'Not Cricket!' Sport in Germany, or How the British Model Fell into Oblivion

Christiane Eisenberg

Introduction

Modern sport is a genuine British culture. It is even a British invention. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries disciplines like cricket, horse-racing, boxing, football, athletics and rowing were subjected to long-term rationalisation. The rules were set down in writing and so-called governing bodies were set up in order to ensure their implementation. These bodies also licensed referees, umpires and other personnel who were to observe the players' adherence to the rules. The first bodies to be established were the Jockey Club in 1750 and the Marylebone Cricket Club in 1787. Other organisations have joined the list since the 1860s. They included the Football Association, the Amateur Athletic Association and innumerable other associations for other – sometimes entirely new – disciplines.

Toward the end of the nineteenth century, the rationalised English sports were introduced into the new nation states of Europe and South America. This cultural transfer was a complete success and, more than anything else, promoted the image of Britain as a model of modern society. In Germany, experiences mediated by sport ranged from the symbolic representation of an open society in the process of overcoming barriers of status and class, via the spread of physical capacities and skills like swimming and cycling, to the infiltration of informal habits of dress and everyday manners.[1]

Although 'English sports' proved to be Britain's most durable export, they were unable to retain their modern image in the long term. By the 1920s at the latest the Americans had been taken over as the major role model in the sporting world. A few decades later even the memory of the British origin of modern sport had faded almost into extinction. If we were to ask people at present, at the beginning of the twenty-first century, who invented modern sport, most people would answer: the ancient Greeks. At most, one or two football fans would mention that football had English roots, for the 1996 European Championships in England were presented under the motto 'Football Comes Home'. Nevertheless, even in the football

---

1 Cf. Christiane Eisenberg, *"English sports" und deutsche Bürger. Eine Gesellschaftsgeschichte 1800-1939* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1999), esp. 215-232.

world German memories are mostly linked with a chance event in their sporting relations with England: the legendary third goal in the 1966 World Cup final between England and Germany which threw up the insoluble question, 'was it over the line or not?'.

This development may possibly be explained by the fact that sporting memories of the past are effective on a short-term basis only and that people primarily remember events which have happened during their lifetime or those which have been served up on television. In this particular case it is, however, a fact that memories of Anglo-German sporting experiences had been wiped out long before the television era. Journalists were therefore grateful for anything which gave them an opportunity to invent new traditions.

In this article I should like to address the question of why and how the British model of sport and the British beginnings of German sport fell into oblivion as early as the first decades of the twentieth century. The concept behind this volume suggests that the issue should be analyzed with regard to specific false perceptions and misunderstandings on the part of Germans. This is the argument I should like to put forward in the first part of my paper. Yet German perceptions are only one side of the coin. The British, too, considerably contributed to undermining their own authority in sporting matters. They regarded everything their German disciples undertook as 'not cricket', and reacted in such a way as to give the Germans the impression that the 'inventors' of sport were themselves behaving in an unsporting or unfair manner. The observation that mutual misunderstandings have not been restricted to Germany, but apply to the international sporting community as a whole, leads me to place my arguments within a broad description of the British role in international sport. Furthermore, with regard to recent developments television and PR activities in the area of sport will be dealt with in my contribution. They also comprised elements which may be regarded as 'not cricket'.

The Cultural Transfer of 'English sports' to Germany

The export of 'English sports' to Germany is a process, which can be dated from around the turn of the twentieth century, should not be regarded as an act of British 'cultural imperialism'. It was more a concomitant of British citizens travelling abroad and being unable to 'survive' without satisfying their passion for sport. Whenever they needed team players or opponents they tried to mingle with the local population who in turn were often delighted by the opportunity to take part.

However, German sporting enthusiasts found it difficult to understand the ideas behind certain rules of behaviour which the British considered as only too obvious.[2] The precise meaning of 'fairness' was as alien to them as the gentlemanly virtue of 'disinterestedness'; a virtue which was expressed in playing down any deliberate attempts to improve the performance, and in renouncing the idea of systematic training. Above all, the Germans were completely unable to understand why so much value was placed on the idea of athletes being amateurs. German athletes found nothing dishonourable in accepting monetary prizes or cashing in valuable cups and medals which they had won in competitions as quickly as possible. And they gave the term 'record' a completely new meaning. Whereas Britons understood a 'record' as a certified performance, German athletes took it to mean a hitherto unbeatable performance.

