

A HISTORY OF POST-WAR SPORT POLICY IN JAPAN AND THE UNITED KINGDOM

MASATAKA OZAKI AND FUMIHIRO KANEKO*

Introduction

The aim of this paper is to examine the history of post-war sport policy with regard to community sport in Japan and the United Kingdom.¹

Firstly, Ozaki investigates the history of sport policy in post-war Japan, especially the development of community sport promotion by various governments. Through this investigation, we identify that the idea of the development of community sport can be found in Ministry of Education policy documents as far back as 1946. However, this idea has still not become reality.

Secondly, Kaneko investigates the history of sport policy in the post-war United Kingdom. Based on what was revealed by the analyses of policy documents published by the British government and the Sports Council, and previous studies, he describes the development of community sport policy in the post-war period, which he divides into five distinct periods.

I. *A History of Sport Policy in Post-war Japan with Special Reference to the Promotion of Community Sport*

In this section, I would like to survey the post-war government promotion of community sport, and assess what it has achieved, and what it has failed to achieve.

To begin with, I would like to focus on an official document published by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) in August 2010, *The Strategy for Sports Nation*. It reveals official thinking in connection with the participation of people in sport in the community:

‘To live a happy and prosperous life through sport should be one of the rights guaranteed to all people. Opportunities must be guaranteed to participate in activities to get familiarized with, enjoy, support, and encourage sports under the individual initiative and in the safe and equitable environment in accordance with individual interests and aptitudes.’

This was perhaps the first time that that the word ‘rights’ (to sport) was included in government documents on sport policy.² Following this, the *Basic Act on Sport* was approved

* Graduate School of Social Sciences, Hitotsubashi University, Tokyo, JAPAN

¹ Ozaki is responsible for the introduction and part 1 of the paper. Kaneko is responsible for part 2 of the paper.

² However, the foundation of Shin Nihon Taiiku Renmei, a non-governmental voluntary sport organization, in 1965

in July 2011 and became law in August 2011. When you look at the history of ideological battles over the word 'rights' since the 1960s, the publication of *The Strategy for Sports Nation* and the enactment of the *Basic Act on Sport* could be regarded as a turning point in sport policy in Japan.

However, apart from the word 'rights', the basic ideas expressed in *The Strategy for Sports Nation* and the *Basic Act on Sport* are repeatedly found in past policy documents. That is, that everyday opportunities to participate in sport should be guaranteed, and that the necessary arrangements should be made in order to achieve this. I would now like to examine more closely the changes which occurred in post-war community sport policy. What was the social background to the policy, what were the characteristics of the policy, and what were the consequences of such a policy?

1. The Idea Was Born: The Encouragement of People's Sport in the Community (1945-c.1955)

Japan suffered extensive damage in the Second World War. Essential items such as housing and food were scarce and people struggled just to survive. However, even at this time of extreme poverty, sporting activities began to spring up nationwide. It was as if people's eagerness to participate in sport, which had been suppressed during the war, suddenly exploded. This need for sport was met in 1946, when the first National Athletic Meet was held.³ All this at a time when post-war reconstruction was barely in sight.

Administrative organizations began to be redeveloped. In September 1945, the department for physical education was re-established as part of the Ministry of Education, and in January 1946 the department for the promotion of sport, which was responsible for the encouragement of community sport, was established for the first time. From May 1946 onwards, the Ministry of Education held a series of meetings with local government officials in order to understand the regional circumstances related to sport. After these meetings, in August 1946, the Ministry published *Shakai Taiiku Jisshi no Sanko (A Guideline for People's Sport in the Regions)*, which outlined the basic principles by which sporting activities should be promoted in the regions. In the guidelines, they emphasized the incorporation of sport into daily life, and suggested three basic foundations for the promotion of community sport in the regions. These were leadership, organisation, and infrastructure. The ideas put forward in this official document provided the framework for sport policies in later years.⁴

'Dai-Nihon-Taiiku-kai (The Great Japan Association of Physical Education)', a non-governmental sport organisation, also made it clear that one of its main aims was the promotion of sport for the people. Saburo Kiyose, the chief director of the voluntary organisation, stated, 'It is the duty of sporting personnel, as well as the fundamental mission of the Great Japan Association of Physical Education, to reconstruct physical education and make a contribution to building a new Japan. Physical education is a fundamental element of a civilized state.'⁵

was the first time that the word 'rights' was used in connection with sport in Japan.

³ See Hak Jun Kwon, *Kokumin Taiiku Taikai no Kenkyu*, Aoki Shoten, 2006, pp.37-40.

⁴ See Masataka Ozaki, 'Sport Seisaku no Keisei Katei ni kansuru Ichi Kenkyu (A Study of the Process of Forming Sport Policy in Japan)', *Jimbun Kagaku Kenkyu (Hitotsubashi University Research Series, Humanities)* 39, 2002, pp.166-169.

⁵ Saburo Kiyose, 'Taiikukai no Shimei', in *Shin Taiiku*, August & September 1946, p.1.

In addition, Genzaburo Noguchi, who was an influential academic in the field of physical education at the time, commented, 'If the attempt to incorporate physical education into everyday life is to succeed, it will be necessary to establish organisations, infrastructure, and leadership. This would ensure that everyone would be able to become involved in sport without any difficulties. In a civilised state, in order to promote the people's well-being, these are the rights the people can now demand, and it is the duty of the state to provide them.'⁶

With hindsight, the ideas expressed by the Ministry of Education, the Great Japan Association of Physical Education, and Genzaburo Noguchi, seemingly follow the policy logic of the welfare state. However, there are some difficulties in defining what existed in Japan immediately after the war as a welfare state. Moreover, as Japan was under US military occupation, it is questionable how far these ideas on the promotion of community sport in the regions were unprompted.

Furthermore, we can conclude that these policy ideas were not implemented, partly because material circumstances were very poor: Japan at that time was almost bankrupt and there were extreme shortages of resources.⁷

It seems understandable that not much was achieved, given the constraints of the period. However, the fact that proposals on the promotion of community sport in the regions were put forward as official policy in the immediate post-war period of confusion still has a historical significance.

2. The Slow Progress of the Promotion of Community Sport in the Regions (c.1955 to the first half of the 1960s)

The mid-1950s saw the beginning of a period of rapid economic growth in Japanese society and the end of the post-war reconstruction period. But the government's priority was the growth of the industrial sector, and the tax revenues from the high economic growth were not properly invested in people's everyday lives.⁸ In particular, the central government paid very little attention to the issue of the promotion of sport in the regions. The overall framework for sport policy did not change, and the three basic foundations for the promotion of community sport, that is, leadership, organisations, and infrastructure, were not developed.

One exception to the slow progress in this period was the Tokyo Olympics in 1964. From around 1958, when it was decided that the Olympics would be held in Tokyo, a huge amount of government funds began to be spent on various projects related to the Olympics. However, over half of this money was spent on the construction of railways and roads. Direct investment in sport was limited to the construction of the sporting facilities in which Olympic events were to be held. Here again, priority was given to certain business interests, thus neglecting matters connected with people's physical well-being.⁹

I would also like to mention that in 1961, the *Sport Promotion Act* was passed. It was significant because until then there had been no other legislation related to sport. However, it has been pointed out from the start that this was enacted in order to support the Tokyo

⁶ Genzaburo Noguchi, *Shin Taiiku no Riron to Jissen: Riron hen*, Kokumin Kyoikusha, 1948, p.209.

⁷ See Ozaki, 'Sport Seisaku no Keisei Katei ni kansuru Ichi-Kenkyu', pp.172-175.

⁸ See Ken-ichi Miyamoto, *Shakai Shihonron (revised version)*, Yuhikaku, 1976.

⁹ See Ozaki, 'Sport Seisaku no Keisei Katei ni kansuru Ichi Kenkyu', pp.197-199.

