Harvey, Jean, John Horne, Parissa Safai, Simon Darnell, and Sébastien Courchesne-O'Neill.
"Analysing Sport and (Global) Social Movements." *Sport and Social Movements: From the Local
to the Global*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2014. 9–26. *Bloomsbury Collections*. Web. 26 Apr.
2023. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781472544995.ch-001>>.

Downloaded from Bloomsbury Collections, www.bloomsburycollections.com, 26 April 2023,
13:05 UTC.

Copyright © Jean Harvey, John Horne, Parissa Safai, Simon Darnell & Sébastien Courchesne-
O'Neill 2014. You may share this work for non-commercial purposes only, provided you give
attribution to the copyright holder and the publisher, and provide a link to the Creative Commons
licence.

Analysing Sport and (Global) Social Movements

As noted in the introduction, the term ‘social movement’ has been used quite loosely in both academic and popular discourse. In this chapter we discuss how the concept of ‘social movement’ has been understood and debated in academic literature in order to contextualize our use of the term in this book. For us, ‘movement’ implies a change over space and time; a relocation from one place to another and talk of social movements refers to the historical agency of social classes and other social collectivities in the shaping of society. Simply put then for us a social movement combines the idea of change with the notion of a strategy or intentionality and the coming together of dominated or minority social groups in efforts at social transformation (Bennett et al. 2005, pp. 224–5).

Some writers about sport and society, for example, Jarvie with Thornton (2012, pp. 381ff), have suggested that sport itself should be considered as a social movement. From their viewpoint, in its organized form, it has characteristics such as informal interaction networks, shared beliefs and organizational goals that can be found in other social movements. We argue that such a broad and inclusive definition is too imprecise to help understand the differences between movements that have a progressive social agenda and those that do not, which includes several so-called ‘movements’ within sport. As we demonstrate in this book, rather than positioning sport itself as a social movement, it is more accurate to state that sport has often had a connection to social movements and social movements have influenced sport. For example, in Chapter 3 we show how various forms of the women’s rights movement and of feminism have influenced the development of a global women’s sport movement. It is not analytically helpful therefore to simply conclude that sport itself can be described as a social movement.

With this in mind, the remainder of the chapter consists of two main sections. First, we explore definitions of the concept of social movements through an examination of two major theoretical traditions in the study of social movements – the so-called school of ‘contentious politics’ and ‘the theory of action’ – and attempts by scholars to find a synthesis of them. In so doing, we pay attention to different forms of activism and resistance, or in Charles Tilly’s words, different forms of ‘contentious politics’. We do this in order to identify

the forms of action specific to social movements in contrast to, for example, local ad hoc protests and political pressure groups. Drawing on the work of Touraine and other theorists, we develop a blended theoretical model by which to grasp the developmental trajectories of the different social movements we focus on in this book. This also serves to outline the conceptual underpinning of the book. In the second section we use this theoretical framework to revise a typology, as well as a periodization, of the history of social movements that was first discussed in Harvey et al (2009). This section also discusses the specifics of the contemporary phase of global social movements, including the different political responses to neo-liberal globalization and to more recent forms of 'alter-globalization' (Pleyers 2010).

Competing approaches to the study of social movements

While there are several approaches to the study of social movements in the literature (see Chesters and Welsh 2011) according to Wieviorka (2005), there are broadly two main competing theoretical approaches for understanding social movements in sociology and social theory. These approaches have come to define the field and we have utilized them to underpin the research in this book. While the differences between them have been so profound that the International Sociological Association (ISA) established two separate research committees (RC) on social movements in the 1990s (RC 47 and 48), we will adopt a blended model drawing from each of them to frame the analysis of social movements and sport, since they are not entirely incompatible as they focus on different levels of societal functioning (Wieviorka 2005).

ISA RC 48 has been closely associated with the theoretical approach of social historian Charles Tilly and is often referred to as the 'contentious politics' school that evolved from the theory of the 'mobilization of resources' pioneered by economist Mancur Olson (1965). Wieviorka (2005, p. 1) states that the contentious politics school defines social movements as 'the rational behavior of collective actors attempting to establish themselves at the level of the political system, maintaining this position and extending their influence by mobilizing all sorts of resources including, if necessary, violence'.

Indeed for Tilly and Woods (2009, p. 3), social movements 'are a distinctive form of contentious politics – contentious in the sense that movements involve collective making of claims that, if realized, would conflict with someone else's interests'. Politically speaking, the claims put forward by social movements often involve, in one way or another, governments. Governments (at local, regional, federal or national levels) can be the object of the claims, or the allies, claimants or the monitors of the point of contention (Tilly 2004, p. 3). The process by which social movements are formed is thus, in Tilly's view,

intimately linked with the political apparatus, and its role can be detached or involved, depending on the specific social setting.

