
CONFERENCE

Traslated by John Bell

TEAM SPORTS: A WORLD CREATED IN ENGLAND*

Claudio Véliz

Contrary to what we are led to believe, the origins of modern sport and its maximum symbol, the Olympic Games, do not derive from its remote Greek ancestor but from the Victorian England of the Industrial Revolution, as Claudio Veliz points out in the following pages. It was there that not only were the most popular sports of today invented but also the codification and beginnings of many others. Workers Associations with sporting aims were founded in the great industrial cities as substitutes for the humane communities that had

CLAUDIO VÉLIZ has a Ph.D in History from the London School of Economics. At present he is Emeritus Professor of Sociology at the La Trobe University in Australia and Professor of History at Boston University in the U.S.A: he is also Director of the University Professors at the latter. His best known works are "*Historia de la Marina Mercante de Chile*" (Santiago: Universidad de Chile publications, 1961); "*The Centralist Tradition of Latin America*" (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980); and, more recently, "*The New World of the Gothic Fox, Culture and Economy in English and Spanish America*" (Berkley: University of California Press, 1994). Among his last articles published by "*Estudios Públicos*" are "Simetrias y divergencias en la historia de Argentina y Chile", "Un Mundo Made in England" and "El Nuevo Mundo: Gesta menor del momento castellano".

* Conference given at the Centre for Public Studies on August 22nd 1996, as part of the seminar "Greek and English Sports". The present version is taken from a transcript edited by the magazine "*Estudios Públicos*". See in the same volume the conference given by Alfonso Gomez-Lobo "The Olympics in the ancient world" and the colloquium "Greek and English Sports" in which both Carlos Veliz and Alfonso Gomez-Lobo participated together with Arturo Fontaine Talavera and Ernesto Rodriguez Serra.

been left behind when those same workers had emigrated from their fields and villages: they were founded on principles of “fair play”, principles stemming from the upper classes and from the image of the gentleman, and generating a concept that never existed in the Classical world.

I should like to start by thanking the Centre for Public Studies for giving me this opportunity to converse with you and my distinguished colleagues gathered together here, about a theme that has interested me for some time and maybe from a somewhat different point of view than the usual one: not excessively original but different. I am going to try and deal with four themes, in fact, and briefly, because each one of them could take a week. First of all I am going to describe the origins of what is considered to be specifically modern sport. I am then going to spend a few minutes, or maybe seconds, to mention one of the concepts so crucial for doing sport in this way. I will go on to make a sociological analysis, somewhat audaciously you might think, or maybe not audaciously at all, of what we have at hand and end up with a brief account of the circumstances that led to the resurrection of the Olympic Games a hundred years ago. That is more or less the picture. Later on I will leave a lot of doors open for questions and objections.

The easiest way to deal with the question of the origins of sport is to start by quoting the person considered to be the best philosopher of the century and certainly one of the most influential: Wittgenstein. When he was faced with the problem of defining or describing the significance of something, in this specific case a word, his reply was “The significance of a word is in its use”. You can say for example that you are having the whale of a time, or in Spanish “estoy pasando bomba”, and then go to the Dictionary of the Royal Academy, you’ll find that you won’t understand what on earth is happening, because the significance of the word, in fact, lies in the way you use it. I am going to extend this concept of significance by use to sport by making the following observation: it seems to me nowadays that apart from the rights of passage and the biological functions that we all have to satisfy that possibly the most popular and diffuse human activity on the face of the Earth is something that we are accustomed to label – sport. And not even sport in general: I believe that if we stick to football, volleyball and basketball we are talking about a huge number of the human race, if not the majority. If we add golf, tennis, mountaineering, skiing and all the other sports it seems to me that we are grouping together an absolute

majority of humanity. From the point of view that use is what gives significance, we can say that this is one of the most significant activities in modern life. It doesn't matter if one does not like it or not, or considers it to be a waste of time or makes any kind of objection to it whatsoever, it's still an activity that a lot of people do with a lot of pleasure —because nobody or very few people are forced to do it— something that is not compulsory: and so I come back to Wittgenstein. The significance of this, what it means, is something that is worth exploring.

