Hans Bonde

The Gender of Extremes. The Radicalisation of Young Male Football Supporters during the German Occupation of Denmark (ref.)

The game between the Austrian-German team Admira and a team of select Copenhageners on the Danish Constitution Day in 1941 is the starting point for an analysis of the radicalisation of young Danish men in the stadium stands against the occupying power. The key questions are: What type of gender connotations did the German-Danish sports relations reveal, and what was the impact of sport riots as a masculine form of protest against the occupier?

The tendency of young men's aggressive and violent behaviour in the form of hooliganism is well-known. Less recognised is the fact that this type of radicalisation sometimes has taken political forms, as seen in Italy in the 1970s, when the political left wing used club affiliations as a platform for politicisation through activation of the spectator culture. This inspired the extreme Italian right wing shortly thereafter to make use of the radicalisation of spectator masses – with greater success – to claim more political power.[1]

That sports in particular can trigger violent confrontations is connected with its being based on a lose-win code in which the death-like confrontation between two teams creates intense excitement and passion over the outcome of a match. According to Norbert Elias and Eric Dunning, the fascination of sports comes from a tickling sort of tension that momentarily unburdens the spectator of self-control and becomes an outlet for a pleasurable release of aggression that may culminate in a mental cleansing experience of catharsis – especially if those with whom we strongly identify have a chance for victory.[2] Pragmatically said, there is a greater chance for political oppositions to the surface at a football match than at a classical music concert, for which there is a strict code of conduct, no competition exists, and the outcome of musical expression is well-known.

Is it a coincidence that typically young men create unrest in the stands and, in addition, occasionally engage in the political radicalisation of spectators? Hardly, as the tendency for men to be attracted to extremes is almost universal in time and in space.[3] Men, in general, experiment – to a larger degree than women – with going all the way to the edge or even past it, whether it involves risky financial adventures, entrepreneurship in science and knowledge, reckless crime, doping, or adventure sports. This experimentation causes an elimination race among men that clearly is symbolized in sports with its winners and losers, stars and water carriers. Men occupy so much space on the social scene partly due to these extremes, for better or worse.

It is therefore misleading to compare men and women without taking into account that men, to a larger extent than women, are a polarised group. The discussion about the 'extreme gender' may sound like a new gender stereotype, as the vast majority of men are of course placed within the normal range. Nevertheless, the normal distribution for women in many spheres is without major fluctuations, while men to a greater degree tend to be placed at the top and bottom. Men appear more often at the extremes of the curve. This can, for example, be measured in the social and health sectors. Men hold more places at the top of society as leaders and highest earners, but they also dominate the bottom as outcasts, the homeless, alcoholics, etc.[4] It is thus no coincidence that the man who sits on "The Bench" in the 2000 Danish film was praised by critics. Whilst he

sits on the bench, there is something almost heroic in the self-conscious destructive way in which he lets himself disintegrate. So too is this evident in Danish writer Tom Kristensen's novel *Hærværk* (Vandalism): "I have longed for vandalism, sailing disasters, and sudden death" (1930).

Traditionally, the teenage period has in the last 100 years been a time of violent masculine rebellion, from 'greasers' and their rock 'n' roll to fights with the police in James Dean's "Rebel Without a Cause" to gang activities. Globally, we are currently talking about 'angry young men' – particularly in developing countries – who form a latent source of unrest affected by desperation in the face of no future prospects apart from continued poverty.[5] Some of these angry young men represent a ticking time bomb that can explode in the direction of vandalism, terrorism and a flight from any social responsibility.

Although men much more easily fall to the bottom of society after a tough divorce or loss of employment, the welfare society is not equipped to take care of these shipwrecked men, who for their part do not seek help through family, friendships or other networks.[6]

The tendency to break the limits and go one's own way can be creatively innovative as is the case with much scientific activity, yet it can also be clearly destructive, such as the act of doping. For example, young men are highly represented among stand-up comedians but also among traffic violators.[7] Although many men dream of reaching the stars, most wake up to the routines of everyday life. While the engineer in Danish author Henrik Pontoppidan's novels about Lykke-Per is initially endowed with adventure, exploration and conquest, he ends up as a 'technical artist in the service of industry', a somewhat less heroic position in mass society. But the fantasy still lives in many boys. The Danish leisure study describes how many young boys seek what is called 'the technological heavenward flight' in airplanes and spaceships.[8]

