

England versus Germany:
On *Tommies*, *Krauts* and *Footie Foes*

Anglo-German relations and discourses of national character in English and German press coverage of football games between these countries



“..our portrait
in the English press..”

(Fritz Wolf, *Neue Tagespost*, 29/07/1966)

Astrid Fedeler

A thesis submitted for the degree of Master of Philosophy in English

Department of Foreign Languages
University of Bergen
May 2008

Acknowledgments

First of all and above all, THANKS TO GOD who carried me through ‘all this’!

A huge thanks goes to my supervisors for this thesis, Kari Haugland and Leiv Egil Breivik; always positive and encouraging, always ready to help, constructive in their criticism and competent in their judgment. Kari; I hope you`ve finally caught the football fever!

Thanks to

Maria Carme Torras and Kari Normo at the University Library in Bergen;

Warrant Officer Carl Tomkinson, British Forces Germany, Osnabrück, for his helpfulness in connection with the survey at ILANCS;

Werner Koller and Kevin McCafferty, who provided relevant articles;

staff at *British Library Newspapers*, Colindale, London, for professional assistance, reliability and courtesy;

Eli Richter, my lovely friend in Germany, who got up at 5:30 one morning to help me find my way in Münster;

Thorsten Schmidt, *ULB Münster* (press archives), for letting me come early before the ‘rush’ set in, and for good preparations;

Carmen Vosgröne and Christiane auf dem Kampe, *Neue Osnabrücker Zeitung* (press archives), for their kind assistance.

Last but *not least*:

THANKS to my wonderful parents and family for prayers, encouragement and support in every possible way.

I dedicate this work to my parents.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Acknowledgments | 2 |
| Table of contents | 3 |
| List of tables | 5 |
| List of abbreviations | 5 |
| | |
| 1 INTRODUCTION | |
| 1.1 The national dimension of identity in England and Germany..... | 6 |
| 1.2 Media, sport, national identity..... | 8 |
| 1.3 Football in England and Germany – more than just a game..... | 10 |
| 1.4 Stereotypification of national character..... | 10 |
| 1.5 Discursive strategies for the construction of national character in sports reporting..... | 11 |
| | |
| 2 THEORETICAL CONCERNS and METHODOLOGY | |
| 2.1 Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)..... | 16 |
| 2.2 The media – a complex factor in the formation of national character..... | 18 |
| 2.3 Globalisation of media sport – a challenge to the national dimension..... | 19 |
| 2.4 Methodology of the present study..... | 19 |
| | |
| 3 MATERIAL | |
| 3.1 Primary data – English and German newspapers analysed in this study..... | 21 |
| 3.2 Delineation of subject matter: reasons for the specific choice of games..... | 22 |
| | |
| 4 ANALYSIS | |
| 4.1 The World Cup 1966 in the English press..... | 26 |
| 4.1.1 Use of stereotypes..... | 26 |
| 4.1.2 Military and aggressive language..... | 31 |
| 4.1.3 Football-nostalgic references..... | 33 |
| 4.1.4 Assessments of the Anglo-German relationship..... | 33 |
| 4.1.5 Displays of nationalism, chauvinism, jingoism..... | 34 |
| 4.1.6 Meta-discourse: Reactions to journalistic representations in the other country..... | 35 |
| 4.1.7 Summary..... | 36 |
| 4.2 The World Cup 1966 in the German press..... | 36 |
| 4.2.1 Use of stereotypes..... | 37 |
| 4.2.2 Military and aggressive language..... | 39 |
| 4.2.3 Football-nostalgic references..... | 40 |
| 4.2.4 Assessments of the Anglo-German relationship..... | 40 |
| 4.2.5 Displays of nationalism, chauvinism, jingoism..... | 41 |
| 4.2.6 Meta-discourse: Reactions to journalistic representations in the other country..... | 42 |
| 4.2.7 Summary..... | 44 |
| 4.3 The World Cup 1990 in the English press..... | 44 |
| 4.3.1 Use of stereotypes..... | 45 |
| 4.3.2 Military and aggressive language..... | 47 |
| 4.3.3 Football-nostalgic references..... | 49 |
| 4.3.4 Assessments of the Anglo-German relationship..... | 49 |
| 4.3.5 Displays of nationalism, chauvinism, jingoism..... | 51 |
| 4.3.6 Meta-discourse: Reactions to journalistic representations in the other country..... | 52 |
| 4.3.7 Summary..... | 52 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| 4.4 The World Cup 1990 in the German press..... | 52 |
| 4.4.1 Use of stereotypes..... | 53 |
| 4.4.2 Military and aggressive language..... | 55 |
| 4.4.3 Football-nostalgic references..... | 56 |
| 4.4.4 Assessments of the Anglo-German relationship..... | 57 |
| 4.4.5 Displays of nationalism, chauvinism, jingoism..... | 57 |
| 4.4.6 Meta-discourse: Reactions to journalistic representations in the other country..... | 60 |
| 4.4.7 Summary..... | 61 |
| | |
| 4.5 The 2001 qualifier in the English press..... | 62 |
| 4.5.1 Use of stereotypes..... | 62 |
| 4.5.2 Military and aggressive language..... | 65 |
| 4.5.3 Football-nostalgic references..... | 67 |
| 4.5.4 Assessments of the Anglo-German relationship..... | 68 |
| 4.5.5 Displays of nationalism, chauvinism, jingoism..... | 69 |
| 4.5.6 Meta-discourse: Reactions to journalistic representations in the other country..... | 70 |
| 4.5.7 Summary..... | 71 |
| | |
| 4.6 The 2001 qualifier in the German press..... | 72 |
| 4.6.1 Use of stereotypes..... | 72 |
| 4.6.2 Military and aggressive language..... | 73 |
| 4.6.3 Football-nostalgic references..... | 74 |
| 4.6.4 Assessments of the Anglo-German relationship..... | 74 |
| 4.6.5 Displays of nationalism, chauvinism, jingoism..... | 77 |
| 4.6.6 Meta-discourse: Reactions to journalistic representations in the other country..... | 78 |
| 4.6.7 Summary..... | 80 |
| | |
| 4.7 The 2007 friendly in the English press..... | 80 |
| 4.7.1 Use of stereotypes..... | 81 |
| 4.7.2 Military and aggressive language..... | 82 |
| 4.7.3 Football-nostalgic references..... | 83 |
| 4.7.4 Assessments of the Anglo-German relationship..... | 84 |
| 4.7.5 Displays of nationalism, chauvinism, jingoism..... | 85 |
| 4.7.6 Meta-discourse: Reactions to journalistic representations in the other country..... | 86 |
| 4.7.7 Summary..... | 87 |
| | |
| 4.8 The 2007 friendly in the German press..... | 87 |
| 4.8.1 Use of stereotypes..... | 87 |
| 4.8.2 Military and aggressive language..... | 89 |
| 4.8.3 Football-nostalgic references..... | 89 |
| 4.8.4 Assessments of the Anglo-German relationship..... | 90 |
| 4.8.5 Displays of nationalism, chauvinism, jingoism..... | 91 |
| 4.8.6 Meta-discourse: Reactions to journalistic representations in the other country..... | 93 |
| 4.8.7 Summary..... | 94 |
| | |
| 4.9 Summary..... | 95 |
| | |
| 5 CONCLUDING DISCUSSION: Football reporting in context – Anglo-German relations and discourses of national character..... | 99 |
| | |
| Final comment..... | 107 |
| | |
| References..... | 108 |
| | |
| Appendix | |
| I England–Germany games survey..... | 110 |
| II Questionnaire..... | 111 |

List of tables

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 3.1: Game survey..... | 22 |
| Table 4.1: English press 1966-2007..... | 95 |
| Table 4.2: German press 1966-2007..... | 97 |

List of abbreviations

Bild - *BILD-Zeitung*

CDA - Critical Discourse Analysis

dpa - *Deutsche Presse Agentur*

Independent - *The Independent*

N.o.t.W. - *News of the World*

NOZ - *Neue Tagespost (1966); Neue Osnabrücker Zeitung*

sid - *Sportinformationsdienst*

Sun - *The Sun*

Sunday T. - *The Sunday Times*

Times - *The Times*

Anglo-German relations are a riddle wrapped in an enigma inside a football.

(Simon Barnes, *Times*, 01/09/2001)

1 INTRODUCTION

This study sets out to explore in which ways, to what extent and for what purposes the media both reflect and promote – and in some cases even revise – representations of national character. By analysing German and English press coverage of football matches between these two countries, I want to shed some light on the relationship between the stereotypical *Tommies* and *Krauts*, and thus to some degree uncover the “enigma” (see quote above) of their mutual prejudices and issues of national identity. For each game, at least two German and two English¹ newspapers will be examined, one ‘tabloid’ and one ‘broadsheet’ paper, respectively. Four games of the years 1966, 1990, 2001 and 2007 have been picked for analysis. These are, of course, not only important in a purely sporting, but also in a broader historical and sociological context, which must also be taken into account in this multidisciplinary approach. Through a chronological evaluation of coverage of the games in question, it will be possible to trace some of the changes and developments in discourses of national character and Anglo-German relations. The methodological approach chosen here is that of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA).

1.1 The national dimension of identity in England and Germany

In a largely globalised world like ours today, questions of national identity and stereotypical images of self and other are as topical as ever. Increasing similarities in lifestyle and virtues (mostly due to what has been labelled American cultural imperialism) have also led to a growing need for contrast and national self-definition. As Fox notes (2005: 14), “the principal effect of globalization [...] has been an *increase* in nationalism and tribalism”,² a statement which certainly proves true with regard to the two groups to be analysed here, the English and the Germans.

According to Fox, the English, typically nostalgic and possessed with their own history and traditions, “are becoming ever more fretful about their own cultural ‘identity

¹ Obviously, papers like *The Sun* and *The Times* are British, rather than English newspapers. However, as this study is interested in the English versions of these and, moreover, how English ‘national character’ is presented, they are referred to as ‘English’.

² See also Boyle & Haynes 2000: 161ff.

crisis” (2005:15). A short and very simplified survey of English history in the 20th century may help decipher some of the reasons for this. At the beginning of the 20th century, England, then the centre of an Empire, was a supreme military, political and economic force. Victorious in two world wars, the status they occupied in Europe and the world was not only one of political and military dominance but also one of moral supremacy, particularly over the defeated foe, Germany. However, things changed for England with the fall of the Empire (as one by one the colonies gained independence) and with the gradual decline of political and economic power during the second half of the 20th century (cf. Maguire et al. 1999: 440). In recent years, the assumed merging into a vast monoculture along with the political integration in the European Union have by many been perceived as a threat to their own traditional values and borders (both literal and figurative). Cravings of the nation`s glorious and heroic past, the time when, to quote Margaret Thatcher, “the Great was still in Great Britain” (in Blain et al. 1993: 148), have become more and more central for the sense of national pride and collective identity for the English.

Thus, as Rowe et al. put it (in Bishop & Jaworski 2003: 244), “the more [their] national-political, economic and military sovereignty is undermined the greater the need for states to construct a semiotically potent cultural nation”. The ideology behind this ‘nation-constructing’ process, whose main goals are the assertion of a supposedly ‘given’ historical uniqueness and the deliberate demarcation from other states and cultures, may be summed up by the term nationalism. According to Billig (1995, in Bishop & Jaworski 2003: 248f.), nationalism is omnipresent in most Western societies, though mostly subconsciously as “banal nationalism” (through common rhetoric of *us* and *them*, *ibid.*) and only sometimes as fervent, flag-waving “hot nationalism”. In both cases, nationalism generates a strong feeling of collective identity which has the nation state as its main point of reference. Accordingly, identity – be it national or cultural – may in itself be seen as a construct which is continuously defined and redefined by external factors of political, economic or cultural nature.

As for the development of German national identity, the course of history has in many respects been contrary to that of England. Against the background of two lost world wars, both global tragedies in which Germany was the (main) culprit, and with the horrors of the Nazi Regime and the Holocaust looming large, Germany was in the middle of the last century “something of an international pariah” (Maguire et al. 1999: 440) with minimal political or economic significance. Due to ‘the nation`s shame’, nationalistic feelings were practically non-existent or at least not expressed overtly. Nevertheless, the West German *Wirtschaftswunder* (‘economic miracle’) in the fifties and the strategic geographical position during the

Cold War helped regain a substantial degree of economic and political importance in Europe (ibid.).³ The reunification of West and East Germany in 1989/1990 caused in this country a new wave of nationalism and in other countries, particularly in England (British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher being extremely negative to the reunification), fear of a new political and economic super-power in the middle of Europe. In addition, Germany wanted to further integration in the European Union, “whereas Britain/ England remain[ed] suspicious of any further relinquishment of national sovereignty and resentful of Germany’s privileged position” (Maguire et al. 1999: 440). In the last few years, as German economy and politics have largely stabilised and the world has seen that unification of East and West has not brought about a new *Third Reich* or posed a threat to the power balance in Europe, the image of the Germans in the rest of the world has, at least to some extent, improved. Whilst, as Beck points out, “British perceptions of Germany [...] remain influenced, indeed distorted, by fading memories of British greatness alongside images moulded by Hitler’s Germany and the Second World War” (2006: 37), from an official standpoint, contemporary Anglo-German relations can be described as excellent and harmonious (as Tony Blair and Angela Merkel affirmed in February 2006; cf. Beck 2006: 38). Another indicator of Germany’s upgraded profile in the world, and of the Germans’ positively revised self-image, is the country’s successful hosting of the football World Cup in 2006.⁴ The motto: “Die Welt zu Gast bei Freunden” (officially translated into English as “A time to make friends”) emphasised the friendly and world-open nature of the events to take place, and media all over the world praised the Germans’ happy ‘party-patriotism’ (cf. Albrecht et al. 2007). For the first time since the Second World War, it was said, the millions of – predominantly young – Germans were able to wave their black, red and golden flags without any sense of shame or self-consciousness, without the notorious German *angst*. Among the factors contributing to the formulation of this supposedly new sense of collective national identity, one plays a major role – the media.

1.2 Media, sport, national identity

The power of the media in the construction of national identity and character must not be underestimated. Reaching out to millions of people,

³ This study focuses on the Federal Republic of Germany (‘West Germany’). In the following, the term ‘Germany’ will be used for the Federal Republic unless otherwise specified. An analysis of the (sporting) relationship between the German Democratic Republic and England is clearly beyond the scope of this thesis, but provides another interesting field for future research.

⁴ The Germans did not reach the final, but finished third and were celebrated as “Weltmeister der Herzen (World Champions of the hearts)” (NOZ, 10 July 2006).

the press are able to reproduce, maintain and police hegemonic social relations, in- and outgroup distinctions (on both inter- and intranational lines) and articulate a sense of what is considered normative in terms of membership to the national collective. (Bishop & Jaworski 2003: 267)

Particularly, mass media products such as national papers invest in nationalism not only to help maintain national unity and thus serve the interests of the state, but also to comply with their average readers` desire to experience a sense of (national) belonging. Of course, the motives of the press may vary from case to case (see section 2.2 on the complex relationship between media output, media institution, state etc.), but it is the very fact that nationalistic ideas are being promoted to a remarkable extent through the media which is of interest here.

A site where “nationalism can be paraded with (almost) unrestrained free abandon” (Bishop & Jaworski 2003: 249) are the sports pages. As a legitimate and almost universally appealing stage for competition, rivalry and antagonism, sport carries an immense symbolic significance for the relationship between two (sportingly) opposing groups. Especially international sports events like the Olympic Games or the World/European Championships with their explicitly national frame provide a fertile ground for nationalism, invoking and promoting a sense of collective identity as well as a sense of historical continuity (cf. Bishop & Jaworski 2003: 249). Or, as Whannel puts it (in Blain et al. 1993: 15), “[s]port provides us with a sense of belonging to a nation, however irrational that may be”.

The fact that “[o]rganised sport has been viewed by governments of all political persuasions as an important sphere in the forging of ‘national character’” (Blain et al. 1993: 13) has had numerous effects. Thus, the enthusiasm during big sports events such as the World Cup has often resulted in outbursts of what Billig refers to as ‘hot nationalism’, the kind of nationalism that includes all layers of society in a joined flag-waving fervour. One need not go further back than to the football World Cup 2006 in Germany to find an instance of newly-awakened patriotic feelings (see above). This in turn may be seen as the expression of a collective identity in which, say, eleven men on a pitch represent the whole nation and “embody and project messages about national values and qualities across the globe” (Beck 2006: 37). As representatives of their country, a national team can even make it possible to carry out symbolic wars; e.g., “[f]ootball gave the Scots a way of fighting ‘the old enemy’ [England]” (Blain et al.1993: 12). Moreover, as has been stressed in various studies, many people believe that there is a deep connection between a nation`s sporting results and its political situation. For instance, the German World Cup victory in 1954 was and is still frequently regarded as the beginning of a new era. The slogan “Wir sind wieder Wer” (the German expression does not have any real equivalent in English but could be translated “We are being acknowledged again”) indicates that people saw their team`s successful

performance on the football field as having a direct influence on the rehabilitation of the nation's battered reputation. Arthur Heinrich (in Dragowski et al. 1995: 18ff.) even equates the German World Cup triumph in that year with "The birth of the Federal Republic in the Wankdorf Stadium in Bern".

1.3 Football in England and Germany – more than just a game

With its immense popularity in Europe, especially in the two countries focused on in this study (England being the self-acclaimed 'Motherland', or 'home' of football), soccer has proved to be an especially fruitful field with regard to sports reporting and national identity. Indeed, "[f]ootball history is deeply embedded within national history and the stories told about the legendary exploits of past (inter-)national players contribute to the construction of a sense of national identity" (Bishop & Jaworski 2003: 249). Moreover, as a part of contemporary history, football history (20th/21st centuries) is also of current interest.

As two big and influential nations and cultures in Europe and as two big football powers, England and Germany share a long and complex history of antagonism and rivalry, both military and sporting. The importance of nationalism and self-definition for both of these arch rivals and 'old foes' typically emerges in footballing contests and their reporting in the media: "The long-standing political and military rivalry between Germany and England makes sporting confrontations between the two nations particularly potent occasions, and this fact is reinforced by the way in which the media structure their re-presentation of the events" (Maguire et al. 1999: 441). In Germany, a football game against the *Tommies*, as they like to call the English, is usually greeted as a classic, and thus receives an almost mythical status. On the English side, the legendary clash with the *Krauts*⁵ "remains capable of stirring national passions like no other game" (Beck 2006: 38). Here, the saying comes true that football is more than just a game, at least against Germany. In public, especially in media discourse, it is seen as a symbolic war; and it mirrors not only perceptions of 'the enemy', but also of one's own nation and the current relationship with the opponent, on and off the football pitch.

1.4 Stereotypification of national character

The link between (press reportage of) sport and national identity has been explored in several studies,⁶ perhaps most significantly by Blain et al.,⁷ who found that "[m]edia coverage of

⁵ Military jargon for 'Germans' dating back to the Second World War, maybe even earlier; cf. Blain et al. 1993: 148.

⁶ For references, see Bishop & Jaworski 2003: 249.

⁷ *Sport and National Identity in the European Media* (1993).

international sports events provides unique evidence of the way European cultures frame their view of other nationalities” (blurb). Of particular interest here is the static nature of such conceptions of national identity as are prevalent in sports journalism, “how again and again the will to construct a historically continuous account of [...] national character prevails against the contrary indications of everyday experience” (Blain et al. 1993: 192). This is specifically intriguing with regard to English perceptions of Germany, which for a long time have largely been informed by hostile media discourses that equate Germany with wartime/Nazi Germany, even decades after World War II. Ultimately, such representations can amount to what Blain et al. refer to as “that form of discursive paralysis which we call stereotypification” (1993: 64). And the press do not only convey a certain image of other nations (heterotypification), but also of their own supposed national character (autotypification, cf. Blain et al. 1993: 79).

Stereotypes have been defined by Franz W. Dröge (in Albrecht et al. 2007: 6) as

anticipating complexes of imagination (by individuals and groups), which are prior to experience and have developed through generalisations of partial experiences or through insufficient information about the counterpart. They more or less pin down specific features and character traits of the people concerned.⁸

In other words, discourses of national character seem to be stuck with particular predetermined conceptions which are rooted “very deeply in the soil of the history of myth” (Blain et al. 1993: 64) and which are extremely resistant to external evidence that might prove these very preconceptions, or stereotypes, to be faulty or outdated. Their functions are a strengthening of in-group ties and a clear demarcation from and evaluation of out-group members (cf. Koller 1998: 45). On the other hand, social stereotypes can and do change, which is “all the more impressive when one considers the powerful cognitive and behavioral forces [...] that work to perpetuate stereotypes” (Snyder 1981: 209). It is important to be aware of the fact that institutions such as the media possess considerable power not only to reproduce and reflect national stereotypes but also to enforce or revise certain images of their own or other nations, depending on a number of interrelated factors such as the current (domestic and foreign) political, economic and, in the case of sports reporting, sporting situation.

1.5 Discursive strategies for the construction of national character in sports reporting

The media can resort to a number of methods to induce and stimulate a sense of collective national identity. Bishop & Jaworski have identified three main discursive strategies for the

⁸ My translation from German.

construction of national character and the formulation of nationalism in sports-journalistic style, namely, separation, conflict and typification (2003: 243).

‘Separation’ they describe as being largely manifested through the use of the personal pronouns *we/us* and *they/them*, as in “We beat `em” (*News of the World*, 18/06/2000), which is an effective, if not very subtle, way to mark in- and outgroup distinctions. Additionally, generic references such as “Germans dislike being underestimated” (*The Sun*, 30/07/1966) enforce the notion of the nation as a collective identity with one ‘character’. Apart from that, the common metonym which describes “the nation as one sentient being” (Blain et al. 1993: 80) is another strategy which could be included in Bishop’s & Jaworski’s ‘separation’ category. Examples such as “England went wild last night” (*N.o.t.W.*, 31/07/1966) or “Britain woke up yesterday with a World Cup hangover” (*Sun*, 06/07/1990) mirror the experiences of a large group of people – in this case those interested in football – onto the whole nation and thus construct a homogeneous collective, whilst at the same time prescribing which feelings are required of the individual to be a part of this collective. All of these methods (use of personal pronouns, generic references, metonyms) are frequently applied in all kinds of international sports reporting. As they do not particularly shed any new light on the relationship between England and Germany, or on their specific ‘national character’, discursive strategies of the ‘separation’ type will not be taken into account in the present analysis.

Nevertheless, the two other categories employed by Bishop & Jaworski, the ones they label ‘conflict’ and ‘typification’, are highly relevant for this context. ‘Conflict’, realised through military metaphors and war imagery, is a recurrent and extremely significant model in press coverage of England versus Germany. In order to keep the focus on specifically Anglo-German issues in this study, it is important to distinguish between two types of military language, namely, on the one hand, language of war and aggression in general,⁹ and, on the other hand, specific references to German and English military history, especially the two world wars.

By ‘typification’, Bishop and Jaworski mean “the use of stereotypes, representing the nation as ‘timeless’ and ‘homogeneous’” (2003: 243). Here, stereotypes are seen as discursive strategies, “in this case constructing supposed national character on the basis of sporting performance” (O’Donnell 1994: 346).¹⁰ Certain footballing characteristics or, indeed, a

⁹ Cf. Tannen 1999 (esp. pp. 52-55) on “The Argument/Aggression Culture and the Press”.

¹⁰ In the following, O’Donnell’s working definition of stereotypes as discursive strategies will be adopted, keeping in mind the related function of stereotypification as the stasis and “synchronic and diachronic immutability” in discourses of national character as pointed out by Blain et al. (1993: 82).

particular style of play, are presented as indicative of and amounting to a national character that fundamentally distinguishes one people or country from another. In his 1994 study “Mapping the Mythical: A Geopolitics of National Sporting Stereotypes”, O’Donnell lists a number of the most common and stable stereotypes applied to different nations or parts of the world and discovers an “astonishing uniformity both within and across national boundaries” (354). Of English characteristics, he particularly mentions “work-rate, commitment, courage, giving it their all, fighting back in the face of adversity” (349). This ‘English’ fair (but not necessarily beautiful), ‘all-out’ fighting football slightly contrasts with the ‘German’ result-oriented and disciplined ‘machine football’; here, the dominant stereotypes are identified as “strong mental control, [...] discipline, efficiency, reliability and hard work” (348).¹¹ In spite of some differences, similarities between England and Germany are also often stressed, most frequently perhaps in ‘macro-discourses’ about the ‘European’ versus the ‘Latin American’ style, as will be seen in the analysis. O’Donnell’s findings with regard to German and English stereotypes will be drawn upon when these countries’ supposed characteristics are investigated here. For now, suffice it to say that many of these stereotypes, such as the ‘English’ fighting spirit and bravery and the ‘German’ mechanical efficiency and discipline, have their origin in mutual perceptions and experiences that date back to the beginning of the last century, not least to the two world wars (cf. Koller 1992: 166).¹²

In addition to the use of stereotypes and military language, four other discursive strategies will be taken into account in the present study. The first can be described as football nostalgia and includes sport-historical references, especially to ‘old times of glory’ and the ‘heroes of old’. Specific games or players are mythologised and, in the case of England and Germany, the arch rivalry is presented as atavistic and traditional. Pre-match build-ups to England–Germany encounters are therefore frequently marked by a certain hype around the ‘old enmity’ and around past players who function as ‘national symbols’. Moreover, it is important to be aware of the fact that football history is very often mingled with ‘real’ history, most notably perhaps in English discourses about their relationship with Germany, as the famous slogan “Two World Wars and One World Cup” (cf. Beck 2006: 36) suggests.

¹¹ A survey conducted among twenty-five 17-27 year-old English soldiers in Osnabrück, Germany to a large degree confirms these stereotypes. Asked what they associate with English football (question 3.6), the most frequent answers (of the few given) were as follows (the numbers in parentheses refer to the number of identical, or very similar, answers): “fighting”/“give 100%” (6); “passion” (3); “fast tempo” (3); “hooligans”/“beer” (3); “aggressive” (2); “loyalty”/ “commitment to the club” (2); “play fair” (2). The “most typical English players” (question 3.7) were picked for their fighting spirit (Scholes: “small and never goes down and if he does he is straight back up”); and team spirit (Gerrard: “plays for team not glory”). German players were associated with their “will to win” (Lothar Matthäus, Oliver Kahn) and “arrogance”. (See Appendix II, Questionnaire.)

¹² For further descriptions of stereotypes (which support O’Donnell’s findings), see Honigstein 2006, Fox 2005 and Kuper 1996 (English stereotypes); Koller 1992 and Dragowski et al. 1995 (German stereotypes).

Furthermore, direct assessments and comments about the counterpart (as in “the Germans deserve respect” or “the English are crazy”) can provide useful information about the Anglo-German relationship at a given time. Mutual criticism, respect, (dis)approval or even praise must be considered a vital part of the framing of another nation in public discourse.

Apart from that, displays of nationalism, chauvinism or jingoism reveal a lot about a country’s self-image and treatment of other nations; one nation may be presented as inherently superior to another through the use of denigrating stereotypical terms and symbols in connection with the counterpart and, on the other hand, self-glorifying, triumphant or boisterous language about oneself. Thus, national ‘character’ is rated, usually with one’s own emerging as the higher-ranking.

Last but not least, what can be labelled a ‘meta-discursive’ strategy is included in this analysis. Foreign journalistic representations are frequently taken up by newspapers, most notably in quotes. Which parts of the press reports are included and how they are commented on in the ‘home’ newspapers very often reflect the stance of the latter to their counterpart abroad. Moreover, *assumed* auto- and heterostereotypes (cf. Koller 1998: 39) and judgments of these may come to the fore.

Thus, in sum, the discursive strategies that are relevant for this study are: 1) use of stereotypes, 2) military and aggressive language, 3) football-nostalgic references, 4) assessments of the Anglo-German relationship, 5) displays of nationalism, chauvinism, jingoism and 6) meta-discourse: reactions to journalistic representations in the other country.¹³

Through a close textual analysis of both English and German football coverage of the years 1966, 1990, 2001 and 2007, and with specific focus on their use of the discursive strategies mentioned here, the aim is to illuminate the development of the relationship between these two countries and their auto- and heterotypification of national character. By showing how such discourses may vary in correlation with external circumstances, this study argues that ‘national character’ is a construct that is continuously defined and redefined. In the concluding discussion (ch.5), an attempt is made to explicate some of the processes which forge, reinforce or revise discourses of ‘Englishness’ and ‘Germanness’, such as the sporting

¹³ In line with cognitive linguistics, it is important to keep in mind that these are by no means ‘natural’ or ‘pre-existing’ categories – they are created by me to structure relevant material and may be fuzzy and overlapping. They must be seen as ‘working categories’ just as much as the definitions applied are ‘working definitions’ and not ‘absolute’.

context (the psychological impact of victories and losses), the political climate between the two countries in question and their perceived world status at a given time.

In the following chapters, some theoretical matters and the methodology applied here will be discussed (ch. 2) and the reasons for the specific choice of data (both in terms of material and the selection of particular games) will be given (ch. 3), foreshadowing the actual analysis in chapter 4.

2 THEORETICAL CONCERNS and METHODOLOGY

2.1 Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

As stated in the introduction, the theoretical and methodological approach underlying this study is Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), advocated, among others, by Fairclough, Halliday and van Dijk.¹⁴ CDA lends itself to the purpose of the present investigation for a number of reasons.

Generally, “discourse refers to the language in which a subject or area of knowledge is discussed” (Murfin & Ray 2003: 114). In this study, press discourses of national character, or more specifically, of ‘Englishness’ and ‘Germanness’, are the focal point. CDA sees discourse as “a form of social practice” (Fairclough & Wodak 2003: 258); and the relationship between the discursive event and its situational, institutional and social frame is described as a dialectical one: On the one hand, discourse is socially constituted, i.e. shaped by the historical, social etc. realities; on the other hand, it is socially constitutive – forging, reinforcing or reproducing these realities (cf. Fairclough & Wodak 2003: 257f.). This two-way relationship must be kept in mind in the analysis of Anglo-German relations and their influence on/by discourses of national character.

Apart from that, “discourse may [...] try to pass off assumptions (often falsifying ones) about any aspect of social life as mere common sense” (ibid.). Specifically, Boyle & Haynes (2000: 147) point out that “[m]ediated sport can be an important cultural arena in which ideas about various aspects of social relations can become naturalized”. Thus, it is important to be aware of the fact that such assumptions which underly, for instance, stereotyping and ‘national identity’ in sports reporting are ‘only’ constructs, being subject to continuing political, economic and social influences. By trying to explicate such processes, “CDA aims to make more visible these opaque aspects of discourse” (Fairclough & Wodak 2003: 257f.) – which in this case means to uncover, or, at any rate, illuminate the “riddle” or “enigma” of Anglo-German relations pointed out by Barnes (*Times*, 01/09/2001, see p.6).

