

John Terry and the Predicament of Englishness: Ambivalence and Nostalgia in the Premier League Era

Neil Ewen

This article examines media discourse surrounding the Chelsea and England footballer John Terry and argues that his iconicity embodies multiple anxieties about Englishness and English football in the era of neoliberalism. In a nostalgic culture in search of 'traditional' English heroes, Terry is celebrated for his physicality and traditionally 'English' style of play; yet, his off-field behaviour is seen to be both emblematic and symptomatic of a celebrity culture considered to betray the values coded as English in football history. Taking Terry's dilemma as a starting point, this article historicizes the rise of footballers as celebrities; examines widespread anxiety about the loss of the typically English, noble working class footballer; and interrogates the problems of thinking about sporting icons of Englishness without recourse to the dominant nostalgic mode.

Introduction

[W]hat a lift it would give the footballing nation if the England captaincy reverted to being an honour rather than a public-relations hand grenade. Terry, for all his qualities as a leader and a footballing central defender — his hard-man image belies the Chelsea captain's excellence as a distributor of the ball from the back — has been a near-disaster in the job, a recurrent source of embarrassment [...] England cannot be led out again by someone who comes with more baggage than Louis Vuitton.ⁱ

The wider question in all this is: why is the Chelsea defender so often given the benefit of the doubt? He continues to command a reputation as the embodiment of the English bulldog spirit, a man who would sacrifice his right arm for club and country. But when you look at the totality of his actions, it is difficult to understand how he has managed to sustain such a lucrative aura of moral dependability for so long. [...] Perhaps the most extraordinary thing is that Terry has managed to sustain his position as the England captain. This is surprising because the England captaincy is not just a footballing position, but a symbolic role as a figurehead of our national game.ⁱⁱ

Football, history, national identity and nostalgia: these are the broad coordinates within which the present article interprets the media treatment of the Chelsea and England centre half John Terry, a man whose career has been marked by controversy and scandal, and whose iconicity acts a lightning rod for discursive expression of the

anxieties of his era, especially regarding the status of English football and English national identity. Underpinned by a strong sense of nostalgia, the epigraphs to this article are representative of the ambivalence with which Terry is greeted in both the popular and broadsheet press, and across other media outlets. For both Barclay and Syed, Terry embodies the traditions of English football in terms of playing style, but betrays the traditions of English football in terms of his off-pitch behaviour. Terry's iconicity, therefore, is constructed as both symptomatic and representative of the excesses of the neoliberal Premier League era: an era whose values are widely considered to clash with the history and traditions of English football.

In this discourse, Terry's celebrity is bound up in his success in the globalized, multicultural, and moneyed Premier League, and is to blame for his off-field excesses. This celebrity and excess is not only blamed for the deficiencies of the perpetually underperforming England national team, in the assumption that players are now more interested in money than they are in 'playing for the shirt', it is also positioned discursively as being at odds with everything for which the England national team is considered to stand. As this article will argue, the focus of English football's popular historiography in the Premier League era – as well as much of the banal, everyday discourse of the media – has been to attempt to form a rearguard action, reinforcing ideologically ideas that English football and Englishness rest together in the history of the Victorian era and in the values of muscular Christianity, in response to the real and imagined threats posed by globalization and neoliberalism.

But why does Terry, particularly, act as lightning rod for these anxieties? Why do so many critics agree that '[t]he behaviour of John Terry...sums up all that is foul about

modern football’ and that ‘[e]ven by the skewed moral standards of today's professional football, John Terry is in a class of his own’?ⁱⁱⁱ As Oliver Kay notes, ‘he is hardly the first sportsman to have strayed from his marital bed or to have lusted after money’, and the list of English professional footballers caught up in scandals over the last few years – including current England internationals – is indeed a lengthy one.^{iv} In the months either side of the 2010 FIFA World Cup finals, for example, no fewer than three other high-profile players appeared on tabloid front pages for indulging in extramarital affairs (Cole and Crouch) or alleged dalliances with prostitutes (Rooney). One reason behind the focus on Terry lies in the fact that none of those other players have occupied the England captaincy and have been seen to betray the traditions and meanings bound up in a position that is widely seen as a ‘symbolic role as a figurehead for our national game’.

As discussed below, while the figure of the captain is relatively inconsequential in other national contexts, it is an issue of peculiar importance to English sensibilities. Although the list of Terry’s indiscretions is particularly ignominious – ranging from insulting American tourists in the wake of the September 2001 terrorist attacks, through urinating in public, to being caught parking his car in a disabled bay in order to ensure a short walk to a restaurant – Terry’s most serious *faux pas* – sleeping with a teammate’s ex-partner, and allegedly subjecting an opponent to racial abuse – led to disruption within the England squad and his being stripped of the England captaincy before the 2010 World Cup and UEFA Euro 2012 (having been reinstated in between these tournaments).^v The reaction to both incidents (discussed in detail below) can be read as a peculiar kind of national trauma, and this is why Terry is considered to be

distinguished more than any other player as the embodiment of the anxieties examined in this article.

While Terry is overwhelmingly constructed in popular discourse as a product of the neoliberal present in terms of his excesses and vulgar off-pitch behaviour, he is also constructed as a product of the history, traditions, and values of English football in terms of his style of play: a style based on physicality, 'hardness', functionality and collective endeavour, in opposition to the stereotype of flair and individualism attached to foreign teams and players. His embodiment of 'Englishness' in this sense is overwhelmingly considered as valuable and noble. This article will contend, however, that the constant celebration of Terry's 'traditional' English values only serves to emphasize the ambivalence that underpins the cultural memory of English football history as a whole. While worries about the 'Englishness' of the Premier League (most obvious in expressions of angst about the dissolution of the distinctive style of English league football) are voiced with every other foreign player's arrival in England, the quality of the league itself has not been in serious doubt for going on two decades. These are worries that are thrown into sharp relief when we consider the lack of success of the England national team – a team that continues to comprise English players and play in a recognizable 'English' style, despite fears that changes to eligibility rules allowing more scope to 'choose' their nationality would render meaningless 'the point' of national teams. The flip side of the anxiety about the multinational Premier League, then, is the pride in being the host country of the world's richest / exciting / quality-laden domestic competition (interchangeable adjectives in Sky TV promotions).