American anthropologist David D. Gilmore shows in his book *Manhood in the Making* (1990) how virtually all known cultures have been based on male images that can be summarised in three words: the seducer, the provider and the protector (in Danish, the three Fs: *forføreren, forsørgeren* and *forsvareren*). According to Gilmore, men are expected in virtually every culture – including our modern culture – to step into character and de-

liver something extra, from being good providers to taking the initiative towards the other gender. Men who are reluctant to show initiative and ambition are considered non-masculine.

Sports in particular are a preferred area in which to study the masculine tendency to break limits. In 1896, the French baron Pierre de Coubertin created the modern Olympic Games with the boundary-breaking motto: 'Faster, higher, stronger'. For Coubertin, there was no doubt that the Olympics were created by and for men, and the main role of women was to place the laurel crown on the victor. Whilst women today are highly represented in sports and participate in many Olympic disciplines, generally women's interest in vigorous competitive sports is significantly weaker than that of men, whether we speak of participation in competitions, on the stands, or behind the screen.[9] The tendency of norm-breaking behaviour among men in sports must absolutely not be romanticised: consider hooliganism simply as an arch-masculine form of aggression. The threshold-bursting behaviour is not inherently positive and culturally creative, rather it can develop in one of two directions in terms of its effect on society: beneficial or destructive.

Throughout the 1930s and during the first part of the German occupation, general decorum prevented young people in particular from expressing too-strong opinions, and politics was often regarded as the older generation's business. In public contexts, people were expected not to behave too exaggeratedly. During the early occupation years, this standard was impressed further upon the people by the Danish political leaders who feared that the Germans would become so angered that they would intervene directly in Danish domestic politics and, for example, replace the Danish police with a branch of the Gestapo. Even at sporting events, it was not normal to whistle during the national anthem of the opponents, much less attack the opponent fans. With this as the background, it is important for researchers to be extra attentive to 'the parliament of the streets' during the occupation.

Sports co-operation with the Germans

During the occupation of Denmark, Hitler and Goebbels wanted to use open-air concerts, military parades, and sporting events to foster a friendly relationship between the Danes and Germany.[10] The German authorities assigned sports a central role in ensuring the development of popular and emotional forms of cooperation between the two countries. In practice, however, neither the open-air concerts nor the parades worked as intended, not least because the Danes would sometimes whistle and boo at the marching troops. Neither in other forms of culture – like theatre, cinema, or associations, such as the Danish-German Association – did the Germans gain any convincing cultural propaganda against the Danes.

The German plenipotentiary in Denmark, Renthe-Fink, put strong pressure on Danish sports and was eventually assisted by the Danish Foreign Ministry. Particularly after the accession of Scavenius as Foreign Minister on July 8, 1940, the Danish Foreign Ministry considered sports a suitable means by which to obtain the goodwill of the Germans and thereby took measures to ensure that the policy of collaboration ran smoothly.

Immediately after the occupation on April 9, 1940, the top management of the Danish Sports Federation (DIF) decided to stop sport competitions with foreign countries. The rationale behind this decision was nervousness about whether highly emotional football games shortly after Denmark had been occupied would heighten the emotions and tempers of spectators and destroy future possibilities for international sport cooperation. There was great fear of political reactions to continued sport cooperation with the Germans. This fear was fundamental to the entire German-Danish sport cooperation period during the first half of the German occupation.

From the autumn of 1941 onwards, Danish sport organisations nevertheless initiated a collaboration with the occupying power that was far more extensive than has since been publically known, because DIF has not exactly prioritised shedding light on these relationships. In the relatively short period from the first event on August 22, 1940 to the last match against a German team – a handball match on November 20, 1942

– there were held a wealth of national matches, city matches and other events, in which particularly the boxing and wrestling associations and the track and field associations were involved as active organisers. After this time, the Germans became very busy with the war effort, and the sport activities and cooperation therefore ceased. Before this, however, sport matches with Germany took place in football, handball, boxing and wrestling – during which all the teams faced the Germans twice – as well as in weightlifting, fencing and hockey. Sport matches also took place with the other Third Reich powers, such as tennis matches with Italy, athletics competitions with Hungary, and wrestling matches with Croatia. Swastika banners waved side-by-side with the Danish flag, the German athletes gave the Nazi salute, the German spectators responded with the Nazi salute, and spectators sung both the Danish Royal Anthem and "Deutschland, Deutschland über Alles" which in Germany was followed by the Nazi battle anthem, the Horst Wessel song.