Also of importance for Tilly is the need for a deep understanding of the historical setting pertaining to the social movement(s) studied: (1) it explains why social movements have incorporated important features enabling them to be separated from other form of politics; (2) it identifies significant changes in how they operate; and (3) it makes possible the singling out of particular political conditions that made the appearance of social movements possible (Tilly 2004). For Tilly, 'the rise and fall of social movements mark the expansion and contraction of democratic opportunities'. (2004, p. 3). More precisely, in their extensive detailed history of social movements, Tilly and Wood (2009) argue that it is between 1765 and 1830 in England and in the United States that the historical elements crystallized which made possible the emergence of social movements as a distinctive form of contentious politics. For them, the elements that constitute (and define) the distinctive features of social movements are (1) an organized public effort put forward in order to stake a variety of claims on specific, targeted forms of authority (i.e. a campaign); (2) the use of different forms of political action (i.e. performances); (3) and a concerted display of Worthiness, Unity, Numbers and Commitment (WUNC) (Tilly 2004, pp. 3–4). WUNC is, by any standards, the bread and butter of social movements as it involves direct representation on the street coupled with pragmatic factors like headcounts at a demonstration or the chanting of slogans during a march. Tilly argues that it is only by a combination of the three above-mentioned elements that a social movement may arise and have a concrete impact on any given social cause.

The combination of all these factors, together with the importance of a thorough historical investigation of the social setting, defines the broader spectrum of a social movement. Upon revisiting the definition in one of his last books on the subject, Tilly clearly stated that the term 'social movement' was still very much up for debate. However, taking into account his extensive work on the subject, he adopted the following definition:

... a distinctive way of pursuing public politics began to take shape in Western countries during the later eighteenth century, acquired widespread recognition in Western Europe and North America by the early nineteenth century, consolidated into a durable ensemble of elements in the middle of the same century, altered more slowly and incrementally after this point, spread widely through the Western world, and came to be called a social movement. That political complex combined three elements: 1) campaign of collective claims on target authorities; 2) an array of claim-making performances including special-purpose associations, public meetings, media statements, and demonstrations; 3) public representations of the cause's worthiness, unity, numbers, and commitment. I am calling that historically specific complex a social movement. (Tilly 2004, p. 7)

Finally, Tilly's overall research agenda is to develop a detailed historical account of the evolution of the widest possible range of social movements. He suggests that (1) from their beginnings, social movements were interactive campaigns rather than ad hoc events; (2) they combine three kinds of claims: programme, identity and standing; (3) the relative salience of the former varies significantly among and within social movements, as well as over time; (4) democratization helps the formation of social movements; (5) social movements promote people's power; (6) social movements depend on political entrepreneurs; (6) once established, social movements collaborate and get accepted in other settings; (7) social movements evolved in forms and personnel; and (8) social movements can evolve in other social forms (Tilly and Wood 2009, pp. 12–14). In this book we take from Tilly the emphasis on the importance of historical accounts of the evolution of social movements, although our focus is on a much more modest range of movements.

By contrast, the other main approach to the study of social movements found in ISA RC 48 is associated most closely with the French sociologist Alain Touraine and his 'theory of action'. This approach 'sees in a social movement the action of an actor who is dominated and challenges the order by opposing a social adversary in an attempt to appropriate the control of historicity, that is to say the main orientations of community life' (Wieviorka 2005, pp. 1–2). Tourainian analysis is thus more interested in understanding the wider social conditions under which social movements develop than the mechanisms by which they develop. Crossley (2002), for example, suggests that Touraine developed the theory of NSMs at a time when the conventional Marxist approach to social change and social movements was being supplanted. NSMs would be the new 'revolutionary vanguard' once the proletariat had been incorporated into consumer capitalism.

Another major distinction between the two approaches is that for Tilly, reforms within the existing political system have specific, defined goals, whereas for Touraine, the action is aimed at a higher and more abstract social level or what he terms 'historicity'. 'Historicity' refers to the entire mode or structure of social organization at any one time in a social formation. Touraine identifies three specific components of historicity: the system of knowledge (by which society can act and reflect on itself), the system of accumulation and the dominant cultural model (for a detailed exploration of the concept, see Touraine 1977, Chapter 1). While for Tilly action in a social movement can take any direction – from emancipatory, to self-interested or even reactionary – in Touraine's collective action definition, social movements can only take the direction of emancipation towards a better society, a characteristic that suggests an ethical dimension to the conceptualization of social change. Hence for Touraine, counter-emancipatory groups, such as neo-fascists and terrorists, cannot be considered as social movements, but rather constitute 'anti-movements' (Wieviorka 2005). Put differently, while for the contentious politics approach, social movements

may arise from either dominant or dominated actors, in Touraine's definition social movements emerge *only* from and among the efforts of *dominated* social actors. Acknowledging that social classes are no longer the principal collective agents that will bring about fundamental social transformation, for Touraine the search is to understand the single social movement that epitomizes the struggle against historicity at any one period of time. In turn, for Touraine, if social movements become dominant, they can no longer strictly be defined as social movements as they become part of a new hegemonic social order. Indirectly distancing himself from Tilly, Touraine (1988, p. 63) argues that:

Most of all, the empiricist illusion must be clearly rejected: it is impossible to define an object called social movements without first selecting a general mode of analysis of social life on the basis of which a category of acts called social movements can be constituted.

