
Sport History: Into the 21st Century¹

by S.W. Pope

HUMAN KINETICS PUBLISHERS

Prologue

What is the state of sport history? To what extent can those working in the Americas, the United Kingdom, Europe, Australasia, and elsewhere agree on methodological, theoretical, pedagogical, and professional issues? In a recent essay, Douglas Booth wonders whether sport history is in its death throes, and if so, what practitioners can do to reverse its demise. Booth scrutinizes the institutional forces that have collectively marginalized sport history in kinesiology departments in particular and the academy in general. He challenges sport historians to be more mindful of the “interrelationships between science and physical education and the intellectual and social changes which have occurred in the latter,” as well as the need for scholars to make a stronger case for the relevancy of the subdiscipline.²

Despite the fact that historians, sociologists, anthropologists, philosophers, literary scholars, and psychologists have established subdisciplines in sports, their work remains ghettoized and on the margins of the parent disciplines. Moreover, as Elliott Gorn and Michael Oriard perceptively note, “the booming field of cultural studies seems oblivious to the work done on athletics,” which is ironic because its interdisciplinary analysis of history, cultural expression, and power is “exactly where the study of sports is most needed.”³ During the 1970s and 1980s, such issues commanded close scrutiny as our collective enterprise matured from infancy through advanced adolescence. Despite sport history’s considerable expansion during the past decade, however, there has been a conspicuous reticence for thorough, searching review and evaluation.⁴

The same cannot be said about our sister field, sport sociology. Sport sociology has gone through at least two fundamental identity crises. During the 1970s, the early debates and types of problems studied were shaped primarily by several early leaders who had come from physical education and who were more concerned with sport for its own sake than with broader sociological issues and problems. As Richard Gruneau has recently characterized the scene, sport sociologists, like

sport historians of that earlier era, were more likely to focus on the apparent effects of social organization on sport—how sport is shaped by society—than on the role played by sport in the ongoing production of society. Much of the research in the sociology of sport “adopted theoretical and methodological frameworks from the parent discipline that paid scant attention either to questions of power and domination, or to broad issues and problems of social development.”⁵

During the 1980s, several sociologists brought a more critical theoretical approach into the mainstream of sport studies that inspired a new generation of sport historians to analyze their subject as a medium of class, gender, racial domination, and resistance. Gruneau’s influential *Class, Sports, and Social Development* was the key work in this new phase of scholarship. The book brought a rigorous analysis of sociological theory to the study of sport and, thereby, helped resolve the subfield’s early identity crisis (in much the same fashion that Allen Guttman’s pioneering *From Ritual to Record* did for contemporary sport history).⁶

The sport sociology field is currently in another state of transition. Peter Donnelly and Alan Ingham have recently pondered if “the sociology of sport is an apt description for what we are now doing. More and more, it seems that social studies of physical culture may best describe the cultural formation that once was the sociology of sport.” The crucial question that North American “sociologists” of “sport” must address, according to Donnelly and Ingham, is “whether the future of our ‘community’ will be anchored in sociology or in sport at all and, if not, what will be its alternatives?”⁷ In short, there is no prevailing consensus among sport sociologists about the content, practice, and trajectory of the field.

It’s also worth noting the prevailing controversies within the parent historical profession. The politicized controversies that hijacked the National History Standards project and a revisionist Smithsonian exhibit on Hiroshima several years ago are symptomatic of the ways many scholars find themselves under fire by conservative critics and populist demagogues who charge the “new” generation of radical historians with fragmenting the nation’s past and thereby undermining the possibility for a coherent, orderly, uplifting national narrative. Calls for “historical literacy” emanating from various historians and public policy spokespersons press for a sanitized version of social and political developments in Western history, countering appeals for a more comprehensive subject matter, more global coverage, and a more analytical thrust.⁸ Most recently, more than 200 historians withdrew their memberships from the American Historical Association and Organization of American Historians (OAH) in protest of the “politics of race and sex, a reliance on theory instead of evidence, rampant navel-gazing, obscurantism, and writing that reads like badly translated German,” as the *New York Times* characterized it. Eugene Genovese and Elizabeth Fox Genovese are among the most outspoken critics of what has become the mainstream of the historical profession. “The history profession is in disarray,” polemicalizes Genovese, former president of the OAH and president of the newly formed rebel Historical Society, “It is clear that the disaffection is wide and deep.

