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ABSTRACT

This research analyzes changes in the rhetoric of a sustaining myth in order to better assess what happens when a myth is threatened. By examining American sport and its current struggle to withstand the widespread use of steroids, the author investigates how public discourse about the scandal turns athletes from mythical heroes to cheaters. The author begins by explicating the rhetorical construction of the athlete as a moral hero in America and how this myth is perpetuated today. The author then examines how steroids threaten the myth of the moral athlete and uses Major League Baseball as a case study to illustrate the rhetorical justification of their use. Ultimately this research offers a cyclical method of mythical analysis as a new method to analyze threatened myths. Current research offers few methods to explain how myths develop and this cyclical method attempts to provide specificity for one-way myths can survive. It is argued that the cyclical method acts as a way to account for threats to the myth, as well as to allow for rhetorical shifts.
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Myths hold a long and complex grasp on how humankind makes sense of the world. Like a hand stretched out that alternately clutches and loosens its grip, myths work themselves into our society where they grope along the spectrum of obvious untruths and clear reality. Myths, however, serve a fundamental part of cultures allowing early humans ways to understand life, death, and the creation of the universe. Today humans still rely on them to guide and offer explanations for chaos. The necessity of myths and their ability to form perceptions of reality quickly reveals the power myths hold.

The power and purpose of myths, as identified by various scholars for the past several hundred years, grew more complex as humankind developed. Mythic studies vary from Descartes and Bacon’s views on myth’s affect on philosophic inquiry and rationality to Vico’s challenge that myths were part of a rational mind and could be used to create “truths.” Years later Sigmund Freud viewed myth’s function in the internal environment of the mind as the expression of an individual’s unconscious wishes, fears, and drives. Stemming out of Freud’s perception, Joseph Campbell and Carl Jung offered a broader viewpoint and argued myths were an expression of a universal, collective unconscious. Additionally, other scholars such as Eliade viewed myths as the essence of religion, Radin viewed myths from an economic perspective, and Lévi-Strauss saw myths as abstract constructions instead of narratives or symbols of experience (Rosenberg, 1994). The diversity of myth’s purpose and function, therefore, makes studying it both a complex but a potentially very rewarding endeavor. Myth gives meaning to our lives, relationships, and communities, and by understanding it we can better understand the world around us.

At the heart of myth lies the role of language to create symbolically and socially constructed meaning. This rhetorical viewpoint of myth emphasizes the struggle over symbols to
create meaning, as well as the ability for the meanings of the symbols to change. Discourse serves as a way to structure myth and works to recycle and reinscribe the myth. Custodians of myths impose a rhetorical frame on events and constantly reinscribe the major components of the relevant myth. Myths, therefore, can become highly coherent and powerful pieces of ideo-topoi and when employed through this frame, myths serve as symbolic action.

This study looks at an institution in crisis. American sport is currently struggling to withstand the widespread use of steroids and how their use turns athletes as mythical heroes into cheaters. Institutions are based on guiding standards and presumptions, but in crisis, institutions may be forced to change their core justifications and the guiding social myth that legitimizes and sustains them. For example, American agriculture was long sustained by the myth of the yeoman farmer as the ideal citizen. Jefferson and other founders of the Republic taught that the farmer had a stronger sense of responsibility and morality than city dwellers or wage workers and that the Republic could only be sustained by a large mass of small family farmers. This myth served to provide a legalizing rhetoric for societal actions such as land grant colleges, county agents, and homesteading grants. This myth, however, could not survive massive urbanization and industrialization. Despite the populist revolts and the support of rural legislators, the mechanization of agriculture altered farming and the farmer beyond recognition. The myth survives as an aesthetic bit of nostalgia, but is dead as a living force. Instead the myth has transformed into the myth of the cowboy. Modern agricultural magazines and digests feature the farmer as a technical expert and the farm as a valuable mass of resources that must be managed in a rational and systematic way to maximize production.

Similarly, Kipling’s myth of the Imperial Adventure – that of brave Europeans bringing the benefits of advanced Western Civilization to the non-Europeans – is bankrupt. The myth, however, did give meaning and purpose to the lowliest British civil servant serving in India and
to the French missionary priest in an African leper colony. Over time, every part of this once
sustaining myth has undergone symbolic transformation. The white adventurer is seen as an
exploiter, the ideals of westernization as racist and sinister, missionaries as breakers of native
culture, and industrialists as destroyers of native arts and crafts.

This dissertation proceeds on the assumption that the rhetorical transformations of these
sustaining myths may be barometers of the institutional vitality of an enterprise. Changes in the
rhetoric of the myth may signal warning, or even symbolic death, for the institution. It may be
that some institutions exhibit a more robust mythic rhetoric than others. Their authorizing myths
might survive the most devastating attacks or the greatest social upheavals.

Accordingly, I have chosen a very robust and pervasive human practice for study: sport. Recognized as “the most important and quite possibly the sole repository for myth in American society today” (Oriard, 1982, p. 212), sport’s institutional form and guiding myth have changed over the centuries. Its present institutional form, that of a commercial mass marketed sport, has achieved some stability over the past century and a half. The sustaining myth of the athlete as a moral hero has been widely accepted and eagerly embraced; it has justified an enormous spectrum of sporting activity. The myth transcends race, class, and gender; it forms surrogate communities; is advanced as preparation for the good life; as well as the embodiment of the values of honesty, fair play, and productive competition. The myth is poetically embellished, endlessly adapted and crafted by thousands of coaches, sports writers, and politicians. It is what Burke would call “a very robust rhetoric.”

I have chosen the study of the intentional formation of myth in sport because it is in grave
danger of losing its power of communal integration. The current steroid crisis in baseball has
presented what might be a direct frontal attack to its cherished mythic narrative of sport as a
character building and moral enterprise. Although illegal supplements have been a part of sport
since ancient Greek times, American society is only recently reacting to their use. In the past, occasionally news would develop out of an Olympic event half way around the world with obscure athletes and sports being reprimanded for steroid use. Now one cannot open a major newspaper without reading about steroids or testosterone use by major athletes. Fan reaction, the institution of new drug testing procedures and policies, and governmental intervention illustrate the public’s disagreement with their use.