In other words, Touraine defends a much more restrictive definition of what should be understood as a social movement than Tilly. He proposes to call 'collective behaviors' all those '... conflictual actions that can be understood as attempts to defend, to reconstruct, or adapt a sick element of the social system' (Touraine 1988, p. 64). He continues 'when conflictual actions seek to transform the relations of social domination that are applied to the principal cultural resources, they will be called social movements' (p. 64).

While the distinction between these two schools of thought has remained significant and even steadfast, some bridges have been identified. Diani (1992; Diani and Bison 2004), for example, has attempted to find common ground between these two traditions, as well as to identify the forms of collective action specific to social movements. Diani (1992) helpfully defines social movements as 'networks of informal interactions between a plurality of individual groups, or associations, engaged in a political conflict, on a basis of a shared identity' (p. 13). There are several dimensions to Diani's definition that are compatible with our view of social movements in relation to sport. First is the idea of 'networks of interactions' between different types of organizations. We agree that social movements are recognized for possessing a constellation of organizations acting at different levels – sometimes very locally, in a city or even a neighbourhood, and sometimes at an international or global scale. As a result, we consider that there is no single organization that is *the* social movement; organizations, coalitions and initiatives all contribute to the formation, direction and maintenance of a social movement. Second, Diani shares with Touraine the idea of a 'shared identity'. From this perspective, social movements regroup a diversity of collective actions around a specific cause that serves to constitute the identity of the group. In other words our understanding of social movements is that they

can most usefully be seen as a network of groups and organizations that are unified by a shared conception that they *do* form part of a single "movement" with

specific goals, by deliberate attempts on the part of the groups and organizations to ally themselves with one another through joint action, coalitions, umbrella groups and so forth, and by shared beliefs and ideals among the members of the groups and organizations. (Scott 2012, p. 154)

While we embrace Diani's definition and Scott's elaboration of it, we follow Touraine's (1977) recognition that social movements have three interconnected dimensions: (1) they have a collective identity; (2) they have a clear social adversary; and (3) they are the bearers of a new social model that they strive for. Hence in our discussion of social movements and sport in the following chapters, we will discuss the three components that underpin their formation: their identity, their opponent and an alternative conception of social order (or 'totality'). Touraine defined these principles as follows. First, '... the principle of identity is the definition the actor gives of himself. A social movement cannot be organized unless this definition is conscious ... it is conflict that constitutes and organizes the actor'. (Touraine 1977, p. 311). The principle of opposition was defined in the same manner: a movement 'cannot be organized without being able to name its adversary. ... The conflict causes the adversary to appear, as it shapes the consciousness of the actors confronting each other' (Touraine 1977, p. 312). Thirdly, all social movements possess what Touraine (1977) calls a principle of 'totality', the latter being a new 'system of historical action' that the social movement wishes to implement. Hence, as an example, as we shall see in the next chapter, throughout its long history the labour movement has always identified itself as *the* movement of workers; a social movement opposed to capitalism as a social and economic system based on the exploitation of all workers. The movement struggles either for major reforms to capitalism or for its overthrow and replacement by a socialist system. In each of the subsequent chapters we will attempt to demonstrate how these three principles are present in other social movements.

Nonetheless we also embrace criticisms of the social movement literature itself. As noted by a number of key writers in the area (e.g. Ferree and Mueller 2007; Rupp and Taylor 1999; Taylor 1999; Taylor et al. 2001), and in a two-part special issue on gender and social movements in *Gender & Society* (1998; 1999), scholarship on social movements has tended to neglect sex and gender despite the fact that political protest – from inception to mobilization, leadership, strategies, culture, symbols, narratives and ideologies – is profoundly gendered. As part of the cultural turn in social movement theory, and as studies on women's and feminist movements grew among scholars, social movement theory was criticized for 'operating with gender-neutral terms, for assuming the men as the normative political actor and for conspicuously failing to examine the role of women in political protest' (Yulia 2010, p. 629). Feminist scholarship on the state, discourse and identity (in particular, looking at the ways identity is intersected by sex, gender, race, ethnicity and class) challenged existing conceptualizations of all social movements, not just those that pertained to or

involved women. For example, researchers began paying more careful attention to the division of labour within mixed-sex movements – the ways in which women tend to be allocated auxiliary roles (e.g. secretarial roles) aside male leadership and/or are excluded from leadership positions altogether in spite of the fact that, in some cases, women initiate the movement and constitute the clear majority during the movement's infancy (see Fonow 1998).

