

## **Bulgarian sport policy 1945-1989: A strategic relation perspective**

Vassil Girginov

### **Abstract**

The 2008 Beijing Olympic Games have stimulated discussions about the success of different sport systems and the Chinese model in particular. Revisiting explanations of sport in the former communist countries of Eastern Europe during the Cold War seems timely, as the current Chinese model of sport was largely designed after the Soviet example established in this period. This paper examines Bulgarian sport policy between 1945 and 1989. It employs a Strategic Relation approach (Jessop, 1990) to analyse sport policy making as a strategic relation closely linked to the dominant state project of building a new stateness. It goes beyond ideological interpretations and argues that the state represents a strategic terrain where these relations have to be established in struggles, the outcomes of which are always uncertain. Furthermore, past and present struggles and their outcomes create various socio-political environments that presuppose the forms of state selectivity and intervention in sport. The process of constructing sport policy was influenced by two main categories of strategic relations: intra-state, including political, organisational and personal relations between the Party, state apparatus and various sport and non-sport organisations and their managers, and transnational, concerning ideological, political, economic and organisational relations with both communist and western countries and international sport organisations.

**Dr Vassil Girginov** is Reader in Sport Management/Development in the School of Sport & Education at Brunel University, West London. He has taught at the National Sports Academy in Sofia, Bulgaria, the Universities of Luton, England and the Windsor, Canada. His research interests and publications (including five books) are in the field of sports development and comparative management and policy analysis, the Olympic movement and Eastern European sport. Vassil Girginov is currently working on two projects concerning the relationship between the culture of national sport organisations and participation in sport and the process of constructing sustainable sporting legacy in relation to the 2012 London Olympic Games.

### **Address for correspondence:**

School of Sport and Education  
Heinz Wolff Building  
Brunel University  
Uxbridge, Middlesex UB8 3PH, UK  
Tel: (+44) 1895 266811  
Fax: (+44) 1895 269769  
Email: [vassil.girginov@brunel.ac.uk](mailto:vassil.girginov@brunel.ac.uk)

## **Bulgarian sport policy 1945-1989: A strategic relation perspective**

### **Introduction**

The success of China at the 2008 Beijing Olympic Games resurrected interest in popular and academic discourses about the communist model of sport, which delivered country's best performance ever with 51 gold medals in 17 out of 28 Olympic sports. Many commentators, however, were quick to note that London 2012 will not even attempt to match China's achievements both on and off the field because they could only be made possible by an authoritarian communist state. But as Jim White, a Daily Telegraph correspondent, remarked: "...Beijing has set the bar so high, London will get a crick in the neck just looking at it. You have been warned" [1]

Explaining the success of Chinese sport, as indeed that of the former European communist countries, purely on ideological grounds obscures the complex and contingent relations and interactions taking place in the sport policy domain. It recycles an old argument about the omnipotent Communist party, which largely through coercion mobilises society and by manipulating its athletes delivers success. [2, 3, 4] This, of course, is supposed to be in contrast with the practices of democratic states. However, as a headline of *The Times* on the day after the Beijing closing ceremony stated "Threat to British Olympic hopes for London 2012". [5] This brings to the fore a fundamental question about the role of modern state in funding elite sport against promises for a just society by creating equal sport opportunities for all. It also clearly urges the British Government to make a political choice in favour of investing in Olympic sport if British athletes are to be triumphant again in 2012. Interestingly, it was also *The Times* in 1913, which in an attempt to raise £100,000 for sending the GB Team to the 1916 Olympics, undertook to explain to the British public that success in sport requires time and money. [6]

Using ideologically-informed analyses of sport policy in Eastern Europe during the Cold War at the expense of more in-depth studies is superficial and lacks theoretical underpinning. It is the aim of this paper therefore, to demonstrate that the reality of sport policy-making has always been much more complex and defies ideological explanations. The conceptual grounding, cultural forms and legacy of totalitarian sport have been detailed elsewhere. [7] This study therefore, addresses Bulgarian

sport policy during the Cold War period (1945-1989). It employs a Strategic Relation approach (SRA, Jessop, 1990) [8] to reveal the emergence of the new Bulgarian stateness, the evolution of state projects, concepts, structures and relations, and their effects on sport policy. This in turn allows the identification, conceptualisation and operationalisation of strategic relations in sport policy making. More specifically, the study pursues the questions what constitutes the socialist state's formation and the nature of its project and strategies; what was the impact of the socialist project on the conceptualisation of sport and its structuring and which were the state's key strategies and strategic relations in sport policy making. The paper first introduces the theoretical background to the study, followed by an analysis of the construction of the sport policy domain through state projects and interventions and concludes with a summary of strategic relations in Bulgarian sport policy during the Cold War.

### **The state as a strategic relation: theoretical background**

The SRA examines the relationships between state and society in a Western setting. It provides an interpretation of the state that Jessop described as “a strategic terrain, as the crystallization of political strategies, as a specific political form which offers structural privileges to some but not all kind of political strategies”. [9] Jessop's major claim that the state is a social relation was substantiated by an analysis that saw it as the site, the generator, and the product of strategies. He asserted that the state system is the site of strategy because:

*it can be analysed as a system of strategic selectivity, i.e. as a system whose structure and **modus operandi** are more open to some types of political strategy than others... I believe this notion of strategic selectivity is more fruitful than that of structural selectivity because it brings out more clearly the **relational** character of this selectivity. [10]*

The state is seen as a generator of strategies in the sense that it is where its formal unity (as a sovereign state) and substantive unity (as the social basis of support and a hegemonic project) can be established. An important implication of this unity concerns the actions of the state as a united political force, where:

*...the role of state managers is crucial in understanding how a relative unity is imposed on the various (in) activities of the state and how these activities acquire a relative autonomy from the conflicting pressures emanating from civil society. [11]*

The structure and *modus operandi* of the state system can be understood in terms of their production in and through past political strategies and struggles. These strategies and struggles could have been developed within that system and/or at a distance from that system, and they could have been concerned to maintain it and/or to transform it. Jessop claimed that “*in this sense the current strategic selectivity of the state is in part the emergent effect of the interaction between its past patterns of strategic selectivity and the strategies adopted for its transformations*”. [12]

The notion of strategic selectiveness is informative for analysing sport policy because it helps to identify the key preconditions for instigating the policy process (the pursuit of specific strategies), establishing two domains: membership (social identities) and structure (social relations). The SRA also informed analysis of the significance of specific historical settings in which state-society relations evolved and asserted the idea that previous contests form the conditions for recent/current struggles. The key features of the SRA implied the following:

- a) The state is a social relation, which has no pre-given powers or structure. Rather, it represents a strategic terrain where these have to be established in struggles, the outcomes of which are always uncertain;
- b) The nature of these struggles is the pursuit of the state’s formal unity (as an institution) and substantive unity (as a hegemonic project), whereby different projects (including those for sport) are put forward by individual actors or groups trying to assert their interests and knowledge while competing for core positions in the domain and for greater privileges;
- c) If the state is the site of competing strategies, it is the state managers who act within the state system, thus their interpretations of the struggles is crucial for the materialisation of state policies;
- d) Past and present struggles and their outcomes create various socio-political environments that presuppose the forms of state intervention in sport;
- e) State strategic selectivity may be class, gender, regional and local, or elite and mass sport, and needs to be established rather than taken for granted.