The Danish troop was greeted with 'heil' salutes from the public, during their entry march into the Olympic Stadium in Berlin. The Danish Olympic committee, nevertheless, maintained that the games were quite a-political.

The sport cooperation was for the German occupiers a sensitive barometer of the Danish population's acceptance of the prevailing power relationship. It certainly created anxiety among both German and Danish sport leaders that during the occupation period's first match against Sweden in Denmark on October 6, 1940, in the midst of the community singing, flyers

with political content were distributed. After the Swedish and Danish national anthems had been sung, many spectators pointedly began singing the Norwegian national anthem, which the Danish police interrupted because this support for the hard-occupied Norwegian brothers was considered anti-German.

Overall, the Danish presses were positive about the sport cooperation with the Germans. Due to media censorship, a negative attitude towards the Germans could not be expressed, but nevertheless the press could have chosen to downplay the news reports of the sport cooperation. Some resistance could be spotted in subtle forms: for example, a picture of a young footballer wearing a hat with Royal Air Force colours in the middle of summer. But such images were rare and perhaps even unintentional.

The illegal press was against the sport cooperation with the Germans, but only one example of resistance against the cooperation can be found in the legal press. It involved Harold Philipson, a Dane with British roots who had great significance for the development of the archetypal British sport cricket in Denmark. He edited the magazine *Football*, which was published in the first quarter of 1941 with a clear pro-British logo. In relation to the athletic competition with the Nazi-controlled Norwegian sport federation in Oslo in September 1941 and the football match against Germany in Dresden in November 1941, the British directed a sharp criticism of the sport cooperation via the BBC, and the Danish resistance movement delivered criticism via the London paper *Frit Danmark (Free Denmark).* The Danish-German sport cooperation obviously did not please a country that was involved in a fight for existence against Germany.

Nazi-saluting opponents

After the first Danish-German football match, which took place in Hamburg in November 1940, football cooperation moved to Denmark, where the big question was whether everything could happen there just as peacefully as in Germany. At the start, everything seemed calm. The spring of 1941 may be described as the most peaceful time during the occupation. A silent protest, however, was beginning to emerge, with some Danes beginning to wear red-white-and-blue Royal Air Force in-

signias.[11] Organised resistance, including sabotage, was not yet on the agenda, and sport cooperation, which was now under way, helped to give the situation a semblance of normality. It was not to last long.

The breakthrough for the meeting between the large Danish sport public and the German teams would be in the summer of 1941, when plans were set for exchanges between clubs and the first national football match against Germany on Danish soil during the occupation. The meeting with the German clubs Austria and Admira would prove to have a fatal impact on the continued Danish-German sport cooperation. Austria had been incorporated in 1938 into Greater Germany, and its football clubs had been known for a light, elegant and impromptu soccer style since the mid-1920s. Soon nicknamed *Wunderteam*, the Austrian national team won the 1933 European Mitropacup against the best two Viennese teams and teams from Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Italy,[12] and in 1936 won silver at the Olympic Games in Berlin, second to the powerful Italians. During the same period from 1926 both Austria and the German Admira had become professionalized.

On May 28, 1941, Austria played the first match against a select Danish team. The superior style of the Viennese did not show up in the first match, which the team lost 4–1 in front of 11,000 spectators, a near anticlimax.[13] On May 30, Austria and Denmark played a rematch before 15,000 spectators, and this time it was an Austrian victory of 1–0. According to the newspaper *Politiken*, 'the Danish everyman's-tempo' team surpassed Austria, which scored on an imprudent Danish dribbling.[14] After the Viennese had scored in the 22nd minute of the second half, they concentrated, according to the Danish *Sports magazine*, on "slowing the game as much as possible in meaningless long kicks over the sidelines. With this, Austria did nothing for its popularity during this visit."[15] In addition, the *heil* of the Austrian players irritated the young Danish men in the stands, and tumult occurred at times.[16] The Danish fans were probably surprised that an Austrian club team now stood and propagated political salutes in Denmark's national stadium, Parken, in Copenhagen. That the German national team expressed itself with the heil on Danish soil was more commonly known, but it is not certain that all the Danish fans had understood that Austria from 1938 had been part of the Greater German Reich and that heil salutes were therefore mandatory.

