

What Happens to Us in Football

On Play, Work, Market and Nation

Kai Froeb

About this translation

This translation was produced by machine using AI and has not yet been fully checked by a human. If you find any errors, please report them to us at feedback@reflexivitypress.com. Anyone who has bought the book and reports errors to us will receive the corrected version as an e-book free of charge.

Author

Kai Froeb

https://kai.froeb.net

Publisher

Reflexivity Press

São Martinho do Porto

Kai Froeb Edition

Latest version and notes on corrections:
https://reflexivitypress.com/en/books/froeb-fussball-essay

Feedback: feedback+en.fussball-essay.v2.9@reflexivitypress.com

Cover: https://reflexivitypress.com/en/about/cover-art/

Publication

2026-11-21

Translation: 2026-11-22

Version 2.9

Typeset with LaTeX (LuaHBTeX, Pandoc + Eisvogel)

Note on authorship

Written with the language model Claude (Anthropic). Conception, content and responsibility rest with the author. The translation was made with the help of AI language models. How the work was done is described in the essay “Philosophy in the Age of Machines That Write”: https://reflexivitypress.com/en/about/machines-that-write/

© Copyright 2026 by Reflexivity Press, São Martinho do Porto.

All rights reserved.

Zero Marginal Cost License 1.4 (ZMC 1.4)

Reader-friendly summary

What has no marginal cost should have no barriers.

You may

- **Read, download, and copy** the work free of charge.
- **Share the unaltered work digitally for noncommercial purposes**, with attribution to the author, source, and license.
- Convert the file format and make technically necessary accessibility adjustments without changing the content.
- **Print or commission individual copies and give them away** for personal, noncommercial use; direct costs may be reimbursed without markup or profit.
- **Translate the work** for your own personal, nonpublic, noncommercial use.
- **Mirror the unaltered work** openly: noncommercially, with version, date, and a reference to the current version.
- Use the work individually for education and research, and quote it for noncommercial purposes in accordance with scholarly standards, without using a collection of excerpts as a substitute for the work.

Conditions

Use must remain **noncommercial**. When sharing the work publicly, identify the **author, source, and license**, wherever reasonably possible. **Only the rights holder may relicense the work or issue new versions.** You must not impose additional legal or technical restrictions or suggest endorsement by the author or publisher.

All other rights reserved

This license permits only the uses expressly stated. Any use beyond these permissions requires separate authorization from the rights holder, unless it is already permitted by law.

Statutory permissions and remuneration claims remain unaffected. Third-party material may be subject to separate terms.

Important: This summary is for guidance only and is not a standalone license. The full **ZMC 1.4** is the authoritative text:

https://reflexivitypress.com/en/zmc/



About the Author

Kai Froeb (born 1963) is a German philosopher and IT expert living in São Martinho do Porto, Portugal. His work combines more than 35 years of systematic Hegel research with the possibilities of artificial intelligence, developing a new form of philosophical collaboration.

His thinking is radically interdisciplinary. He studied mathematics and computer science at the University of Erlangen–Nuremberg, business administration at EBS, and cultural studies and law at the University of Hagen. At the same time, he pursued intensive general studies in philosophy, sociology and history. He deliberately conducted his studies without orienting them towards academic degrees, preserving the freedom to follow an independent path of thought and research beyond the boundaries of university disciplines.

Since the late 1990s, Froeb has edited and maintained **hegel.net**. Available in twelve languages, the website ranked among the leading results in international Google searches for Hegel for many years and developed into one of the central online resources on Hegel's philosophy. It is probably still the most extensive multilingual website devoted to Hegel on the internet.

In connection with **hegel.net** and **hegel-system.de**, Froeb also created an extensive, publicly accessible archive of primary sources. The German-language collection alone offers 506 digitised original editions of works by Hegel and nineteenth-century Hegelians for free download. Further collections in other languages include 19 original works in English.

More than 40 years of programming experience, beginning in 1980, form another methodological foundation of his work. His first program was a reimplementation of Joseph Weizenbaum's ELIZA, thus completing a circle from the earliest experiments in artificial intelligence to his productive collaboration with Claude today. Froeb uses his IT expertise not merely as a technical resource but also as an instrument of thought: he analyses social and philosophical structures with the precision of a software architect.

