</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>119,178</td>
<td>11,300,000</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>10,236,000</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3,564,000</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>6,515,000</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>5,181</td>
<td>60,144,000</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>30,005</td>
<td>82,476,000</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>59,251,000</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>10,976,000</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>163,000</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>7,049,000</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>9,877,000</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>10,656,462,000</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>219,883,000</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>3,956,000</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>6,433,000</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>57,423,000</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>4,407,000</td>
<td>127,654,000</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>31,987,000</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>3,444,000</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>4,535,000</td>
<td>103,457,000</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>23,799</td>
<td>16,149,000</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands Antilles</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>221,000</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>3,875,000</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>5,980</td>
<td>5,466,000</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>4,533,000</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>153,578,000</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>15,150</td>
<td>3,120,000</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>27,167,000</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>79,999,000</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>38,587,000</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>123,988</td>
<td>3,879,000</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>2,267</td>
<td>22,334,000</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>2,332</td>
<td>143,246,000</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marino*</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>28,119</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>5,402,000</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1,984,000</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td>45,026,000</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>6,543</td>
<td>47,700,000</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>41,060,000</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1,315</td>
<td>8,876,000</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>7,169,000</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan*</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>22,603,001</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>62,833,000</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>4,909,000</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>9,832,000</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>48,523,000</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>20,000,000</td>
<td>294,843,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>12,891,000</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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