Shifts in accentuation were not only due to the ignorance of the newcomers, and they did not result from the deliberate campaign of disinformation pursued by the equipment industry which fought for amateur paragraphs to be watered down when translating sporting rules (because those engaged to represent them would otherwise be classed as professionals). Neither did the shifts in accentuation come about from the fact that sporting activities in Germany were based on a different social structure. As in England, German sport enjoyed wide support amongst the middle classes.[3] The creation of a new and in some respects 'un-English' sporting spirit in Germany can rather be explained by the fact that sporting activities developed under a different framework of conditions as in their land of origin.

At first these conditions included certain courtly and military traditions which had either never existed in England or died out long before. In Germany, however, they were still extremely vigorous and attached themselves to the new culture of sport. Amongst these traditions were the preference for uniforms and medals, which victorious sportsmen could wear on their jackets as if they were military or social decorations; the 'challenge' to a match which recalled duelling rites; the value placed on the correct (officers') posture during the riding event; and finally the translation of the English concept of 'fairness' as *'Ritterlichkeit'* or 'chivalry'. In this way sportsmen in Germany bedecked themselves with a particular aura of superiority which could be used as a vehicle to integrate themselves into the established culture and at the same time to subvert it by ironic means.

---

2 Cf. ibid., ch. III.

3 At the most there was a certain difference in the fact that, in England, industrial workers had given football a special flavour at a very early stage in the game's history, whilst in Germany the working-classes were conspicuous by their absence here, as well as in many other disciplines. See ibid., 209-214.

In addition, Germans committed themselves to sport in the knowledge that this was an article which they were importing from England. For the first sporting nation was simultaneously an industrial pioneer and a global power. The ambition of many young people was, therefore, not only aimed at taking part in competitions and attaining the standards set by their teachers. They also wanted to beat the English at their own game. The prevailing attitude to sporting competition in Britain as an inherently satisfying social activity was therefore rather underdeveloped in Germany. By contrast, sporting events were used as a stage for presenting national strength and proficiency. This was the standard attitude towards sport adopted by athletes and the communities which represented them – the clubs, towns, circles of dignitaries, aristocratic society, the army and the public media.

It is no accident that there was such an emphasis on amalgamating sport with nationalist attitudes. Against the background of accelerated industrialisation, urbanisation and other modernisation processes which were racing ahead in Germany at the turn of the twentieth century and which had, to some extent, progressed much further than in Britain itself, Germans introduced a new and different quality to their everyday sporting activities. The first of these was the location in which sporting activities were conducted. Whilst in Britain particularly popular disciplines like the national game of cricket had arisen and developed in rural areas and therefore won over even reactionary critics of modern industrial society, sport in Germany developed from the start as an urban, even metropolitan phenomenon. The different frameworks of conditions in the two states influenced the preference for certain disciplines. British sportsmen regarded modern technical disciplines like cycling, motor sport and flying as marginal activities. Germans, on the other hand, developed a special taste for those very same sports. Contrary to the English model, the German image of sport was shot through with connotations of progress, speed and danger from the beginning.

German athletes' distinct love of experimenting with the human body was an equally important factor in image-building. This feature, too, was less conspicuous in the mother-country of sport, not only because deliberate physical training was rejected by many gentlemen sportsmen, but also because Britain had no institutionally mediated traditions of rational physical culture. There was no universal military service with the corresponding habituation of broad sections of the population to military drill. Non-military physical activities like gymnastics and *Turnen* which had spread all over Europe and North America since the start of the nineteenth century, remained largely unknown in Britain, as well, because they had been popularised neither within the state school system nor

through a system of clubs which identified themselves with middle-class political movements.[4] The creation of a general consciousness that it was possible to change and train the body was a significant factor in paving the way for Germans to associate sport with values such as power, stamina and performance.

This particular accentuation was further underlined by the fact that modern natural sciences and applied social sciences were much more developed on the Continent than in Britain during the period when sport was beginning to spread. Whilst students at Oxford and Cambridge Universities who were keen on sport generally tended to follow courses in the humanities (preferably classical languages), a significant number of academic sportsmen in Germany dedicated their studies to modern natural and social sciences. Against this background, a number of student doctors, chemists, clinical psychologists and experts on manpower studies made experiments on themselves in cooperation with the leading researchers of the time. They conducted anthropometrical, ergo- and cardiographic measurements, x-ray examinations, chemical and microscopic analyses of urine and exhaled air, exercised with dumb-bells and chest expanders, attempted self-hypnosis and experimented with drugs like brandy, caffeine, strychnine and cocaine. Their interest in bodily experimentation was shared by politicians concerned about health and the military establishment, which demanded physical fitness. Sport studies therefore developed into a modern academic discipline in Germany even before 1914.[5]