What is ‘critical’ about CDA is that this theory is seen as an “engaged and committed” science with “emancipatory interests that motivate it” (Fairclough & Wodak 2003: 258f.). Some of the objectives of the present investigation are, first of all, to remind the reader of the fact that ‘national character’ is merely a construct and therefore leaves no room for

¹⁴ For a comprehensive presentation of CDA, including an outline of different versions of this theory, see Fairclough & Wodak 2003: 258ff. and the references cited there.

discrimination against individuals or groups; moreover, to raise the awareness that stereotypification of national character often serves ideological functions, for instance celebrating one country's supposed superiority over another (cf. Boyle & Haynes 2000: 147); and, finally, to show that discourses of national character must be seen in context and not be taken as 'mere common sense'. The latter point implies an interdisciplinary approach (and CDA is "by its nature interdisciplinary"; Fairclough & Wodak 2003: 271), in which "intertextuality as well as sociocultural knowledge" (ibid.) should be included.

Placing the discourse in its social, historical etc. context can be rather intricate. As indicated earlier, CDA investigates the link between text and society, "making connections between social and cultural structures and processes on the one hand, and properties of text on the other" (Fairclough & Wodak 2003: 277). Translated into the purposes of this study, one question might be: What historical, socio-cultural etc. forces in the Anglo-German relationship may influence discourses of national character and vice versa? Or, put differently, what are the connections between Anglo-German relations and discourses of national character in sports reporting? If such questions are asked, no simple answer must be expected. It lies in the nature of these connections that they are extremely complex and interrelated. Therefore, they should not be seen as straightforward, one-to-one connections, but as "indirect or 'mediated'" (277).

To some degree, the *socio-cognitive* mediation of the text-society link as advocated by van Dijk (see Fairclough & Wodak 2003: 265, 278) is relevant here. Thus, it is argued that "no direct relation can or should be constructed between discourse structures and social structures, but [...] they are always mediated by the interface of personal and social cognition" (265). One specific cognitive resource which is frequently drawn upon in discourses of national character is the use of stereotypes. On the one hand, stereotyping is a process which is 'natural' and necessary; it is a perceptual and cognitive activity that helps "reduce and make more manageable the complexity of the social world" (Ashmore & Del Boca 1981: 30; see also Koller 1998: 43ff.). On the other hand, the use of stereotypes is influenced by as well as influencing social structures and is often ideological in purpose. Therefore, it must be pointed out yet again, while preconceptions of national 'character' may be unavoidable and to some extent indispensable, it is important always to keep in mind the context of such discourses.

Finally, CDA stresses the fact that explanations and interpretations arrived at through this methodology must never be seen as absolute, definitive or authoritative; "they are dynamic and open, open to new contexts and new information" (Fairclough & Wodak 2003:

279). Likewise, the conclusions drawn at the end of the present analysis must only be taken as possible factors influencing discourses of national character, not as ultimate keys.

2.2 The media – a complex factor in the formation of national character

While acknowledging the power and significance of the media in the construction of national identity (see section 1.2), it is problematic to place the media at the centre of these processes without being aware of “the size and complexity of the discursive and ideological framework” (Blain et al. 1993: 189), which may differ from country to country.

As “media institutions are themselves subject to a range of economic, cultural and political pressures which in turn heavily influence how they choose to frame or make sense of events” (Boyle & Haynes 2000: 148), these economic, commercial and ideological determinants must also be taken into account when it comes to media representations of national character in Germany and England. In other words, attention must be paid to factors like the audience/readership targeted, the specific media institution and how it is funded (market), as well as to current political and social attitudes (cf. *ibid.*).

Honigstein (2006) points out some general differences between the conditions in the English and the German press. In Britain, with a dozen supranational *dailies* fighting for readers, there is a unique, almost cut-throat competition (Honigstein 2006: 146), which manifests itself in the fact that there is “no cooperation, only pressure” (149). News agencies’ articles are seldom used in the English press, especially not in the sports pages. In England, each paper sends individual football writers to games in order to ensure exclusive and individual coverage (147). Evidently, efforts on the part of sports journalists to add ‘spice and scandal’ to their reports (always jockeying for sales) have contributed to a generally strained relationship between the press and football clubs in England. According to Honigstein (2006: 156), the resulting scarcity of “*outspoken players* [sic]” requires even more journalistic *spin* to ‘create stories’, which may be especially true for the ‘tabloid’ press.

These “existential anxieties of the popular press writers” (Honigstein 2006: 151) in England are to that extent unknown to journalists in the German press. Here, even supraregional papers fall back on articles by major news agencies like *Deutsche Presse Agentur (dpa)* and *Sportinformationsdienst (sid)*. Moreover, players in Germany are (culturally and morally) almost obliged to cooperate with the media (Honigstein 2006: 155); and the fact that it is the interview partner who is in possession of the copyright, not the writer, as is the case in England, ensures that nothing can be printed without the explicit approval of the interviewee (156).

All in all, these different economic, cultural and structural conditions indicate that the German press can both afford and is constrained to be ‘milder’ in the (sports) coverage than the English (‘popular’) press. The distinction between ‘tabloid’ and ‘quality’ press will be elaborated on in section 3.1.

2.3 Globalisation of media sport – a challenge to the national dimension

Another aspect that has to be taken into consideration in the analysis of the framing of national character in sports reporting is the fact that in recent years, the rapidly increasing globalisation and commercialisation of media sport have become a challenge to the national dimension.

As Inthorn (2006: 157) points out, “[g]lobal, profit-driven football and media industries have challenged the extent to which football in the media can continue to be a meaningful and significant source of identification with the nation”. The emergence of international football stars like David Beckham and Michael Ballack, who have long since ceased to play for clubs in their home countries and are worth millions of pounds on the international football market, can be seen as “a symbol of a globalized football industry” (162). Likewise, the number of German players in the Premier League is all but booming (e.g., Ballack, Lehmann, Huth, just to name three players from the German national team), while English players still do not seem to rank the Bundesliga as their favourite work place. Anyway, it is obvious that the national leagues, and especially the richest clubs, are more than open for transfers of international stars.

On the other hand, the nation still remains a central point of identification (cf. section 1.2), particularly during international sports events such as the World Cup. The economic utility of fixed accounts of the national dimension as described by Blain et al. (1993: 194) is taken up by Inthorn (2006: 158): “The concept of the nation, though, might be saved by its financial profitability, in the persisting public interest in particular stars as national figures”. Thus, in spite of an increasing focus on the international dimension, the national dimension continues to play an extremely important role. It is necessary to keep in mind that today, both these discourses are prevalent.

2.4 Methodology of the present study

Having looked at the methodological approach of CDA and some other theoretical concerns that arise in connection with examining discourses of national character in the print media, it is now time to outline how the present study goes about analysing the relevant material.

As already mentioned, the focus is on press coverage of four encounters between England and Germany in at least one ‘broadsheet’ and one ‘tabloid’ per country. (Initially, several more newspapers were considered, but given the limited scope of this thesis, the primary data had to be narrowed down.) All articles concerned with the England–Germany encounters were examined for analysis. This includes the pre-match build-ups (and for 1966 and 1990 also coverage of the preceding and following World Cup games of either side).¹⁵ The choice of material and the context of the games in question are explained in chapter 3. After sufficient data had been collected from the respective newspaper archives in England and Germany, the six discursive strategies for the framing of national character described in the introduction were set up as categories to structure the analysis. Relevant quotes from the German newspapers were translated into English to the best of my ability; in cases where culture-specific idioms or phrases could not be rendered satisfactorily, the original German expressions appear in parentheses after the translation. The papers are analysed chronologically in order to find out how the mutual portrayals of national character and the Anglo-German relationship change over time. In the concluding discussion, some suggestions are made about why the discourses seem to have developed the way they did.

Maguire et al. (1999: 452) have pointed out that the audience reception is not, or only seldom considered in these types of study. In order to ‘test’ “the role [of] the readers as active interpreters and negotiators of mediated messages” (Bishop & Jaworski 2003: 267), it was originally planned to run interviews and surveys on people’s reactions to media representations. Due to the short time span, this has not been possible in the present study – but would be of major interest in a more complete work. One survey on English versus German football and national stereotypes, however, has been included here (Appendix II) and is mentioned in sections 1.5, 3.2 and 5.

¹⁵ Attempts at quantifying the data were soon abandoned, as it was often impossible to decide whether, for instance, small insets, quotes or headlines (most notably in the ‘tabloids’) should count as articles or not. See Bishop & Jaworski 2003: 245 f. on the variety of editorial/typographical formats and the resulting inaccuracy of counts. In terms of pages, altogether around 600 pages were considered.

3 MATERIAL

3.1 Primary data – English and German newspapers analysed in this study

The primary data used in this study mainly consists of two newspapers for each country, one ‘quality paper’ and one ‘tabloid’, respectively. The distinction between ‘quality’ and ‘popular press’ has been deemed especially crucial in Britain (cf. Blain et al. 1993: 85), as there are substantial differences in terms of readership, conventions of journalistic style and form. It is generally known that the ‘broadsheets’¹⁶ mainly reach out to readers from high-scale socio-economic groups and try to maintain an accordingly ‘appropriate’ and educated style (cf. Blain et al. 1993: 6), while the ‘scandal seeking’ mode of the ‘tabloids’ is aimed at people with less substantial socio-economic backgrounds. Henceforth, the terms *quality press/broadsheet* and *popular press/tabloid* will not be marked by inverted commas. Nonetheless, it is important to keep in mind that these terms must not be seen as definite and absolute; they merely point to the two major categories of newspapers.¹⁷

In the present analysis, on the English side, *The Sun* and its Sunday equivalent *News of the World* represent the popular press, whilst the quality press is covered by *The Times* and *The Sunday Times*. For 1966, additional material from *The Daily Mirror*, *Sunday Mirror* (tabloids), *The Daily Telegraph* and *The Sunday Telegraph* (broadsheets) is considered, due to difficulties in obtaining sufficient data from *The Sun* and *The Times* for this year.¹⁸ The same applies to 2007, where one more quality paper (*The Independent*) is included.

For the German press, the broadsheet/tabloid distinction does not apply to the same degree as in England. Still, there are sufficient parallels between the German and English newspapers chosen here to provide a balanced background for the analysis. The major German tabloid, which is examined here, is the (in)famous *BILD-Zeitung*, as Blain et al. explain (1993: 85): “Newspapers such as the British *Sun* [...] have no real equivalent on the continent apart from the German *Bild*”. As “Germany is a country in which the regional press dominates, and where there are few newspapers with a truly national readership” (Blain et al. 1993 : 86) the regional daily *Neue Osnabrücker Zeitung*¹⁹ was chosen as a representative of the German quality press. The fact that many articles are provided by the two main German

¹⁶ The name often (but not always) indicates the size and format of the newspapers as opposed to the ‘tabloids’.

¹⁷ See Jucker 1992 for more information on the broadsheet/tabloid distinction.

¹⁸ Several articles from 1966 were missing or not readable on microfilm in the newspaper archives of The British Library.

¹⁹ Called *Neue Tagespost* in 1966, but referred to as *NOZ* in the analysis.

news agencies, *Deutsche Presseagentur* and *Sportinformationsdienst* (see section 2.2), should justify comparisons between this local paper and the other national papers examined here.

3.2 Delineation of subject matter: reasons for the specific choice of games

As mentioned earlier, this study aims to contribute to the existing corpus of works on football reporting and national character by examining not only one England vs Germany game in isolation (as has been done by e.g. Bishop & Jaworski 2003, Maguire et al. 1999), but by analysing coverage of a number of matches over a larger period of time. Changes in the Anglo-German relationship and developments or stasis in the framing of national character can thus be traced.

The following table provides an overview of the four game dates, venues and results which are relevant for the present study:

Table 3.1: Game survey

| Date | Venue | Result | Event |
|-------------|--------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| 30/07/1966 | Wembley | England – Germany 4-2 | World Cup Final |
| 04/07/1990 | Torino | Germany – England 5-4 | World Cup Semi-Final |
| 01/09/2001 | Munich | Germany – England 1-5 | World Cup Qualifier |
| 22/08/2007 | Wembley | England – Germany 1-2 | Friendly |

In order to maintain some balance in the outcome of the games and the nature of the press reporting in both countries, two of the matches that were selected were won by England (1966 and 2001) and two by Germany (1990 and 2007). Obviously, the intervals between the encounters are not regular, but nonetheless the games on these particular dates can provide an interesting insight into the evolution of national identity issues when seen in connection with their sporting and political relevance and context. As has been stressed above, to make sense of the origins and developments of national stereotypes, it is necessary to take into account the “sociological and historical, as well as a social psychological, analysis of the relationship between the groups in question” (Eiser in O’Donnell 1994: 347). Or, in Koller’s words (1998: 43), the situational, social, historical and cultural embedding of stereotypes makes an interdisciplinary approach almost imperative.

‘Wembley 1966’ is probably the most important game ever for Englishmen. Those who did not experience England’s first and only World Cup triumph themselves, are more than frequently reminded of that year’s ‘unequaled glory and magnificence’ through an

overwhelming number of press reviews, television documentaries, books and interviews with ‘the heroes of old’. The legendary status of this match and those involved links to a time when England could consolidate its ‘rightful supremacy’, especially over countries like Germany, as ‘the Motherland of football’. Indeed, at that time, Germany had never won against England in soccer.²⁰ And in a time – ‘the swinging sixties’ – which saw the emergence of pop culture and the commercialisation of football, England’s superiority was not restricted to the football pitch: Culturally, they were the centre of Europe. Politically and militarily, they were far ahead and together with the other victorious powers of the Second World War, they were in full control of Germany. Morally, they were on the winner side. In all these respects, Germany was still a defeated and deflated nation; “they looked on the World Cup Final as a huge image-booster – whether they won or lost” (*Sun*, 03/07/1990).

The article just quoted from, entitled “*CHANGING HANS* – How the Germans became World beaters after ‘66”, also describes the powerful resurgence of Germany in the time between 1966 and 1990, the second year which will be investigated in this study. During those 24 years, England’s success on the football field had virtually stagnated, whilst the Germans went from strength to strength. In 1968, they could celebrate their first soccer victory over England in Hanover – ‘the ban’ was finally broken. They won the World Cup in 1974 and were European Champions in 1972 and 1980. And the tide had turned in other aspects as well: In 1990, on the verge of reunification, with the economy booming, Germany was suddenly heading for political and economic dominance in the West and “strong nationalist feelings awakened by unification [were] worrying [sic] liberal Germans – and Europe” (*Sun*, 03/07/1990). Obviously, Germany’s beating England in the semi-finals and going on to winning the World Cup that year did not improve the image of the ‘all-conquering’ and dominant *Krauts* or lighten the burden of English inferiority in their ‘national game’ as well as in the extra-sporting situation in 1990.

As “Germany came to be depicted as the prime obstacle to English progress in major tournaments” (Beck 2006: 36) – another dramatic penalty shoot-out followed in Euro ‘96 – the antagonism between these two countries only grew stronger. But whilst the rivalry largely limited itself to the football field from the German viewpoint, the ongoing ‘Hitlerisation’ of this nation in England created in the public consciousness here a predominantly hostile attitude that was not restricted to sport (cf. Beck 2006: 37 ff.). Against this background, the 5-1 victory of *The Three Lions* over Germany in Munich in 2001 caused a public outpouring of delight and national pride in England. Not only had they won by a remarkable number of

²⁰ For an overview of matches and results between the two countries, see Appendix I.

goals, but they had beaten their arch rivals on their own ground for the first time since 1965. The game was described as historic and compared with the World Cup victory of 1966 (Michael Owen with his hat-trick was the ‘new’ Geoff Hurst). For many young Englishmen (who did not experience Wembley `66), this was the proudest moment, as the survey among English soldiers in Germany suggests:²¹ 19 out of 27 ranked the 5-1 win in 2001 as the most memorable encounter between England and Germany, because “we stuffed them in their own backyard”, “ England smashed the f... out of Germany” and “beating arch rivals by such a large amount [of goals] made me proud to be English”. For the Germans, this defeat marked the lowest point in what came to be described as a deep footballing crisis. “The debacle”, as the weekly sports magazine *Kicker* called it (03/09/2001), gave rise to profound criticism and gloomy predictions about Germany`s footballing future, but was not talked of as significant outside the domain of sports.

As has been mentioned earlier, the World Cup 2006 in Germany supposedly created a whole new image of the host country, both in Germany itself and in the rest of the world – not only because of the attractive football played by the German team under Jürgen Klinsmann but also with regard to the immaculate organisation and overwhelmingly friendly atmosphere in the country. Unfortunately, at least for the purpose of this study, Germany did not play England during that tournament, as the English side only made it to the quarter-finals. As Beck rightly points out, “an England–Germany clash in the actual final would have been far more than merely another World Cup final in terms of illuminating present-day British media and public attitudes towards what was presented as the ‘new Germany’” (2006: 39). Still, one review from the *Neue Osnabrücker Zeitung* (10/07/2006) that focuses on the British impressions of the World Cup, is worth looking at more closely in this connection. Entitled “The new country of smiles” (“Das neue Land des Lächelns”), it is sub-headed “British commentators fall over themselves with praise for the Germans and do away with clichés”. The article goes on to quote several major English newspapers and British Prime Minister Tony Blair, who applauded the German nation on a successful and utterly positive tournament. It concludes with the following paragraph:

What no officially-dictated youth exchange programmes and no exquisite cultural events were capable of achieving, the football-party accomplished: The long shadow of the Nazi-past has finally been driven away. Hitler was always looming in the background when England thought of Germany, and the progress of democracy in the post-war period threatened to be extinguished by this gloomy image. ‘With a mighty stroke of exemption (Befreiungsschlag),’ so the commentators from London agree, ‘Germany freed itself from these shackles.’ Cheerful, friendly, even exuberant and emotional – these are all attributes which to the present day haven`t exactly been associated with the teutonic neighbour.

²¹ See Appendix II, Questionnaire, question 3.9.

The question is whether this “stroke of exemption” has been of enduring quality, lasting beyond the summer of 2006, or whether its significance was restricted to the World Cup, i.e. to an extraordinary event within an organisational framework and with a temporary limitation. Media analysis of the latest game between Germany and England, the friendly played on 22 August 2007, might help shed some light on this. Though it lies in the nature of a friendly that the result is totally unimportant for any championships etc., the symbolic significance must not be underestimated. It is the honour that is at stake. Especially for self-acclaimed arch rivals like England and Germany, each encounter is seen as “everything, but never a friendly” (dfb.de 20.08.07 Nationalmannschaft: “England gegen Deutschland ist eben alles, aber nie ein Freundschaftsspiel”). Moreover, adding to the symbolic momentum is the fact that this friendly was only the second international game played in the newly-built Wembley stadium. Wembley had always been regarded as a fortress of English football, with tradition and myth attached to it (it was here that England beat the Germans in the World Cup final of `66). Germany had won the last game between these two countries at Wembley before the old stadium was torn down in the year 2000, and this serious blow to English national pride called for revenge. But it was only followed by yet another blow, as the Germans ‘conquered’ the new Wembley as well in 2007. Thus, the friendly played in 2007 is interesting not only with regard to the Germans’ supposedly new image and self-image but also in terms of the reactions to yet another English defeat against their arch rivals on home ground.

In the light of all these sporting and extra-sporting factors, press coverage of the four games in 1966, 1990, 2001 and 2007 can be regarded as particularly interesting for this study.²²

²² Of course, there are many other games which are interesting in terms of Anglo-German relations, particularly before and during the Second World War; however, analysing, let alone getting hold of, any more material than what is included here, would definitely exceed the scope of this thesis. Here, then, is another interesting field for future studies.

4 ANALYSIS

In this main part of the study, the newspapers of the years 1966, 1990, 2001 and 2007 are examined in chronological order with regard to the framing of national character and the Anglo-German relationship, beginning with the English papers, considering both quality press and tabloids of one year, and repeating this sequence for the German press. Moreover, the analysis is structured by the discursive strategies identified in the introduction, namely

- 1) use of stereotypes,
- 2) military and aggressive language,
- 3) football-nostalgic references,
- 4) assessments of the Anglo-German relationship,
- 5) displays of nationalism, chauvinism, jingoism and
- 6) meta-discourse: reactions to journalistic representations in the other country.

4.1 The World Cup 1966 in the English press

The World Cup was for the first time hosted and won by ‘the Motherland of football’, England, in 1966. In the final, the team triumphed over Germany by 4-2 after extra-time. Broadcast on television (a fairly new medium at that time) and extensively covered by radio and press, the tournament attracted the interest of millions of people from all layers of society and, notably, of an increasing number of women. With such a widespread audience and with the greatest trophy of their national game at stake in their home country, in England, the national dimension of the event acquired particular significance, as English press coverage of the tournament reveals.

4.1.1 Use of stereotypes

As has been mentioned earlier, the framing of nations in sports reporting relies to a great extent on stereotypes. In this part of the analysis, the portrayal of ‘typically English’ and ‘typically German’ characteristics in press coverage of the 1966 World Cup will be investigated. Also, these countries’ overlapping features will be mentioned in what can be described as a ‘macro-discourse’, distinguishing the ‘European’ from the ‘Latin American’ style.

English characteristics

With regard to ‘English character’, certain values emerge repeatedly in sports reporting. The “excellent traditional qualities of the English professional footballer” (*Sun*, 01/08/1966) are summed up in *The Daily Mirror* (30/07/1966) as “strength, courage, fitness, determination, discipline”. In fact, this list covers most of the stereotypical British/English attributes identified by O’Donnell (1994: 349f.).

In their “‘realistic’, pragmatic, no-nonsense approach” (ibid.), physical power, speed and toughness play a major role for the ‘English’ style. After the ‘66 World Cup final, they are described as “the fastest and strongest team” in the tournament (*Sun*, 01/08/1966). Moreover, as *The Sunday Times* suggests (31/07/1966), England team manager Alf Ramsey has succeeded in bringing out the ‘traditional English virtues’: “With the new tactics, Ramsey has combined the traditional speed and fitness of English football. And the men involved are not as characterless as the machine-type game they sometimes play.” The last part of this quote is important in terms of the notion of mechanical work – for, it suggests, though hard-working and pragmatic, the English players do have individual skills and strong feelings about playing for their country.

Dedication, fighting spirit, bravery and a ‘never say die’ approach along with the ability to take pain are all typically masculine qualities which are highly appreciated in English football. A list of player characteristics from *The Sunday Times* (10/07/1966) reveals some of the most valued features: George Cohen is portrayed as “dedicated, fast, strong”, Geoff Hurst has the attributes “powerful, courageous”. Nobby Stiles is “tiny but fearless” and Alan Ball is characterised as “small, red-haired, dedicated”. The latter of these, Alan Ball, has in fact been idolised in England for his commitment and spirit. *The Sunday Times* (17/07/1966) depicts him as playing “with the desperate energy of a willing terrier” and after the final against Germany he is quoted in *The Sun* (01/08/1966) as saying: “My legs said I couldn’t go any more, my heart said I had to, so I did”. On the same page, a foreign commentator remarks upon Ball’s never-tiring spirit and extreme work-rate: “Suddenly [...] the Rolls-Royce people have developed an engine that you can put inside football shorts. [...] He never stopped. Even when he was floored he started to work before he got up again.” Yet, again, the unfeeling, mechanical aspect of such a footballer is countered by a very humane, likeable image: “He looks like a schoolboy. [...] with that high-pitched voice and baby face”. England’s strengths are described as “courage, guts and fighting spirit” (*News of the World*, 31/07/1966), and “stamina, strength of purpose, unselfish effort and superbly disciplined control were there for all the world to see and savour” (*Sun*, 01/08/1966).

If *The Sun* talks about the effort being “unselfish” here, this touches upon another extremely important value in English football: team spirit and, along with it, loyalty. Thus, one *Sun* article before the England–Germany encounter (30/07/1966) begins with the words “Eleven loyal Englishmen...” and stresses “the harmony and magnificent camaraderie of England United”. Somewhat idealistically, it concludes with the statement that “in team spirit, understanding, tactical blend, collective effort and single-mindedness of purpose, England United are the best club side in the country”. After the match, the tabloid continues to praise “Ramsey’s one-for-all all-for-one philosophy” in a piece entitled “NO HEROES – BY REQUEST” (*Sun*, 01/08/1966). Here it poses a rhetorical question: “why should anybody [...] pick out individuals in this triumph of triumphs by an England TEAM?”. Nonetheless, some players are named and thanked individually, but always in the light of their contribution to the team, for example “Bobby Moore, footballer of the championships [...] – but for England just one of the boys” and Roger Hunt with his “immense if relatively inconspicuous contribution”. And the loyalty and supreme morale are not restricted to the players, as an interview with Alf Ramsey in *The Sun* (01/08/1966) implies: “Would he go abroad if the price was right? ‘I don’t think so – I am an Englishman’”.

The English maxim of fair play and sportsmanship is another dominant stereotype in sports discourse. That the English are supposed to be extremely concerned about fighting hard (including tough tacklings), but in a fair way, is reflected in two Italian players’ statements in *The Sunday Times* (10/07/1966): Bulgarelli declares that “they were hard, but not dirty like us”, and Rivera holds the opinion that “the English are very sporting, very objective. They’ll applaud the team that plays, not the team that kicks”. A similar English notion of themselves as fair and innocent becomes clear when it says in an article about the violent encounter between England and Argentina: “England [played] in all-white – an unintentional symbol of purity [...]. Argentina should instead have been in all black as the villains” (*Sunday Telegraph*, 24/07/1966). And the self-praise for their sportsmanship reaches its peak after the World Cup final, where in a *Sun* article (01/08/1966) the English appear as noble, chivalrous victors and gentlemen who do not scorn or tramp on the losers: “We won with dignity and we greeted our victory with joy. We celebrated the success without a moment’s remorse and we congratulated the losers without a trace of patronage”.²³

Finally, a ‘typically English’ trait seems to be the lack of artistry and ball skills and the dismissal of “continental [or South American] celebrations as ‘airy-fairy’” (O’Donnell 1994: 349). Whilst *The Sun* (01/08/1966) concedes that “we may never be as good in ball skills and

²³ Note the use of the personal pronoun *we*, creating a sense of collective identity and in-group belonging.

control as some of the South American and Latin European countries”, *The Sunday Telegraph* (10/07/1966) labels England “a team without conspicuous grace but burning with purpose” and thus stresses one of England’s assets, their commitment and will to win. This realistic and pragmatic approach is valued higher than the individual flair of the Latins.

All in all, the stereotypical English player in 1966 emerges as powerful, tough, dedicated, hard-working, unselfish, fair and realistic – all of these qualities which are ascribed to British soldiers during World War II (cf. Blain et al. 1993: 149).

German characteristics

At first sight, the German stereotypes in 1966 are rather similar to the English; some of the most prevailing characteristics seem to include physical strength, discipline, hard, efficient work and a stern will to win (cf. O’Donnell 1994: 348). “The Germans will be aggressive, feeling they can play their natural physical game in England”, writes the *Sunday Mirror* before the opening of the Cup. And after the final, *The Sun* (01/08/1966) confirms the expectations: “The Germans we knew were going to be relentless, disciplined and brave opponents”. Still, in spite of their “athletic, incisive, controlled power” (*Sunday Times*, 31/07/1966), in the final, they could not match England’s fitness and “the hitherto tough Germans wilted during extra time” (*News of the World*, 31/07/1966).

As opposed to the allegedly heartfelt dedication and fighting spirit of the English, the ‘German’ seriousness and commitment is often portrayed as aggressive, stern, grim, dour. Sentences like “Germans riled, warns Trautmann” or “Germans dislike being underestimated” (*Sun*, 30/07/1966) support a common notion that the Germans are arrogant and do not have a sense of humour but, rather, a sense of superiority.

Like the English, the Germans are said to have little, if any, artistic flair in their footballing style. In what came to be described as the most violently physical clash of the competition, the encounter between Argentina and West Germany, the Germans’ lack of artistry is depicted in *The Sunday Times* (17/07/1966) in terms of their “crude and clumsy play” and their “[running] right into it heads down, with all the impotence of moths at a bedroom window”. In accordance with the unfavourable connotations related to crudeness and impotence, the “stolid” Germans’ first goal in their game against Uruguay is characterised as “softish”, but “vital” in *The Sunday Times* (24/07/1966).

In the Uruguay match, as against Argentina, the Germans are accused of “taunting and provoking the South Americans” and cheating the referee to send off opponents for the slightest offence. Ben Wright, the writer of this *Sunday Times* article (24/07/1966), refers to

them as a “workmanlike but far from imaginative team” with a “flair for melodrama”; Helmut Haller is called “the West German ‘Hamlet’” and “some West German acting” is regarded as “positively Wagnerian”.²⁴ Notwithstanding such heavy criticism and accusations, some comments do not conform with the stereotype of German cunning: “I admired the Germans’ restraint. This torrid clash between Europe and South America could have ended in complete chaos if the Germans had retaliated in force”, it says in the *Sunday Mirror* (24/07/1966). Here, the Germans appear as noble, fair sportsmen. Equally interesting with regard to fairness are the English press reactions after the final. Whilst Brian Glanville in *The Sunday Times* (31/07/1966) sees Germany’s 2-2 equaliser as “flagrantly illegal”, Geoff Hurst’s highly questionable 3-2, the famous ‘Wembley-goal’ that has been disputed for over four decades now in Germany (because the ball in all probability did not cross the line), is taken as clearly valid. Glanville even goes on to lament that “One would write more happily about Germany’s performance had it not been for the displeasing nature of their equalising goal”. Again, the Germans are depicted as cunning and calculating.

In a nutshell, the stereotypical German player is thought of as strong, disciplined, crude, aggressive and sometimes calculating, sometimes fair. As with the English stereotypes, these characteristics resemble the image of Germans during the war(s).

Similarities and differences

Common characteristics and similarities between England and Germany are stressed especially in macro-discourses that set up the ‘European’ against the ‘South American’ style (cf. O’Donnell 1994). In a World Cup postscript, *The Times* (02/08/1966) maintains that “the European and the South American way of playing football has always been as different as some of our temperaments and languages”. Of these differences, the ‘Latin’ concern with flair and artistry as opposed to the ‘European’ dedication and physical strength is most crucial. *The Times* (30/07/1966) predicts that the World Cup final “may not be as fine a match technically”, but that England and Germany are “two sides physically powerful, trained to the inch, astutely prepared, and both possessing buoyancy of temperament and morale”. The article goes on explaining why “the English and the German styles, in fact, are highly similar: Both believe in the hard tackle, both go for the ball fairly, and both will play till they drop.” After the game, these observations are confirmed: “Both teams played with dogged persistence, supreme courage and methodical efficiency, qualities that amply compensated for

²⁴ References to Richard Wagner, the German composer (Nibelungen operas, epics) and idol of Hitler, are (like the terms ‘Teuton’ and ‘Teutonic’) often used to imply a dramatic scene (as in this case) or to create a link to the ancient heroes of German mythology (cf. Blain et al. 1993: 142).

the absence of Latin artistry” (*The Daily Telegraph*, 01/08/1966). In discourses about European and South American ‘character’, England and Germany are thus ‘on the same side’.

Evidently, discourses of ‘Germanness’ and ‘Englishness’ have both specific and shared characteristics and the stereotypes (most probably) “derive essentially from definitions which arose in connection with the Second World War” (Blain et al. 1993: 68). In the next section, the use of aggressive language in general and of war/military references in particular will be examined further.