TABLE 1. THE MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR THE PROVISION OF PUBLICLY OWNED SPORT FACILITIES

Population	10,000	30,000	50,000	100,000
Playgrounds	area: 10,000m ²	area: 10,000m ²	area: 10,000m ²	area: 10,000m ²
	1	2	3	6
Tennis Courts	area: 1,560m ²	area: 1,560m ²	area: 1,560m ²	area: 1,560m ²
	2	4	6	10
Gymnasiums	floor space: 720m ²			
	1	2	3	5
Judo & Kendo gyms	floor space: 200m ²			
	1	1	1	1
Swimming pools	floor space: 400m ²			
	1	2	3	6

Olympics, and not to promote people's sport activities in their communities.¹⁰

The Ministry of Education frankly admitted that 'either directly or indirectly, physical education and sport in Japan developed with the Olympics. Issues of physical education and sport in Japan cannot be discussed without mentioning the Tokyo Olympics.'¹¹ Policies for people's sport activities in their communities tended to be neglected in the preparation for the Tokyo Olympics because the government placed undue emphasis on the importance of having a successful Olympics.

3. Re-emergence of the Idea for the Promotion of Community Sport (the second half of the 1960s to the 1970s)

While the economy continued to prosper, its negative side, environmental pollution, became apparent. Against this background, local residents' campaigns emerged, demanding improvements to their environment and daily lives.¹² At the same time, life in Japan was becoming more stable, and it was apparent that the Japanese people expected a better quality of life. Because of these circumstances, in the early 1970s, Japan seemed to be embarking on the road to the welfare state.

Simultaneously, Hoken Taiiku Shingikai (The Commission for Public Health and Physical Education) at the Ministry of Education published its report, *Taiiku-sport no Fukyu Shinko ni kansuru Kihonteki Hosaku ni tsuite (Basic Policies concerning the Promotion of Physical Education and Sport)*. In this report, the disproportionate emphasis on sporting competitiveness was criticised, and it recommended that the official policy should change so that Japanese people could enjoy sport as part of their daily lives. In addition, it recommended that sport clubs be established in the regions. This report deserves special mention because, for the first time, the minimum standards for the provision of publicly owned sport facilities were put in writing (see Table 1). The standards were considered appropriate for the encouragement of

¹⁰ See Setsuo Iino, 'Sport Shinko-ho no Mondai-ten', *Gekkan Shakai Kyoiku*, October 1961.

¹¹ Mombusho (The Ministry of Education), *Nihon Sport no Genjo*, 1961, p.9.

¹² See Jiro Matsubara, Kamon Nitagai, eds., *Jumin Undo no Ronri*, Gakuyo Shobo, 1976.

TABLE 2. THE NUMBER OF FACILITIES THAT NEED TO BE BUILT

Population	Number of municipalities	Playgrounds	Tennis courts	Gymnasiums	Judo & Kendo gyms	Swimming pools	Total
-9,999	1,481	(1) 1,481	(4) 5,924	(1) 1,481	(1) 1,481	(1) 1,481	11,848
10,000- 29,999	1,114	(2) 2,228	(12) 12,368	(2) 2,228	(1) 1,114	(2) 2,228	21,166
30,000- 49,999	250	(3) 750	(18) 4,500	(3) 750	(1) 250	(3) 750	7,000
50,000- 99,999	218	(6) 1,308	(40) 8,720	(5) 1,090	(1) 218	(6) 1,308	12,644
100,000-199,999	94	(9) 846	(60) 5,640	(8) 752	(2) 188	(9) 564	7,990
200,000-299,999	50	(15) 750	(100) 5,000	(13) 650	(2) 100	(15) 750	7,250
300,000-499,999	41	(24) 984	(160) 6,560	(20) 820	(3) 123	(24) 984	9,471
500,000-	22	(30) 660	(200) 4,400	(25) 550	(3) 66	(30) 660	6,336
Total	3,270	9,007	54,112	8,321	3,540	8,725	83,705

Note: ()=number of facilities that need to be built per municipality

Based on the standards in the report of the Commission for Public Health and Physical Education at the Ministry of Education (1972)

people's participation in sport. Based on these standards, the Ministry of Education calculated the number of facilities that needed to be built (see Table 2).

During this period, the Japanese post-war conservative regime began to become unstable. In order to 'relax social tension' through sport, or in order to achieve social integration via sport, government departments other than the Ministry of Education also published their own policy vision for the encouragement of sport. For example, the Economic Planning Agency and others spoke of their vision of 'Community Sport', and the *Community Sport Shisetsu Keikaku Chosa Hokokusho (Report on the Provision of Community Sport Facilities)* was published in 1974.

However, these visions for the encouragement of community sport would not be realised because the oil crisis and the Nixon Shock had a very negative effect upon the Japanese economy.

4. Administrative Reform and Privatization (the 1980s to the first half of the 1990s)

In the 1980s, central government policy as a whole was subject to the idea of 'Administrative Reform', and the policy trends towards a welfare state were reviewed to a great extent. As a result, government budgets particularly for welfare, education and culture were reduced.

For example, while grants-in-aid for local government construction of sport facilities, 'Shakai Taiiku Shisetsu Seibihi (budget for the provision of sport facilities in the regions)

TABLE 3. THE NUMBER OF SPORT FACILITIES

Year	Total	Primary and secondary schools	Universities	Publicly owned	Corporations	Non-profit	Commerce
1969	148,059	101,672	5,720	10,193	23,768	2,522	4,184
1975	188,224	120,098	7,198	19,835	26,873	3,896	10,324
1980	218,631	135,170	6,624	29,566	29,013	5,592	12,666
1985	292,117	148,995	9,124	60,777	29,332	16,741	27,148
1990	×	156,548	9,726	62,786	×	×	×
1996	258,026	152,083	8,531	65,528	12,737	19,147	
2002	239,660	149,063	9,022	56,475	8,286	16,814	
2008	222,533	136,276	8,375	53,732	6,827	17,323	

Source: MEXT, *Report on the Facilities of Physical Education and Sport*

reached 11.8 billion yen in 1982, in later years it declined steadily until by the middle of the 1990s, the budget was reduced to almost half that sum.

'Hoken Taiiku Shingikai (The Commission for Public Health and Physical Education)', which published a groundbreaking report in 1972, changed its mind and in its 1989 report there was no mention of the standards for the provision of local sport facilities. The report implies that the responsibility for the construction and maintenance of local sport facilities lay in the hands of local government, but it never indicated how money to fund this could be raised.¹³

In 1990, in the midst of the bubble economy, the Ministry of International Trade and Industry published *Sport Vision for the 21st Century*. In this report, it was strongly recommended that the private sector should provide opportunities for the enjoyment of sport.¹⁴ But shortly after the publication, the economic situation began to deteriorate dramatically and during the subsequent decade, later known as 'the lost 10 years', this vision disappeared.

During this period of unfavourable economic circumstances, the total number of publicly owned sport facilities reached a peak, as can be seen in Table 3. What is the explanation for this?

From the national and international point of view, it can be seen that Japan's recovery was relatively swift in comparison with other countries affected by the economic crisis.¹⁵ This factor probably contributed to the rebuilding of government tax revenue. With the government financial situation stabilised, funds were perhaps available for the construction of sport facilities. It could be argued that this was a propitious time for local governments to give financial priority to the construction of sport facilities. Up to then, local authorities had been preoccupied with the construction of schools and hospitals, which were essential for communities throughout the country. However, the momentum was quickly lost, and it soon became apparent that local governments could not provide the necessary funds for sport facilities, and they followed the path already taken by the central government.

¹³ See Harunami Seki, *Sengo Nihon no Sport Seisaku*, Taishukan Shoten, 1997.

