

## *Sport History and the History of Sport in North America*

**Mark Dyreson**

The terms “sport history” and “history of sport” are often used interchangeably to describe analyses of the historical dimensions of particular human practices. However, in my humble estimation, they reveal two different foci and two different pasts. They also share a co-mingled present and an uncertain future. As president of the North American Society for Sport History, an organization with a name that reveals a connection to one of the pasts but, in my experience, embraces the “history of sport” as well as “sport history,” I have come to the conclusion that the distinctions between the two are not merely semantic and that understanding the peculiarities of each are critical to grasping the present conditions of the field and charting paths to robust futures.<sup>1</sup>

As a historian, I am condemned to begin my prospectus on the present and my prophecies regarding the future where historians always begin—in the past. The chronicles of sport history and the history of sport reveal two very different lineages. Turning first to the history of sport, academic interest in the subject can be dated to the 1917 publication by Frederic L. Paxson of an article entitled “The Rise of Sport” in what was then the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, now re-christened as the *Journal of American History*. Paxson was a distinguished disciple of the leading theorist of *fin-de-siecle* American history, the frontier-thesis spouting Frederick Jackson Turner who codified the idea of American exceptionalism for U.S. academics. Turner made the frontier into the prime mover of every important U.S. social institution and, bewilderingly, at the very same moment pronounced the American frontier as extinct. Turner’s students made careers out of announcing that they had discovered “new frontiers” to reanimate American civilization. Paxson famously discovered in sport a new frontier to keep America “young,” conveniently ignoring that modern sport had been born in “old” Europe. Paxson’s parochial grasp of world, or at least Western, history

aside, he does deserve recognition for identifying sport as a major agent of American social change. Paxson credited sport with sparking the era of progressive reform in government and business, with making Americans more temperate in their consumption of alcohol, more committed to the quest for “equal rights for all,” and even with the “real emancipation” of women. Sport, Paxson, grandly concluded, would “inspire a new Americanism for a new century.”<sup>2</sup>

Setting aside, for the moment, the credibility of Paxson’s extravagant claims for sport as a progressive agent of social change, Paxson is the first professional American historian to make the study of sport essential to the understanding of American history. He proclaimed that “no one can probe national character, personal conduct, public opinion” nor any other important dimension of contemporary American civilization without taking into account the “rise of sport.”<sup>3</sup>

Academic historians promptly ignored Paxson’s clarion call for the study of sport for the next sixty years.<sup>4</sup> Not until the 1970s did scholars in history or related departments such as American studies produce explorations of sport in substantial numbers. When they did, they harkened back to Paxson’s grand claims of the power of sport in reforming American life as they explained to their colleagues in the plaintive apologia introducing their sporting tomes why they were studying matters most members of their profession dismissed as trivial and career-killing topics. From the “founders” of the new American sport history such as Jules Tygiel, Randy Roberts, Steven Riess, Melvin Adelman, Richard Crepeau, Benjamin Rader, Allen Guttman, and Elliott Gorn in the 1970s and the 1980s, to their intellectual progeny who sprouted in the last decade of the twentieth century and the early years of the twenty-first century (myself, unfortunately, included) sermons decrying the neglect of sport and thundering its far-reaching significance, tempered by mournful pleas not to banish historians of sport from the temple of academic history, were required introductions to the burgeoning numbers of volumes produced.<sup>5</sup> In those same years many of us in the history of sport discovered the

North American Society for Sport History (NASSH) and the *Journal of Sport History*, a new venture launched in 1972 not by those trained in academic departments of history but in altogether different fields.<sup>6</sup>