We could expand this point and call your attention to the fact that sport is one of the few activities that has its own section in all the newspapers and news bulletins in the world. Some very prestigious ones might lack a financial section but none of them lacks a sports one. Let me add something else: the influence of sport on the way you dress. I was thinking a short time ago, while I was waiting around for a connection at an airport and looking at the people passing by, that when I was born and growing up I entered a world in which the children were dressed like grown ups, with sailor suits, ties and shiny shoes. Now I find that I live in a world where the old dress like young kids..... but kids clothes that have their origin in some sport. All the clothes of every group of people who passed by at the airport, their hats, rucksacks, and shoes, that type of thing, had their origin in one sport or another. And it's possible to go on and on developing this theme on the importance and significance of sport in modern life. An opportune and fair question, in my opinion, is therefore when this began and what was the character of such sport.

I

I now come to my first theme. As far as the Olympics are concerned, it has been often said that they originated in Ancient Greece, and that this was demonstrated even more by Baron de Coubertin in Athens in 1896 etc, etc. I am going to defend a theory which is not immensely original: the opposite one, if you like. No: modern sport originated in England and is a sub product of the Industrial Revolution. And note these words well: it has nothing to do with the classical Olympics or with classical sport. We are not dealing with a slightly different phenomenon here but one that is completely different. I am going to take a few examples of the factual origins of sports, which are said to have come from Ancient Greece. Let us take one of the sports that Alfonso Gomez-Lobo mentioned the other day in the eloquent and interesting presentation that he gave. He reminded us that in classical

boxing they toned down the brutality of the event by prohibiting the boxer from gouging out the eyes of the other or biting him, but that everything else was allowed. Here we can see that there is a definite difference in the case of English pugilism which we know was pretty brutal as well up to the 18th century but changed in the 19th with the invention of the boxing glove, which had as its object the idea of not harming the opponent. So they began to use boxing gloves and much later, some 80 years later, came the famous Marquis of Queensberry rules, which were accepted in England and then became the rules for boxing throughout the world. They are rules designed so as not to cause your opponent unnecessary damage. Boxing is the most brutal of the sports that seem to have survived from Ancient Greece: one person flattening another. The difference is that in the modern version, taken up in England, the impact of the blows has lessened almost completely: I am sure that you have seen that in today's Olympics the boxers wear helmets, the rounds are short and, to sum up, in no way do they try and kill their adversary. There are a lot of other examples like this: I am going to carry on with the theme a little and then look at team sport.

If we take skiing, it seems to be obviously associated with a region in the world, and practiced by one or two peoples: the least we can say is that it must have been a sport invented by the Swedish or the Norwegians or even the Swiss. But it turns out to be an invention of the English. The Swiss, Swedish and Norwegians have been skiing for centuries, but never as a sport. For them skiing was a means of transport that was as good for them as it was for others who had to transport themselves by bicycle, but it was not a sport. The systemisation of skiing as a sporting activity carries the unmistakable stamp of its English origin. The first great Alpine championship, a combination of slalom and downhill racing, carries the name of Lord Roberts of Kandahar, who invented it in India. From there it travelled all over the world and reached us here in Chile. I don't know if it still exists today but when I was young, there existed a Kandahar of the Andes. The first rules for the slalom in the world, and slalom is a Norwegian word, were published in the Public Schools Alpine yearly handbook in 1920, as late as that. The systemisation of skiing over its first 50 years was of English manufacture – the United States had very little to do with it: it was due to the English who used to visit India and go as tourists to the Alps. The oldest ski club in the world is in Australia, which is not a skiing country, but one that has received English influence more directly.

A few days ago, I think it was on the 13th of August, a group of four Chileans reached the summit of K2, the second highest mountain in the world. But human beings have been climbing mountains since the beginning of history – and hating it.

At the dawn of the Renaissance – and I hope that Professor Gomez-Lobo will back me up on this – for the first time someone reached the summit of a mountain with pleasure: the famous case of Petrarch who made an agreeable report saying that the experience was no at all bad. But he had no followers. And so up to the beginning or middle of the 18th century, people continued thinking of a mountain as an excrescence, a terrible wart on the surface of the Earth. Nobody wanted anything to do with them; you had to get as far away from them as possible and the worst that could happen to anyone was if they had to make a journey that involved crossing mountains. And then, at the end of the 18th century or the beginning of the 19th, the English discovered how sublime it was to climb mountains – that it was a form of romanticism, for sure, something I am not going to go into at the moment. The first ascents for sport were made by Englishmen, one of whom was Sir Alfred Wills, who climbed the Wetterhorn in Switzerland in 1854. And the first Alpine club to climb using ropes, and equipment like ice axes and crampons was an English Alpine club, founded in London. I could go on giving innumerable examples about this.....