4.1.2. Military and aggressive language

General

War imagery and language of aggression are stylistic devices which are very common in all kinds of sports reporting (Tannen 1999: 52ff.). Therefore, only some quotes have been picked here from an abundance of examples. Interestingly for this study, the military metaphors are applied above all to the Germans, both in the tabloid and quality press.

Even before their first appearance on the World Cup stage, Germany’s players are characterised as “raving football assassins” (*Sunday Mirror*, 10/07/1966); they possess “a destroyer of fantastic stamina – Karl-Heinz Schnellinger, Teutonic runabout” (ibid.) and “a sharpshooter, Emmerich” (*Times*, 30/07/1966). Of course, these expressions easily trigger associations to the war. Moreover, the semi-final between Germany and the USSR, a rough game for both sides, is depicted in particularly aggressive military terms – despite this being an extremely sensitive topic given the grim recent military history between the countries. *The Times* (25/07/1966) describes the match as “a naval battle with heavy gunfire” in which “the Germans were not able to rub as much salt into the wounds of their burnt-out enemy as they would have liked” (translated back from *NOZ*, 27/07/1966). Brian Glanville in *The Sunday Times* (31/07/1966) even takes it further when he writes: “in the early minutes, so many bodies littered the field that one awaited only the arrival of young Fortinbras and his army: ‘Go, bid the soldiers shoot!’ In fact, it was the German forwards who shot”. Note the fact that it is the Germans who are the aggressive actors in all these examples.

War language is used with regard to the English as well – however, mostly in broader military terms where war is a necessity and the English emerge as noble and heroic fighters, not aggressive instigators of conflict. Before the England–Germany encounter, the English footballing tactics are explained in terms of military strategy: “they must press [...] for an early goal since that will force the Germans to come back at them, leaving them prone at the back to the sharp, swift attack” (*Times*, 30/07/1966). Alf Ramsey, also known as ‘the

General', "would not disclose information that might be of use to the enemy" (*Sun*, 30/07/1966). During the battle, or game, the English "were best when the chips were down in open combat" (*Sunday Telegraph*, 31/07/1966), again a 'quality' reminiscent of the war. Renditions of the English celebrations after the victory evoke the impression of a military ceremony:

A drummer of the Royal Marines band gave an appropriate 'victory roll' on his drum. The Queen stood smiling, watching the scenes of enthusiasm [...]. Then her Majesty presented the gold cup to Bobby Moore who looked very English and very dignified as he held the Cup aloft. [...] Then came the triumphant march of the team. (*Sunday Times*, 31/07/1966)

Thus, when war language is used in connection with the English, the illustrations deal predominantly with tough but fair battles or with triumph and glory.

War references

Although, as Steve Richards writes in *The Sun* (30/07/1966), "patriotism, politics and history should never interfere with judgment of a football match",²⁵ both explicit and covert references to English and German military history can be found in tabloids as well as broadsheets.

The Sunday Times (17/07/1966) alludes to the Prussian ethos of militarism and nationalism when it comments on "the bumps and the buffetings, the ruthless fouling, the Bismarckian policies of blood and iron". The next stage of German military history is referred to when the *Daily Mirror* (28/07/1966) recounts how "England last night got some tips on how to shoot down the Germans. They saw 'The Blue Max' – a film on aerial combat in the first world war". Surprisingly, in this case the military discourse is not restricted to journalistic imagery but applied 'in reality' to the England team's 'preparations'. (Whether preparation was the only motive behind showing this movie is highly questionable, more likely it served to stir up hostile feelings before the match.) Furthermore, Peter Lorenzo (*Sun*, 30/07/1966) hints at Germany's inferiority to England not only in football but in two world wars, as he remarks: "As the Fatherland are embarrassingly aware, England have never lost to Germany – at Soccer either." The most overt and fierce references to the last world war are found in reports of the Germany–Russia semi-final already mentioned above. *The Daily Telegraph* (25/07/1966) speaks of "a cruel battle that rekindled bitter memories of the 40s" and *The Times* (25/07/1966) declares that "[the Germans] did by no means encounter footballers of high standard, rather something like the spirit of Stalingrad". However, the

²⁵ Ironically, whilst refraining from patriotism etc. in connection with football journalism here, Steve Richards in this same article has a fairly patriotic line under his signature reading "as English a name as you can find". Moreover, a piece by him on the same page describes 'Bert' Trautmann as "the only German who ever deserved to play for England".

writer of the last quote from *The Times* tones this statement down and partly apologizes for it by calling it “an unfortunate, if innocent reference of mine to Stalingrad” (*Times*, 02/08/1966) some days later.

Although all these quotes deal with aspects of German military history that put the Germans in a very unfavourable light, such examples are rather scarce and mostly implicit.

4.1.3 Football-nostalgic references

As the English national team had not won any significant football trophies yet before the 1966 World Cup, the football nostalgia in English papers largely limits itself to reminiscences about the origins of ‘their’ sport.

England is glorified as “the nation who gave football to the world” (*Sun*, 30/07/1966), “the Motherland of football” (*Sun*, 01/08/1966). Somewhat imperialistically, the importance of bringing “soccer`s crown back home to where the whole thing began” (ibid.) is rated as great not only for England, but for the whole of Britain: “At last here is the golden chance of the host nation, the original home of football, to write a happy ending to the most important match ever played in these islands” (*Times*, 30/07/1966). Accordingly, after the victory, Alf Ramsey is praised for “the riches he has again brought to English – no, British – Soccer” (*Sun*, 01/08/1966). Another aspect of football nostalgia that is taken up in several papers is the image of the Wembley stadium as an English ‘fortress’: “Since the Hungarian conquest²⁶ of 1953, we have lost only twice at Wembley” (*Sunday Times*, 31/07/1966). The fact that the Germans had never beaten England at football is also stressed in several articles after England`s World Cup victory at Wembley.

4.1.4 Assessments of the Anglo-German relationship

There are several instances in English papers where the German players and supporters are rated explicitly. The extent of criticism, disapproval, respect or praise can help illuminate the Anglo-German relationship in 1966.

Harsh criticism is voiced by *The Sunday Times* (24/07/1966) in connection with the Germany-Uruguay match in which, as noted above, the Germans were accused of play-acting by the same paper; here, the German fans with their seemingly boisterous and nationalistic attitude are also disapproved of: “No one, particularly the very large German contingent brandishing their black, red and yellow banners and braying horns, who reacted so noisily to the antics of their idols, emerges with credit from [this] match”. This negative attitude

²⁶ Note the military metaphor.

towards the Germans is partly reconsidered after the final where *The Sunday Times* (31/07/1966) concedes that in spite of “the displeasing nature of their equalising goal [...] they are a team which deserves appreciation”.

Respect for the rival is shown in *The Times* (30/07/1966), as the Germans are acknowledged as “vociferous, enthusiastic supporters [...] and there could be as powerful a rivalry on the terraces as down on Wembley’s flawless turf”. In this case, the Germans are treated as equals and even accredited with being “England’s greatest test yet”. Moreover, after the final, *The Times* (01/08/1966) has on its front-page an article entitled “OVATION FOR GERMANY’S TEAM” with a photograph of the crowds cheering the German players in Frankfurt – another sign of approval. However, the most overt display of appreciation is found in the *News of the World* (31/07/1966): “Praise every English player and praise every German for putting up such a disciplined and sporting performance. [The English] were all splendid fellows and so were the Germans.” If the Germans are applauded here along with the English, the latter are given a superior role as the triumphant victors when it says:

So well done England. Well done Ramsey. Hard luck Germany. They return home knowing that never have they beaten England at football. But this time they need not be downhearted for they were well and truly beaten by the new Soccer champions of the world. (*News of the World*, 31/07/1966)

Similarly, *The Sun* (01/08/1966), having first recognised the Germans as “brave opponents”, calls to mind that they “have still to beat England on the Soccer field – but they showed that in defeat they have a lot to give to the rest of the world”. The last statement is rather ambiguous, as it can be taken to refer either to defeat in football or defeat in a larger, political context. In the latter case, the ‘world order’ of the English looks like this: England maintains its ‘rightful’ position as the triumphant power and Germany, in their defeat, can contribute to the world, but only as long as they are ‘under control’.

Thus, the degree of respect and praise for the defeated Germans can be regarded as relatively high in the English press of 1966, whilst at the same time their own triumph is celebrated exceedingly.

4.1.5 Displays of nationalism, chauvinism, jingoism

If we do not make it [the World Cup] an occasion for national hysteria, as the Chilenians did in 1962, or for rowdy chauvinism, as the Swedes did at Gothenburg in 1958, that does not mean we are not awaiting it with pride, excitement...and, above all, hope. (*Sunday Times*, 10/07/1966)

This claim in *The Sunday Times* that “national hysteria” and “rowdy chauvinism” are absent in England and there is only “pride, excitement and hope”, is fairly questionable in the light of the following examples.

The *Sun*-headline “THE WORLD WAITS FOR ENGLAND” (30/07/1966) confronts the readers with quite a jingoistic and arrogant notion in which English supremacy is regarded as ‘rightful’ and the world’s support as ‘natural’: “and it would be fitting [...] for England, the nation who gave football to the world, to look down again on all who have taken to the greatest sport in the universe. Go to it England – the world and the cup are waiting” (*Sun*, 30/07/1966). Another image of the English as front runners and commanders of the world emerges in the headlines “COME ON, ENGLAND, YOU CAN LEAD THE WORLD AGAIN!” (*Daily Mirror*, 30/07/1966) and, after the victory, “THE WORLD BEATERS!” (*News of the World*, 31/07/1966). Even *The Sunday Times* (31/07/1966) joins in the national fervor it had earlier rejected when it rejoices: “We’ve got the whole world in our hands!”. The first paragraph (printed in bold) of another article in the *News of the World* on the same date (entitled “ENG - LAND”) is an example of how a football victory can be taken beyond the sporting realm (“Wembley Stadium”) and into politics (“Houses of Parliament”), and how it is seen as a victory for the whole nation over the arch rival “across the Rhine”: “ENGLAND are the Soccer champions of the world! Shout it from the twin towers of Wembley Stadium. From the Houses of Parliament. And shout it across the Rhine” (*N.o.t.W.*, 31/07/1966).

Statements like these clearly can be read as messages fuelling both nationalism and chauvinism. However, they mostly deal with the triumph and glory of the new world champions and instances of severe, let alone dangerous, jingoism or nationalism are very scarce; ‘Germanophobic’ headlines are totally absent.

4.1.6 Meta-discourse: Reactions to journalistic representations in the other country

To keep their readers informed about how events are presented in Germany, English newspapers regularly bring quotes from the German press, as well as interpret and comment on these. Two instances from *The Times* are picked out here to show how such comments often mirror the English view of the Germans.

The first example deals with German press comment after the final, which “takes the line that it was a fair and sporting game, bravely played on both sides. But inevitably, perhaps, there are sad and bitter feelings about Britain’s [sic!] third goal” (*Times*, 01/08/1966). Apart from the fact that the fairness of both teams is stressed (in the German papers as well as in *The Times* mentioning this), the writer empathises with the Germans’ “bitter feelings” about Hurst’s ‘Wembley-goal’, calling their reaction ‘perhaps inevitable’. This reveals a respectful, if not positive, attitude towards the Germans.

The other case concerns the reference to Stalingrad (in the Germany–Russia game), “that raised some readers` hackles abroad” (*Times*, 02/08/1966). As mentioned in section 4.1.2., the writer, on account of the German readers` indignation, tones this statement down as “unfortunate, if innocent”. The very fact that he apologizes for this allusion to the war may serve as evidence of the attempts to uphold an atmosphere of respect. Thus, both examples of meta-discourse convey efforts to maintain a respectful tone in the Anglo-German relationship.

4.1.7 Summary

Taking everything into account, discourses of English and German national character and identity in press coverage of the 1966 World Cup can be said to be influenced by the recent military history between these countries, as is obvious in the use of stereotypes and military language; accordingly, the Germans emerge with a rather unfavourable image, as ‘German’ aggression and discipline are set up against ‘English’ dedication and fairness. Moreover, English ‘supremacy’ is celebrated through football nostalgia and chauvinistic headlines after their World Cup triumph. However, the chauvinism is mostly restricted to their own ‘glory’ – ‘Germanophobic’ displays do surface sporadically in military references, but notably not in any headlines or articles *after* the England–Germany match. Apart from that, the relative scarcity of war references (and the fact that one writer even apologises for one of these), along with the largely positive explicit judgments of Germany after the final and the courtesy of the journalistic meta-discourse all contribute to the impression that the English attitude towards Germany in 1966 is characterised by a remarkable degree of respect.

Distinctions between quality and tabloid press are very difficult to draw here. Some of the harshest war metaphors and criticism against the Germans are – surprisingly – found in *The Sunday Times*; references to German military history and displays of nationalism emerge in all kinds of papers alike. One may draw the conclusion that the English press of that year is fairly unanimous in its coverage of and attitude towards themselves and the Germans.

4.2 The World Cup 1966 in the German press

Needless to say, the `66 World Cup is seen from a totally different perspective in the German press, not only with regard to the team that is supported, but also with regard to how discourses of national character emerge in the football coverage.

4.2.1 Use of stereotypes

As O'Donnell found in his 1994 study, the application of national stereotypes is very similar even across national borders. Moreover, broadsheets and tabloids seem to employ the same notions of national character in the German press.

English characteristics

In the *Neue Tagespost* (forerunner of the *Neue Osnabrücker Zeitung, NOZ*), the English style of play is described as “modern, pragmatic and fast [...] but also very fair” (27/07/1966) and “primarily built on speed and strength” (28/07/1966). These features are almost identical with the ones found in the English press. Apart from this, one *Bild* journalist, placing his bet on England to become world champions, sums up “the professional virtues such as stamina, toughness and fighting spirit [which] make the athletic Englishmen favourites. Their solidity will triumph over Brazil's artistry” (*Bild*, 11/07/1966). And after the Uruguay-match (0-0), “England's eleven proved their virtues: strength, courage, stamina, commitment. What they lacked were ideas and goalscorers” (*Bild*, 13/07/1966). Thus, most of the ‘English’ characteristics established in section 4.1.1 – speed, fairness, toughness, power, fighting spirit, dedication, lack of artistry – are confirmed.

Interestingly, in one *Bild* article, the machine metaphor often applied to the Germans is used in connection with the English team: “that's a perfect battle machine (Kampfmaschine). [...] The English come on like a rolling machine. It rolls on and on” (*Bild*, 28/07/1966). Apart from the martial connotations of a ‘battle machine’, the mechanical and ‘unstoppable’ work is emphasised. However, this work-like style of play is not scorned, as the ‘battle machine’ is labelled “perfect” and has attributes such as “speed, power and tremendous morale”.

In fact, all the characteristics of the stereotypical English player are positive, which is also implied through the use of the term “virtues”. Not even the lack of artistry is necessarily regarded as a disadvantage, as it can be explained and justified by the realistic, no-nonsense, pragmatic approach which is so similar to the German style.

German characteristics

As for the Germans, they are well aware of their image as *Krauts* in England. A *Bild* article (05/07/1966) depicts the first reaction of a concierge at the arrival of the food-supply for the German team at their hotel in Sheffield: “‘Here comes the Sauerkraut-Bus!’ His disappointment was huge as the German team cook had to tell him that there was not a single

tin of sauerkraut in the German luggage.” Of course, this is a rather humorous account of ‘the silly Englishmen’s misconceptions’ of the Germans. Still, it is significant in the sense that prejudices (such as all Germans eating copious amounts of squashed cabbage) are presented as false and outdated. The image of the Germans conveyed in their own press obviously focuses on positive character traits which to a great extent overlap with the stereotypes found in the English papers.

In an interview with the national team manager Helmut Schön, the *Neue Tagespost* (06/07/1966) stresses the importance of complete dedication and fighting spirit in the German team: “Each of them is going to give it their all [...] on the basis of good will and fighting effort”. Unlike the English press, the German papers present the commitment and will to win not as grim and aggressive, but as “sober” and “compelling”, alluding to the mental strength of the Germans: “Now, in 1966, the sober matter-of-factness, the compelling will to win have triumphed. The game against the Sovjet Union was one of the toughest in German football history – a true torture until the last second” (*NOZ*, 27/07/1966). As is evident from the last part of this quote, toughness, endurance and stamina also play a vital role. Still, the rough game against the USSR is not described in terms of a battle, as it is in English papers (although it is seen as a “true torture”).

Moreover, some of the ‘German virtues’ emerge in a *Bild* interview with team captain Uwe Seeler, who stresses the fact that “in our team (Truppe, which can also mean ‘troop’), there is comradeship – and above all, there’s discipline” (05/07/1966). These features, comradeship (team spirit) and discipline, which may resemble military values, appear as utterly positive along with the image of the Germans as “clean sportsmen”:

In this World Cup of choppers and spitters, our boys have proved themselves clean sportsmen. They were battered, kicked and sworn at. But they did not pay the others back tit for tat. They fought doggedly but decently. [...] These splendid fellows have shown that one can also have success in football by playing fair. (*Bild*, 26/07/1966)

Here, the Germans’ fairness stands out gleamingly against the grim background of ‘dirty’ play from teams like Argentina and Uruguay. Their “dogged but decent” fighting very much resembles the ‘English’ qualities of play.

All in all, the negative aspects that relate the Germans to the war, as found in the English use of stereotypes, are largely absent in the German press. On the contrary, positive features such as fair play and sportsmanship are emphasised and ‘German character’ is presented as very similar to ‘English character’.

Similarities and differences

The similarities between the two countries are frequently stressed in German papers. For example, the *Bild* quotes Ex-Liverpool manager Shankley as saying: “[The English] are as disciplined and as able to march on as your boys (eure Boys)” (12/07/1966). Besides discipline and stamina, one of the most dominant overlapping characteristics is fighting spirit: “Both countries have a great tradition within fighting football. In this respect, they won’t yield to each other at all. Natural fighters such as the Charltons and Stiles, Seeler and Held never give up. None of them breaks down” (*Bild*, 30/07/1966).

Thus, the use of stereotypes in the German press is notable for its emphasis on similarities between England and Germany and for its implicitly distancing itself from war-related characteristics by presenting all features as positive and fair.

4.2.2 Military and aggressive language

General

With regard to military language, it is extremely noteworthy that no direct or indirect references to the war can be found in those parts of the German press of 1966 analysed here. However, language of war and aggression, as is usual in sports commentary, exists in abundance, both in tabloids and broadsheets.

One example of a military metaphor is found in the *NOZ* (13/07/1966) after the Germany–Switzerland encounter (5-0), where “Helmut Schön’s battle plan to blast the Swiss bar (Schlachtplan zur Riegeltötung)” was successful in spite of the fact that “the Swiss fought with the glamour of warriors who try to hold a hopeless front line”. A similarly fierce and violent illustration of battling and fighting on against the odds is applied to the English after their poor draw against Uruguay: “Like those irrepressible who promise to win wars even with a shattered body and without a gun, Alf Ramsey bridled up: ‘And we’ll win all the same’” (*NOZ*, 13/07/1966).

The tabloid *Bild* is even more blunt in its military language. Before the game against Russia, a huge front-page headline demands from the German players: “ATTACK, ATTACK, AND EVEN THE IVANS WILL TOTTER! (Stürmt, stürmt, dann wackeln auch die Iwans!) ...but beware of the fast Russians” (*Bild*, 25/07/1966). Still, if this headline rekindles memories of the war, such associations are blown away by a very conciliatory note when it says: “Above all, we want a clean, fair and beautiful game between Ivan and Fritz. The time of ‘battles’ on the football pitch should be over now that the South American louts have dropped out”. Here, *Ivan* and *Fritz*, the stereotypical names of Russians and Germans, are on the same side,

opposing the ‘unfair South American louts’. A ‘battle’ (note the inverted commas in the quote!) between Germany and Russia is not welcome at all, only a “clean, fair and beautiful game”.

A *Bild* article about the World Cup final may serve as a last example of military language. Entitled “Two BILD journalists in the midst of Wembley’s hell”, it describes the game in terms of a battle, a “dangerous gauntlet run”:

Tilkowski trembles, his tongue is bleeding. There the English come again. [...] ‘Emma bombs’ [...]. The shot comes like a bullet out of a gun. [...] ‘No! No! Never!’ It doesn’t help. The game is lost. ‘Take hands (anfassen)’, yells Uwe and stands to attention, his eyes directed at the Queen, his hands held out searching for his comrades. (*Bild*, 01/08/1966)

In this vivid description, the war imagery is obvious, and the toughness of the fight is stressed as much as the dignity of the defeated Germans. Yet, the form of the article is marked as rather exceptional, as the journalists were placed near the pitch to render their experiences from an immediate range. A longer article with a more neutral description and analysis of the game is found on the same page.

On the whole, military language is used as much in the German as in the English press. However, the German press distinguishes itself through the absence of concrete references to military history and frequent endeavours to present football as a game, not as a battle.

4.2.3 Football-nostalgic references

The football nostalgia in the German press limits itself to references to the first great triumph of a German national team, the winning of the World Cup in Bern in 1954. Advice and good wishes are given from the former World Champions (“The heroes of 1954 say: ‘Lads, we’ll sweep them away!’”, *NOZ*, 08/07/1966) and some superstition is fueled before the final: “As in 1954: A penny in the lawn to bring luck” (*NOZ*, 30/07/1966).

4.2.4 Assessments of the Anglo-German relationship

The judgment of the English and the Anglo-German relationship is overwhelmingly positive in the German papers.

Both in the *Bild* and the *NOZ*, a great point is made of the enthusiastic welcome the German players got in England and of the friendly attitude the English seem to show towards the team. The *Bild* (09/07/1966) has the following headline on the arrival of the German squad in Manchester: “Flowers for the ‘German boys’ [sic]”, and the *NOZ* brings an article about how “All Liverpool wished Germany good luck for the semi-final” (25/07/1966). Moreover, the *NOZ* (12/07/1966) attaches a lot of importance to the fact that “For the first

time after the war, the flag of the Federal Republic is waving on the market-place [in Sheffield]”. This information is intended to show that the times of hostility between the two countries are over, that a spirit of friendship prevails and that the English do not bear the Germans any grudge.

Even after the lost final, German papers emphasise their admiration for the English and the similarities between both nations. Despite insisting that the third English goal was illegitimate (and providing ‘evidence’ for this even weeks and months after the game), the celebratory mood in both England and Germany is described as equally grand:

Cheers in London and Frankfurt – [...] two countries celebrated their football heroes on Saturday and Sunday; in London the English with a refreshing bath in the fountain at Trafalgar Square, in Frankfurt the Germans with Uwe-Uwe-chants, singing, waving, throwing flowers. (*NOZ*, 01/08/1966, front page)

The English are seen as lucky winners, but their victory is not begrudged. Rather, tribute is paid to the country with the ‘greatest football tradition’, “and certainly there is no football fan in the world who looks with jealousy to the island where the most beautiful and fascinating game has had its home for the longest time” (*NOZ*, 01/08/1966).

Thus, admiration and respect for England along with a strong emphasis on the good relations between the two countries dominate the German press commentary in 1966, especially after the final.

4.2.5 Displays of nationalism, chauvinism, jingoism

Nationalistic or chauvinistic displays are almost non-existent in the German press coverage of the `66 World Cup, even in the tabloid *Bild*.

In several articles, the *NOZ* argues that football should be taken for what it is – no more than a game that can be “the greatest minor matter in the world (die schönste Nebensache der Welt). [...] And from this point of view, there is space neither for excesses of nationalism nor of fanaticism in the stadiums” (*NOZ*, 14/07/1966). In other words, nationalism and fanaticism are regarded as phenomena which have nothing to do with the sport. Along similar lines, “national hysteria” is criticised after the England–Argentina match: “Even in good old England, the very home of ‘fair play’, traces of national hysteria are observable. One can only hope that they do not enter Germany as well” (*NOZ*, 25/07/1966). Here, Germany is presented as still being ‘free’ from such nationalistic outpourings and the writer clearly distances himself from these by posing a rhetorical question at the end of his article: “Enthusiasm is fair enough. [...] But is it really a deed of national significance when eleven players of one country are more skilful or more lucky than eleven players of another country?” (ibid.).

Anyway, the same newspaper points out the importance of the national team as representatives of their country in numerous statements after the final. Frankfurt's mayor Brundert voices his thanks to the German team: "We Germans need nothing more desperately in the world than friends. And to win new friends, you have with your splendid performance contributed immensely" (*NOZ*, 01/08/1966). That the players are aware of their role as representing not only their sport but the whole nation becomes obvious in a statement by 'skipper' Uwe Seeler: "I might perhaps say without sounding presumptuous: I think we have represented German football, German sport and maybe all of Germany as best as we could" (*ibid.*). Moreover, the notion that the footballers have improved Germany's battered image abroad is also supported by the *Bild* (01/08/1966):

One thing is certain: With your great fighting spirit and high playing standard, with your exemplary fair and knightly appearance, especially in the final, you have won new friends not only for German football but for all Germany both in England and in the whole world.

To make new friends in the world – first and foremost in England – is almost presented as a greater victory than a World Cup win. And "even if the German team had not lost to England, even if they had returned home with the World Cup as in 1954, their reception in Germany could not have been more overwhelming" (*NOZ*, 01/08/1966). However, not even the 100,000 Germans welcoming their heroes home are reported as exhibiting any signs of lavish nationalism: "Uwe-Uwe, Franzl-Franzl, 100,000 cheered", says a headline on the front page of the *Bild* (01/08/1966) – the chants were not 'Deutschland-Deutschland'.

Whilst distancing itself from nationalistic 'excesses' as they purportedly occur in other countries, the German press widely acknowledges the importance of the World Cup as an enormous and effective image-booster for Germany in 1966.

4.2.6 Meta-discourse: Reactions to journalistic representations in the other country

English perceptions of Germany are very important in the German press and quotes from British newspapers are provided almost daily during the '66 World Cup.

With indignation the *NOZ* reacts to the style of criticism of the Germans found in several English papers before the final. Among the international press reviews on 27/07/1966, "only the English press is discontented" with the Germans' play and "the criticism is set in a tone which could have been taken right out of the dictionary of war correspondency". The reference to Stalingrad in *The Times* after the Germany–Russia game (see section 4.1.2) is also quoted in the *NOZ* (27/07/1966). The citation is followed by a sarcastic remark: "That is what was written in *The Times*, a paper famous for its objectivity and neutrality". Two days later, the *NOZ* even goes on to speak about "Anti-German

propaganda in English newspapers” (*NOZ*, 29/07/1966) and somewhat humourously tries to ‘explain’ the allegedly hostile English attitude by suggesting that “Germany’s players seem to scare the English”. Otherwise, the ‘mean bullying’ of the Germans and the war references are regarded as “inexplicable” (*ibid.*).

A cartoon in the *NOZ* (28/07/1966) entitled “..our portrait in the English press..” (see front-page illustration) takes the journalistic meta-discourse to a visual level. It illustrates the World Cup final and depicts the German players in an attacking formation (4-3-2-1), wearing *Wehrmacht* uniforms and carrying guns; they face the English players, who are in their normal football outfit and stand in a line with their hands up; a flag with skull and crossbones serves as a corner flag and a huge tank with a German soldier in it (probably the German coach) stands on the sideline. This cartoon is matched by a very similar one called “How *The London Times* sees us” on the *Bild* front-page (29/07/1966), showing a couple of German players in tanks on the pitch, two of them in a battleship with the inscription ‘revenge for Skagerrak’. Through these caricatures, the English image of militant and aggressive Germans is presented as completely exaggerated, and is ridiculed and criticised in a humourous way.

Beside this cartoon, the *Bild* (28/07/1966) has a fairly comic article admonishing its readers not to get annoyed with the “army-English”:

Well, we shouldn’t take the ‘army-English’ of some journalists too seriously. When they rush and hurry clattering away on their typewriters they seem to hear the old noise of the battlefields, a noise that has nothing to do with sports. Then the German team only consists of ‘Kraft-durch-Freude’-players, of the eternal Teutons. (*Bild*, 28/07/1966)

Again, the Nazi references and ‘Teutonic’ stereotypes in the English press are presented as too bizarre to be taken seriously. At the same time, it is stressed that the sportsmen have a different attitude and the *Bild* hopes “that even those English journalists who seem to write their sports reviews with steel helmets and gas masks [...] recall their good reputation in the world as the Motherland of football and fair play” (28/07/1966). The ‘war mongering’ is regarded as very unsporting and unfair.

In a rather eloquent way, *Bild* journalist Werner Pietsch criticises English displays of chauvinism and nationalism in an article entitled “WE ARE THE GREATEST – if I wrote ‘in English’” (29/07/1966):

Unfortunately, I’m not as cold-blooded as some of the English journalists. If I were, I could have written tales about this World Cup, tales in which I could insult the guests and praise my own team to the skies. [...] You as a reader would have been surprised or even disgusted. Exactly as I was each time I picked up an English paper and read all those nasty, unsporting, unfair comments. [...] Here’s an example of what I could have written in the ‘English style’ after the game against Switzerland: ‘CHEESE SAWN UP – Hail Germany! I’m proud of being a German! Eleven German footballers skilfully saw up the Swiss cheese!’. (*Bild*, 29/07/1966)

The 'natural' reaction to such unsporting and jingoistic expressions is here seen as surprise and disgust. An article from 02/08/1966 sums up the *Bild*'s impression of and anger at the English World Cup coverage: "Some papers changed the football stadiums into battlefields. Objective and informative coverage of their guests was absent in these papers. Rather, they hosted national orgies. The right headline, in capital letters, for these papers: PULP THEM!".

All in all, the German press seems to be highly sensitive to references or allusions to *The Third Reich*. 'War mongering' is considered nasty, unfair and silly and is met with surprise, anger or even hurt. The chauvinistic tendencies in England and their representations of Germany are sometimes criticised directly, but most often in a sarcastic or humourous way.

4.2.7 Summary

German press coverage of the '66 World Cup is generally characterised by its rejection of nationalism and war references. This applies to the *Neue Tagespost* as well as the *Bild*. The use of national stereotypes emphasises similarities between German and English 'character' and stresses the 'virtues' of the footballing style; any war-related stereotypes are left out. Military imagery is applied in football reporting, but again without any obvious links to the German past. Also, it is stressed that football is a game, not a battle. Moreover Germany's attitude towards the English is marked by admiration and praise for their great football tradition, and the positive and friendly aspects of Anglo-German relations (also and especially from the English position) are highlighted, particularly after the England–Germany encounter. Whilst 'nationalistic and chauvinistic excesses' as they appear in English papers are rejected, the importance of the World Cup to improve the German image abroad and to 'win new friends in the world' is underlined. To journalistic representations in England before the final that allude to Germany's Nazi past the press reacts with indignation and criticism. Again, this is the case for broadsheets and tabloids alike.