Academic sport history predates the history of sport. More than thirty years before Frederic Paxson discovered sport in American history, one of the founders of the academic field of physical education, Edward M. Hartwell, published a pioneering historical volume entitled *Physical Education in American Colleges and Universities* (1886).<sup>7</sup> Hartwell held an M.D. and a Ph.D. in physiology. He developed a seminal program in the study of human movement at Johns Hopkins University and later supervised physical education for the Boston public school system.<sup>8</sup> In 1885, a year before he published his original history of physical education in the U.S., he helped to found the American Association for the Advancement of Physical Education (AAAPE).<sup>9</sup> The physical educators organized just a year after the founding of the American Historical Association (AHA).<sup>10</sup> The two professional clans sprang to life in the great age of rationalizing, bureaucratizing, and nationalizing “knowledge work” in American culture. The AAPE and the AHA sought, with their fellow guilds, to control their domains, win the favor of governments and the public, and convince the nation that they could foster progress and increase the general welfare.<sup>11</sup>

Hartwell, a sport, or more accurately, a physical education historian, understood how this new game worked. Hartwell’s history had a concrete and clear political purpose. He used his histories to promote his field and garner public and governmental support. He employed the history of American fitness to proclaim that the nation had neglected the scientific study and rational education of the body. That negligence, he warned, put the republic in peril.<sup>12</sup> His essays identified the failure to build institutions to train American bodies as a long-standing social problem. He wrote his histories to win public support for physical education, to carve out a place in school curriculums for the field, and to win government support for training the body. In the social construction of

the new knowledge domain of physical education, Hartwell and his followers used history to justify the need for a “scientific” approach to the problems of building a fitter, healthier nation.<sup>13</sup>

Hartwell’s histories reveal much about the social construction of knowledge in the new science of human movement. These physical education and sport histories championed the importance of physical vigor in human societies. These histories claimed places for physical education in school and college curriculums. These histories urged public support of physical education programs. By connecting physical education and sport to the histories of other “model” societies, especially to ancient Greece, these annals conferred legitimacy on modern practices.<sup>14</sup> Borrowing voraciously, if not always accurately, from Greek antiquity, physical educators have invariably linked physical fitness to social and moral wellness.<sup>15</sup> In this effort, dubbed in the 1920s as the “new physical education,” history has always played a prominent role.<sup>16</sup>

Sport and physical education histories also served as a basic component in the training of teachers—a common practice in American pedagogy-training programs. The histories generated by physical educators detailed the origins and development of the basic canon, the fundamental research methods and problems, and the reigning paradigms in the new field.<sup>17</sup> Institutional histories of early physical education, sport, and recreation programs also served to foster a sense of pride and place for students of the new discipline.<sup>18</sup>

This brief chronology of the origins of sport history and the history of sport reveals that while professional historians long-neglected the study of sport, scholars in physical education built a foundation for the field. The emergence of the NASSH grew on that foundation. Created in 1972 by sport historians from physical education programs, or as they were increasingly reconfigured in that era, exercise science or kinesiology departments, the NASSH has provided a haven for scholars studying sport and history for the past thirty-five years.<sup>19</sup> In its first year NASSH captured 163

individual and 8 institutional, in the form of libraries, historical societies, and other such entities, members. At its individual high point in 1997 NASSH had 418 individual members. The institutional high point was 1993 when 496 organizations joined. In the most recent data set for membership (2006), NASSH had 377 individual members and 452 institutional members. NASSH is currently in a very healthy position as a scholarly society. Annual conferences have drawn approximately 150 presenters for the last decade and the society enjoys a sound financial foundation.<sup>20</sup> The *Journal of Sport History*, NASSH's main public organ, has run behind schedule for the last few years but is (we hope!) on the road to catching up in the very near future.

NASSH quickly became a meeting ground for people from a variety of backgrounds and disciplines. The organization founded by sport historians opened its arms to historians of sport. NASSH developed into a rare society that unites, at least temporarily in once-a-year professor-fests, faculty from physical education and kinesiology programs with scholars from traditional history departments. Interested researchers from other domains such as American studies, sociology, anthropology, philosophy, and even the curious new realm of "sport studies," also find commonwealth at NASSH.