Scholars studying women and social movements emphasize the need for multi-level analytical frameworks that take into account the structural, cultural and interactional dimensions of mobilization and protest. Such frameworks emphasize the interaction of broader sociocultural conditions, referred to as the 'opportunity structures', within which social movements grow or die, the characteristics and processes of mobilization (e.g. the social movement organizations, collective identity), as well as the meaning-making, often referred to as interpretative framing, that underpins social movements and social movement organizations (Pelak et al. 1999; Taylor et al. 2001). For example, it should be unsurprising that social movements draw on gender framing, such as images of femininity and masculinity, to mobilize, legitimize and inspire collective action. Emotionality (often ascribed to the feminine) is often understudied and undervalued in social movement theory. Without positing women as any more emotional than men, studies of women's movements have challenged the idea that emotions interfere with reason. The association of emotion to femininity (and, in turn, rationality to masculinity) and view of emotion as subversive to knowledge has often served as a discursive source for the delegitimization of women as political actors and, consequently, of women's movements such that some female activists often intentionally frame their political messages in less emotional, more rational terms (Einwohner et al. 2000; Taylor 1999; Taylor and Whittier 1996).

A significant contribution put forward by scholars studying the impact of gender on opportunity structures has been in highlighting women's tendency to mobilize in grassroots settings either as a function of being more linked to the domestic sphere than men or by being more often marginalized from formal political settings dominated by men (Yulia 2010). The open or closed nature of political systems around the world, the presence or absence of allies for protest groups, or even the state's capacity or inclination for repression impact women's ability to challenge inequity (Antrobus 2004). The act of social or political protest by women in Canada or the United Kingdom, for example, carries different risks and consequences when compared with such protest by women in some regions of the world where state oppression of dissenting opinions and voices, broadly, and of women's rights, specifically, is more overt, omnipresent and dangerous. Some social movement theorists, however, point out the irony that in some cases, 'the political opportunity for mobilizing women may be distinctively advantageous, as in Chile . . . where women's domestic networks offered them greater protection and moral leverage in challenging dictatorships

in power than did men's' (Ferree and Mueller 2007, p. 579; see also Yulia 2010). Basu (1995, p. 2) adds that '... a much more important influence on women's movements than the level of [socio-economic] development is the extent of state control'. Women's movements tend to be weak where state control permeates civil society and strong where state control has been relaxed. Bringing gender squarely into the analysis of social protest leads us to ask whether the forms of organization that characterize women's protest groups may, in fact, be more diffuse and local? With regard to sport, some contend that the exclusion of women from meaningful leadership positions in high-performance sport leaves women no choice but to mobilize and participate at the grassroots/community level (Hargreaves 2001; Hayhurst 2011). In terms of the so-called 'women and sport movement', as will be discussed in Chapter 3, the most organized and politically visible organizations dedicated to advancing women's sport have tended to originate within and among nations where the political opportunity structures are more amenable to women's rights and advocacy work.

Having briefly discussed the main theoretical perspectives, and considered the cultural and gender turn, in social movements studies, we now focus our attention on identifying the main types of social movements historically.

From old to global social movements and alter-globalization

Individually, social movements can be seen to go through a series of phases in their development – formation and problem identification, activism in search of solutions and dealing with the aftermath of new policies and practices that emerge as a result (Blumer 1971). However, irrespective of their singular history, social movements evolved within larger historical contexts and therefore take different forms accordingly.

Table 1.1, 'A Periodization of Social Movements', outlines significant shifts in the evolution of social movements according to the development phases of modernity. The table is partly derived from Raymond Williams' (1977) identification of different hegemonic phases in the development of cultural forms (see also Gruneau 1983) and also Wiewiorka's (2005) analysis of social movements. In each phase in history, dominant, residual and emergent cultural practices have been present and active. That is, for each major shift in the social development (in Touraine's language, 'historicity') of capitalism, dominant, residual and emerging forms of social movement have existed. Accordingly, and as summarized in the table, it is possible to identify three major phases in the evolution of social movements.

The first period, from the mid-nineteenth century to the late 1960s, was marked by the emergence and prominence of the workers' or labour movement. Although Tilly points to the existence of several workers movements before

Table 1.1 A periodization of social movements

Historicity	Period	Forms		
		Dominant	Residual	Emergent
Industrial	Nineteenth century to 1960s	Workers	Suffrage (e.g. First wave feminism)	Peace
Post-industrial	1960s–late 1990s	New social movements (NSMs) (e.g. Women's; Civil rights)	Workers	Human rights
Global	Mid-1990s–to date	Global	NSMs	Environmental

Source: Adapted from Harvey et al. 2009.

then (Tilly and Woods 2009), arguably, the birth of that phase can be traced to the formation of the First International Meeting of the International Working Men's Association in London in 1864, the Second International from 1889 to 1914, and its continued dominance well into the twentieth century. While it can be argued that it is no longer as central to social and political life as it once was, the labour movement (and its influence on sport) is still apparent and influential today (as will be discussed in the next chapter). It is also important to recognize that it was during this same time period that the first phase of struggles for civil rights emerged. For example, we see the emergence of struggles for women's rights in different countries that coalesced in 1888 with the founding of the International Council of Women. Hence the dominant social movement in this period was the labour movement, while the movements for suffrage, civil and political enfranchisement were either residual (because women obtained the right to vote after men in most nations) or emergent, such as the human rights and peace movements.