Froeb is developing an independent philosophical body of work that stands in the tradition of Hegel while attempting to continue that tradition under contemporary conditions. At its centre is his own performative approach to truth, which forms the common foundation of his philosophical books. Truth appears here not merely as the object of propositions, but as a movement that must also prove itself in the form of thinking and presentation.

His aim is demystification through conceptual clarification: to penetrate every boundary through thought, including the boundary of what initially appears inaccessible. In his work, form follows content—structure, concepts and method are determined by the subject matter itself. At the same time, he seeks accessibility: to present demanding philosophy as clearly as possible, in the spirit of the best Anglo-American scholarly tradition, without simplifying it.

His guiding motif is Hegel's formula: "The truth is the whole"—the search for a form of integration that need not repress or exclude anything.

Zur Herkunft dieses Textes

In meiner Grundschule in Belgien gab es jeden Morgen Gymnastik. Ich habe jede Stunde darauf gewartet, dass sie vorbei ist, und bei Sportübungen geht es mir bis heute so. Beim Mannschaftssport wurde ich als Letzter gewählt. Im Fußballverein, in den meine Mutter mich anmeldete, durfte ich Torwart oder Verteidiger spielen, weil das niemand wollte; nach ein paar Monaten waren der Verein und ich uns einig. Beim Judo habe ich jahrelang meinen weißen Gürtel verteidigt. Das Beste daran war das Malzbier mit meinem Vater danach. Sportübertragungen im Fernsehen bedeuteten, dass die Zeichentrickserie ausfiel.

Später habe ich mit Kollegen Fußball geschaut, und hier im Café in Portugal tue ich es wieder. Nicht wegen des Spiels — das langweilt mich noch immer. Die Leute freuen sich, und man kommt ins Reden.

Genau das ist der Gegenstand dieses Essays. Wie bildet sich dieser Zusammenhalt? Woher kommt die Tradition, das Gefühl von Gemeinschaft, das „Wir" eines Menschen, der keinen Ball berührt hat? Dass Politiker und Firmenchefs das benutzen, ist die kleinere Frage. Die größere ist, warum es sich benutzen lässt.

CONTENTS

What Happens to Us in Football **1**
A Goal 1
Play and Labor 1
The Fan 3
Why It Binds 5
Why Football in Particular 6
The Reverse Side 7
Who Earns 9
The Great “We” 11
What Remains Open 14

WHAT HAPPENS TO US IN FOOTBALL

A Goal

A goal is scored[1], and a whole stadium leaps to its feet. Strangers fall into each other's arms. In a thousand living rooms people shout at the television as if the players could hear them. The next morning someone at the office says, "We won" — and yet he never touched the ball, knows none of the players, and had nothing whatsoever to do with what happened on the pitch.

Where does this "we" come from?

Play and Labor

Since antiquity, people have distinguished necessary labor, rest, and free activity; in modern times this often becomes the opposition between labor and play. Play seems free because its purpose lies within itself; labor seems unfree because it aims at wages, bread, a livelihood. Play would then be the island of freedom in a world full of constraints.

But this separates what cannot be separated. A footballer runs, passes, shoots, and every step pursues a purpose: keep the ball, find the teammate, hit the goal. The pass serves the move, the move serves the goal, the goal serves the win, the win serves the standings. A whole ladder of purposes, one above the other. Play, too, does not have its purpose purely "in itself."

---

1 This essay was prompted by the article "Copa do Mundo – futebol, mercado e identidade nacional" by Christian Iber, Agemir Bavaresco and Lutiero Esswein (A Terra é Redonda, 24 June 2026). From it come the guiding threefold division into play and freedom, market and national identity, as well as several motifs — football as a global language of simple rules, the transformation of fan belonging into consumption, the persistence of the nation under globalization. The present treatment starts elsewhere: with the "we" of the fan, with hierarchies of ends instead of freedom from ends, with the mechanics of fan attachment, and with attention as an economic raw material.

The joy is there nonetheless — in the movement, in the successful dribble, in the pass that arrives. But it does not stand apart from the purposes; it is embedded in them. One has it by pursuing the purpose, not instead of it. Even someone who plays only to relax is thereby pursuing a purpose — namely, relaxation.