If NASSH membership numbers are a bit down from the historic highs of the 1990s, the first decade of the twenty-first century has witnessed a period of solid production from the scholars who comprise NASSH. It remains a robust inter-and cross-disciplinary clubhouse.<sup>21</sup> The climate for research has never been more favorable. A strong group of North American scholars produces books and articles on a great variety of topics. Many North American presses have started "sport and society" lists grounded in historical approaches. The number of journals devoted to sport history and to the history of sport have multiplied while more general historical journals routinely publish sport-related articles. A great variety of thematic and theoretical approaches appear in

current publications. Sport history and history of sport courses litter American and Canadian universities.<sup>22</sup>

Still, just below the surface of this beneficent environment lurk some troubling signs. History departments have not yet begun to hire faculty for “history of sport” positions, nor does it appear that they are moving in that direction. Kinesiology, exercise science, and physical education departments have for a variety of reasons not been as friendly in the last decade to those who investigate the history of sport and related social and cultural approaches to the study of human movement.<sup>23</sup>

NASSH itself reflects some of the schisms that such diverse home academic locations inflict on a field of scholarly endeavor. On one level, some of U.S. and Canadian sport history and history of sport remains parochial and disconnected from the sport histories and histories of sport of other nations and cultures. A prime example of this neglect is the fact that while the North American Society of Sport History draws an impressive array of scholars from Canada, the U.S., and the rest of the world to its membership, not a single scholar from Mexico, one of the three nations that inhabits North America, is currently on the rolls. NASSH has never had a conference in Mexico, the *Journal of Sport History* has never published an article in Spanish, while Mexican sport history and history of sport remain neglected topics.<sup>24</sup>

The schisms run deeper than a neglect of one on North America’s three nations. Sport history and the history of sport represent, at a fundamental level, distinct domains. NASSH has been a mostly happy club for both groups, a strange anomaly given that in the larger academic universe historians belong to a hidebound fraternity clustered among the classic fields of liberal arts, the very folk who have traditionally dismissed physical education, even in its current reincarnation as kinesiology, as a trivial and un- or even anti-intellectual pursuit. We gather and gab in relative harmony at NASSH but rarely interact across disciplinary lines when we return to our respective campuses.

At the risk of making a “post-modern turn,” a bit of autobiography might illuminate my peculiar sensitivity to my distinction between sport history and the history of sport. I took my graduate training in the history department at the University of Arizona from 1981 to 1989. I conceived of myself, and my mentors conceived of me, as a young scholar with a modicum of potential in the fields of modern U.S. intellectual, cultural, and social history, who, depending on their limits of their embrace of “diversity,” had a strange, indeed, for some a fatal fascination with sport—deadly at least to my career prospects if not my corporeal existence. They, and I, understood my focus as the history of sport, an endeavor some thought trivial or misguided, but still, in their minds and my own, committed to exploring the grand intersections between sport and history. My goal was to illuminate broader historical dimensions of the human experience and not to learn more about sport—although a few of my mentors actually accepted the latter as a necessary evil for my courageous, if addled, commitment to launch myself into what they perceived as a very new subdiscipline sprouting in the historical fields over which they zealously stood guard. A few of them had heard of, though never actually read, the early explorers of this new world of the history of sport. They occasionally dropped the names of Allen Guttman, Jules Tygiel, Randy Roberts, Elliott Gorn, Steven Riess, Bill Baker, or Richard Creapeau, in their efforts show interest in my project.

In 1988, near the end of my graduate career, I came across the *Journal of Sport History* in the University of Arizona library and learned of the NASSH graduate student essay contest. I cobbled together an essay from pieces of a few dissertation chapters and sent off an entry. I did not win but did garner the notice of one of the judges who shepherded my essay into the first publication of my young career. Too timid, and too traumatized by my brief encounters with the profession at the mega-conferences of the American Historical Association and the Organization of American Historians, I failed to drive the one-hundred miles of interstate highway from Tucson to Phoenix, Arizona, to

attend the 1988 NASSH conference. The next year, I finished my dissertation and dashed off another essay to the NASSH graduate student contest. Somehow, I won the competition, which included a trip to the NASSH conference to present the essay. In the process I discovered a new scholarly world. That world orbited the intersection between the history of sport and sport history.