This research hopes to add to previous scholarship and is particularly interested in how myths change and function over time. Because myths have often been seen as repositories of large universal “truths,” scholars have seldom studied them as protean narratives evolving through the pressure of social changes. Their function as guides to their communities has obscured their capacity for rhetorical adaptation. Predominantly following Campbell’s and Jung’s view of myth as illustrative of a collective unconscious based on archetypes, I argue that traditional linear models of myth do not provide an adequate portrayal of what myths do when they are threatened. Ultimately, I argue that theoretical notions of how myths develop are inadequate. Many scholars argue that as myths develop, they either go through stages or spiral out. I agree with this, however, I argue that when myths are in an advanced stage or they are threatened, there is a hole in the research that adequately offers a way to account for what occurs when myths are threatened. I extend Burke, Vico, and Doty’s (2000) phases of myth to argue that the phases can be cyclical in nature. By understanding myths in cyclical rather than linear developments, a better understanding of how myths change when threatened can be attained.

My research, therefore, formulates a new cyclical method of mythical analysis as a way to account for this inadequacy. Steroids present a serious threat to the myth of sport as an honest, character building activity that most fans arguably base their attendance, loyalty, and dollars on each season. As more stories of steroids in sport surface, fans must reconcile the myth
of sport with the reality of sport. This method is analogous to Neo-Platonism, the doctrine that argues that even a community’s highest ideals are gradually modified through social practice. Thus, behavior and ideals are interactive, not separate realms. Ideals do drive social praxis, but inevitable contradictions arise in attempting to conform to an ideal and the result is a dialectical synthesis.

The cyclical method of mythical analysis hinges on the way the body and death in sport have been contextualized throughout history. Sport for the ancient Mayans and Aztecs consisted of games played with balls that stretched over hundreds of yards and lasted for days. The games ended when there was one man left alive. A major way Romans understood sport was by watching Gladiators fight one another or animals to the bloody finish. Sport at this time was associated with myths such as hard work, temerity, and personal character, but it was also associated with life and death. Over time, and as technological advances led to a clear line between sport and leisure, the myth of sport started to change. Although the core characteristics were still there -- hard work, perseverance, etc. -- sport now was seen as a way to overcome difference, build character, leadership, and goodwill among various groups of people. The athlete accomplishing amazing feats on the playing field, and the discourse that framed these achievements, transferred to an overall myth of sport that centered on the athlete as moral and altruistic.

The use of illegal supplements and the destruction to one’s body is central to this research. Using Doty’s (2000) terms for the stages of myth -- Primary, Implicit and Rational -- I argue that the use of illegal supplements moves the myth of sport as moralistic from a Rational stage back to a Primary stage. In ancient sport, willingly killing oneself for the sake of sport was accepted through sacrifices. Broadly looking at myth, sport at this time was in the Primary stage of development. Societal development led to different views of sport’s impact on the body, as
harming bodies moved from the accepted destruction of oneself to a focus on the destruction of others. In this middle stage of sport, sport no longer had death as a part of its mythical state. Broadly looking at myth, sport at this time was in the Implicit stage. In modern sport, the Rational stage of myth, the use of illegal supplements forces people to reanalyze the role of athlete’s bodies. Illegal supplements, specifically steroids, destroy bodies and the willingness to use them may illustrate a rhetorical return to a Primary stage of myth in order to accept the use of steroids in sport and the destruction of one’s body. Sport allowed for athletes to willingly kill themselves in the Primary stage of sport myth, and the use of steroids may indicate a return to that stage. Evidence of growing acceptance of steroids should therefore be accompanied by a mythic shift.

The analysis of steroids in sport was chosen for this research due to the infusion of myth in sport and the unique role that steroids hold in sport versus other subject areas. Chuck Klosterman’s March 26, 2007 ESPN The Magazine article “Why We Look the Other Way” illustrates the uniqueness of steroids in sport as a form of cheating. His article raises an interesting point about the role of illegal supplements in sport. During the mid-1960s, the Beatles recorded the album Rubber Soul and Revolver while using marijuana and other serious drugs. Jack Kerouac wrote On the Road during a Benzedrine binge. A Wall Street broker might snort a line of cocaine before entering the trading floor and proceed to make money for his clients. Reaching beyond Klosterman’s article, the use of performance enhancing drugs was rampant among 19th century artists from Coleridge and De Quincey to Baudelaire and Wilde. In other words, the use of various drugs has long been associated with creating a superior product. The casual acceptance of this practice raises a puzzling question: why are their products not questioned while the use of illegal supplements by athletes is scrutinized and criticized under a very public microscope? Many use a drug or a combination of drugs in an attempt to increase
the value of their product – a music album, a book, money – but areas outside of sport are seemingly accepted with little rebuke.

This question is central to this study. In fact, this one query leads to multiple ways to investigate the relationship of sport, the use of illegal supplements, and the myth of sport. For example, why are illegal supplements in sport so problematic? How have players, fans, and the media coped with their use? Is athletes’ use of performance enhancing drugs new to sport? If not, why is their use only now being scrutinized? What larger ramifications does their use have for sports studies? What is the role of the myth of sport, or the myth of athletes such as the homerun king, in understanding their use? What can we learn about how myths function when they are threatened? These questions are what this study attempts to answer in order to find out why the use of illegal supplements by athletes dominates the headlines as immoral, problematic, and a threat to the enjoyment and belief in sports such as “America’s favorite pastime.”

This dissertation fills a gap not adequately discussed in myth study by addressing two major holes. The first weakness is the lack of researchers who view myth with a broad lens. Trubshaw (2003) identifies the narrow focus the majority of critics use to look at myth as the fundamental weakness among mythology research. This prevents firmly grasping what myths do on a broad level and the subsequent ramifications of myths acting so extensively. Few modern-day scholars attempt to mesh the micro views to formulate larger meanings of myth. Looking at how myths function across time in order to account for societal changes affords a kind of broad view of myth that to this point is missing.

The second weakness is the lack of researchers who apply myth to modern societies. Mythology often is considered to be the study of narratives from ancient societies, thereby becoming relegated to issues and concepts that seem very distant from contemporary times. This disconnect between myths in ancient and modern cultures threatens the importance of mythology
if they are not considered to be alive in modern cultures (Trubshaw, 2003). Furthermore, Campbell (2004) mirrors this argument by emphasizing the application of mythic systems specifically to modern societies in order to appreciate and grasp the cultural value traditional mythic orientations convey. That is why looking at myth through sport offers so many opportunities to fill the gap in research. Because sport has existed for most of recorded history, it affords an opportunity to look at a very broad development of myth. Sport’s development over thousands of years, and the increase of leisure time in modern times, has vastly increased the level of participation and significance in many societies. Its constantly growing importance as a repository of symbols and values make it attractive for the student of myth.