4.3 The World Cup 1990 in the English press

The national dimension of 'Italia '90' was particularly significant in the newly-reunited Germany. The team (officially still named 'West Germany') beat England in the semi-final by 5-4 after penalty shoot-outs and went on to win the World Cup against Argentina (again through a penalty). In the English press, nationalistic tendencies in the now powerful political state Germany as well as the German football victory are strongly disapproved of.

4.3.1 Use of stereotypes

English characteristics

The stability of supposed ‘English’ characteristics over several decades is remarkable. Especially the words ‘spirit’ and ‘character’ are applied frequently. *The Times* (07/07/1990) frequently draws comparisons between the national teams of 1990 and 1966 and finds that as “Robson [England coach 1990] spoke of his team of ‘determination, speed and character’ but lacking the ‘artistry of Brazil’, in 1966 Ramsey praised his team for their running and character, regretting we would never equal South Americans”. Beside dedication, speed and commitment, ‘character’ is also pointed out as an ‘English’ feature by Germany manager Beckenbauer (who played in the `66 final): “English spirit. English character. Ja,²⁷ we will always respect that” (*Sun*, 03/07/1990). Talking about one player, Beckenbauer emphasises the fighting spirit and ability to take pain: “I watched him against Sweden with his shirt covered in blood and I thought ‘This is England. Terry Butcher is England’” (ibid.). On the same note, *The Sun* (03/07/1990) makes a point of the “fantastic pride and bulldog spirit running through the team. [...] The team spirit has been borne out of going through some hard times”. Fighting and sticking together in the face of ‘hard times’ is another ‘English’ value. It is declared that “the English have a history of being at their best with backs to the wall” (*The Sun*, 04/07/1990); and after the semi-final, attention is drawn to the fact that “the boys went down fighting against West Germany” (*The Sun*, 06/07/1990).

With regard to fairness, it is notable that this value is still regarded as a specifically ‘English’ quality. Although England’s penalty against Cameroon was rather questionable, *The Times* (02/07/1990) speaks of Lineker’s ‘diving’ in terms of “his instincts around the penalty area” and his “nerve to protect his country’s interests in the tournament”. Thus, the unfair behaviour is not criticised but rather appreciated. However, a few days later, *The Times* (06/07/1990) depicts ‘diving’ as a bad trick used only by foreign players: “We do have things to learn from other countries [...]. But do we really want to see English footballers feigning injuries in the hope that opponents will be cautioned or sent off?”.

As for the growing fear in Europe of the hooligans from England, the stereotype of ‘the English thug’ is counteracted by many papers. For example, *The Sun* (06/07/1990) marks the hooligans’ ‘out-group membership’ (cf. Bishop & Jaworski 2003: 257ff.) by referring to them as “mindless, vicious, perverse morons” who threaten the English way of life. Thus, they cannot be seen as representing the ‘national collective’.

²⁷ Note the mocking of the German accent here.

On the whole, the use of English stereotypes in 1990 seems to focus on dedication and fighting spirit in the face of adversity, i.e. qualities of ‘true and noble warriors’.

German characteristics

Concerning German stereotypes, the English press lays stress on the alleged mechanical efficiency and unattractive ‘machine’ play of the Germans. Moreover, to an overwhelming extent, the ‘tabloids’ dig up old nicknames such as *Kraut*, *Hans*, *Fritz* and *Herr* and apply them whenever possible.²⁸

Quite apart from football, *The Sun* (03/07/1990) indulges in images of the Germans as *Sauerkraut*- and *Weisswurst* gobblers, as it informs its readers in an article entitled “HERR TONIC”:²⁹ “We call the Germans krauts because each eats 130lb of Sauerkraut – pickled cabbage – every year.” What’s more, “Weisswurst white sausage” is described as a “popular breakfast dish made of offal wrapped in a sheep’s bladder taken with beer made from oats”. Of course, details like these only function as deterring examples which suggest that the Germans are repulsive and queer. Therefore, the readers will not find it surprising that “colleges run classes to improve the image of German tourists abroad” (ibid.).

Translating the stereotypes into sport, Franz Beckenbauer is used as an example of ‘German character’ in *The Sun* (03/07/1990):

Nicknamed ‘The Dour Kraut’ by his enemies. Aggressive, calculating and determined [...], explodes in rage when things don’t go according to plan [...], known as The Kaiser because he rules his side with a rod of iron [...], obsessed by winning. His German temperament means he is always careful about what he says and does and is rarely caught out.

Here, apart from aggression, dour, obsessed determination and almost military rule and discipline, careful and cunning calculation is presented as a German character trait. This is also taken up when *The Sun* implies that Germany win their games through ‘diving’, e.g. when “Klinsmann’s over-dramatic reaction to a two-man ambush brought the Germans a penalty” (02/07/1990).

Related to this winning by penalties is the stereotype of mechanical efficiency. *The Sun* calls the German side “the most efficient [team] in years” (02/07/1990) and Kevin Keegan suggests that they are “like a finely tuned machine” (*Sun*, 04/07/1990). The machine metaphor is also used in *The Times*, as the Germans’ disciplined performance against Czechoslovakia is summed up under the headline “West Germany’s machine grinds on” (02/07/1990). Furthermore, after the tournament, *The Times* (09/07/1990) claims that “the

²⁸ All these nicknames arose in the early 20th century, and were applied especially often during and after World War II.

²⁹ Puns around the German word *Herr* (‘Mister’) are very frequent in the tabloid press.

deplorable World Cup final of 1990 will be remembered not for the way West Germany won it, mechanically and without style [...]”. Here, the ‘mechanical’ play is clearly marked as negative.

As opposed to 1966, all German stereotypes in the English press of 1990 are extremely unfavourable and to a large degree war-related, the aggressive ‘machine’ style of play being presented as the most prevalent German feature. However, while *The Times* shares in the machine metaphors, the constant condescending talk about *Krauts* (also in an extra-sporting context) is mostly limited to the tabloids.

Similarities and differences

If similarities were stressed in 1966, the emphasis seems to be on differences between English and German ‘character’ in the English press in 1990.

More than once, their respective features are presented as diametrically opposing: “West Germany against England, the masters against the novices, the efficient against the spirited, the practised against the spontaneous” (*Times*, 04/07/1990); or “the power and efficiency of the West Germans against a determined and seemingly indestructible England” (*Times*, 06/07/1990). Moreover, Simon Barnes in *The Times* (06/07/1990)³⁰ exemplifies “Germanic” and “British” character on the national team managers:

Beckenbauer, the German coach, was very Germanic. When asked what he thought about the shoot-out ordeal, he said: ‘It’s the regulation. That is how it is. There is no alternative.’ Bobby Robson, the England manager, was almost equally British: teams should play on and on until a goal is scored: ‘Football is supposed to be about endurance and temperament and fighting spirit.’

Repeatedly, ‘German’ discipline and obedience are set up against ‘English’ dedication and fighting spirit, and thus, two mutually exclusive ‘characters’ are created.

4.3.2 Military and aggressive language

Compared with 1966, the sheer amount of military language and war references in connection with the Germans in 1990 is overwhelming, especially in the English popular press.

In line with the machine metaphor described above, *The Sun* (02/07/1990) depicts the Germans as “moving with Panzer power to [the] final”. War imagery also comes to the fore when the tabloid depicts how “skipper Lothar Matthaeus launched a missile of a penalty into the Czech net” (ibid.).

A column headlined “Herr today gone tomorrow” (*Sun*, 03/07/1990) quotes a number of famous persons before the semi-final, among them “former Dad’s Army star Clive Dunn,

³⁰ Interestingly, Barnes had just three days earlier stressed that the Germans “are like us, only better; that is all” (*Times*, 03/07/1990; see section 4.3.4).

now 70: ‘Give `em the cold steel, lads – they don’t like it up `em’’. Such obscene and aggressive language is presented as funny, coming from a comedian. Likewise,

comic Stan Boardman is happy to lead England into battle – because the Jeermans bombed his chip shop. He says: ‘Their World Cup hun-y-moon is over. When Gazza breaks down their defences, they’ll be kraut of the Cup. It’s time we showed `em who’s in charge. We’ve done it before and this time it will be Bonn-voyage!’ (*Sun*, 03/07/1990)

The puns in this quote on *Jeermans-Germans*, *hun-/honeymoon*, *kraut-out* and *Bonn-/bon voyage* may appear rather far-fetched but nonetheless fit in the condescending, ridiculing and otherwise aggressive tone.

A very explicit and overtly hostile reference to Anglo-German military and football history is provided by Bernard Manning: “We beat Germany in 1914, we beat them in 1945, we beat them in 1966 and we are going to beat them in 1990. We should put the numbers on the FRONT of the German shirts so that it looks like they are attacking” (*Sun*, 03/07/1990). Beneath the same column, in bold letters, another ‘famous person’ is ‘quoted’: “1945 - ‘VE CAN STILL VIN IT LADS’ - Adolf Hitler” (*Sun*, 03/07/1990).

An image of Hitler also appears in a cartoon published in *The Sun* on the England–Germany match day (04/07/1990): Surrounded by several elderly people looking like Nazis (one with a scar and a monocle, one smoking a pipe, two wearing Wehrmacht-uniforms), Hitler is on the stands in a football stadium, an old man waving his stick and shouting at the German players entering the pitch; one of the latter, Guido Buchwald, upon this: ‘WHO’S THE NUT SHOUTING ‘VICTORY OR THE FIRING SQUAD’?’.

Also on match day, *The Sun* (04/07/1990) has a headline reading “TEAR THEIR HERR OUT ENGLAND! – Let`s blitz `em”. After this belligerent order (and a Nazi reference: *Blitzkrieg*) follows yet another chauvinistic display alluding to the two world wars and the one world cup won by England: “Whether it`s with a ball or a bomb – we usually beat your lot” (*Sun*, 04/07/1990).

Although ‘war mongering’ and aggressive style as found in *The Sun* are primarily restricted to the tabloids, military references do emerge in the quality press as well, if slightly more implicit and less belligerent. One example appears in *The Times* (03/07/1990), where the England team is praised for “not throwing in the towel, the Dunkirk bit”.³¹

All in all, military language and especially references to the Second World War are extremely widespread in the tabloid press in 1990. *The Sun* uses war imagery in humorous

³¹ ‘Dunkirk’ is a metonym for the battle between German and British forces at Dunquerque, Belgium, during the Second World War. Although the Wehrmacht could have annihilated the entire British army at this point, against all odds, that did not happen. Therefore, ‘Dunkirk’ can be seen as a model for not giving up though the chips are down.

contexts, poking fun at the Germans, or in a harsh tone that builds up aggression in anticipation of the classic duel.

4.3.3 Football-nostalgic references

Of course, the football nostalgia in 1990 for the English revolves around their one and only great triumph, the World Cup victory in 1966.

The Sun (03/07/1990) has a three-page piece dealing with 1966 nostalgia. One headline, “HIT `EM FOR 66”, takes up one third of a page. Here, `66 hero Geoff Hurst claims that “We beat them in `66 – and we can beat them again”, arguing that the same spirit has lived on in the English team through 24 years. “Reliving a distant triumph” and “memories of glory” (*Times*, 07/07/1990) with Hurst go on even directly after the 1990 defeat. *The Times* (07/07/1990) explains this with “the force of re-awoken memory”: “Hurst`s role all week has been to act as a sort of touchstone to help Britons [sic] believe that the thing done once might be accomplished again”. Now, defeated again, the papers provide extra consolation by reminding the English of how “even on holiday we have Germans come over. ‘Herr Hurst? When you score the goal, I kick in zer front of my television.” (ibid.), thus poking fun at the Germans and rekindling emotions of superiority and triumph.

If the `66 victory is associated with a “glorious past” (*Sun*, 04/07/1990), “bitter memories” (*Sun*, 03/07/1990) are connected with the following games against the arch rival. The 1970 defeat in Mexico Gary Lineker remembers because, as *The Sun* headlines, “THE GERMANS MADE ME CRY MY EYES OUT”, and now, in 1990, he vows to “settle the score” (ibid.). *The Times* (04/07/1990), commenting on the good German performances during Italia `90, quote one pundit saying: “you might start thinking they are super-human. But it would be difficult for any team to maintain that form for seven matches”. As an afterthought to this almost respectful evaluation of the Germans (cf. section 4.3.4), the author of the article adds: “The Germans, though, have maintained that form across 24 years” (ibid.). The World Cup victory in 1966 obviously remains the major point of reference for English football nostalgia.

4.3.4 Assessments of the Anglo-German relationship

Both tabloids and broadsheets comment on the English attitude towards the Germans and vice versa.

With regard to German judgments of the English, both *The Sun* and *The Times* quote Beckenbauer: “I would be more than happy to manage your England side” (*Sun*, 03/07/1990); “We respect England very much” (*Times*, 04/07/1990). This overt display of German respect,

which the English press seems to be well aware of, is countered by a totally different English attitude.

The Sun readers exhibit a particularly hostile stance, as is obvious from the following readers' letters published on 04/07/1990: "It'll be nice to thrash the pants off the Germans. They think they are so good at everything. Let's show them who is really boss!"; or, "Gary with your thighs and looks, Keep those Krauts on tenterhooks". The aggressive style of these quotes is continued after the semi-final, as *The Sun* (05/07/1990) reports that "army lads" stationed in Germany had to be kept inside "after the Krauts TAUNTED soldiers and their families over the World Cup". One wife is cited: "They are arrogant and behave like pompous pigs". Actually, in this article, the Germans are not once referred to by other names than *Kraut*, which adds to the stereotypification and overgeneralising aversion against this people.

A slightly more differentiated attitude towards the Germans is shown by *Times* journalist Simon Barnes in his article "Awesome Germans so hard to support" (03/07/1990). Here, the English aversion to German football teams (notably not to all Germans) is said to have "little to do with sporting history. It has almost nothing – and certainly nothing conscious – to do with real history. It is simply that German football teams do not stir English blood". Obviously, in the light of all the military and sporting references seen in the sections above, this 'explanation' ruling out military and sporting history seems rather dubious. However, basing his view on stereotypes ("Germany? They offer neither familiarity [like the English with their weaknesses] nor exoticism nor relief from the humdrum. They are like us, only better; that is all. They are athletic, very strong on the ball, and very, very accurate"), the writer comes to the conclusion that Germany are "a team that inspires respect rather than affection".

No trace of respect or goodwill for the new world champions is found, however, in *The Times*' coverage of the final and the following celebrations in Germany. Labelling it "the worst final ever played" (*Times*, 09/07/1990), the paper criticises "Argentina's behaviour" as well as "the orgiastic embracing of the whole German team", the "frenzied close-ups of Franz Beckenbauer" and "the excessive scenes of celebration which were a conspicuous contradiction of FIFA's campaign for fair play" (it is also mentioned that England were awarded the trophy for fair play). Indeed, adjectives with negative connotations such as "orgiastic", "frenzied", "excessive" are used throughout the descriptions of the German celebrations, as in another *Times* article from 09/07/1990. Here, the fear of German nationalism is presented as justified in the light of the depictions of a country out of control: Images of "thousands chanting, waving huge victory banners and West German flags" give

rise to worries, as “in Berlin, hundreds of right-wing youths, wielding clubs and bellowing, ‘Deutschland-Deutschland’ smashed shop windows [...]. Police did not intervene”. Associations to earlier times of nationalistic ‘fervour’ in Berlin do not seem far-fetched considering the descriptions of “intoxicated triumph”. A young East Berliner’s statement towards the end of the article must appear likewise alarming and contemptible to the English readers: “‘This victory is especially sweet, especially significant this year because [of the] German unification [...]’ Andreas Langner, aged 19, said in East Berlin. ‘Look at this: everyone is going crazy.’”. The ‘natural’ English reactions to such ‘nationalistic craziness’ are worry and contempt.

Thus, while the English tabloids have an openly hostile and aggressive attitude towards the Germans, the reactions in the quality press are predominantly characterised by aversion, contempt and apparently concern about nationalistic tendencies in the reunited nation (though some degree of respect is also shown before the England–Germany encounter).

4.3.5 Displays of nationalism, chauvinism, jingoism

Chauvinistic remarks in English tabloids, like “lead England into battle – [...] it’s time we showed `em who’s in charge” (*Sun*, 03/07/1990); “We beat Germany in 1914, we beat them in 1945, we beat them in 1966 and we are going to beat them in 1990” (*Sun*, 03/07/1990) or “TEAR THEIR HERR OUT ENGLAND! – Let’s blitz `em” (*Sun*, 04/07/1990) have already been mentioned in section 4.3.2 and will not be taken up again in detail here.

However, the consequences of such ‘nationalistic war mongering’ and the coverage of the ‘real’ nationalistic excesses are worth taking note of. As Anglo-German hostility culminated in violent clashes between German and English hooligans, *The Sun*’s front-page headline after the England–Germany match reads “SOCCER YOBS IN WAR OF TURIN” (*Sun*, 05/07/1990). Significantly, the game result and football commentary are given a minimum of space on the front-page, the article focussing on the riots. Moreover, the war metaphor is carried on – yet this time not in gloryfying or humorous, but in negative terms, as the participants are labelled “yobs” and “thugs” and thus alienated from the ‘normal’ fans. Ironically, the most ‘war mongering’ of all English papers here criticises the ‘war’ of the hooligans.

In sum, nationalistic and chauvinistic displays are very salient in the popular press’ and, as mentioned earlier, the tone is extremely belligerent and boisterous; at the same time, ‘real’ violence by nationalistic hooligans is condemned in the tabloids.

4.3.6 Meta-discourse: Reactions to journalistic representations in the other country

Reactions to coverage in German newspapers are rather scarce in the English press in 1990. This might indicate quite an indifferent attitude towards opinions in the other country.

Obviously, the tabloids are aware of the negative impact of their aggressive style abroad. Anyway, the indignation and resentment of German readers and journalists are merely mocked and ascribed to the ‘German lack of humour’ (another common stereotype fitting the ‘grim seriousness’ of the Germans): “If their football was as bad as their sense of humour they wouldn’t be in the World Cup” (*Sun*, 03/07/1990). The ‘war mongering’ is presented as a joke – and at the same time, the “aghast gathering of German sports writers” (*The Sun*, 04/07/1990) is presented as too dour to laugh at these jokes. Thus, the militant stereotype of ‘the stern and grim Germans’ is even enforced in the meta-discourse.

4.3.7 Summary

Compared to 1966, the English papers (especially the tabloids) in 1990 exhibit an overwhelmingly negative attitude towards the Germans. While the English stereotypes with their emphasis on spirit and character seem to have remained rather stable since 1966, the German stereotypes experience a considerable shift of focus, now concentrating primarily on mechanical efficiency, ‘machine’ style and other negative characteristics. Moreover, instead of paying attention to similarities between the two countries, as was common in 1966, only differences are stressed in 1990; the ‘fighting, noble warriors’ as opposed to the ‘inhuman but supreme war machines’. With regard to aggressive language, the ‘Kraut bashing’ and war references in the tabloids evidently know no bounds. Belligerent and chauvinistic displays in *The Sun* appear in aggressive as well as in ‘humorous’ contexts. Nostalgia around the ‘66 triumph is also frequently put in connection with the ubiquitous ‘Two World Wars and One World Cup’. Moreover, the tabloid press exhibits an openly hostile and aggressive stance, while the quality papers express their aversion and contempt rather implicitly, pointing to their concern about nationalistic tendencies in Germany. The degree of respect shown in 1966 is not nearly equalled by the English press in 1990. Regarding journalistic meta-discourse, the scarcity of comments signals indifference towards German views; the few remarks upon their ‘lack of humour’ only enforce the war-connected stereotype of the ‘stern and grim’ Germans.

4.4 The World Cup 1990 in the German press

As has been pointed out, the 1990 World Cup gained an exceptional degree of national significance in Germany due to the ongoing processes of unification between East and West;

political as well as footballing triumphs are frequently greeted in the press with displays of nationalism, and these displays are especially salient in the leading German tabloid *Bild*.

4.4.1 Use of stereotypes

English characteristics

The stereotype of the English fighter and the related ‘qualities’ of dedication, team spirit, toughness and stamina are very much focused on in 1990: “The English team consists of strong fighters who never give up” (*NOZ*, 03/07/1990). An outstanding example of this is Mark Wright, who wants to play ‘in pain and stitches’ against Germany: “Wright’s attitude documents the strength of the British [sic] who do not exactly play attractively but who fight self-sacrificingly and patriotically” (*NOZ*, 03/07/1990). On the same note, after the semi-final, a big point is made of the disappointed “English power packets (Kraftpakete)” (*NOZ*, 06/07/1990) who let their tears flow freely: “Gascoigne and Waddle, the big fighters, cried like small children” (ibid.). However, though fighting is clearly seen as a ‘virtue’, the German press focuses increasingly on the little attractive and old-fashioned nature of the English play. Commenting on England versus Ireland as “an aesthetically poor, tough but fair game – pure ‘kick and rush’ from the English” (12/06/1990), the *NOZ* claims that “the game’s development seems to have stagnated on the island” (ibid.), thus implicitly criticising ‘English’ conservatism.

Moreover, the apparent ‘mental’ weakness of the English players is emphasised and slightly ridiculed in the *Bild*: During the penalty shoot-outs, German keeper Bodo Illgner is reported to have “driven the Tommies mad”³² (*Bild*, 06/07/1990) by making them nervous. The German quality of mental control and efficiency is thus contrasted with an English foible: insecurity.

Five years after the Heysel catastrophe that involved hooligans from Liverpool and caused the deaths of hundreds of Juventus fans, the international image of ‘the English thug’ was extremely widespread. Before the England–Germany encounter in Torino, the *NOZ* (03/07/1990) describes the place as “a town that fears”. A photograph of a young Englishman waving a swastika-flag (caption: “Fear of the hooligans from the British Island”) serves as a reminder of the terror and enforces the fairly new stereotype of ‘the English *lager lout*’.

Thus, while ‘English’ features were almost exclusively positive in German press coverage in 1966, the focus on fighting but old-fashioned and clumsy football as well as on

³² Note the use of the nickname *Tommies* in the German ‘tabloid’ press.

the threat by English hooligans in 1990 yields a considerably more negative impression of English 'character' in that year.

German characteristics

In 1990, the stereotypical 'German virtues' are said to be brought to perfection. The team is described as "an ideal mixture of fighting force, skills, tactical and technical blend, courage and morale" (*NOZ*, 09/07/1990). Apart from that, the new world champions are praised for their "team spirit and harmony, and the greatest possible perfection in the conjunction of forces" (*ibid.*). On account of this alleged perfection, other sides see the Germans as "teachers and masters" (14/06/1990), the *NOZ* points out, and quotes Columbia's Alvarez: "We have to copy the Germans' game, [...] disturb them each time they get the ball and play very aggressively" (*ibid.*). In spite of their aggressive style (Germany–Columbia is "marked by a lot of fighting, a lot of roughness" (*NOZ*, 20/06/1990)), the Germans are applauded for their fairness and sportsmanship, most notably in their game against the Netherlands: "a team that showed a high degree of morale even in times of trouble. Trouble which was conjured up by the referee, who rightly sent off Frank Rijkaard and who totally unjustly sent off Rudi Völler" (*NOZ*, 25/06/1990).³³

Discipline, morale and inner firmness are said to be the main ingredients in the result-oriented, efficient 'German' style. With regard to the stereotype of mechanical efficiency, it is interesting to note that this is also taken up in Germany itself: "WHO CAN STOP OUR FULL-STEAM TEAM (unsere Volldampf-Elf)? Always at full blast! [...] our wondrous eleven speed through the preliminary round" (*Bild*, 18/06/1990). In this case, the machine metaphor – which is commonly used in English sports reporting about the Germans – is elaborated, as the team is compared to a steam engine. On the other hand, artistry and beautiful play are dismissed as unrealistic and inefficient: "Cameroon played like a dream. But in a World Cup, dreams don't count, only results. Beckenbauer's players know that" (*BILD*, 04/07/1990). Thus, the German footballers have successfully adapted to "a time when the value of a performance is solely measured by success" (*NOZ*, 09/07/1990).

If arrogance is seen as a 'German' characteristic elsewhere, some German papers seem to be aware of this danger. The *NOZ* (15/06/1990) quotes Beckenbauer's rather pompous statement before the game against the Arab Emirates: "His answer came rather matter-of-factly: 'We want to win and we will win. But as for the extent of our victory – we can talk about that later'". The headline of this article reacts with a simple demand: "Fight arrogance

³³ Rijkaard had spit at Völler.

like a germ”. Thus, the paper distances itself from conceited and chauvinistic displays and tries to weaken the stereotype of German arrogance.

In sum, discipline, morale, and perfection are presented as the most dominant German characteristics in 1990, features that were also prevalent in the 1966 press coverage. The extreme focus on mechanical efficiency is notable in that this stereotype is presented in very negative terms elsewhere, especially in England; in the German press of 1990, however, it is portrayed as a ‘virtue’.

Similarities and differences

Similarities between English and German characteristics are given some attention in the German press, yet not nearly as much as in 1966. These similarities are restricted to fighting spirit, morale and sportsmanship in 1990: “It was not until they thought of their fighting virtues [...] that the German team caught up with the English. [...] The duels were almost always fair” (*NOZ*, 05/07/1990). The endeavours to focus on the likeness between Germany and England seem to have decreased considerably from 1966.

4.4.2 Military and aggressive language

General

Military language is used frequently in connection with the England–Germany encounter. In its match report, the *NOZ* (05/07/1990) relates how “the extra-time resulted in aggressive end to end stuff (offener Schlagabtausch), in an honest and great battle between two evenly matched sides”. The *Bild* (05/07/1990) rejoices: “What a thriller – what a fight!” and features a photograph of the players in action: “Matthäus marches on, chased by England’s Gascoigne” (ibid.). While the footballing ‘battle’ is thus described in terms of honesty, dedication, fairness and greatness, with terror and hostility being absent from the military imagery, the real violence between hooligans is not glorified: Torino is portrayed as “a highly explosive mixture of fear and hatred” (*Bild*, 05/07/1990), and the town is said to have its own “‘reception committee’: police forces wearing helmets and carrying truncheons. Each time a train rolls in, the hunt for Englishmen begins” (ibid.). If it is primarily the English who are depicted as dangerous rowdies here, the report is somewhat balanced through a photograph of a German hooligan being arrested. In this way, the paper condemns troublemakers from both countries. On a similar note, the arrival of German fans before the World Cup final is described in military terms in the *NOZ* (07/07/1990): “Rome is still in the hands of the Romans. The ‘invasion of the Germans’ [...] has not yet begun 48 hours before the final. Just

one single lonesome black-red-golden flag adorns the piazza in front of Termini station”. In the light of the German history of military invasions, this comparison – though marked as a metaphor through inverted commas – may seem rather surprising in a quality paper.

War references

Remarkably, war references are still practically non-existent in German football reporting in 1990. Before the game against the Netherlands, the *Bild* (23/06/1990) features a whole page to explain the special rivalry and why the Dutch “hate” the Germans:

Memories of 1940, when German troops occupied Holland? ‘No’, said Koeman [a Dutch footballer] once. The trauma had its origin in the year `74. World Cup final in Munich. Holland were the better team, but it was the Germans who became world champions. (*Bild*, 23/06/1990)

Here, the paper attempts to keep the rivalry on a purely sporting basis by explicitly dismissing the war as a reason for the animosity. Further, the argument and its credibility are enforced by the fact that it comes from a Dutchman.

On the whole, the military language in German papers serves to glorify the tough football-fighters and, on the other hand, to degrade hooliganism. Although the talk of a “German invasion” of football fans in one instance may give rise to war-associations, the few explicit military references are repudiated as having nothing to do with sports.

4.4.3 Football-nostalgic references

In 1990, German football nostalgia with regard to England is best summed up by the *NOZ* headline “England – those are good memories” (04/07/1990). In this article, Beckenbauer recalls his memories of the most significant games against the arch rival, especially dwelling on the German 3-1 victory at Wembley in 1972 that the British press referred to as “a black day” (ibid.). Nostalgia is also frequent in the *Bild* (04/07/1990) before the semi-final; Bobby Charlton (who played for England in 1966) writes in the paper and people are warned that “‘Wembley ref’ Dienst [the ‘father’ of the ‘Wembley goal’ in `66] participates again – this time on the terraces” (ibid.). Moreover, several former Germany players comment on “[o]ur great games against England” (*Bild*, 04/07/1990).

Thus, references both in the quality and the popular press to the great football history between England and Germany, which of course is overwhelmingly positive from a German point of view, serve to highlight – on an entirely sporting basis – the ‘historical’ importance of a new memorable roll-up of the football classic before the semi-final.

4.4.4 Assessments of the Anglo-German relationship

The German press appears fairly unanimous in their attitude towards England in 1990: Both in the *NOZ* and the *Bild*, the keywords are ‘polite respect’ – no more and no less. Moreover, the strong, almost submissive admiration for the ‘masters’ from the ‘home of football’ that was salient in 1966 has largely given way to a solid self-confidence and the knowledge of being the favourites in the encounter with the rival.

The *Bild* (04/07/1990) puts it bluntly before the game: “We respect the English, but we are not afraid of them”. And the *NOZ* (03/07/1990) explains the development of the German attitude:

There were times in football when German players went to games against England like schoolkids on their way to a difficult exam: With anxious respect in their hearts and doubts of their own strength in their minds. Tonight in Torino, everything is different: Germany’s national players will come out onto the pitch with a firm belief in their own power and capacity. The baggage of being the favourites they will carry with calmness. And with regard to the English, they [the Germans] have polite respect but not a trace of fear.

Thus, both papers show a ‘fair’ amount of deference towards the English while simultaneously maintaining an utterly positive self-assessment.

After the match, the *NOZ* (05/07/1990) praises both teams for their performance: “A great English team lost to a great German team that deserved the grain of luck it had”. Again, self-assurance is mingled with due respect towards an ‘equal’ counterpart.

4.4.5 Displays of nationalism, chauvinism, jingoism

If displays of nationalism were looked down upon and heavily criticised as an unsporting, unobjective journalistic style in 1966, the situation seems to have been completely reversed in 1990, especially with regard to the tabloid *Bild*.

Particularly the mingling of sports and politics was condemned in the *NOZ* in 1966 (see section 4.2.5). Interestingly, twenty-four years later, political and footballing events are treated alongside each other and ascribed equal national significance in the tabloid press. The *Bild* (30/06/1990) features a front-page article blending World Cup news and reunification events under the headline “THE GERMAN WEEK-END”. This headline and the two sub-headings (“Deutschmark rolls into the GDR” and “Franz vows: Full blast against the Czechs”) are surrounded by a frame in the national colours black-red-gold. Similarly, two headlines on 02/07/1990 give a rather nationalistic impression by the way they are combined on the front-page: “1:0 GREAT FIGHT – ROME, HERE WE COME!” – “CLEAR ROAD, GERMANY! At midnight all the borders fell and the D-Mark was there!”. The pro-unification attitude of the *Springer* press also becomes evident in the *Bild* as the new geographical realities in Germany are taken

into account in connection with the football enthusiasm: “Between the Rhine and the Oder tens of thousands celebrated Germany’s moving on to the final” (*Bild*, 06/07/1990), or “From Rostock to Regensburg, from Cottbus to Cologne, everybody demands: GIVE US THAT THING! [photograph of the world cup trophy]” (*Bild*, 07/07/1990, front-page). Thus, the World Cup is raised to a level of new national significance, including both East and West Germany.