Swimming. We have always been swimming. There was the famous crossing of the Hellespont by Lord Byron. People swim, throw themselves into the water, take baths in the sea etc, etc. But as a sport, swimming has its origins in England as well. The idea of having races in the water had occurred to nobody, i.e. racing from here to there in the water and measuring the time and so on. The English began founding a Swimming Federation and constructing the first swimming pools, a thing that grew in Australia, where an Australian called Richard Cavill invented what we call Freestyle. When he invented it he broke the world record at a 100 yards, unforgettably in the year 1900. And so here we have very recent invention which, once again, bears the stamp of England.

Polo. A sport which has already been mentioned here and which has been played in India since Classical times: but its organisation as a sport was also the work of the English.

Hockey. Chile might claim to be one of the originators of the sport, I'll have to look at the background, but I am sure that we are in no way older than the Persians who also played it. All the world played hockey in the Ancient world because the idea of hitting a ball with a bent stick is a question of limited alternatives in terms of social anthropology: it's much easier to hit the ball with a bent stick than a straight one, with the result that everywhere in the world something that resembles hockey is played. But, once again, it was the English who organised the game and invented rules for it and practically nothing has changed since they did so.

And there are even other sports, like tennis, “real tennis”, which was played by Henry VIII at Hampton Court and by French kings but which had very little to do with “long tennis”, which is an English invention organised by the English and launched by them on a world wide scale. On reading the translation of an article of mine published in the Centre for Public Studies magazine, I have just discovered (this is not a date that I knew from memory) that in 1877 they played the first Wimbledon Championship, a championship that has continued to be the Mecca for world tennis.

And so and so on.

But if there is a sport that really is old, and which I am completely sure that everyone in the world has played at least once: kicking a ball on a piece of earth, that is more or less large, from one end to the other. What is the origin of modern football and why is it of such interest?. Modern football started intentionally: it was no accident. The decision was due to Dr. Arnold, the very distinguished headmaster of one of the most famous public schools (in fact a private school even though the English call them public schools), Rugby. This person, who has been the focus of various biographies, was the father of Matthew Arnold, the thinker who wrote a famous essay on Culture and Anarchy, a piece that should be compulsory reading for anyone interested in these subjects on a general level. Dr. Arnold established, off his own bat , a functional relationship between the practice of sport and the strength of character of a human being.

He believed, and maybe he is right, that practising sport (later on we'll see what type of sport) helps to form character and although the acquisition of knowledge in a school was very important, forming the character of the students was even more so. The best way of forming their character was through a sport, a sport in which they would have to behave within a clear, moral and ethical framework.

II

Out of the above comes the second theme that I want to touch on and which refers to the spirit in which these physical activities are acted out in the modern world. It has a lot to do with the word *sport*, which has a strange etymology in English: it can mean “mutation”, for example a genetic mutation is a *sport* : a phenomenon like those with three heads pickled in formalin that used to be found in the Quinta Normal in Santiago. But the way in which the English have tied the word to an attitude, to an ethical and moral definition is so unique that it cannot be translated. It would seem that

“sport” was another word, but it comes directly from *sport*. There is no language into which the word sport can be directly translated because it is an invention of the English and an invention that is tied to a very special concept of behaviour.

Here I would like to refer to something that Professor Gomez-Lobo touched on from a different angle, from the angle of Ancient Greece: I found fascinating that part of his explanation when he said that in Greece to come second had no value: you either won or lost. Here there is another thing which is a little like the boxing gloves because the idea of sport, the idea of sport that was born in England, that had its roots in Victorian culture and the Industrial Revolution, is exactly the opposite. The important thing is to play the game, play the match and practise sport in the best way possible, and not about who wins or loses. The important thing is to play correctly. It is much better to play the game correctly and lose than to resort to cheating and win. To win is an instrumental end not an absolute one. What is important is to play well. This is so important that there is no need to overdo things, to put in too much energy or too much fervour. You have to put in a lot of effort but not too much. Avoid excesses. Where does that come from?. To not let yourself be carried away to such an extent that you say “Let’s try a little bit of cheating here and there...”.