One aspect largely ignored by Jessop is that of global interconnectedness – the relations between transnational and local forces in shaping state and sport projects – important for sport policy during the Cold War. [13]

Despite some limitations of the SRA it was deemed appropriate to employ it outside western settings because of its analytical power. As the rest of the paper demonstrates the history of the communist period in Bulgaria provides ample evidence to substantiate the implications of the SRA. It transcends the traditional Marxist and popular ideological accounts of the former communist states in Eastern Europe and their sport policies as planned, centralised and ideologically dependent. In particular, it has argued that the state can be better understood if several important implications with bearing for sport policy are acknowledged:

- (a) state-building always occurs at specific historical conjunctures and involves individual and group actors;
- (b) state's emergence, development and separation from society should be viewed as a process of past and present struggles, that is, the state seen in motion;
- (c) states never achieve full separation/closure from society and their boundaries are usually in doubt;
- (d) human interests (the common will in societal terms) and sources of power are interrelated, and the outcomes produced in the course of agent interactions are predetermined historically by specific conjunctures;
- (e) conceived as a resource, power becomes a means to an end. The important question - To what ends or purposes is power put? - can be answered if, as suggested by the Strategic Relations Approach, we examine how projects emerge to promote the general interest which represent a balance of forces within and beyond the state.

The argument here is that modern states are more likely to pursue their projects by engaging in a complex network of competition and collaboration. This urges the analysis to account for the relationship between state and civil society, and poses the question how powerful was the totalitarian state indeed? Weiss and Hobson's study on *States and Economic Development* helps us to understand the significance of various dimensions of state power. The study advanced the notion of the despotic and infrastructural power of the state based on the difference between its penetrative and extractive capacity. They identified three key dimensions of state power: 'penetrative', which entails the ability of a state to reach into and interact directly with its population; 'extractive', referring to the ability of the state to extract resources

from society; and ‘negotiated’, which in today’s societies is manifested in the capacity for co-ordinating the industrial economy, and involves strategic institutionalised forms of collaboration between political and industrial actors. According to this classification, communist regimes fall into the category of despotic (weak) states as they can generate only low-to moderate penetrative and extractive power. To explain this seeming contradiction of the omnipotent totalitarian state, perhaps it is worth recalling a popular folklore from totalitarian times in Eastern Europe: ‘they [the state] are lying to us for they are paying, and we are lying to them for we are working’. Weiss and Hobson concluded that: “state strength increases with the effective embedding of autonomy, whereas state weakness ensues from despotic abrasion against society. This is the irony of state strength: the more autonomous a state is, the more isolated it is from social groups, with a low amount of economic and social energy created. Conversely, the more embedded a state’s autonomy through supportive social linkages, the more economic and social energy can be generated”. [14]

Previously secret documents revealed, as demonstrated by Claire Wallace and Raimund Alt, that cultural opposition to dogmatic totalitarian visions emerged in Nazi Germany, as well as in Soviet Russia and other East European countries. [15] This challenges the widely accepted notion that the communist states were identical with civil society. Most western commentators tend to view civil society as playing a mediating role between the citizens of the state and the power of state apparatus. It provides a counterbalance to the coercive use of the state power against citizens, and is perceived as comprising of groups of citizens in voluntary organisations. Brinton, however, offered a useful distinction between western and eastern interpretations of civil society. As he argued: “In the context of the communist regimes of Central-Eastern European under communism, however, civil society had somewhat different meaning...In this more Kafkaesque environment civil society existed in someone’s living room, in the café, in the churches and even at jazz clubs at later years. It was the small space between the regime and the individual where dissent against the regime occurred. While it was much harder to define, Central-Eastern European civil society under communism proved to be a very powerful force that allowed citizens to resist the automation of life that the communist system created”. [16] Grass roots

sport clubs in Bulgaria represented similar ‘small spaces’ as they were not directly controlled by national sport governing bodies, the central Sport Union or any party committee. Several examples further in the text support this argument and extend it beyond the civil domain to include the political as well, thus providing support for the application of the SRA in a non-western setting. Ian Henry’s use of the SRA to analyse the politics of leisure policy in Britain reinforces the need for empirical analysis, regardless the actual settings, with particular emphasis on how policy change was effected, by whom, and reflecting which sets of interests. He noted that “the achievement of hegemony is never complete and the effects of strategies can never be wholly predicted. Thus empirical analysis of strategies in relation to leisure (or any other policy domain) is required”. [17] While the work of Henry concentrated mainly at transnational level, the present study examines strategic relation in sport policy at local, national and transnational level.

### **Building the socialist state and its projections for society**

As result of the geo-political reshaping of Europe after 1945, Bulgaria undertook the task of building a new socialist stateness. On 8<sup>th</sup> September 1944 the Red Army occupied the country, and facilitated a military coup led by the political group Zveno, which put in power a government of the Fatherland Front, dominated by the Communist Party. Bulgaria’s strategic orientation for the next 45 years was decided in an arrogant “percentage deal” struck by Stalin and Churchill in October 1944 and sealed later by the Yalta Conference. This deal determined the USSR, Great Britain and the USA control over the Balkans. As a result, with 80% to 20% Bulgaria was placed in the Soviet zone of influence [18]

Communist party’s ascendance to power was chiefly guaranteed by the USSR’s support. With a modest 15,000 membership and a weak working class of 300,000, the Party lacked the political and social resources needed to win such a strategic battle and to embark on the road of new stateness. Three critical implications regarding state-society relations deserve attention. First, a mass and deep transformation of the forms of ownership, from private to collective, occurred, which in turn changed economic relations and subsequently the social structure of society. Second, the introduction of the leading Soviet principle of inseparability of the legislative, executive and juridical powers opened the way for extra-constitutional forms of

governance, and later for the party's uncontrolled intervention. Third, both the 1947 constitution and the new overtly Communist version endorsed in 1971 finally renounced the national ideal and its substitution by an ideological construct - the building of socialism. As Velev et al (1997) put it:

*Bulgaria was forced by the ruling BCP to deny its national ideal, which is being declared 'pan-Bulgarian and chauvinistic'. The national clause was subordinated to the class struggle and sacrificed in the name of 'socialist revolution'. [19]*

Scokpol's (1979) [20] study of the French, Russian and Chinese revolutions echoed this conclusion by pointing out the totalitarian state's rootlessness, neglect of national interests and contempt for utilitarian motives. From a political perspective, however, this tendency was not a novelty rather continuity. As the Bulgarian history evidences, similar to 1878, the political model of state construction was compliant with foreign visions, and only less contingent issues were left to the new state builders.

The Soviet intervention was not only decisive in Bulgaria. It also marked a geopolitical restructuring of the world's political and economic balance and signalled the beginning of the Cold War. A new phenomenon appeared - the world Communist system comprising eight states in Europe, Cuba and some Asian countries - which had great impact on state strategies and policies for sport. Long term political (the Political Consultative Council of the Communist Parties), military (the Warsaw Pact) and economic (CMEA) treaties were introduced binding those countries to well planned and controlled patterns of development. Sport policies were no exemption.

For 45 years, the building of a socialist society, under the leadership of the Communist Party, dominated the political and economic agenda. The state project presupposed pursuing three interrelated and contested processes: of capital accumulation (industrialisation), of generating social (political) support and social stratification (which could be seen equally as an aim and outcome). Sport was assigned an essential role in this project. The main political, economic and organisational mechanism for achieving this task was the omnipresent state Plan, as an epitome of the supreme knowledge possessed by the party-state and the socialist organiser. Most aspects of economic and social life were subject to planning and approval from the top. The logic of the plan presupposed setting an ever-increasing



spiral of measurable outputs and their over-achievement (mere achievements were not good enough). In sport, the plan represented a central plank of the concept of *Spartakiade*. This was a four-yearly nation-wide competition for the ‘best sport work’ and all political committees, public, trade and voluntary organisations were obliged to take part in it.

Bulgaria’s rapid institutionalisation, combined with the ideological enthroneing of the Communist party has led to the disappearance of any dividing line between political and administrative powers. From a strategic relations perspective, there were two important implications of this process. Firstly, it resulted in the state apparatus losing its independence from the Communist party, and secondly, in blurring the boundaries of prerogatives of the different state and public bureaucracies. The duplication of administrative, public and party offices destroyed actors’ and agencies’ sense of responsibility and competence. Sport’s organisational and decision making structure illustrates the point. Party representatives sat on most sport governing bodies’ boards at national, district and local levels. Strategic decisions, as well as staff key appointments, had to be approved by the supervising Party committee. Subsequently, sport organisations’ performances were judged not by those whose interests they were supposed to represent - members and general public - but by the Party.