For the next decade I wandered betwixt the two worlds. I initially taught in history departments but eventually earned a position as a sport historian in a kinesiology department and became merely an affiliate member of a history department. Since that kinesiology department has a powerful international reputation, and because I somehow was elected the president of NASSH, I found myself strangely appointed to key positions in organizing the discipline of kinesiology. Thus I sit as an original member of the board of governors of the nascent American Kinesiology Association<sup>25</sup>, regarded not as a historian who studies sport but as a sport historian among the sport psychologists, sport sociologists, sport philosophers, sport managers/administrators/marketers, physical educators, athletic trainers, and myriad varieties of sport scientists (exercise physiologists, biomechanists, motor controllers/behaviorists, etc.) that comprise the polyglot little universities within universities that are currently springing up as kinesiology departments in so many institutions of higher education in North America and around the world. At my home university I find myself at the center of a new sport studies consortium that seeks to redistribute the innumerable varieties of kinesiologists into a strange new variant by sprinkling the scholars interested in sport into departments spread all over the campus rather than into one academic unit. With the various schisms comes a special richness. Having so many disciplines interested in sport chums the academic waters.

My abnormal career path has forced me to become a kinesiologist as well as a historian, or at least a sport historian as well as a historian sport. I have begun to grapple what that means, although VO2 Maximum remains a bit of mystery as I remain uncertain

whether it represents a brand of shampoo or a fundamental measurement of human physiology. Having feet in both domains requires me to focus on the particular histories of various forms of human physical activity, especially sport, physical education, recreation, the human biomedical sciences, and to communicate with fellow scholars and with graduate and undergraduate students about how these histories shed light on the nature, meaning, and practice of physical activity. It has also clarified for me some of the differences between the history of sport and sport history.

Some of the differences between these two domains are indeed merely semantic, representing pride in ties to graduate training or to particular patches of academic turf. Sport history and the history of sport share methodologies, subjects, sources, tools, audiences, and even canons. The divergence between the two domains resides in how they perceive their contributions to the larger academic discourses that swirl through expert and lay communities. As a historian of sport, I have tried to explain how American ideas about sport in the Progressive Era illuminated larger issues in the history of the modern U.S., from the nature and practice of political and social reform to the role of class, race, and gender in shaping culture. From that vantage, I could comment, in the much-qualified manner of an academic, on the larger meanings of sport in human societies. As a sport historian, however, I am in certain ways commanded to do the opposite. Students and colleagues are far more interested in the nature of sport and other forms of physical activity in human societies than they are in the particularities of historical experience. They are neither familiar with nor interested in the nuances of progressive historiography though they are keenly interested in the invention of basketball. In contrast, students and colleagues in history possess an inverted perspective, eager to speculate on how the invention of basketball illumines progressivism.<sup>26</sup>

For historians of sport, history itself is the contextual shroud with which they seek to envelop their enterprises. Their work flows out of the broader intellectual projects of

the historical profession and seeks to return home to animate and amplify scholarship in history. Sport historians serve different interests. Human movement rather than history represents their home turf. They must connect with different paradigms and different audiences.

Semantic differences litter this divide but the divergence is not merely semantic. I am now both a historian of sport and a sport historian (though some might say that I possess little skill in either field). I regularly sneak my historian's training into my classes, pushing students to consider how racial dynamics on playing fields illuminate the larger history of race relations in the U.S. and other nations. At the same time, since I am housed in a science-driven kinesiology department, my students need me to serve them as a sport historian, especially a sport science historian, and to ask them to reconsider notions that race is a scientific fact written in human biology that represents a causal force in the human physical abilities—a perspective that still shapes some of the science they learn.<sup>27</sup>