¹⁴ See Masataka Ozaki, 'Sport no Sangyo-ka to Shogai Sport (Industrialization of Sport and Life-long Sport)', in *Ikkyo Ronso (The Hitotsubashi Review)*, 105(3), 1991.

¹⁵ See Osamu Watanabe, *Kigyo Shihai to Kokka*, Aoki Shoten, 1991. Osamu Watanabe, ed., *Kodo Seicho to Kigyo Shakai*, Yoshikawa Kobunkan, 2004.

5. The 'Exit' of the Government? (the second half of the 1990s to the present)

Globalisation has had a profound impact not only in the area of economics, but also in other areas, and the traditional welfare states have had no choice but to change in many ways.¹⁶ Neo-liberalism, which has diffused into every aspect of Japanese government policies, has failed to provide a valid prescription for the encouragement of sport in the community. It has, however, succeeded in reducing the role of government to a minimum in that particular area. In this sense, we may say that community sport policy is a field in which the idea of neo-liberalism is truly realised.¹⁷

I would now like to inspect the MEXT budget for 2010. The budget for the 'promotion of sport' amounted to 18.6 billion yen, 16.8 billion yen of which was to be used for the 'improvement of international competitiveness'. Compared to this, only 0.57 billion yen would be spent on the promotion of community sport.

The above mentioned 'budget for the provision of local physical education facilities' was reduced to 10 billion yen in 2005, and in 2006 no funds were allocated at all. 2006 was also the year when the Sport Promotion Act was 'reformed', which meant that financial responsibility for the provision of sport facilities was transferred from the central government to local government.

At this point, the Japanese government left the field of community sport policy for good. Having taken into account the post-war history of the policy, the performance of the government in this area could not be described as either 'a failure' or 'unsuccessful', simply because the government had never really attempted to make its policy work.

So, we might pose the question as to who should be responsible for the promotion of community sport. In *The Strategy for Sports Nation*, which I have already mentioned, we can find the following:

'We need to move away from the conventional concept of free public services offered by the administration and to facilitate the creation of "New Public Commons" embodied by community sports clubs that are regarded as not-for-profit type organizations managed with membership fees and donations from local residents and that fall under the NPO Act.'

The idea that community sport clubs should take the main responsibility for providing lifelong opportunities for people so that they could participate in sport was first put forward in a Ministry of Education plan, the *Basic Plan for the Promotion of Sports (2001-2010)*. This was published in August 2000, a decade ago. It aimed to put into practice the idea of 'Lifelong Participation in Sport'. In order to achieve its aim, the Ministry of Education suggested that by the end of 2010 fiscal year, at least one 'Comprehensive Community Sport Club' should be established in every local government area.¹⁸ The Ministry of Education estimated that the

¹⁶ See Michio Goto, *Shushuku suru Nihongata 'Taishu Shakai'*, Junposha, 2001.

¹⁷ See Masataka Ozaki, 'Shin Jiyu Shugi Kaikaku to Chiiki Sport no Yukue', in Osamu Watanabe, ed., *Henbo suru 'Kigyo Shakai' Nihon*, Junposha, 2004.

¹⁸ 'Basic Plan for the Promotion of Sports' stated:

Policy Goals: (1) To establish a society that is active in sport by providing everyone with the opportunity to become involved in sport, anywhere and anytime, regardless of physical strength, age, ability, interest, or purpose. (2) The target is to achieve at the earliest possible time a level of involvement in sport whereby one out of every two adults

TABLE 4. THE NUMBER OF PUBLICLY OWNED SPORT FACILITIES (2005)

		Total	953
Field and track	lap	400m	745
		201m - 399m	132
		- 199m	76
		Total	6,449
Baseball grounds	area	10,000m ² -	3,251
		6,600m ² - 9,999m ²	1,649
		- 6,599m ²	1,549
		Total	1,177
Other ball bame grounds	area	10,000m ² -	611
		6,400m ² - 9,999m ²	329
		- 6,399m ²	237
		Total	6,917
Play grounds	area	10,000m ² -	3,386
		4,000m ² - 9,999m ²	2,102
		992m ² - 3,999m ²	1,429
		Total	1,533
Indoor swimming pools	floor space	1,000m ² -	259
		400m ² - 999m ²	504
		150m ² - 399m ²	770
		Total	2,498
Outdoor swimming pools	floor space	1,000m ² -	545
		400m ² - 999m ²	654
		150m ² - 399m ²	1,299
		Total	6,674
Gymnusiums	floor space	1,300m ² -	2,295
		660m ² - 1,299m ²	2,452
		132m ² - 659m ²	1,927
		Total	768
Judo gyms	floor space	128tatami -	412
		40tatami - 127tatami	304
		- 39tatami	52
		Total	687
Kendo gyms	floor apce	200m ² -	512
		67m ² - 199m ²	146
		- 66m ²	29
		Total	949
Judo & Kendo Gyms	floor space	400m ² -	655
		200m ² - 399m ²	226
		- 199m ²	68
Outdoor tennis courts	the number of facilities		5,121
	the number of courts		20,301
	the number of courts per facility		4.0
Indoor tennis courts	the number of facilities		145
	the number of courts		356
	the number of courts per facility		2.5

Source: MEXT, Report on Social Education in 2005

total number of the clubs would come to 10,000.

So, how many clubs were established? In 2010, the total number of clubs came to 2,905. 65% of the local governments in Japan now have at least one Comprehensive Community Sport Club. I do not consider this to be impressive progress.

The clubs that have been established have also encountered various difficulties. The most serious problem they have faced is securing the space needed to take part in sporting activities. In Japan, unlike in Europe, it is almost impossible for community sport clubs to own their own grounds and facilities; instead, they usually have to make use of publicly owned sport facilities and the facilities attached to local schools.

To make matters worse, there are now fewer publicly owned sport facilities than there were in the past. In fact, there has been a steady decrease since the mid-1990s. Because of financial constraints, the idea of renovating ramshackle sport facilities was abandoned and these facilities were subsequently demolished. The merger of local governments in the Heisei era also contributed to the reduction in the number of publicly owned sport facilities. This rationalisation process was also noticeable with regard to community school sport facilities. Maintaining and developing publicly owned sport facilities has thus become increasingly difficult.

Finally, there has been a decline in the number of industrial sport facilities open to the public. In the past, they were open to the general public based on the idea of contributing to the local community. Now, however, the worsening economic situation does not permit the business concerns to entertain this idea, and many facilities have been either closed down or sold off (see, Table 3).

6. In Conclusion: What is the 'Public Common'?

I agree with the idea expressed in official documents such as the *Basic Plan for the Promotion of Sports (2001-2010)*, *The Strategy for Sports Nation*, and the *Basic Act on Sport*. This proposes that citizens with a shared interest in sport should come together, establish sport clubs in their own community, and take responsibility for promoting community sport. In a modern society, it is important that local people create the 'public common' or the 'public sphere' by getting together and forming an association.

However, while people have repeatedly stated in the last sixty years that the promotion of community sport is necessary, the infrastructure for the promotion of same has remained poor, as the above mentioned shortage of sport facilities and budget cuts in community sport clearly indicate. With the existing infrastructure, I doubt if the community sport clubs formed by local citizens could play the 'public' role instead of the government.

I hope that we can examine this point by looking at the concept of the 'New Public Commons', which featured in the MEXT document, *The Strategy for Sports Nation*. And I am sure that the next section by Mr. Kaneko, which will examine sport policy in the United Kingdom, will provide us with some interesting comparative viewpoints.

(50%) engages in sport at least once a week.

Measures Essential for Achieving the Policy Goals: The goals to be achieved by 2010 are to create at least one Comprehensive Community Sport Club in each municipality (city, town, village).