All of which is to say that to speak of English football history and values is to enter in to an inevitably nostalgic discussion about the disappearance of a ‘golden era’, and that English football history is always structured by loss, even when the national team wins. Tied to notions of Victorian values and muscular Christianity, the version of Englishness idealized in English football history is one tied to a tradition that has been annihilated by the forward march of history: economic, social, and cultural. The historical ascendancy of neoliberal economics (dramatized so intensely in the realm of sport by the Premier League) has led to a culture in which the working class has been demonized, and to search for a hero in sport or in other areas of ‘entertainment’ is to drown in a sea of celebrity scandal. It is to recognize that noble heroes such as Bobby Moore have been replaced by the like of Terry, the ultimate ‘chav’.^{vi}

Much work in celebrity studies in general, and on sporting celebrity in particular, has pointed out that throughout the twentieth century – with the growing symbiosis between sport and the media – the traditional star was replaced with the depthless celebrity.^{vii} The point to be emphasized here, in the context of a discussion on John Terry, is the strength of the relationship between the discursive and imaginative constructions of Englishness and Victorian ideas of virtue, and the extent of their (re)articulation in football discourse in the Premier League era, when, as this article argues, the expression of these values in media discourse and in other cultural products (such as literature boom of ‘the new football writing’) has intensified.

In terms of playing style, too, English football has been ‘swimming against the tide of progress’ for much of its history. As Brian Glanville (a journalist who has spent his

whole career warning against the navel-gazing of English football's establishment)

reminds us, as early as 1923 James Catton had written:

If England is to retain her prestige in the face of other nations, all players, whether they be forwards or backs, must use more intelligence, and by constant practice obtain control of and power over the ball with the inside and outside of each foot. Unless players get out of the rut into which they have fallen, the game will lost its popularity and Great Britain her fame.^{viii}

Glanville, himself, suggested in 1955 that England's position as a football nation had suffered from years of living in 'splendid isolation', opening *Soccer Nemesis* with the following assessment:

The story of British football and the foreign challenge is the story of a vast superiority, sacrificed through stupidity, short-sightedness, and wanton insularity. It is a story of shamefully wasted talent, extraordinary complacency and infinite self-deception [...] British style and tactics, which were once the envy of every other country, are now both clumsy and outmoded.^{ix}

This assessment from Glanville came in the aftermath of a particularly traumatic moment in English football history: the twin heavy defeats to the 'Magnificent Magyars' of Hungary in November 1953 and May 1954. These defeats, in turn, came after a shock defeat to the USA in the 1950 World Cup finals. Glanville's observations therefore make explicit an anxiety about the loss of England's preeminence on the world stage that has informed English football history ever since. In the wider sweep of history, we can even read England's 1966 World Cup victory in terms of a discourse of loss, in the sense that the tournament only briefly assuaged fears that English pragmatism and functionality were anachronistic in the face of foreign opposition through Alf Ramsey's shrewd marshalling of the 'Wingless Wonders'. However celebrated that victory, the fact is that England's preeminence

was a short-lived phenomenon. As such, the 1966 team has been like a noose around the neck of every England team ever since. Indeed, both times John Terry was sacked as England captain the media has projected the ghost of Bobby Moore as a haunting example of everything Terry is not. In some ways, then, 1966 represents a key marker of ambivalence in English football history: a victory to be savoured and celebrated as the pinnacle of achievement, for sure; but at the same time a reminder of England's lack of success since, a historical memorandum that the English functional style really is obsolete.

To consider this discourse, then, is to address latent anxieties about the loss of the status and prestige that came with being the nation that codified the sport and gave the game to the world. It is also to acknowledge that nostalgia has long underpinned the lexicon of English football's historiography. Another contention of this article, however, is that amid the anxieties brought on by globalization and the neoliberal takeover of English football at the end of the twentieth century, nostalgia became what might be termed the 'cultural dominant' in terms of football discourse in the Premier League era. Football in England (as, of course, elsewhere) creates and thrives upon narrative processes coloured by multiple, conflicting emotions – among them, euphoria, happiness, despair, frustration, and anger – in a series of fleeting moments during games, or over longer periods such as whole seasons and lifetimes. However, it is impossible to think critically about English football in the neoliberal present without considering the impact and force of what Svetlana Boym calls 'restorative nostalgia' that colours the ambivalent discourse concerning everything from ticket prices and over-paid players, to the soullessness of generic stadia and the mass

infiltration of domestic leagues by the cheating, diving, money-grabbing foreigners of popular stereotype.^x

One main symptom of this condition is a nostalgic yearning for 'heroic' players of a pre-Premier League 'golden age' before commercialism sullied the 'soul' of the game. As such, the iconicity of John Terry is both symptomatic and emblematic of anxieties about the condition of Englishness, English football, and, indeed, the Englishness of English football, that are reinforced (as Michael Billig suggests in his study of nationalism) in a banal manner in the daily discourses of the sport, but which flare up at certain moments, such as major international football tournaments, England losses, and scandals such as those involving the erstwhile England captain.^{xi}

Ambivalence and Nostalgia in Contemporary English Football Discourse

In the final chapter of *My Father and Other Working-Class Football Heroes*^{xii} Gary Imlach writes about arriving in the USA in 1989 to begin a decade-long stint reporting on the NFL for British television and recalls finding the culture of American professional sport to be strange and entirely foreign: a 'cash-fuelled soap opera ... [that] struck me as an entirely indigenous phenomenon, something which had no parallel at home [in the UK]'.^{xiii} This observation follows from a brief interview with an unnamed gridiron fan whose relationship with the Buffalo Bills was defined by a peculiar sense of cynicism and alienation. The fan told him that 'players are just chasin' the money' and 'teams threaten to leave every time a city won't come up with the dollars for a new stadium'. 'Nowadays', the fan continued, 'we're basically rootin' for jerseys... If you like a team's jersey colour, go root for 'em'.^{xiv}

We might note the irony in the use of the word ‘root’, for roots in this account are exactly what is considered to be missing in the arena of professional American Football, with players and teams in constant flight to where the money is, ‘emancipated from local constraints’ in the words of the sociologist Zygmunt Bauman.^{xv} The fan’s passion and sense of loyalty to his team was met with an absence of reciprocation, leaving a relationship between fan and team based purely on consumption. As such, the culture of American Football is characterized in this example as being defined by superficiality, surrounding a sport whose *raison d’être* is little more than to provide frivolous entertainment and spectacle for the masses in the name of maximizing profits for the few.^{xvi}