This image of the athlete or sportsman as an *Übermensch* able to call on his own reserves of power and energy was universally popularised, for the triumphal march of sport in Germany occurred simultaneously with the breakthrough of modern mass media. Advertising posters and illustrated magazines with glossy photographs were soon followed by 'living images' in the cinema, which gave athletes an extraordinary prominence. Some professional cyclists, especially the winners of exhaustingly long tours and

---

4 Cf. Christiane Eisenberg, "'Deutsches Turnen' in England: Das Scheitern eines Kulturtransfers", in: Frank Otto, Thilo Schulz (eds.), *Großbritannien und Deutschland. Gesellschaftliche, kulturelle und politische Beziehungen im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*. Festschrift für Bernd-Jürgen Wendt zu seinem 65. Geburtstag (Rheinfelden: Schäuble, 1999), 13-32. An extended English version will be published in: John Davis, Stefan Manz, Margrit Schulte Beerbühl (eds.), *Migration and Transfer from Germany to Britain, c. 1660 to 1914* (München: Saur, forthcoming 2007).

5 Cf. Hans Langenfeld, "Auf dem Wege zur Sportwissenschaft: Mediziner und Leibesübungen im 19. Jahrhundert", *Stadion* 14 (1988), 125-148; John M. Hoberman, "The Early Development of Sports Medicine in Germany", in: Jack W. Berryman u. Roberta J. Park (eds.), *Sport and Exercise Science. Essays in the History of Sports Medicine* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1992), 233-282.

six-day races, were soon surrounded by an aura otherwise only enjoyed by film stars.

English sportsmen were irritated by this development. On the one hand, they regarded German sport and its corresponding idea of sportsmanship with admiration and respect. On the other hand, the specifically German attitude to sport seemed to show no respect for the 'spirit' of their own original invention. Indeed, it seemed to be little more than a bowdlerisation. There were two ways the British could possibly deal with this ambiguous perceptions. They could either appropriate the new interpretation of sportsmanship or they could reject it in disgust. The second reaction predominated. This explains why the overwhelming majority of Britons in Germany turned their backs on German sport after the turn of the century.[6]

There is no doubt that the tendency to reject German sport was further promoted by the political spirit of the time. We may therefore assume that some Britons turned their backs on German sport because the chauvinism of the time was obtrusively reflected in the public representation of sport and its presentation in the mass media. On the other hand German sportsmen continued to look for opportunities to measure their prowess against British teams and regarded sporting bodies in Britain as indisputable authorities on the matter. Arguably, other, possibly internal, factors therefore also played an additional role in Britons refusing to accept German sport. Such specific British attitudes emerge most clearly when we extend the scope of bi-lateral research and look at the behaviour of the British and their sporting associations in the context of the growing international sporting community.

The British on the international Sporting Stage

International sports meetings increased rapidly from the turn of the twentieth century at the latest. This was the time when English sports were becoming known all over Europe and people in many disciplines expressed the desire to set up an international governing body to unify rules and regulations and iron out conflicts. By the time the First World War broke out, there already existed such governing bodies for sixteen disciplines.[7] One of them was the *Féderation Internationale de Football*

---

[6] I dealt with these processes in greater detail in: "Does Cultural Transfer Lead to Mutual Understanding? The Example of Sport in Britain and Germany", to be published in: Dominick Geppert, Robert Gerwarth (eds.), *Wilhelmine Germany and Edwardian Britain: Cultural Contacts and Transfers* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

[7] Counted on the basis of information presented by Friedrich Mevert, *Internationale und europäische Sportorganisationen* (Wiesbaden: Deutscher Fachschriften-Verlag Braun, 1981). For an overview see Christiane Eisenberg, "The Rise of Internationalism in Sport", in:

Association (FIFA), whose experiences with the British will be outlined in more detail because of the particular significance of football in German-English relations.