### **Constructing the sports policy domain - state projects and interventions**

From a political point of view, sport was seen both as a subject and as an essential contributing factor for asserting the state project. In line with Marxism’s socialist visions of sport, which were based on a profound disdain of body culture and the perception that it could only be viewed as a constructive leisure, sport had to be transformed to become a ‘people’s movement’. Subsequently, at the start, all existing sport organisations were labelled Fascist and their activities and achievements were disregarded and banned, while athletes had to join the Fatherland Front’s committees and participate in building the new people’s state [21]

The shaping of the sport policy domain, as a process of establishing strategic relations, was influenced by four key contributing factors - the state’s *generic*, *utilitarian* and *specific* sports policies, and the *public sports movement*. These policies were implemented through a complex ideological, legislative, executive and

clientelistic mechanism. These incorporated Communist party theses and decisions, parliamentary acts, ministerial decrees and measures, as well as sports organisations' struggles to secure greater privileges.

The state's *generic policies* carried some important implications for the construction of the policy domain. In 1945 the new regime abandoned the 1934 legislation banning political parties and public organisations. In addition, the 1947 constitution guaranteed several universal civil rights, such as free education and health services, paid holidays, equal opportunities, state pensions, and freedom of association. The right to create associations and societies had to comply with a public order defined by the state and was further developed by the Persons and Family Act (1968). [22] However, with the advance of socialism nationally and internationally, this liberal approach was changed and a new law was endorsed in 1951 abandoning all pre-1944 legislation. This law dismantled the normative basis of the third (non-profit) sector and laid the foundations for a new centralised and simplified structure by unifying and merging various associations. It also signalled the end of their autonomy and voluntary identity in return for state subsidies. This was about to change according the BCP's July (1987) *Conception for Socialism*, which was the party-state response to Gorbachov's Perestroika in the Soviet Union. [23] Despite its more open character, this document did not transform the ideological dependency of society from the Party. The sports movement response to the BCP's attempt at reconstruction - a policy document '*Conception for a Profound Reconstruction of the BSFS* - never received Party approval and was not even published for discussions [24].

State *utilitarian policies* with implications for the sports domain could be broadly divided into three categories. First, policies concerning the building of a socialist society's material base (laws and measures for urban and industrial development). For example, the Urban Planning Act (1962) [25] and the Industrial Establishments decree (1970) [26], both envisaged compulsory construction of public sport facilities in living areas, while the Council of Ministers' decree (No79 of 1961) [27] was designed to reduce state administration. Second, policies referring to people's general well-being and the defence of the country, such as the Labour Act (1963) [28], the Health Care Act (1976) [29], the Military Service Act (1958) [30] and various Communist Party Congress decisions. These regulated universal civil rights and in the case of

labour legislations committed all municipalities, industrial and service estates to establish social and cultural activity funds to provide for pupils' and workers' leisure. Third, policies dealing with the moral and physical development of the individual encompassed by the Public Education Acts (1948, 1983) [31], BCP Politburo *Theses for Youth* (1967) [32] and a parliamentary decree for setting up a Youth and Sport Commission (No760 of 1968) [33].

Between 1945 and 1989 the party-state *sport specific* policies comprised more than 35 critical interventions addressing a wide range of issues. These included two Acts of Parliament (1945 and 1948) [34], Politburo decisions and ministerial decrees concerning single sport development (e.g. a Council of Ministers (CM) decree No48 of 1969 for wrestling) [35] and setting up of state structures (Committee for Youth and Sport - Politburo decision - December 1971). [36] Interventions varied in degree of concreteness, as some CM's decrees (No36 of 1972) [37] envisaged the exact state subsidy for sport allocated to each member of society aged 6 to 60, while others set standards of provision for elite sport (No5 of 1974). [38] The party-state intervention became gradually more overt and influential, which is illustrated by the transformation of the students sports movement. Professor P. Slantchev, the first chairman of the voluntary student association 'Academic' (1947), explained:

*at the beginning Academic was a truly voluntary and independent organisation full of sport lovers. However, by 1952-53, it all changed due to political considerations as more paid staff were appointed, and the organisation's leadership became fully accountable to the local Party committee. Today's sport is not made by students [39]*

Table 1 shows the key state interventions in Bulgarian sport policy.

Table 1. Key state interventions in sport policy between 1944 and 1989

1949	The first Socialist Sport Act
1949	Communist Party sets up Supreme Committee for Physical Culture and Sport
1957	Communist Party sets up Bulgarian Union for Physical Culture&Sport (BSFS)
1964	BSFS is given mandate by the Party to improve sporting excellence
1969	Politburo decision on improving sporting excellence: focus on athletics, swimming, gymnastics
1971	Politburo decision: State Committee for Youth and Sport (CYS) set up

- 1974 Council of Ministers decree (No5 of 26/1/74) for improving Bulgarian athletes' mastery
- 1976 National programme for Healthy Way of Life; CYS dissolved
- 1985 Politburo decision to dismantle army (CSKA) and police (Levski) representative teams
- 1988 Communist Party's Perestroika attempt to reconstruct the sports movement

Often, Party's political decisions had more powerful bearing on sport's conceptualisation than formal legislative acts. For example, a 1949 Politburo decision reflected the subordinate position of sports scholarship with regard to practice stipulating that "*the curricula of the Higher Institute of Physical Culture and Sport, and the Ministry of Education have to be approved by the VKFS (The Supreme Committee for Physical Culture and Sport)*". [40] This nurtured an uncritical environment where sport policy making was largely immune from academic scrutiny. Virtually no academic analysis ever challenged sport policies and practices. This was strictly a party preserve.

State *generic, utilitarian* and *specific policies* had significant implications for the sports movement's conceptualisation and structural relations, as well as for domain membership and agenda setting. The shaping of the socialist sports movement followed the general principles for organising society. According to them sport was assigned by the party-state to become a people's movement, thus involving masses of people in physical activities. This strategic project was accomplished by conceptual, principal and structural transformations which set the boundaries of the policy domain and determined its membership.

Borrowing largely from the Soviet example, the first major step in unifying and centralising the governance of sport was the establishment in 1948 of the VKFS as a state-public body. Its mission was three-fold to: involve the working population in sport; increase labour productivity; and enhance people's ability for self-defence. [41] In addition, a number of voluntary sports organisations based in the main Trades Unions (those of the miners, builders, and light industry), together with four departmental sports organisations (for the army, police, students, and army construction forces) were also established. Gradually, two structural tendencies started

to emerge - a growing number of local sports establishments (from 600 with 170,000 members in 1944 to 2,260 societies with 362,000 members in 1946) and a reduction of national governing bodies - from 24 unions and associations in 1944 to a single state agency in 1948. [42]

The construction of the sport policy domain at national level was eventually completed in 1957 with the set up by the Party of a new umbrella governing body - the Bulgarian Union for Physical Culture and Sport (BSFS). [43] Despite its doctrinal and financial dependency on the Party-state, the Union (as with other voluntary organisations) was an attempt to join public, voluntary and economic potentials of society to achieve greater social and political results. BSFS's charter mirrored the founding principles of socialist constitution. Article 1 asserted that it is a "*mass voluntary organisation of the people...voices the interests of its members, and creates conditions for expressing their aspirations and abilities in sport*". Furthermore, it claimed that the "*BSFS is learning from the rich experience of the Soviet and other socialist countries' sports movements. BSFS is an inseparable part of the progressive sport movement, works whole-heartedly for enhancing the friendship between Bulgarian and the athletes of socialist countries...*". Naturally, sport people's interests were viewed as identical to society's interests as defined by the Party: "*the BSFS realises its multi-sided activity under the guidance of the Bulgarian Communist Party*". [44]

The process of structural centralisation of sport was accompanied by another essential step for classifying sports organisations, which shaped the core and the periphery of the domain in a truly decisive manner. Similar sport categorisations were evident across the ideological divide including countries such as the USSR, China, Australia, Canada and the UK. [45] The four major sports categorisations in 1949, 1958, 1969 and 1988 were instigated by Politburo's decisions. These can be seen as a form of political and social engineering aimed at promoting sports with high utilitarian potential. Between 1949 and 1959 rational criteria included team sports' capacity to organise large contingents and generate support for the Party's committees. [46] Bulgaria achieved its major international success in basketball and volleyball in this particular period. The third classification in 1969 was rationalised on two grounds: sports' capacity to provide young people with basic training and military skills for

defence and to win international prestige. [47] Team sports were now harder to administer and sustain and less cost-effective for the system, thus not prioritised. The fourth reshuffling of the sports domain followed similar criteria and also included only single sports, although their numbers increased along the way. [48] The restructuring of the sports movement has had great impact on the distribution of resources and privileges as well as on agency's capacity to pursue strategies. Table 2 shows the changing priorities in sports development.