The German Wehrmacht's own newspaper noted with irritation the unrest among the young hotspurs.[17] With a picture from the match and the heading "Wiener footballers in Copenhagen", it was determined that part of the Danish audience unfortunately displayed a "very unsporting attitude." After the match, when the Austria players brought forth "the German greeting", a concert of catcalls began, which testified, as it was expressed, to the lack of discipline in the Danish sport public. Commenting on the upcoming match against Admira, the Wehrmacht's newspaper intimidated that no similar episodes were expected at the upcoming matches and the coming national match. When in fact this did happen again, the Wehrmacht newspaper stopped its coverage of German-Danish sport events. It turns out that there was good reason to fear the reaction of the Danish audience.

Rebellion on the tribune

On Constitution Day, June 5, 1941, it was Admira's turn to play in Copenhagen in front of 12.500 spectators. During the match, Admira did not succeed in showing the people of Copenhagen the decidedly Viennese style, in which the ball is passed along the ground from man to man with great accuracy. The field was both rough and hard, causing the ball to jump up and change direction. Yet the Austrians won 4–1, among other things with a goal in the match's very first minute, and the team could show "us examples of the pure, intelligent and imaginative play, which has always characterized the team."[18]

Admira's success on the pitch did not help the mood of the Danish fans, who read the outcome as a symbol of the occupation power's general supremacy. The attending German soldiers' *heil* to the players immediately before the match also created resentment among the young (Danish) male audience, and "there were tough comments from both sides, and some German soldiers got their caps forced down on their heads".[19] At the same time, there were disturbances and tumult in the stands between Danes and German soldiers that in some cases resulted in actual fights.[20] For once, a large number of young Danish men clearly outnumbered the

German soldiers, and it was difficult for the Germans to call in reinforcements from either other German soldiers or Danish police. After the referee's final whistle, when:

> ... People streamed onto the pitch, it went really wrong. Since the German soldiers on the cheap long side had to leave the stadium on foot, they did so in clusters, and the Danish spectators suddenly found themselves clearly outnumbering Wehrmacht's soldiers. At the exits, the German soldiers were clenched together with Danish spectators, which led to some battles.[21]

The disturbances continued outside the stadium, where about 25 to 50 German soldiers came together in the middle of the crowd to defend themselves as a group. The situation was running amok, and a police commissioner was able to place a chain of policemen around the soldiers and ordered the "truncheons out". In this way, the police separated the quarrelsome Danish men and German soldiers, who hurriedly left the

It was not difficult to identify German or German-friendly spectators at Idrætsparken on 7 October 1934, when Denmark played against Germany. It may possible be Frits Clausen, leader of the Danish Nazi party, giving the 'heil' salute, to the furthest left of the picture.

area. The Danes went "forward reluctantly", and the police managed to settle the situation without using their batons. This situation could have developed into actual fighting between Danes and German soldiers. It was at any rate the involved police officers' impression that if they had not interfered at the time, the German soldiers might have taken serious action, "as they seemed really excited."[22] A man who shouted at police "your turn will also come" was arrested.

Some of the spectators had turned up with explicit political intentions to challenge the occupation force, for example, by handing out flyers. Historian Niels Gyrsting wrote that:

> In Østerbro/Ryvang, which the Communists called District 15, a local newspaper group made many copies of 'Political Monthly'/'Land and People,' as well as their own paper, 'News Service'. One of the staff of this magazine group, from 1941 to the liberation on 5th May 1945, was Erik Rønne Petersen, who described himself as being a DKU member (Danish Communist Youth) during the occupation. He told me in 1993 when we talked about the magazine work that he had also participated in the DKU provocations during international matches against the Germans, which he described as the events at the main stadium in the summer of 1941. He said that it was the first thing he had been involved in, reading the resistance. They were a group from DKU who before the game agreed that they should distribute handouts/flyers with anti-German content among the audience and to shout slogans against the Germans. This they did, and he was very happy that much of the rest of the audience joined in the expressions of discontent against the Germans.[23]