Moreover, recalling the *Bild* article from 29/07/1966 about the ‘detestable English style of journalism’ (see section 4.2.6), where the writer gives an example of how *not* to insult the football opponents (“CHEESE SAWN UP – Hail Germany! [...]), it is highly ironic to read in the same paper twenty-four years later: “WE’LL SHOOT HOLES IN HOLLAND’S CHEESE - The vow: We’ll make Gullit a flying Dutchman” (*Bild*, 23/06/1990). Similarly bumptious and offensive remarks playing on ‘national symbols’ in a humorous way are not difficult to find in the *Bild*, e.g. “With the Emirates we’ll play Ali Baba and the 40 robbers – Make the desert tremble, lads!” (14/06/1990).

Coverage of the England match in the *Bild* is also characterised by boisterous and slightly mocking headlines. However, ‘Anglophobic’ expressions are absent and the slogans are not quite as aggressive as those aimed at, say, the United Arab Emirates, Columbia or Holland. In the pre-match build-up, the *Bild* (03/07/1990) demands: “LOTHAR, GET OUT THE HAMMER! - Now the Englishmen tremble at the thought of the ‘Power-Krauts’!”. In the last part of this quote, the paper uses the (somewhat derogative) nickname invented by the English about the German team, but with pride and in a positive sense. Anyway, in spite of ‘talking big’ on the day of the match, front-page headlines like “GOOD BYE, ENGLAND!” (*Bild*, 04/07/1990) appear rather tame and innocent compared with the overwhelmingly Anti-German, ‘war mongering’ style in *The Sun* and other English tabloids on the same date (cf. section 4.3.2). After the “dramatic penalty shoot-out and tough battle” (*Bild*, 05/07/1990), the space on the front-page is given to cheers and jubilation (“5-4 HURRAH! FINAL! Well done, boys, we are proud of YOU”), again without seriously malicious or gloating comments about the losers. A *Bild* article two days after the semi-final (06/07/1990) is maybe the closest one can get to hostile, ‘Anglophobic’ displays in the German press. Apart from describing “Germany as it sings and laughs – street parties, hooting, singing”, it portrays (and provides a photograph of) a group of pensioners ‘preparing’ for the England match:

Before the game, some of Germany’s craziest football fans danced around a scarecrow that was attired in an England shirt. [...] After it had been burned, there was beer and barbecue for all the ex-miners and Hoesch-workers in their Germany jerseys. (*Bild*, 06/07/1990)

Anyway, the fact that these fans are labelled “some of Germany`s craziest” along with the depiction of a ‘working-class’ neighbourhood make the situation appear rather innocent and humourous than aggressive.

Self-confident and chauvinistic displays are also exhibited in the quality press – though in a more indirect and less unruly way. The *NOZ* relates how the German supporters have chosen the *Triumphant March* from *Aïda* as their second national anthem and quotes Beckenbauer in a headline: “We can only beat ourselves” (18/06/1990). Moreover, the victory against the Netherlands is described in terms of “an unpleasant stumbling block that has been removed on the way to success” (*NOZ*, 25/06/1990) and the prospect of a World Cup victory is regarded as ‘appropriate’: “If they win, Germany will be in the final of a football World Cup for the sixth time [...]. And that would be [...] in accordance with all laws of logic and justice” (*NOZ*, 03/07/1990). Ironically, this comes from a paper which a few weeks earlier demanded to fight arrogance “like a germ” (see section 4.4.1).

As in the English press, hooliganism and violence inspired by nationalism are heavily condemned in both quality and popular papers. Especially the “night of horrors” (*Bild*, 06/07/1990) in England after the semi-final with one dead, “Anti-German actions” and “Germanophobia” (*NOZ*, 06/07/1990) are given extensive coverage. Likewise, the cases of riots in Germany after the final are criticised; yet, at the arrival of the German players in Frankfurt, the *NOZ* (09/07/1990) depicts the Germans` joy at the victory as drowning out the impressions of violence and fear:

A sea of black-red-golden flags, deafening noise and again and again the chants: ‘Deutschland - Deutschland!’ [...] The night of joy and horror after the 1-0 final against Argentina with riots, many injured and four dead in the Federal Republic was simply suppressed by fireworks, feasts of joy and flags.

It is interesting to note that the crowd receiving their heroes home in 1990 shout “Deutschland - Deutschland”, while in 1966, as any signs of lavish nationalism were repressed, the chants were reportedly restricted to players` names (“Uwe, Franzl”, see section 4.2.5). However, unlike the English papers, which portray the celebrations in Germany in 1990 as frenzied, excessive and dangerous (cf. section 4.3.4), the German press stresses the positive aspects of the collective joy and the right of the Germans to enjoy their football triumph. This line is taken by Jürgen Bitter in the following front-page comment in the *NOZ*:

Why not join in the celebrations?

Every time the Germans celebrate particularly exuberantly – even if only because of a sporting triumph – reprimanding index fingers are raised. The evil word of chauvinism is spread especially fast in the Federal Republic – which is understandable in a country which has had its terrible experiences with nationalistic tendencies. But if anyone thinks that he can read such developments into the buoyant joy of football fans in both parts of Germany, if anyone mistakes the Germans` enthusiasm [...] for political declarations, then that person knows neither the people nor their feelings. [...] What is important is that the euphoria does not boil over, that it remains under control and that the victors know how to treat their sporting triumph with caution. There is greatness in that as well. [...] Those who rioted and fought the police only

used the buoyancy of the fans as a cloak for their interests. [...] Football and its officials need to be warned and aware of this. [...] But what speaks against joining the round dance of the non-violent football friends after a victory like this? (*NOZ*, 09/07/1990)

In this rather reflective article, the writer acknowledges the need for a country with a Nazi-past like Germany to be wary of and keep nationalistic displays under control. At the same time, he regrets the situation that dangerous tendencies are read into each personal or collective expression of patriotism³⁴ and defends “the non-violent football friends”, i.e. the majority’s right to celebrate a sporting triumph with joy and pride.

On the whole, the German press in 1990 is far from refraining from chauvinistic and nationalistic displays. Especially the *Bild* adopts what in 1966 was criticised as an ‘English’ style, mocking the counterpart and mingling sports and politics (national significance is ascribed to the ‘new’ (re-united) Germany). However, ‘Anglophobic’ expressions do not occur and the tabloid headlines seem rather more innocent than those of the English press in the same year. Last but not least, hooliganism and violence are condemned throughout the German press, whereas the right to show patriotic feelings and celebrate without remorse is defended, particularly in the quality papers.

4.4.6 Meta-discourse: Reactions to journalistic representations in the other country

Before the semi-final, both the *NOZ* and the *Bild* make a big point of the “unanimous admiration” (*NOZ*, 26/06/1990) in the European press for the German team. Notably, many English papers are cited and particularly the positive evaluations in the English press seem to be of special importance to the German counterpart. Often, quotes from English newspapers which praise the German performances are set off and commented on, e.g. in the *Bild* (26/06/1990): “*Stainless steel Germany* – England rejoices!” (emphasis original).

Directly before the England–Germany encounter, as especially the English tabloids adopt a belligerent and offensive attitude (see section 4.3.2), the mood changes in Germany as well. However, the reactions to the headline “WE BEAT THEM IN 1945...” in *The Sun* are slightly different in the German quality and tabloid press. The *NOZ* (04/07/1990) sees the unsporting comment as merely part of “a release of emotions in Great Britain”, but stresses the fact that “the British press does also report objectively”, providing some examples of the latter point. Hence, it seems that little, if any, resentment is made explicit in this broadsheet and conflict is largely avoided. On a sporting basis, the equality of both teams in terms of fighting spirit and skills is pointed out, as “Not only the will to win becomes evident in the

³⁴ This phenomenon of ‘German’ self-consciousness with regard to national feelings has also been labelled *German angst* (*Angst* – ‘fear, anxiety’).

British press. Some commentators also think that a good amount of luck is needed to wipe out Germany” (ibid.). Thus, a sporting rivalry is maintained, while other hostile discourses are ignored and avoided in the *NOZ*.

The *Bild* (04/07/1990), on the other hand, takes up the “big talking” and aggressive style of *The Sun* in a front-page article: “These flash and bumptious (*großkotzig*)³⁵ remarks have only goaded our boys on for real. Captain Matthäus: ‘We`ll run for our lives. We`ll make it’”. Apart from that, the belligerent style of the English tabloids is referred to as “embarrassing” (*Bild*, 04/07/1990): “The English, not gentlemen at all, make this semi-final a battle, constantly reminding their readers of the war”. As in 1966, the ‘war mongering’ is explicitly condemned as unsporting and unfair.

While the world press reactions after the semi-final “celebrate Germany and [...] console England” (*Bild*, 06/07/1990), the “mourning” in the English papers is described as “understandable” in the *Bild* (ibid.). In the light of the previous animosity (especially between the *Sun* and the *Bild*), this degree of understanding and consolation and the lack of gloating or malicious comments on the German part is quite noteworthy.

All in all, while much space is given to praise from the English during the preliminary round, their belligerent attitude right before the semi-final is criticised in the German press as embarrassing. However, the ‘war mongering’ is not overrated and the reactions are not as sensitive and indignant as in 1966. Though the *Bild* does not (unlike the *NOZ* to some extent) shun the conflict that is conjured up by the English tabloids, the reactions in the journalistic meta-discourse after the game are characterised not by aggression but by a largely conciliatory and consoling note, even in that paper.

4.4.7 Summary

While the overall depiction of English character in the German press is much more negative in 1990 than in 1966 (with emphasis on hooliganism and fighting but unattractive football), the German self-assessment in that year is overwhelmingly positive, as the ‘German virtues’, most notably discipline and efficiency, are said to be brought to perfection. Moreover, there is not nearly as much focus on similarities between ‘Germanness’ and ‘Englishness’ as in 1966. German self-confidence in 1990 also shows itself in explicit comments about the counterpart, where the English footballers are no longer admired as masters of the game, but are met with polite respect and nothing more. War references are still extremely scarce in the German papers – the only example discussed in this analysis is an endeavour to ‘prove’ that military

³⁵ *Großkotzig* is a fairly derogative term, *Kotze* meaning ‘puke’.

history has nothing to do with sports, not even in connection with ‘old foes’ like Holland or England. Football-nostalgic references to the great history between Germany and England ultimately serve the same purpose, namely to focus on the sporting grounds and significance of the rivalry. As for nationalistic and chauvinistic displays, these are very frequent in both tabloids and broadsheets; the *Bild*, having vehemently criticised the ‘English’ journalism in 1966, now adopts a style quite similar to that of the English popular press, although the lack of ‘war mongering’ and direct insults makes the headlines seem rather more innocent than those of, say, *The Sun*. Apart from that, non-violent public celebrations and expressions of patriotism are defended as positive and ‘natural’; rebukes for excessive and dangerous nationalism are reflected on in the *NOZ*, but rejected as generally unjustified. In the journalistic meta-discourse, praise from the English is still treated as important, whereas the reactions to aggressive and offensive displays in the English tabloids are marked by considerably less sensitivity, hurt and indignation than in 1966.

4.5 The 2001 qualifier in the English press

The England–Germany encounter on September 1, 2001 in Munich was a crucial game for both sides, the qualification for the World Cup finals in 2002 being at stake. Covered live on BBC1 at 6.30 on a Saturday evening, “it was a great national occasion” (*Times*, 03/09/2001). Apart from that, the build-up in the English tabloids to the classic against the arch rival resulted in what *The Sunday Times* (02/09/2001) dismisses as “hype”: *The Sun* features a countdown and football-historic reports (“Great England v Germany clashes”) in every issue during the week before the game, and offensive headlines and ‘oompah stunts’ serve to whip up emotions; after the 5-1 triumph, the Germans are ridiculed and sneered at.

4.5.1 Use of stereotypes

English characteristics

Footballing stereotypes indicating national character are not used as frequently in 2001 as in 1966 or 1990. However, ‘English’ characteristics in 2001 appear to be identical with the ‘qualities’ promoted as typical for that country in earlier years: physical power, speed, aggressive play, work-rate, team spirit and commitment.

Strength and speed are exemplified by Sol Campbell according to *The Sun* (01/09/2001): “He is big, strong, quick, good in the air and a good defender – so what more do you need?”. Moreover, Owen’s and Gerrard’s “zest, speed and fitness”(*Sunday Times*, 02/09/2001) are pointed out, and particularly Michael Owen is regarded as a personification

of 'English virtues'. *The Sunday Times* (02/09/2001) describes him as "a glorious compound of skill, pace, initiative, courage and determination" and at the same time "unspoilt, modest, impeccably behaved off the field". While an individual player is picked out and praised here, the importance of valuing the team over the individual is mentioned several times elsewhere. Contrasting the powerful and aggressive English team with individual German players, *The Sunday Times* (02/09/2001) comments: "the big names of the host country [...] would ultimately be swamped in the swift, assured and devastating football played by England". Also with regard to team work, the *News of the World* (02/09/2001) quotes team captain David Beckham, who "paid tribute to the team's character for coming back after going a goal behind": "We knew we would have to work hard and we did that. It was about the whole team tonight". Aside from team spirit, fighting spirit and commitment are emphasised in this evaluation.

All in all, those few instances in which 'English' footballing characteristics are presented in the English press in 2001 confirm the positive stereotypes found earlier.

German characteristics

German stereotypes, whilst stressing discipline and mechanical efficiency in 1990 (see section 4.3.1), experience yet another shift of focus in the English press in 2001. At least in the tabloids, arrogance is presented as the most prevalent 'German' feature.

Despite the German failures in the 1998 World Cup and in Euro 2000 and despite the fact that "people say the Germans are not as strong as they used to be" (*Sun*, 01/09/2001), *The Sun* reminds its readers of an old 'German' property: "they have a habit of producing the goods when required" (ibid.). Thus, the stereotype of efficiency is kept alive before the game.

Both in the build-up to and reporting of the match, references to 'German' self-confidence and arrogance are frequent: "As usual, the Germans themselves are supremely confident" (*Sun*, 30/08/2001); "[the home crowd] had been entitled to wallow in the illusion that their team's habit of being invincible on their own soil would be sustained" (*Sunday Times*, 02/09/2001). Two instances in which Germans behaved arrogantly previous to the encounter are taken up by the *News of the World* and presented as characteristic not only of the whole German team but of the whole nation. The first case concerns Gerhard Mayer Vorfelder's [president of the DFB] arranging friendlies on the days which had been reserved for the play-offs – a decision that was criticised harshly by German team manager Rudi Völler and several players. In an article on 02/09/2001, under the sub-heading "ARROGANT", the *News of the World* makes use of a metonym describing how "[a]rrogant Germany had been so

confident of avoiding defeat against England they even booked friendlies on the dates of the play-offs”, not mentioning the criticism in Germany. The second instance refers to a statement of one German player: “German star Stefan Effenberg had shown his arrogance before last night’s game by claiming he’d never heard of Liverpool’s Steven Gerrard. *Like the rest of his countrymen, he certainly knows his name now*” (emphasis original) (*N.o.t.W.*, 02/09/2001). Again, inferences are drawn from the characterisation of an individual to “the rest of” the Germans, thus enforcing the stereotype of ‘German’ arrogance.

Apart from these football-connected characteristics, the tabloids (as in 1990) make a sport of playing on ‘national symbols’ and presenting the Germans as a beer-drinking, sausage-eating, ‘oompah’-music-playing lot. Particularly one cartoon in *The Sun* (30/08/2001), depicting the German players in Bavarian costumes and with the attributes mentioned above, promotes this impression. What’s more, in 2001, the national stereotyping is taken to extremes, as it is no longer restricted to journalistic discourse. *The Sun* organises an “Oompah Band of Page 3 girls” (01/09/2001) to ‘terrorise’ the German players out of bed very early: “their daring attempts to blast the Germans into submission by blowing their horns at the crack of dawn has [sic] unsettled them [the German team]” (*Sun*, 01/09/2001). Moreover, as one *Sun* correspondent in Germany reports,

four days of sabotaging the Germans’ preparations have taken their toll. One end of me is so stuffed full of German sausage it is difficult to do up my camouflaged lederhosen. The other has reacted explosively to bucketfuls of sauerkraut. (*Sun*, 01/09/2001)

Obviously, these may be seen as rather humourous attempts to ridicule an old foe, but nonetheless, the constant repetition of such stereotypes in the tabloids can have a significant, if subconscious, influence on the English view of the Germans.

On the other hand, quality papers such as *The Times* largely distance themselves from “this festival of parody, this shameless indulgence in the worst kind of national stereotyping, into which the build-up to matches between Germany and England inevitably descends” (*Times*, 01/09/2001). Apart from such rather harsh criticism of tabloid journalism, the paper comments on the fact that the German squad “reacted with amusement” (ibid.) to *The Sun*’s ‘oompah stunt’: “That’s right: this Germany incarnation has a sense of humour, too. It is hard to imagine the English FA reacting with quite the same equanimity if there was a similar incursion at their team hotel” (*Times*, 01/09/2001). Not only do the Germans emerge with a rather more positive image than the English (the FA being implicitly criticised), but the stereotype of ‘German’ lack of humour is even revised to some degree.

Thus, while arrogance is generally presented as the most notable ‘German’ characteristic in 2001 (throughout the English press), the non-football related stereotypical

image of *the* Krauts, which is conjured up again and again in the tabloid press, is rejected as silly and unfair in the broadsheets.

Similarities and differences

Before the game, the quality press pays some attention to similarities in character. *Times* journalist Matt Dickinson holds the view that “in their revival under Völler, Germany have followed a path parallell to England`s”, and speaks of “two well-matched teams” (01/09/2001). Moreover, as in 1990 (see section 4.3.4), Simon Barnes in *The Times* states that “[i]n character and style we are closer than any other two football nations” (*Times*, 01/09/2001). The overlapping characteristics that he points out are, among others, team spirit, selfless devotion above glory-seeking individualism, a certain ruggedness of approach, courage and a mistrust of flashiness and deviousness (cf. *ibid.*). In sum, “both sides play like northern Europeans, and not like Latins” (*ibid.*). Thus, as in 1966, Germany and England are placed on the same side in the ‘macro-discourse’ (see sections 4.1.1 and 4.2.1). However, some specifically ‘German’ qualities are named as well, for instance organisation, technical ability and “a strong sense of their destiny” (*Times*, 01/09/2001).

All in all, it is noteworthy that *The Times* emphasises the similarities between England and Germany to a remarkable extent and that specific ‘German virtues’ (which the English lack) are mentioned additionally.

4.5.2 Military and aggressive language

General

While military and aggressive forms of expression appear in both quality and popular papers, the latter exhibit a considerably more offensive style, often including insulting and belligerent phrases in their headlines.

The Sun (30/08/2001) features a headline taking up half a page: “I DON`T CARE IF THEIR PLAYERS ARE TALL, SHORT, FAT OR UGLY.. AS LONG AS THEY DON`T SCORE says Rio Ferdinand”. The article is particularly concerned with Carsten Jancker, the tall German forward and Ferdinand`s direct opponent. It concludes with the words:

Ferdinand`s job at the Olympic Stadium: To stop Jancker finishing on the winning side. It`s a tall order. But, as we know, Rio does not mind if it is tall, short, fat or ugly. England fans, no doubt, reckon Jancker is two of those... (*Sun*, 30/08/2001)

Clearly, this is an insult against an individual as much as it is aimed at the Germans as a whole. Similarly offensive language before the game is used in the headline “STICK IT OOP YER OOMPAH – We test out Germans` World Cup weaponry” (*Sun*, 31/08/2001), dealing with

German ‘oompah’ (brass band) music and other stereotypical features. As could be expected, the aggressive tone is kept up in the match report after “THE NIGHT WE HAMMERED THE GERMANS” (*Sun*, 03/09/2001). Hat-trick scorer Michael Owen is depicted as the “quick killer” who “struck with the savagery of a butcher’s meat cleaver on Munich’s night of the long knives. [...] He was the most deadly of all” (*Sun*, 03/09/2001). But ‘murderous’ imagery like this is not restricted to the tabloids. In the pre-match build-up, *The Times* (01/09/2001) announces a “death-or-glory battle” in which the Swedish England team manager Eriksson “needs all his ammunition”. The victory is celebrated in the broadsheets as “England’s 5-1 slaughter of Germany” (*Sunday Times*, 02/09/2001); the English “put the old foe ruthlessly to the sword” (*ibid.*) and left the Germans “scarred for life” (*Times*, 03/09/2001).

Military imagery and aggression are thus common in both types of paper to varying degrees.

War references

As opposed to 1990, war references in 2001 are very scarce and mostly implicit. Three instances were found in the tabloid press.

The first two appear in the article about Ferdinand and Jancker quoted from above. Under the sub-heading “FIGHTING”, it relates that this is Ferdinand’s first game against Germany: “As far as Ferdinand is concerned, Deutschland Uber Alles [sic] is confined to TV replays and boyhood memories. Memories when he was fighting them from the beaches” (*Sun*, 30/08/2001). Apart from an allusion to the usual ‘beach fights’ among young tourists of either country in their summer holidays in Southern Europe, this is a covert reference to Churchill’s famous “We shall never surrender” speech in June 1940; this defining speech of World War II includes the line “We shall fight them on the beaches”. Apart from that, the phrase *Deutschland über alles* refers to the German national anthem that was used at the time of the Second World War.

The other example is a short article entitled “WE’VE PUT THE WIND UP `EM - SPY IN DER CAMP” and signed “Redcard Baron” (*Sun*, 01/09/2001). While “der Camp” may raise associations to ‘der Kampf’ (and, in extension, Hitler’s *Mein Kampf*), “Redcard Baron” plays on *The Red Baron*, the nickname for the legendary pilot of the German *Luftwaffe* during the First World War, Manfred von Richthofen.

In any case, while war language is used throughout the English press, military references in 2001 are confined to the tabloids and the few instances that can be found are very latent and probably only comprehensive for people interested in history.

4.5.3 Football-nostalgic references

Having definitely received the status of a 'classic' by 2001, football nostalgia naturally plays an outstanding role in that year. Moreover, the extent of the English victory causes English papers to ascribe historic significance to September 1, 2001.

In the build-up to the encounter, *The Sun* publishes a series called "Great England v Germany clashes" (*Sun*, 29-01/09/2001). Apart from the games in 1966, 1970 and 1972, the first English victory in a competitive match since 1966 during Euro 2000 is marked as important: "We`d finally beaten Germany and it was nice to put the ghosts of 34 years to rest" (*Sun*, 01/09/2001). The last match at the old Wembley stadium in the second England–Germany encounter in 2000 is also frequently referred to, as England are said to be "on a revenge mission for the Wembley woe" (*Sun*, 01/09/2001). Accordingly, after the English triumph in Munich, *The Sun* (03/09/2001) features the headline "IT`S VON FOR ZE HISTORY BOOKS"³⁶ and lists a whole number of football statistics (e.g., "We`d never won top game on German soil"; "It`s Germany`s worst ever World Cup defeat"; "They`d lost only one home World Cup tie"; "And their last loss in Munich was 1973"). Thus, the reader gets the impression that this is a truly historic and important event. Moreover, as *The Sun* points out, the bare statistics of the 5-1 are "dwarfed by the sheer significance of the match [...]. But they are worth repeating anyway, as they will be for generations to come" (03/09/2001).

Besides being described as a historic game, parallels are drawn to England`s other great triumph against Germany in 1966. Like Hurst, who was knighted "for his part in England`s finest hour" (*Sun*, 03/09/2001), Owen (who "also banged in three against the Germans") should become "Sir Michael", *The Sun* suggests (ibid.). Although the paper presents the game in 2001 as "the ideal opportunity to consign Hurst and his team-mates to history and start dreaming of the future rather than the past" (*Sun*, 03/09/2001), nostalgia and statistics are copious after the victory, also in the broadsheets. *The Sunday Times* (02/09/2001) calls it "a day in a lifetime for anyone from these islands too young to have witnessed Bobby Moore, Bobby Charlton and company in the 1960s" and even holds that "in postwar history, it was wonderfully, deliriously, unforgettably unique".

Thus, the 'historic magnitude' of the English victory in 2001 is emphasised by broadsheets and tabloids alike.

³⁶ Note the mock imitation of the 'German' accent.

4.5.4 Assessments of the Anglo-German relationship

The attitude towards the Germans and the Anglo-German relationship that emerges in the English press is fairly ambiguous in 2001.

A common theme in both popular and quality papers is the traditional rivalry between the two nations. Before the game, England coach Eriksson and several players describe the ‘magnitude’ and weight of expectation. *The Sun* (30/08/2001) quotes Ferdinand: “The fan base behind this game, the interest and the old rivalry from the past adds so much spice to the game. [...] Walking round the street, the message is always the same – beat the Germans at all costs”. Mingled with this general atmosphere of competitiveness and enmity is a certain amount of respect for the counterpart. This is obvious from the sub-heading “RESPECT” in a *Sun* article on 01/09/2001, which quotes former England star Alan Shearer: “You have to respect the Germans. And we have to stop them all”. Likewise, *The Times* (30/08/2001) expresses the view that Völler has contributed to polish up Germany’s image in England: “The respect is back. The Germans have earned it”. – Thus, two concepts which at first sight seem mutually exclusive, ‘hate’ and respect, seem to be the main ingredients of the rivalry.

Even after the game, *The Sun* focuses on the antagonism between England and Germany. With some glee, the paper remarks that “Owen’s greatest feat was to destroy the sense of superiority which our bitterest rivals in the game have always felt when they take on the English” (*Sun*, 03/09/2001). To show that the sense of rivalry is not restricted to the English point of view, the *News of the World* (02/09/2001) quotes some German supporters, e.g. “heartbroken Otto Schneider, 34, from Munich, said: ‘That wasn’t a defeat, that was a disgrace. [...] But for this defeat to come at the hands of the English, and in such an emphatic way, makes this an all-time low’”. Thus, the tabloid underlines the ‘mutuality’ of dislike and rivalry between the two countries.

Yet, as mentioned earlier, there are substantial differences in the treatment of the Germans in the English popular and quality press. While *The Sun* publishes insulting and belligerent headlines (see section 4.5.2) and accuses the Germans of “trick[ing] [the] England team into booking [a] beer hall hotel” (*Sun*, 29/08/2001), *The Times* seems to take a more reflected stance. With regard to the ‘beer hall episode’,³⁷ the paper notes that “the hosts could not hide their surprise and amusement and [...] gave the distinct impression that they were enjoying themselves at the old enemy’s expense” (ibid.). However, *The Sun*’s vehement accusations that this was a German ‘set-up’ are rejected as “comic-book suggestions” (*Times*, 30/08/2001).

³⁷ England had chosen to stay in a rather raucous location, next door to the *Hofbräuhaus*, “Munich’s most uproarious bierkeller, which attracts drunken revellers from all over Europe” (*Times*, 29/08/2001).

A lot of attention is paid to the German attitude in *The Times*. A one-page article entitled “GERMANY MAINTAINS CONCILIATORY AIR DESPITE TALES FROM BIERKELLER” by Oliver Holt (*Times*, 30/08/2001) describes “the host nation`s manful efforts to suggest that the World Cup Qualifying tie [...] will be a celebration of football not an opportunity to indulge in the tired old imagery of war”. Implicitly, the belligerent displays of the English popular press are criticised here, whereas the efforts of the Germans to leave the past behind and concentrate on football as a sport are praised as honest and “manful”. Not without respect and self-criticism, Holt goes on to present the reactions in the German press conference to some of the English tabloids:

Undeterred, the Germans, whose attitude to the English on occasions such as this, tinged as it is with a mixture of courtesy, friendship and pity, invariably forces reassessments about which of these competing nations really is the arrogant one, pressed on with their theme of promoting links between the countries. (*Times*, 30/08/2001)

Thus, as opposed to a rather arrogant English attitude, the German endeavours to create a positive relationship are emphasised. This is also the case when Dietmar Hamann and Christian Ziege (playing for Liverpool and Tottenham, respectively) “sounded like paeans to the virtues of the English game and the abilities of English players” and “caused a happy *frisson* among the ranks of German reporters by telling them [...] that the preparations for Saturday`s match have been characterised by friendly banter” (*Times*, 30/08/2001). As a whole, the article stresses the benign German attitude towards the English and criticises the opposite posture that is particularly represented by the English tabloid press.

All in all, both quality and popular press make a point of the traditional Anglo-German rivalry. However, the attitude towards the Germans remains largely competitive and hostile in *The Sun*, whereas *The Times* deals at some length with the German endeavours to create a conciliatory and friendly atmosphere and presents these as positive, while at the same time criticising the tabloids.

4.5.5 Displays of nationalism, chauvinism, jingoism

Chauvinistic displays in the tabloids have already been touched upon in section 4.5.2. *Sun* double-page headlines like “THE NIGHT WE HAMMERED THE GERMANS” (*Sun*, 03/09/2001) or expressions like “England`s epic victory: the 5-1 humiliation of Germany” (*Sun*, 03/09/2001) are frequent but not unexpected in the popular press.

More noteworthy is the fact that similarly chauvinistic and nationalistic attitudes are exhibited in the quality press as well. For instance, *The Sunday Times* (02/09/2001) notes that “[t]riumphalism is hard to suppress this morning. [...] England did not defeat Germany, they obliterated them”. Featuring another huge double-page headline (“IT DOESN`T GET ANY

BETTER THAN THIS”; *Sunday Times*, 02/09/2001), the broadsheet explains the “atavistic English triumphalism” with the seeming invincibility of Germany in “Fortress Munich” (ibid.) and in World Cup qualifiers in general; “but Sven Goran Eriksson`s England rewrote that chapter of the history book in red, white and blue last night, with what may go down as the Three Lions` greatest win” (*Sunday Times*, 02/09/2001). The “red, white and blue” of course referring to the colours of the Union Jack, it is remarkable that the flag of the UK, not the English St. George`s Cross flag is used as a national symbol here. Apart from such nationalistic (and almost imperialistic) manifestations, a substantial amount of gloating is found in *The Times*: “All that was left was for euphoric English supporters to send the home crowd streaming for the exits to gleeful choruses of ‘You`re not very good’” (*Times*, 03/09/2001); or “1966 was Wembley, but this was the Meister`s own backyard” (*Sunday Times*, 02/09/2001). The grossest example of chauvinistic and offensive imagery playing on stereotypical German symbols (*Bratwurst* and *Lederhosen*) appears in *The Times* on 03/09/2001: “English football sent the inferiority complex that has dogged it for more than 30 years lurching and weeping into the night with its lederhosen around its ankles and a bratwurst shoved up each nostril here on Saturday”. For a broadsheet, such a display seems exceptionally fierce, especially in light of the criticism aimed at the tabloid style earlier.