Table 2. Sports classification in policy domains instigated by Communist Party

1949	1958	1969	1988
Athletics	Basketball	Athletics	Athletics
Gymnastics	Football	Gymnastics	Gymnastics
Basketball	Volleyball	Swimming	Swimming
Volleyball	Wrestling		Wrestling
Boxing	Table tennis		Boxing
Football	Chess		Weightlifting
Cycling			Rhythmic gym
Shooting			Rowing
Wrestling			
Equestrian			
Tourism			

Three more interrelated critical factors deserve attention in order to fully comprehend the nature of the sport policy domain: the principle of setting the sports movement (i.e., how to become a member), the nature of sports delivery and participation, and the international sports system. First, following a BCP's Central Committee's decision of 1948 [49] the sports movement was fundamentally transformed. The '*territorial*' principle, that is, individuals' ability to take part in sport by joining any local club or activity, was substituted by a '*professional and departmental*' one, suggesting that sports participation should take place predominantly where people studied and worked. Hence, a network of sport clubs in schools, factories and

institutions began to emerge. Gradually, a less limited network of sport clubs in residential neighbourhoods also started to appear.

The key ‘production units’ of the national sports domain, however, were not the clubs but sports societies (DFS-multi-sport clubs) established at municipal level. As table 3 illustrates, the number of DFSs was well-regulated and exhibited the same tendencies of reduction and centralisation. In addition, after 1970 all DFSs were categorised into five groups according to a number of factors, including their contribution to Olympic sport. Those in group 1 and some in group 2 were assigned to develop elite athletes, whereas the rest (groups 2 to 5) were given the role of nurseries - talent identification, selection and initial training. By 1981 there were 19 DFSs in category 1 based in 12 of 237 towns nationwide, but more than half of the districts (16 out of 28) did not have top teams or athletes. [50] However, despite their significance for the delivery of sport, no DFS’s representative ever sat on the BSFS Executive Board. Membership of BSFS’s working commissions was also strictly controlled. After 1981 there was only one chairman of a District Sports Council (out of 28 districts), four representatives from National Sports Federations (of more than 45 federations), and one active athlete (of more than 1,000 on the BSFS’s payroll alone). [51]

Table 3. Sports domain members at local level

	<b>1958</b>	<b>1965</b>	<b>1971</b>	<b>1976</b>	<b>1981</b>	<b>1988</b>
Clubs	9,000	6,000	4,800	4,500	2,697	2,600
DFS	n/a	951	924	991	324	276
Members	420,000	n/a	608,663	758,194	938,270	n/a

Source: BSFS I-VII Congress reports [52]

Membership in sport organisations was supposed to be individual and collective. As clubs were not grounded in people’s interests, individual membership quickly turned into a fiction. This issue for the first and only time was acknowledged in the BSFS’s founding Congress report. It shows that from the planned contribution of 800,000 Leva individual and 950,000 Leva collective membership fees, only 70,000 Leva (5.6%) and 617,000 Leva (65%) were collected respectively. [53]

Second, because membership in sport was collective, the main patterns of participation were also collective and their meaning, as a vehicle for promoting and regulating sport consumption, was limited. The decreasing number of sports establishments coupled with an ever-growing number of members supports the point. Sport participation was free of charge, except for some symbolic charges for a few activities such as swimming, tennis or skiing. Sociological surveys [54] and BSFS congress reports [55] claimed relatively stable rates of participation: between 25% and 50% for school-aged youth, 10% to 20% for workers and 3% to 8% for peasants. The collective form of sport production-consumption offered only limited added value for the well-being of society because it did stimulate some job creation, but failed to diversify services or to enhance general satisfaction.

Third, as the Party charged sport with the task of winning prestige for the socialist system, international contacts and competitions, both within and outside the world socialist system, became important. From a geopolitical point of view, however, the 'Iron Curtain' which separated communism from capitalism, was an ideological façade behind which there were some important similarities and mutual interests. This is how the 'Vodka-Cola' enterprise, to use Charles Levinson's eloquent phrase, was born. [56] Levinson provides ample evidence to substantiate his claim. For example, the average growth in East-West trade was 18 per cent compared to 11 per cent for world trade; some 25 leading Western banks had their offices in Eastern Europe; the overall socialist countries' debt to Western banks was estimated at nearly \$50 billion; and in 1977 there were about 4,000 trade agreements between Eastern Europe and the West, of which 70 were active projects in Bulgaria. [57] The purpose of this joint enterprise was co-production where for example, individual workers and athletes from Bulgaria could be linked to their counterparts in Britain or France through the joint production of a car or an athletic performance. Girginov and Sandanski demonstrated the workings of the 'Vodka-Cola' enterprise in British gymnastics both before and after the fall of the Berlin Wall. [58] Similarly, between 1964 and 1983, the BSFS signed over 140 agreements and protocols (including governmental agencies) with 42 countries, and 100 Bulgarian representatives sat on various committees in 37 international sports governing bodies. [59] The co-operation between the Soviet block countries was considered essential and was multi-sided. This suggests that sport policies in the former communist states were not constructed only by Party directives,



but through complex domestic and international interactions as well. Bulgarian sport has made a concerted effort for integration in the world sport system and has both impacted on and has been influenced by global sport developments.

### **Strategies and strategic relations in sport policy making**

Structurally and conceptually the sport policy domain was shaped largely by the socialist project and various state interventions in combination with global influences. Those had great effects on the pursuit of particular interests essential for ensuring strategic relations in sport policy. Two key strategic socialist sport projects - mass participation and elite sport - illustrate the process of promotional strategies and alliances. They are supported by two examples, the state support for wrestling and Sofia's bid for the 1992 and 1994 Winter Olympics. Each example represents different approaches used by various actors seeking to secure a place in the domain and for gaining more privileges.

Table 4 shows the Communist Party's various strategic orientations and its related sports strategies. Clearly, the socialist project has evolved and its priorities over the years have changed. Strategic sport projects and mechanisms were shaped in line with that. The strategic political mechanism for ensuring congruency between party visions and voluntary sports organisations' responses followed a line from the Party congress to the BSFS congress. Usually, the BSFS would receive an address from the BCP Central Committee evaluating its work and providing guidelines for the future. In return, the Party-state offered various structural, material and moral privileges. Between 1971 and 1976 alone, 333 sport administrators and athletes were decorated with State Council medals and orders including the highest honour, the 'Hero of Socialist Labour'. [60]

#### *Table 4 about here*

Mass participation and elite sport were the two key strands of the BSFS's strategy. The former was supposed to generate much needed social participation and support, while the latter sought to gain political recognition for the system both domestically and internationally. However, it was clear from the beginning that the BSFS was not in a position to equally pursue these two projects with the available resources and structures. As the pressure for better results and effectiveness from the Party increased, BSFS' strategic response was further centralisation, tougher control, and

greater structural disintegration of mass and elite sport. This outcome was partly predicated by the territorial and departmental principle for organisation of sport, because BSFS did not have direct control over grassroots sports establishments. More than 95% of sports clubs were set in schools, factories and institutions, which financed them as well as 80% of sports facilities.