It cuts across political lines, from the Marxist left to the traditional right. The trivialization of subject matter is a widespread complaint.”⁹

In short, both American history and sport sociology (to say nothing about the Modern Language Association) are contentious. So why isn't sport history? Most people I know come away from the annual North American Society for Sport History (NASSH) conference with warm, supportive experiences and memories. I rarely read of any substantive debate in our journals or Internet listserv. Does such collegiality imply disciplinary consensus? Does the lack of explicit, sustained debate suggest that sport history is in its death throes?

I proposed this special issue nearly two years ago as a means of provoking and advancing the debate. The *Journal of Sport History* is, fittingly, one of the primary places where sport historians collectively engage in a conversation about how we practice our craft. Those “conversations” generally center on the products of our practice—articles and reviews. Yet, as David Thelan noted in his editorial introduction to a 1994 issue of the *Journal of American History*, as practitioners, “we rarely step back and ask basic questions about why and how we do things, about the values and cultures we have created and embraced, about the company we are keeping and not keeping, about the institutions with which we have made peace.”¹⁰

All scholarly interventions bear a personal dimension. Thelan inspired me to initiate a conversation about the practice of sport history. I've been intrigued by these and other issues since the early 1990s when I commenced work on *The New American Sport History*.¹¹ During the fall of 1995, I organized what became the opening session of the 1996 NASSH conference titled “Toward a New Paradigm: Sport History in the 21st Century,” which featured Stephen Hardy, Syndy Sydnor, Mark Dyreson, John Nauright, and myself. Later that summer, Steve Hardy and I continued the conversation and proposed this special issue.¹²

Martin Polley delineates four primary fronts in the production and dissemination of sports history. He identifies the first front as the academic study of sport history in the several scholarly journals and monograph series. As he notes, academic sport history “remains a minority affair,” and, as such, “we need to broaden our view to see other fronts on which opportunities for sports history research now exist.”¹³ On a second front is the burgeoning popular history, “a necessary and dynamic part of sport's postwar development [that] has helped to confirm for increasing numbers of followers a sense of tradition and place in sport.” The third front on which we see interest and opportunity for sport history is through museums and “heritage sites.” The points of contact between local and amateur historians/enthusiasts constitute another level. And, finally, television and feature films offer an ever-widening scope for the public exploration of sport history, “Arguably, these are the most important of all the genres,” Polley posits, “as more people watch television programmes and films than read history books or visit specialised museums.” In sum, through these various genres, increasing numbers of people are prepared to think critically about where sport has come from,” and, I would add, what it means in contemporary society and where it's poised to go in the future.¹⁴

The Main Attraction

This special issue features provocative reflections on sport history along its various fronts, as well as attention to four areas in need of further research and debate: methods, mediums, audiences, and narratives.

Sport historians tend to be conservative in their exploration of mediums and primary sources. Despite the fact that film and television scholars have used cultural studies for years, relatively little scholarship has focused on media representation of sport. **Aaron Baker's** work is a corrective to this under-canvassed area.¹⁵ He directs our attention to the various discursive positions inherent in American sports films—most of which proffer a progressive view of history presented in melodramatic terms. Baker's essay, derived from his 1994 doctoral dissertation and forthcoming book, illuminates how sports films tend to frame "history" from the perspective of individuals' emotional desires, and, as such, historians who utilize such biopics in their research need to properly interrogate such artifacts as primary documents.

Whereas Baker sees sport historians neglecting nuanced analyses of moving pictures, **John Bale** makes an appeal for scholars to better scrutinize photographs as evocative primary sources. Although sport historians tend to use photographs, cartoons, drawings, and the like for aesthetic rather than documentary purposes, Bale analyzes photographs to broaden the notion that "representation" can be more than merely textual, in short, nonliterary sources count, and photographs, in particular, can be read in a number of different ways. Bale focuses on how a particular bodily practice of the Rwandan Tutsi during the early 20th century dramatizes how historians can neither be certain of the role of the photographer nor the role of the photographed subjects.