The Sunday Times (02/09/2001) distances itself explicitly from “the endless hype and silly stunts involving oompah bands” in the popular press, particularly in *The Sun*. After the match, the paper argues that the success of the England team has “blown away all the hot air with hurricane force” (ibid.):

The martial music of the tabloid headlines had sought to rouse England to the football equivalent of a bayonet charge but instead Eriksson`s team brought to their endeavours a calm determination to exploit their skills and on this night the talent they represented sent German pride to deeper depths than they have reached before. (*Sunday Times*, 02/09/2001)

Apart from criticising the ‘war mongering’ of the tabloids, the last part of this quote implies a ‘better way to destroy German pride’, through skills and talent. Thus, the rivalry is pointed out yet again and there seems to be no sympathy for the losers, only triumphalism.

To sum up, chauvinistic displays are not at all restricted to the popular press. Nonetheless, in spite of fierce examples of triumphalism and chauvinism in the broadsheets, these papers condemn similar outpourings in the tabloids. Hence, the quality press can be said to exhibit a rather ambivalent stance with regard to chauvinism.

4.5.6 Meta-discourse: Reactions to journalistic representations in the other country

As in 1990, journalistic representations in Germany are largely ignored in the English press in 2001.

Only two instances where German papers are quoted were found here. Both appear in *The Sunday Times* (02/09/2001) on the day after the match and are concerned with how the most important German Sunday newspapers depict their national team's defeat: "The Germany Sunday newspaper *Welt am Sonntag* [*Welt am Sonntag*] described the result as 'Germany's debacle'. *Bild am Sonntag* [sic] said what their national side had suffered at the hands of England was 'cruel'". As these quotes are not further commented on, it is difficult to say anything about whether their function is merely informative or whether these very examples are intended to fuel the readers' glee.

Anyway, the fact is that not much space is given to German press coverage (and the only instances discovered here were in 'broadsheets'), and this may be taken as a sign of indifference towards the counterpart.

4.5.7 Summary

All in all, English press coverage of the 2001 game has many parallels to that of 1990, but the overall impression is that the attitude towards the Germans has improved, if only to a small extent and most notably in the quality press.

With regard to national stereotypes, these are not as frequently applied as in 1966 or 1990; anyway, while 'English' characteristics seem to be identical with the qualities promoted as typical for that country earlier, what is presented as the most prominent 'German' feature in 2001 is arrogance. Moreover, as the 'Kraut bashing' and 'oompah stunts' of the tabloids reach new extremes, these are criticised in *The Times* as "the worst kind of national stereotyping" (01/09/2001); thus, the broadsheets create links with the other country by emphasising and reflecting on similarities between English and German character and style. As for military and aggressive language, the tabloids, as might be expected, are more insulting and fierce than the broadsheets; however, specific war references (only found in the popular press) have decreased extremely since 1990 and are quite covert. Describing the game as a classic in the build-up and of historic significance after the English victory, football-nostalgic references as well as comments about the Anglo-German relationship stress the rivalry between the countries. Yet, while the tabloids maintain a very competitive and hostile stance throughout in explicit comments and chauvinistic displays, the attitude of the quality press is rather ambiguous. On the one hand, *The Sunday Times* criticises *The Sun* for its 'war mongering' and chauvinism, and evaluates German efforts to promote a friendly atmosphere as positive; on the other hand, chauvinistic displays and gleeful triumphalism appear in the broadsheets as well, sometimes even quite relentlessly. Concerning the journalistic meta-

discourse, the English press appears to be fairly disinterested in representations in the other country, as in 1990.

4.6 The 2001 qualifier in the German press

In the German press, the encounter with England in September 2001 is described as the match of the year. Here as well, football history is brought up before the game to mark its legendary status; chauvinistic displays are rather common in the tabloid *Bild*. With regard to the English, the initially conciliatory German attitude deteriorates as the English ‘Kraut bashing’ becomes more extreme. The 5-1 defeat to the arch rival is considered an all-time low and a debacle.

4.6.1 Use of stereotypes

English characteristics

As in the English press coverage that year (see section 4.5.1), national stereotypes are used rather scarcely in the German papers. Some ‘English’ characteristics like toughness and fighting spirit are mentioned specifically in connection with the German team’s preparations for the game and are discussed below under “Similarities”.

After the match, the most prominent features of the English play are presented as speed and commitment in the *NOZ*: “They all kept moving”; “the English have pace, while our team...” (03/09/2001). In all, the stereotypes appear to be the same as those presented earlier.

German characteristics

In line with the new optimism in their “renaissance” (*NOZ*, 31/08/2001) under Völler, the *Bild* (30/08/2001) writes that the German team have resumed the ‘traditional’ qualities, vowing to play “with passion, dedication, commitment and an iron will”. Accordingly, their failure in the England match is remarked upon in the *NOZ* (03/09/2001): “We missed all the German virtues, determination, fighting, discipline”. The lack of fighting spirit is regarded as especially serious. Uwe Seeler comments: “At 1-3 we just gave up, I cannot understand that” (*NOZ*, 03/09/2001). Thus, the stereotypes that emerge in connection with the Germans are salient in that these ‘German’ qualities are listed as absent in their play that day.

Similarities and differences

Coverage of the German team’s preparations in advance of the England encounter is perhaps the most informative source of stereotypes of both countries and similarities in ‘character’.

Their training is reported to focus on “tough duels and tackling (knüppelharte Zweikampfschulung)” (*NOZ*, 30/08/2001), as “Völler reminded his team that success over England can only be achieved through fighting: ‘On Saturday, they will have to give it their all; of course, with fair play’” (*ibid.*). Thus, dedication, toughness and fairness are emphasised as the most important features for both sides. As earlier, the aesthetical component of the game is dismissed as inefficient and useless, which is obvious when Völler is quoted in the *NOZ*: “If anyone starts talking about attractive football now, he shouldn’t forget that particularly against England, we can only triumph with absolute commitment and an indomitable fighting spirit” (30/08/2001).

On the whole, the fact that England–Germany encounters are depicted as ‘traditionally’ tough, fast and aggressive enforces the stereotypes of fighting spirit and dedication that are prevalent in both countries and supposedly make their ‘characters’ so similar.

4.6.2 Military and aggressive language

General

Military and aggressive language only emerges in general terms in the German papers in 2001 and is used to a remarkably small extent. War references, as earlier, are absent in the press coverage.

Very few belligerent slogans are used before the game. One example is Beckenbauer’s message to the German players: “Go out and get them” (*NOZ*, 01/09/2001). Apart from that, the *Bild* uses terror imagery (though in a rather humorous context) in connection with *The Sun*’s ‘wake-up action’ in front of the German team hotel; the front-page headline on 01/09/2001 reads “THE ENGLISH TERRORISE OUR NATIONAL TEAM – With an ‘oompah’ band of four models they raided the hotel of the German players”. Further, the tabloid discloses that the hotel and the German Football Association have “generously” refrained from reporting the “scoundrels” (*ibid.*) to the police and transfers the enmity to the football stadium: “Best thing our boys just blow them off the pitch tonight” (*Bild*, 01/09/2001).

The game itself is sometimes described in terms of a battle in the press. The *Bild* (03/09/2001) speaks of “The 1-5 disgrace” and headlines “That was an execution” (*ibid.*), apart from commenting on a photograph of Germany forward Carsten Jancker and several English players with heavy criticism: “‘Tanker’ Jancker of all people squeals during a tough fight with Scholes, Beckham and Campbell – this is not how you win a battle!” (*Bild*, 03/09/2001).

Anyway, compared to 1990, military imagery is almost negligible in the German press in 2001, especially with regard to aggressive headlines.

4.6.3 Football-nostalgic references

As in England, the encounter in Munich is greeted as a classic between two arch rivals in Germany; hence, football-nostalgic references are also widespread in the German press that year. In the same way, historic gravity is ascribed to the 2001 game, but of course from a negative viewpoint.

Germany goalkeeper Oliver Kahn describes the emotional situation in the national team before the game in the *Bild* (30/08/2001): “Germany against England is more than a mere football game. Everybody feels the weight of history. Wembley 1966, the World Cup battles in 1970 and 1990, Euro 1996 in England...It’s time the great games take place in Germany”. Football history is also taken up in statistics, which evidently speak for a German victory: “Fortress Munich: Germany haven’t lost at the Olympic stadium for 28 years” (*Bild*, 31/08/2001); or, “England’s national team set out to beat the Germans for the first time in 36 years” (*NOZ*, 01/09/2001). The *Bild* (01/09/2001) features a whole page with football nostalgia, headlined “We always won when it mattered most”.

With all these favourable statistics being magnified and elaborated in the build-up, the disappointment is proportionally big after the match. The *Bild* (03/09/2001) states with ironic contempt: “Our national team has committed a historic deed, indeed. This has been the highest defeat in 92 years”. The *NOZ* (04/09/2001) is upset about “the cruellest loss on home soil in 70 years”. Even the scoreboard in Munich is seen as a “historical document”, as the *Bild* (03/09/2001) subtitles a photograph from the Olympic Stadium: “Document of shame: Mercilessly huge reads the 1-5 on the scoreboard, with England fans singing in front of it”.

Thus, the historic significance of England versus Germany in general and their 2001 encounter in particular is all but exaggerated in the German press.

4.6.4 Assessments of the Anglo-German relationship

In the course of the build-up to the match, it is interesting to note how the judgment of the English and the assessment of Anglo-German relations change from humourous-friendly to indignant and hostile in the German tabloid press.

First of all, the sporting rivalry between the two nations is stressed in the *NOZ* (01/09/2001): “A maximum of concentration is required in the game of the year against the arch rival England”. But not only the tension, spur and pressure in the home country are

pointed out; the broadsheet quotes England coach Eriksson “indicating the atmosphere on the island: “Everybody says: Beat the Germans. [...] You can feel that this is an extra-special encounter for the boys. The strain, the concentration, the motivation will be extremely high” (*NOZ*, 01/09/2001). However, for all the rivalry and tension on both parts, mutual respect is an important element in the quality paper as well. A big point is made of the fact that England ‘legionnaire’ and Liverpool player Didi Hamann “did report that the English still have ‘a lot of respect’ for their eternal rival Germany” (*NOZ*, 30/08/2001). Thus, as in some English papers (see section 4.5.4), mutual respect and rivalry in sporting terms seem to go hand in hand.

The situation becomes more complicated with regard to the extra-sporting edge of England versus Germany. As mentioned, the German – or at least the *Bild*’s – attitude towards the English deteriorates as nationalistic and belligerent displays in the English press become more and more extreme during the pre-match build-up. Starting out with a friendly air,³⁸ the tabloid reacts with amusement to the ‘beer hall trap’ accusations from *The Sun*. Ironic remarks about “our English friends” (*Bild*, 30/08/2001) appear in connection with humorous articles poking fun at the counterpart (e.g., “A welcoming song for our English friends: ‘In Munich stands a beer hall house’”; *ibid.*).

While the press reactions to journalistic representations in England will be discussed in detail in section 4.6.6, it may be useful to have a look at the headlines in the *Bild* from 30/08 to 05/09/2001 here, as these very often contain explicit comments about the counterpart and reveal a lot about the development of the tabloid’s assessment of Anglo-German relations. In connection with the ‘*Hofbräuhaus* scandal’ touched upon above, the headline “ENGLAND FOAMS!” (*Bild*, 30/08/2001) implies a rather amused and relaxed attitude on the German part. The tone becomes considerably more sharp on 31/08/2001 with the front-page headline “NOW THE ENGLISH ARE GOING CRAZY” and a huge headline inside the paper saying “SHAME ON YOU, ENGLAND! YOU ARE JUST EMBARRASSING” (*ibid.*), criticising the ‘Kraut bashing’ in the tabloids. Commenting that “now the English are going completely mental” (*Bild*, 01/09/2001) with reference to *The Sun*’s ‘oompah stunt’, the front-page headline on the next day reads “THE ENGLISH TERRORISE OUR NATIONAL TEAM” (*ibid.*). After the thrashing German defeat, the paper complains about English triumphalism on the front-page (*Bild*, 04/09/2001): “German football shattered – THE ENGLISH KICK US WHILE WE’RE LYING ON

³⁸ See section 4.5.4: Numerous measures had been taken on the German side to improve Anglo-German relations; e.g., a five-a-side tournament for supporters from both countries and a special screening of Nick Hornby’s *Fever Pitch* in Munich.

THE GROUND (DIE ENGLÄNDER TRETEN ÜBEL NACH)!”. Having reached its absolute low here, the assessment of Anglo-German relations is summed up by the comment “*We are good losers. But you are bad winners* [emphasis original]” (*Bild*, 04/09/2001). Press coverage in the *Bild* on the following days is characterised by a markedly hostile stance towards the English. Trying to get back at them in other areas than soccer, the paper blows up Michael Schumacher`s supremacy in motorsport (“Schumi – and other things where we are better than you”, *Bild* 04/09/2001) and a story around Ralf Schumacher`s problems with BMW team manager Dickie Stanford, an Englishman who caused trouble for the driver as he forgot to remove two stands under the car: “The blunder of the year. AND IT WAS THIS ENGLISHMAN`S FAULT [photograph of Stanford]. Maybe we`re not so good at football. But THAT wouldn`t have happened to us” (*Bild* 04/09/2001), the paper sneers. Moreover, the *Bild* openly supports Albania in their qualifying tie against England, stating that “The English tremble already!” (*Bild*, 05/09/2001). Talk of “our English friends” (30/08, see above) is out of the question at that point; instead, the tabloid lists “4 REASONS WHY OUR ALBANIAN FRIENDS WILL WIN” (*Bild*, 05/09/2001). Thus, the favours have changed remarkably in the course of a few days.

Significantly, the ‘Kraut bashing’ outpours of the English tabloids, while provoking the popular press papers such as the *Bild*, do not seem to have a major impact on the German quality press. The ‘oompah stunt’, for instance, being labelled as “pure terror” on the front-page of the *Bild* (01/09/2001), is merely covered in a very brief article with the heading “Four models and brass music on tape” in the *NOZ* (01/09/2001). Moreover, Völler`s reaction to this “extraordinary wake-up campaign initiated by the English tabloid *Sun*” (ibid.) is quoted in the broadsheet as follows: “We thought this was quite funny and entertaining. We didn`t consider it bad at all” (ibid.). Thus, a seemingly humourous and relaxed attitude is maintained in the *NOZ*. Also, as opposed to the *Bild`s* fierce complaints about the English gloating after the match, the broadsheet merely reports that “[a]fter days of nationalistic campaigning the joy in England was unspoilt. Hundreds of fans celebrated under the Nelson column on Trafalgar Square without any need for police intervention” (*NOZ*, 03/09/2001). No sign of disapproval is exhibited here.

Regarding the actual sporting performance, the England team is praised throughout the German press, albeit with some resentment in the *Bild*, as the swearing in the headline “OWEN – OH SHIT (sic), HE WAS GOOD!” (*Bild*, 03/09/2001) suggests. The *NOZ* (03/09/2001) concedes that “England were superior by at least one international class” and states that “not only Franz Beckenbauer marvelled at and praised the strong English side” (ibid.).

All in all, the *NOZ*, stressing mutual respect before the game and praising the English team afterwards, emerges as considerably more positive in its judgment of the arch rival and less affected by tabloid excesses in England than the *Bild*. The latter initially expresses a rather conciliatory and comradely attitude, which changes to indignation, hurt and animosity as the tabloid hype in England gets worse.

4.6.5 Displays of nationalism, chauvinism, jingoism

In the tabloid press, chauvinistic – or, at any rate, very self-confident and boisterous – remarks are not hard to find in the pre-match build-up. After the game, the opposite is the case, as the German defeat is described as a humiliation both in the broadsheets and the tabloids.

Several days before the game, the *Bild* talks big against the English. For instance, speculations whether England's superstar David Beckham is able to play with his injury or not are concluded with midfielder Sebastian Deisler's statement "He should play in Munich. Then at least England won't have any excuse when they are thrashed once again by our team on Saturday!" (*Bild*, 28/08/2001). Similarly, the *Bild*'s front-page headline on 30/08/2001, announcing an interview with the German goalkeeper, reads: "Kahn: THIS IS HOW WE ARE GOING TO BEAT THE ENGLISH". Moreover, poking fun at the 'Hofbräuhaus affair', the "welcoming song" for the English (mentioned in section 4.6.4) is introduced with the following words:

'In Munich stands a beer hall house' ... Everybody knows Bavaria's swaying-hymn. *BILD* has printed the song in Bavarian English so that our English friends also may learn to love it. *Hofbräuhaus* visitors may greet the English with this text and serenade them. (*Bild*, 30/08/2001)

A picture of a Bavarian woman carrying huge beer mugs and the 'Bavarian English' song text add to the nationalistic impression given here. Another 'welcome' ("Welcome, England, to the Fortress Olympic Stadium!"; *Bild*, 31/08/2001) and 'goodbye' ("BYE, BYE[sic] ENGLAND! We are going to the World Cup and you will stay home"; *Bild*, 01/09/2001) illustrate the jingoistic sense of superiority in the tabloid.

The front-page headline in the *Bild* after the match is concerned with the German team manager, whose father suffered a heart attack at the stadium during the game: "Rudi Völler: 'My worst night'" (*Bild*, 03/09/2001). The "terrible 1-5 against England", the "game of shame" (ibid.) is thus focused on only partly on the front-page. Inside the paper, amidst fierce criticism against the German team, the ignominy is formulated thus: "The English had railed at us: 'Arrogant Germans.' – It looks like they were right" (*Bild*, 03/09/2001). On a similar note, the *NOZ* (03/09/2001) reports about "the England debacle with historic dimensions" and

“the embarrassing 1-5 trouncing by the arch rival from Britain”, quoting a number of reactions to the defeat, which is spoken of as “a humiliation”, “a catastrophe”, “the super MCA (maximum credible accident)”, “an absolute disaster”.

Thus, after very chauvinistic and partly nationalistic displays in the tabloid press before the match, the criticism of the own team afterwards is proportionately big.

4.6.6 Meta-discourse: Reactions to journalistic representations in the other country

The most remarkable feature of German press reportage in 2001 is the extreme relevance that is ascribed to journalistic representations in England. In fact, the meta-discourse takes up most of the coverage in the tabloid press.

Under the heading “ENGLAND FOAMS!”, the *Bild* on 30/08/2001 prints several pictures of *The Sun* and the *Daily Express* issues from the day before, where headlines like “Germans have tricked us into beer-trap” are readable. To these, the tabloid reacts with the statement that “Germany versus England always makes the blood boil. But this time England is boiling over!” (*Bild*, 30/08/2001), thus acknowledging the outpour of emotions caused by the rivalry and at the same time criticising the exaggerated charges by the English popular press. Moreover, the accusations are harshly rejected: “The English FA have booked the hotel near the *Hofbräuhaus* themselves, although they were warned by the DFB. Beer-trap my foot!” (*Bild*, 30/08/2001). The next day, pictures and quotes from the *Daily Sport*, the *Daily Mail*, the *Daily Express* and *The Sun* are included on the sports pages of the *Bild* with the comment “Shame on you England! Why are you like that? You are just embarrassing” (*Bild*, 31/08/2001). The hurt and annoyance are fairly obvious in the German tabloid. In the light of “all the dirty lines and hateful comments about the Germans” (*ibid.*), the *Bild* specifically condemns the fact that the sport becomes a platform for discrimination and serious slander:

Somehow the English must have forgotten that this is just about football. First the silly accusations about ‘beer hall traps’. Alright, that’s just some sort of British humour, we said to ourselves. But enough is enough! [...]

Their 0-1 defeat in the last game at the venerable Wembley stadium last year is like a thorn in the English soul. Their qualifying for the World Cup is in danger. All that may play a part in whipping up the emotions. *But that is no reason for raving like those disgraceful Englishmen* (Pfuui-Engländer) *now, shame on them!* [emphasis original] (*Bild*, 31/08/2001)

As opposed to these indignant and resentful reactions in the German tabloid paper, “England’s crazy football fantasies” (*NOZ*, 31/08/2001) are not taken quite as seriously in the quality press. The *NOZ* publishes a brief but humourous and ironic account about the ‘silly’ English nationalism and belligerence:

And here we are again: The United Kingdom mobilises its forces. Great Sons of the Nation like Robbie Williams and Elton John display their patriotism in public. Following Admiral Nelson, the *Sun* featured the slogan ‘We are expecting a heroic victory over Germany’. (*NOZ*, 31/08/2001)

Apart from that, reports about the idea to clone David Beckham, about the ‘beer hall trap’, the ‘oompah accusations’ and the “German attempts to make ‘our boys’ [sic; i.e. the English players] drunk, and upset their fish-and-chips spoilt stomachs with disgusting *sauerkraut*” (NOZ, 31/08/2001), illustrate the ironic treatment of the English tabloids. Comparing *fish and chips* with *sauerkraut* again plays on ‘national symbols’, or rather dishes, and adds to the humorous air of the article. Unlike the *Bild*, no pictures or big headlines surround the piece in the broadsheet and thus, the hostile English attitude does not receive as much attention here as in the tabloid press. This is also the case on 01/09/2001, where quotes by *The Sun* and the *Daily Express* are merely introduced with the metaphorical statement “[a]nyway, the aggressive English tabloids have already made themselves comfortable in the trenches (Schützengraben)” (NOZ, 01/09/2001). However, the quotes are not further commented on.

The different reactions in the German broadsheets and tabloids are also evident after the game. While the *Bild* (03/09/2001) focuses on “That malicious sneering (diese Häme!)” in the English papers (“Of course: the English used their 5-1 triumph for lots of glee and even more sneering. Even the respectable *Times* spoke of ‘slaughtering the Germans’”), the NOZ pays attention to the joyous disbelief of the England supporters:

The English simply cannot believe it. Therefore the tabloid *News of the World* has printed a poster which only shows the scoreboard in Munich’s Olympic Stadium: Deutschland – England 1:5. For only one pound sterling the picture is distributed as a large-sized reminder of England’s finest national hour since their World Cup victory in 1966. And the adoration of the heroes of Munich has only just started. (NOZ, 03/09/2001)

In fact, the game is largely described from an English perspective here – and no resentment is shown of England celebrating their ‘finest national hour since ‘66’. Other English press reactions (including the more malicious ones) are only quoted in a separate column.

Meanwhile, the *Bild* keeps the ‘journalistic war’ with the English tabloids going. Pictures of the obituary notice in *The Daily Mirror* (“Death of German football”) and the burning of Oliver Kahn’s keeper gloves by English football fans are reproduced in the sports pages on 04/09/2001 and heavily condemned (cf. section 4.6.4):

Awfully macabre. Of course we had expected sneering and glee (Hohn und Spott). We do know the black English humour. But THAT’s going too far! A lot too far. [...] The English might call it satire. We call it tasteless. We have won lots of games. But we never reviled the English losers so below the belt. Never [sic]. [...]
But not all papers overreacted like the *Mirror*. There were – thank God – wise words as well. The *Daily Telegraph* praised the Germans for dealing with the defeat with ‘philosophical equanimity’. *There you are. We are good losers. But you are bad winners* [emphasis original]. (*Bild*, 04/09/2001).

As the last paragraph of this quote shows, positive press reactions in English broadsheets are also taken up by the *Bild* to ‘prove’ how ‘dirty, unfair and unsportsmanlike’ the English are as opposed to the Germans, who are presented as both good winners and good losers.

On the whole, considerable attention is paid to the English coverage throughout the German press. However, while ‘Kraut bashing’ displays in the English tabloids do not go unnoticed in the German quality press, they are not focused on or elaborated and criticised nearly as much there as in the popular press.

4.6.7 Summary

German press coverage of the 2001 encounter is characterised by a very limited use of national stereotypes and military language; only similarities in ‘character’ (fighting, commitment, fairness) are stressed before the game and belligerent headlines are hardly found. Football nostalgia, as in the English press, revolves around the terms ‘classic’ and ‘rivalry’, and the historic significance of 2001 is also pointed out (from a negative stance). Chauvinistic and nationalistic displays are frequent in the tabloid press during the pre-match build-up. Apart from that, the most important elements of the reporting seem to be the journalistic meta-discourse and, in connection with that, the assessment of the English and the Anglo-German relationship. With regard to judgments of the counterpart, the quality press is mostly concerned with the sporting performance. Before the game, mutual respect between the arch rivals is emphasised in the *NOZ* – after the game, the England team are praised for their performance. As for the predominantly extra-sporting hype in the English tabloids, only some quotes are provided in the German broadsheet, sometimes with ironic comments. Still, the attitude towards the English remains rather friendly and relaxed in the *NOZ*. The *Bild*, on the other hand, has an almost extreme focus on representations in the English press; here, the attitude deteriorates from humourous overbearance to hurt, indignation and hostility as the hype in the English tabloids gets worse. Being provoked by belligerent and ‘Kraut bashing’ displays, the German popular paper also makes attempts at revenge and can thus be said to enter the ‘journalistic war’ with the English tabloid press, particularly *The Sun*.

4.7 The 2007 friendly in the English press

Of course, an international friendly does not normally receive as much media attention as a competitive match. However, England versus Germany, ‘the classic between the arch rivals’, is treated as more than a mere friendly.³⁹ Apart from being presented as preparation for the European Championship qualifying campaign (in which England failed to qualify for Euro 2008), the latest game between England and Germany is described in the English press as very significant for various other reasons, too; for one, this was the first encounter between

³⁹ Full coverage of the 2007 game was given in *Match Of The Day Live* on BBC1.

the two teams since September 2001 in Munich. Moreover, the World Cup 2006 in Germany had made a very positive impression on the English. And apart from that, Germany had won the last game at the old Wembley site – and now ‘conquered’ the new-built stadium as well.

4.7.1 Use of stereotypes

English characteristics

In 2007, the characteristics which are presented as ‘typically English’ are physical strength, toughness and commitment – features which should appear familiar by now.

Dedication, toughness and the ability to take pain are exemplified by three players; first, Steven Taylor, who participated in the European Under 21 Championship in June 2007, is described as “the England hero who soldiered on, limping, [...] and showed real grit in ignoring his injury” (*Times*, 19/08/2007). Secondly, Frank Lampard, who had been booed and criticised by several England fans for some weak performances, is depicted in the papers as resilient and dedicated: “Playing in a friendly with a broken toe when his club has suggested he rest, should end the debate over Frank Lampard’s commitment to his country” (*Times*, 22/08/2007). And in *The Sun* (21/08/2007), “Lamps” is quoted: “Playing for England can be tough. I’ve worked bloody hard to get here so criticism hurts, but you can’t be weak enough to let it get to you”. Thirdly, also with regard to work-rate and dedication, striker Alan Smith is pointed out as possessing these ‘English qualities’: “his attitude and commitment are fantastic” (*Sun*, 22/08/2007). Still, as *The Times* (23/08/2007) observes after the game, “for all the energy and effort, he does not look like scoring”. This inefficiency in front of goal is also criticised with regard to another player: “Joe Cole: As too often, an abundance of flair, a dearth of end product” (*Times*, 23/08/2007). – “His obsession with cleverness on the ball can be frustrating” (*Times*, 02/09/2007). Evidently, these last examples illustrate the ‘English’ aversion to artistry seen earlier.

That physical power is still highly valued in English football becomes clear in the description of “the towering figure of Micah Richards, whose outstanding athleticism took him through the German defence” (*Sun*, 23/08/2007). In *The Times* (23/08/2007), he is praised for his “brain and brawn. And confidence, too”. Thus, the ‘qualities’ which emerged as ‘typically English’ in press coverage of earlier years are sustained here.

German characteristics

As for German stereotypes, self-confidence and mental supremacy appear to be the dominant features highlighted in the English press in 2007.

Germany keeper Jens Lehmann, having made “two dreadful howlers” (*Sun*, 22/08/2007) in his club’s (Arsenal’s) two opening league fixtures in 2007, nonetheless serves as an example of mental strength, as “those blunders have not affected Lehmann’s supreme self-confidence” (*Sun*, 22/08/2007). Moreover, the goalkeeper “has claimed England are mentally inferior to his native Germany” (*Times*, 20/08/2007), stressing the psychological advantage because of Germany’s history of success: “Mentally, Germany are stronger, because we have experience of success in the last 20 years. We are always successful, not always winning, but somewhere near or winning, and that is what England are lacking” (ibid.). This mental edge that the Germans hold over their rivals also comes to the fore in *The Independent* (23/08/2007) after England’s defeat:

This was another party hijacked by the Germany team, for whom crisp passing, confidence and the capacity to control a game seem to be passed down in the genes. For the first 10 minutes England looked as if this generation of players might not be in thrall to the legend of German football and then, slowly, they fell under its spell.

Here, the ‘German’ self-assurance is explained as something ‘genetic’, i.e. something inborn and irreversible that lies in the ‘nature’ of the German footballer. Moreover, references to the “legend of German football” and “its spell” – though obviously used metaphorically – to some degree mystify Germany’s supremacy over England and thus enforce the stereotype of absolute mental control. As opposed to 2001, not the ‘German’ arrogance, but their supreme self-confidence is pointed out in the English press in 2007. It is also important to note that – besides being slightly more positive – this stereotype seems to be entirely football-related: The supposed mental superiority is presented as resulting merely from Germany’s footballing successes in the past.

Similarities and differences

Apart from the declared differences in mental control, a few similarities in ‘character’ are mentioned. These concern the tough and robust style of play in both countries, as Lehmann points out before the game: “It will be very physical and very intense” (*Times*, 20/08/2007). Otherwise, not much attention is given to similarities between England and Germany.

4.7.2 Military and aggressive language

The most striking feature about military language in the English press in 2007 is the complete absence of war references. Moreover, insulting or offensive headlines as found in 2001 and earlier are practically non-existent, and aggressive language in general is used quite scarcely.

Apart from constant references to the “arch enemy” (*Sun*, 22/08/2007) and “old foe” (ibid.) Germany, the oxymoron ‘friendly fire’ in the heading “McClaren hoping for friendly

fire” (*Times*, 21/08/2007) suggests a respectful atmosphere in spite of the will to fight and ‘battle’. Moreover, one fairly belligerent headline before the match can be found in *The Sun* (22/08/2007): “WEMBLEY MUST BE A FORTRESS – Gary Lineker insists England must turn the Wembley arch into a symbol of fear for opponents when they take on arch-enemy Germany tonight”. The martial imagery of a fortress is taken up again after the game – however, with a very sarcastic overtone: “The much vaunted fortress, the key to our European Championship qualifying campaign, had been stormed” (*Sun*, 23/08/2007). Similarly, the defeated England goalkeeper, who ‘committed’ two serious blunders during the game (one of which led to a goal for Germany), is depicted in military terms: “Robinson [...] looks shot to pieces” (*Sun*, 23/08/2007).

The fact that these are about the only instances of military language that were found in the English press in 2007 shows that the style is considerably less aggressive than in the earlier years analysed in the present study.

4.7.3 Football-nostalgic references

Football nostalgia is an extremely important part of the press coverage in 2007. The ‘ancient rivalry’ between England and Germany is pointed out through numerous football-historic references.