The initiative to set up FIFA[8] came from the football associations of the Netherlands, Belgium, Denmark, Switzerland and France, all of which kept up a lively timetable of fixtures against one another. The German Football Association (*Deutscher Fußball-Bund, DFB*) also supported the foundation of this organisation. By contrast, a corresponding invitation to the English Football Association (FA) remained unanswered for over a year. When the suggestion was sent to the FA once again it was met with a rejection. In May 1904 FIFA was, inevitably, set up without British participation. One year later, the FA changed its attitude and decided to join the international association. It did so because it hoped to have its monopoly of representation confirmed in a dispute with a rival football association at home and – decisively – because FIFA had in the meantime declared that they were prepared to grant the FA, as the 'mother of all football associations', special rights. FIFA accorded all four British Football Associations – the English, Welsh, Scottish and Irish – a place and voting rights, although international football was otherwise organised on the principle of 'one state, one association'. An established FA committee known as the International Football Association Board (1886) was given the last word in all questions of rules and regulations.[9]

The example of the FIFA example highlights two specifically British problems on the international sporting stage. Firstly, they already possessed their own written rules and regulations before international sporting bodies were set up. Any deviation from these would have meant having to abandon their own well-worn conventions. This, in turn, would have affected the way they organised their own sporting fixtures. Secondly, competitive fixtures had given rise to regional structures in Great Britain as early as the 1870s, and this collided with the needs of international sporting bodies for a clear system of responsibilities based on national associations as members. There was a further problem: Matches between England, Wales, Scotland and Ireland were regarded as internationals in Britain. Against this background, organisations like FIFA seemed completely superfluous. Correspondingly, British representatives

---

Martin H. Geyer, Johannes Paulmann (eds.), *The Mechanics of Internationalism. Culture, Society and Politics from the 1840s to the First World War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 375-403.

8 Cf. Christiane Eisenberg, Pierre Lanfranchi, Tony Mason, Alfred Wahl, *100 Years of Football. The FIFA Centennial Book* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2004), 58-59 and passim.

9 Incidentally, this arrangement is still valid today. The Board was originally purely a British affair, but since 1913 then FIFA has at least the right to send two representatives to meetings.

had no patience with international football officials. As long as international sporting organisations failed to respect the fully developed structure of British sport, British associations were, for their part, prepared to treat them with equal disrespect. This explains why Britain or her component countries still do not belong to a number of international sporting organisations.

The International Olympic Committee (IOC) is one of the sporting governing bodies which have paid little heed to the specific demands of the British and insisted on the principle of the nation-state. It comes as no great surprise to discover that the British, for their part, distanced themselves from the Olympic movement.[10] This is also true for the great majority of the British population, as can be seen from their reaction to the IV. Olympic Games held in London in 1908.

The British capital was granted the games as a result of a freak accident. Rome, the original choice, was forced to abandon the games following a volcanic eruption on Vesuvius, and the British representative at the IOC let himself be talked into organising the games at short notice in London, because the city was in the process of building a representative stadium and other sporting venues were also available. Unfortunately, the event failed to arouse much enthusiasm either in London or in the rest of the country. Because cricket, the most popular British summer sport, was not represented in the Games, the Olympics were themselves considered 'not cricket'. The game was utterly unpopular outside the British Empire. In addition, the Olympic rules laid down that only autonomous states – in this case the United Kingdom – had the right to take part. This meant that the popular international cricket matches between England, Wales, Ireland and Scotland could not even be played as special events.[11] Out of deference to the cricket season the Olympic football tournament was postponed until the regular football season had begun in October, long after the Games had come to an end. But at the very moment the tournament began it was faced with competition from a whole range of attractive league games taking place at the same time. The result was that only 5,000 spectators turned up to witness the victory of the British football team against Denmark in the Olympic final.[12] Taking the interest of the spectators as a yardstick, the London games were a considerable flop. The new stadium, with a capacity of over 80,000, was only full on the day of the marathon. Moreover, the stands along the rowing and regatta

---

10 Cf. Don Anthony, *Britain and the Olympic Games* (Birmingham: British Olympic Association, 1984).

11 Cf. Peter McIntosh, "Twentieth-Century Attitudes to Sport in Britain", *International Review of Sport Sociology* 1 (1966), 24.

12 Cf. Walter Bensemann, "Fußball-Olympia vor 20 Jahren", *Der Sportsmann* 1 (1 April 1928), 28.

course in and around London, as well as other venues, mostly remained empty.[13] This was not surprising, because the British sporting world had a regular date at Wimbledon for the international tennis tournament at the end of June. The annual Oxford and Cambridge boat race took place on the Thames in London every March, and all other events were regarded as secondary.

The gap between British sport and the rest of the world became even greater between the two World Wars, for, in addition to the problems already mentioned, international cooperation was aggravated by political tensions and disagreements after 1918. How were the warmongering nations and losers of the Great War, Germany and Austria, to be treated? This was the major problem immediately after the War. Most governing bodies of British sport came out strongly in favour of a strict exclusion, a position not shared by many other countries. Furthermore, the British regarded Continental proclivities towards mass spectacles of collective physical culture and the political exploitation of sport not only with admiration but also with a feeling of alienation. Finally there were recurrent and bitter disputes on the regulations concerning amateurism, which were much more strictly interpreted in Britain than almost anywhere else in the world. For example, Continental football associations were accustomed to granting players travelling expenses and compensation for any loss of wages, something which the British considered to be out-and-out professionalism.