Imlach’s declaration that America’s sporting culture has ‘no parallel at home’ suggests, through the creation of a binary opposition between commercialism and authenticity, an idealized version of sporting culture – specifically football culture – in Britain. In characterizing American football as decadent and vulgar – having succumbed to a historical movement towards ‘pure’ commercialism, as the fan’s use of the word ‘nowadays’ laments – football in Britain is, by implication, imagined as ‘authentic’ and prelapsarian. That is to say, Imlach implies that where American football is often considered merely frivolous entertainment – articulated in the pejorative use of ‘soap opera’ – football in Britain is imagined as being of some higher cultural importance, an intrinsically valuable pursuit; where the NFL comprises franchises which can be moved at an owner’s whim, football in Britain comprises clubs which are institutions with long histories of being extensions and representatives of local communities; where American fandom, on the one hand, is exemplified as being based on a somewhat arbitrary choice, fandom in Britain is, on

the other, assumed to be governed by longstanding familial lineage or geographical ties; and thus, where the value of American sport is articulated as being governed primarily by commercial concerns, the value of sport in the UK is assumed to be that it cultivates complex and meaningful relationships between individuals and groups.^{xvii}

This binary lends emphasis to Imlach's next observation: that 'by the time I arrived back [home] for good nearly a decade later ... the landscape was undoubtedly altered'.^{xviii} During his time in America, football in the UK had succumbed to a 'transatlantic drift', a widespread cultural shift towards treating football as a business rather than its traditional role as a cottage industry, and a general trend of professionalization, commercialization, and Americanization throughout every level of the sport. Although English football's bureaucratic system of governance can be seen as dissolving slowly throughout the second half of the twentieth century (beginning in the early 1960s with the abolition of the 'retain and transfer' system and the end of the maximum wage), the speed at which neoliberalism took hold in the early 1990s (fed by the new settlement between media companies and football, and the Bosman ruling of 1995) was shocking and traumatic. As Fynn and Davidson comment:

A fan returning to these shores [in 1996] after a four-year absence would not recognize the game he left behind. The players, their strip, their wages, their ages, the tactics, the stadia, the TV coverage, the transfer fees, the media attention, the club owners, the admission prices, the crowd make-up and the merchandising would perplex anyone who hadn't actually lived through the changes.^{xix}

Imlach's response to this shift, then, echoes the sentiments of the American football fan quoted above in the sense that he feels on his return to the UK that the process of commercialization had sullied football's purity: 'the stridency of the brash, relentless circus surrounding the game', he writes, 'made it seem increasingly remote, like someone else's sport. [...] Now I felt like a stranger to my own game'.^{xx}

On an initial reading, there is a certain irony in Imlach's reaction here – which implies a longing for football's past – because his book tends not to romanticize a 'golden era'. Indeed, it serves as one of the most powerful critiques of the inadequacies of what I term the bureaucratic system (the highly-regulated structure of governance which lasted, albeit with minor alterations, throughout the twentieth century until 1992), focusing specifically – through the lens of his own father's career as a professional footballer – on the ways in which players and fans in the first half of the twentieth century were exploited by their clubs through the lack of investment in physical infrastructure and harsh constraints on employee rights. As such, it stands apart from the prevalent trend in recent football discourse that not only speaks to a collective experience of disorientation but also seeks to nostalgically preserve an idealized view of football's history.

One of the joys of Imlach's book, therefore, is that it struggles elegantly with the ambivalent nature of football's recent historical trajectory, and declines to project the past as a simple utopia. A good example of this appears when he balances, on the one hand, that the new levels of investment in football's infrastructure had brought certain benefits to being a football spectator, with the realization on the other, that, for all the benefits that this investment had achieved, something sacred had been erased in this process (the feelings of connection with your team, with the players, with those fellow fans with whom, due to the conditions of old-style terraced stadia, you would

previously be squashed up against in both a bodily and emotional unity). Noting that football was no longer run by small-time businessmen for little or no profit and as focal points of their local communities, he argues that the structural shift to football becoming a big business – underpinned by a ‘dangerously leveraged Darwinism’ – had eroded the traditional relationship between fans and clubs:

The arrival of the Premiership with its empty columns of new all-time records waiting to be set, looked from a distance like football’s year zero ... [My friends] were reluctant to mourn the loss of a connection with the past for its own sake; a break with tradition may be no bad thing if tradition consists of standing to watch the game ankle-deep in a stream of other people’s piss. Still, how do you passionately support a PLC? How do you maintain the undying devotion that makes you a fan when the club is doing its damndest to turn you into a consumer? One answer is that you simply blank it all out and focus on the team, on what happens on the pitch. But what if the team is a rotating cast of millionaires with no more connection to your world than Tom Cruise, half of them here for no better reason than that the lira supply dried up in Serie A. What are you rooting for then?^{xxi}

Imlach’s book, then, can be considered as an excellent example of what Boym calls reflective nostalgia, in opposition to the restorative nostalgia that serves as a response to the traumatic neoliberal takeover of English football, and which can be seen as a discursive rearguard action: a method through which the disorientated, ambivalent culture attempts to regain its bearings.^{xxii}

As the Fynn and Davidson quote above outlines, the Premier League brought changes to every aspect of the sport's culture: 'the players, their strip, their wages, their ages, the tactics, the stadia, the TV coverage, the transfer fees, the media attention, the club owners, the admission prices, the crowd make-up and the merchandising'.^{xxiii} Clearly, constraints of space do not allow for a detailed examination each of these constituent parts of football culture in the present article; moreover, it seems almost idle to make reference to specific examples from media discourse that emphasize the discontent that individuals feel about the poor quality of the *Match of the Day* pundits' analysis or the fact that ticket prices are outrageously high. The point here is that these types of complaints are so entirely ubiquitous as to be familiar for everyone who engages with football in the contemporary era: that these types of complaints are now simply the very basis of everyday football discussion. Alongside the emotions of euphoria, happiness, despair, frustration, and anger that the sport still engenders, the discourse of English football is always, irrevocably coloured by ambivalence and nostalgia.