II. *A History of Sport Policy in the Post-war United Kingdom: Focusing on the Changing Discourse on the Promotion of Community Sport*

The aim of this section is to review a brief history of sport policy in the United Kingdom after World War II, in comparison with Ozaki's section which surveys the situation in Japan. In particular, this section focuses on the change in community sport policy, a policy relating to the promotion of community sport at local level. According to Uchiumi, UK sport policy has been one of the most remarkable subjects in sport policy studies in Japan for a long time.¹⁹ In addition, it is claimed that there will be a number of implications from the process of the formation of UK sport policy when it comes to discussing *The Strategy for Sports Nation* and *The Basic Act on Sports Act* in Japan, because the New Labour government oriented itself towards 'a truly world leading sporting nation',²⁰ associated with hosting the 2012 Olympic Games in London.²¹ In this regard, it will be of great use in understanding the similarities and differences in the content and context of community sport policy between the UK and Japan to examine the development and the current issues of community sport policy in the UK.

This section draws on data with analyses of key sport policy-related documents published by the Government and the Sports Council (now known as UK Sport and Sport England), a leading authority on the development of sport policy in the UK. These analyses examine in particular the changing discourses on 'the promotion of community sport', which leads to a better understanding of the contexts, the purposes and the actors behind the process of community sport policy. In addition, we review previous studies which explain the development of UK sport policy.

Based on the features revealed by the analyses of policy documents and previous studies, this section describes the development of community sport policy in the post-war period in the UK, as dividing into five periods: 1) towards 'Sport for All' under the Keynesian welfare state (from the 1960s to the mid-1970s); 2) towards the promotion of community sport as social policy (from the late 1970s to the early 1980s); 3) the 'withdrawal' of the Government from community sport and the industrialisation of sport under neo-liberalism (from the late 1980s to the mid-1990s); 4) towards a 'social investment state' through community sport (from the late 1990s to 2007); and 5) back to the promotion of community sport for sport's sake? (from 2008 to the present).

¹⁹ See Uchiumi, K., *Sport for All in the United Kingdom: Sport Policy in the Welfare State [Igirisu no Sport for All: Fukushi Kokka no Sport Seisaku]* (Tokyo: Fumaido, 2003).

²⁰ Department for Culture, Media and Sport, *Playing to Win: A New Era for Sport* (London: DCMS, 2008), 3.

²¹ For example, Uchiumi and Yamamoto introduce the outline of sport policy under New Labour (See Uchiumi, K., 'The Issues of "The Strategy for Sports Nation" in Comparison with UK Sport Policy [Igirisu no Sport Seisaku kara Mietekuru "Sport Rikkoku Senryaku" no Mondaiten]', *Taiiku Ka Kyoiku*, November (2010), 42-45; Yamamoto, M., 'Sport Policy in the World I : the United Kingdom [Sekai no Sport Seisaku I: Igirisu]', in Sasagawa Sports Foundation, ed., *Fundamental Law of Sports* (Tokyo: Sasagawa Sports Foundation, 2010), 8-11). Also, *Yomiuri Shimbun* deals with UK sport policy in its discussion of 'Sports Nation' (21 April, 2010; 13 August 2010). Moreover, in the symposium of the subcommittee for sociology of physical education and sport in Japan Society of Physical Education, Health and Sports Sciences 2010, Prof. Kiku (Tsukuba University) spoke about the current state of sport policy in the UK (See Kaneko, F., 'The Report on Annual Conference of Japan Society of Physical Education, Health and Sports Sciences 2010: Focusing on the Subcommittee for Sociology of Physical Education and Sport [Nihon Taiiku Gakkai Dai 61 Kai Taikai Bochoki: Taiiku Shakaigaku Bunya wo Chushin ni]', *Taiiku no Kagaku*, 60(12) (2010), 854-857).

1. Towards 'Sport for All' under the Keynesian Welfare State (from the 1960s to the mid-1970s)

Until the 1970s, the British Government had been oriented towards the idea of the Keynesian welfare state. It was the *Beveridge Report* in 1942 that influenced the foundation of the welfare state in the post-war period. This report recommended that the Government should be responsible for the redistribution of wealth by means of a welfare policy, which would cover areas such as social security, the medical service, education, housing, and employment. These suggestions were realised under the Labour government of Clement Attlee, which, for example, established the National Health Service in 1948. This political philosophy, sometimes referred to as 'from the cradle to the grave', continued until the 1970s under the 'consensus' between the Conservatives and the Labour Party.

In this context, the promotion of community sport became a part of welfare policy. The *Wolfenden Report*, which was published in 1960, was influential in the development of sport policy. This report dealt with broad issues, such as the decline of Britain in international sporting competitions and youth problems, and recognised sport as a means of ameliorating social problems such as anti-social behaviour, as well as making improvements in areas like health and education.²² In its conclusion, it pointed out the need for better and more easily available sports facilities and coaching, and the improvement of the organisations and administrations involved in sport in the UK.²³ As Houlihan and White indicate, the *Wolfenden Report* marked a watershed in the development of UK sport policy, 'not only in raising the profile of sport with government but also, and more importantly, in shaping the context within which public involvement in sport was to be considered for the next generation'.²⁴

However, some of the proposals of the *Wolfenden Report* were not put into practice because they were 'anathema to many conservatives in and out of government who saw sport as private, pastime, something government should steer clear of'.²⁵ In spite of this, the establishment of the Sports Development Council, one of the key recommendations of the report, was achieved as a consequence of the formation of the Advisory Sports Council in 1965. From that time, the Council's main priority was the construction of sports facilities, although there were 'the competing policy emphases of promoting elite sport and mass participation' in the organisations of sport in the UK.²⁶

In the early 1970s, the development of sport policy with the welfare state ideology began to accelerate. The creation of the Executive Sports Council in 1972 proved groundbreaking in terms of public intervention in sport. This event was 'located within a broad welfare state discourse best reflected in the egalitarianism of what was later to be referred to as "Sport for All" campaign'.²⁷ In addition, the reorganisation of local authorities in 1974 led to an increase in the number of sports and leisure facilities and the establishment of leisure service

²² See Central Council for Physical Recreation, *Sport and the Community* (London: CCPR, 1960).

²³ See CCPR, *Sport and the Community*.

²⁴ Houlihan, B. and White, A., *The Politics of Sports Development: Development of Sport or Development through Sport?* (London: Routledge, 2002), 18.

²⁵ Collins, M., 'Public Policies on Sports Development: Can Mass and Elite Sport Hold Together?', in V. Girginov, ed., *Management of Sports Development* (Oxford: Elsevier, 2008), 61.

²⁶ Bloyce, D. and Smith, A., *Sport Policy and Development: An Introduction* (Oxon: Routledge, 2010), 33.

²⁷ Houlihan and White, *The Politics of Sports Development*, 24.

departments in many local authorities. These then became the basis for 'Sport for All'.²⁸ Moreover, these trends were notable in discourses in policy documents in this period. For example, in the *Cobham Report*, we can find a discourse on the responsibility of the public sector for the provision of sport:

'...local authorities and other public suppliers...have to be convinced that their policies will create the maximum opportunity for sport and recreation, and that they are providing a wide range of facilities which will meet the needs of the greatest number of people'.²⁹

And most notably, *Sport and Recreation*, the first White Paper in this policy area, stated that sport and recreation should be regarded as 'one of the community's everyday needs'.³⁰

As described above, sport was recognised as a part of welfare policy until the mid-1970s. At the same time, however, according to Henry, *Sport and Recreation* also represented a shift from community sport policy with welfare state philosophy.³¹ Indeed, *Sport and Recreation* described sport and recreation as a 'part of the general fabric of the social services'.³² Moreover, with regard to the responsibility of the public sector for sport provision, this document mentioned that 'the role of government is to co-ordinate and give a lead to the planning and use of resources within the community' and not 'to adopt a paternalistic attitude to many different providers of recreation in this country'.³³ Furthermore, although local authorities seemed set to 'become the main providers of new sports facilities and of parks and open spaces for informal outdoor recreation in the towns',³⁴ the Government rejected the viewpoint 'that a statutory duty should be placed on certain local authorities to provide adequate recreational facilities'.³⁵ According to Henry, this was because of the serious financial crisis that confronted the British government.³⁶ In short, and this is something that I will return to later, the characteristics of community sport policy had begun to shift from 'recreational welfare' towards 'recreation as welfare' from the mid-1970s.³⁷

2. Towards the Promotion of Community Sport as Social Policy (from the late 1970s to the early 1980s)

From the mid-1970s, it became difficult for the central government to maintain the welfare statist policy, due to several challenges to the welfare state, such as the oil crisis, the economic

²⁸ See Roche, M., 'Sport and Community: Rhetoric and Reality in the Development of British Sport Policy', in J. Binfield and J. Stevenson, eds., *Sport, Culture and Politics* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 72-112.