According to one of the German reports, it had in the German soldiers' macho language been necessary for them to "thrash a number of Danes". With the German soldiers' appraisal of their own manly punch of the provocative Danish fans they stated that "Wehrmacht soldiers had beaten them so thoroughly that they believed that the problem was over and done with".[24]

In reality, the Germans were shocked by the disturbances. Much suggested at this point that the war would soon be over, and the Danes would

therefore have to find their place in the new German order. But was it perhaps just this that affected the psychology of the situation? For many of the young Danish men, the overwhelming German progress was a suffocating reality. To see the German superior forces so tangibly displayed by German football players in red and white defeating a Danish football league team in Denmark's national stadium on Constitution Day and saluting jubilant uniformed representatives of the occupying power with numerous German *heils* was like a red rag to a bull for the Danish spectators.

The Admira episode can be viewed as the beginning of the story of Danish hooliganism as performed by young Danish men prior to which there could of course have been trouble, but not to such an extent. In his 1990 memoir the Danish national team player Knud Lundberg strikingly contrasted the 1930s and 1940s quiet-spectator atmosphere of the up-to 36,000 spectators in the national stadium with the atmosphere of today, in which we have "high grills between the public and the players, also in the national stadium":

> How peaceful and cosy it was in the stadium at that time. I can best describe it as a stage scene that I have never seen equalled. We were going to play against Frem, which was the country's most popular team. The stands were packed even before the game began. Many spectators could not get admission – which they could not bear. They blew up the gates and poured in. This can be dangerous. Elsewhere in the world, spectators are crushed to death against walls and fences. But at the stadium, it was no problem. The boys who were at greatest risk as they were always allowed to stand in front to see were in danger of being trapped against the meter-high fence around the field. But they were just lifted over it and onto the grass.[25]

The Admira episode in particular stands out because the word 'disturbance' at sporting events was unknown in Denmark at the time, let alone 'political' and 'ideological' protests. There had been isolated scuffles between drunken supporters from different teams, and good-natured teasing at Swedish-Danish games between 'supporter groups', but nothing else. The Admira episode can thus be seen as the starting point of the

story of Danish collective spectator violence or, to use a contemporary expression hooliganism.

The outbreak of unrest during the Admira game was connected with the Nazi salutes by the Admira players both before and after the game, which clearly demonstrated that the Viennese squad presented itself as a Nazi team, and Denmark was therefore playing against representatives of the occupying power. Spectators could thus no longer ignore the players' active support of the Nazi regime and their idea of a greater German nation. This recognition must have occurred long ago among the most loyal part of the Danish public who also had attended the previous two games against *heil*-saluting Austrian players. The German fatherland had also been particularly piqued over "something so outrageous as to reply to a sports team's well-intentioned greeting after the game with catcalls."[26]

Compared to other conflicts between German soldiers and the Danes prior to June 5, 1941, it becomes clear that the Admira incident regarding violence and scope clearly surpassed all previous disturbances, most of which were characterised by young Danish men yelling and whistling at German parades and the weekly German revues in cinemas and fights at dancing establishments where alcohol levels could be high. Although Renthe-Fink, the German plenipotentiary in Denmark, was very sensitive to any kind of turmoil and could use any incident to blackmail the Danish government, there was nothing prior to the Admira episode that was remotely at the same level of political impact.

The German and Danish football leadership both understood the riots clearly as being politically motivated, and Renthe-Fink used this opportunity to reorganise the Danish police and to dispose of the Danish Minister of Justice, Harald Petersen, who had long been a thorn in the eye of the occupying power. It happened as follows: on June 7, two days after the Admira game, Renthe-Fink called Prime Minister Stauning and Foreign Minister Scavenius to a meeting to present them with his demand for the Minister of Justice's to retire from office. A further requirement was to establish a special police department within the Ministry of Justice. Renthe-Fink presented clearly his dissatisfaction with Minister Harald Petersen's attitudes and actions and made him personally responsible for the Admira episode.[27]