The following examples serve to illustrate this contention. In the article 'What On Earth Has Happened to Football?', Charlie Burgess writes:

...the game is in some sort of turmoil. Attendances at Premiership games are down, there is increasing disgust at the huge wages paid to the stars, and the appalling lack of discipline that some of them display both on and off the pitch is not only worrying to those of us watching with children but also detrimental to the general feeling about the game. And there is increasing worry among those who think that history, and the modern game's relationship with it, is being thrown away by those who administer the sport.^{xxiv}

Kaveh Solhekol's 'The Fifty Worst Things About Modern Football' outlines what he sees as television's pernicious impact on the sport, the decline of importance of historical competitions such as the FA Cup, a rise in the 'metrosexuality' of players at the expense of traditional masculinity, and the perception that a simple sport has been irrevocably complicated by the new focus on tactics, science, and technology.^{xxv} Sean Ingle's article 'Football Fans are Idiots' argues that, having been positioned as consumers, fans should respond to the recent cultural shift in the only way a capitalist system appreciates: by simply refusing to consume the sterile fare on offer.^{xxvi} Simon Jenkins's 'Forget the Bling and Egotists, This is the Beautiful Game' compares unfavourably football with cricket, arguing that the top footballers have become 'bling-encrusted idols' and that 'soccer is now a modern version of prize-fighting, choking on egoism and vulgarity'.^{xxvii} Meanwhile, Nick Davidson and Sean Hunt's book *Modern Football is Rubbish: An A – Z of All That is Wrong With the Beautiful Game* (2008) and Michael Henderson's *50 People Who Fouled Up Football* (2009) serve as a more in-depth riffs on the same themes.^{xxviii}

These are all examples of a restorative nostalgia. Each picks out something apparently bad in the present and claims (often implicitly) that in the past that thing was better (a simple binary opposition that closes down the contradictions inherent to any historical process), usually without providing detailed analysis of why the past was better, or solutions to the current problems. Each example, moreover, illustrates the emotional economy of football discourse in their use of words such as 'wrong', 'rubbish', and 'fouled'. (This emotional vocabulary is also present in texts about English football that do seek to understand the roots of the neoliberal takeover. Consider, for example, the titles *Big Money*, *Beautiful Game: Saving Soccer From*

Itself, Broken Dreams: Vanity, Greed and the Souring of British Football, The Beautiful Game? Searching for the Soul of Football).^{xxix}

These texts, then, represent the dominant notion that the commercialization of the sport has sullied its purity, creating a disenfranchised public. For these authors – even if they do not state it explicitly – neoliberalism changed football. Their frustrations repeatedly hone in on signs of financial excess: the extravagant lifestyles of players; the corporate box seats and the empty tiers that reflect the high ticket prices; the VIP lounges and fancy types of food in new stadia; the exorbitant price of replica strips; pink boots; the stratification of difference in financial resources and therefore success of clubs. All of which have alienated fans from the celebrities that used to be heroes; and the clubs that used to serve the local community.

In all these cases of restorative nostalgia, there is a yearning for English football's historical bureaucratic system of governance (or more specifically, a reformed system of bureaucracy) – even if this is not stated explicitly. Underpinning all of these articles is a desire for communion between fans, players, and clubs; and for uncomplicated and comprehensible notions of local and national identity: all provided under the old system (whatever its flaws) through the regulation of wages and movement.

This nostalgic yearning, then – the majority of it without an explicit political thrust – simply ends up being a function of the capitalist, neoliberal system, reinforcing the new status quo. This kind of restorative nostalgia masquerades as a critique of the system (in its laments about player wages, the big teams 'buying' trophies, etc). But its lack of political thrust renders it merely another cog in the system of neoliberalism. English football's history – its traditions, its former stars and sporting icons like Bobby Moore – becomes in this mode a series of themes and/or

images that are stripped of their residual political potential and sold to the consumer fan in a haze of nostalgic heritage. The endless articulation of nostalgia as critique has become a huge part of football's new neoliberal economy in itself, a staple of tabloid newspapers and radio phone-ins, which gives space to wallowing that leads to wallowing that leads to wallowing. Perversely, this discourse creates an ever-increasing sense of loss, the only cure for which (in its own eyes), is the articulation of more nostalgia which, ironically, only serves to perpetuate the cycle.

The Re-nationalization of English Football

One major strain in the ambivalent discourse of contemporary football concerns the loss of a coherent national identity. In March 2009 *TimesOnline* hosted a open forum and invited readers to debate the following question: 'Is English Football No Longer English?'.^{xxx} This debate took place in the aftermath of a pair of Champions League semi-finals in which three out of the four clubs were English: Chelsea, Liverpool, and Manchester United. In light of the fact that Premier League teams were dominating the most prestigious competition in Europe, this debate may, at first glance, seem to be a strange one to be conducting. However, as James Lawton suggested in the *Independent*, in these games

English football... was a distinctly marginal presence. We cannot say that [it is our game] because if our money pays for it through the turnstiles and TV subscriptions, it doesn't control it. Russian and American money does that, and foreign managers picked the teams and the tactics on Tuesday night.^{xxxi}

As more evidence that this success was not an English one, Lawton pointed to the fact that in one of the semi-finals, Chelsea v Liverpool, there were only two English players on the pitch. This predicament is emblematic of the wider trend in the Premier League, which many observers have seen as a hollowing out of Englishness in England's top league in terms of the ownership of its clubs and their makeup of their management and their players. 'At the dawn of the Premiership', wrote Amy Lawrence in 2005,

when only two new arrivals came from abroad, nobody could have foreseen the extent to which the English game would fling open its turnstiles to football folk from here, there and everywhere. Not just players. Managers, owners, sponsors, administrators, agents and even supporters have made England their sporting home.^{xxxii}

In concert with changes to the rules regarding player eligibility for national teams (in that, players more than ever before have scope to choose which nation they want to represent) the rise of wealth and power in club football in England and across Europe has led to explicit fears about the relevance of national teams. The views of Franz Beckenbauer, in a 2006 interview, are typical:

A European league will come and the top clubs will gain in power. One day there won't be national teams any more. They will be replaced in the World Cup by club sides. Europe is growing together. At the moment the national team has a high value. But the influence of the clubs is getting bigger.

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in Sport in History on 20 Nov 2013, available online:
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17460263.2013.850268>

In the same article in which Beckenbauer's comments were quoted, the *Observer* journalist Kevin Mitchell suggests that the time has come where the quality of the top club sides in Europe means that they could, theoretically, beat the top national teams, were they to meet. This idea would have been considered risible a generation before.

As much anxiety as there is surrounding national teams in the present era, the fact is that football and nations have a long and interweaved history that tends to play on the nostalgically minded. This is illustrated by Simon Barnes, when he writes:

The national team matters more than anything else in football. It is not the tallest in a family of giants, it is a vast mountain surrounded by an endless range of foothills. Club football is, without doubt, the heart of football, and the heart of football is opposition. But it is not the soul. The soul of football lies in unity. And nothing in football, nothing in life, unites people such as international football. Manchester United don't even unite Manchester, but the England football team unite us from Cornwall to Carlisle... That is the point. That is the point of the England football team, that is the point of international football, that is the point of sport: to unite us all by means of thrilling action, enthralling tales, powerful emotions and the creation before our eyes of a shared national mythology...^{xxxiii}

In a 2007 article Raffaele Poli argued that the dissolution of regulations with regard to the movement of club players across national boundaries and changes to the stipulations governing who can represent national teams, along with the development of global broadcasting, have led to the 'deterritorialization' and 'de-ethnicization' of sporting practices.^{xxxiv} While at club level, the increase of migratory movement means

that teams now increasingly comprise players of multiple nationalities (challenging the traditional notion that teams represent homogenous local and regional identities), the changes to the rules regarding national representation has led to a process of ‘de-ethnicizing’ national teams. While these structural changes are self-evident, one may argue that there has been a discursive *re-nationalization* within football discourse.