NASSH can have a vibrant future if it remains the meeting ground, or the “frontier” to use the Turnerian metaphor, between the history of sport and sport history. The withdrawal of either group would threaten the future of the organization. So too, would the failure to recognize that though they share a great deal, they often speak to different congregations. Let me close by bowing to the new reflexivity commandment in “the field”—pun intended.<sup>28</sup> These claims about sport history and the history of sport arise from my personal history. I have a political stake, as a NASSH officer, in keeping the disparate factions of the field together. I have a career-stake in fostering the growth of the field to provide jobs for my graduate students. I have a professional stake in arguing that the two factions make for a healthier whole since I have one foot in history and one foot in kinesiology. My reflexive disclosure ends with the observation that in straddling these two worlds I have adopted the guise of a contemporary American president,

appearing as a “uniter not a divider.” I am not, however, as my academic dancing betrays, much of a “decider.”

---

<sup>1</sup> As the historiographer Douglas Booth has uncovered in his explorations of this subject, some scholars have in fact argued for a focus on “sport history” rather than on the “history of sport.” Booth identifies historian Stephen Hardy, sociologist Maurice Roche, and philosopher William Morgan as promoters of the notion that sport histories should engage and illuminate sport contexts rather than relentlessly seeking broader connections to other forms of histories. Douglas Booth, *The Field: Truth and Fiction in Sport History* (London: Routledge, 2006), 184-185. See also, Stephen Hardy, “Entrepreneurs, Organizations, and the Sport Marketplace: Subjects in Search of Historians,” *Journal of Sport History* 13 (spring 1996): 14-33; Jack Berryman, “Sport History as Social History,” *Quest* 20 (June 1973): 65-72; Maurice Roche, *Mega-Events and Modernity: Olympics and Expos in the Growth of Global Culture* (London: Routledge, 2000); William J. Morgan, *Leftist Theories of Sport: A Critique and Reconstruction* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press).

<sup>2</sup> Frederic L. Paxson, “The Rise of Sport,” *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 4 (September 1917): 143-168. Quotation from 168.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 167.

<sup>4</sup> The exception that, perhaps, proves the rule, to employ the old logical homily, is John Rickards Betts who worked on sports during the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s. John Rickards Betts, “The Technological Revolution and the Rise of Sport, 1850-1950,” *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 40 (September 1953): 231-256. Significantly, Betts’ 1951 dissertation, written for Columbia University’s history department, *Organized Sports in Industrial America*, did not appear in book form until the 1970s. John Rickards Betts, *America’s Sporting Heritage, 1850-1950* (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1974).

<sup>5</sup> “Still, even though sport has become the most important institution through which many Americans deliberate political, racial, ethical, and social questions, scholars too rarely take sport seriously,” I wail on the very first page of my own introduction. “That failure to consider sport seriously has hampered historical understandings of the United States, for the grand experiment in forging a working republic in the nation has become permeated with the cultural practices of modern athletics in myriad ways: politicians persistently frame their messages in athletic rhetoric; African-American Olympians protest their exclusion from republican promises with black-gloved protests against racism; judges hear frequent cases about the constitutional rights of athletes, teams, and sporting leagues; and Olympic basketball and hockey contests serve as defining moments in American foreign policy,” I grandly seethe. Mark Dyreson, *Making the American Team: Sport, Culture and the Olympic Experience* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1998), 1.

<sup>6</sup> Alan Metcalfe, “Marvin Eyler: A Personal Tribute,” *Journal of Sport History* 32 (Spring 2005): 71-75.

---

<sup>7</sup> Edward M. Hartwell, *Physical Training in American Colleges and Universities*, Circulars of Information of the Bureau of Education, No. 5, 1885 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1886).