The idea – and this is conjecture, well founded I think, but open to objection - seems to me to be eminently compatible with the definition of a gentleman. *Caballero* in Spanish is not an ideal translation of the word gentleman, which in reality means “a gentle man”. The etymology of both words is actually quite distinct because “gentleman” is as much a person with noble ancestry, a person from a good background as it is someone who is both pleasant and tactful. But in Spanish *caballero* means only one thing, a man on a horse. Thus the parallel between both words lends itself to interpretation but with this reservation: that, at that moment in English cultural history, it meant someone who did not need to make too much of an effort, someone who could look on life with a certain tranquillity, someone who could dedicate himself to playing golf or polo or even boxing, but only because he liked it. He liked it: the principal motivation of the association between man and sport was because he liked it, he loved it. He is an amateur at it and that’s why he does it.

There is quite an interesting difference between those who do sport because they like it and those who do it for professional reasons, something which is reflected in a sport which is viewed as sacred in this cultural tradition: I refer to cricket, you know, men wearing white flannels, where, until a short time ago, matches were played between gentleman and players.

And the players were paid, while the gentleman were amateurs. The notion of amateurism which colours the Olympics (and this is something I am going to come to in a minute) comes from this. Like that concept of sport, which is untranslatable in other languages.

III

And so we come to my third theme. What is the sociological significance, if there is any, of this phenomenon and why do I say that it took its roots not only from that moment in Victorian England but from the Industrial Revolution, and why do I associate this with team games ?. In short, how do we connect this process and tie it to what I have been describing so succinctly as a vision or a sociological explanation ?. One of the few solidly established concepts in classical and contemporary sociology is the distance measured between a *gemeinschaft* and a *gesellschaft* society, i.e. the distance between a community and an association, the one based on personal ties and the other based on impersonal ones. There is no adequate translation for *gemeinschaft* and *gesellschaft* but that comes near enough. In other words the distance between a traditional society, the society of San Vicente de Tagua Tagua or Pitrufquen, a hundred years ago, which is a *gemeinschaft* society, and society today in the heart of Santiago which is almost completely *gesellschaft*,

We could spend a month trying to make the difference between the two more precise, but, briefly, the traditional society is one to which a person belongs, whether they like it or not. You are born into a religion, into a language, a region and a family. Afterwards you can change your nationality, your surname, do all kinds of things, but it is impossible to change the fact of being born into that religion, that city and that family. The *gesellschaft* society, and I hope my sociology colleagues will forgive me here because I know that we're dealing with something more complex, is a society to which you do not belong whatever the effort you put into it. It's an anonymous society. For example you can buy shares in a limited company and attend all the shareholders meetings, you can be a member of a stamp club, you can become a student at university and be fireman in a fire company: they are all associations which come near to being like a traditional community but they're not and never will be, in the same way that all the members of this club are like the fingers on one hand and play all the same sport and support the same football team.

It happens that the first victim of the process of industrial modernisation – this is classic sociology – is traditional society: because of all kinds

of factors, it's the one that collapses and disappears first and this generates a society where, in the words of Peter Berger, you are surrounded by people you don't know. In a traditional society you live surrounded by people you know: everyone knows who you are and you know everybody. In modern industrialised society we don't know each other.

Conscious of the pain of this process, because it is an extremely traumatic, tormenting and terrible one, and without any deliberate intent – but simply because it happens to be in the natural order of things, I imagine, since there was no English sociologist who stated “this is the way of resolving the problem” – this rare and new phenomenon called sport, emerged from the cradle of the Industrial Revolution, in regions that first suffered the destruction of their traditional society. In its most popular phase sport was associated with a particular game or games: in the case of England, football, and in the case of the United States, basketball and volleyball. I want to talk briefly about them before I turn to my last theme.

Football, which originated at Rugby School with the didactic intention of forming the character of the students, as we said a few moments ago, began to travel and was adopted by groups of workers in the industrial cities of England's Black Country, where the focus of the Industrial Revolution was to be found. They say that the inventor of Rugby was a young lad, also at Rugby School, who got the ball and ran with it. There is a bronze plaque in the school which recalls the boy who invented a new game by simply grabbing the ball, running with it and scoring a try. This was a new game which would become separate from football. Football went one way and Rugby another. And, as for Rugby, there was also an early division between what today is called Rugby Union, played by amateurs, principally at private schools and universities and Rugby League, which began to be played in industrial cities, especially the mining ones.