This study has several goals. The first goal is to treat myth as a dialectical communication form that accommodates social and cultural change. While scholars offer methods and models that treat myth as linear progressions (e.g. Doty, 2000), I argue threatened myths can work in a new more interactive way. It is within this method that apparent violations of social mores can be examined. The second goal is to seek to understand why the numerous stories of illegal supplements by athletes have altered certain mythic features while others remain recalcitrant. Many of the athletes in question are players who have revolutionized their sports, thereby fans and society must question how sport functions (or does not function) within the framework of hard work and perseverance. The third goal of this research is to ascertain the validity of studying sport from a rhetorical point of view. The growth of sport study in the past twenty years repeatedly illustrates its importance as an important area of human endeavor, but sport still is overlooked or disregarded by many scholars. Its popular culture status has undermined its legitimacy in the eyes of academic elites who have tended to define culture in terms of the high European canon of philosophy, art, music, and literature. This research calls
attention to the oversight and seeks to establish solid reasons for the benefit of rhetorically studying sport.

Let me further develop this last point. How has sport been overlooked? Often researchers and analysts reduce sport to numbers as a way to establish its validity. For example, sport is a $50 billion a year industry (McCleneghan, 1997) that reaches both fans and non-fans. According to the American Gaming Council, $5-6 billion is gambled legally and illegally on the Super Bowl each year. One thirty second advertising spot for the 2004 Super Bowl cost $2.3 million – this increased to $2.7 million in the 2008 Super Bowl. The NFL has a $200 million marketing contract with Nike. In 2004, ABC, NBC, and CBS televised approximately 600 hours of sports, and ESPN televised 2,293 hours of live or taped events reaching 82% of America’s 108 million homes with televisions (Martzke & Cherner, 2004). Consistent with the rise in cable television sports broadcasting, the number of weekly hours spent watching sports on television increased from 4.2 in 1987 (Gantz & Wenner, 1991) to 5.3 in 1998 (Beasley & Shank, 1998). In 1998, more people watched the Super Bowl than voted in the 1996 presidential election.

Football, the most watched American televised sport, drew one billion fans from 188 countries to watch the 2004 Super Bowl. With monetary and audience figures such as these, for some the numbers are enough. Although the majority of sport finds its legitimacy in the numbers – yes, a lot of people play sports and a lot of money is spent and earned – sport’s sheer popularity does not necessarily correlate with why it should be studied. Beyond the numbers, sport affords opportunities for personal growth, communal identity, and cohesive recreation.

Sport is part of a collective culture that acts as a symbolic thread that can tear communities apart or bring them together (O’Rourke, 2003). There have been protests over teams moving to a new city, congressional hearings when Major League Baseball (MLB) attempted to put a movie advertisement on the bases, and songs that made fun of team rivals
received major airplay. For example, in 2003 the song “Yankee’s (Stink),” sung to the beat of the 1988 New Kids on the Block hit “Hangin’ Tough,” became a Top 40 radio station’s most requested song in Boston. There are countless other examples of how communities are effected and how narratives spin out of sport. Research by Martin and Miller (1999) takes a cultural studies perspective that mirrors this way of thinking. They argue that looking at bodies at work and at play helps us to rethink the parameters of sport, as well as the very conception of the practical and the popular. Examined at this level, sport begins to turn into something much more relevant.

Beyond sport at a community level, sport works on larger societal levels. Sport incorporates virtually every significant social issue of the twentieth century (O’Rourke, 2003). Ping-Pong Diplomacy and the United States’ defeat of the Russian Olympic hockey team served as a stage for Communist and Democratic relations between nations. National and international race issues were personalized through baseball players such as Jackie Robinson and Fleetwood Walker; boxers Jack Johnson and Joe Louis; and runners Jesse Owens, Tommie Smith, and John Carlos. Muhammad Ali helped America challenge the draft and participation in the Vietnam War. On a business level, Franklin Foer (2004) argues about the ways soccer encourages globalization. He argues that sport is further along in globalization than any other economy on earth.

Sport, therefore, acts as a nexus of associated and interlocking organizations that includes media, industry, government, education, recreation, art, science, medicine, and technology (Burstyn, 1999; Rail, 1998) to teach us about culture, identity, bodies, the practical and the popular, gender, race, bureaucratization, commercialization, racism, sexism, homophobia, greed, exploitation of the powerless by the powerful, alienation, and ethnocentrism. Sport combines the spectacle (“a universal human social tendency to combine sport and pageantry”) with drama (“an
outcome that is not perfectly predictable”), with excellence (“the most able physically”), and with clarity (“exactly who won, by how much, and in what manner”) (Kyle, 2007, p. 4). There is a transcendent component to sport as you feel the undeniable emotional reaction you have to a big play even though you tell yourself that sport is not a big deal. Sport also satisfies the human desire to find or identify with something bigger than oneself. Just as athletes want to identify as part of a team or organization working and sacrificing towards a common goal, fans want to be part of a community through allegiance to a team or sports hero (Kyle, 2007). Former President of Yale University and the seventh commissioner of MLB, A. Bartlett Giamatti (1989), summarizes all of these insights valorizing the study of sport in the following statement: “It has long been my conviction that we can learn far more about the conditions, and values, of a society by contemplating how it chooses to play, to use its free time, to take its leisure, than by examining how it goes about its work” (p. 13).