²⁹ House of Lords, *First Report from the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Sport and Leisure* (chairman: Lord Cobham) (London: HMSO, 1973).

³⁰ Department of Environment, *Sport and Recreation* (London: HMSO, 1975), 1.

³¹ See Henry, I., *The Politics of Leisure Policy* (London: Palgrave, 2001 edn), 73.

³² Department of Environment, *Sport and Recreation*, 1.

³³ Department of Environment, *Sport and Recreation*, 4, cited in Bloyce and Smith, *Sport Policy and Development*, 36-37.

³⁴ Department of Environment, *Sport and Recreation*, 8.

³⁵ Department of Environment, *Sport and Recreation*, 9, cited in Bloyce and Smith, *Sport Policy and Development*, 37.

³⁶ See Henry, *The Politics of Leisure Policy*.

³⁷ See Coalter, F., Long, J. and Duffield, B., eds., *Recreational Welfare: The Rational for Public Leisure Policy* (London: Sports Council and Economic and Social Research Council, 1988).

crisis, symbolised by a loan from the International Monetary Fund in 1976, and the inefficiency of public service provision. In this context, the 'restructuring' of the welfare state started under the Conservative government of Margaret Thatcher. She proposed a reduction in the role of the public sector in welfare service provision, and suggested that it be privatised. As a result, neo-liberal reform was implemented throughout the 1980s.

Subsequently, community sport policy in this period was affected by this political context. Firstly, although the Sports Council initially promoted the 'Sport for All' campaign with 'generalist' ambition,³⁸ there had been a shift towards 'sport for the disadvantaged' and 'sport for inner city youth' since the mid-1970s.³⁹ Such emphases could be recognised in key policy documents in this period. For example, *Sport in the Community: The Next Ten Years* referred to people like 'housewives, especially those with young children, semi and unskilled workers, people over the age of 45, and the handicapped, ethnic minorities and unemployed'⁴⁰ as 'target groups', and proposed concentrating their limited resources on the promotion of community sport among such groups:

'The [Sports] Council recognises that the only way of reconciling growing demands with limited resources is to set priorities, and to concentrate resources either where need is judged to be greatest, or where it will produce the greatest social or economic return. This is the basis of the Council's Strategy for the 1980s'.⁴¹

Secondly, although it had been predicted that spending on sport would be reduced dramatically under the neo-liberal reform of the government, there was in fact a small increase, because community sport policy was seen as a part of social policy in the face of urban riots in the early 1980s by the central government.⁴² The Action Sport programme, initiated by the Sports Council between 1982 and 1985, best reflected the instrumental use of sport by the Government in this period. This programme provided grants of up to £1 million pounds a year for local authorities faced with urban riots, and attempted 'to demonstrate the part that could be played by sport and physical recreation within deprived urban areas'.⁴³

In summary, as Green indicates, there was a shift in community sport policy between the mid-1970s and the early 1980s:

'away from spending on targeted groups..., which was rationalized on the basis of alleviating recreational disadvantage and the fostering of community development, and towards the use of sport and leisure as a form of 'benign policing', realigned political priorities for sport, recreation and physical activity policy'.⁴⁴

In this context, even in the Sports Council, some people were unsure about such direction of community sport policy. For instance, McIntosh and Charlton stated that 'it is possible that at

³⁸ See McIntosh, P. and Charlton, V., *The Impact of Sport For All Policy 1966-1984 and a Way Forward* (London: Sports Council, 1985), 113.

³⁹ See Houlihan, B., *The Government and Politics of Sport* (London: Routledge, 1991), 99.

⁴⁰ Sports Council, *Sport in the Community: The Next Ten Years* (London: Sports Council, 1982b), 2.

⁴¹ Sports Council, *Sport in the Community: The Next Ten Years*, 31

⁴² See Henry, *The Politics of Leisure Policy*.

⁴³ Sports Council, *Annual Report 1981/82* (London: Sports Council, 1982a).

⁴⁴ Green, M., 'From "Sport for All" to Not About "Sport" at All?: Interrogating Sport Policy Interventions in the United Kingdom', *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 6(3) (2006), 225.

least some of the social functions which Sport for All was intended to fulfil may be as effectively fulfilled by other Leisure Activities for All,⁴⁵ and they claimed that community sport policy should be a policy towards the promotion of sport for sport's sake.⁴⁶

3. The 'Withdrawal' of the Government from Community Sport and the Industrialisation of Sport under Neo-Liberalism (from the late 1980s to the mid-1990s)

By the mid-1980s, the Government's expenditure on community sport had increased even under the neo-liberal thinking of the Thatcher government, because community sport was used as a policy tool to tackle social problems at that time. However, community sport policy began to reflect neo-liberal restructuring with the aim of reducing the role of the public sector in welfare service provision from the late 1980s.

Indeed, the review of the role of local authorities, one of the key providers of public service provision for sport, and the privatisation of their services started in this context.⁴⁷ Firstly, Compulsory Competitive Tendering (CCT) was introduced for the management of public sports facilities in 1989, which forced local authorities to put the contract to manage their facilities to tender, and to compete with commercial providers for the contract. In addition, the Audit Commission reviewed and tried to clarify the role of local authorities in sport and recreation provision.⁴⁸ In its document, the Audit Commission emphasised the significance of financial objectives in public service provision, as well as that of social goals:

'While the private sector provides leisure facilities principally for financial gain, the public sector is able to pursue broader objectives such as health promotion or the alleviation of social deprivation...But whatever their social aims, local authorities also need financial objectives if they are to manage their facilities properly. Local authorities have found it hard to strike the right balance between social and financial objectives'.⁴⁹

In conclusion, this document stated that under CCT, '[local a]uthorities will be transformed from service operators to service enablers'.⁵⁰

The neo-liberal attitude towards the promotion of community sport became more prominent during the early 1990s. The Conservative government of John Major formed in 1991, wanted the central government and the Sports Council to 'withdraw' from community sport provision, instead of focusing on elite sport and school sport.⁵¹

According to Henry, the launch of the National Lottery in 1994 could be regarded as a sign of neo-liberal thinking, because although it partially replaced government expenditure on sport and brought more funding to sport than before, it required providers of community sport to compete with each other in bids for funding.⁵² As a result, '[i]n terms of community sports

⁴⁵ McIntosh and Charlton, *The Impact of Sport For All Policy 1966-1984 and a Way Forward*, 191-192, cited in Roche, 'Sport and Community', 101.

⁴⁶ See Roche, 'Sport and Community', 101.

⁴⁷ See Henry, *The Politics of Leisure Policy*.

⁴⁸ See Audit Commission, *Sport for Whom? Clarifying the Local Authority Role in Sport and Recreation* (London: HMSO, 1989).

⁴⁹ Audit Commission, *Sport for Whom?*, 1.

⁵⁰ Audit Commission, *Sport for Whom?*, 16-17.