The rapid popularity of football among the workers led to the formation of clubs, especially in the industrial region of England. And then what happened?. I'm going to exaggerate a little because if I don't we'll be spending the whole night talking about this. These people - workers who for one reason or another had been displaced from the agricultural areas where they or their fathers or grandfathers had been living for years- were now alone. They had been displaced, positively or negatively, either by the agricultural reform or redistribution of land that had taken place at the end of the 18th century, or because the salaries in the industrial areas attracted them away from the countryside. But the fact is that practically all of them were gathered together in a male society, with few women and no relations. They were alone or with their immediate family but not with the rest of the

family. They were dispersed: some went here, others there and during the week they lived lives relatively isolated from their neighbours and relatively isolated at work. For those of you who have seen it, work became a little like it was portrayed in Charlie Chaplin's film "Modern Times". The nature of industrialised work isolates people from their fellow men and they suffer from what sociologists call anomie and alienation and similar things. Nevertheless, for three hours every Saturday afternoon, the traditional community spirit was restored up to a certain point. For three hours people were surrounded by others like themselves who felt passionately about supporting one team against another. They sat, they stood, they got wet, because it used to rain all the time, and it was terrible but fantastic because they shouted and booed and for three hours they submerged themselves in as plausible a community as it was possible to invent. Little by little this began to transform itself (and I use the words carefully and with respect) into a kind of communion: a kind of weekly ceremony in which a person could meet with his fellows and carry out a rite which bound them all together. A type of communion, of a restoration of the community spirit, which was a direct response to the situation generated by the Industrial Revolution.

What has the word "sport" got to do with all this?. It so happens that this community cannot be an immoral one or one that lacks a soul: it cannot be a primitive or barbaric one. It had to have a certain set of rules, a scheme of things that allowed it to operate within certain limits, because the extraordinary thing about sporting activity in the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th was that it also operated within certain limits. And now here comes that instinctive or intuitive thing from the creators of the concept of "sport" and the founders of those first teams, which was to absorb, from the upper class, the ideal of the gentleman. The ideal of the gentleman who does what he does because he wants to do it, who doesn't cheat to win and acts in the way that we explained before. It was this ideal that was introduced into sport, not just in England but world wide. Sport had to be an amateur activity, there had to be no cheating: it had to be played honestly. The idea was to play the game but without committing any offences to win it. These ideas also came an almost instinctive desire to recover the spirit of the traditional community, based on what people imagined it to be, because traditional communities were never so honest, friendly and pure but in reality pretty brutal. Thus we are talking about a traditional community of the imagination created at a time when a palliative was deemed necessary to make up for the tragic collapse in values.

Let us now take a look at the two cases of basketball and volleyball.

It was in London where an association was first produced between two concepts that were thought to be stimulating, positive and beneficial within the area of social work: Christianity and sport. The Christianity in question was mainly Methodism and I should like to refresh your memories here. The Methodism of Wesley was a phenomenon of the last decades of the 18th century, linked in particular to the Industrial revolution and based on a code of conduct that was both austere and positive: the idea of living a good Christian life interpreted from a Christian viewpoint. Methodism became associated with the practice of sport, creating what the English called *muscular Christianity*, a Christianity which had to do with sport and all the virtues which I have mentioned above.

Such an association of concepts indirectly generated the establishment of certain institutions world wide. The main one was called the Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA), founded in London during the second half of the 19th century which was followed later on by the Young Women's Christian Association. The YMCA's were always associated with a gym and the activities practised there. The idea spread to North America, throughout the whole of the USA and Canada, then to Australia, France and Germany and finally to the rest of the world. And it was in the USA, and specifically in Massachussetts, where it had to confront a real problem: during winter a workman could not practise any sport like football or rugby, which needed space in the open air, because there was two metres of snow. What can a man do in two metres of snow?. Skiing was still not popular in those days and neither were other snow sports. But it was still very important to practise sports and one could not spend the whole winter without them. So the YMCA 's, confronting the problem, came up with a couple of solutions, one in Holyoke and the other in Springfield. In 1891, the same year as the Chilean Civil War, they invented basketball and in 1895, volleyball.

Today basketball and volleyball are by far the most popular social activities in China. There are more Chinese playing volleyball today than there were inhabitants of the United States when they invented the sports. Thus the most popular social activities in the world today have their origin in those values and concepts that I have mentioned previously.