A report in *The Times* (19/08/2007) about the German press conference before the game illustrates the importance of the ‘heroes of the past’, who enforce the sense of an almost mythical antagonism: “Announcing his party for the trip to London, Löw was flanked by German players of various eras including Uwe Seeler and Paul Breitner, and their audience was given a show of England–Germany meetings at Wembley through history”. Obviously, it is the Germans’ focus on the ‘legendary’ Wembley games which is described here; but past sporting encounters between the two countries are given at least as much attention in England; *The Sun* (22/08/2007) lists a number of games under the heading “ENGLAND v GERMANY – MOMENTS TO SAVOUR, MOMENTS TO FORGET”. Among the first are mentioned, of course, the World Cup victory in 1966, the win in 2000 that “end[ed] 34 years of hurt” (*Sun*, 22/08/2007), and the 5-1 in 2001. The “moments to forget” are the semi-finals in 1990 and 1996 and the qualifier in 2000. This last match at Wembley and Germany’s apparent superiority at that venue are frequently referred to after the English defeat in 2007: “And so the arch enemy became the last team to win at the old Wembley and the first to win at the new stadium. No matter who is in charge it would seem that England’s luck against Germany never changes” (*Sun*, 23/08/2007). England’s first defeat in only their second appearance at the new stadium

is described throughout the English press as unacceptable, but depressingly familiar; *The Times* (23/08/2007) states that “England did not play badly against Germany last night and were unlucky to lose, a familiar story at this venue since 1966”, and *The Independent* (23/08/2007) remarks sarcastically: “At least Wembley is starting to feel like home for England. Two games in and the place has already been consecrated with one of the national team’s oldest traditions: a debilitating defeat to the old enemy Germany”. Thus, England’s bad luck against Germany on the football pitch is presented as almost predetermined and inevitable.

All in all, the football nostalgia in the English press serves to mystify and bemoan Germany’s supremacy at Wembley and to give the rivalry between the two countries a legendary status – on a purely sporting basis.

4.7.4 Assessments of the Anglo-German relationship

Apart from these entirely footballing references, an article in *The Times* (21/08/2007) illustrates how the roles of sports and politics get mingled from time to time:

Prime Minister Gordon Brown will be taking Angela Merkel, the German Chancellor, to Wembley Stadium tomorrow, amid pressure on him to call a referendum on the European Union treaty. But the talk will be of football rather than politics...

What is interesting about this is that the sporting rivalry becomes a connecting element between two politically disagreeing forces because of its nature of being a ‘game’. Brown is depicted as avoiding ‘serious’ matters, as in this case the treaty talk, in favour of ‘not-so-serious’ football talk. Here, football is a simple means to ‘bridge’ disagreements; this is a plain signal that efforts are made to further a positive Anglo-German relationship.⁴⁰

Otherwise, the assessment of the Germans in the English press in 2007 seems to be characterised to a remarkable extent by respect and admiration for the arch rival. This becomes clear in a piece about the German team and their progress in *The Times* (19/08/2007). First, it describes how then head coach Jürgen Klinsmann and his assistant Joachim Löw went on together in 2006 “[a]ll the way to a World Cup semi-final, sweeping away a decade of gathering pessimism around Germany’s national game, becoming affectionately known as ‘Klinsi’ and ‘Jogi’ to their admirers” (*Times*, 19/08/2007). The fact that these nicknames are adopted and henceforth used frequently by the author of the article speaks for itself. Moreover, Germany is presented as “the most impressively placed of all the

⁴⁰ Another positive signal was given by English football fans in the stadium; with thousands of red and white cardboard signs they formed the German sentence “Danke für 2006” and thus expressed their gratitude and positive assessment of the tournament in Germany the year before. However, this action does not seem to be given much attention in the English press.

teams in [sic] qualifying for Euro 2008” (ibid.), and “Wembley, being a friendly, will not truly find them out even if England have a strong night there” (ibid.). The respect and high esteem for the German team should be evident here.

The significance ascribed to the friendly in 2007 is rather ambiguous. On the one hand, the game is described as “pure preparation” (*Times*, 21/08/2007, *Sun*, 22/08/2007) for the Euro 2008 qualifiers ahead; on the other hand, “England versus Germany will never be ‘just a friendly’” (*Times*, 19/08/2007; cf. *Sun*, 22/08/2007) and “is never a match you do not take seriously. There’s too much at stake. [...] There will be 90,000 people there and eight million watching on TV. That is some friendly” (*Sun*, 22/08/2007). The particular motivation of the two teams and the great interest in England–Germany encounters, especially at Wembley, are highlighted before the match and once again illustrate the strong sense of rivalry. After the match, however, the defeat (“It was even more cruel that it had to be against the arch footballing enemy” (*Sun*, 23/08/2007)) is seen primarily in the light of the following qualifying campaign in the broadsheets: “History says we have always done better in the meaningful games. [...] The next two games are much more important”, *The Times* (23/08/2007) quotes Michael Owen. Thus, while the rivalry and extra-special significance are stressed before the match, afterwards, it seems as though it is presented in the quality press as ‘just a friendly’, after all.

Apart from the respect for the German team mentioned above, the English press is unanimous and unrestrained in its praise for the second German goal, “a simply outstanding strike by Christian Pander” (*Times*, 23/08/2007),⁴¹ a “screamer that would have graced any arena” (*Sun*, 23/08/2007), “a strike that even Goldenballs [Beckham] himself would have been proud of” (ibid.). Several German players are described as “impressive” in *The Sun* (ibid.), and *The Independent* (23/08/2007) states: “This was Germany’s B team and they looked good”.

On the whole, the judgment of the Germans in the English press is overwhelmingly positive in 2007; though still depicted as the ‘arch enemy’ before the match, the German team is respected, admired and praised in broadsheets and tabloids alike.

4.7.5 Displays of nationalism, chauvinism, jingoism

Some chauvinistic headlines can be found in the popular press before the match. The article entitled “WEMBLEY MUST BE A FORTRESS” (22/08/2007) as well as Michael Owen’s bold

⁴¹ However, *The Times* does poke fun at the fact that Pander is “a part-time rapper, who revels in the name of Funky Pee” (23/08/2007).

'Wembley challenge' "LET'S SEE IF ANYONE CAN BEAT US HERE" (emblazoned across the cover of the programme, cf. *Independent*, 23/08/2007) may serve as examples. 'Kraut bashing', offensive displays, however, seem to be completely absent.

After the game, a few remnants of the stereotypical labelling of Germans, like *Herr* and *Hans*, emerge in *The Sun*. A double-page headline on 23/08/2007 reads "ENGLAND v GERMANY: THE BIG MATCH VERDICT: BAD HERR DAY FOR WEMBLEY" and a photograph on the same page is subtitled "CLAP HANS... the delighted German players applaud their supporters after beating England at Wembley" (*Sun*, 23/08/2007). In neither case are there any apparent negative or hostile overtones, and one might suspect that the terms are merely applied to create (somewhat forced) puns.

Moreover, while *The Times* stresses that the following Euro qualifiers are more important than this friendly (see section 4.7.4), *The Sun* elaborates on the ignominy of "another unpalatable defeat against a side who had left all their top stars – the Ballacks, the Kloses and the Podolskis – at home" (23/08/2007). The crowd at Wembley is described as "embarrassed beyond belief" and "[t]he humiliation was complete shortly after the final whistle, when Germany's reserves took a standing ovation in front of 8,000 delirious travelling fans" (ibid.), who, like after their last victory at the old Wembley, were chanting 'Football's coming home'. Far from expressing any nationalistic or chauvinistic feelings, *The Sun* actually criticises jingoism in a rather sarcastic way in an article by Steven Howard:

So much for Fortress Wembley – the terrestrial version of the Titanic, the ship that could never sink. And so much for Michael Owen's programme boast 'Let's see if anyone can beat us here'. Yeh, let's. While all this jingoistic nonsense was going on, a few of us were trying to remind everyone that far from being cowed by the Wembley experience, the best teams would simply respond to it. And so it was here. Except this was far from the best Germany can offer. (*Sun*, 23/08/2007)

The fact that credit is given to the German team and boastful remarks before the game are dismissed as "all this jingoistic nonsense" here seems quite remarkable in the light of all the chauvinism, 'Kraut bashing' and jingoism found in *The Sun* in previous years.

All in all, very few chauvinistic displays can be found in the popular press; and, astonishingly, jingoism is even criticised in *The Sun* after the game.

4.7.6 Meta-discourse: Reactions to journalistic representations in the other country

No direct quotes from the German press were found in the English papers in 2007. Nonetheless, an instance in *The Times* may be mentioned in connection with the journalistic meta-discourse: "Germany closed the old place down by inflicting defeat and, considering the rivalry between the nations, will have been mightily pleased to enter the record books at the reconstructed site, too" (*Times*, 23/08/2007). Here, it is assumed that the Germans will be

gloating after their first victory at the new Wembley. Or, as *The Independent* (23/08/2007) puts it: “The Germans have a word for that: they call it schadenfreude”. In both cases, the German response which is predicted is the natural response of an enemy; here again, then, the sporting rivalry is emphasised through the meta-discourse.

4.7.7 Summary

On the whole, English press coverage of the 2007 friendly exhibits a remarkably positive image of and relationship towards the Germans. While English stereotypes sustain their ‘qualities’ mentioned earlier, ‘German’ characteristics are now entirely football-related and considerably more positive than in 2001, shifting from arrogance to self-confidence and mental superiority. As for military imagery, no single war reference and no offensive or insulting remarks were found; generally, there is much less aggressive language than in earlier years. Football nostalgia mystifies the ‘ancient’ sporting rivalry between the two countries and Germany’s supremacy at Wembley. Moreover, aside from initiatives by fans and politicians to strengthen positive Anglo-German relations, the assessment of the German team is very favourable; respect, admiration and praise emerge in broadsheets and tabloids alike. While a few chauvinistic remarks do appear in the popular press before the game, jingoism is explicitly criticised in *The Sun* afterwards, which reveals an attitude very much unlike that in 1990, let alone 2001. Finally, journalistic meta-discourse does not play any significant role and merely serves to emphasise the established sense of rivalry.

4.8 The 2007 friendly in the German press

In the German press, the friendly in 2007 is seen primarily as a new edition of the ‘classic’; due to eleven injured players, it is not regarded as preparation for the Euro qualifiers. Football nostalgia takes a great part of the pre-match build-up and enforces the sense of a ‘historical rivalry’. After the surprising German victory, lots of chauvinistic and nationalistic displays are found in the tabloids.

4.8.1 Use of stereotypes

English characteristics

In fact, the German papers do not make much use of stereotypes for indicating national ‘character’ with regard to the English. Rather, the focus seems to be on individual players, on ‘superstars’: “Where was England’s superstar, by the way? David Beckham was completely inconspicuous. And Michael Owen, who scored a hat-trick during the last encounter in

Munich, became a tragic figure” [as he missed several chances to score] (*NOZ*, 23/08/2007). Moreover, the *NOZ* points out that “players like David Beckham and Michael Owen stagnate in England” (*ibid.*). The fact that new players and modern tactics are said to have a difficult stance in England (as opposed to the ‘young revolution’ in Germany initiated by Klinsmann) may be in line with the stereotypical English conservatism. Nevertheless, in general, the amount of English stereotypes is almost negligible here.

German characteristics

Typically ‘German’ characteristics, however, are widespread in the German press. Like earlier (most notably in 1966), fairness, toughness and commitment are highlighted as the most prevalent features.

Having to cope with eleven cancellations before the game, Germany coach Löw complains about what he calls a “moral decline” in the Bundesliga (*NOZ*, 20/08/2007); as opposed to the league, the national team is presented as still being a model for sportsmanship and dedication, as “the examples of national players like Philipp Lahm, Christoph Metzelder or Per Mertesacker show that it is possible to play fair and win duels” (*ibid.*). Accordingly, the *NOZ* (21/08/2007) headlines that “the German makeshift team (Notelf) promises a tough fight (will ‘Haut teuer verkaufen’)” and describes the “anticipation as well as a sense of defiance among the rest of the national team”. After the victory, the ‘German’ fighting spirit and bravery in the face of adversity are emphasised: “In spite of the unprecedented series of injuries, the German team delivered courageous play. [...] The lack of experience was compensated by great commitment. To play at Wembley evidently spurred on the young Germans” (*NOZ*, 23/08/2007). In the players’ words (quoted in *NOZ*, 23/08/2007), apart from dedication and self-confidence, hard work was the ‘German’ virtue that was the key to success: “Philipp Lahm: We worked hard and got our reward; Christian Pander: We gave it our all and managed well”. Thus, the ‘traditional German qualities’ are perpetuated in 2007.

Similarities and differences

As in the English press that year, descriptions of similarities in ‘character’ are confined to a few assessments of the game, which was – ‘typically’ for Germany versus England – marked by dedication and speed: “A fast and exciting game developed” (*NOZ*, 23/08/2007). Regarding differences, these are presented as lying in the mental control; here as well, Lehmann’s statement that “Germany are mentally stronger than the English on account of

their history of success” (*NOZ*, 21/08/2007; cf. section 4.7.1) is taken as ‘proof’ of the contrasting characteristics.

4.8.2 Military and aggressive language

General

Military imagery is used rather scarcely in the German papers in 2007, and is primarily restricted to the tabloid press. After the German win, the front-page headline “WOOMBLEY (Wummbley) GOAL SHOOT ENGLAND DOWN TO A KNOCK OUT” (*Bild*, 23/08/2007) and the description of how “[o]ur national team has conquered England’s new football temple with a makeshift team (Notelf)” (*ibid.*) may serve as examples of fairly martialistic displays. Moreover, the *Bild* depicts goalscorer Christian Pander as “Bang-bang-Pander [Ballermann Pander]!” (*Bild*, 23/08/2007), a nickname which – besides its aggressive connotation – raises associations with sharp-shooting. In the quality press, an instance where warlike language is used is a quote from the German coach: “We have to improve our counter-attacking to give the opponent the death blow” (*NOZ*, 23/08/2007). All in all, these few examples do certainly not give the impression of a very hostile or aggressive press coverage in 2007.

War references

One reference to England’s military history is found in the *NOZ* (23/08/2007): “In the football classic, the Three Lions suffered their Waterloo during the 1-2”. However, the phrase ‘suffer one’s Waterloo’ has become so common in the everyday language of both England and Germany as a metonym for describing defeats and catastrophes of various degrees that it is rather doubtful whether it should be regarded as an example of war language. It has been included here because of the fact that it is used specifically about the English team; thus, the military connotation is enforced, even though, of course, England was the winning part at the historical Waterloo (1815). Anyway, the ‘reversed’ and thus implicit nature of this war reference, if it can be called that, to some extent weakens its aggressive potential.

4.8.3 Football-nostalgic references

Football nostalgia, especially in connection with the old and new Wembley stadium, is extremely widespread in the pre-match build-up of both tabloids and broadsheets in Germany in 2007.

Before the 30th duel with England, both the *Bild* and the *NOZ* feature an abundance of photographs, statistics and stories on England versus Germany. The *NOZ* even has a one-page

special about Wembley that is announced on the front-page under the heading “The football classic” (22/08/2007):

Breathtaking penalty shoot-outs, tragic heroes and the most famous goal in football history: For 99 years, the international classic England versus Germany has brought about numerous dramas – and humiliations – in both countries. The duel in London`s Wembley stadium entralls not only football fanatics.

Inside the paper, a long article entitled “WEMBLEY – THE MYTH LIVES ON FOR EVER: The modern colossus and the dramas of the past” (*NOZ*, 22/08/2007) describes ‘historic moments’ at the old stadium (e.g. in 1966, 1996 and 2000). Former national players are interviewed and a number of photos add to the nostalgic impression. Moreover, the paper declares that “[i]n the new stadium, the mythos of the old is to be revived” (ibid.). This legendary, almost religious status of “Wembley`s holy turf” (*NOZ*, 23/08/2007) is also described in the *Bild*, where ‘Kaiser Franz’ [Beckenbauer] writes about his own experiences: “Wembley! Not only the hearts of football fans beat faster at the sound of this magical word” (*Bild*, 22/08/2007). Furthermore, it is pointed out that the German team have not lost on English soil for 32 years, and “[t]he German players look forward to the game as well. On 7 October 2000, they closed down the old Wembley with a 1-0 win over England. Tonight, they want to mark a successful beginning of the new stadium” (*NOZ*, 22/08/2007). This being accomplished on 22/08/2007, a historic dimension is ascribed to that date as well – and to Pander`s 2-1, which “will go down into history as another extra-special Wembley goal” (*NOZ*, 23/08/2007).

Thus, the Anglo-German rivalry and the venue of Wembley are elaborated on and mystified through football nostalgia in the German press.

4.8.4 Assessments of the Anglo-German relationship

With regard to explicit assessments of England and the Anglo-German relationship, the German press coverage (in the quality papers, at any rate) seems to be rather ambiguous.

Both the *NOZ* and the *Bild* point out the English attitude that seems to have taken a significant turn for the better after the World Cup 2006 in Germany. With some self-satisfaction, the *Bild* describes the English fans` action before the 2007 friendly as “touching”: “Before kick-off, there is an atmosphere which is touching enough to give one goose bumps (Gänsehaut-Atmosphäre): England supporters form the sentence ‘Danke für 2006’. After all, our World Cup has made a deep impression on the English, too” (*Bild*, 23/08/2007). Anglo-German relations are thus presented as a lot stronger and more positive than earlier.

In the *NOZ*, the relationship between the two countries is not depicted quite as clear-cut. If the ‘Kraut bashing’ of English tabloids was largely ignored in the broadsheet in 1990

and 2001, it does not seem to have gone unnoticed, after all. On the extra-page about Wembley in the *NOZ* (22/08/2007), a column from the series “Of course! – Facts for kids” entitled “Ancient rivalry” is worth looking at more closely in this connection:

The football classic Germany versus England is often used by the British media and football fans as an opportunity for ‘German bashing’ [sic]. By that is meant the public and generally tolerated abuse of Germans. Frequently, the Germans are compared to Nazis, although it is not really meant that way. This time, at least the football fans refrain from such things: 20,000 cardboard signs forming the German sentence ‘Danke für 2006’ will be held up on the upper terraces of the opposite stand at Wembley stadium tonight. Reportedly, the English supporters want to thank Germany in that way for the great hospitality during the World Cup last year. (*NOZ*, 22/08/2007)

First of all, this article (in a fairly neutral and objective tone) presents the ‘ancient rivalry’ as an established ‘historical’ fact and introduces and provides a definition for the term ‘German bashing’. No differentiation is made between quality and popular press or English and, say, Scottish or Irish media (“British media”). Moreover, the insults and ‘war mongering’ are described as “public” and as “generally tolerated”. Obviously, this casts a very negative light on the English and their attitude towards the Germans. To some extent, the gravity of the ‘traditional’ English ‘German bashing’ displays is mitigated through the afterthought “although it is not really meant that way”. (Here, the tone becomes more colloquial and more aimed at children.) As in the *Bild*, the World Cup 2006 is presented as very positive for Germany and their image abroad. Yet, it is with caution, not with overwhelming optimism, that the *NOZ* relates that “at least” the English football fans have adopted a different attitude and “reportedly” want to thank Germany; no stand is taken on the English press.

To sum up, the article for children in the *NOZ* portrays the Anglo-German rivalry as ‘historical’ and the offensive English attitude as ‘traditional’ and not necessarily evil; the amelioration of the relationship after 2006 is regarded as positive but treated with caution. In the *Bild*, the supposedly new kind of English behaviour is presented with some (self-) satisfaction.

4.8.5 Displays of nationalism, chauvinism, jingoism

Nationalistic and chauvinistic displays are found in abundance in the German tabloids after the game in 2007.

In the broadsheets, the predominantly descriptive and neutral coverage of the game (*NOZ*, 23/08/2007; front-page heading: “Goals from Schalke:⁴² Victory at Wembley”; “With a slightly lucky 2-1 victory, the injury-weakened German national team have continued their tale of success at Wembley”) is only interrupted by sporadic expressions of chauvinism and gloating. For instance, a headline in the sports pages reads “Who`s Beckham? Löw`s got

⁴² Both goalscorers, Kevin Kuranyi and Christian Pander, play for the Bundesliga club Schalke 04.

Pander” (*NOZ*, 23/08/2007). One might argue that, here again, the focus is on ‘superstars’ rather than the national team as a whole; however, the introduction to the article can be said to be fairly chauvinistic, playing on the Anglo-German rivalry: “To tease the Englishmen at football is special fun. And a victory at Wembley is like a humiliation of the hosts” (*ibid.*). Apart from that, a number of comments from Germany players and officials after the game also create a rather chauvinistic impression; yet, these are only quotes and even the headline “‘It’s nice to win here’” (*NOZ*, 23/08/2007) is identifiable as such through the use of quotation marks. If the paper thus signals a certain distance to players’ remarks such as “There are not many places where it is so nice to win as Wembley” and “It’s always nice to win in England”, the very choice to include exactly these comments adds to a certain sense of gloating and jingoism in the quality paper.

In the *Bild*, on the other hand, chauvinism is not so difficult to detect. Front-page headlines such as “YES [sic] JOGI! ENGLAND KNOCKED OUT” (*Bild*, 23/08/2007) are fairly overt in their message. Moreover, the paper features three full pages about the German victory (or, rather, the English defeat) on the day after the match. Gloating at England’s expense is common throughout these articles: “It made *woom!* From 30 yards, Christian Pander hit England right into the football heart and made the Wembley-wonder perfect! With a terrific Woombley goal. [...] The greatest classic of all times we won with a makeshift team!” (*Bild*, 23/08/2007). Examples like these are very frequent and cannot all be listed here for lack of space. However, one more article will be included, as it illustrates the obvious glee, chauvinism and nationalism in the *Bild* in quite an entertaining way. Apart from the big headline “BILD RENAMES WEMBLEY! Now this is our WEMBLBURG!” (*Bild*, 23/08/2007), there is a huge photograph from inside the stadium, subtitled “Already before kick-off, the new Wembley was a little bit German. England’s fans showed the sentence ‘Danke für 2006’, a thank you for our World Cup” (*ibid.*). To say that England’s newest stadium is “a little bit German” (and that in the light of such a conciliatory gesture from the English fans), is certainly provocatively nationalistic. The article continues along the same line:

This is our favourite venue for victories...

‘We’ve got a home game at Wembley...’ [emphasis original], sang the German fans until the walls were trembling. The English were silent at that point. [...]

BILD renames Wembley: From now on, this is our WEMBLBURG [emphasis original]! Our football feels at home there. We enjoy ourselves so much that we want to play our home games there hereafter... [...]

At any rate, Wemblburg sounds like good old German football tradition. And in order that the English – after Wembley – won’t have any problems with the new name: It is pronounced ‘Wämbblörg’. [...]

The Queen’s Lounge will become ‘Kaiser Suite’. That’s not such a bad idea: While the Queen prefers equestrianism anyway, our football Kaiser enjoyed the 90 minutes. [...]

And of course: German beer will flow in Wemblburg, there will be gorgeous *bratwurst* and one will pay in Euro. For our English friends and their pounds, we’ll have exchange offices.

If Jogi Löw is looking for a nice opponent for friendlies, England may also play at Wemblburg again.

Anyway, Wemblburg or Wembley – the stadium is magnificent. See you [sic], we love to come back!
[emphasis original] (*Bild*, 23/08/2007)

This piece, no doubt, aims to provoke with its nationalism, irony (“our English friends”) and playing with German stereotypes (“*bratwurst*”). If this is seen as a sort of revenge for the ‘Kraut bashing’ in the English tabloids (especially in connection with the last encounter in 2001), the last two sentences suggest that ‘it was just a joke’ and that, of course, the article is not to be taken seriously. Anyway, compared to the extremely insulting and obscene treatment of the Germans in the English popular press in earlier years (notably not in 2007), this story, for all its provocation and glee, seems rather innocent.

On the whole, some displays of chauvinism appear (rather covertly) in the German quality press in 2007. In the tabloid papers, nationalism, chauvinism and jingoism are very frequent, explicit and provocative after the game.

4.8.6 Meta-discourse: Reactions to journalistic representations in the other country

Journalistic meta-discourse is not by far as prevalent in the German press in 2007 as in 2001. In the pre-match build-up, the criticism in England of Arsenal and Germany keeper Jens Lehmann is taken up in the German tabloid press: “Now of all times, before the international in England, Jens Lehmann comes under fire from all sides. *The Mirror* characterises our keeper as a security risk.” (*Bild*, 21/08/2007); “England`s press clobbers our national keeper” (*Bild*, 22/08/2007). Evidently, the use of the possessive pronoun *our* (“our keeper”) functions as an expression of sympathy for and identification with Lehmann on the part of the *Bild*. Thus, a polarisation and opposition between England and Germany are achieved once again. After the game, only a few quotes from English papers are included in the German press. The *Bild* writes that “[t]he newspaper *Sun* complains after the first English loss in the brand-new stadium: ‘It was even more cruel that it had to be against our arch footballing enemy...’” (*Bild*, 23/08/2007), again emphasising the rivalry between the two countries. The *NOZ* (23/08/2007) only features two quotes from *The Sun* and *The Daily Mirror* where England are criticised in a sarcastic way, without further comments.

Thus, the few instances of journalistic meta-discourse in the German press in 2007 serve to accentuate the Anglo-German rivalry and to some extent reflect the gloating on the opponent`s expense.

4.8.7 Summary

All in all, while the English press exhibits a rather conciliatory attitude towards the Germans in 2007, the German papers, apart from a very positive self-assessment, increase their focus on rivalry and criticism of the English.

While almost no stereotypes indicating English national character are used (the emphasis being on 'superstars', rather), 'traditional German qualities' like fairness, toughness and commitment are highlighted with regard to the friendly. A few similarities (speed and zest) and differences in 'character' (mental superiority of the Germans) are also mentioned. Some examples of military imagery and a reference to Waterloo do not create an overall hostile or aggressive impression. Moreover, a great amount of football nostalgia enforces the myth of 'Wembley' and the 'historical' Anglo-German rivalry. With regard to explicit assessments of the Anglo-German relationship, the *NOZ* features a factual presentation (for children) of the 'traditional German bashing' in England (which was largely ignored in 2001!) and thus highlights the negative English attitude. However, both the *NOZ* and especially the *Bild* remark upon the ameliorated stance of the English after 2006 with a considerable amount of self-satisfaction with the successful hosting of the World Cup that year. Accordingly, displays of nationalism and chauvinism after the game are very frequent and provocative (though not directly insulting) in the *Bild* and more covert in the *NOZ*. The journalistic meta-discourse does not seem very relevant in the German press in 2007; only a few quotes from English papers which emphasise the rivalry and give room for gloating are included.

4.9 Summary

After this detailed analysis of English and German football reporting, it may be useful now to sum up in broader terms the developments of discourses of national character that emerge in both countries' press coverage over the years. This will make it easier to gain a larger perspective before drawing conclusions about these developments by placing them in their historical, political and sporting context of Anglo-German relations. The use of the six discursive strategies in the English and German press have been rendered in tables to provide a simplified overview. (Note: Where the terms *tabloid/quality press* are not mentioned explicitly, general press reporting is referred to.)

Table 4.1: **English press 1966-2007**

| English press | 1966 | 1990 | 2001 | 2007 |
|------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| Stereotypes | | | less frequently used than earlier | relatively scarcely used |
| <i>English characteristics:</i> | dedication, toughness, fairness | spirit, character, toughness, fairness | see 1966 and 1990 | see 1966 and 1990 |
| <i>German characteristics:</i> | discipline, dedication, aggression | mechanical efficiency, 'machine' style | arrogance | self-confidence, mental superiority |
| <i>Similarities:</i> | 'European' (vs. 'South American') style | | <u>quality press</u> reflects on some similarities, see 1966 | see 2001 |
| <i>Differences:</i> | | 'fighting, noble warriors' (English) vs. 'inhuman but supreme war machines' (German) | | mental supremacy of the Germans |
| Milit. & aggr. language | | | | |
| <i>General:</i> | frequent in connection with the Germans | extremely frequent; 'Kraut bashing' in the tabloids | <u>tabloids</u> : hype; fierce & insulting 'Kraut bashing' | very scarce |
| <i>War references:</i> | some before the final; afterwards apologies by one writer | abundance of milit. references | only in the <u>tabloids</u> ; less than in 1990; more covert | none |
| Football nostalgia | England's 'rightful supremacy' as the 'Motherland' of football | before the semi-final: 1966 nostalgia; 'Two World Wars and One World Cup' | stressing the 'classical' sporting rivalry | see 2001; mythologising of the rivalry and Germany's supremacy at Wembley |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| Assessments of the Anglo-German relationship | positive after the final; respect | <u>tabloids</u> : openly hostile & aggressive; <u>broadsheets</u> : more covert aversion; concern about nationalism in Germany | <u>tabloids</u> : openly hostile & aggressive <u>broadsheets</u> : positive to German efforts to strengthen Anglo-German ties; criticism of the tabloids | respect, admiration, praise (fans at Wembley: 'Danke für 2006') |
| Nationalism, chauvinism, jingoism | prevalent after the final; no Anti-German displays | very frequent, mostly in connection with 'Germanophobia' (esp. <u>tabloids</u>) | <u>tabloids</u> : hype; 'oompah stunts', 'Kraut bashing'; gleeful triumphalism after the game <u>broadsheets</u> : triumphalism, glee after the game | <u>tabloids</u> : some chauvinism before the game but no Anti-German displays; jingoism criticised after the game |
| Meta-discourse | courtesy | scarcely used; stresses 'German' lack of humour | irrelevant | irrelevant |

As is obvious from this table, English stereotypes, revolving around their 'typical qualities', seem to have remained stable in the English press over the years. German stereotypes, however, experience a considerable shift of focus; from 1966 to 2001, they may be seen as largely negative and both football- and war-related, while more positive and solely football-related characteristics surface in 2007. Just like war references seem to have decreased in 2001, football nostalgia is not mingled with military history in and after that year. As for the journalistic meta-discourse, this does not seem to play any significant role after 1966.

In 1966, the English press appears fairly unanimous; the coverage before the final is influenced by the recent military history between the countries and afterwards exhibits largely positive, or generous, judgments of the Germans. An overwhelmingly negative attitude rules in 1990, the tabloids with their chauvinistic and Anti-German displays being extremely and overtly, the broadsheets more implicitly hostile. Reporting in 2001 has many parallels to that of 1990; however, the 'Kraut bashing' in the popular press seems to become even more extreme, while the broadsheets distance themselves from the tabloid 'hype'. Finally, in 2007, the English appear to take a largely conciliatory and positive stance towards their counterpart.

Thus, in an extremely oversimplified account, one might say that the attitude towards the Germans as revealed in the English press in these years takes on a figurative U-shape, with its positive 'peaks' in 1966 and 2007 and its 'lows' in 1990 and 2001.