⁵¹ See Houlihan and White, *The Politics of Sports Development*.

provision, the Lottery funding system rewarded those most able to bid effectively for funds, rather than those most in need'.⁵³

Secondly, the government's intention to 'withdraw' from community sport provision began to appear in key policy documents during this period. For example, Iain Sproat, the Conservative Minister for Sport, said, '...the Sports Council will withdraw from the promotion of mass participation, informal recreation, leisure pursuits, and from health promotion...and shift its focus to service in support of excellence'.⁵⁴ In addition, the White Paper, *Sport: Raising the Game*, the first major policy statement on sport for twenty years, expressed the growing interest and intervention in both school (youth) sport and elite sport by the central government who wished to enhance British nationalism in the process of the globalisation and the Europeanisation. Such orientations were best reflected in the foreword to this document presented by the Prime Minister:

'We are setting out today a detailed blueprint for the future of sport in schools...I am determined to see that our great traditional sports — cricket, hockey, swimming, athletics, football, netball, rugby, tennis and the like — are put firmly at the centre of the stage...Finally, I want to help our best sports men and women make the very best of their talents...With the help of the National Lottery we will create a new British Academy of Sport with worldclass facilities, to help sporting stars, and we will support it by a developing network of regional and sports academies to bring on the best'.⁵⁵

At the same time, however, according to Bloyce and Smith, this White Paper 'was of particular significance, for it marginalized considerably the role of local government and made little reference to mass participation ("Sport for All") or to local authorities who are the key vehicles of its promotion'.⁵⁶ Thus, these documents seemed to confirm two important directions towards subsequent sport policy in the UK: 'an increasing preoccupation with elite sport development', and 'the ongoing retreat of support for community recreation'.⁵⁷

Thirdly, the discourse on the 'industrialisation' of sport could also be identified in some policy documents during this period. For example, the Audit Commission referred to the contribution of sport towards 'helping urban regeneration and attracting tourists and thus helping the local economy'.⁵⁸ Indeed, some major cities started to use sport and leisure as a means of urban regeneration and city marketing.⁵⁹ For example, Sheffield hosted the World Student Games in 1991 in the hope that the event would help regenerate a city which was faced with deindustrialisation and a high rate of unemployment.⁶⁰ In summary, as Roche indicates,

⁵² See Henry, I., 'Globalisation, Governance and Policy', in I. Henry and the Institute of Sport and Leisure Policy, *Transnational and Comparative Research in Sport* (Oxon: Routledge, 2007).

⁵³ Henry, 'Globalisation, Governance and Policy', 13.

⁵⁴ Department of National Heritage, *Sport for 21st Century* (London: HMSO, 1994), 4, cited McDonald, I., 'Excellence and Expedience?: Olympism, Power and Contemporary Sports Policy in England', in M. Keech and G. McFee, eds., *Issues and Values in Sport and Leisure Cultures* (Oxford: Meyer and Meyer Sport, 2000), 88.

⁵⁵ Department of National Heritage, *Sport: Raising the Game* (London: DNH, 1995), 3.

⁵⁶ Bloyce and Smith, *Sport Policy and Development*, 46.

⁵⁷ Green, M., 'Changing Policy Priorities for Sport in England: The Emergence of Elite Sport Development as a Key Policy Concern', *Leisure Studies*, 23(4) (2004), 371.

⁵⁸ Audit Commission, *Sport for Whom?*, 7.

⁵⁹ See Gratton, C., Shibli, S. and Coleman, R., 'Sport and Economic Regeneration in Cities', *Urban Studies*, 42(5/6) (2005), 1-15.

'[s]port policy now provides facilities for the tourist market, and sporting spectaculars for the world media market'.⁶¹

In this sense, as *Sport in the Nineties: New Horizons* indicates below, there was a growing emphasis on the importance of sport in economic terms.⁶² At the same time, however, according to the Sports Council, such orientation gave rise to the question about what public sport policy should be:

'Sport now accounts for nearly £10bn of consumer spending and just under half a million jobs. Sport has grown from a series of pastimes through a substantial voluntary movement, into a major industry spanning public, voluntary and commercial sectors...As public resources become scarcer, so economic arguments grew in importance. However, it is important to recognise that public funding of sport is primarily for its personal, social and health benefits. Economic benefits should be viewed very much as secondary in importance and not used alone as the justification of policy'.⁶³

4. Towards a 'Social Investment State' through Community Sport (from the late 1990s to 2007)

In contrast with the neo-liberal restructuring of the welfare state under the Conservative government, the New Labour government of Tony Blair, which was formed in 1997, began to lean towards the 'Third Way'. In other words, the Blair government tried to 'modernise' the British welfare state in the face of the ongoing process of globalisation.

In this 'modernisation' programme, New Labour especially emphasised combatting the problem of 'social exclusion', because it would cause further social problems such as crime and unemployment, and, as a consequence, lead to an increase in social costs. In this regard, the Blair government aimed towards a 'social investment state' where the Government intended to ensure equal opportunities in the market and in society through welfare policy, such as education and vocational training, and then create 'active citizens', that is, individuals and communities with 'greater responsibility for their own actions and welfare future'.⁶⁴ At the same time, there was more emphasis on 'partnership' between stakeholders, especially with communities or 'active citizens', under New Labour, in order to deliver welfare policy more efficiently and effectively.

In this context, community sport policy strongly reflected New Labour's political philosophy, which was directed towards a 'social investment state'.⁶⁵ Firstly, New Labour had reoriented their attention towards 'Sport for All' / mass participation, because they came to consider community sport 'as a malleable and instrumental policy tool' for broader social objectives, such as health, reduction in crime and anti-social behaviour, education, and

⁶⁰ See Henry, *The Politics of Leisure Policy*; see also Henry, I.P. and Paramio-Salcines, J.L., 'Sport and the Analysis of Symbolic Regimes: A Case Study of the City of Sheffield', *Urban Affairs Review*, 34(5) (1999), 641-666.

⁶¹ Roche, 'Sport and Community', 104.

⁶² See Sports Council, *Sport in the Nineties: New Horizons* (London: Sports Council, 1993).

⁶³ Sports Council, *Sport in the Nineties*, 54-55.

⁶⁴ See Giddens, A., *The Third Way: The Renewal of Social Democracy* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1998); See also Green, 'From "Sport for All" to Not About "Sport" at All?', 225.

⁶⁵ See Green, M., 'Governing under Advanced Liberalism: Sport Policy and the Social Investment State', *Policy Sciences*, 40 (2007), 55-71.

especially, social inclusion, in order to aid the creation of 'social capital' and 'active citizens'.⁶⁶ This trend was initially identified in *Sporting Future for All*, the first policy document under New Labour:

'Sport can make a unique contribution to tackling social exclusion in our society...Some pioneering work has already been done and we will be building on this to develop creative and innovative ways of using sport to help re-engage people and to equip them with the skills and confidence to re-join the main stream of society'.⁶⁷

Similarly, in *Game Plan*, the Prime Minister stated that, '[s]port is a powerful and often under-used tool that can help Government to achieve a number of ambitious goals'.⁶⁸ This document indicated the possibility that sport and physical activity 'have a major part to play in promoting health, and as part of a basket of measures can contribute to improved educational outcomes, reduced crime and greater social inclusion'.⁶⁹

Moreover, this trend was pursued in the documents published by Sport England, the successor to the Sports Council and the leading agency of community sport policy in England. For example, in *Sport Playing Its Part*, Sport England recognised that:

'Sport can enrich people's quality of life, raise self-esteem and confidence levels and provide enjoyment to individuals. But sport has also a much larger part to play in achieving other outcomes, building stronger safer communities, strengthening the economy and developing the skills of local people, meeting the needs of children, as well as the associated health benefits'.⁷⁰

Secondly, 'partnership' with stakeholders was employed as a key mechanism to deliver sport policy under New Labour. Such discourse was reflected in some key policy documents. For example, in the foreword to *Sporting Future for All*, Tony Blair indicated the importance of 'the organisations involved in sport working together to make our vision for sport happen' and the 'modernisation' of the way in which sport is delivered for the achievement of government's goals.⁷¹ In addition, *Game Plan* referred to the change in the role of central government and that of two agencies, namely Sport England and UK Sport, from one of providers of services to one of investors of funding from the government and the National Lottery.⁷² At the same time, the importance of partnership with various providers of sport was stressed once more:

'It highlights the central importance of Government working closely in partnership with those that provide sport — national governing bodies, clubs, schools, local authorities, the voluntary and the private sectors — to help deliver key outcomes'.⁷³

⁶⁶ See Coalter, F., *A Wider Social Role for Sport* (Oxon: Routledge, 2007); See also Green, 'From "Sport for All" to Not About "Sport" at All?', 218; Green, 'Governing under Advanced Liberalism'.