Harald Petersen had been a nuisance to the occupying power because

as Minister of Justice he refused to do favours for the Germans. He showed great resolve against German demands, for example, by maintaining the Danish ban on public meetings, which irked the Danish Nazi party, and by bringing charges against Danish Nazis for having committed violence against the police in the 'shovel battle' in Haderslev in December 1940. The Germans were especially angry that he advocated that police officers should be rewarded and receive honourable distinctions after the violent confrontation. In the period leading up to the Admira game, the Ministry of Justice's jurisdiction areas (Harald Petersen's sphere of influence) had been increasingly eroded according to German orders.[28]

The Danish government was ready to reject a note from the Germans that demanded the Minister of Justice step down, with reference to the German promise to allow Danish domestic political autonomy, but Harald Petersen was himself prepared to resign in order to not contribute to a future escalation of the conflict. The government then decided that his departure should first take place in early July so that people would not connect his departure with the Admira turmoil, which popular opinion nevertheless quite easily could grasp. In addition, the other German request for a closer relationship between the Ministry of Justice and the Police was complied with through the creation of a special 'Department of Police Affairs'.[29]

There are clear signs that the German uniformed soldiers – who enjoyed being spectators, not in the least due the Nazi focus on fanatic masculine sport behaviour – felt themselves less and less welcome in the following year at Danish sporting events. Danish troublemakers made life so difficult for the German spectators that they preferred to stay at the barracks than risking unrest by just showing up. Sport events –with their ability to gather large emotionally excited crowds of young men – were the perfect places to provoke the representatives of the occupying power. For once they were in the absolute minority, and sport events comprised places in which Danish troublemakers could hide themselves within the crowd if necessary.

Conclusion

"Your turn will also come."
(Danish spectator to police on June 5, 1941)

At the beginning of the occupation, Danish sports collaborated very closely with their German counterparts. Compared to other cultural sectors, such as film and the theatre, sports were the only sector in which the Danish-German cooperation for a period experienced a major breakthrough with enthusiastic spectators in Denmark and Germany.

For the ordinary Dane, the occupation period's decisive schism was not cooperation or resistance. For the vast majority, there was no doubt that cooperation with the Germans was necessary in order to not throw the country into poverty and chaos. The big question, however, was how close to the Germans one should move. Preferably no closer than was absolutely necessary to keep the politics of cooperation going was the belief of the majority. The problem was simply that the limit of what was needed was in a grey area, in which it was very difficult to draw the line.

During the first year of the occupation, however, a dividing line between DIFs and the sport associations' very close collaboration with the occupying power appeared, as well as the pro-democratic Danish Youth Association's desire to keep the Germans at arm's length. Gradually it also became clear that among the spectator masses, there was a strong irritation over the politicised sport cooperation. DIF had allowed the many perhaps less critical young elite athletes as well as spectators to have their spiritual immune systems weakened through too-close contact with the enemy and its propaganda.

DIFs ideology of not mixing sports and politics was used to legitimise the most extensive politicisation ever of Danish sports and resulted in the most striking example of cultural interaction with the occupation power. It is ironic that DIF was actually too apolitical to be able to prevent the cynical German rulers from using Danish sports for propaganda purposes.

'The rebellion in the park', Constitution Day 1941, was a clear example of the trend among young men to go to the edge. This 'rebellion' thereby became an example of the tendency of young men in particular to act as the 'extreme gender' that, for better or worse, can react radically to challenges.

It was not without danger to challenge the occupying power, which in mid-1941 had emerged as a military victor and seemingly as the future ruler of continental Europe. Reflecting a typical masculine desire for confrontation, the real game took place between armed and uniformed young German soldiers, who obviously felt humiliated by the crowd's rebellion, and the pocket state's young football spectators.

It was the Germans, and not the Danish sport authorities, who toned down the interest in sport cooperation. What initially made the collaboration go to pieces was the turmoil from below from the unruly elements of the population, and just as in the August uprising in 1943, it was large-scale unrest in Danish provincial cities and towns that led to a confrontation with the cooperation policy up until then. The Danish sport authorities were not interested in this break, but were implementing a continuous cooperation at the highest level. However, their scope after June 5, 1941, was so reduced that the issue of sport collaboration with foreign countries was totally out of their control.