Furthermore, after 1970 BSFS' main structural element, DFSs and sport Federations were given a mandate to focus on elite sport. [61] The lack of integration between mass and elite sport is demonstrated by gymnastics and weightlifting. For 20 years (1968-1988), with fewer than 20,000 gymnasts, Bulgaria won 30 medals in the Olympic Games, World and European championships. But from a national perspective, gymnastics could have been considered a mass sport, as during the same period some 4,000 weightlifters brought in more than 400 medals. As Gartner (1989) [62] and Riordan (1991) [63] pointed out, the public-good aspect of international sporting success bore more forcefully on centrally planned allocation decisions than the results produced by the market. After all, as the former head of the state and Secretary General of the BCP, T. Zhivkov, admitted in 1980 "*we might not have the right resources to provide for sport for all, but we can always find some 40-50 millions levs for our top athletes*". [64]

Those examples indicate how the struggle for limited resources and privileges was shaped. As the BSFS had no clear commitment to its members' needs, its mass sport strategy aimed mainly at ensuring government actions on the political promises made by the Party, thus committing the state more to its project. In this regard, the Council of Ministry decrees No36 of 1972 ensuring a minimum annual state aid for sport for every member of school or working establishment, No63 of 1980 for improving the economic management of sports organisations, No3 of 1983 establishing the national fitness complex Rodina, and the inclusion of mass sport indicators in the state plan were considered huge successes.[65] In reality, these administrative measures delegated rights and responsibilities to other state and voluntary agencies operating in the domain, thus further blurring organisational responsibilities, and easing the burden on the BSFS.

The BSFS was fully aware that ensuring mass participation was beyond its capacity. All congress reports provided clear signals about that. [66] However, the only strategic response the Union was capable of producing, within its structural and ideological constraints, was to further centralise its activities and to exert tougher control. For example, the BSFS's 5<sup>th</sup> congress voiced concern about the Government disregard of the norms of the Council of Ministers decree No36 of 1972 stipulating an annual state sport subsidy of 6 Leva for every working person. It was reported that, on average, the allocated amount did not exceed 2 Leva. [67]

Subsequently, the BSFS sought to encourage individual participation in residential areas but the proposed mechanism was a uniform state plan and a system for participation. [68] Similarly, the BSFS 6<sup>th</sup> Congress was alarmed about the poor fitness of the population and the need for more individual sport services, as opposed to centrally organised mass activities. In this regard, some incremental measures were undertaken, including setting up health-consultancy centres. [69] These were health and sports authorities partnerships, a new entry in the domain, which proved short-lived. The strategic response, however, was the re-introduction of a uniform system for participation and a central co-ordinating planning unit. Plan indicators (for mass and elite sport) for all DFSs were developed, but DFS were expected to 'uncover their reserves' by surpassing centrally given quotas. [70]

Elite sport was more attractive for all actors - from party functionaries to instructors, because it offered many tangible and intangible privileges. Although party officials' personal sporting endeavours were never publicised, their partialities towards sports and teams were well known. Mr. P. Kubadinski, a member of the Politburo, was also chairman of the Bulgarian Wrestling Federation and a keen supporter of equestrianism. Mr. H. Meranzov (BSFS vice-chairman 1963-1980), was another highly influential figure in Bulgarian sport and deputy head of BCP' CC Organisational department overseeing sport (1980 -1989). Meranzov recollected how in 1969 he secured a Council of Ministers decree ensuring more resources for wrestling. Until the 1968 Mexico Olympics, wrestling was responsible for 70% of all Bulgarian Olympic medals and still contributed 42% in the 1972 Munich Games. Despite wrestling's undisputed contribution to the country's Olympic glory, the Politburo decision of 1969 only identified athletics, gymnastics and swimming as

priority sports. The leadership of wrestling and BSFS were acutely aware that this could mean fewer resources and medals prospects and that they still had to compete for resources.

After being categorically told by the Prime Minister that such a proposal for a decree for wrestling would not stand, and after failing to promote it through official channels, Mr. Meranzov went to see the chairman of the Federation. Mr. Kubadinski promised to persuade the head of the Politburo, T. Zhivkov, to sign the proposal first, which would then proceed without any obstructions in the Council of Ministers. And so he did - the decree was approved on the next day. [71] The significance of this episode is in the fact that, in the whole history of Bulgarian governments' interventions in sport there were only two special decrees regulating particular sports - one for wrestling [72] (No48 of 1969) and one for equestrianism [73] (No266 of 1975). It also exemplifies the significance of strategic relations between the Party executive powers and voluntary organisations for asserting their place in the sports policy domain.

Another illustration of strategy and relations involved the most prestigious project Bulgarian sport ever undertook - Sofia's consecutive bids to host the 1992 and 1994 Winter Olympic Games (WOG), launched in 1983. The bid was well-substantiated from a political, economic and sporting point of view. The 1980s was an interesting period, as Bulgaria made a serious attempt to rebuild, at least morally, its national identity, in sharp contrast to Brezhnev's doctrine for limited national sovereignty. The country launched a massive national and international campaign to celebrate the 1300th anniversary of the Bulgarian state (681-1981). The ultimate goal of this project was to open Bulgaria to the cultural heritage of the world, and to promote the national culture abroad, thus raising national consciousness and transcending the boundaries of socialist reality. Sofia's Olympic bid was considered an essential element of this project.

Despite the Party's decisions of 1983 and 1984 [74], the bid did not take off because it had to overcome three contesting interests. The first included economic concerns voiced by A. Lukanov (responsible for the Party's foreign economic relations) and the group behind him. Their arguments were very strong, not at least because the 1980 Moscow Olympics incurred massive financial losses. In a conscious attempt to

prevent its success, those people ensured that the disagreements over the bid in Bulgaria's state apparatus are known to the International Olympic Committee (IOC). After all, state guarantees for political and economic stability were critical requirements that determined the IOC decision about the host city. The second critical concern was expressed by the Environmental Ministry and citizens of the city of Sofia living at the foot of the Vitosha mountain national reserve where the Games were to be staged. This concern was voiced by the member of the Initiative Committee, V. Josifov, who was also chairman of the Union of Bulgarian Journalists. He wrote several critical articles about the negative environmental impact of the Sofia Olympic bid.

The third resistance came from the Communist party's ranks. National and local officials (nick-named 'local party barons') rightfully feared that an Olympic Games in Sofia would have severely cut budgets for local economic and social programmes. Moreover, the Games would have inevitably attracted massive material and human resources from all districts to the capital. The Party functionaries' reluctance was reinforced by the clientelism and nepotism of national politics. Once in power, most officials felt obligated and would abuse their powers to do something for their home place and relatives, thus securing greater local eminence. The erection of a 15,000 seated stadium in a settlement of 4,700 people and building an Olympic standard swimming pool to serve a small village were just two examples of political clientelism. [75]

Contesting political, economic and ecological considerations were dealt with by different strategies. These were elaborated by Ivan Slavkov, Chairman of the Bulgarian Olympic Committee (BOC), IOC member and son-in-law of head of state, T. Zhivkov. Slavkov went to see his father-in-law in his residence on the Black Sea and shared his concern about the bid's slow development. Zhivkov referred to Sofia's bid as 'a political project with great significance' and as 'fools' those who underestimated its meaning. He quickly ordered the preparation of a Council of Ministers's decision (No113 of 1984) [76] and the bid really took off. Environmentalists were disarmed publicly by selectively disclosing the hypocrisy of their claims. Slavkov published an open letter to Josifov questioning his real concern about Vitosha, as the latter had his country house built in a preserved area on the same

mountain. Subsequently, Josifov was sacked. [77] However, the contesting political, economic and ecological interests were indicative for the lack of unity, did the damage, and Sofia's bids for the '92 and '94 winter Olympics failed.