⁶⁷ Department for Culture, Media and Sport, *A Sporting Future for All* (London: DCMS, 2000), 39.

⁶⁸ Department for Culture, Media and Sport and Cabinet Office Strategy Unit, *Game Plan: A Strategy for Delivering Government's Sport and Physical Activity Objectives* (London: HMSO, 2002), 5.

⁶⁹ DCMS and Strategy Unit, *Game Plan*, 14.

⁷⁰ Sport England, *Sport Playing Its Part: The Contribution of Sport to Community Priorities and the Improvement Agenda* (London: Sport England, 2006), 2.

⁷¹ DCMS, *A Sporting Future for All*, 3.

⁷² DCMS and Strategy Unit, *Game Plan*, 18.

⁷³ DCMS and Strategy Unit, *Game Plan*, 5.

As a response to the recommendations in these documents, County Sports Partnerships (CSPs) and Community Sports Networks (CSNs) were established.⁷⁴ Both of these are partnerships between agencies, such as local authorities and national governing bodies of sport (NGBs), as well as other non-sport agencies at county level and at local authority level. In this context, voluntary sport organisations, such as NGBs and local sport clubs were to be recognised as partners by central government and national agencies, and subsequently delegated the delivery of programmes for community sport.⁷⁵

5. Back to the Promotion of Community Sport for Sport's Sake? (from 2008 to the present)

Under the New Labour government of Tony Blair, there was a growing emphasis on the extrinsic values of sport, such as the contribution of community sport towards achieving social inclusion and creating 'active citizens'. However, it seems clear that the Government and other agencies have recently changed their attitude towards community sport policy, back to its promotion for the sake of sport itself.⁷⁶ It might be due to the impact of hosting the 2012 Olympic Games in London and the change in the Minister for Sport, followed by the change of leadership in New Labour from Tony Blair to Gordon Brown. This change of direction can be seen in the most recent policy documents, namely *Sport England Strategy 2008-2011* and *Playing to Win: A New Era for Sport*.

According to Sport England, the review of its strategy for community sport was carried out between late 2007 and the first half of 2008, at the same time as the awarding of the 2012 Olympics and the Paralympics to London.⁷⁷ As a result, Sport England developed a new strategy. This strategy demonstrated a shift in the role of Sport England, away from the promotion of community sport to achieving non-sporting objectives towards the notion of sport for sport's sake:

'In the future Sport England's role will be to focus exclusively on sport. Sport can and does play a major role in achieving wider social and economic benefits — notably on the health front. However, the driving force behind the strategy and investment is to address the needs of sport participants across the country'.⁷⁸

This trend was more conspicuous in the foreword to *Playing to Win: A New Era for Sport*. In his foreword, Andy Burnham, the new Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport, positioned this document as 'a plan to get more people taking up sport simply for the love of sport; to expand the pool of talented English sportsmen and women; and to break records, win medals and win tournaments for this country'.⁷⁹ In addition, he also stated:

'I believe in sport for sport's sake. We should value sport because it is a good thing in and of itself. We should invest in sport for maximum sporting benefit...My aim is clear and

⁷⁴ See Sport England, *The Delivery System for Sport in England* (London: Sport England, 2007).

⁷⁵ DCMS and Strategy Unit, *Game Plan*, 11.

⁷⁶ Bloyce and Smith, *Sport Policy and Development*, 53.

⁷⁷ See Sport England, *Sport England Strategy 2008-2011* (London: Sport England, 2008).

⁷⁸ Sport England, *Sport England Strategy 2008-2011*, 1.

⁷⁹ DCMS, *Playing to Win*, preface.

simple — to create a healthy ‘playing to win’ culture in English sport by creating competitive opportunities for all’.⁸⁰

In this context, the roles of the DCMS and Sport England in community sport policy were redefined as ‘to set the overarching strategy and work with stakeholders from across the sporting landscape’ and ‘to take a strategic lead for community sport’ respectively.⁸¹ And as described below, ‘partnership’ remained at the heart of the system for community sport provision. In particular, NGBs have been regarded as the primary partner in delivering community sport policy:

‘Sport England’s new approach will be to operate at a strategic level, working with and through national governing bodies, and drawing in other partners such as Local Authorities who drive local provision and are key to delivering a world-leading community sport infrastructure. National Governing Bodies, who have particularly been involved with the strategy review process, will be empowered to have greater autonomy over the investment of public funds within their sport — along with greater responsibility for the delivery of outcomes’.⁸²

6. Conclusions

This section has briefly reviewed the development of sport policy in the UK in the post-war period, particularly by tracing the discourses on the promotion of community sport in key policy documents. Overall, as discussed above, there has been a great deal of fluctuation in the rationale for community sport policy, between the promotion of community sport for sport’s sake, which was most clearly expressed in a ‘Sport for All’ campaign in the early 1970s, and the instrumental use of community sport for broader economic and social objectives, such as alleviating urban frustration in the early 1980s, contributing to economic development from the late 1980s, and combatting social exclusion and creating ‘active citizens’ under the Blair government. In short, although we can see the redirection of sport policy towards sporting goals in recent documents, we can conclude that the political justification for public investment in community sport policy has shifted away from ‘the development of sport’ towards ‘the development through sport’ in the last fifty years, following the transformation of the British welfare state.⁸³

In addition, the above discussion reveals that there has been ‘intervention’ by the government in community sport, because the state has realised the extrinsic value of sport for its political goals. At the same time, however, it seems that the central government and public agencies for sport (the Sports Council and Sport England) have intended to ‘withdraw’ from, or to take only a strategic role in the provision of community sport. Instead, the growing discourses on ‘partnership’ with stakeholders, in particular with voluntary organisations like NGBs and local clubs can be seen in policy documents. So, what are the consequences of this situation? In the final part of this paper, we will discuss the issue by focusing on the current

⁸⁰ DCMS, *Playing to Win*, 2.

⁸¹ DCMS, *Playing to Win*, 8

⁸² Sport England, *Sport England Strategy 2008-2011*, 6.

⁸³ See Houlihan and White, *The Politics of Sports Development*.

context surrounding NGBs.

As already mentioned, NGBs were recognised as the main partner by Sport England, and given greater autonomy about how they used grants from public funds. At the same time, however, they were also required to submit their Whole Sport Plan to Sport England,⁸⁴ in which they had to demonstrate how they could contribute to the government's goals. These plans are evaluated and monitored by Sport England and then Sport England decides on the amount of the grant to be given to each NGB.⁸⁵ In this context, as Green and Houlihan indicate, the 'modernisation' of NGBs would reduce their autonomy, because although NGBs seems to exercise autonomy through control of public funds, national agencies for sport, on behalf of the government, can still control of their actions by setting targets, monitoring their performance and evaluating their results in contracts through the Whole Sport Plan.⁸⁶ In short, 'partnership' with stakeholders, including NGBs, can be easily controlled by the central government towards its own political orientation.