Drawing directly from Touraine's work, Wieviorka (2005, p. 4) lists five major characteristics that are at the basis of the labour movement as the dominant form of social movements in industrial society: 'it operates within the framework of the nation-state, it challenges domination, the actions associated with it are genuinely social, it rarely rises to the political level of its own accord, and it is impelled by a subject which is also social'. In other words, despite the fact that early in its development the workers' movement put in place international networks of solidarity, their main level of action was at the nation-state level. Where the movement was challenging the relations of domination stemming from the workplace, a strong local, and sometimes regional, working-class culture often animated it. Finally, the worker's subjectivity 'was defined in social terms on the basis of the relationships of production and domination . . . in

which they have of been deprived of the control of productive activity, or of any control over what is produced' (Wieviorka 2005, p. 4). The subjectivity of the workers was also social in the sense that workers were conscious of belonging to the working class with its culture and organizations.

The second period of social movement activity was primarily initiated by economic transformations after World War II that eventually led to the prominence of 'new social movements' at the end of the 1960s and beginning of the 1970s as the Western world entered into a new phase of historicity, labelled by Touraine as the post-industrial (or programmed/technocratic) society. NSMs were concerned with a wide range of issues, from civil rights, to feminism, human rights and ecology. Camilleri (1990, p. 35) suggests that NSMs 'articulate [d] new ways of experiencing life, a new attitude to time and space, a new sense of history and identity. Indeed, it may not be far-fetched to suggest that they [were] in the process of redefining the meaning and boundaries of civil society'. These NSMs should be recognized as different from the previous phase of social movements in so far as they did not hold economic concerns as their central focus nor did they advocate, as their main goal, the radical change of society through radical measures or proletarian revolution. In this sense, and drawing on the work of Touraine, Melucci and Habermas, Crossley (2002, p. 151) concluded that the recognition of NSMs was related to 'the shift in the modes of historicity in western societies and the corresponding shift in the central struggles of those societies. It is the mode of historicity and its fault lines which lends NSMs their "newness"'. In other words, NSMs aimed at changing society not only in economic terms, but also in various social, cultural, identity and political ways.

Returning to Touraine and Wieviorka (2005), the characteristics of NSMs were significantly different than in the previous stage although not entirely so. Like the labour movement, NSMs continued to define themselves in the context of the nation-state, although some of their attributes started to show global reach. For example, the ecology movement was concerned with the fate of the whole planet. Contrary to the workers' movement, the social adversary of the NSMs was less easily identifiable (i.e. technocratic structures in general). However, these movements had a high degree of cultural awareness, as they 'had no qualm about challenging the cultural orientation of the societies in which they lived' (Wieviorka 2005, p. 6). Proclaiming that everything is political, their aim was to eliminate various forms of institutionalized forms of power relations such as unequal gender relations. Finally, NSMs were mainly interested in the subjectivity of actors. Contrary to the labour movement, NSM mostly invested their energies in cultural rather than social issues. Also, compared with the labour movement, they were not proposing a whole new model of society. Their claims remained specific to their singular identities. Some critics have argued that NSMs failed to produce a significant impact on the historicity of the time as the 1980s witnessed an increase in individualism (Wieviorka 2005).

Following the fall of the Berlin wall and the end of the Cold War, the 1990s marked what we consider, along with several authors (e.g. Wieviorka 2005; McDonald 2006) to be a third period of global social movements, connected to specific responses and resistance to the hegemonic nature and aspects of contemporary globalization. Adapting Crossley's (2002) logic of argumentation and modifying his account of current 'historicity', we argue that a response to the application of the 'Washington Consensus' and the spread of neo-liberal globalization has led to the emergence of *global social movements* (GSM). These in turn have coalesced into what some call the 'movement of movements' or alter-globalization (de Jong et al. 2005; McDonald 2006; Pleyers 2012). The expression 'Washington consensus' originates from a 1989 document by economist John Williamson listing ten recommendations for developing countries facing debt problems. The World Bank (WB) and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) decided that loans to these countries would be subject to conditions such as budget discipline, fiscal reform, financial liberalization, privatization of public corporations, deregulation of markets and the elimination of barriers to foreign investments (Beaudet et al. 2010).

In our terms, global social movements differ from the NSMs discussed above in three ways: (1) they represent a shift in scale from the state level to multiple levels, including the global; (2) they are characterized by new forms of social interactions, often devoid of hierarchical structure, that regularly embrace alternative forms of affective and embodied organization and practice (Pleyers 2010); and (3) they take up a specific principle of 'totality' (Touraine 1977) aimed at no less than developing more humane forms of globalization and humanity (although as we shall see later that identity is loosely defined). Referring back again to Wieviorka (2005), GSMs present a shift in scale from previous movement stages as their struggles no longer are limited to the framework of the nation-state. They confront international spheres of negotiations, worldwide economic regulation and justice, as well as the governance of transnational institutions. This shift in scale results from a recognition that under neo-liberal globalization the nation state has lost some of its sovereignty over transnational institutions, like the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the IMF, for example. While many of the protest are fought at the local level, they are nevertheless global also in the consciousness of actors thinking globally and acting locally. Finally, while GSMs do exist by themselves, they coalesce in alter-globalization.