In one way or another, these conflicts were played out in most forms of sport. In football, however, they were particularly prominent and culminated in a huge flare-up in 1920 when the English FA, which had been so difficult to recruit into the ranks of FIFA, withdrew from the organisation completely because of its sympathetic treatment of the warmongers, Germany and Austria. Although the FA was persuaded to join in 1924 once again, the question of amateurism once more led to a rupture four years later, and the English FA, followed by the football associations of Scotland, Wales and Ireland, remained outside FIFA until 1946. During this time FIFA tolerated international fixtures between its members and the British associations, and English clubs were quite successful on the European scale. But no English team took part in the first three World Championships in Uruguay (1930), Italy (1934) and France (1938). This detachment was to have severe repercussions, for the World Championships established an international market in players, thereby promoting new ways of playing. The inventors of football had excluded themselves from this development. Thus, it was hardly any surprise that, when the English team finally took part in the World Cup in Brazil in 1950,

---

[13] Cf. Brian Dobbs, *Edwardians at Play. Sport 1890-1914* (London: Pelham, 1973), 158 f.

they had lost contact with the latest international developments in skills, training methods, tactics and strategy.[14]

First they were disastrously knocked out in the preliminary rounds of the championships – the results included a 1-0 defeat to the United States of America, a dwarf in football terms. There then followed a series of spectacular defeats at home. At the start of the 1950s major British league clubs lost a series of matches to Moscow Dynamo; and in 1953 the English team suffered a humiliating 6-3 defeat to Hungary in Wembley Stadium, the first time that England ever lost at home - and this to the team which, in the following year lost 3-2 to Germany in the World Cup final in Berne. Isolated highlights like Roger Bannister's first four-minute mile in May 1954 failed to make any long-term improvement to the total impression that British sport had lost its position as a role model. For that, it was much too unsuccessful.[15]

German Perceptions of British Sport Since the 1920s

Against this background, it is no surprise that the respect for the pioneers of modern sport which had still existed in Germany at the turn of the twentieth century completely disappeared in the years between the two wars. At most, only ill-informed intellectuals, who observed sporting events from the sidelines, were still willing to accept the ideas of equality, fairness and other virtues associated with English sports. Two examples may serve as cases in point: the London correspondent of the "Frankfurter Zeitung", Rudolf Kircher, who, in 1927, published a book entitled "Fair Play. Sport, Spiel und Geist in England",[16] and Herbert Schöffler, a professor of English, whose book "England das Land des Sportes. Eine kultursoziologische Erklärung" appeared in Leipzig in 1935. If one reads between the lines this is not only a study of the creation of modern sport in early-modern England but also of the preconditions for civilised behaviour

---

14 Cf. Pierre Lanfranchi, Matthew Taylor, *Moving with the Ball. The Migration of Professional Footballers* (Oxford: Berg, 2001), 47-69.

15 Cf. Richard Holt, Tony Mason, *Sport in Britain 1945-2000* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000), 140 ff. and passim; Peter J. Beck, "Losing Prestige on and off the Field. England versus Hungary, 1953-54", *Sport in History* 23, 2 (2003/04), 10-26.

16 (Frankfurt/Main: Societäts-Druckerei, 1927). There was also an English translation of the book: *Fair Play. The Games of Merrie England*, transl. by R.N. Bradley (London: Collins, 1928). On Kircher, see Ulrich P. Schäfer, *Rudolf Kircher als London-Korrespondent der Frankfurter Zeitung 1920-1923* (Frankfurt/Main: Peter Lang, 1994); Norbert Frei, *Journalismus im Dritten Reich* (München: Beck, 1989), 154 ff.

in society. Looked at it in political terms, this was a courageous enterprise in the second year of the 'Third Reich'.[17]

In contrast to these intellectuals, German sport circles had definitely abandoned England as a role model in sport by the end of the First World War. Whereas the broad majority of sportsmen supported *Deutscher Sport* (with a capital D), top athletes orientated themselves almost automatically towards America – which was not only a symbol of modernity but also a mirror of the dynamism and violent tendencies of the Weimar Republic.[18] The German amateur boxing champion Ludwig Hamann expressed his antipathy towards what he called the 'overbred' English style in 1924 with this pregnant formula: 'No artificial pauses with superfluous handshaking, no mercy on the opponent'.[19] Hamann was a journalist on the staff of the "Völkischer Beobachter" at the time, but his opinions were shared by many other athletes.