To sum up, through an investigation of the history of community sport policy in the post-war UK, this section has identified the two issues which the promotion of community sport faces in relation to the central government: the instrumental use of community sport, and the autonomy of voluntary sport organisations from the Government. As Ozaki indicates in the previous section, these challenges are similar to community sport policy in Japan, despite the difference in the national context. So, how should community sport be promoted? Who should have the responsibility for the promotion of community sport as a public concern? What should be the role of central government in community sport policy? And ultimately, should we return to the age of amateurism to resolve the two issues? The comparative studies of a history of amateurism and community sport policy in the UK and in Japan provide us with food for thought to confront these questions.

REFERENCES

- Audit Commission. (1989). *Sport for Whom? Clarifying the Local Authority Role in Sport and Recreation*. London: HMSO.
- Bloyce, D., & Smith, A. (2010). *Sport Policy and Development: An Introduction*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Central Council for Physical Recreation. (1960). *Sport and the Community*. London: CCPR.
- Coalter, F. (2007). *A Wider Social Role for Sport*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Coalter, F., Long, J., & Duffield, B. (Eds.). (1988). *Recreational Welfare: The Rational for Public Leisure Policy*. London: Sports Council & Economic and Social Research Council.
- Collins, M. (2008). Public Policies on Sports Development: Can Mass and Elite Sport Hold Together?. In V. Girginov (Ed.). *Management of Sports Development*. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Department for Culture, Media and Sport. (2000). *A Sporting Future for All*. London: DCMS.
- Department for Culture, Media and Sport. (2008). *Playing to Win: A New Era for Sport*.

⁸⁴ See DCMS, *Playing to Win*; See also Sport England, *Sport England Strategy 2008-2011*.

⁸⁵ See Sport England, *Sport England Strategy 2008-2011*.

⁸⁶ See Green, M. and Houlihan, B., 'Governmentality, Modernization, and the "Disciplining" of National Sporting Organizations: Athletics in Australia and the United Kingdom', *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 23(1) (2006), 47-71.

- London: DCMS.
- Department for Culture, Media and Sport & Cabinet Office Strategy Unit. (2002). *Game Plan: A Strategy for Delivering Government's Sport and Physical Activity Objectives*. London: HMSO.
- Department of Environment. (1975). *Sport and Recreation*. London: HMSO.
- Department of National Heritage. (1994). *Sport for 21st Century*. London: HMSO.
- Department of National Heritage. (1995). *Sport: Raising the Game*. London: DNH.
- Giddens, A. (1998). *The Third Way: The Renewal of Social Democracy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Gratton, C., Shibli, S., & Coleman, R. (2005). Sport and Economic Regeneration in Cities. *Urban Studies*, 42(5/6), 1-15.
- Green, M. (2004). Changing Policy Priorities for Sport in England: The Emergence of Elite Sport Development as a Key Policy Concern. *Leisure Studies*, 23(4), 365-385.
- Green, M. (2006). From 'Sport for All' to Not About 'Sport' at All?: Interrogating Sport Policy Interventions in the United Kingdom. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 6(3), 217-238.
- Green, M. (2007). Governing under Advanced Liberalism: Sport Policy and the Social Investment State. *Policy Sciences*, 40, 55-71.
- Green, M., & Houlihan, B. (2006). Governmentality, Modernization, and the 'Disciplining' of National Sporting Organizations: Athletics in Australia and the United Kingdom. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 23(1), 47-71.
- Henry, I. (2001). *The Politics of Leisure Policy* (2nd ed.). London: Palgrave.
- Henry, I. (2007). Globalisation, Governance and Policy. In I. Henry, & the Institute of Sport and Leisure Policy. *Transnational and Comparative Research in Sport*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Henry, I.P., & Paramio-Salcines, J.L. (1999). Sport and the Analysis of Symbolic Regimes: A Case Study of the City of Sheffield. *Urban Affairs Review*, 34(5), 641-666.
- Hoken Taiiku Shingikai (Commission for the Public Health and Physical Education) (1972), *Taiiku-sport no Fukyu Shinko ni kansuru Kihonteki Hosaku ni tsuite (Basic Policies concerning the Promotion of Physical Education and Sport)*.
- Houlihan, B. (1991). *The Government and Politics of Sport*. London: Routledge.
- Houlihan, B., & White, A. (2002). *The Politics of Sports Development: Development of Sport or Development through Sport?*. London: Routledge.
- House of Lords. (1973). *First Report from the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Sport and Leisure* (chairman: Lord Cobham). London: HMSO.
- International Trade and Industry (Japan), (1990), *Sport Vision for the 21st Century*.
- Kaneko, F. (2010). The Report on Annual Conference of Japan Society of Physical Education, Health and Sports Sciences 2010: Focusing on the Subcommittee for Sociology of Physical Education and Sport [Nihon Taiiku Gakkai Dai 61 Kai Taikai Bochoki: Taiiku Shakaigaku Bunya wo Chushin ni]. *Taiiku no Kagaku*, 60(12), 854-857.
- McDonald, I. (2000). Excellence and Expedience?: Olympism, Power and Contemporary Sports Policy in England. In M. Keech and G. McFee (Eds.). *Issues and Values in Sport and Leisure Cultures*. Oxford: Meyer and Meyer Sport.
- McIntosh, P., & Charlton, V. (1985). *The Impact of Sport For All Policy 1966-1984 and a Way Forward*. London: Sport Council.
- Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science & Technology (Japan) (MEXT), *Report on the*

- Facilities of Physical Education and Sports.* (published irregularly)
- MEXT, *Report on Social Education.*(published about per 3 years)
- MEXT (1999), *Basic Plan for the Promotion of Sports (2001-2010).*
- MEXT (2010), *The Strategy for Sports Nation.*
- Ozaki, M. (1996), *The History of the Sports Industry in Japan since 1945*, Mike Collins (Ed.) *Leisure in Industrial and Post-Industrial Societies*, LSA (UK).
- Ozaki, M. (2010), *Sport Seisaku no Grand Dezain wo*, *Gekkan Shakai Kyoiku*, Oct. 2010, Kokudoshu, Tokyo.
- Ozaki, M. (2011), *'Sport no Kenri' Rinen no Gugenka he*, *Gekkan Shakai Kyoiku*, Oct. 2011, Kokudoshu, Tokyo.
- Roche, M. (1993). *Sport and Community: Rhetoric and Reality in the Development of British Sport Policy.* In J. Binfield, & J. Stevenson (Eds.). *Sport, Culture and Politics.* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Sport England. (2006). *Sport Playing Its Part: The Contribution of Sport to Community Priorities and the Improvement Agenda.* London: Sport England.
- Sport England. (2007). *The Delivery System for Sport in England.* London: Sport England.
- Sport England. (2008). *Sport England Strategy 2008-2011.* London: Sport England.
- Sports Council. (1982a). *Annual Report 1981/82.* London: Sports Council.
- Sports Council. (1982b). *Sport in the Community: The Next Ten Years.* London: Sports Council.
- Sports Council. (1993). *Sport in the Nineties: New Horizons.* London: Sports Council.
- Uchiumi, K. (2003). *Sport for All in the United Kingdom: Sport Policy in the Welfare State [Igirisu no Sport for All: Fukushi Kokka no Sport Seisaku].* Tokyo: Fumaido.
- Uchiumi, K. (2010). *The Issues of 'The Strategy for Sports Nation' in Comparison with UK Sport Policy [Igirisu no Sport Seisaku kara Mietekuru 'Sport Rikkoku Senryaku' no Mondaiten].* *Taïku Ka Kyoiku*, November 2010, 42-45.
- Yamamoto, M. (2010). *Sport Policy in the World I : the United Kingdom [Sekai no Sport Seisaku I: Igirisu].* In Sasagawa Sports Foundation (Ed.). *Fundamental Law of Sports.* Tokyo: Sasagawa Sports Foundation.