According to Johnston and Laxer (2003), the seeds of alter-globalization are to be found in the resistance that emerged against the North American Free Trade Agreement (e.g. by groups like the Zapatistas in Chiapas, Mexico), the successful campaigns against the Multilateral Agreement on Investment (MAI), and the infamous Seattle demonstrations against the WTO in 1999. However, it is important to remember that the crowds that converged on Seattle were composed of various individuals and organizations – from religious groups to anarchists – with different, sometimes opposing, views of society. Notably,

the Seattle activists in 1999 included two Brazilians who eventually visited the office of the journal *Le monde diplomatique* in 2000. Out of the discussions with journal staff emerged the idea of organizing a World Social Forum (WSF) as a counter forum to the World Economic Forum (WEF) organized each year in Davos, Switzerland, during which heads of state and of multinational corporations meet to discuss economic and social policy. As a result, in 2001, the first WSF was held in Porto Allegre with the goal not to reject globalization outright, but to discuss and promote the idea that another form of globalization was possible (Mertes 2003).

With 20,000 participants, the first WSF forum was successful in attracting participants and was followed by several follow-up forums, even better attended. WSF are still today organized on a regular basis. The recognition of the WSF eventually led to the organization of numerous regional forums across the globe and, in January 2008, a global call for action. As its point of departure, the WSF (and the regional social organizations that operate more locally and which feed into and out of the WSF network) champions 'the new global social movements of the oppressed that include indigenous peoples, peasants, sexual minorities and women as well as working classes' (Scholte 2005, p. 45). The organization and direction of the WSF has not gone without criticism – ranging from accusations of its vague idealism devoid of real-world application, its incorporation of popular grassroots movements and its ineffective decision-making structure – seen by some as too centralized while, ironically, seen by others as too diffuse (Curran 2007). Still, to date, the WSF remains one of the few established worldwide entities explicitly committed to struggle and resistance against social exclusion as fostered under neo-liberal globalization and stands as an important illustration of the alter-globalization ethos (Grzybowski 2006; de Sousa Santos 2006; see also Pleyers 2010).

Clearly then, the concept of alter-globalization is important for understanding global social movements. Often now described as the 'movement of movements' (Grzybowski 2006; Mertes 2003), alter-globalization is characterized as a multifaceted form of resistance to neo-liberal globalization active at the local and the global levels in advocating for more humane globalization. Most important is that where proponents of anti-globalization tend to resist any and all forms of globalization, alter-globalization refers to a large spectrum of global social movements that support new and reformed modes of globalization based upon values of democracy, justice, environmental protection and human rights.

The championing of alter-globalization connects with global social movements since a key feature of the concept of alter-globalization is the principle that alternatives to neo-liberal globalization do exist and that 'another world is possible': 'a fairer world, with greater solidarity and greater respect for differences'. (Pleyers 2010, p. 5). Importantly, alter-globalization can have both reformist and transformist tendencies; the 'alternative' ethic

of alter-globalization can either support current forms of globalization in a reformed manner or the replacement of current globalization by an alternative one. Hence, a distinctive feature of alter-globalization is its diversity.

Alter-globalization can be understood to be concerned with the question of what to do about current hegemonic neo-liberal globalization. The position taken in response to this question is what separates alter-globalization advocates from other political and social actors. While 'neo-liberals' tend to accept globalization as a means of expanding market exchange and promoting capitalist relations of production, 'rejectionists', who might also be considered to support anti-globalization, tend to look to local, or rather national, responses to it. Only 'reformists' and 'transformists', among whom the global social movements we consider here take their place, can be understood as proposing alter-globalization itself as a response. Drawing from Held and McGrew (2007) and Scholte (2005), we define 'reformist' as the position of actors who assert that globalization can be reshaped to encourage economic efficiency, stability equity and ecological sustainability.

'Transformists' are actors guided by the principle that a more global world is an opportunity for large-scale, wide-reaching social change in order to build a fundamentally different global society. These two responses focus either on harnessing the force of globalization for carrying out institutional reforms within a mixed economy via public policy initiatives or on utilizing globalization as a means of stimulating social change, fighting for human security and protection of the environment, as well as for a wide range of human rights. Indeed, while this book focuses more specifically on the development of global movements rather than on alter-globalization itself, developing a better understanding of reformist and transformist types of alter-globalization responses as they connect to sport is also one of our main interests in this book.