Sydney Sydnor challenges traditionally trained sport historians to widen their perspective on historical narrative. **Catriona Parratt** characterizes Sydnor as one who, like **Walter Benjamin**, is "uncomfortable with linear historical rendering"; who eschews "conventional historical practices such as recording facts, periodizing, describing, and explaining"; and, as such, aspires to present history "not as an unbroken chain, but as a jumble of fragments and snapshots" in a poetic, literary, exhibitivist style.¹⁶ Sydnor demonstrates how various types of artifacts can be combined into a pastiche of postmodernism and, in so doing, demonstrates how historical narrative itself might take new forms. Sydnor's innovative essay (written in vivid, accessible prose) is the first genuinely postmodern sport history essay to be published. As Parratt observes, "Sydnor assembles and sets out on the page fragments, flashes, and snatches of the images, symbols, and spectacles of synchronized swimming." In so doing, Sydnor "deliberately draws attention to the raw materials, the nuts and bolts, the juxtapositions and joinings of elements of her work, a strategy that not only exposes but also highlights its contested nature."¹⁷

Sydnor's essay is likely to be attacked from several directions. The Joe Friday-strict empiricists who content themselves with collecting "just the facts, ma'am" will likely denounce the work as an irreverent, trivial piece of "history" by a trendy, interdisciplinary interloper with little or no regard for "objective" scholarship.

Despite its Benjamin influence, the neo-Marxists are likely to be suspicious of postmodern discourse analysis for its formulation of domination in purely discursive (rather than materialist), subjectivist terms. Cohn Howell, a distinguished Canadian social historian with a discerning historical materialist orientation, offers some astute, accommodating theoretical and methodological insights. In particular, Howell advises sport historians to “seek out ways of reconciling postmodernist concerns with representation, on the one hand, and materialist preoccupations about production, on the other.” Acknowledging postmodernism’s “great contribution” to dramatizing the ways in which “the very language we employ reflects and reinforces the structure of power and domination in the world about us,” Howell assesses the considerable intellectual cost: “If an appreciation of the power of language to influence life is a useful antidote to economic determinism or other forms of materialist reductionism, the postmodernist rejection of materialism makes much of life incomprehensible.”¹⁸ Or, as Richard Holt said at the 1996 European Committee for Sport History conference held in Rome, “If the account becomes nothing more than the context, with individuals and activities crushed under the weight of the analytic framework, sports history becomes a lifeless thing—a *Hamlet* without the prince.”¹⁹

Mediums, methods, and narratives propel us toward the centrality of audiences. Despite the boom in genealogical societies, historical museums, historical societies, historical documentaries, and the like, academic sport histories persist as marginal sideshows for the lay reading public and scholarly community alike. Roy Rosenzweig advises historians to consider both historical production and historical consumption. Who are we trying to reach and why? What are we trying to say to them? In what voice and in what form (e.g., print, film, exhibit) are we trying to speak? “Just as there may be no single historical synthesis, there is probably no single historical audience and no single means of reaching that multiplicity of historical audiences,” he writes. “Instead, the problem of creating a historical synthesis is closely tied to identifying a particular historical public for whom that synthesis is to be created.”²⁰

Sport historians have been tentative not only in their dealings with movies and photographs, but also, as **Wray Vamplew** suggests, conspicuously reluctant to utilize museum artifacts. This would appear to be a curious negligence from the perspective of most nonspecialists. In their defense, sport scholars have ably critiqued the nostalgia, jingoism, and simplicity of sports hall of fames and museum artifacts and exhibits.²¹ Yet, as Vamplew argues, it’s in the interest of sport historians to encourage the growth and development of sports-oriented museums “for therein lies the possibility of a greater awareness of sports history.” In so doing, scholars must not only widen their criteria of source material, but also broaden their use of such sources in research and teaching. In so doing, sport historians might embrace the concept of performance as captured in photos and videos. Virtual museums are ideal for this type of research since digitized photos and videos are (and will continue to be) easily accessed via CD-ROM.

Richard Cox and **Michael Salter** explore how information technology will shape the future of sport history.²² Cox and Salter delineate how the medium

transforms the message, methodology, and audience. The Internet will play an increasing role in teaching and learning, radically changing the roles of teacher and learner. Recent and emergent electronic technologies create access to richly structured information via the Internet and increasingly mediate learners' interaction with it. Information technology will continue to create networks of interconnections between groups of learners and their teachers and, as such, will replace some of the functions of teachers. The students of today and tomorrow are growing up in a multimedia, information-rich environment, and will demand learning environments that utilize the information technology effectively. Not only will lecturing likely be perceived as an inefficient form of instruction in the near future, but students will have to be taught how to manage their own learning processes to an unprecedented degree. As publisher Rainer Martens predicts, students will "need to learn to swim in a sea of information, to use the vast resources of a supportive learning environment, to self-pace and self-structure their own programs of learning." They will be able to choose from a spectrum of learning styles, ranging from self-instruction with tutor support to group work of various types. "If higher education wishes to serve this segment of education," Martens postulates, "it will have to adapt radically in order to provide the forms of training which industry and professional bodies will demand."²³