The socialist period of sport reinforced the critical role of the state as site, generator, product and mediator of strategies, and blurred its boundaries with civil society. All significant sport projects were in line with the Party's programme for socialism, but some represented an attempt for a break with Soviet domination. Different groups' real concerns never became a factor in sport policy making, as it was believed that Party's interests coincided with, and best represented the general interest of society.

### **State, society, interventions and power in Bulgarian sport policy**

The building of a new stateness was at the heart of the state project after 1945. It represented a structural-creative process with critical implications for the conceptualisation, structuring, production and consumption of sport, as well as for the strategic relations in the domain. The great transformation from capitalism to socialism began with a total negation of previous settlements and achievements, thus introducing a 'new' strategic selectivity. The process of constructing sports policy was influenced by two main categories of strategic relations, intra-state and transnational relations. Manifesting the first category were political, organisational and personal relations. *Political relations* were established between various Party committees, and sports structures at central, regional and local levels, and proved critical for forming policies. *Organisational relations* involved dealings between state apparatuses - the Council of Ministers, Ministries of Education, Defence, and Internal Affairs - and central (BSFS, BOC), and local (DFS) sports organisations. They included also relations between voluntary sports and non-sports organisations - the BSFS and DFSs, Trades Unions, the Youth Communist League, at both levels. *Personal relations* proved also important, particularly in making strategic decisions, and for actors' placements in the domain. Of particular significance were nepotistic relations (e.g., Slavkov), but non-kinship relations were also relevant (e.g., Meranzov).

The form of the state and its basic structural mechanisms preconditioned the state as the site, the generator and the product of strategies. Individual interests and strategies

were largely subordinated to the general interest of the Communist Party's elite, but continued to exert influence. Although still illusory, this general interest was highly effective because of society's submission. The core of the state-sport project relations constituted an authoritative form and state structures imposed by foreign forces coupled with an uncertain process of capital accumulation. As grass roots formations and their members interests were traditionally excluded from policy formulation this turned the state apparatuses into a main source of support, resource and privileges for sport. What is more, the Communist state created a whole class of rulers. Claus Offe's useful distinction between 'class organisations' and 'policy-takers' helps to understand this process better. [78] Class organisations include those organised groups that play a key role in shaping an economy through their role in the market, and that seek to influence the state to help the market positions of their members. 'Policy-takers', on the other hand, are those collectives shaped not by the market, but by the state, and are responsible for implementation within the framework given by the state. By 1989, this group in the field of sport was substantial and has reached in excess of 4,000 professional sport policy-takers (these were managers paid by the state, not allowing for technical and pedagogical staff). As this ruling class did not have a choice, its historical mission was to be in and to maintain its power. Sports organisations' uncritical acceptance of this relation made them tacit supporters of the notion of the general interest, as promoted by the state, and nurtured a culture of clientelism. This clientelism was just as strong but less oppositional than that of Greece, as demonstrated by Henry and Nassis (1999). [79] Interestingly, Houlihan and White (2002) also referred to the British sport policy community as 'policy-taker and not policy-maker' because it was subordinated to more powerful political agendas. [80] Thus, the socialist state assumes a decisive role in shaping interests and behaviours, and does not confine itself to a mere ideological role. Yet, a large segment of the population, such as women and rural residents, were not fully integrated in the state-building project through sport. [81]

The key difference between agents, interests and strategies in capitalist and communist environments is that while capitalism still influenced outcomes of struggles, the Communism inscribed all political and non-political agents in the state system. Subsequently, this predetermined their ability to advocate transformations by promoting strategies which did not conform to the general interest, as defined by the

state. As Nassis argued about Greek sport policy between 1980 and 1993: “*the relation between the strategies of those agents and the sport policy system is said to be dialectic...and simultaneously may result in the reproduction or transformation of the structure of sport*”. [82]

The forms of state intervention were presupposed by the nature of the state project and had clear implications for pursuing strategies in the sport policy domain. They included how issues were recognised, domain was structured, general and sport-specific laws passed, policy aims were formulated, key appointments were made, resources were allocated and controlled and how outcomes were assessed. Interventions varied in degree of concreteness and harshness, but most of them were imperative and did not invite an interactive participation of non-governmental and private agents. Indicative for this type of relations was the trend for centralisation of the sports domain. This was in contrast with state and sport administrations proclaimed concern for democratic set up and participation in policy making.

The state-society relations determined the nature of power in the sports policy domain. Binding sports policy to the state project highlighted three important factors for constructing the social base of the state’s power in sport. First, ideological justification with concerns ranging from defence of the country to improving individual fitness and well-being so as to appeal to wider social groups outside sport (the ‘hegemonic project’ in Jessopian terms). Second, grounding state power in a strategic configuration of the non-governmental sport sector in such a way that it would always be supportive of the state regime. The state project never allowed voluntary sport organisations to unify in a collective body representing a powerful political actor. This was partly permitted with the forming of the BSFS, but only in a fashion strictly controlled by the Party-state thus, ensuring representative support without real mass backing. Third, a consensus over the means of channelling demands upwards and flows of resources downwards needed for establishing and maintaining the state’s power in sport. The former was chiefly achieved through recruiting politically loyal sport managers, while the latter was ensured by political clientelism. Both depended very much on the placement of individual actors in the sport domain that is, on structural and interpersonal relations. The construction of state power in sport shed light on why the Bulgarian sport policy community was disintegrated and



dominated by key state or individual actors, and excluded the interests of large groups. The state power in sport displayed very little penetrative (the ability of state and voluntary agencies for direct intervention with the population) and extractive (the ability to extract resources from society for constructing a viable voluntary sector), and only limited negotiating (the ability for collaboration between state political apparatuses and sport agencies) capacity.

Transnational relations included ideological, political, economic and ideological aspects. Although the English and Swiss concepts [83] of sport diffused in most European countries, they did not succeed in Bulgaria because they lacked state backing. Instead, the Russian sports doctrine, which enjoyed political patronage, penetrated and shaped the visions of Bulgaria's state and sport managers. Before the Second World War the international sports movement was loosely organised and its influence on national sport policies was rather symbolic. In this period Bulgaria was a member of only five international sport federations, and marked a modest participation in four of ten Olympic Games mainly in military oriented sports such as shooting, riding and fencing. After 1945 transnational sports linkages started to dictate not only the rules and forms of sports, but to offered various tangible and intangible benefits. Transnational relations were mainly collective including multilateral co-operation between the Soviet block countries within the framework of political, economic and military treaties. The extension of the cooperation in the sporting area was critical for establishing state and sports projects. The shaping of elite sport was clearly influenced by the nature of the international sports system nurtured by the East-West rivalry. But the participation of Bulgarian representatives in various international sports structures was used more as a means of promoting collective socialist visions than specific national interests.

In summary, three overriding tendencies of continuity, statisation and incongruity, pertinent to Bulgaria's sport policy, could be discerned. The continuity concerns the forms of state intervention and state-voluntary sport sector relations and domain constitution, which were similar to the pre-communist period. The continuity in sport policy was presupposed to a great extent by territorial and constitutional aspects of the state which were subject to complex geo-political struggles. The statisation of sport policy reflects a process of neutralising and channelling popular initiatives in favour

of continued domination of the political leadership. It involved a gradual growth of state apparatus in the sport policy domain as initiator, mediator, facilitator, allocator and controller of strategies. The call for more government was popular in the political and sports domains, and was promoted by the state and voluntary sports organisations' managers. As sports organisations never established a clear membership orientation, they could not rely on mass support. Therefore, the material and other privileges offered by the state were seen as more valuable and worth pursuing. It could be suggested that, together with the first trend of continuity, there was in place a process of active reproduction of social structures and the status quo in sport promoted both by state and voluntary organisations' managers. Gruneau identified a similar process in Canadian sport, although from a class struggle perspective. [84] The incongruity in sport policy depicts a lack of correlation between state sports projects and their outcomes. No outcome of a state sport project fully corresponded to what was originally envisaged. Virtually no strategic sports policy document was based on a comprehensive analysis of society. Consequently, policies failed to address the interests and needs of those who were subject to interventions. Strategic relations in the sport policy domain were formed around what was perceived as a priority by the state hegemonic project. An essential condition for promoting particular strategies was the placement of individual agents. Membership of sports organisations as well as athletes and private actors were not well organised, and so found themselves excluded from the policy making process.