For Pleyers (2010), alter-globalization is a movement concerned with the struggle for alternate and progressive forms of globalization. Alter-globalization is recognizable in the ways that it believes in, and proposes, legitimate alternatives to current forms of economic and corporate-led globalization. According to Pleyers (2010), in this way, alter-globalization is underpinned by diverse stakeholders and participants who propose, celebrate and attempt to strengthen a 'global consciousness'. Here lies the unity of GSM and alter-globalization as there is neither a central organizational structure nor any form of hierarchy among the components of the movement as their relationships are network-like and fluid, constantly evolving as events are organized. It is not uncommon that protest events regroup under various coalitions of actors from different horizons, such as was the case with resistance against the Vancouver Winter Olympics (Boykoff 2011).

Pleyers (2010) situates the alter-globalization movement as the (often difficult) convergence between two forms of contemporary political action – subjectivity and reason – creating different organizations and objectives for

social change and the potential for structural tensions to underpin alter-globalization. In the subjectivity and creativity approach, the aim of alter-globalization activists is to experiment with different forms of social and political existence and 'feel' these alternatives in daily life. Such objectives do not stand in linear relation to activism – neither do they preclude action – but are co-constitutive with it. From this perspective, alter-globalization activity aims to 'unlearn' the experiences and citizenship of neo-liberal globalization and to assert new autonomies of subjectivity.

In the second form of alter-globalization, based on reason and expertise, activists seek to propose alternative forms of social and political organizing that are more egalitarian, environmentally responsible and ethical towards fellow (global) citizens. As opposed to experience and feeling, the terms of debate in this form of activism are, for example, the ever-widening income gap between rich and poor or the numbers of people across the world forced to live without regular food, water, shelter or health care. Exposing the limited success of neo-liberalism in bringing prosperity to the world, and proposing alternative approaches to and policies for economics and politics becomes the focus of this form of alter-globalization.

Alter-globalization movements are thus recognizable by the ways in which they seek to exploit the possibilities of globalization while recognizing the challenges this entails. According to Scholte (2005), the possibilities include technological and organizational developments; greater public awareness of global problems; larger transnational solidarities among people; and an increased receptiveness among political and economic elites to refer to policies on globalization. Moreover, we argue that alter-globalization movements rely on a consciousness that each and every human being is part of a single world, a world that has been fragmented by a neo-liberalism that exacerbates individualism and, as a result, is in need of a re-articulation of the social, the political and the economic through new, more legitimate and democratic forms of global governance. The challenges that remain are not inconsiderable: the continuing force of neo-liberal economic ideology at key levels of government; the power of large capital; attachment to the idea of state sovereignty; and the underdeveloped institutional capacities of alternatives. Another major problem remains the lack of a strong and distinctive alternative economic strategy to free trade and foreign direct investment.

Still, alternatives are regularly put forth by social movement actors and by scholars. Literature on globalization and alter-globalization covers developments around such issues as democracy from below (Dallmayr 1999), global civil society (Germain and Kenny 2005; Holton 2005), cosmopolitanism (Beck and Sznaider 2006), global governance (Held 2007) and global citizenship (Cabrera 2011). Of note is Appadurai's (2006) discussion of 'grassroots globalization'. In the midst of the development of an 'international civil society', which exists in the shape of networks of activists, civil society institutions, transnational

organizations and popular social movements converge to form transnational NGOs. Appadurai refers to Keck and Sikkink (1998) and their idea of transnational activist networks involved in (1) new forms of international bargaining; (2) global social movements; and (3) the creation of a 'third space', outside the market and the state. Appadurai suggests that there are thus two types of transnational activity: (1) visible street protests and (2) less publicized advocacy and coordination in pursuit of policy change at local, national and global levels. This second form of transnational activism attempts both to slow down neo-liberal processes – force greater transparency, put pressure on states and circulate information more rapidly in order to mobilize protest, for example – and to form partnerships – 'the David and Goliath leverage through which such networks have become effective' (Appadurai 2006, p. 133). This activity can foster the creation of 'deep democracy' (Appadurai 2006, p. 134) by moving away from agitation-based politics and towards an emphasis on the capacity building of poor and disadvantaged people through the setting of goals, the development of expertise, the sharing of knowledge and the generation of commitment. This new transnational activism builds solidarity not from the declaration of broad universal principles alone (as in socialism) but 'from smaller convergences of interest . . . in a more ad hoc, inductive, and context-sensitive manner' (Appadurai 2006, p. 136). In this way, 'global networking is put at the service of local imaginings of power' (Appadurai 2006, p. 136) creating 'utopian cellularities' of 'new transnational organizational forms' (Appadurai 2006, p. 137).

For our purposes, this theorizing suggests that we could place examples of alter-globalization movements into at least two camps – 'visible' and 'less visible'. In relation to sport, some sport initiatives may reside more in the less visible, inductive and ad hoc, while others may be linked with more visible transnational organization (e.g. UNESCO). To make better sense of this, though, requires a scholarly commitment to understanding the complex, and sometimes contradictory, relationships between sport and social movements. In the next section, therefore, we turn our attention to the need to understand the place of sport in relation to global social movements and struggles for alter-globalization.