The difference between play and labor, then, does not lie in one having purposes and the other lacking them. It lies in how the purposes are anchored in life. The purposes of play are framed: they hold within a bounded space, their consequences are limited, the whole thing is repeatable. You lose a game and stand at the starting point again the following Saturday. The purposes of labor stand under the pressure of real self-preservation — whoever fails at them loses not a game but wages, position, livelihood. This lack of consequence is what makes play light, as long as it remains play. In the professional, the seriousness of labor returns into the game.

The professional pursues the same purposes as the boy on the sandlot, the same ladder from pass to promotion. What is added in his case is not a different purpose, but a foreign hand over the whole ladder. He is a wage laborer: he sells his labor power, stands under contract, obeys the coach, serves a club under economic pressure. While he plays, the decision over what he does no longer belongs entirely to him — he trains when it is scheduled, plays where he is fielded, changes clubs when he is sold. His will does not disappear; he improvises, decides, interprets the game every second. But he moves within a frame set by others, and he now wills what he is supposed to will under the purposes of contract, club, and coach. Not because his situation resembled that of the serf or the slave — the professional is legally free and often wealthy — but because, in a milder, voluntary form, the same structural feature recurs: the activity stands under a foreign purpose.

More than football hangs on this. It is not playing that becomes a burden, but playing under someone else's direction. The very same activity delights as long as it is one's own, and weighs one down as soon as a foreign will stands over it. Whoever sees this hears the demand that one "simply work more" with different ears.

In football, something conceals this hardness, which is what makes it so useful as an image. The competition, the cohesion of the eleven, the shared goal outshine the fact that the players render their performance for others — for the club, its owners, its balance sheet. That is why the team so readily serves as a model for the world of work: one pictures the workforce as a team running together toward a common goal, and the capitalist form beneath it — whose purposes are being carried out, to whom the result belongs — disappears from view. That is precisely what makes the image ideologically useful.

In the top player, wage labor tips in two directions at once. Upward: a world-class player is so scarce that he dictates terms an ordinary employee would not dare dream of. Downward: his career is short, his body wears out, his recognition hangs on his performance. A slump in form, an injury, age — and yesterday's celebrated star no longer counts for anything. His capital is his body, and it loses market value faster than an ordinary career ends; no safety net catches this. For the top earners, money cushions the fall: whoever puts aside millions in the years of fame is provided for afterward. It stays harsh for the many below — most professionals, who barely make a living from football anyway and end up with nothing. Elite football is not the exception to the world of work, but its sharpened form.

The players themselves also circulate in this order like commodities and labor power. Talents from poorer regions — Africa, Latin America, parts of Asia — are discovered early, trained, sold, and drawn into the centers of football capital, to Europe and now increasingly to wherever the money sits thickest. It is the same movement as with any other capital: it seeks cheap labor power wherever it grows and draws the yield toward where it is already accumulated. Football mirrors the international division of labor in miniature.

The Fan

The fan does not play; he watches — and suffers, cheers, hopes, despairs at an event he does not influence. What first sustains him is an appreciation of skill. Whoever sees a good match sees people who have mastered something, and knows how to value it; precisely because he cannot do it himself, he senses how difficult it is. This is how one appreciates the skill of a singer, an actor, a dancer — the achievement that shows itself in performance. Applause for a successful dribble is not bought.

But that alone does not make a fan. One can appreciate an opponent's skill and still not be able to stand him. The fan is partisan, and that is the core of it.

He belongs. "I'm a Schalke fan," "I support Argentina" (DE: „ich halte zu Argentinien") — such sentences place a person. Whoever is a fan is somebody: part of a community with its history, its heroes, its arch-rivals. The old forms of belonging fall apart — religious denomination, social class, the lifelong profession — and the question "Who am I?" stands open. The club offers an answer that is immediately at hand, requires no education, and places one within a larger order.

Behind this stands a need older than the market. The isolated individual, calculating for himself, whose freedom consists in buying and choosing whatever he wants, does not exist in this original form. No one is born a Robinson Crusoe; one is born into a family and thinks in terms of relationships from the start. Where the market has not yet penetrated everything, this is more visible — there the individual first understands himself through kinship, place, shared history, not as a choosing single being. The market dissolves these bonds, piece by piece, into mere individual traders — but it does not dissolve the need for community. It intensifies it. The more isolated the individual, the stronger the longing for belonging, and brands, consumer communities, fan circles, sports all serve it, each in its own way.