The same applied to club and association officials. Between 1920 and 1940 they abandoned any attempt at courtesy, especially those officials who – like Peco Bauwens, the German official delegated by FIFA to attend the meetings of the International Board of the English FA –were able to get a close-up view of how the British played power politics with the football nations of the rest of the world. By October 1940 Bauwens was so frustrated that he proposed to the leaders of the National Socialist sporting bodies that FIFA be taken completely under the influence of the axis of

---

17 (Leipzig: Bernhard Tauchnitz, 1935; reprint Münster: Lit-Verlag 1986). See also Kloeren, Maria, *Sport und Rekord. Kultursoziologische Untersuchungen zum England des sechzehnten bis achtzehnten Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig: Bernhard Tauchnitz, 1935; reprint Münster: Lit, 1985). Maria Kloeren was one of Schöffler's graduate students. On Schöffler, see Frank-Rutger Hausmann, *Anglistik und Amerikanistik im "Dritten Reich"* (Frankfurt/M.: Vittorio Klostermann, 2003), 371-377; idem, "Herbert Schöffler: England das Land des Sportes. Eine kultursoziologische Erklärung", in: Jürgen Court, Eckhard Meinberg (eds.), *Klassiker und Wegbereiter der Sportwissenschaft* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2006), 231-236.

18 Cf. Arnd Krüger, "'We Are Sure to Have Found the True Reasons for the American Superioty in Sports': The Reciprocal Relationship between the United States and Germany in Physical Culture and Sport", in: Roland Naul (ed.), *Turnen und Sport: The Cross-Cultural Exchange* (Münster: Lit-Verlag, 1991), 51-80; Dietrich R. Quanz, "Studien zu Bild und Funktion des amerikanischen Sports in der deutschen Sportentwicklung", in: Giselher Spitzer, Dieter Schmidt (eds.), *Sport zwischen Eigenständigkeit und Fremdbestimmung* (Bonn: Wegener, 1986), 129-144; Frank Becker, *Amerikanismus in Weimar. Sportsymbole und politische Kultur 1918-1933* (Wiesbaden: Deutscher Universitäts-Verlag, 1993). Barbara Keys shows that this admiration for America was a general phenomenon in international sport in the interwar years, see "Spreading Peace, Democracy, and Coca-Cola: Sport and American Cultural Expansion in the 1930s", *Diplomatic History* 28 (2004), 166-196.

19 Ludwig Haymann, "Vom Wesen des modernen Boxens, Fußball", *Illustrierte Sportzeitung* B, 39 (25.9.1924), 1117.

Fascist powers in order to isolate England permanently from the rest of the football world.[20]

After 1945 the representatives of German sport could not afford to allow such remarks any more, particularly as cultural contacts between Britain and Germany in other fields intensified to an unprecedented degree.[21] Nonetheless the active contribution of British occupation officers to rebuilding German sporting activities failed to lead to a renaissance of the British as role models in this area. The mantle of oblivion was now spread even more assiduously over the past.

The most important German sporting official in the early years of the Federal Republic, the journalist Carl Diem (1882-1962), whose career dated back to the days of the German Emperor, made a significant contribution to this development. He was one of the most influential persons in creating German sport. Yet he was too young to have consciously lived through the early phase of British influence around 1900. Furthermore, he had orientated his ideas towards those of Pierre de Coubertin and the Olympic movement at an early age. With regard to the Olympics, Diem was a great 'inventor of traditions', because he significantly contributed to promoting the idea amongst the public at large that the Greek Olympics were supposedly at the root of modern sport. As General Secretary of the Berlin Games in 1936, he introduced, for the very first time, the highly effective ritual of carrying the Olympic torch from Athens to Berlin. He also ensured that the young film director Leni Riefenstahl was able to build into her film of the Games the lighting of the Olympic fire at a holy location: an impressive event which is now, in the television age, broadcast all over the world every four years. As a *Bildungsbürger*, Diem undertook additional measures especially for his fellow countrymen. In 1960 he rehashed his old journalistic articles on the Olympic Games into a two volume "World History of Sport", in order to provide cultural evidence that *Turnen*, games and sport were anthropological constants. [22] The whole

---

[20] Peco Bauwens to Guido v. Mengden, 25. October 1940, quoted in: Arthur Heinrich, "'Rücksichtslos deutsch'. Peco Bauwens, das Fachamt Fußball und die FIFA", *SportZeiten* 2 (2002), H. 2, 39-52, here 44 (unfortunately, Heinrichs is unaware of the International Board context of Bauwens's initiative). See also: Carl Koppehel, "'Los von England'. Die sportliche Neuordnung Europas erstreckt sich auch auf den Fußballsport", *Krakauer Zeitung* 290 (8./9 Dec. 1940) (newspaper clipping in: Bundesarchiv Potsdam 62 DAF 3 Nr. 19456).