The importance of studying sport and social movements within alter-globalization

As noted in the Introduction, since the late 1990s, the intersections of sport, identities and cultures, at both the local and global level, as well as local reactions to hegemonic global forces in sport, have been well documented. In recognizing the importance and salience of these phenomena and, indeed,

arguing for more comprehensive conceptualizations of global-local resistance, Harvey and Houle (1994) argued that research on sport and globalization should pay close attention to NSMs and their potential impact on sport. Harvey and Houle (1994, p. 344) highlighted how these movements go beyond traditional categories of nation, state and class:

The emergence of such new political identities, transcending the self and national space, is not only the product of globalization but also a contribution to the global reconfiguration of space. . . . This means . . . that we must adapt our conceptions of the relationships between the nation-state and civil society, and between political authority and political community.

To our knowledge, besides Jarvie's (2003) passing reference to the existence of an anti-globalization movement, only three contributions (from Wilson) have so far answered this call for studying sport and global social movements. Wilson (2002) provided a foundational study of the 'anti-jock' movement and its organization and dissemination through the internet. Of particular relevance was his positioning of online communication as a forum for community building, information sharing and a portal for interventionist/activist practices by sport scholars. Wilson (2007, p. 472) called for more nuanced and theoretically informed analyses of the internet as a communication tool and conduit for 'the potentially changing nature of local responses to global forces' within the sociocultural study of sport. Most recently Wilson (2012, Chapter 5 especially) has explored the role of social movements and activists more generally and it is worth briefly considering his contribution.

Wilson suggests that there is a range of activist responses to social injustice within sport, as well as activism conducted by sports people themselves. These forms of political activism are heterogeneous, ranging from formal organizations (like feminist advocates for women in sport) to more loosely formed cultural groups that nonetheless seek change in and through sport. He draws attention to three ways in which social movements in sport might be identified in sociological terms. The first is through subcultures, groups that identify and organize around a particular cultural (or sporting) practice and use this group formation as a platform for collective action. The second is 'alter-globalization' or the movement of movements. The third, according to Wilson, is the notion of life or lifestyle politics, as understood through the work of Giddens (1991). In opposition to the transformist and reformist ethos of alter-globalization, lifestyle politics are more concerned with lifestyle and consumer choices that construct and reflect a political perspective. The choice to purchase sporting apparel that is not made using sweatshop labour would fit into this category of sport-related political activism.

In his analysis of the topic of social movements and sport, Wilson gives significant attention to the question of evaluation and success. How might analysts and researchers conclude that a social movement (in sport) has been

successful in effecting social change? Drawing on Davis-Delano and Crosset (2008), he suggests that the mobilization of resources, the leveraging of existing political opportunities and the establishment of frames of collective action are important criteria by which to assess social movements and political action in sport. Importantly, though, Wilson suggests that much more research is possible, and needed, in this area in order that scholars have a detailed and nuanced understanding of the efforts, successes and even failures of sport-related social movements. In his words (Wilson 2012, p. 98):

With the exception of Davis-Delano and Crosset (2008), little attention has been paid to . . . sport-related activism, or to the theories that help explain the success of social movements in particular contexts. In light of the attention that is consistently paid to protests around hosting the Olympics in particular . . . it would seem that this area deserves more attention.

In sum, Wilson argues for the importance of recognizing that all social movements (sport-related or otherwise) are not successful, nor do they all approach the issue of social change in a uniform manner. Indeed, it is possible to identify forms of 'ironic activism' in sport (Wilson and Hayhurst 2009) in which sport-focused social movements, through the negotiation of hegemonic power formations, may actually serve to re-inscribe neo-liberalism and the very social injustices they seek to challenge.

We agree with Wilson that it is necessary to investigate (global) social movements in more detail in order to better understand the contemporary global sport order. At the start of the twenty-first century, this order continues to be one based on fully commodified sport, that is a form where sport is prominently an exchange value, monopolized by multinational corporations of the manufacturing and professional sectors of the sport industrial cluster and governed by supra-national authorities, like the IOC and the largest international federations' globocracy (Nelson 2002). To some extent, this global sport world order constitutes the sport branch of the current supranational 'Empire' described by Hardt and Negri (2002). And yet, as we have noted, since the 1990s, contestation and resistance to globalization has expanded to form a vast, loosely connected, international network of resistant groups that have coalesced around the notion of alter-globalization. We aim to demonstrate the way that these developments relate to sport, athletes and sports organizations.

In this chapter, we have discussed the concept of social movements and proposed a periodization of their evolution, from the labour movement, to NSMs and global movements. We have also discussed alter-globalization and the two types of responses to globalization that it carries. Hence, we have outlined the theoretical framework that underpins the following empirical chapters, which present a selection of case studies of social movements in relation to sport. While subsequent chapters focus on the history of these

movements as they interact with sport, making a particular emphasis on their last phase as global social movements, less attention is paid to their relationship with alter-globalization. Nonetheless, this chapter has attempted to situate global social movements within the development of alter-globalization since this is the historical trajectory that global social movements have been taking. It is possible that alter-globalization will grow in importance as various forms of contentious politics take shape in sport in the future.