The strength of ‘the national’ is not only illustrated in a tabloid media that revels in national stereotypes; it is also illustrated and reinforced by much of the large body of popular literature that has appeared in the era of neoliberalism.^{xxxv} This literature – which both reflected and participated in the cultural shift that saw football gain middle-class respectability in the early 1990s – rests on the idea that football and the nation together tap into the emotions and hearts of fans searching for stable identities in a time of crisis. This body of work includes David Winner’s *Brilliant Orange: The Neurotic Genius of Dutch Football* (2000), Alex Bellos’s *Futebol: The Brazilian Way of Life* (2002), Ulrich Hesse-Lichtenberger’s *Tor!: The Story of German Football* (2003), Paddy Agnew’s *Forza Italia: A Journey in Search of Italy and Its Football* (2006), and many others.^{xxxvi}

Simon Kuper’s *Football Against the Enemy* (1994), is a seminal text of this genre: the text that established the methodology that underpinned much of the subsequent work.^{xxxvii} At the beginning of this book, Kuper writes:

My first question ... [is] how football affects the life of a country. My second was how the life of a country affects its football. What, in other words, makes Brazil play like Brazil, England like England, Holland like Holland? Michel Platini told L’Equipe, ‘A football team represents a way of being, a culture’. Is that so?^{xxxviii}

Kuper's book rests on the notion that each national football culture has different values and different interpretations of the universal rules of the sport that reflect certain core characteristics of each specific nation, and that they are illustrated aesthetically through the development of nationally specific styles of play. Kuper's methodology thus involves tracing the historical development of football in a specific nation and establishing how different economic, political, and cultural pressures became reflected on the field of play.

While this methodology acknowledges that different national styles are constructions based on economic, political and other social pressures – happily eschewing the simple characterization of national styles as being direct reflections of intrinsic national difference – there is little acknowledgement, however, that styles can and do change over time within specific nations themselves due to the constant political, economic and social changes within both the football cultures, and wider societies, of each individual nation.. In pronouncing that he wanted to find out ‘What... makes Brazil play like Brazil, England like England, Holland like Holland?’, Kuper assumes that there is one dominant style exhibited by each of these nations that, once coded as ‘Brazilian’, ‘English’, or ‘Dutch’, becomes discursively fixed eternally. Another example of this comes in the form of Bellos's question: ‘what is it about Brazil that makes its footballers and its fans so...well...*Brazilian?*’, as well as Winner's discussion of Ajax of Amsterdam's ‘singularly Dutch style’.^{xxxix}

What we find in these texts is that the emergence of styles coded as specifically national are tied to periods of history during which an individual nation has been relatively successful; times during which its national football team has attracted a measure of global attention. Often, a national style becomes something to

cherish, wrapped up by a vocabulary of emotion. Hence, it is often the case that after a nation has been ascribed a style during periods of success, subsequent periods of failure are often seen as a result of an ‘unfaithfulness’ to, or ‘betrayal’ of, specific national styles. For example, in the World Cup finals of 2006 and 2010, there was a widespread outcry about the Brazilian national team’s performances for playing in what was perceived to be a boring, efficient, functional style, one alien to Brazilian tradition. After the 2010 World Cup final, the Netherlands team was similarly criticized.

In the English context, David Winner’s *Those Feet: A Sensual History of English Football* (2005), D.J. Taylor’s *On the Corinthian Spirit: The Decline in Amateurism in Sport* (2006), and Julian Norridge’s *Can We Have Our Balls Back, Please?: How the British Invented Sport* (2008) elaborate a myth of origin which sees the traditional English style of play as an expression of the values that underpinned the British Empire.^{x1} The sustained focus in these popular texts on the mid to late nineteenth century debates about amateurism and professionalism, and the playing style that arose from Muscular Christianity is debilitating, and exposes a fantasy: it does little but ram home what has been lost in the contemporary, globalized era – that is to say, an assumed homogeneous imagined community. The version of Englishness elaborated in these books is safe, conservative, backward-looking. They are examples, again, of restorative nostalgia.

The process of creating a national tradition of character and playing style entails the canonization of archetypal players who are said to represent the core values of the nation. As such, it necessarily also entails a process of exclusion whereby players who do not conform to the dominant model are sidelined. An examination of the history of English football writing uncovers a striking repetition in the language

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in Sport in History on 20 Nov 2013, available online:
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17460263.2013.850268>

used to describe the archetypal English player. Their style tends to be physically aggressive; however, more importantly to this tradition, their 'attitude to the game' is usually without fault. They inspire their fans and fellow players through their actions and deeds on and off the park, and are usually described in such terms as 'honest' and 'durable'. These qualities are regularly and explicitly linked to the notion of traditional Englishness.^{xli} Geoff Hurst, scorer of a hat-trick in the 1966 World Cup final, is described, for example as 'diligent, willing, hard-working, and coachable. He grew big and strong. He had a friendly grin'.^{xlii} And the former Manchester United centre half Steve Bruce is described as exhibiting 'Durability... [he was] dependable... [he showed] resolution...[he] commanded respect and affection [and] led by example'.^{xliii} Voted the top English player of all time by the goal.com website, Bobby Charlton was described in the following terms:

No-one symbolises English football - or a nation's sporting aspirations and achievements - more than Bobby Charlton. During the 1960s he was the most famous - and popular - Englishman in the world, a byword for sportsmanship and fair play, whose fame and universal esteem were based upon the twin virtues of phenomenal footballing ability and a quintessentially Corinthian spirit.^{xliv}

Another player afforded English 'legend' status is Stanley Matthews. Arthur Hopcraft describes him thus:

He would get up at daylight, drink a cup of tea and drive to the beach; there he would breathe deep, do stretching exercises and sprint, a thin and angular

figure well wrapped up and self-absorbed. All this might take half an hour or one and a half, according to how soon his body's responses told him he had done enough. Then he would drive home, take a cold shower and eat a breakfast of cereal, toast and honey. An old friend of his told me he once said to Matthews on some grisly, sleeting morning: 'You can't be serious about going training in this lot'. Matthews said simply: 'It's my living' [...] There was the courage of manhood here, of the very English, stubborn, contrary, self-determining kind.