<sup>8</sup> Roberta J. Park, "The *Research Quarterly* and Its Antecedents," *Research Quarterly of Exercise and Sport Science* 51 (March 1980): 1-22; Nancy Struna, "Sport History," in *The History of Exercise and Sport Science*, John D. Massengale and Richard A. Swanson, eds. (Champaign, Ill.: Human Kinetics, 1997), 143-179. See also, Melvin Adelman, "Academicians and American Athletics: A Decade of Progress," *Journal of Sport History* 10 (Spring 1983): 80-106; Roberta J. Park, "Research and Scholarship in the History of Physical Education and Sport: The Current State of Affairs," *Research Quarterly of Exercise and Sport Science* 54 (June 1983): 93-103; Steven A. Riess, "The New Sport History," *Reviews in American History* 18 (September 1990): 311-325; S.W. Pope, "American Sport History—Toward a New Paradigm," in *The New American Sport History: Recent Approaches and Perspectives*, ed. S.W. Pope (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1997), 1-30.

<sup>9</sup> Originally the Association for the Advancement of Physical Education, the society renamed itself the American Association for the Advancement of Physical Education in 1886. The organization has gone through seven name changes: Association for the Advancement of Physical Education (1885); American Association for the Advancement of Physical Education (1886-1902); American Physical Education Association (1903-1937); American Association for Health and Physical Education (1937-1938); American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation (1938-1974); American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation (1974-1979); American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance (1979 to the present). Park, "Research Quarterly and Its Antecedents," 1.

<sup>10</sup> Wendy Gamber, Michael Grossberg, Hendrik Hartog, eds., *American Public Life and the Historical Imagination* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2003).

<sup>11</sup> Robert H. Wiebe, *The Search for Order, 1877-1920* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1967); Burton J. Bledstein, *The Culture of Professionalism: The Middle Class and the Development of Higher Education in America* (New York: Norton, 1976); Paul Starr, *The Social Transformation of American Medicine* (New York: Basic Books, 1982). John R. Thelin, *A History of American Higher Education* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004).

<sup>12</sup> See, for instance, Edward M. Hartwell, "The Conditions and Prospects of Physical Education in the United States," *Proceedings of the American Association for the Advancement of Physical Education* (1892): 13-40.

<sup>13</sup> On the history of sport and physical education as tools for building a healthy American republic see Melvin Adelman, *A Sporting Time: New York City and the Rise of Modern Athletics, 1820-1870* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1978); George B. Kirsch, *The Creation of American Team Sports: Baseball and Cricket, 1838-1872* (Urbana:

---

University of Illinois Press, 1979); Peter Levine, "The Promise of Sport in Antebellum America," *Journal of American Culture* 2 (Winter 1980): 623-634; Dominick Cavallo, *Muscles and Morals: Organized Playgrounds and Urban Reform, 1880-1920* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981); Stephen Hardy, *How Boston Played: Sport, Recreation and Community, 1865-1915* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1982); Donald Mrozek, *Sport and American Mentality, 1880-1910* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1983); Roy Rosenzweig, *Eight Hours for What We Will: Workers and Leisure in an Industrial City, 1870-1920* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983); Harvey Green, *Fit for America: Health, Fitness, Sport, and American Society* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1986); Warren Goldstein, *Playing for Keeps: A History of Early Baseball* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1989); Steven A. Riess, *City Games: The Evolution of American Urban Society and the Rise of Sports* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1989); Michael Oriard, *Reading Football: How the Popular Press Created an American Spectacle* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993); S.W. Pope, *Patriotic Games: Sport and the American Imagination, 1876-1926* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997); Dyreson, *Making the American Team*.

<sup>14</sup> Richard Hofstadter, *The Progressive Historians: Turner, Beard, Parrington* (New York: Knopf, 1968).

<sup>15</sup> David C. Young, *The Olympic Myth of Greek Amateur Athletics* (Chicago: Ares, 1984); Donald G. Kyle, *Athletics in Ancient Athens* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1987); Mark Golden, *Sport and Society in Ancient Greece* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

<sup>16</sup> The foundational statement of this position can be found in Jesse F. Williams, *The Principles of Physical Education* (Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders, 1927).

