

Student Name

Prof. Name

Name of the Class

Date

**An Analysis of *How Soccer Explains the World: An Unlikely Theory of Globalization* by
Franklin Foer**

Franklin Foer's *How Soccer Explains the World: An Unlikely Theory of Globalization* is undoubtedly a good read in terms of its development towards the arguments made inside the content. Apparently the text cannot be referred as the best piece due to its scope limitation being a sporting topic reflected on an economic agenda which is strongly tied with individual interests. However, Franklin Foer should be appraised towards the efforts he made and for the exemplary points he made.

Franklin Foer explains the game of football using its players, fans and spectators. It is a rarity to bring a game as a distinguisher of globalization choice as an indicator. Even though we perceive his notions in the interpretations that the economies surrounding the game can be key indicator towards the perceptual adoption of globalization on the North American context. In his work, he details his personal experience as a Football player, details on his mentors, his family's involvement and the class he represented. At the same time he clearly divided the explanations into political ideologies of Americans and Europeans. His obvious commentaries are all applied on the games adoption on American context, which he refers as the 'cleavage' in the US. According to him, while the US was getting divided in the Red and Blue, many places

across US adopted the game even after strong advocates disfavoring the game. He is also right in putting the game on cultural perspective to analyze American people.

Foer is right addressing the changing consensus on globalization as countries and economies have individualistically responded to the call; while this has benefitted many economies, certain regional arrangement and lack with capitalizing on key competitive advantages and failure to instant response towards changing policies, have resulted in some incidental economies. While the globalization as a promise was positive to many, for the US, apparently appearing more concerned with the failure seems the otherwise result was not predictable. While it is not Franklin Foer's failure, but in gross, such failure that has now become issues to research should have been into the agendas of advocates of globalization because every plan has a contingency plan within it. The multinational corporate reference in this case, does not make solid ground because many least developed countries organizations have also grown to multinational. (Haas)

At the same time, I must mention here that, cultural divulgence was always identified as suspect to fall victim of globalization. Franklin Foer's claim on this ground is pure but his expectation or better to say, his concerns over globalizations impact on localized game are way too much as an expectation. Multinationals being blessed with globalization concept still faced the same challenge and they too had to localize their offerings. A Coca-Cola bottle in the US does not taste the same in Middle East, even though it is the long trusted brand that is believed to have relayed its recipe across the goal. The reasons that push the companies to meet choice, taste preference across geographic difference are not only posed by the consumer groups but also by the company itself to remain profitable. (Herbig and Kaynak)

On his family involvement Franklin is not wrong to note the happenings in detail. The way it has been postulated, it was a choice for everyone, not a must option. Basketball grown to be too much Americanized like the can and tin culture that but it failed to spread across the globe while the tin and can culture spread throughout the world. Another important issue raised in his work is that safety concern. It seemed Football induced violence more frequently. Such perception and exclamatory incidents does not validate any logical point because 'fair play' is also a motto for any game. If violence sparks it sparks for human limitation, not for game and thus such reservation reflects the collective limitation. (Giulianotti and Robertson)

Regarding opposing Football, it seems the US had very tough opponent than anywhere else in the world. Jim Rome's radio commentary or his public remarks on football does not shape or form the choices American audiences are likely to get helped off. Instead, it must be iterated here that, comments like "Yes, OK, soccer is the most 'popular' game in the world. And rice is the most 'popular' food in the world. So what? May be other countries can't afford football, basketball and baseball leagues: maybe if they could afford these other sports, they'd enjoy them even more". Allen Barra's comment on this much appreciable because globalization did not call for delimiting the differences but it always asked for collective leverages to stay advantageous to all, not for monopoly, neither for capitalism in that sense. (Giulianotti and Robertson, The Globalization of Football: A Study in the Glocalization of the Serious Life)

Clearly Foer is right in bringing Football as his medium to differentiate the cultural differences on the globalization perspectives. However, his findings cannot validate anything more importantly as culture is only one side of issues that are discussed over globalization's impact on economies. His intention of using football as a identifier succeeds to some extent as the present situation have changed completely and the US authorities acknowledges that the

global hemisphere of football sports business can be of good interest to American investment and organizing World Cup back in 90's was an effort to popularize the game to their natives. His prologue, anecdotes were successful to make the ground and in making the presumption of the "American Exceptionalism".

Quoting the American Exceptionalism, we can try to see it in new light. The way is straight forward, one claims, he lets others to assume and he takes action right per his claims. The American Exceptionalism is to some extent rhetorical when it fails to justify or validate reasons. But to me, coining such terminology would have failed the content if was written for some other theme than the culture itself. It is true that the Americans suffer deeply in exceptionalism, which is poured to them by personal liberty, better democratic practices, and presence of strong institutions to uphold civic rights.

At the beginning Franklin Foer was successful to tend to move towards making his ground but serious level of detailing and switching between perspectives made the write up poorly engaging. Taking focus from there, his select of the topic is interestingly sound and genius. In cases, his analysis and revelation of findings from both sides of any case he referred have strengthened his cause. However, finally, he was away from making any concluding remark that gives the reader an indication of his thoughts. This seemed to me like his willful disappearance, quite tricky, from the stage and an attempt to get the readers plugged with the thoughts discussed in the paper.

Works Cited

Giulianotti, Richard and Roland Robertson. "Recovering the Social: Globalization, Football and Transnationalism." Global Networks, A Journal of Transnational Affairs (2007): 166-186.

—. "The Globalization of Football: A Study in the Glocalization of the Serious Life." The British Journal of Sociology (2004): 545 - 568.

Haas, Astrid. "A Changing Game: Ethnicity, Gender and Nation in the US American Soccer Film." Comparative American Studies (2014): 301 - 315.

Herbig, Paul and Erdener Kaynak. Handbook of Cross - Cultural Marketing. Binghamton: The Haworth Press, 1998.

PROPERTY OF 4STUDENTS LLC