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Preface

If we were to describe a certain contemporary global system with one culture and no social or other kinds of barriers this would be sports. After the Olympic Movement, sports entities started forming autonomous (international and national) sports authorities that operate as sports-states next to nation-states. The sports world, facing no local obstacles, was very quickly internationalized and globalized, perhaps even too quickly.

Although the world is a hundred years back from the sports world in terms of globalization, on the other hand the sports world politically speaking is still in the middle ages.

The global sports system headquarters are seated in Switzerland and from a legal point of view it operates as a Swiss private entity. This highest authority in sports however, is not a national not even an international entity. It functions at a higher level. It does not need any recognition by national authorities and has no obvious political claims. It is therefore a non-national, global authority governing local state-like sports entities.

This global system is self-governing and regulating its own affairs to the best interest of its subjects and it is assisted by the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) offering dispute resolution services at international level for sports-related cases. Its rulings generate a new legal order called Lex Sportiva which is separate from any national legal order.