Table 4. State projects, sport projects and strategic mechanisms - 1946 - 1989

<b>State Project</b>	<b>Sport Projects</b>	<b>Strategic sport mechanisms</b>
<b>1946</b> Establishing people's power	Assisting Fatherland Front to achieve power	Dismantling old structures and relations
<b>1950</b> Setting foundations of a Socialist society	Ready for labour and defence complex	Specialisation, centralisation, bureaucracy
<b>1957</b> Building state socialism - the April's line	People's mass involvement - sports classifications	Command competition, Spartakiades
<b>1962</b> Developing socialism's industrial base	Sport into people's way of life-political image	Centralised planning - further specialisation
<b>1966</b> Expanding socialism-improving living	Healthy generations - builders of Communism	Mass sport competitions-NSF focus on elitism
<b>1971</b> Transition to a developed socialist society	Increasing the nation's vitality - sports mastery	DFS's mandate for elitism, sport complex Rodina
<b>1977</b> Developed socialism-greater effectiveness	'Mass sport, elitism, bright Communist virtues'	Priority sports - Uniform system for participation
<b>1982</b> Total intensification-socialist democracy	'Mass sport, elitism, bright Communist virtues'	State plan for participation - Olympic standards
<b>1987</b> Reconstruction of socialism	Greater voluntarism and democracy in sport	State professionalism, more sport services

Source: Compiled by author

## Notes

- [1] Jim White, The games have put Beijing on another planet, *The Daily Telegraph*, 5 August, p.18, (2008).
- [2] See Beamish, R. and Ritchie, I., 'The Spectre of steroids', (2005).
- [3] Bonde, H., 'Sport and Anti-communism' (1999).
- [4] See Green and Oakley, 'Elite sport development systems', (2001).
- [5] See Ashling O'Connor, 'Team GB Coaches May Quit in Funding Dispute. Threat to British Olympic hopes for London 2012.', *The Times*, 25 August, (2008), p.1.
- [6] For more details see Girginov, V. & Sandanski, I. 'From Participants to Competitors', (2004).
- [7] Girginov, V. 'Totalitarian sport', (2004).
- [8] Jessop, B., 'State Theory', (1990).
- [9] *ibid.*, p.260.
- [10] *ibid.*, p.260.
- [11] *ibid.*, p.:261.
- [12] *ibid.*,261.
- [13] Girginov, V. 'Strategic Relations', (2001).
- [14] Weiss, L. and Hobson, J., *States and Economic Development*, (1995), pp. 7-8.
- [15] Wallace, C. and Alt, R. "Youth Cultures Under Authoritarian Regimes (March, 2001).
- [16] Brinton, Aspen, "The idea of civil society: Evolution and Challenges in the Central and Eastern European Context since 1989", p. 2.
- [17] Henry Ian, 'The Politics of Leisure Policy', (2001), p. 237.
- [18] See Manolova, M., *Istorija na*, (1994).
- [19] Velez, et al., 'Bulgaria prez', (1997).
- [20] See Scokpol, T., 'States and Social Revolutions', (1979).
- [21] *Naroden Sport* [People Sport newspaper], 25 September, (1944).
- [22] *ibid.* 14
- [23] BCP, 'Conception for Socialism', (1987).
- [24] (BSFS, 1988)
- [25] *ibid.* 14
- [26] *ibid.* 14
- [27] See BSFS, 'Sbornik...', (1986)
- [28] *op. cit.* 14
- [29] *op. cit.* 14
- [30] *op. cit.* 14
- [31] *op. cit.* 14
- [32] See BSFS, 'Sbornik...', (1986)
- [33] *ibid.*
- [34] *ibid.*
- [35] *ibid.*
- [36] *ibid.*
- [37] *ibid.*
- [38] see BSFS (1986, 1986a).
- [39] Interview with Petar Slantchev, 5 August, 1998.
- [40] BCP, 'Za sastojanieto...', (1949), p.53.
- [41] Vasev, A., 'Zadaci I organisacia.', (1950), p.62.
- [42] *ibid.*
- [43] BSFS, 'Founding Congress', (1958).
- [44] BSFS, (1982a), p.3.
- [45] See for example, Hong, F., Wu, P. and Xiong, H, 'Beijing Ambitions', (2005), and Green & Oakley *op. cit.* 2.
- [46] BSFS, (1958).
- [47] BSFS, (1986).
- [48] BSFS, (1988a).
- [49] *ibid.* 37.
- [50] BSFS, 'Statistical yearbook', (1982).
- [51] BSFS, (1990), p. 38.

- [52] See BSFS, 1<sup>st</sup> – 7<sup>th</sup> Congress Reports, -1958-1990, (1998).
- [53] BSFS, (1958), p. 77.
- [54] See for example, Bankov, (1984) and Stoychev, (1986).
- [55] See BSFS, 1<sup>st</sup> -6<sup>th</sup> Congress Reports, (1958-1982).
- [56] Levinson, C., 'Vodka-Cola', (1980).
- [57] *ibid*
- [58] See Vassil Girginov and Ivan Sandanski, 'From Participants to Competitors...', (2004)
- [59] Haralampiev and Bankov, 'Physical Education and Sport', (1983).
- [60] BSFS, (1977).
- [61] See BSFS, (1972 and 1998).
- [62] Gartner, M., 'Socialist Countries', (1989).
- [63] Riordan, J., 'Sport, politics, communism', (1991)
- [64] Girginov, V., 'Capitalist Philosophy and Communist Practice..', (1998), pp. 125-6.
- [65] See BSFS, 7<sup>th</sup> Congress Report, (1990).
- [66] BSFS, Congress Reports, (1966, 1972, 1977, 1982b).
- [67] BSFS, (1977), p. 30.
- [68] BSFS, (1977), pp. 30, 159-59.
- [69] See Bankov, P., '*Physical Education and Sport*', (1988).
- [70] BSFS, (1982), p. 90.
- [71] Interview with Hristo Meranzov, 1<sup>st</sup> September 1998.
- [72] See BSFS, 'Sbornik...', (1986)
- [73] See BSFS, 'Sbornik...', (1986)
- [74] See, BCO, 'Document...', (1989).
- [75] See Party Guidelines to BSFS's 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Congresses, (1962, 1966 and 1972)
- [76] See, BCO, 'Document...', (1989).
- [77] Interview with Ivan Slavkov, 7<sup>th</sup> September 1998
- [78] Offè, C., 'Varieties of Transformation', (1996).
- [79] Henry, I. and Nasis, P., 'Political clientelism', (1999).
- [90] Houlihan, B. and White, A., 'The Politics of sports development', (2002).
- [81] See Girginov, V., 'Pre-totalitarian, ...policy, (2000).
- [82] Pantelis, 'Analysis of Sport Policy in Greece', (1994), p. 211
- [83] For a detailed discussion on the nature of English, Swedish and Russian doctrines of physical education see Riordan, J. and Kruger, A., (2003).
- [84] Gruneau, R., 'Class, Sports and Social Development', (1999).

## References

- Bankov, P., 'Analisis na sportno-sastezatelna dejnost v oblastta na masovija sport' [An analysis of sport-competitive activity in mass sport], *Sport & Science*, 10, (1984), pp. 614-19.
- Bankov, P., *Physical Education and Sport in Bulgaria*, (Sofia Press: Sofia, 1988).
- BCP, '*Za Sastojanieto na Fiziceskata Kultura i Sporta i zadacite na Partijata v тази област*' [On the state of Physical Culture and Sport and the tasks of the Party], (Sofia: Fizkultura, 1949).