<sup>17</sup> Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 3rd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996); John V. Pickstone, *Ways of Knowing: A New History of Science, Technology and Medicine* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001).

<sup>18</sup> For a classic example see James G. Thompson, "Logos *Protrepitkos*: Building Pride in the Profession," *Canadian Journal of Sport History* 15 (December 1984): 1-4. For the quest for "unity through diversity" see Park, "Research Quarterly and Its Antecedents," 16-21. See also, John D. Massengale and Richard A. Swanson, "Exercise and Sport Science in 20<sup>th</sup>-Century America," in *The History of Exercise and Sport Science*, Massengale and Swanson, eds., 1-14.

Following Hartwell's lead, in its first few decades the AAAP published a smattering of historical studies in the antecedents of the *Research Quarterly*—the *Proceedings of the American Association for the Advancement of Physical Education* (1885-1895) and the *American Physical Education Review* (1896-1929). Fred E. Leonard's historical series, which ran in the *American Physical Education Review* from 1899 to 1907, expanded on Hartwell's template. Fred E. Leonard, "The Period of Philanthropism," *American Physical Education Review* 4 (March 1899): 1-18; Fred E.

---

Leonard, "Jahn's Life Up to Publication of *Die Deutsche Turnkunst* (1816)," *American Physical Education Review* 5 (March 1900): 18-39; Fred Leonard, "A Select Bibliography of the History of Physical Training," *American Physical Education Review* 7 (March 1902): 39-48; Fred E. Leonard, "The Beginnings of Modern Physical Training in Europe," *American Physical Education Review* 9 (June 1904): 89-110; Fred E. Leonard, "Friederich Ludwig Jahn and the Development of Popular Gymnastics in Germany," *American Physical Education Review* 10 (March 1905): 1-19; Fred E. Leonard, "The Transition from Medieval to Modern Times," *American Physical Education Review* 10 (September 1905): 189-202; Fred E. Leonard, "The 'New Gymnastics' of Dio Lewis," *American Physical Education Review* 11 (June 1906): 83-95, (September 1906): 187-198; Fred E. Leonard, "Chapters from the History of Physical Training in Ancient and Medieval Europe," *American Physical Education Review* 12 (September 1907): 225-240, (December 1907): 289-302. Leonard and his followers produced a small but steady stream of essays chronicling the institutional development of American physical education. Struna, "Sport History," 150-152.

By the late 1920s, the leadership of the organization, rechristened as the American Association of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation (AAHPER), responded to the unceasing battles between various areas of interest in the profession by deciding to split the organization's publications into a more "applied" periodical dubbed the *Journal of Health and Physical Education* and a more "theoretical" journal christened the *Research Quarterly of the American Physical Education Association*. History had by then established a foothold, albeit a small one, in the multi-disciplinary study of human movement. History's cubbyhole would survive the schism. Park, "Research Quarterly and Its Antecedents," 2-5; George H. Sage, Mark Dyreson, and R. Scott Kretchmar, "Sociology, History, and Philosophy in *The Research Quarterly*." *Research Quarterly of Exercise and Sport Science* (Special 75<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Issue) 76 (June 2005 Supplement): S88-S107.

<sup>19</sup> Struna, "Sport History," 143-179.

<sup>20</sup> Ronald A. Smith, Secretary-Treasurer's Report for the Thirty-Fifth Annual Convention, May 25-28, 2007, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas.

<sup>21</sup> R. Scott Kretchmar, "Jigsaw Puzzles and River Banks: Two Ways of Picturing Our Future," *Quest* 57 (February 2005): 171-177.

<sup>22</sup> Electronic searches of the *Chronicle of Higher Education* and *Perspectives*, the job-listing newsletter of the American Historical Association, reveal nary a job advertised since 1988 in history departments that included sport as a desired subfield. Indeed, among the 126 specializations and 352 specific fields listed, including "maritime" and "chemistry," in the American Historical Association's History Doctoral Program Directory, the history of sport appears only in Kansas State University's entry. <<http://www.historians.org/projects/cge/PhD/Specializations.cfm>> (accessed 12 October 2007).