Some of these communities are real: colleagues at work, schoolmates — though one might ask how far even these have already been eaten away by competition and money. Others are only imagined, and are not thereby unreal: they do not exist prior to the shared sign but arise with it, and they have real effects. An established commonality helps in conversation, generates sympathy, gives a point of connection: whoever names the same club is no longer entirely a stranger. In football, the signs of dissolution lie plainly in view, and yet the fan experiences himself as bound to other fans and shares with them a feeling that strikes him as fundamental.

The local club, one might think, is at least reasonably grounded — after all, this is "my" team. But the players themselves are not us. They are not our children, not even our friends, but people who happened to be born in the same city — in the case of a professional club, not even that, but expensively bought in from all over the world. We do not know them.

What connects, then, does not lie in the team but in what surrounds it. The closer the matter, the more traces of real commonality can be found. Perhaps a friend's nephew plays on the team. Above all: the colleagues all go together, everyone in the office follows the games with excited anticipation, and one's father and grandfather already supported the same club. And everyone who lives in the place already shares something — the club makes this commonality visible; it symbolizes it. Here a real foundation lies underneath: the people of a place really do have dealings with one another, and in the club they see it once more before them.

This changes as the unit grows larger. In a microstate — Monaco, an island nation — the citizens still share almost as much as those of a city. In large countries like Germany, Brazil, the United States, or China, the shared foundation grows thin; what the national team symbolizes then has hardly any real community

underlying it. The farther away, the fewer the traces — until, with the distant star, nothing real remains but the enthusiasm itself.

Hence the peculiar role of sport today. When there were only two television channels, the nation sat before the same crime drama at the same hour. People watched with family and knew that millions were watching the same image at the same moment. This simultaneity created community beyond the living room. That has fallen apart; everyone has their own series, their own channel, their own screen. Sport is one of the last places where millions still experience the same thing at the same time — a last campfire.

Why It Binds

Why does the club bind more fiercely than would be reasonable? A comparison with other things people attach themselves to helps.

First, the brand. One shows through what one buys who one is — car, label, technology. With most brands, it remains a sign; hardly anyone builds their identity on wearing one athletic shoe brand rather than another. With a few, more is achieved: Apple users, Harley riders experience their brand as part of themselves, defend it, recognize one another. This is the advertiser's dream — turning customers into a congregation. Where it succeeds, the brand is already almost a club.

With the fan, this congregation is there, and it rests on something the brand lacks. The brand binds through possession; one shares what one buys. The club binds through shared fate: victory and defeat, promotion and relegation, the derby, the injury, the transfer. The Apple user does not lose to Samsung on Saturday; the Harley rider does not get relegated. The brand has customers; the club has fellow sufferers. People meet, follow the games together with excitement, share joy and disappointment — a family of like-minded people, more than a shared sign.

And the shared excitement is no lukewarm feeling. The heart beats faster, something is at stake, the outcome is open. Similar to a horror film or a thriller, one enjoys the tension and the dread precisely because one sits in the audience and is not really affected. Except the fan, unlike the moviegoer, believes he really is affected — and he is, together with others. The shared anxiety, the shared jubilation, feel to him like something fundamental, almost existential, and this binds more strongly than any calm agreement.

In sport, something peculiar is added: one believes one contributes oneself. The twelfth man, the home match, the belief that one's own cheering makes a difference. In the stadium there is something to this: the noise from the stands carries some and puts others under pressure, and the home advantage is not mere imagination. But in front of the screen, where most people sit, no player hears the shouting — and yet the fan there follows the game with no less excitement, and experiences himself just as much as a co-player in his team's fate. The bond is strongest precisely where the influence is smallest.

Then competition. Apple and Windows do not settle it; each camp feels superior, but there is no referee, no result, no decision. Sport decides, by fixed rules, with a winner and a loser. This is its own source of passion, with two sides.

One is the pleasure of contest itself, of measuring oneself against another. It is found not only in the stadium but in the rappers' verbal duel, in the YouTuber's beef, in the exchange of blows in politics. The dispute pulls one in; one belongs to a side by taking a stand against the other party. The other side is the peculiarity of league operation. An election decides once, and then there is quiet. Here, the fight is fought anew week after week, won, lost, and no sooner has the season ended than the next begins. One never wins finally and is never done; one never loses finally and never gives up. A machine that keeps generating new tension — that is why it binds over the long term like almost nothing else.