Not only is studying sport an important area for research, it is fundamental to understanding myths. Myth and sport are inextricably linked and have been since the beginnings of sport. The classical poet Pindar wrote poems to winners of athletic contests in ancient Greece extolling the athletes as gods. The Odyssey and the Iliad describe the myth of the hero leaving home to face adversity all in order to fulfill some type of conquest. Newby (2006) looks at the literary account of sport in the Iliad and the Odyssey. At the time Homer wrote these epic poems, the eighth century, sport was held in two primary contexts – as part of funeral ceremonies or as entertainment. The Iliad focuses on sport as part of the funeral ceremonies while the Odyssey focuses on sport as entertainment. At the end of both of these epic poems, however, the hero returns home to the village to be embraced by those the hero had left. The notion of leaving home and returning is fundamental to sport. The hero, the athlete, and the myth are virtually indistinguishable.
This study builds an argument from one chapter to the next in order to fulfill a larger goal of illustrating how the rhetorical construction of the athlete hero and the threatened myth leads to a cyclical method of mythical analysis. The following, therefore, offers a brief overview of how this research is divided. Chapter Two discusses the academic history of myth and the role myths play in society. In this chapter, I look at popular definitions and functions of myth and how they are conveyed, in order to argue that sport is inextricable from myth. To understand either myth or sport, we must realize that the two cannot be separated. Chapter Three analyzes how literary discourse created the myth of sport, the athlete hero, as well as perceptions of the damaged hero. The foundation for modern fans to view athletes as courageous, honest, and role models stems from thousands of years of putting athletes in that role. Chapter Four looks at the rhetorical construction of the moral athlete hero in America. Specifically the years from 1850 – 1920, however, will be analyzed as they coincide with the most significant advances of sport in American history. Rhetorical efforts of the YMCA, Muscular Christianity, Bernarr Macfadden, Theodore Roosevelt, and the NCAA, offered a consistent proliferation of the myth of the athlete as a moral individual. Chapter Five explicates the arc of the myth today and how the moral athlete is still rhetorically perpetuated through sports commentators, broadcasters, advertising, movies, and novels. Chapter Six analyzes the history of steroids in sport and demonstrates how the ethos of the hero serves as the exigence for using steroids. Steroids have a long history within sport, but the mainstream exposure and perceived violations due to their use are unmatched by previous examples. Steroids, therefore, present a serious threat to the myth of the moral athlete and Chapter Six addresses this threat. Chapter Seven interrogates the rhetorical discourse of how the sporting public frames the use of steroids and “forgives” their heroes. I analyze the discourse through rhetorical analysis of two mainstream sports magazines between 1998 and 2008 – *Sports Illustrated* and *ESPN the Magazine*. Chapter Eight explicates the
acceptance of steroids and how that leads to a new method of analyzing myth. By looking at the rhetorical contextualization of death in sport from the ancient, middle, and modern periods respectively, a pattern emerges. I argue that this pattern illustrates that fans are returning to a primitive understanding of how fans view the body in sport. Chapter Nine offers a conclusion and explicates possible implications for rationalizing the destruction of the body through steroids and future research opportunities.

Overall, this dissertation attempts to analyze how even the hardiest myth is not infinitely elastic. Can the myth of sport accommodate this further fragmentation of its narrative or will it lose cohesion and relevance in a postmodern (and perhaps post-mythic) world? Can the ideal of the unaided individual batter, the man in the arena, survive the practice of judging? Can norms of fair play survive a roster of natural and enhanced athletes? This and other probable outcomes will be examined throughout this research.
CHAPTER TWO: A HISTORY OF MYTH AND HOW MYTH FUNCTIONS

Jean Houston’s (1980) phrase, “The myth is something that never was but is always happening…” (p. 6) succinctly suggests the complex nature of myth. Riddled with multiple definitions and applied to various topics, completely understanding myth requires a familiarization with its development and change historically and academically. This historical framework establishes myth as a deeply studied research area, but also illuminates how myths function and how we can analyze myths from different perspectives.

Myths provide meaning. From ancient times to modern day, people seek out myths to figure out what the world means, why we are alive, what happens when we die, why we should marry and have children, what we should think of our neighbors, enemies, or friends. The application of myths to our lives, however, is not always an intentional practice and can fall along a spectrum of positive and negative results. Myth research unveils the ways myths frame themselves as “truth” and defy the popular perceptions of myth as a falsehood. Hitler manipulated myths about Jews to justify concentration camps. Rape myths abound as justification for nonconsensual sex. Myths of how marriages and families are supposed to work often eventualize in divorce and dysfunction. For women there are myths about blondes, large breasts, and being single. For men there are myths about shoe size, penis size, refusing to ask for directions, and never showing emotion. Myths can infiltrate politics, personal relationships, families, businesses, and entertainment on a variety of levels.

This chapter explicates myth research by analyzing the development of myth study across pre-modern, modern, postmodern, and transmodern epochs. The chapter moves from defining myth; to explaining the relationship between myths, narratives, ideologies, and rituals; discussing what myths convey; how myths influence; the academic progression of myth; and the evolutionary models of myth. Furthermore, this chapter identifies myth as a part of social
invention. Sports writers, fans, and communities use discourse to reinscribe and (perhaps) reshape myth. This chapter provides the framework of how myth is studied in order to fulfill the larger goal of the project that corresponds the changes of myth with the changes in sport.

**Definition of Myth**

Definitions of myth generally come from two different perspectives: the popular and the academic. Both of these areas incorporate multiple ways to know what a myth is and how it works. Academic and popular definitions have hundreds of years of theory behind them arguing what myths are and how they function, but myth’s connotations might not immediately reveal the complexity of what a myth means – often it is relegated to something that is simply not true. One only needs to think of a politician who is easily refuted because what is said is simply a “myth” (Armstrong, 2005). This simplification, however, does not justify the broad manners through which people experience or perceive myth. An example of the complexity in finding an agreed upon definition is illustrated by a study over several years asking college students how they defined myth (Doty, 2000). The study revealed fifty individual definitions. Common themes within those definitions centered on the following seven concepts: 1. Myth as a narrative, literary form, or aesthetic device; 2. Subject matter referencing god or the “other” world; 3. Explaining origins; 4. A mistaken or primitive science; 5. Myth’s dependence on ritual; 6. Making universals concrete or intelligible, explicating beliefs, collective experiences, or values; 7. And expressing “spiritual” or “psychic” expressions. Although the fifty definitions can focus on a few themes, the themes themselves are disparate.

Popular perceptions, however, usually relegate myth to something untrue. One way to account for myth’s popular correlation to fiction, fantasy, or the imaginative is illustrated through the etymological development of the word. In ancient Greece, mythos – translated as “word” or “story” – originally referred to the way words were organized in story form (Doty,
Homer and other Greek poets recognized mythos as the way words were treated on the surface level of a text. Myths, simply understood, were the ornamental or the aesthetic arrangement of words in a literary text. Similar to Homer, Plato viewed mythos as an aesthetic or emotional complement to more rational discourse. He described myth as an art of language that could be placed alongside or within poetry. Greek scientific and philosophical development, however, soon drew a sharp distinction between the use of mythos versus logos. Logos, also translated as “word,” was closely associated with doctrine or theory as opposed to the ornamental or fictional use of mythos. Over time, therefore, mythology as imaginative became dichotomized with logos as logic. Latin adaptations and translations of mythos as fabula (the basis of “fable” or “fabulous” in English usage) solidified the fantastical nature of myth and separated it from the concrete and empirical domain of science. This etymological development of myth, thereby, demonstrates how myth gained its modern meaning closely aligned with falsehoods.