V

Let us now turn to the resurrection of the Olympic games. The type of feeling and attitude, associated to the problems of the Industrial Revolu-

tion, which I have described above, had international repercussions in Chile, in Argentina and throughout the world: the result was that people liked to do these activities. These international repercussions practically came to kill, or at least to postpone, an alternative vision of things which sportsmen also felt in their hearts. I haven't mentioned this before but I think that now is the time to do so: I am referring to the fact that in the years 1820, 1830, the first half of the 19th century a series of gymnastic associations were founded in Scandinavia and Germany and they began to fulfil the same role as the sporting activities that I mentioned before, aiming to be mediators for communities that were breaking up. They had a fundamental difference from the English initiatives: they aimed to get young men physically well trained for war. In this way they had military training, not in barracks or regiments, but in gyms, using gymnastics as the excuse for having young men very well prepared physically, at an age when they could carry arms.

The first Athletics championship of modern times was organised by the Royal military Academy, at Woolwich Arsenal, in 1849, precisely with the same intention, but it only lasted two years. Why didn't this come off in England?. Maybe because it was incompatible with the spirit of the times or perhaps for some other reason, I really don't know. The fact is that it did not take off, except at Exeter College, Oxford University, which welcomed the idea of having Athletics championships and which has continued holding them up to today.

The universal impact of the initiatives which had taken place in England and the initiatives which were directed, both visibly and expressly, at military preparation, by keeping the athleticism of the military side and transforming it into an amateur activity, also made a great impression on a gentleman by the name of Baron Coubertin. Baron Coubertin was one of the many European Anglophiles of the era: European Anglophilia, especially in France, was massive. Coubertin read "*Tom Brown's Schooldays*", an entertaining book written by a Mr. Hughes, which was made into a television series a couple of years ago. It was a book about life at school and the formation of character and was set at Rugby. Coubertin read it and saw the light. For him it was a kind of Bible: he took it with him everywhere he went and he even slept with it under his pillow. He became obsessed with the idea that Dr. Arnold, at Rugby School, had resolved the Platonic problem of how best to educate a human being. Arnold had discovered.....Sport. What Coubertin wanted was to discover it for France, a France that had been so disastrously defeated in 1871 after the Franco-Prussian War. It was necessary to *rebronzer la France*, revive her and make

her strong again. The way to do it would be through sport: so he went to Rugby.

Coubertin describes, in his own hand, his visit to Arnold's tomb. He practically falls to his knees, has a mystical experience and says "There, at that moment, I realised that not only was I seeing the tomb of a great man in this chapel, but I also understood that this was the corner stone of the British Empire: this was the solution to all the problems of modern times. There it was, so simple, and no one had realised it before".

And so he launched his campaign to introduce sport into France, into schools, everywhere. People had always thought of reviving the Games, whether it was the Danes, the Swedes, the Germans or even someone living in Calera de Tango. But all these initiatives had failed, except one that had begun around 1839 or 1840. They revived the Olympic Games in a little village on the borders of England and Wales: Much Wenlock. This village had been having the Games for 40 years when Coubertin arrived on a visit and, according to his account, he fell completely under its spell. The people had the Olympic Spirit, he writes in his memoirs. This was the way to do it. They were the pioneers. The only thing one had to do now was to take the idea and apply it internationally.

What were the principles that caught Coubertin's attention so strongly?. According to his understanding, the principles were the ones that had motivated Dr. Arnold: the idea of amateurism, of behaving like a gentleman and the idea that winning is not everything but competing is i.e. everything that we now associate with the Olympic tradition. It has nothing to do with Greece: it was an invention of Dr. Arnold and interpreted by Coubertin, who now led a campaign to revive the Olympics.

The first ones were held in Greece, but they were not very popular: participation was tiny and the people who most supported Coubertin As I understand it, the Olympic Games and the modern sport with which we are familiar are a product of our times. They are a re-invention. The expression "Olympic Games" has all the background that Professor Gomez-Lobo explained to us in his conference, but the spirit, the content and the way of proceeding area long away from many of the games played in the Hellenic world, since their basis was either warlike or ritualised. I liked this aspect of the conference, which related to the complex rituals of the Classical Games, very much, because it was important and because it hardly exists in the modern games. They have tried to emphasise the importance of the Olympic torch and that type of thing, but I don't think that that part has really taken off.

In two words: the spirit which moves the Olympics and modern sport can easily be traced back to the social impact of the Industrial Revolution, as well as interpretations and improvements in educational policy, and finally to the decisions adopted, de facto rather than de jure, by Dr. Arnold of Rugby School.