BCP, *'Materiali ot Decetija kongres na BCP'* [BCP 10th Congress], (Sofia: Partizdat, 1976).

BCP., *'Julaska Konceptia za Razvitiето na Socializma v Balgaria'* [July Conception for the development of socialism in Bulgaria], (Sofia: Partizdat, 1987).

BOC, *Document 'Communist party and Council of Ministries decisions concerning Sofia 1992 and 1994 bid'*, (Sofia: BOC, 1989).

Beamish , R. and Ritchie, I., (2005). 'The Spectre of steroids: Nazi Propaganda, Cold War Anxiety and Patriarchal Paternalism', *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 22 (5), pp. 777-795.

Bonde, H. 'Sport and Anti-Communism: Danish Gymnastics' Encounter with Stalinism in its Formative Years, *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 16, 1 (1999), 138.

Brinton, A. 'The idea of civil society: Evolution and Challenges in the Central and Eastern European Context since 1989', In *The Contours of Legitimacy in Central Europe: New Approaches*. (Graduate Studies, European Studies Centre, St Anthony's College, Oxford), available from [http://users.ox.ac.uk/~oaces/conference/papers/Aspen\\_Brinton.pdf](http://users.ox.ac.uk/~oaces/conference/papers/Aspen_Brinton.pdf), retrieved 15 September 2008.

BSFS, *'Materiali ot ucreditelnia kongres na BSFCS'* [Founding Congress of the BSFS], (Soifa: Medicina i Fizkultura, 1958).

BSFS, *'Otcet na CS BSFCS II Kongres'* [BSFS 3rd Congress Report], (Sofia: BSFS, 1962).

BSFS, *'Otcet na CS BSFCS III Kongres'* [BSFS 3rd Congress Report], (Sofia: BSFS, 1966).

BSFS, *'Otcet na CS BSFCS IV Kongres'* [BSFS 4rd Congress Report], (Sofia: BSFS, 1972).

BSFS, *'Otcet na CS BSFCS V Kongres'* [BSFS 5rd Congress Report], (Sofia: BSFS, 1977).

BSFS, *'Statistical yearbook'*, (Sofia: BSFS, 1977a).

BSFS, *'Nacionalno saveshtanie po uslugite v oblata na fiziceskata kultura i sporta, Sliven'* [National Convention on Sports Services, Sliven], (Sofia: BSFS, 1981).

BSFS, *'Statistical yearbook'*, (Sofia: BSFS, 1982).

- BSFS, '*Ustav na BSFCS*', [BSFS Charter], (Sofia: BSFS, 1982a).
- BSFS, '*Shesti Kongress na BSFS*' [BSFS 6th Congress, Report], BSFS, Sofia(1982b),
- BSFS, '*Sbornik ot postanovlenija na Ministerskia savet za razvitiето na fiziceskata kultura i sporta v NRB*' [A collection of Council of Ministers' decrees concerning sport in Bulgaria], (Sofia: BSFS, 1986).
- BSFS, '*Sbornik ot postanovlenija na CC na BCP za razvitiето na fiziceskata kultura i sporta v NRB*' [A collection of the BCP Central Committee decrees concerning sport in Bulgaria], (Sofia: BSFS, 1986a).
- BSFS, '*Osnovni polozenia na koncepciata za dalboko obnovenie na BSFCS*' [Conception for a profound reconstruction of the BSFS], (Sofia: BSFS, 1988).
- BSFS, '*Plenum po Olimpijskaka podgotovka*', [A Plenary session on Olympic preparation], (Sofia: BSFS, 1988a), December.
- BSFS, '*Otcet za dejnosta na BSFS*' [BSFS Report], (Sofia: BSFS, 1990).
- BSFS, '*40 godini Balgarski Sauz za Fiziceska Kultura i Sport: Cifri, Fakti, Sabitia*' [40 years of Bulgarian Sports Union: Data, Facts, Events], (Sofia: BSFS, 1998).
- Gartner, M., 'Socialist Countries 'Sports Success before Perestroika and after?', *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 24/4., (1989), pp. 283-96.
- Girginov, V., and I. Sandanski, 'From Participants to Competitors: The Transformation of British Gymnastics and the Role of the Eastern European Model of Sport', In Girginov, V. and M. Collins (Eds.), *Sport in Eastern European Society: Past and Present*, (London: Taylor & Francis, 2004), pp. 815-833.
- Girginov, V., 'Pre-totalitarian, Totalitarian and Post-totalitarian Masculinity: The Projection of the Male Image in Sports Policy in Bulgaria', *European Sports History Review* 2 (2000), pp.160–84.
- Girginov, V., 'Totalitarian Sport: Towards an understanding of its logic, practice and legacy', *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions*, 5 (1), (2004), pp.25-58.
- Girginov, V., 'Capitalist Philosophy and Communist Practice: The Transformation of Eastern European Sport and The International Olympic Committee', *Culture, Sport, Society* 1/1 (May 1998), pp.118–48.
- Green, M. and Oakley, B., 'Elite Sport Development Systems and Playing to Win:

Uniformity and Diversity in International Approaches', *Leisure Studies*, 20 (2001), 247-267.

Gruneau, R., '*Class, Sports and Social Development*', (Champaign, Ill: Human Kinetics, 1999).

Haralampiev, D., and Bankov, P., '*Physical Education and Sport in the People's Republic of Bulgaria*', (Sofia: Sofia Press, 1983).

Henry, I., and Nassis, P., 'Political clientelism and sports policy in Greece', *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 34 (1), (1999), pp. 43-58.

Henry, I. '*The Politics of Leisure Policy*' 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001)

Hong, F., Wu, P. and Xiong, H. 'Beijing Ambitions: An Analysis of the Chinese Elite Sport System and its Olympic Strategy for the 2008 Olympic Games'. *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 22 (4), (2005), pp. 510-529.

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

Jessop, B., '*State Theory-Putting Capitalist States in their Place*', (Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, University Park, 1990).

Levinson, C., *Vodka-Cola*, (Tiptree: Gordon & Cremonesi, 1980).

Manolova, M., '*Istorija na darzhavata i pravoto: Treta Balgarska darzhava 1878-1944*' [History of the state and the law: Third Bulgarian state 1878-1944], (Blagoevgrad: South West University "N. Rilski", 1994).

Nassis P., 'Analysis of Sport Policy in Greece, through a Strategic Relations Perspective 1980-1993', *Unpublished PhD Thesis*, (Loughborough: Loughborough University, 1994).

Offe, C., '*Varieties of Transformation: The East European and East German Experience*', (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996).

Riordan, J., *Sport, politics and communism*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991).

Riordan, J. and Kruger, A. (Eds.). *European Cultures of Sport: Examining the nations and regions*. (Bristol: intellect, 2003).

Skocpol, T., '*States and Social Revolutions; A comparative analysis of France, Russia, and China*', (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979).



- Stoichev, A., '*Sociologia na sporta* [Sport Sociology]. (Sofia: Medicina I Fizkultura, 1986).
- Toshkova, V., '*Primiriето s Balgaria-28 Oktomvri 1944*' [The Armistice with Bulgaria-October 28, 1944], *Izvestija na Darzhavnite Arhivi*, 68, (1994), pp 43-97.
- Vassev. A., '*Zadaci i organizacia na fizkulturnoto dvizhenie v NR Balgaria*' [Tasks and organisation of sports movement in PR Bulgaria], (Sofia: Fizkultura, 1950).
- Velev, G. et al, '*Balgaria prez dvadeset i parvi vek-Balgarska natzionalna Doctrina*' , parva cast [Bulgaria in Twenty First Century- Bulgarian National Doctrine, part one], (Sofia: Znanie, 1997).
- Wallace, C. and Alt, R. 'Youth Cultures Under Authoritarian Regimes: The Case of Swings Against the Nazis', *Youth and Society* 32 (3), (March 2001), pp.275– 302.
- Weiss L. and Hobson, J. *States and Economic Development* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995).