I was reminded of this recently when I went to get my haircut. As I told my hairdresser that I wrote about myth, he exclaimed: “Oh, like urban legends!” For him, there was no line between myth and falsity. What is interesting about his statement, however, is that he compared myth to an urban legend; a story that combines features of truth and fiction. Urban legend is defined in the following ways: “A story that appears mysteriously and spreads spontaneously in various forms and is usually false; contains elements of humor or horror and is popularly believed to be true” (WordNet), or “An apocryphal story involving incidents of the recent past, often including elements of humor and horror, that spreads quickly and is popularly believed to be true” (American Heritage Dictionary). Urban legends are fictitious stories, but they are based on events that could happen. The car breaking down on a deserted road and the sound of scratching on the roof, the lady walking to her car while someone waits underneath with a knife
to cut her Achilles, or alligators living in the New York City sewers are all examples of popular urban legends. They are stories that do not exist, but they could happen since they are based in experiences that could feasibly occur. A couple’s car could break down on a deserted road, and there could be someone waiting in the woods. I walk to my car at night often; there could be someone hiding underneath. A couple could have become overwhelmed with baby alligators and could have flushed them down the toilet to spend their lives in the sewers. Although my hairdresser’s simplification of myths as urban legends did not do justice to what myths are (or my research!), he did correctly identify a major issue popular perceptions of myth produce when only seen as untrue.

Interpretations of myths as solely false are problematic. Myths are inseparable from our cultural background and as they get more ingrained into our societal fabric, they can become accepted and rationalized. This is reflected in the majority of modern academic myth research that analyzes how myths work in society and how people often are unaware of their power. Depending on the myth and its development, therefore, myths can represent “truth.” This area is where much of the academic research of myth occurs which I will discuss in more detail later in the chapter by explicating what myths convey and how they influence.

Academic circles mirror the multiplicity of popular definitions of myth as intellectuals ranging from Descartes and Vico, to Campbell and Gould, have scrutinized myth for hundreds of years. All of the different definitions and meanings, however, have the underlying acceptance that the world prior to myth is chaotic, and myth offers a way to find meaning and identity in order to make sense of the world. According to Daniel (1990), “Nothing other than chaos exists prior to the world that the myth reveals, and what the myth reveals is the ability of discourse to order experience and expression in such a way as to make possible a world to be known” (p. 4). Within this agreed upon foundation, however, there are a wide array of interpretations that cross
notions of the sacred and the secular. For example, O’Rourke (2003) links classical meanings of myth as sacred stories with contemporary perceptions that myths are fictional stories such as urban legends. According to O’Rourke: “[Myth is] a sacred story of identity, not reliant on logical proofs that defines an aspect of an individual or a community’s world and their place in it” (p. 66). Burke (2001) defines mythos as the name for some particular action or the choosing of one story over another and views myth as a part of cultural coherence and a force for identification. Burke (1961) argues that myths originate when a perfect myth duplicate is imagined giving rise to an image of a natural design. Murray (1968) believed that myths are large, controlling images that we use to make our experiences intelligible to ourselves. Capable of various configurations, myths are dramatic representations of our deepest intellectual life upon which we rest all of our opinions and attitudes. According to Daniel (1990), myth “is a particular mode or group of functions, operative within discourse, that highlight how communication and even thought are themselves possible” (p. 3). Barthes (1957/1972) offers a concise definition when he relates that myths are stories we tell ourselves about ourselves.

Puhvel (1987), however, focuses on the somber reality of myth’s potential for destruction. Myths have power. They are not necessarily true or false, but instead they gain power from how they are communicated and how people continue to perpetuate them. Puhvel defines myth in the following manner:

Myth in the technical sense is a serious object of study, because true myth is by definition deadly serious to its originating environment. In myth are expressed the thought patterns by which a group formulates self-cognition and self-realization, attains self-knowledge and self-confidence, explains its own source and being and that of its surroundings, and sometimes tries to chart its destinies. By myth man [sic] has lived, died and – all too often – killed. (p. 2).
Similar to other myth scholars (e.g. Cooper, 1992; Cupitt, 1982; O’Rourke, 2003; Trubshaw, 2003), Puhvel further argues that through myth the sacred past impacts the present, and both sacred and secular myths are some of the most powerful myths in society today.

Puhvel’s perception of myth serves as the guiding definition of myth in this study. Myths give groups notions of identity and existence that can become so ingrained in our societal fabric that they are virtually indistinguishable from reality. In sport, the infiltration of myths form a society that gets lost within the realities of sport and the rhetorical portrayal of sport heroes as moral and altruistic. Fans might know that athletes on and off the field participate in all kinds of illegal and immoral behavior, but the overall perception of athletes representing goodness reigns as a supreme myth. This myth brings fans to the games, sports pages are filled with tributes to athletes who demonstrate the myth, and movies exemplify the underdog who wins through hard work and perseverance. Consequences of myths in sport obviously fall along a spectrum that might not coincide with Puhvel’s definition that hints at xenophobia. The use of steroids, however, demonstrates a clear division between a moral athlete and one who cheats. The myth of the athlete as hero illustrates why using steroids is a problem in the first place since steroids would be considered a form of cheating.

Understanding myth from both popular and academic perspectives is imperative as it shows how myth yields a variety of meanings and functions. The various popular and academic definitions, meanings, and functions of myth suggest several conclusions. The first conclusion deals with the saturability of myth within our world. Myths allow for sense to be made out of the world, thereby suggesting how they infiltrate daily actions, beliefs, and understandings. Because myth does permeate on such a personal and societal level, the second conclusion centers on how important myths are to how we function and essentially exist as humans. Without myth, humans exist in chaos and without order it would be impossible for societies and communities to develop.
and grow. Myth’s importance to how humans function and make sense of the world leads to the
third conclusion that there are consequences when myths are threatened or challenged. If
humans comprehend the world through myth, then potential paradigm shifts occur when the
myths are endangered. Not all challenged myths necessarily end in paradigm shifts, but it is
important to understand the ramifications of myths being altered. Finally, myths allow for both
permanence and change. Permanence is found through their ability to organize chaos and offer
stable understandings of the world, while change is found through their ability to adjust to
changes that threaten them. This mixture of permanence and change through myth provides a
sense of the transcendent universal that is continuously being adjusted, updated, and
reinterpreted.