---

<sup>23</sup> For an overview of the current state of kinesiology see Karl Newell, "Kinesiology Challenges of Multiple Agendas," *Quest* 59 (February 2007): 5-24; Jerry R. Thomas, Jane E. Clark, Deborah L. Feltz, R. Scott Kretchmar, James R. Morrow, Jr., T. Gilmour Reeve, Michael G. Wade, "The Academy Promotes, Unifies and Evaluates Doctoral Education in Kinesiology," *Quest* 59 (February 2007): 174-194; Roberta Rikli, "Kinesiology: A 'Homeless' Field: Addressing Organization and Leadership Needs," 58 (August 2006): 287-309.

<sup>24</sup> Mexico has received some attention from scholars in the *Journal of Sport History*. Mary Lou LeCompte, "The Hispanic Influence on the History of Radio," *Journal of Sport History* 12 (spring 1985): 21-38; Gary Kuhn, "Fiesta and Fiascos: Balloon Flights in Nineteenth-Century Mexico," *Journal of Sport History* 13 (summer 1986): 111-118; Joseph L. Arbena, "Sport Development and Mexican Nationalism," *Journal of Sport History* 18 (fall 1991): 350-364; William Schell, Jr., "Lions, Bulls, and Baseball: Colonel R.C. Pate and Modern Sports Promotion in Mexico," *Journal of Sport History* 20 (fall 1993): 259-275; David G. LaFrance, "Labor, the State, and Professional Baseball in Mexico in the 1980s," *Journal of Sport History* 22 (summer 1995): 111-134; Richard V. McGehee, "The Dandy and the Mauler in Mexico: Dempsey, et. al., and the Mexico City Press, 1919-1927," *Journal of Sport History* 23 (spring 1996): 20-33; Mark Dyreson, "The Foot Runners Conquer Mexico and Texas: Endurance Racing, *Indigenismo*, and Nationalism," *Journal of Sport History* 31 (Spring 2004): 1-31.

<sup>25</sup> The new American Kinesiology Association was organized in February of 2007 and will be launched in the autumn of 2007. The original board of governors includes representation from the subdisciplinary areas within kinesiology. I garnered a position on the board as the representative of sport history.

<sup>26</sup> Dyreson, *Making the American Team*.

<sup>27</sup> Confusing social data such as the percentages of African Americans in the National Basketball Association or National Football League, or the number of Olympic medals won by ethnicity or race, with genetic data remains an all too common problem in studies of race and sport, as Jon Entine's *Taboo: Why Black Athletes Dominate Sports and Why We Are Afraid To Talk About It* (New York: Public Affairs, 2000), illustrates. For histories that illuminate this particular intersection of science and culture see John Hoberman, *Darwin's Athletes: How Sport Has Damaged Black America and Preserved the Myth of Race* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1997); David K. Wiggins, "'Great Speed But Little Stamina: The Historical Debate Over Black Athletic Superiority,'" *Journal of Sport History* 16 (summer 1989): 158-185; Patrick B. Miller, "The Anatomy of Scientific Racism: Racialist Responses to Black Athletic Achievement," *Journal of Sport History* 25 (Spring 1998): 119-151; Mark Dyreson, "American Ideas About Race and Olympic Races from the 1890s to the 1950s: Shattering Myths or Reinforcing Scientific Racism?," *Journal of Sport History* 28 (summer 2001): 173-215. See also, Jeffrey T. Sammons, "A Proportional and Measured Response to the Provocation That Is Darwin's Athletes," *Journal of Sport History* 24 (Fall 1997): 378-388; and John Hoberman, "How Not to

---

Misread *Darwin's Athletes*: A Response to Jeffrey Sammons," *Journal of Sport History* 24 (Fall 1997): 389-396.

<sup>28</sup> For an outline of this new commandment see Booth, *The Field*, 210-221.