Sport History on the Cusp of a New Millennium

Academic legitimacy for sport scholarship has come at a high price. In their rush to embrace the class/gender/race mantra, as well as the 'promises' of postmodernism, many sport historians have effectively lost their ability to communicate with a broader public audience. Although sport historians have introduced new voices and points of view (in the cause of cultural pluralism) into a system long dominated by white males, they have lost the battle with critics who blast such efforts as signs of academic elitism and intellectual "smoke and mirrors." Some of the most trenchant criticisms have come from scholars who are familiar with the profession's prevailing historiographical and conceptual issues. Stephen Fox, an independent scholar of American culture, chastises certain sport historians for aiming to "derive what sport has meant in the broadest contexts of American history" rather than on its own terms. In his review of *The New American Sport History*, Fox characterizes the collected essays as "at times perhaps too serious-minded, too far from the playing field, for its subject." The reader, according to Fox, "gets little sense of just why so many Americans have loved sports."²⁴

Sport historians can no longer luxuriate in the tacit acceptance of their field in academe, the existence of several journals and monograph series, and a relative handful of college courses devoted to it. Trends in higher education, academic publishing, and public culture collectively force sport historians to evaluate and reorient their scholarly lens in the name of the field's very survival. Such a scenario, however, offers sport historians (who enjoy broad public interest in their subject matter) an opportunity to engage multiple audiences—to transcend the handful of our obscure journal readers and marginally promoted monograph series.

We must pose questions that both expand our understanding of the historical function of sport in society and simultaneously engage the concerns of contemporary audiences and publics. As Michael Pickering has written, “we must find ways of talking, discussing, and analyzing which are not ‘worlds apart’ from the popular culture which is addressed.” In so doing, we might well ponder the plentiful popular works, ascertain their staying power, and realign our conceptual frameworks accordingly.²⁵ In short, the issue is not whether to displace the traditional scholarly questions and methodologies, but rather to think more clearly about their relationship to broader educational concerns and the public world where historians feel most marginalized.²⁶ I’m reminded of Elliott Gorn’s comments several years ago that many works in sport history are “heroically bland and monotone in style.” Either sport historians overwhelm readers with abundant facts or eschew narrative for theoretical abstractions in hopes that “they will be alright by the standards of their colleagues and of their own academic superegos.” Even more tellingly, Gorn speculates (and I agree wholeheartedly), “Many practitioners are afraid of coming across too passionately for fear that the exciting nature of sport will, somehow, overcome their scholarly ‘detachment.’”²⁷

Sport historians can no longer conceive their works in a specialized, narrowly focused fashion and expect wide institutional and public approval. Historical case studies cannot be written in a scholarly vacuum; they must be relevant to contemporary issues and problems. In his own crystal ball, Rainer Martens sees a new breed of scholars emerging—knowledge integrators—well-versed generalists able and motivated to synthesize information into useful knowledge. These scholars’ stock will soar in the near future due to the “continued avalanche of information, the enormous chaos in the [academic] brickyard, the demand by society that academe pay its dues to those who pay its salaries.” As the integration of knowledge eclipses narrow, specialized research, the basic curriculum will, itself, move away from textbooks and monographs toward multimedia, interactive courseware designed by teams of content experts, instructional designers, software designers, and programmers. The future of sport history may well depend on the degree to which practitioners engage and help shape these changes within academic and publishing environments.²⁸

I trust that the following essays will provoke us to redirect our collective thinking into new grooves and will, thereby, spark debate on the future of our practice.

-
1. I wish to thank Stephen Hardy for his advice, intellectual generosity, and comradeship during the past six years, and for his suggestions to an earlier version of this essay. I would also like to thank David Wiggins for his patience and unwavering support of this issue.
 2. Douglas Booth, “Sports History: What Can Be Done?” *Sport, Education and Society* 2 (1997), 191-204. See also “The Academy Papers: Meeting the Challenges of the 21st Century in Higher Education,” *Quest* 50 (May 1998).
 3. Elliott J. Gorn and Michael Oriard, “Taking Sports Seriously,” *Chronicle of Higher Education*, March 24, 1995, A52. Two years earlier, David L. Andrews and John W. Loy