Meanings of Myth and What They Convey

Having established the definition of a myth, there are various ways myths work together
to convey their meaning to society. Myths do not simply “appear,” but gradually work
themselves into acceptance while simultaneously making themselves known in various ways.
Waardenburg (1980) identifies seven types of meanings a myth might carry. These include the
original meaning of the myth or ritual in its earliest context, subsequent meaning of the myth or
ritual in later contexts, specific ways the myth or ritual has a role in providing frameworks to
give meaning to other aspects of society, particular meanings that formal analysis of myth or
ritual may provide, and ways the myth has functioned in order to secure its own significance. In
other words, myths can start to build upon themselves by finding different meanings depending
how the myths had been worked into society. Over time, myths begin to form what Doty (2000)
refers to as a mythological corpus:

A mythological corpus consists of (1) a usually complex network of myths that are (2)
culturally important (3) imaginal (4) stories, conveying by means of (5) metaphoric and
symbolic diction, (6) graphic imagery, and (7) emotional conviction and participation, (8) the primal, foundational accounts (9) of aspects of the real, experienced world and (10) humankind’s roles and relative stratuses within it.

Mythologies may (11) convey the political and moral values of a culture and (12) provide systems of interpreting (13) individual experience within a universal perspective, which may include (14) the intervention of suprahuman entities as well as (15) aspects of the natural and cultural orders. Myths may be enacted or reflected in (16) rituals, ceremonies, and dramas, and (17) they may provide materials for secondary elaboration, the constituent mythemes having become merely images or reference points for a subsequent story, such as a folktale, historical legend, novella, or prophecy. (pp. 33-34)

Doty (2000) emphasizes that myths are made from combinations of various factors such as images and both real and fictional experiences. Myths are not only understood definitionally, but as Doty suggests, they function in societies on various levels.

Campbell (1988) argues that myths have four functions: Mystical or metaphysical, Cosmological, Sociological, and Psychological or Pedagogical. Mystical reconciles consciousness with the preconditions of its own existence, as well as redeems human consciousness from feelings of guilt in life. The purpose of the great myths, which are myths that deal with large and abstract understandings of the world, is to create a sense of awe. This is illustrated through creation and origin myths. These myths emphasize that creation was not accidental and our presence, therefore, is a gift. The Mystical function allows for the ability to accept one’s presence and livelihood and deal with the feelings inherent to receiving a gift. The Cosmological function formulates a cosmological image of the universe that adheres to the science of the time and reinforces the mysterious aspects of the universe associated with the Mystical function of myth. The defining characteristic of this second function, however, is that
the logics and sciences of that time period need to be satisfied. Sociological supports the current social order and myths are used to imprint and validate the norms of a moral code. Campbell (1988) points out the problematic nature of these myths because the Sociological function of myth varies among different communities. For example, depending on your society, you can have a mythology for polygamy and a different mythology for monogamy. This myth, therefore, forms a type of moral relativism that Campbell argues is out of date. Instead, the fourth function of myth, the Psychological or Pedagogical function, needs to have a stronger role in today’s modern society. This function shapes individuals to the aims and ideals of their various social groups and assimilate the inner, personal, private human with the outer, impersonal, public roles that a particular culture offers. This function stresses the interaction between members of a culture and the importance of navigating moral and ethical boundaries.

Although sport has all four of these functions ingrained in its development, the Sociological and the Psychological functions are most pertinent to this study. The moral issues inherent to the steroid controversy play on sociological myths of the morality of drugs and the morality of sport. The Psychological function highlights the personal decision of the athlete to use steroids and how that challenges the public role and perception athletes have in today’s society.

**Historical Development of Myth**

Besides the definitions and meanings they convey, myths have a long historical development across pre-modern, modern, postmodern, and transmodern epochs. The historical changes illustrate how modern scholars view the role of myth in society today. Myths surround human’s first interactions. Myth in the pre-modern epoch focused on the ontological use of myth to explain and deal with humankind’s perceptions of their place in the world. From the beginning of humanity, humans created stories as a way to conceptualize the underlying patterns
of human experiences, as well as to provide meaning and value to life (Armstrong, 2005). Campbell (1990) traces the first human myths and explicates how Homo sapiens evolved from 200,000 BCE to 40,000 BCE. They differed from previous Neanderthals in their brain size and transformation of consciousness, and Homo sapiens produced the first dependable signs of mythology in their culture: human burial and worship of cave bear skulls. For example, a boar’s jaw-bone was found in the remains of a Mount Carmel burial in 60,000 BCE. The bone is associated with a sacrifice that accompanied the burial. Other notable burials from that same time period have been found in northern Iraq and Iran. At Shanidar in Northeastern Iraq, a male was buried with flowers placed upon him, and two women and a child buried beneath him. The flowers, identified as types of medicinal plants, suggest the man was a shaman and the multiple bodies indicate a suttee burial. The burial of the man with objects and other people, or “grave gear” as Campbell refers to it, demonstrates the belief that even though someone died, they were still alive.

The finding of cave bear skulls in Switzerland’s Alps and current day Poland and Czechoslovakia is a second example of human’s first use of mythology. Archaeologists found six cave chapels containing collections of bear skulls placed in different configurations. Some had rings of stone around them, some had one of the bear’s bones placed in the skull (representing the bear eating his own flesh), while some had one of the bear’s bones sticking out of the eye sockets. Similar to the burials and the belief that the human spirit continued to live, the killed animal’s spirit remained as well. Within hunting cultures, and arguably similar to athletes throughout history, a basic myth is that animals come willing to be sacrificed. At this time, however, Homo sapiens believed that the animal was killed willingly and with gratitude, and the ceremony was mandatory for it to be reborn and sent again the following year. Both the
burials and worship illustrates two of the first ways early humans used myth and ritual to demonstrate the value of life and give it significance.

Pre-modern notions of myth were almost always rooted in the experience of death and the fear of extinction. Burial rituals and acts of worship served as rituals for the myths to be communicated among early humans. These myths served a vital importance in the society and helped establish ways people should behave and what they should hold as important. These acts, therefore, served the principle function of myth that is the ability for humans to get into harmony and tune with the universe and stay there (Campbell, 1990).