While Charlton and Matthews both successfully melded the type of skill not usually associated with the English style with notions of hard work and decency, these skills were often constrained by the strict tactical formations favoured by English coaches. Simon Featherstone sees this as typical 'of a peculiarly persistent trait of English football culture that could cherish exponents of skilful play like Matthews but remained sceptical of the application of those skills to the broader game, instead remaining wedded to traditional values of force, labour and getting stuck in'.^{xlv}

The careers of these England national team players span the second half of the twentieth century, and it is no mistake that most of the members of the victorious 1966 World Cup-winning team are habitually described in these terms.^{xlvi} The descriptions of these players defining characteristics fulfill the ideal of the Corinthian ethos as it was originally set out in the 1890s and all of them represent a version of the working class that provides comfort to the middle class establishment in the Premier League era. They are at once hyper-masculine, honest, hardworking, and down to earth. It is within this lineage that John Terry is constructed as an icon. In terms of style and effort on the pitch, and in terms of his leadership qualities, he fits in

seamlessly. His off-pitch behaviour, however, is seen as nothing less than a betrayal of this tradition.

John Terry and the Betrayal of English Football

The England national football squad has entered the finals of the last two major championships (the 2010 FIFA World Cup and UEFA Euro 2012) against the backdrop of major scandals revolving around John Terry. Both scandals resulted in Terry being stripped of the England captaincy (he was reinstated in March 2011, having been replaced by Rio Ferdinand in February 2010); both are widely considered to have caused extensive disruption to squad preparation before, and performance during, the respective tournaments; and the media's treatment of both are potent examples of the phenomenon Garry Whannel calls 'vortextuality'.^{xlvii} Most importantly in the context of the themes discussed here, however, both scandals engendered debates about the meanings attached to the role of England captain, as well as illustrating how his iconicity embodies the contradictions and ambivalences of English football in the Premier League era.

Terry's first sacking was the result of a number of stories dating back to November 2009 when it was revealed that he had attempted to 'cash in on his status as England's...captain by authorizing a rather blatant speculative mass email offering himself up for commercial deals'.^{xlviii} The journalist Matt Lawton described this as 'putting the nation's armband up for sale'.^{xlix} Within a month, Terry was accused of accepting brown paper bags full of cash for guided tours of Chelsea's training complex without the knowledge of the club. At this point, numerous critics called on him to be replaced as captain, citing the incident as only the most recent in a long line of outrageous acts by a person unfit for the role.¹ Terry was finally removed as captain

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in Sport in History on 20 Nov 2013, available online:
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17460263.2013.850268>

in February 2010 when a ‘super-injunction’ Terry had filed with the High Court preventing media reports about certain aspects of his private life was overturned, and it was revealed that Terry had sought to keep secret the allegations that he had been conducting an extramarital affair with Victoria Perroncel – the former partner of his one-time Chelsea and then-England teammate, Wayne Bridge – and that he had paid for Perroncel to terminate a pregnancy.^{li} Amid the fallout, Bridge retired from international duty, claiming he would prefer not to play alongside his former friend.

The second major scandal involving Terry flared up in December 2011 when he was criminally charged for the alleged racial abuse of Anton Ferdinand whilst playing for Chelsea against Queen’s Park Rangers a month prior. The fallout to this included a number of ensuing controversies that threatened to overshadow the forthcoming European Championship finals. First, the England manager Fabio Capello resigned in protest after the Football Association (FA) demanded the dismissal of Terry as captain. Secondly, the eventual decision that Terry be included in the squad for Euro 2012 – taken by the new manager, Roy Hodgson, with the backing of the FA – despite Terry’s criminal trial being set for a few weeks after the tournament, alongside the decision not to include Rio Ferdinand (the Manchester United veteran of 81 England caps who replaced Terry as captain from February 2010 to March 2011, and the brother of the man who made the allegations of racism against Terry) served to highlight divisions within the ranks of the squad along the lines of those players who supported the inclusion of Terry and those who did not.

After Terry was dismissed as captain for the second time, there was almost uniform agreement that he it was no longer tenable for him to hold the position. The first scandal, however, engendered a fraught debate about the meanings attached to

the England captaincy. Many journalists pondered the English obsession with the position. Paul Hayward wrote:

No other country elevates an armband to such sacred status. The game's real superpowers know the limits of the clenched fist. There is a case to be made for strong leadership — for force of personality on the pitch — but the constant fretting over who will toss the coin reflects poorly on English football's grasp of international reality.^{lii}

Tom Kington noted that the Italian media found it ridiculous that the English expected their captain to be a 'moral authority', while Paul Wilson asked, 'Can we not be a little bit grown up about this and accept that footballers are paid to play football – something Terry is still able to do perfectly well – and what they get up to with their copious free time and spare cash is no one else's business as long as it does not infringe the law?'^{liiii} Rod Liddle, meanwhile, wrote:

Why any of this should surprise, shock or even disturb seems to me a moot question. We are dealing with a Premier League footballer here, not John Stuart Mill or the Archbishop of Canterbury. [...] I don't know how many working-class young men, given unlimited incomes and a charismatic, gilded profession, would stand up to the glare of media scrutiny and emerge as paragons of virtue.^{liv}

The argument that these journalists make against calls for Terry to be sacked from other parts of the media (that argued that his behaviour was ill-befitting the

captaincy)^{lv} is that he is simply a product of the contemporary neoliberal culture and that the captaincy is an on-pitch role which should have little wider meaning. The problem, of course, is that it does have wider meaning because it cannot escape the weight of restorative nostalgia that I have argued structures all interpretations of English football history. As Chris Bascombe writes:

Football captaincy is a curious English obsession. The country does not want or even need a strategist to lead them on the pitch, but craves a flawless symbol of their bulldog spirit. [...]The problem for Capello and every future English manager is the perfect captain is no longer around. He stands proudly as a bronze statue outside Wembley Stadium, the immortal reminder of an ideal no contemporary can ever live up to.^{lvi}

That statue is of Bobby Moore, the iconic English football captain, who, as we were endlessly reminded during these scandals, ‘grew up in the same rough area of Barking, east London’ decades before Terry; a man who ‘famously wiped his hands before lifting the World Cup for England in 1966’; and to whom Terry is constantly compared.^{lvii}

Both scandals, and the debates about the captaincy, illustrate how the construction of Terry’s iconicity embodies the contradictions and ambivalences of English football in the Premier League era examined in this article. On the one hand, his style and his qualities of on-pitch leadership are illustrative of the restorative nostalgia of the re-nationalization narratives outlined above, positioning him as the heir to former England captains such as Bobby Moore. However, on the other hand, his lifestyle, his celebrity and his off-pitch antics represent the ambivalence in English

football culture wrought by neoliberalism: he is seen as a product of a culture that lacks taste and self control, and as representative of the replacement of the noble working class by the 'chav'. Embodying the ambivalence of English football discourse, Terry illustrates the difficulties of thinking about Englishness in the contemporary era without recourse to restorative nostalgia.