[21] Cf. Gottfried Niedhart, "Tor zum Westen und Konkurrent im Westen. Zur Wahrnehmung Großbritanniens in Westdeutschland nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg und zu Beginn der Adenauer-Ära", in: Gottfried Niedhart (ed.), *Das kontinentale Europa und die britischen Inseln. Wahrnehmungsmuster und Wechselwirkungen seit der Antike* (Mannheim, 1993), 205-213; Peter Alter, "Building Bridge the Framework of Anglo-German Cultural Relations after 1945", in: Jeremy Noakes, Peter Wende, Jonathan Wright (eds.), *Britain and Germany in Europe 1949-1990* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 327-346.

[22] (Stuttgart: Cotta, 1960); a second edition was published in 1967.

of the first volume was devoted to the ancient world. By contrast, the development of sport in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century England was scanned over in a short chapter in volume two. The book was dedicated to Willy Daume, the organiser of the 1972 Games in Munich, who in a foreword written for the second edition in 1967 praised the book as a 'timeless document'. The book remained the standard work on sport history in Germany for decades.

To crown it all, the German Sport University in Cologne, which Diem had helped to create after 1945, set up a professorship for classical studies. The rich fund of knowledge mined by successive holders of the post was a major reason for the fact that an article on ancient Greek sports appeared in the German "Lexikon der Alten Welt", as early as 1965.[23] It should be noted, in passing, that, as a consequence, the late nineteenth-century distinction between 'bodily culture', 'gymnastics' and 'cult activities' on the one hand, and 'sport' on the other is more and more fading into the background even in classical studies.

Thus, British sporting history was swept into oblivion, and it is hard to find even passing references to it in contemporary German newspaper and television reports. Nor is it surprising that German reporters snatch indiscriminately at the first convenient example when they have to write about Britain. In the 'swinging sixties', it was Manchester United, the self-styled European super club, which symbolised the alleged nature of football as an anti-establishment sport.[24] More recent commentators have tended to take up the legendary third goal in the 1966 World Cup final at Wembley. Although the 1966 championships were the first to be transmitted live and in colour to Germany and enjoyed massive viewing figures,[25] most of the journalists who now refer to the goal were too young

---

[23] Only recently the "Neue Pauly", another most important encyclopaedia of classical studies, included a lengthy article on 'sport' – which indicates that today such PR activities in the area of modern sport have even infiltrated into academic circles. For a critical overview of these tendencies see Hans Langenfeld, "Antiker Sport? Spezielle Gedanken zu einem Grundsätzlichen Problem der Sportgeschichte", in: Institut für Sportgeschichte and Carl und Liselott Diem-Archiv der Deutschen Sporthochschule Köln (eds.), *Olympisch bewegt.* Festschrift zum 60. Geburtstag von Prof. Dr. Manfred Lämmer (Cologne: Carl und Liselott Diem-Archiv, 2003), 431-444, here 433 ff. Langenfeld is an expert of both the history of ancient greek and modern sport. On the tradition of the Greek reception in German Turnen and sport, see Ingomar Weiler, "Zur Rezeption des griechischen Sports im Nationalsozialismus: Kontinuität oder Diskontinuität in der deutschen Ideengeschichte?", in: Beat Näf together with Tim Kammasch (eds.), *Antike und Altertumswissenschaft in der Zeit von Faschismus und Nationalsozialismus* (Mandelbachtal and Cambridge: edition cicero, 2001), 267-284, esp. 272 ff.

[24] Vgl. Gavin Mellor, "The Genesis of Manchester United as a National and International 'Super Club' 1958-68", *Soccer and Society* 1, 2 (2000), 151-166.

[25] Cf. Fabio Chisari, "When Football Went Global: Televising the 1966 World Cup", in: Christiane Eisenberg, Pierre Lanfranchi (eds.), *Football History: International Perspectives /*

to have ever actually experienced it personally. Yet the countless replays of the incident during European and World Cup championships are fixed firmly in their minds, to be rolled out at will as 'personal experiences'.