Taking a distinct shift away from using myth to explain the meaning of life and death, myth study during the modern epoch focused on the philosophical role of man as a rational subject. Bacon, Descartes, Vico, Herder, and Hamann offered differing insights, but they all analyzed how mythic or fabular thinking affected philosophic inquiries into truth and logic (Daniel, 1990). Bacon argued that an appeal to mythic thought contained the key for developing a theory of discovery or a logic of problem solving. Mythic thought provided the context for specifying the prerational and prephilosophic structures that a theory of discovery could be based upon. From his research, Bacon developed three main themes. The first theme suggested that the procedure of discovery relies on the literary character of both nature and one’s experience in it. Metaphors, therefore, construct the text of the world. The second theme suggested that mythic and metaphoric writing are especially appropriate for the description of the world as created, yet remain resistant to a closure of meaning. To describe the world in mythic terms reveals how any account of the world must remain indeterminate. The third theme suggested the linguistic presuppositions that regulate epistemological development and the procedure of discovery are the presuppositions that operate on the prerational level of myth. Ultimately, Bacon wanted to justify the possibility of radically new conclusions and discoveries about the
world and how a method of discovery might be described through mythic thought. Myths unite both sense and intellect, and the appeal to myth making as an aspect within a method of discovery was more promising than relying solely on human reason. Myths can be used to expand human wisdom, and for Bacon, human’s understanding of the world and of himself/herself is always understood within the ultimately irresolvable fabular or mythic mode. Bacon attempted to describe how a new philosophy is possible, how a renovation of thought about nature and humans can be accomplished, and how others might be persuaded to understand those mysteries. He believed this new philosophy was possible through the agency of ingenium (creative and natural wits or minds). Overall, Bacon looked to reinstate mythic thinking to a position of respect within philosophic reflection.

Another major theorist during this time was Descartes who focused on philosophical reflection and rules for the rational direction of the mind. Descartes grounded his universal mathematics, physics, and purified geometry of nature on his belief that myth provides a sensible sign system. While Bacon accepted the fables of the ancients as starting points for developing lines of inquiry, Descartes focused on the feigning mind behind the fabular construction. Descartes argued that certainty was based on myths and fables.

For Bacon and Descartes, they primarily viewed myth’s importance within philosophical and scientific study. While the average sports fan probably does not correlate their visit to the ballpark or playing field with philosophical importance, what Bacon and Descartes establish is the role that myth has in establishing wisdom and how people understand their surroundings. Vico, Herder, and Hamann, however, start to take myth beyond philosophy and science and we begin to see a shift in how myths create reality and “truth.”

Largely in response to Descartes, therefore, Vico challenged previous understandings of myth, philosophy, and rationality. Specifically, Vico disputed the fundamental assumption that
myth is a product of a rational mind and highlighted the inherently metaphoric character of philosophic language. Central to Vichean teachings is his assertion that men don’t discover truth, but instead men make truth. Ultimately, the contingency of language that Vico emphasizes has major ramifications within philosophy and offers a counter position to the Cartesian method.

J.G. Herder and J.G Hamann are noteworthy because of their expansion of myth to topics such as poetics, history, philosophy, and psychology. Hereder accomplished this by focusing on the anthropological implications of language-centered historiography. Hamann, however, focused on the religious character of logos within language and the understanding that language expresses a physiology of individual and social experience. Together these thinkers expanded an understanding of mythology to include lived experience as linguistically ordered in social and historical settings. Their comments about epistemology, poetics, or philosophy of history point to, rather than begin from, a redefinition of myth. Herder and Hamann’s approach countered the classicist ideal of starting with a definition of myth or fable and deducing its characteristics and proper applications.

The modern developments of myth are important because they illustrate the important role myths play in everyday life. Through these few scholars, we begin to see a shift in how myth is studied to prove concepts of rationalism and truth to an eventual shift demonstrating how myths impact us in everyday life. Myth during modern times and its focus on the rational subject and methods of discovery undergoes additional understandings with the introduction of postmodernism.

Dominated by fragmentation, postmodernism allows for multiple understandings of the way myth works that strays from rationalism. Jameson (1981) explicates myth’s role within postmodernism. Specifically, Jameson develops a Marxian interpretive framework as a way to argue for the priority of the political interpretation of texts. Jameson argues that Marxism offers
an answer to the problematic that historicism evokes – that genuine philosophies of history are numerous and few survive in forms that are usable and workable in contemporary society. Only through Marxism can the essential mystery of the cultural past be accounted. Jameson believes that you cannot read one text without other texts being read into it and therefore all texts are political. It is important to understand how social and political texts work together because the master narratives that they produce serve to blur the understanding of the oppressor and the oppressed. Jameson pulls from Marx to argue that political unconscious develops because of the false consciousness of class bias and ideological programming. He argues that the only way to “deal” with being within this state of false consciousness is the “painful ‘decentering’ of the consciousness of the individual subject, whom it confronts with a determination (whether of the Freudian or the political unconscious) that must necessarily be felt as extrinsic or external to conscious experience” (pp. 283-284). Jameson seeks to understand how it is possible for a cultural text that fulfills an ideological function as a hegemonic text that legitimizes differing forms of class domination to embody a properly Utopian impulse and fulfill its immediate ideological vocation.

Although Jameson’s research focuses on politics and Marxism, it is important to emphasize his interpretation of the role of intertextuality and the role master narratives play in myths. Texts ultimately set up this dichotomy and it is imperative to an understanding of myth because of the relationship between myths and narratives. This is especially important to sport studies since sport practically depends on myths (Homerun Kings, baseball as the National Pastime, World Championships, etc.) and narratives to continue their dominance in popular culture.

Although modernism and postmodernism have different foundational structures, and thereby approach myth differently, Rushing and Frentz (1995) offer an additional approach to
studying myth and discuss the move from modernism to postmodernism. They offer transmodernism as an answer. Transmodernism rests on the following requirements: 1. The “sovereign rational subject” is still a valued part of humanity without which scientific progress and intellectual insights into the arts and humanities would be impossible. 2. This view recognizes that the spiritual impulse cannot be denied and is hostile if repressed – it has to be detached from modernism’s Thinking Man and postmodernism’s Other. 3. The view does not accept a fatalistic vacuum of meaning.