ⁱ Patrick Barclay, 'Fabio Capello must strip John Terry of England captaincy and give it to Wayne Rooney', *The Times*, Feb 1, 2010.

ⁱⁱ Matthew Syed, 'England captain John Terry greedy to embrace hire purpose', *The Times*, Dec 23, 2009.

ⁱⁱⁱ Richard Pendlebury, 'Surely the serial brawler, drinker and womanizer John Terry can't remain captain of his country?', *The Daily Mail*, Feb 1, 2010; Julie Burchill, 'Sorry, but I can't wait for England to get knocked out of the World Cup', Mail Online, 11 June 2010, available at <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/debate/article-1285739/WORLD-CUP-2010-I-Sorry-I-wait-England-knocked-out.html>

^{iv} Oliver Kay, 'Captain contradiction John Terry puts Fabio Capello in a quandry', *The Times*, Jan 30, 2010.

^v Pendlebury (2010); Gordon Rayner and Martin Evans, 'England football captain John Terry loses privacy battle', *The Daily Telegraph*, Jan 29, 2010; Kate Mansey, 'Exclusive: John Terry got Wayne Bridge's girl pregnant', Jan 30, 2010, Mirror.co.uk, available at <http://www.mirrorfootball.co.uk/news/World-Exclusive-John-Terry-got-England-team-mate-Wayne-Bridge-s-girl-pregnant-and-arranged-for-her-to-have-an-abortion-article306993.html>; Oliver Kay, 'Captain contradiction John Terry puts Fabio Capello in a quandry', *The Times*, Jan 30, 2010; Sam Wallace, 'A scandal even Terry cannot kick aside', *The Independent*, Jan 30, 2010.

^{vi} Owen Jones, *Chavs: The Demonization of the Working Class*, (London: Verso, 2011).

^{vii} See, for example: David L. Andrews and Steven J. Jackson (eds.), *Sport Stars: The Cultural Politics of Sporting Celebrity*, (London: Routledge, 2001); Whannel, *Media Sport Stars*; Barry Smart, *The Sport Star: Modern Sport and the Cultural Economy of Sporting Celebrity*, London: Sage, 2005).

^{viii} Brian Glanville, *England Managers: The Toughest Job in Football*, (London: Headline, 2008), 6.

^{ix} Brian Glanville, *Soccer Nemesis*, (London: Secker and Warburg, 1955).

^x Svetlana Boym, *The Future of Nostalgia*, (New York, Basic Books, 2001). Boym contrasts 'restorative' nostalgia with 'reflective' nostalgia. The former seeks a 'transhistorical reconstruction of the lost home', generating reactionary versions of nostalgia – nationalist, fundamentalist, etc. – that does not strive to understand or interrogate its own anxiety, but rather to assuage that anxiety by recovering 'truths' inherent in history and tradition. In contrast, the latter 'dwells on the ambivalences of human longing and belonging' and revels in the contradictions of (post)modernity, interrogating history and tradition in complex ways.

^{xi} Michael Billig, *Banal Nationalism*, (London: Sage, 1995).

^{xii} Gary Imlach, *My Father and Other Working-Class Football Heroes*, (London: Yellow Jersey Press, 2005).

^{xiii} *Ibid.* 213.

^{xiv} *Ibid.* 212.

^{xv} Zygmunt Bauman, *Globalization: The Human Consequences* (Cambridge: Polity, 1998).

^{xvi} Imlach, 213.

^{xvii} Interestingly, in *The Meaning of Sports: Why Americans Watch Baseball, Football, and Basketball and What They See When They Do* (New York: Public Affairs, 2004) Michael Mandelbaum turns these value judgements on their heads, arguing that the frequent movement of players in the NFL facilitated by the franchise system reflects the fact that Americans have historically been geographically mobile, moving from place to place in search of employment. 'Professional athletes are Gatsbys', he argues, 'shifting locations and identities – one season a New York Yankee, the next a Los Angeles Dodger' (35). Team sports in America, therefore, 'reflect the great social and political project around which much of American history...has revolved[:] the creation of a single society and political unit out of many different peoples on a vast continent [...] Specifically, they express the ongoing national effort to overcome two of the country's main sources of division, geography and ethnic differences' (34). According to Mandelbaum, this means that American sports 'serve as an antidote to parochialism, to the local chauvinism sometimes on display in European team sports' (36).

^{xviii} Imlach, 213.

^{xix} Alex Fynn and H. Davidson, *Dream On: A Year in the Life of a Premier League Club*, London: Pocket Books, 1997), xiii.

^{xx} Imlach, 213; 215.

^{xxi} Imlach, 215.

^{xxii} Boym, 41.

^{xxiii} Alex Fynn and H. Davidson, xiii.

^{xxiv} Charlie Burgess, 'What on earth has happened to football?', *The Guardian*, 9 February 2005.

^{xxv} Kaveh Solhekol, 'The 50 worst things about modern football', *The Times*, Jan 26, 2009.

^{xxvi} Sean Ingle, 'Football Fans Are Idiots', *The Guardian*, Aug 18, 2005, and 'Football Fans Are Idiots: The Fans Respond', *The Guardian*, Aug 24, 2005.

^{xxvii} Simon Jenkins, 'Forget the bling and egotists, this is the beautiful game', *The Guardian*, Sep 14, 2005.

^{xxviii} Nick Davidson and Shaun Hunt, *Modern Football is Rubbish: An A – Z of All That is Wrong With the Beautiful Game*, (Cheltenham: SportsBooks, 2008); Michael Henderson, *50 People Who Fouled Up Football*, (London: Constable, 2009).

^{xxix} Paul Dempsey and Kevan Reilly's *Big Money, Beautiful Game: Saving Soccer From Itself*, (London: Nicholas Brealey, 1998); Tom Bowyer, *Broken Dreams: Vanity, Greed and the Souring of British Football*, (London: Pocket Books, 2003); David Conn, *The Beautiful Game? Searching for the Soul of Football*, (London: Yellow Jersey, 2004).

^{xxx} The link to this page is now dead.