From a professional historian's point of view, this particular historical reference is not only artificial but somewhat banal. We must however ask ourselves what other reference to Anglo-German sporting relationships so readily springs to mind. That this is precisely the core of the problem becomes only too clear when we cast our eyes over the English Channel and look at how British journalists view the incident. Then we can see that British efforts to place current sporting relationships with Germany in a historic continuity are even more problematic than those of their German colleagues. For, on the grounds of their self-imposed isolation in international football, the British have proved either unable or unwilling to keep the important 1966 World Cup final within the context of sport. Instead, they prefer to choose a very particular non-sporting reference – one where the Germans conformed entirely to the idea of what is 'not cricket'. In his newspaper preview of the legendary game at Wembley Vincent Mulchrone wrote the following in the "Daily Mail": 'if Germany beats us at Wembley this afternoon at our national sport, we can always point out to them that we have recently beaten them twice at theirs'.[26] On the afternoon of the final, it was not yet necessary to mention the two World Wars, but the series of defeats to Germany which followed has always provided an ideal opportunity to do so.[27]

Conclusion

This example of 'un-fair play' marks the random post-modern nature of British-German sporting relationships at the turn of the twenty-first century. It has had a long tradition going back to the creation of modern

---

Fußball-Geschichte: Internationale Perspektiven. Special Issue of *Historical Social Research / Historische Sozialforschung* 31, 1 (2006), 42-54.

26 Kenneth Wolstenhome, *They Think It's All Over: Memories of the Greatest Day in English Football* (London: Robson, 1996), 118-119.

27 Cf. David Downing, *The Best of Enemies: England v. Germany, a Century of Football Rivalry*, (London, 2001); Andreas Helle, "Worthy Opponent Football Rivalry as Ersatzkrieg?", in: Jeremy Noakes, Peter Wende, Jonathan Wright (eds.), *Britain and Germany in Europe 1949-1990* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 365-378; Christopher Young, "England - Deutschland. Two World Wars and one World Cup - selten so gelacht", in: Markus Hesselmann, Christopher Young (eds.), *Der Lieblingsfeind. Deutschland aus der Sicht seiner Fußballrivalen* (Göttingen: Die Werkstatt, 2006), 81-107; John Ramsden, *Don't Mention the War. The British and the Germans since 1890* (London: Little, Brown, 2006), 325-362. For the results of England-Germany football matches see Peter Beck, "The Relevance of the 'Irrelevant': football as a missing dimension in the study of British relations with Germany", *International Affairs* 79, 2 (2003), 389-411, here 404.

sport in Germany during the second German Empire. By then the British transfer model had already become unable to build traditions, because the relationship of 'teacher' and 'pupil' was shot through with problems. The most important contributory factors were the creation of an alternative idea of sport with specifically German significance, for sharing the same idea of sport was the essential prerequisite for adopting English customs and practices. Furthermore contemporary Germany athletes were keen to beat their teachers at their own game, and the end of the nineteenth century was a time of great tension between the two nations.

The dissociation of the British from the newly created model of *Deutscher Sport* and an ongoing series of failures in major international competitions, which has continued down to the present day, have served to confirm a 'non-relationship' which was first noticed in the 1920s. It should be explicitly stressed here that a very similar development can be observed in other 'import' nations. Richard Holt, the author of "Sport and the British" (1989) pinpointed the issue when he stated that in general the arrogance and overbearing self-importance of the British during this time on the international stage generally contributed to other nations rejecting them as a model: 'By the time England started to take the rest of the world seriously, the rest of the world no longer had anything to learn from us.'[28]

Against this background, the aggressive rejection of the British model in Germany, which was first observable in the 1920s and reached a peak in Nazi propaganda, was less due to the fault of an exaggerated spirit of nationalism amongst the Germans that the result of concrete sporting meetings with the British. After 1945, when it was regarded as politically inopportune to reject the British model explicitly, German antipathy was expressed by recourse to the 'ancient Greeks' and the alleged roots of modern sports in the Ancient World. Since then both the British and the Germans are forced back into the 'invention of tradition' when they have to present mutual sporting relationships in terms of history. The Second World War, when Germany did not 'play cricket', has become the standard general point of reference since the famous Wembley goal in 1966.

Other connotations may replace this fixation in the future, because references to the two world wars poison German-British relationships.[29] But whatever frame of reference eventually replaces the Second World War, we may safely assume that the idea of a British sports model is now completely redundant. At least in Germany, it has long since fallen into oblivion.

---

[28] Richard Holt, *Sport and the British. A Modern History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 273.

[29] Cf. Beck, "Relevance".