

Communications

To the Editor:

Those of us who publish books must expect negative as well as positive criticism. Robert Rinehart certainly has a right to express his strong disapproval of the structure and style of *Games and Empires*, and to wish for a more extensive discussion of the theoretical issues relevant to the diffusion of modern sports. I feel, however, that I must respond to two of his comments. (1) I find odd Rinehart's complaint that I devote more attention to the acceptance of modern sports than to the resistance against them. The proportions still seem right to me (and they are similar to those judged appropriate by J. A. Mangan and other scholars in the field of sports diffusion). Can it have escaped Rinehart's attention that soccer and basketball are more popular, globally, than *buzkashi* and *inukyudo*? (2) I must protest emphatically against the misrepresentation of my research habits. Rinehart writes, "Guttman's use of secondary sources seems to be limited to those entries which advance his final chapter's argument." This is simply untrue. With this book, as with others, I made certain that I read and pondered the work of scholars whose positions I opposed as well as those whose views I shared. Among those whose contrary opinions I read and discussed are scholars from various fields who condemn dependency and cultural imperialism without mentioning sports (for instance, Andre Gunder Frank and Edward Said) and those who decry these phenomena while focussing on the domain of sports (for instance, Henning Eichberg, Borhane Errais, Wolf Krämer-Mandeu, and Peter Rummelt). I do not see how anyone who has read (and understood) my text, extensive notes, and bibliography can doubt this—unless he or she is guilty of the same "obstinate and forced premises" of which I am accused.

Amherst College

Allen Guttman