^{xxxi} James Lawton, 'This was not a great game, nor was it English', *The Independent*, Apr 23, 2009, available at <http://www.independent.co.uk/sport/football/news-and-comment/james-lawton-this-was-not-a-great-game-nor-was-it-english-1672529.html>

^{xxxii} Amy Lawrence, 'League of Nations', *The Observer*, Aug 28, 2005.

^{xxxiii} Simon Barnes, 'Second in importance only to the Prime Minister? The eyes have it . . .', *The Times*, December 14, 2007.

^{xxxiv} Raffaele Poli, 'The Denationalization of Sport: De-ethnicization of the Nation and Identity Deterritorialization', *Sport in Society*, 10:4, 2007.

^{xxxv} See Liz Crolley et al. 'Playing the identity card: stereotypes in European Football', *Soccer and Society*, 1:2, 2000, 107-128.

^{xxxvi} David Winner, *Brilliant Orange: The Neurotic Genius of Dutch Football*, (London: Bloomsbury, 2000); Alex Bellos, *Futebol: The Brazilian Way of Life*, (London: Bloomsbury, 2002); Ulrich Hesse-Lichtenberger, *Tor!: The Story of German Football*, (London: WSC Books, 2003); Paddy Agnew, *Forza Italia: A Journey in Search of Italy and it's Football*, (London: Ebury, 2006). See also: Jonathan Dart, 'Review essay: tackling a nation's football history', *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 26:11, 2009, 1748-1757.

^{xxxvii} Simon Kuper, *Football Against the Enemy*, (London: Orion, 1994).

^{xxxviii} Kuper, 1, 2.

^{xxxix} *Ibid.* 3; Winner, *Brilliant Orange*, 3.

^{xl} David Winner, *Those Feet: A Sensual History of English Football*, (London: Bloomsbury, 2005); D.J. Taylor, *On the Corinthian Spirit: The Decline of Amateurism in Sport*, (London: Yellow Jersey, 2006); Julian Norridge, *Can We Have Our Balls Back, Please? How the British Invented Sport*, (London: Allen Lane, 2008).

^{xli} Garry Whannel examines this type of player in terms of masculinity and morality in *Media Sport Stars*.

^{xlii} David Thomson, 4-2, (London: Bloomsbury, 1996), 177.

^{xliii} Alex Ferguson, *Managing My Life* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 2000), 267.

^{xliv} 'Goal.com's top 50 English players', Jul 1, 2009, available at <http://www.goal.com/en/news/2274/goalcoms-top-50-english-players/2009/07/01/1357107/goalcoms-top-50-english-players-bobby-charlton-1>

^{xlv} Simon Featherstone, *Englishness: Twentieth-Century Popular Culture and the Forming of English Identity*, (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009), 138.

^{xlvi} English players of the past who have exhibited a more 'foreign' style of play (that is to say, a more free-spirited approach, basing their play on ball-skills and aesthetic beauty) have been ignored for England team selection and / or heavily criticized because they are assumed not to be 'team players' or 'pulling their weight' in terms of

effort, and have thus been excluded from the canon of traditional English style players: a process which Brian Glanville has called 'the age-old English bias against brilliance'. Such examples include: Len Shackleton, Jimmy Greaves, Peter Osgood, Rodney Marsh, Stan Bowles, Glen Hoddle, Chris Waddle, Matthew Le Tissier, and 'maverick of mavericks, superbly skilled but wildly unpredictable', Paul Gascoigne (Brian Glanville, *England Managers*, 1, 162).

^{xlvi} Whannel, 201.

^{xlvi} Sam Wallace, 'Terry scores PR own goal with World Cup cash-in', *The Independent*, Nov 27, 2009, available at <http://www.independent.co.uk/sport/football/news-and-comment/terry-scores-pr-own-goal-with-world-cup-cashin-1828548.html>

^{xlvi} Matt Lawton, 'Psssst... want to buy an England captain? John Terry puts the nation's armband on sale', Mail Online, Nov 27, 2009, available at <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sport/football/article-1231310/Psssst--want-buy-England-captain-John-Terry-puts-nations-armband-sale.html#ixzz0Y3INyiNB>

^l Matthew Syed, 'England captain John Terry greedy to embrace hire purpose', *The Times*, Dec 23, 2009.

^{li} Gordon Rayner and Martin Evans, 'England football captain John Terry loses privacy battle', *The Daily Telegraph*, Jan 29, 2010; Kate Mansey, 'Exclusive: John Terry got Wayne Bridge's girl pregnant', Jan 30, 2010, Mirror.co.uk, available at <http://www.mirrorfootball.co.uk/news/World-Exclusive-John-Terry-got-England-team-mate-Wayne-Bridge-s-girl-pregnant-and-arranged-for-her-to-have-an-abortion-article306993.html>

^{lii} Paul Hayward, 'England must forget their obsession with captaincy if they are to go from near-miss merchants to success story', *The Daily Telegraph*, Feb 12, 2012.

^{liii} Tom Kington, 'Italians amused and bewildered by English hypocrisy over John Terry', guardian.co.uk, Feb 4, 2010, available at <http://www.guardian.co.uk/football/blog/2010/feb/04/italians-english-hypocrisy-john-terry>; Paul Wilson, 'Fabio Capello has no reason to replace John Terry as captain', Jan 31, 2010, guardian.co.uk, available at <http://www.guardian.co.uk/football/blog/2010/jan/31/john-terry-fabio-capello-england-captaincy>

^{liv} Rod Liddle, 'Is sleeping with a teammate's girlfriend a good enough reason to lose the England captaincy', *The Sunday Times*, Jan 31, 2010.

^{lv} Julie Burchill, 'Sorry, but I can't wait for England to get knocked out of the World Cup', Mail Online, 11 June 2010, available at <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/debate/article-1285739/WORLD-CUP-2010-I-wait-England-knocked-out.html>; Robert Crampton, 'The Rise and Fall of John Terry', *The Times*, Feb 13, 2010; Martin Samuel, 'Captains lead by example... so John Terry must go now before he's pushed by Fabio Capello', *Daily Mail*, 1 Feb, 2010; Patrick Barclay, 'Fabio Capello must strip John Terry of England captaincy and give it to Wayne Rooney', *The Times*, Feb 1, 2010.

^{lvi} Chris Bascombe, 'Fabio Capello's problem is that the perfect England captain no longer exists', *The Daily Telegraph*, Feb 3, 2012.

^{lvii} Sam Wallace, 'A scandal even Terry cannot kick aside', *The Independent*, Jan 30, 2010; Martin Samuel, 'Captains lead by example...'