Finally, the shared history, even the painful kind. Every club has its saga: one was there when the old stand still stood, traveled together to the away match, suffered together through the loss from a last-minute goal against. Wounds suffered together, but consequence-free ones — one loses the game, not one's life. Precisely this lack of consequence makes them a bonding agent: whoever has weathered a bitter defeat together with others is bound as people are who have survived real hardship together, only without the price. Life itself often has no story in which one appears; it is a jumble of coincidences. The club's history supplies what is missing — a narrative with triumph and tragedy, in which one has a part.

Why Football in Particular

All this holds not only for football. Every sport has its fans, and in each the same thing recurs, applied to it. Some sports, however, require an explanation of their own for why they in particular grip a country, often a historical one: cricket in England, baseball in the USA, grown over generations.

Football is more than that. It reaches far beyond its origin, across Europe and, along the paths of colonialism, across South America and Africa. In large parts of Asia and in Oceania it does not have the same cultural primacy; there other sports stand first, cricket, baseball, rugby. But even there it is growing, and the tournament increasingly draws these regions in. Why it has gripped some parts of the world so much more deeply than others would have to be investigated separately. But where it has gained a foothold, this reinforces itself: what has rank the media blow up large, and because the stars are millionaires, the idea of wealth joins with that of the game. But the deeper ground is accessibility. Not everyone can sing, and not everyone can play golf: the one needs talent, the other the course, the clubs, the money. Football needs an open space and a ball, nothing else. Everyone has played it himself, everyone can run along, everyone can celebrate along. What one knows from one's own body one values differently from what only the experts master.

The choice of whom to support also has its latitude here. By default it is the club of one's city, the team of one's own country. But one can also take the skill itself as a model, beyond one's origin: Messi, Ronaldo, as earlier many outside Germany took Boris Becker. That the media blow up large what the masses want to see and the masses want to see what is blown up large is no mere manipulation but a business that reinforces itself reciprocally.

The Reverse Side

The fan thinks he contributes by cheering. In sporting terms he does so far less than he thinks, and the one in front of the screen not at all; his cheering replaces no pass, no run, no shot.

He contributes nonetheless, only differently from what he thinks. The fan is not the opposite of the consumer but the most intense consumer: ticket, bratwurst, scarf, jersey, magazine, sometimes the share. And more: by being a fan and getting enthusiastic he keeps his interest in the matches alive. This interest, in the millions, makes the matches valuable, for the attention of the fans is the commodity sold here. So the sporting and the economic effect even fall apart: the one who takes part in the stadium is the rarer; the one in front of the screen, who accomplishes nothing in sporting terms, is the one whose attention carries the machinery.

He really does help the club, then, not by making the eleven play better but by getting enthusiastic and thereby producing the interest on which everything

lives. It is the logic of the Confucian rite: it works not because it forces a goal but because its performance reaffirms the order. So the fan strengthens the club by being a fan and showing it. His performance is the contribution, the economic one that he does not see, not the sporting one that he means.

Perhaps it is good that he does not see it. If at every match he knew that his true role is that of the payer, enthusiasm would be harder to sustain. The falling apart of felt and real effect is no accident; it keeps the devotion pure.

How far the exploitation of attention reaches is shown by the fact that it now rebuilds the game itself. At the 2026 World Cup every half was interrupted by a three-minute drinks break, in every match, even in the air-conditioned stadium and in mild weather. Two halves thus became four quarters, as in American sport. The first reason is respectable: the matches took place in the North American summer, and heat endangers the players. But into the same break the broadcasters were now allowed to put their advertising, at least where program planning and national rules permit it, for not everyone uses it: a full cut away from the ongoing game, which football had not known until then. FIFA assures that it itself earns nothing from it; the profit is made by the holders of the broadcast rights, and for the US broadcaster alone estimates circulate of about 250 million dollars in additional advertising revenue. Whether the exact sum is right is less important than the structure: a stoppage of play becomes sellable airtime.[2] Football was long unusual in that its forty-five minutes ran without interruption, no room for the block in between. Precisely this empty space has now been filled.