Hitler's and Goebbels' idea to win over the Danes through a friendly sport relationship with Germany was a failure, and the German authorities had to admit defeat. On the contrary, sports had led to the first major crisis between the common Danish population and the Wehrmacht. Hitler, Goebbels and Renthe-Fink's confidence in sports as a friendly link between Denmark and Germany was now gone. Sports had become a hotbed of anti-German demonstrations and a source of unrest among young Danish men, who were precisely the group to which the resistance movement appealed.

It was not, as put forth in a leading part of the research about the occupation, the student protests against the Anti-Comintern Pact in late November 1941 that ushered in a collective insubordination against the occupation.[30] It was rather the football disturbance during and after the Admira game that had a broader social foundation and a higher level of aggression than the student protest.

It was typically young men who were the leaders in the resistance movement's violent confrontations with the occupation power, and resistance women therefore worked more in intelligence and communications.[31] This notwithstanding, it must be stressed that the tendency of men to enter the scene as the 'extreme gender' does not necessarily imply a general tendency for what is today viewed as a positive masculine heroism, as seen in the resistance movement. Here one need only think of the many young Danish male volunteers on the eastern front, often

inspired by fantasies about the brave Viking tribes struggling against hordes of 'eastern sub-humans', an armed effort that probably contributed more to the war than the Danish resistance movement.[32]

Maybe DIF should consider celebrating June 5, 1941 – Constitution Day – as a red-letter day for sport; the day when the rebel supporters said no to German propaganda on the sports field. On this birthday of Danish democracy, we could celebrate the indomitable young men in the stadium stands and the elder sportsmen with moral courage and personal integrity, such as DIF board member Ernst Petersen, who categorically rejected DIFs cooperation with the occupation power. In celebrating Constitution Day, DIF would also signal that the organisation now actually operates on a political foundation of democracy and humanism.

Notes

1. Podaliri and Balestri 1998, 88–100.
2. Elias and Dunning 1966.
3. The following is based on my book *Det ekstreme køn (The extreme gender)*, Århus, 2008. The article has been kindly translated by Tina Gail Jensen, Copenhagen University.
4. Bonde 2008.
5. Turner 2004.
6. Andersen et al, 1999, p 31–45.
7. Christoffersen and others, 2008.
8. Bille et al. 2005.
9. Larsen 2003, 55.
10. When no other reference is mentioned, this section is based on Bonde 2006, passim.
11. Brøndsted 1941 I, p. 246.
12. Sports-Bladet 23/5 1941, p. 3.
13. Idrætsbladet 30/5 1941.
14. Politiken 31/5 1941.
15. Sports-Bladet 3/6 1941, p. 5.
16. National Archives, Auswärtiges Amt (abbreviated AA) – package 201 dated June 7th from Renthe-Fink on request from von Grundherr and Auswärtiges Amt – package 201 June 14th from Renthe-Fink to "Auswärtiges Berlin".
17. Kopenhagener Soldatenzeitschrift, no. 48, 8/6, 1941, p. 19.
18. Idrætsbladet 6/6 1941
19. National Archives, Foreign Ministry (abbreviated UM) - package 84.g.5, – "Tysk-dansk

fodboldkamp 5/6 1941 – tyskfjendtl. Demonstr. og Slagsmaal"– police report dated A. d. 5/6–1941.
20. Koch 1994 and A.A. – package 201 dated 14/6 of Renthe-Fink to "Auswärtiges Berlin"
21. U.M. – package 84.g.5/82 – Police report C
22. U.M. – package 84.g.5/82 – Police report A
23. Gyrsting writes further that the DKU member "unfortunately had not saved some of the printed material that he had helped press and distribute". So it may be difficult to document the printed matter. Regrettably I did not "finish" speaking with him because he missed planned meetings etc. – I got the impression that he quickly became demented. Suddenly he could not recognise me when I met him on the street. I found that he and another person in the early 1950s had answered questionnaires about the illegal printing during the Occupation. The questionnaires were concerning 'The Political Monthly Letter', 'Land and People' and 'News Service'. They are on KB mail dated 5/6–2009 from Niels Gyrsting to the undersigned.
24. A.A. – package 201 dated 14/6 from Renthe-Fink to 'Auswärtiges Berlin'.
25. Lundberg 1990, 54.
26. Fædrelandet 11/6 1941
27. A.A. – package 201 dated 7/6 written by Renthe-Fink on request from von Grundherr. To various German authorities.
28. Koch, 1994.
29. Brøndsted and Gjedde 1946, 248f.
30. Kirchhoff 2002, 103–106.
31. Osted 1995.
32. Christensen and Scharff Smith 1998.