Table 4.2: German press 1966-2007

| German press | 1966 | 1990 | 2001 | 2007 |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| Stereotypes | | | scarcely used | |
| <i>English characteristics:</i> | fairness, toughness, commitment | toughness, fighting but unattractive football; hooliganism | | emphasis on 'superstars' rather than 'English' characteristics |
| <i>German characteristics:</i> | fairness, discipline, toughness, commitment | fairness; discipline and efficiency brought to perfection | | fairness, toughness, commitment |
| <i>Similarities:</i> | similarities in character and style stressed | almost no emphasis on similarities | only similarities stressed before the game: fighting, fairness, commitment | some similarities stressed before the game: speed, zest, 'physical style' |
| <i>Differences:</i> | | | | mental superiority of the Germans |
| Milit. & aggr. language | | | | |
| <i>General:</i> | some milit. imagery, but also emphasis on the fact that football is a game, not a battle | milit. imagery frequently applied | hardly any milit. imagery, let alone belligerent headlines | some milit. imagery, but not overly aggressive |
| <i>War references:</i> | none | one ref. to show that war has nothing to do with sports | none | one reference to Waterloo (1815) |
| Football nostalgia | admiration for England's football tradition; 1954 nostalgia | emphasis on the sporting rivalry | emphasis on the 'classical' sporting rivalry; (negative) historic significance of 2001 | strong focus on 'Wembley' and 'classical' sporting rivalry; myth enforcement |
| Assessments of the relationship | highlighting of friendly relations, esp. after the game; admiration, praise & respect; World Cup as a chance to 'win new friends in England and the world' | polite respect and 'nothing more'; English no longer seen as 'masters' of the game | <u>broadsheets</u> : mostly concerned with the sporting performance: respect, praise for the English; <u>tabloids</u> : focus on extra-sporting hype in English tabloids: from humorous overbearance to hurt, indignation, open hostility | <u>broadsheets</u> : highlighting of 'traditional' negative English attitude in a factual account on 'Kraut bashing'; but also focus on ameliorated English stance after 2006 and some self-satisfaction in <u>broadsheets</u> and <u>tabloids</u> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| Nationalism, chauvinism, jingoism | explicit rejection of chauvinistic and nationalistic 'excesses' | frequent esp. in the <u>tabloids</u> ; but lack of fierce 'war mongering' and direct insults; 'natural' patriotism and 'non-excessive' nationalism defended in the <u>broadsheets</u> | frequent in the <u>tabloids</u> during the pre-match build-up | <u>tabloids</u> : very frequent and provocative displays of chauvinism, triumphalism <u>broadsheets</u> : some chauvinism, more covert |
| Meta-discourse | dismay, indignation, hurt at English allusions to German Nazi past; strong criticism of these displays in the English press; after the final: strong emphasis on positive representations in the English press | positive representations in England still highlighted; 'war mongering' and 'Kraut bashing' insults treated with less sensitivity and hurt | <u>broadsheets</u> : hype in the English tabloids is mentioned, sometimes with ironic comments; <u>tabloids</u> : extreme focus on English representations; deteriorating attitude; revenge and entering of the 'journalistic war' with English tabloids | almost irrelevant; a few quotes which emphasise rivalry or give room for gloating |

Generally, the German press coverage is marked by its avoiding war references and focussing on favourable characteristics (except in 1990) and non-war-related stereotypes for both countries. In 1966, the rejection of military allusions and nationalism along with the explicitly formulated intention to use the World Cup to 'win new friends in England' is significant. This attitude changes considerably in 1990, as chauvinistic, nationalistic and militant displays and a more reserved attitude towards the English are prevalent. In 2001, the broadsheet/tabloid distinction makes itself felt in the football reporting; while the broadsheets focus on the traditional sporting rivalry, the most important elements of the tabloid coverage seem to be representations in England. Assessments of the Anglo-German relationship result in the *Bild* metaphorically entering the 'journalistic war' with English tabloids. Eventually, German press reporting in 2007 is characterised by a strong highlighting of the 'classical' Anglo-German rivalry, an increasing criticism of the English and very positive self-assessments.

All in all, the German press seems very much aware of the attitudes exhibited in the English papers until 2007; while generally trying to keep the rivalry on a purely sporting basis and maintain a conciliatory and friendly air, especially the tabloid papers appear to be more and more influenced and provoked by the offensive 'Kraut bashing' in their English counterparts in the years examined here. The 'peak' is reached in 2007, as the *Bild* adopts a provocative and chauvinistic, self-satisfied style quite similar to that of *The Sun* – however, without being too aggressive and 'war mongering'.

5 CONCLUDING DISCUSSION: Football reporting in context – Anglo-German relations and discourses of national character

In this study, the framing of national character in football reporting has been taken as diagnostic of mutual attitudes and beliefs in England and Germany. For a wider understanding of Anglo-German relations and discourses of national character, it has been useful to investigate press coverage of not only one isolated game, as seems to be the most common approach to these topics, but of several games over a longer time period. Changes in the framing of ‘Englishness’ and ‘Germanness’ can thus be traced diachronically in the context of the historical, political, cultural, sporting developments that both countries have experienced. While the following suggestions about the links between these discourses on the one hand and their historical embedding on the other must not be seen as definitive one-to-one connections (see section 2.1), they may provide a deeper insight to the complex factors that conceivably influence media constructions of national character in England and Germany.

It has been stressed initially (section 1.4) that formulations of national character are very often subject to stereotypification and stasis. This has been evident in the English press reportage of the first three games analysed here (1966, 1990, 2001): Constant allusions or references to *The Third Reich* and stereotypical images of disciplined, aggressive, arrogant Germans contribute to the impression that English attitudes seem “stuck in a time warp”, to use Beck’s expression (2006: 37). Simultaneously, it has been evident that the ultimately political and ideological nature of discourses of national character can also result in variation. For instance, variation is found in the autotypification of the German press, which in 1990, during the reunification, apparently embraces the nationalistic and chauvinistic style it has rejected so harshly in 1966.

English press 1966

If the press coverage of the four years is considered in detail, it seems plain that Anti-German tendencies in England and the extra-sporting edge of football games between the two countries arise from their status as opponents in two world wars. This would to a great extent account for the largely war-related image of the Germans in advance of the World Cup final of 1966. However, as shown in the analysis, English judgments of the Germans after that game are predominantly generous and friendly. In the light of their sporting victory and the remarkably fair nature of the game, this should not be too surprising. Apart from that, one

quote from *The Sun* (01/08/1966, see section 4.1.4) appears rather telling of English assessments of the Germans at that time: The Germans “showed that in defeat they have a lot to give to the rest of the world”. As mentioned earlier, “defeat” may refer to the sporting as well as to the recent military German defeat. Thus, one might think that in 1966, German ‘contributions’ on ‘the world stage’ are only tolerated and appreciated as long as England remains in and Germany under control – politically, morally and sportingly.

German press 1966

On the other hand, the German stance through the years is generally marked by strong efforts to shrug off and move on from the Nazi past and by a friendly attitude towards all things English, especially with regard to popular culture and football (cf. Eisenberg 2006: 39). Thus, in 1966, the emphasis on positive characteristics and similarities between England and Germany, the rejection of military references and nationalism, the open admiration for ‘the Motherland of football’ and the hurt in the German press at English allusions to Nazi Germany could be explained in terms of social psychological factors: Guilty of two global conflicts, the horrors of which were still looming large in 1966, the Germans were anxious to distance themselves from their recent history. Along with the ongoing economical recovery in West Germany, and their regained political and military significance during the Cold War, they strove to regain their cultural place and positive image in Europe. In the process of building up and presenting a ‘new’ German nation, the importance of the World Cup as a chance to polish up the battered reputation and to ‘win new friends in the world’, especially in England, was considered greater than winning the tournament, as is stressed in the 1966 coverage. Consequently, extremely few elements of envy or resentment of the English victory are found in the German press – despite the fact that Hurst’s 3-2 still gives rise to lively discussions today.

English press 1990

In 1990, the extreme nature and amount of aggressive, military, ‘Kraut bashing’ language, war references and negatively coloured German stereotypes in the English tabloid press link to a number of historical, political, economical and sporting factors. First of all, as indicated in section 2.2, the English popular papers in general had by that time developed a journalistic style adjusted to the ‘downmarket’ readership and the singular competitive situation in the English press: Excessive jingoism, nasty stereotyping of other nationalities along with

attempts to create puns and headlines as original as possible⁴³ had become common characteristics of the tabloids. Thus, the observation that the *Bild*, while both being sexist and chauvinistically German, appears rather restrained compared to its English counterparts, particularly *The Sun*,⁴⁴ may be partly due to economic and cultural determinants within the domain of the print media.

Furthermore, the “hyping of national rivalries as one way of appealing to and attracting an audience” (Boyle & Haynes 2000: 164) seems to be particularly intriguing for the English tabloids with regard to the Germans. Keil (2005: 144) depicts the situation like this:

Of course, each Englishman will concede with a little forced smile that the English tabloid papers are the worst everyday drugs of their society. On the other hand, the tabloids reach out to 10 million addicts daily. [...] And even more in connection with Germany encounters.

To put it more bluntly: ‘Kraut bashing’ sells. The fact that in 1990, England’s public appears to regard the Germans as ‘enemy no.1’ – and this applies to the broadsheets as well as the tabloid press – may also have a lot to do with the political situation in Europe at that time. Germany’s new-won political and economic dominance along with Britain’s decline in these areas and their fear of the re-united ‘super-power’ becoming excessively nationalistic and threatening the power balance are said to have created an atmosphere of envy, mistrust and hostility during the Thatcher era (cf. Blain et al. 1993: 59). Several of the press articles from *The Sun* and *The Times* discussed in chapter 4 confirm this impression, particularly with regard to the ‘concern’ in the quality press about nationalistic tendencies in Germany. Similarly, the supposed re-emergence of ‘German character’ in the sphere of politics, which here means an ‘all-conquering, aggressive, arrogant’ personality, is reflected in the military-coloured, negative stereotypes of mechanical efficiency.

Certainly mingled with these political issues is the history of football encounters between England and Germany from 1966 to 1990. As found in the analysis, football nostalgia in England revolves around their World Cup win in 1966, but is frequently seen in connection with the military victories during the wars (‘Two World Wars and one World Cup’). Given the sporting and, what’s worse for the ‘Motherland’ of football, footballing inferiority that developed in games against Germany after 1966,⁴⁵ the discourses of failure relating to England and, on the other hand, of success relating to Germany ‘had to’ be countered by references to a ‘historical’ English supremacy. In the coverage of the 1990 World Cup, frequent references are made to periods of English ‘greatness’ in a sporting, political, military and, significantly, moral sense – periods when English ‘character’ was

⁴³ Cf. Honigstein 2006: 152 and Keil 2005: 144.

⁴⁴ See also Beck 2006:36, Honigstein 2006:152 and Blain et al. 1993:59.

⁴⁵ See Appendix I.

'manifested' through fairness, toughness and fighting spirit. These cravings of 'old times of glory' put into perspective the attitude towards the Germans, as they came to be depicted as the major obstacle on England's way to success after 1966, on and off the pitch. Germany's development from a country 'on its knees' to an economic super-power in Europe certainly increased the 'English' sense of 'unfairness of life'. Apart from that, the fact that England lost the semi-final in 1990 through a penalty shoot-out only strengthened the stereotype of the arch rival's all-conquering, mechanical efficiency.

Thus, one might say that the basic intention of 'Kraut bashing' displays in English tabloids in 1990 is more than just to insult the rival. As Blain et al. found in their analysis of reporting during 'Wimbledon '91' (when German tennis stars Boris Becker, Michael Stich and Steffi Graf were rather successful), such displays "represent an attempt to belittle a clear German victory by interspersing references to it with elements of widespread and deeply rooted popular discourses relating to Germany's greatest failures" (Blain et al. 1993: 148). Obviously, these failures are primarily linked with the war. Hence, 'Wimbledon '91' seems to confirm the impression of 'Italia '90'.

The role of the journalistic meta-discourse in England appears to be almost negligible in and after 1990. As suggested in the analysis, this could be due to an indifferent attitude towards representations abroad; but it could also be a sign of a lack of foreign language competence – often, German journalists are better at English than vice versa.

German press 1990

The German press coverage in 1990 seems to be as coloured by the current political developments as the English reporting. The strained political relationship between England and Germany is mirrored by the fact that the papers to some degree distance themselves from the 'English character' they had admired so much 24 years earlier, paying little attention to similarities between the 'English' and 'German' style, highlighting some negative stereotypes (unattractive football, 'the English thug') and characterising their own attitude as 'polite respect but nothing more'. However, no fierce insults or 'Anglophobic' displays are found; reflecting on the disastrous impact of nationalism in earlier periods of German history, especially the broadsheets are wary about excessive jingoism and nationalism.

Otherwise, German self-assessments are very much marked by the fervour and excitement of the ongoing reunification process. A 'sensible' amount of patriotism is defended in the quality papers, whereas the *Bild*, traditionally rather oriented to the political right, features an abundance of chauvinistic and nationalistic displays, again mingling sports

and politics. With the footballing triumph, the ‘German qualities’ of discipline and efficiency are said to be brought to perfection. And as a global political and economic power, the German self-image conveyed in the tabloids reaches new (positive) heights – which in turn seems to make them less sensitive with regard to ‘Kraut bashing’ displays in England.

Thus, the sporting, political and economic contexts are extremely relevant in the framing of national character in both countries` press in 1990.

English press 2001

In 2001, the English press generally seems to continue where it left off in 1990 – though the broadsheets exhibit a lesser, the tabloids a greater extent of Anti-German displays. ‘Kraut bashing’ having become something of a sport in the English popular papers, its cultural embedding has to be taken into consideration. Beck (2006: 37 ff.) points out the “Hitlerisation” of Germany in England through syllabuses (only focussing on German history from 1933-1945), through the “popular ‘histories’” propagated by the tabloid press and history channels, and through the ‘Germanophobic’ comic tradition within British humour (e.g., *Dad’s Army*, *‘Allo, ‘Allo*, *Fawlty Towers*). All these factors certainly influence the average Englishman`s image of the Germans and are in turn reflective of a forceful stereotypification of national character.

The reasons of this English ‘Germanophobia’, particularly the ‘hype’ in the tabloids, are examined quite entertainingly in a conversation between *Bild* journalist Walter M. Straten and chief football correspondent for *The Sun* Steven Howard at a meeting in Munich before the England–Germany encounter in 2001. The following is an extract of the ‘interview’ (Straten being the ‘interviewer’):

- Why are you like that?
 - Maybe because we live on an island and feel threatened on all sides. And you Germans aren`t even our worst enemy. Sorry, lad, but you Krauts are just no.2 after the Scots. [...]
 - Why do you always draw comparisons to wartime and Nazi-Germany?
 - We English are too much like you. Therefore we know how to hurt you. Me, I think that`s just silly.
 - So you`d rather have an oompah band in front of the team hotel?
 - Well, Voller was lucky. [...] It didn`t really work out the way we had planned.
 - Are you jealous because of our victories over you?
 - Jealous?! Huh! Just recently we thrashed you 9-0. That was on March 16, 1909...
- (*Bild*, 01/09/2001)

Evidently, Howard`s answers to Straten`s seriously-meant questions are either evasive or highly ironic, confirming the notion of ‘traditional English humour’. However, the dialogue does touch upon some vague explanations for the English attitude, namely England`s special geographic position (and, in extension, the peculiar ‘psyche’), the likeness of English and German ‘character’ and the resulting envy of the arch rival, especially with regard to football

history. Thus, the interview may be seen as indicative of an ‘English’ inferiority complex mingled with a good deal of ‘English humour’.

Likewise, Simon Barnes in *The Times* (01/09/2001) confirms the theory which explains the general ‘Germanophobia’, the ‘Stand up if you won the war’ chants in the football stadia and the ‘Kraut bashing’ headlines in the tabloids in terms of a strong envy of German superiority. Persistent references to German failures and cravings of historical ‘English greatness’ serve to suppress the knowledge that “Britannia doesn’t rule the waves, and World Cup Willie [the official mascot in 1966] doesn’t rule football. [...] For 35 years, England have relied on their secret weapon to beat Germany. The past” (*Times*, 01/09/2001). Accordingly, with the ‘historic’ win in 2001, the gloating throughout the English press is regarded as a ‘national’ feeling of triumph and glee.

Finally, it should be mentioned here that the relative scarcity of national stereotypes in 2001 and 2007 may correspond to Inthorn’s findings (2006: 157ff.; see section 2.3) that the national dimension of media sport is increasingly challenged by globalisation and the emergence of international ‘superstars’. This also applies to the German press. Nevertheless, the strong focus on ‘German’ arrogance in the English papers in 2001 may again indicate feelings of inferiority and jealousy on the English part.

German press 2001

It has been evident in the analysis that the journalistic meta-discourse is of particular importance in Germany. Assessments from abroad, especially when they are positive and come from the ‘arch enemy’ England, seem to be vital for the German self-image, which – at least in 1966 and 2001 – remains influenced and dogged by a ‘collective’ sense of guilt and shame at the horrors of the war. In 2001, German press coverage is extremely concerned with English representations. This is especially true for the tabloids; like in the English press, the broadsheets rather seem to distance themselves from the hype developing in the popular papers.

The scantness of military language and the emphasis on the sporting nature of the rivalry with England can be seen as elements in this ‘national self-consciousness’ that tries to free itself from its ‘baggage of history’ and war-connected image abroad. Thus, the English ‘Kraut bashing’ in 2001 is dismissed initially with conciliatory, humourous overbearance as a part of ‘British/English humour’ both in German broadsheets and tabloids – “because not to react with humour to humour would be seen as a lack of intelligence and, what’s more, would only confirm all the prejudices against the Germans” (Keil 2005: 143). However, as the ‘Anti-

German hype' in England becomes extremely fierce and 'war mongering', the attempts to 'excuse' the English stance with humour gradually cease in the German popular press. The resulting 'journalistic war' between tabloids of both countries marks a low point in Anglo-German relations; moreover, it may be taken as a symptom of two nations which are not at ease with their history.

English press 2007

The analysis of English press coverage in 2007 suggests an overwhelmingly friendly attitude towards the Germans. While it remains doubtful whether reporting of a friendly may be seen as unproblematically diagnostic of Anglo-German relations, it is remarkable in the light of the Anti-German attitude exhibited during the last encounter between the countries in 2001 that the framing of the Germans is entirely positive in 2007; German stereotypes are less negative than earlier, aggressive language extremely scarce and war references completely absent. In line with the harmonious official Anglo-German relationship, the English press also seems to have taken a more relaxed stance to the former 'arch enemy', though the 'classical' sporting rivalry is still stressed and even mythologised.

As indicated earlier, the World Cup 2006 in Germany apparently had considerable impact on the renewal of the framing of German national character. An utterly positive image was promoted not only through the largely successful and attractive football played by the German team but also through the all but perfect organisation and general 'party atmosphere' in the country (cf. sections 1.1 and 3.2). If the German image has not been completely revised after 2006, it certainly seems likely that a positive shift of stereotypes (which Albrecht et al. 2007 confirm) and a strengthening of Anglo-German ties have taken place on the English side; another indicator of which is the supporters' slogan 'Danke für 2006' at Wembley before the friendly.

Have the Nazi comparisons and complexes with regard to the Germans finally been overcome? Have the English tabloid press and their readership got enough of the 'Kraut bashing' after the hype in 2001? Is the public still interested in a 'war mongering' that refers to events more than sixty years back in time – events that a very low and steadily decreasing percentage of the population have witnessed themselves? It may be too early to answer these questions. And it takes more than a friendly to be able draw somewhat 'safe' conclusions from the press representations of 'Germanness' and Anglo-German relations. Nonetheless, it

seems evident that the construction of German character in the English press is less and less war-related and appears to be on a remarkably positive course in 2007.⁴⁶

German press 2007

German press coverage of the 2007 friendly mirrors the allegedly new-won German self-confidence. The emphasis on their own mental superiority, the considerable amount of military and aggressive imagery in the tabloids, the exceptional focus on the Anglo-German (sporting) rivalry, the factual account of the ‘traditional’ English ‘Kraut bashing’ in the quality press and the abundance of provocative, gloating, chauvinistic displays in the *Bild* along with the apparent indifference towards journalistic representations in England all suggest a rather distanced attitude towards the counterpart and a great amount of self-satisfaction.

The positively revised self-image in Germany after the 2006 World Cup and the awareness of their improved reputation in England and the rest of the world certainly had a consequential impact on the framing of national character in 2007. Moreover, the fact that Germany won the highly symbolic encounter with the ‘arch rival’ at the new Wembley must have added to the triumphant mood in the papers. Again, the question remains whether the extraordinary self-confidence in German press reporting can be said to be reflective of a ‘new era’ of self-esteem, an era in which the ‘Nazi baggage’ and ‘German angst’ have finally been shrugged off and in which a new generation (whose grandparents are too young to have experienced the war) creates an image of a Germany that is no longer dogged by its failures from the beginning of the 20th century. These questions will have to be considered in future studies of national character in sports reporting.

⁴⁶ As for individual feedbacks by Englishmen on the 2006 World Cup, the survey mentioned in sections 1.5 and 3.2 (see Appendix II) also suggests a rather positive attitude towards Germany and German football, confirming the impression of the English press coverage. Here are some of the answers to question 4 (“Has the World Cup 2006 changed your opinion of Germany/German football in any ways?”): “Yes. Because u realize the Germans are very nice people”; “yes; good atmosphere, not a bad team”; “no not really coz they are a good team anyway and Germany is a nice place”; “the World Cup showed me how much Germans love football and how well they get on with other nations”; “it was really good [...] the Germans were very welcoming and polite”.

Final comment

As has been obvious in this study, Anglo-German relations have gone through several highs and lows during the last 50 years. Accordingly, mutual representations and discourses of national character have been influenced by and have in turn influenced the development of these relations. To a large extent the focal point of all the envy, gloating, self-consciousness and rivalry, soccer and its coverage remain important spheres in the forging and reflecting of discourses of 'Englishness' and 'Germanness'. It will be truly interesting to follow the further developments of these discourses in future football encounters between the *Tommies* and the *Krauts*.

References

- Albrecht, Uwe, et al.. *Ein Bericht über den Einfluss der Fußballweltmeisterschaft 2006 unter dem Motto 'Die Welt zu Gast bei Freunden™' auf Stereotype der Gäste*. Hochschule Fulda, Fachbereich Sozial- und Kulturwissenschaften. Fulda. 2007.
- Ashmore, A.D. & F.K. del Boca. "Conceptual Approaches to Stereotypes and Stereotyping." *Cognitive Processes in Stereotyping and Intergroup Behaviour*. Ed. D.L. Hamilton. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum, 1981. 1-35.
- Beck, Peter. "Two World Wars and One World Cup." *BBC History* 7 [8]. 2006. 35-39.
- Bishop, Hywel & Adam Jaworski. "'We Beat `em': Nationalism and the Hegemony of Homogeneity in the British Press Reportage of Germany versus England during Euro 2000." *Discourse and Society* 14 [3]. 2003. 243-271.
- Blain, Neil, Raymond Boyle & Hugh O'Donnell. *Sport and National Identity in the European Media*. Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1993.
- Boyle, Raymond & Richard Haynes. *Power Play. Sport, The Media and Popular Culture*. London: Longman/Pearson Education, 2000.
- Dragowski, Jürgen, Diethelm Knauf & Ian Watson, eds. *Alive and Kicking. Fußball zwischen Deutschland und England*. Hamburg/Berlin: Argument Verlag, 1995.
- Eisenberg, Christiane. "A German view." *BBC History* 7 [8]. 2006. 39.
- Fairclough, Norman & Ruth Wodak. "Critical Discourse Analysis." *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction: Vol. 2. Discourse as Social Interaction*. Ed. T.A. van Dijk. London: Sage, 2003. 258-284.
- Fox, Kate. *Watching the English. The Hidden Rules of English Behaviour*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 2005.
- Honigstein, Raphael. *Harder, better, faster, stronger. Die geheime Geschichte des englischen Fußballs*. Köln: Kiepenheuer & Witsch, 2006.
- Inthorn, Sanna. "A game of nations? Football and national identities." *German Football: History, Culture, Society and the World Cup 2006*. Eds. Alan Tomlinson & Christopher Young. London: Routledge, 2006.
- Jucker, Andreas H. *Social stylistics: syntactic variation in British newspapers*. Topics in English linguistics, Vol. 6. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1992.
- Keil, Christopher. "Herr we go! Aus Liebe zum Fußball: Englands Öffentlichkeit braucht die Deutschen als Feindbild." *England 1966*. Ed. Süddeutsche Zeitung. München: Süddeutsche Zeitung WM-Bibliothek, 2005. 143-145.
- Koller, Werner. *Deutsche in der Deutschschweiz*. Reihe Sprachlandschaft, Vol. 10. Aarau: Verlag Sauerländer, 1992.
- Koller, Werner. "Stereotypes und Stereotype. Sozialpsychologische und linguistische Aspekte." *Muttersprache* 108 [1]. 1998. 38-53.
- Kuper, Simon. *Football Against the Enemy*. London: Orion, 1996.
- Maguire, Joseph, Emma Poulton & Catherine Possamai. "Weltkrieg III? Media Coverage of England versus Germany in Euro 96." *Journal of Sport and Social Issues* 23 [4]. 1999. 439-454.

Murfin, Ross & Supryia M. Ray, eds. *The Bedford Glossary of Critical and Literary Terms*. 2nd ed. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2003.

O'Donnell, Hugh. "Mapping the Mythical: A Geopolitics of National Sporting Stereotypes." *Discourse and Society* 5 [3]. 1994. 345-380.

Snyder, Mark. "On the self-perpetuating nature of social stereotypes." *Cognitive Processes in Stereotyping and Intergroup Behaviour*. Ed. D.L. Hamilton. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum, 1981. 183-212.

Tannen, Deborah. *The argument culture*. London: Virago Press, 1999.

Web sources

Deutscher Fußballbund/Nationalelf – Homepage: www.dfb.de ; accessed 20/08/2007.

Other works consulted

Böttiger, Helmut. *Schlußball. Die Deutschen und ihr Lieblingssport*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 2006.

Hesse-Lichtenberger, Ulrich. *Tor! The Story of German Football*. London: WSC Books, 2003.

Hodge, Robert & Gunther Kress. *Social Semiotics*. Oxford: Polity Press, 1988.

Kicker Sportmagazin, ed. *2006 Deutschland. Fußball-Weltmeisterschaft*. München: Copress Verlag, 2006.

Ramsden, John. "England versus Germany, Soccer and War Memory: John Huston's *Escape to victory* (1981)." *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television* 26 [4]. 2007. 579-590.

Stoddart, Brian. "Sport, Cultural Politics and International Relations: England versus Germany, 1935." *Soccer & Society* 7 [1]. 2006. 29-50.

Tomlinson, Alan & Christopher Young. *German Football: History, Culture, Society and the World Cup 2006*. London: Routledge, 2006.

Van Dijk, Teun A., ed. *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction: Vol. 2. Discourse as Social Interaction*. London: Sage, 2003.

Appendix

I Germany vs England – games survey

| Date | Venue | Result | Event |
|-------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 20/04/1908 | Berlin | Germany – England 1-5 | |
| 13/03/1909 | Oxford | England – Germany 9-0 | |
| 14/04/1911 | Berlin | Germany – England 2-2 | |
| 21/03/1913 | Berlin | Germany – England 0-3 | |
| 10/05/1930 | Berlin | Germany – England 3-3 | |
| 04/12/1935 | London | England – Germany 3-0 | |
| 14/05/1938 | Berlin | Germany – England 3-6 | |
| 01/12/1954 | London | England – Germany 3-1 | |
| 26/05/1956 | Berlin | Germany – England 1-3 | |
| 12/05/1965 | Nuremberg | Germany – England 0-1 | |
| 23/02/1966 | London | England – Germany 1-0 | |
| 30/07/1966 | London | England – Germany 4-2 | World Cup Final |
| 01/06/1968 | Hanover | Germany – England 1-0 | |
| 14/06/1970 | Leon (MEX) | Germany – England 3-2 | World Cup Quarter Finals |
| 29/04/1972 | London | England – Germany 1-3 | EC Quarter Finals |
| 13/05/1972 | Berlin | Germany – England 0-0 | EC QF |
| 12/03/1975 | London | England – Germany 2-0 | |
| 22/02/1978 | Munich | Germany – England 2-1 | |
| 29/06/1982 | Madrid | Germany – England 0-0 | World Cup |
| 13/10/1982 | London | England – Germany 1-2 | |
| 12/06/1985 | Mexico City | Germany – England 0-3 | |
| 09/09/1987 | Dusseldorf | Germany – England 3-1 | |
| 04/07/1990 | Torino (ITA) | Germany – England 5-4 | World Cup Semi-Finals |
| 11/09/1991 | London | England – Germany 0-1 | |
| 19/06/1993 | Detroit (USA) | Germany – England 2-1 | U.S. Cup |
| 26/06/1996 | London | England – Germany 6-7 | EC Semi-Finals |
| 17/06/2000 | Charleroi (BEL) | England – Germany 1-0 | EC |
| 07/10/2000 | London | England – Germany 0-1 | World Cup Qualifying |
| 01/09/2001 | Munich | Germany – England 1-5 | World Cup Qualifying |
| 22/08/2007 | London | England – Germany 1-2 | |

Key: EC: European championship
 QF: quarter-finals

The games in **bold** are those discussed in the present thesis.

Source: www.dfb.de, accessed 03/09/2007

II. Questionnaire

Survey conducted on 27/07/07 in Belfast Barracks, Osnabrück Garrison, British Forces Germany.

Astrid Fedeler
MA-thesis 2007/08
University of Bergen/ Norway
Astrid.Fedeler@student.uib.no

QUESTIONNAIRE

Football in Germany and England

1. Personal data

Age _____ years

Sex male ____ female ____

Occupation (or military rank) _____

Place of birth _____

How long have you been living in Germany? _____ years

2. Your attitude towards football in general

2.1 Personal interest in football (circle a number)

not interested at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 very interested

2.2 How great a part does football take in your life? (circle a number)

does not play any role at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 very important

2.3 Do you play football actively yourself? Yes ____ No ____

2.4 Do you watch football games on TV?

No ____ very rarely ____ sometimes ____ often / regularly ____

2.5 Do you listen to football commentaries on the radio?

No ____ very rarely ____ sometimes ____ often / regularly ____

2.6 How often do you watch football games live in the stadium?

Never ____ very rarely ____ sometimes ____ often / regularly ____

2.7 Are you only interested in the Premier League or do you follow other leagues as well?

Only Premier League ____ other (specify) _____

3. German versus English football

3.1 Which is your favourite team in England? _____

3.2 How important is the English national team for you? (circle a number)

hardly interests me 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 I'm their biggest fan

3.3 Which is closest to your heart:

your favourite club team _____ or

the English national team _____ ?

3.4 How well acquainted are you with the Bundesliga?

not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 very well

3.5 Do you have a favourite team in Germany? (specify) _____

3.6 Associations / brainstorming:

Which words immediately come to mind if you think of the following terms?

German football

- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____

English football

- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____

3.7 Who is the most typical English player? _____

Why / On account of which qualities/ foibles? _____

3.8 Who is the most typical German player? _____

Why / On account of which qualities/ foibles? _____

3.9 Which game between England and Germany is most memorable to you? Why? How do you feel about that particular event?

4. World Cup 2006 in Germany

Has the World Cup 2006 changed your opinion of Germany/ German football in any ways? (please specify)

Date _____ 2007