To the same logic belongs the halftime break of the final, which at the 2026 World Cup was for the first time expanded, on the model of the Super Bowl, into a show with prominent musicians. Both, the drinks breaks and the stage show, have the same origin: nobody among the fans had asked for them, and both were nevertheless introduced from above, without debate. That is the real finding, not that there are advertising and show, but the direction of the decision. The format of the game is not shaped by what game or spectator demands but by what can be marketed. The substance follows the business, not the reverse; and what prevails here on the largest stage will afterward prevail all the more easily in the smaller competitions.

2 Cf. Reuters, 24 June 2026, on the mandatory drinks breaks in the 22nd and 67th minute and their official justification; The Guardian, 14 June 2026, on the advertising rules that allow broadcasters advertising during the breaks provided they are back in the game thirty seconds before the restart. Not all broadcasters use this (for example ITV and Telemundo do not).

Who Earns

The numbers sober up the murmuring. An annual survey records the twenty highest-revenue clubs in the world and divides their income into three streams: matchday (tickets, hospitality), broadcasting, and commercial (sponsoring, advertising, fan merchandise). Most recently about 43 percent fell to commercial, 38 to broadcasting, 19 to matchday.[3]

At the stadium box office the fan thus pays the smaller part. But the two large streams hang on him. What are broadcasting rights worth? They are worth something because so many watch; one pays for broadcasting because advertising can be sold around the broadcast. Sponsoring pays for the same reason: because the fans look on. More than eighty percent of the income in the end amounts to one thing, the marketing of the attention that the fan produces by being a fan.

(The figures come from the largest clubs in the world, those most turned into brands. In the district league the calculation looks different, with more bratwurst and less sponsoring. How far the mechanism reaches downward would have to be examined separately; at the top it is clear.)

At this top sits one more of whom little is said: the organizer. A competition needs someone who hosts it, sets the rules, admits the participants, determines the venue, sells the rights. This one, FIFA for the World Cup, the IOC for the Games, sits on a monopoly. Beside the "World Cup" no second can be placed, any more than a second water network beside that of the city. Whoever holds the monopoly sets the prices for broadcasting, sponsoring, and tickets almost at will.

At the 2026 World Cup this "at will" took on a new form. Ticket prices were no longer fixed but fluctuated with demand, as on a stock exchange: if interest in a match rises, the price rises with it in real time. This is the same dynamic pricing known from flights and hotels, and it moves the ticket close to an object of speculation: its price no longer measures what the match costs but what the market yields at the moment. The organizer thereby skims off exactly the amount that the enthusiasm is currently worth. The attention of the fan, which is the real commodity anyway, is thus milked even at the moment of its strongest swing.

Where one alone decides what turns a worthless good into a valuable one, corruption is near, no differently from the local politician who determines whether a field becomes building land. The history of FIFA is shot through with corruption, from systems of bribery to the disputed awarding of tournaments. The mechanism that keeps it stable resembles that of the United Nations: more

3 Deloitte Football Money League 2026; figures for the twenty highest-revenue clubs of the 2024/25 season, together about 12.4 billion euros.

member associations than UN states, and each has one vote. That of a small island association weighs as much as that of a large football nation. This sounds democratic and has a calculable consequence. The many small associations together form the majority, and they depend on support from above, on money for pitches, coaches, youth development. This support is real and necessary; precisely therein lies its double nature. Whoever distributes it creates dependence and gratitude, whether he wants to or not, and whoever wants to stay on top cultivates it. Not every support is bribery; but a system in which access, recognition, and money run through one hand is susceptible to patronage, rule by allocation. So legitimate help becomes a means of loyalty, without an open purchase ever being necessary. The lucrative business stays undisturbed as long as the majority is held.

How this mechanism works is shown by the enlargement of the tournament. The field of participants was first expanded to forty-eight teams, and on the day of the opening match the FIFA president floated the next increase to sixty-four.[4] It had been proposed by the South American confederation, as a one-off, for the hundredth anniversary of the first World Cup of 1930. In sporting terms little speaks for it; another calculation is more obvious. The new places would benefit above all countries of the Global South, the associations of Africa, Asia, Central and South America, and there first their officials, to whom participation would bring support and fame. Whoever procures both for them has their votes. The expansion looks like more participation and is at the same time the means of enlarging the held majority. It costs the one who sits on top nothing; the price is paid by the tournament, which becomes ever more unwieldy, and by the fans, for whom it becomes more expensive and further away.