References

Andersen, Evald (red). 1964. Dansk Boldspil-Union 1889-1964. København: NC-Trykkeriet.

Andersen, J. and Elm Larsen, J. 1999. Social polarisering og køn, i: Mænd på vej: Ligestillingsrådet, s. 1–45.

Bille, Trine (m.fl.). 2005. Danskernes kultur- og fritidsaktiviteter 2004. – med udviklingslinjer tilbage til 1964. København: akf forlaget.

Bonde, Hans. 1991. Mandighed og Sport. Odense: Odense Universitetsforlag.

Bonde, Hans. 2006. Fodbold med fjenden – dansk idræt under hagekorset. Odense. Syddansk Universitetsforlag.

Bonde, Hans. 2008. Det ekstreme køn. Århus: Hovedland.

Brøndsted, Johannes & Gjedde, Knud. (1946) De fem lange år, København: Gyldendal.

Christensen, Claus Bundgård; Poulsen, Niels Bo and Scharff Smith, Peter. 1998. Under hagekors og Dannebrog – danskere i Waffen SS. København: Aschehoug. 1. udgave.

Christoffersen, M.N., Soothill, K., and Francis, B. (2008): "Risk factors for a first-time drinkdriving conviction among young men: A birth cohort study of all men born in Denmark in 1966" i: Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment, 34, 4.

Elias, Norbert and Dunning, Eric. (1966). Zur Dynamik von Sportgruppen. Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von Fußballgruppen. Lüschen, Günther (red). Kleingruppen-forschung und Gruppen im Sport. Sonderheft 10 der Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie. Köln und Opladen, 118–134.

Gilmore, David, D. 1990. Manhood in the Making: Cultural Concepts of Masculinity. Yale University Press.

Havemann, Nils. 2005. Fussball unterm Hakenkreutz – Der FdB zwischen Sport, Politik und Kommerz. Frankfurt am Main/New York: Campus Verlag.

Kirchhoff, Hans. 2002. Samarbejde og modstand under besættelsen – en politisk historie. Odense Universitetsforlag. 1. udgave.

Koch, Henning. 1994. Demokrati slå til! Statslig nødret, ordenspoliti og frihedsrettigheder 1932–1945. København: Gyldendal.

Kristensen, Tom. 1930. Hærværk. København: Gyldendal.

Larsen, Knud. 2003. Idrætsdeltagelse og idrætsforbrug i Danmark. Århus: Forlaget Klim.

Lundberg, Knud. 1990. Et liv i leg - en gadedrengs bekendelser, København: Gyldendal.

Mangan, J.A. (red.). 1995. Tribal Identities, Nationalism, Europe and Sport. London: Frank Cass Publishers.

Osted, Rie and Wahl, Agnete (red.). 1995. Vi var der også. 26 kvinder fortæller om hverdagen under besættelsen. København: Høst.

Podaliri, Carlo and Balestri, Carlo. (1998) The Ultras, Racism and Football Culture in Italy. Brown, Adam (red). Fanatics! Power, identity and fandom in football. London: Routledge, 88-100.

Rasmussen, Steen (1981) Dansk Idræts Forbund 1940-45 – Med specielt henblik på forholdet til Tyskland, speciale fra Københavns Universitet, vejleder Henrik Nissen.

Teichler, Hans Joachim. 1991. Internationale Sportpolitik im Dritten Reich. Schorndorf: Hofmann.

Turner, Simon. 2004. Introduktion. Turner, Simon (ed.). Vrede unge mænd, Globalisering, marginalisering og mobilisering. Den Ny Verden. Tidsskrift for internationale studier 3, 7–14.

Warring Anette. 1994. Tyskerpiger – under besættelse og retsopgør. København: Gyldendal.