- reviewed this neglected scholarly relationship in "British Cultural Studies and Sport: Past Encounters and Future Possibilities," *Quest* 45 (1993), 255-76; and a year after Gorn and Oriard's jeremiad, Andrew Blake explored the prospects of studying sport through a cultural studies perspective in *The Body Language: The Meaning of Modern Sport* (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1996). Blake suggests the need for scholars to examine performance, design, and aesthetics in their analyses of sport.
4. For useful reviews of the 1970s-1980s literature, see Benjamin G. Rader, "Modern Sports: In Search of Interpretations," *Journal of Social History* 13 (1979), 307-321; Allen Guttmann, "Who's on First: or, Books on the History of American Sports," *Journal of American History* 66 (1979), 348-354; Nancy Struna, "In Glorious Disarray: The Literature of American Sports History," *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport* 56 (1985), 151-160; James Walvin, "Sport, Social History and the Historian," *British Journal of Sports History* 1 (1984), 5-13; Steven Riess, "The New Sport History," *Reviews in American History* 18 (1990), 311-325; Richard Holt, *Sport and the British: A Modern History* (London: Oxford University Press, 1989), 357-367; Patrick Miller, "Homo Faber-Homo Ludens: Sport History and the Working Class," *International Labor and Working Class History* 44 (1993), 79-94; Patricia Vertinsky, "Gender Relations, Women's History and Sport History," *Journal of Sport History* 21 (Spring 1994), 1-25; John Nauright, "Sports History and Social History: The Current State of Australian Sports History," *Sporting Traditions* 11 (1995), 103-110; Arnd Kruger, "German Sports Historiography of the Eighties," *Journal of Sport History* 17 (1990), 261-277; Jeffrey Hill "British Sports History: A Post-Modern Future?" *Journal of Sport History* 23 (1996), 1-19; S.W. Pope, Introduction, *The New American Sport History: Recent Approaches and Perspectives* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1997), 1-30; Stephen Hardy, "Sport in Urbanizing America: A Historical Review," *Journal of Urban History* 23 (1997), 675-708; and Catriona Parratt, "About Turns: Reflecting on Sport History in the 1990s," *Sport History Review* 29 (1998), 4-17. 1998
 5. Richard Gruneau, "A Postscript, 15 Years Later," in *Class, Sports, and Social Development* (Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics Publishers, 1999), 124.
 6. *Ibid.*, 123-139. See also Gruneau, "Modernization or Hegemony: Two Views of Sport and Social Development," in Jean Harvey and Hart Catalon, eds., *Not Just a Game: Essays in Canadian Sport Sociology* (Ottawa, 1988), 9-32.
 7. Alan G. Ingham and Peter Donnelly, "A Sociology of North American Sociology of Sport: Disunity in Unity, 1965 to 1996," *Sociology of Sport Journal* 14 (1997), 364, 395.
 8. The literature surrounding these debates is voluminous. Perceptive analyses include "Social History and the American Political Climate—Problems and Strategies," *Journal of Social History* 29 (1995), supplement; Edward T. Linenthal and Tom Englehardt, eds., *History Wars: The Enola Gay and Other Battles for the American Past* (New York: Henry Holt, 1996); Lawrence W. Levine, *The Opening of the American Mind: Canons, Culture, and History* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1996); James W. Loewen, *Lies My Teacher Told Me: Everything Your American History Textbook Got Wrong* (New York: The New Press, 1995); Michael Berube, *Public Access: Literary Theory and American Cultural Politics* (London: Verso, 1994); and Peter N. Stearns, "History Must Be Taught Not as a Set of Facts, but as an Active Analytical Tool," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, August 7, 1991, A32.
 9. *New York Times*, May 3, 1998.
 10. David Thelan, "The Practice of American History," *Journal of American History* 81 (1994), 933.
 11. Pope, ed., *The New American Sport History*. For a historiographical discussion, see 1-30.
 12. We thought (perhaps naively in retrospect) that a collective snapshot would emerge from our unscientific survey of the NASSH membership in early 1997. To our surprise and disappointment, only 23 people responded to the first survey, and 18 responded to the second (6 responded to both). The first half of the questionnaire was designed to canvass what members deemed to be the most influential books, movies, periodicals, performances, and individuals in sport history. The second half focused on the perceived strengths and weaknesses of sport history as a discipline—with the question: what are the greatest

strengths and weaknesses of the practice of sport history in your country?—followed by thirteen statements with which respondents were to indicate (numerically) whether they strongly agree, agree, were indifferent/ambivalent, disagree, or strongly disagree. The statements were the following:

The practice of sport history is too insular and inward-looking.

The practice of sport history is too given to fads and fashions.