The same power decides who may take part at all. Russia has been excluded from all competitions since the attack on Ukraine; the USA, whose military in the same years repeatedly carried violence across foreign borders, hosts the World Cup. One need not equate the cases to miss the standard: there is no rule that expels the aggressor from the stage, otherwise it would hit not only the one. Russia allowed itself to be excluded because it was already isolated; the USA is host, great market, media power, the center of the order that carries the tournament; to exclude it would mean to smash the tournament itself. Who may stand on the stage of nations is decided not by law but by power.

4 The proposal was brought into the FIFA Council by the president of the Uruguayan association, Ignacio Alonso, in March 2025; the president of the South American confederation CONMEBOL, Alejandro Domínguez, advocated it at its congress on 10 April 2025 (Buenos Aires Times, 10 April 2025). Gianni Infantino spoke of it on 11 June 2026 to the Brazilian broadcaster CazeTV (Malay Mail, 13 June 2026); in July he announced that the bodies of FIFA would examine the proposal (Al Jazeera, 13 July 2026).

The sharpest case played out around Iran. Since the end of February 2026 the host country had been conducting, together with Israel, an undeclared war against that country. When the tournament began on 11 June, this war was still going on. On 14 June, one day before the Iranian team played its first match, an agreement on its end was announced; at the end of June the USA attacked Iran again from the air, and on 12 July, a week before the final, a new wave of attacks followed.[5] The consequences hit the sporting side directly. The domestic league, in which a large part of the eleven play, had been suspended for months because of the war; the team had to move its quarters from the USA to Mexico and received only short-term visas for the days around the individual matches, so that it had to travel back at once each time; some staff were not allowed to enter at all. And yet the tournament ran as if nothing had happened. A competition that presents itself as a festival of the understanding of peoples bears it that the host bombed one of the participants while the ball was rolling; more clearly it cannot be shown that it is not law that orders the stage but the power that possesses it.

The devotion of the many below and the monopoly rent of the few above belong together. The enthusiasm of the fan, the most genuine thing about the matter, is the raw material from which profit is made above.

The Great “We”

There remains the “we” from the beginning, which the man in the office says although he has done nothing. At the World Cup it becomes largest.

Who says “we” there? In front of the same screen, in the same jersey, at the same goal the worker and the board member, the cashier and the chief physician cheer. For the duration of the match what is real all year round seems sublated: the difference of the strata, the classes, the fortunes.

Football stands to this difference in three ways. Some clubs carry it: where two clubs of one city face each other, it takes on a social charge, the refined against the plain, the bourgeois against the alternative, and the choice of club says who one is and who one is not. Other clubs bridge it: behind the club of the

5 Attacks by the USA and Israel on Iran since 28 February 2026 (The Daily Signal, 28 February 2026); President Trump announced the agreement on the end of the war on 14 June 2026 (NPR, “The U.S. and Iran announce a deal to end the war”, 14 June 2026); Iran’s first match, 2–2 against New Zealand, took place on 15 June 2026 in Inglewood (Dawn, after AFP). Renewed US attacks on Iran at the end of June and on 12 July 2026, after Trump had declared the ceasefire over (Al Jazeera, “US launches new wave of strikes against Iran, aimed at ‘degrading’ military”, 12 July 2026); the final took place on 19 July 2026.

industrial city stands the whole city, from worker to director. The national team seems to erase it; it connects across all strata.

This community does not exist outside, in the real economy. There one is divided: above and below, capital and labor, poor and rich. In the stadium what is divided outside appears united, as in the army, where likewise all estates merge into a comradeship that otherwise separates them. A symbolic sublation of classes, real in experience and nil in consequences: after the final whistle everyone returns to his situation.

At the World Cup the country joins the "we". The eleven represent it; they are not only a community that one experiences but one that represents a whole, the nation. With that the rules change. Not clubs but associations compete, and whoever wants to play for a country must have its citizenship. Here the logic tips into the open: the player of other origin, born elsewhere, is naturalized so that he can play along, and the supporters welcome it when he scores. The exclusion that is otherwise attributed to the national does not simply fall away, however; it is suspended as long as the player successfully embodies the national we. Whoever scores belongs. Whoever fails can suddenly appear again as the stranger whose origin one remembers.

And what the teams represent they also express. Each has its colors, its crest, its mascot, often a manner of playing and carrying itself by which one recognizes it. The fans carry it on, adorn themselves with flags and painted faces and push the typical of the country into the folkloric: Viking helmets, sombreros, a beer in national colors. So the imagined unity becomes colorful and visible for a summer, and the variety of countries appears side by side on one stage. It is also the occasion on which a television audience learns in passing something about distant countries that otherwise never come up, a kind of geography lesson between the matches.

Supporting one's own country is not the only relation here. Alongside stands the appreciation of the teams that play especially beautifully, an enjoyment in itself, independent of origin. Some cultivate it as a distinction of their own: they do more than merely wave flags, they can also discriminate and praise the beautiful. Both run side by side, and in case of doubt one's own country wins out. In this the calculation oddly always works out: if one's own team beats the favorite, it is a great achievement; if it draws, an honorable result; if it loses, well, it was against the best. One's own country really cannot lose.

A sympathy of its own goes to the small, not the one who simply goes under, that is merely quirky, but the one who throws a big one out of the tournament before he fails himself. That hits something: in real life most are rather David

than Goliath. As one, small, dreams oneself into the big, so one dreams oneself into the small one who shows the big one.

One goes further who loads the pairings with whatever comes to mind about the countries, their politics, their history, their position in the world. Then in the final it is not Spain against Argentina but the old colonial power against the rising, self-confident Third World; and whoever knows the winner knows where the world is headed. One can, however, cast the same match differently: the country of ultra-neoliberalism and closeness to Trump against a country with another tradition. Both interpretations arise from the same encounter, and the outcome confirms in each case the one that one brought along. What serves for two opposite conclusions supports neither. Every country has enough history that one can give it the role one currently needs; the choice of category is governed by the desired result. At the 2010 World Cup an octopus in an aquarium was consulted that was supposed to predict the matches by choosing between two feeding boxes. Between its choice and the outcome there was no connection whatever, and everyone knew it. The political charging is in its structure the same movement, a connection brought to the matter from outside that has nothing in the matter to support it, only it considers itself profound. Eleven play against eleven; who wins depends on form on the day, chance, and referee decisions, not on the economic policy of the governments. What is satisfied is a need for significance that the game does not yield.

Yet the country is not the club. With the club nothing binds one but the choice; on one’s own country one really depends, through laws, taxes, protection, the life one leads in it. National identification is therefore not as inconsequential as that with the club. Under the veil of friendship of peoples and the good loser a competition of nations nevertheless runs, and it touches something real. The Marxist critique, which already saw in the reconciliation of classes an ideology, an opium, finds its sharper case here. The “we” of the game also embraces those who govern the country, and their politics, precisely when one is dissatisfied with it or it turns against one’s own interests. One sees it in the fact that criticism of one’s own country is easily considered fouling one’s own nest, and in the fact that rulers like to sit in the stands, in the glow of the game that rubs off a little on them.

The glow rubs off, however, not only on the rulers. It also reaches the ordinary citizen. Whoever comes from a country whose team is currently shining is addressed about it abroad, as if he had accomplished something himself. One’s own country has a great eleven, so one is, with it, a little great. Not much follows from that, but a little sympathy does, and that counts in dealing with strangers.

What this means can be seen in two ways. Perhaps the symbolic reconciliation defuses the pressure to tackle the real division; football gives for hours the feeling of equality and takes the edge off the desire for real equality. Bread and circuses. Or the experienced unity, however inconsequential, is a foreshadowing of the possible, a reminder that the strata can meet, that the dividing does not have the last word. Then football does not calm but awakens. Which view is right depends on circumstances that one would have to examine individually.

What Remains Open

Some things have only been touched on. The pleasure of contest, the deep-seated need for "us against them," whose root remains unexplored. The violence of hooligans, which is not explained by fandom itself but by its inversion: where people otherwise feel effective at nothing, the symbolic contest tips over into the real one, and the outlet becomes a source of flame. And the question of how far all this, shown here through the big clubs, holds for the small local club around the corner, where more of the real traces of commonality remain.

Football is play and labor at once, community and business, genuine feeling and sold attention, symbolic reconciliation and perhaps the foretaste of a real one. In the single word "we" that comes from a thousand throats at the goal, all of this is contained. Whoever shouts it can take it apart afterward — and shout it again at the next goal all the same.