Sport history should be good storytelling.

Good historical scholarship engages multiple and diverse audiences.

History should help people find their identities.

Historians have become too inattentive to factual accuracy.

Historians have become too attentive to other historians' interpretations and too uninterested in the past itself

We need a new paradigm of sport history.

Current historical scholarship is of major value to teachers.

Current scholarship has become too divorced from teaching.

Historians don't make enough use of archival research.

Historians have become too enthralled by theoretical issues at the expense of empirical ones.

Historians have become too enthralled by empirical research at the expense of theoretical issues.

I calculated a simple statistical mean for all 13 statements. Respondents were asked to rank the statements with "5" for strong agreement to "1" for strong disagreement. Responses to nine of the statements (1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12) were in the 3.0-3.3 range—indicating a collective ambivalence or indifference. Weaknesses overshadowed strengths by a good margin. A number of respondents saw the manner in which fellow sport historians tackle the broad-ranging subject area as the most noteworthy strength; a couple of others noted the persistence of NASSH and the supportive community of scholars engendered by it. There was a consensus as to the primary weakness of the practice of sport history—it's lack of recognition as a legitimate area of study by other historians and scholars—and, relatedly, sport history's inability to forge closer bonds with the broader field of history. As a group, the respondents "agreed strongly" with the statement that "good historical scholarship engages diverse and multiple audiences"; "agreed" that sport history should be good storytelling; and also "agreed" that "current historical scholarship is of major value to teachers." Respondents tended to "disagree" with the statement that sport history is "too given to fads and fashions" and also "disagreed" that "historians have become too enthralled by empirical research at the expense of theoretical issues."

13. Martin Polley, *Moving the Goalposts: A History of Sport and Society since 1945* (London: Routledge, 1998), 167.
14. *Ibid.*, 168, 169, 171.
15. Noteworthy exceptions include Aaron Baker and Todd Boyd, eds., *Sports, Media, and the Politics of Identity* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997); and Lawrence A. Wenner, ed., *Media, Sports, and Society* (Sage, 1998).
16. Catriona Parratt, "About Turns," 13. I fully agree with Parratt's hunch that "Sydnor herself would probably rather the piece be performed than written," 13-14.
17. *Ibid.*, 13.
18. Colin D. Howell, "On Metcalfe, Marx, and Materialism: Reflections on the Writing of Sport History in the Postmodern Age," *Sport History Review* 29 (1998), 99. For an earlier, trenchant, historical-materialist critique of postmodernism, see Bryan Palmer, *Descent into Discourse: The Reification of Language and the Writing of Social History* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1990).
19. Holt quoted in Roland Renson, "Sport Historiography in Europe: A Comparative Perspective and Heuristic Model," *Sport History Review* 29 (1998), 40.
20. Roy Rosenzweig, "History and the Public: What Can We Handle?" (roundtable discussion) *Journal of American History* 82 (1995).

21. For a representative critique, see Bruce Kidd, "The Making of a Hockey Artifact: A Review of the Hockey Hall of Fame," *Journal of Sport History* 23 (1996), 328-334.
22. For more on this brave new world, see Brian Stoddart, "Convergence: Sport on the Information Superhighway," *Journal of Sport and Social Issues* 21 (1997), 93-102.
23. Rainer Martens, "Information Technology and the Sport Sciences," paper presented to the European College of Sport Sciences, Manchester, England, July 1998. Ethan Bronner notes how this conviction is facing an intellectual backlash at the primary and secondary levels in "High-Tech Teaching Is Losing its Gloss," *New York Times*, November 30, 1997.
24. *Journal of American History* 85 (1998), 1474.
25. As I speculated in "Paradigm Dramas and the Need for Theoretically Informed Popular History," presented at the 24th NASSH conference, Auburn University (May 1996), "The success of Ken Burns' popular documentary, *Baseball*, confirms how it attained remarkable stature as compelling 'history' for most viewers because the expert 'talking heads' waxed just as nostalgically about the ways in which the game intersects with and frames their own childhoods as do the rank-and-file fans in daily barroom and shop-floor conversations. Rather than view this sense of 'history' as 'pulp fiction,' sport historians might analyze how such constructions are created, sustained, and legitimized and, thereby, bridge the gulf between 'serious' and 'popular' work in the public culture."
26. Ibid.
27. See Gorn's review of Steven Riess's *City Games* in *Reviews in American History* 18 (1990), 27-30.
28. Martens, "Information Technology and the Sport Sciences."