Stemming from this viewpoint, Rushing and Frentz (1995) argue that the merging of archetypes and ideologies offers a new approach to criticism as a way to give a different reading of a text. Specifically, they discuss the move from the hunter myth to the cyborg myth by analyzing six films. One illustration is their study of *Jaws* that merges ideology and archetype approaches to criticism. Extending of previous analysis by Jameson and Caputi, the authors reconstruct the frontier hunter myth as a way to offer a moral interpretation and assessment of the film. Their final conclusions assert how gender-as-archetype and ideology-as-class structure work together to promote an American understanding of conquering the frontier; how the cultural psyche presents the shark as a condensation of meanings that center on class society and gender; how the main characters’ masculinity links them to their class and the feminine; how the film scapegoats the feminine for the ills of society; and how heroic hatred, innocent wealth and efficiency can re-masculinize. Ultimately, this research offers an opportunity to account for the way cultural texts affect the health of the body politic. Rushing and Frentz, thereby, offer an excellent example of what this research attempts to find – how cultural texts such as myths of sport affect the health of the body politic as illustrated through the use and acceptance of steroids. Furthermore, they offer a way to for myth to exist beyond postmodernism since postmodernism rejects notions of a grand narrative – what myth needs in order to subsist.
This very brief description of myth throughout the four major epochs offers a small insight into how the study and understanding of myth has changed throughout history. Myth was used as a way to understand one’s place in the world during pre-modern times, modernity used myth to understand the rational subject, and post modernity and transmodernity opened up myth to fragmentation and different understandings of narratives and texts. This foundationalizes the history of myth and how it is defined, but there are still many questions to ask. For instance, how do myths come to have power in our societies? How are they communicated within and among societies? How do they come to be accepted and ingrained in society to the point that society does not see them as myths but as reality? Starting with something that provides consistency among the transient nature of myth, myth has undergone various changes throughout history but its verbal transmission remains constant.

How Myths are Communicated and Constructed

One of the enduring qualities of myth is their oral nature. From early man to today, myths about Gods, heroes, the cosmos, kingship, and gender continue shaping societies from one mouth to another. In Greek society, the first myths were passed orally. Archelochos of Paros invented iambic pentameter that aided in memorizing and communicating myths poetically. The first mythologists, however, are believed to be Herodotus and Plato. During the fifth century BCE, they questioned common beliefs within their cultures. The first notable mythologist was Snorri Sturluson in the thirteenth century. A follower of the Danish historian Saxo Grammaticus, Sturluson focused on Icelandic lore and argued that Norse deities were based on human heroes who had gained divine status by performing great deeds (Trubshaw, 2003). Today myths are communicated verbally through mediums such as movies, television, computers, and video games. Myths find structure and formation three main ways: metaphors, narratives, and ideographs and ideologies.
Metaphors

Metaphors serve as one rhetorical construct of myth. Daniel (1990) describes a metaphor as an abbreviated form of a myth while Ricoeur (2003) defines a metaphor as “giving an unaccustomed name to some other thing, which thereby is not being given its proper name” (p. 64). The power of the metaphor lies in the difference between the proper name and the unaccustomed name and the resulting tension that space allows. Metaphors provide ways to accept difficult or complex concepts in more manageable ways and can create cultural meanings through language. Furthermore, metaphors can be used to link particulars of the real world to larger mythical narratives.

Research analyzing the role and use of metaphors illustrates how they capture and create cultural perceptions, as well as how metaphors operate in popular discourse. For example, Mechling and Mechling (1995) look at how Disney’s animated film “Our Friend the Atom” presents a particular metaphor that serves as a key rhetorical moment in the naturalization and domestication of the atom. With the film, the metaphor of the Genie is used to explain the atom and describe how the atom can be used for positive things such as energy. The metaphor, however, also captures cultural meanings of optimism, pride, and how we can convert something villainous into something that is our friend. The authors illustrate how the use of metaphors frames a dangerous concept into something comfortable, thus permitting acceptance and perceived opportunities for positive outcomes.

Metaphors can be utilized successfully and unsuccessfully. An example of a successful use of metaphors is explicated by Ivie (1982) who looks at the prowar rhetoric surrounding the War of 1812. He argues that the metaphor of force was the driving metaphor within discourse at that time. The force metaphor used in the prowar rhetoric portrayed the war as the only option the people had in order to remain free. Ivie suggests that discussions of war and peace create an
excellent opportunity for the literalization of a metaphor. This literalization was ultimately successful as the prowar rhetoric illustrated the enemy through a “realistic” image.

An example of failed rhetoric and the role of metaphors is explicated by Farrell and Goodnight (1981). Their analysis of the discourse surrounding the accident on Three Mile Island suggests that the crisis largely was generated because of a failure of technical reasoning to inform adequate public deliberation. The authors argue that a combination of industry, ecology, and energy metaphors framed the discourse through which to understand and address the nuclear question. This combination resulted in a discourse comprised of narratives of failed expectations, and Farrell and Goodnight suggest the limits of technical communicative discourses as severe, recurrent, and sometimes irreparable.

Osborne’s research (1967) focuses on archetypal metaphors and their particular relevance in rhetoric. Metaphors become archetypal through four different ways. First, they are popular and easily accessed by the mass public. They are passed along in culture and last from generation to generation. In other words, while something that is “hot” and something is “cool” might connotatively change over time, both words are used to describe fads, movies, or lifestyles. Third, they are established in major experiences, conditions, or objects. Fourth, they carry messages about humanity. He identifies light and darkness, the sun, heat and cold, and the cycle of the seasons as four sources of archetypal metaphors. Through Osborne’s explication of the metaphors he clarifies light (and day) as the basic struggle for survival and development and darkness (and night) as the fear of the unknown. The sun can symbolize human character, while fire has a wide variety of metaphoric associations including bodily comfort, youth, or regeneration. Finally, the cycle of the seasons symbolizes value judgments out of hope and despair, as well as fruition and decay. Archetypal metaphors are important to myth and this research because they ground myths and help communicate their morals.
Metaphors hold a particular role in the sport myth. Metaphors such as warriors, heroes, and gods dominate sport narratives. Metaphors utilizing war concepts also offer a comparison between the “seriousness” of what happens on the court to battles of blood, sweat, and tears. Brown (2003) develops the link between sport and war metaphors in his research explicating the use of metaphor in sport policy debate. In 1985, the House of Commons passed the Sporting Events (Control of Alcohol etc.) Bill in an attempt to eliminate rising incidents of hooliganism in British football. Parliament used terms such as “violent invasion,” “offensive weapons,” “spread of the problem,” and made between the hooligans’s actions and “social terrorism” (p. 167). Brown argues that the use of military metaphors to describe football violence served as a justification to pass the bill quickly.

Metaphors, therefore, use language to make comparisons between two different concepts. Metaphors work in myths as additions to narratives that create correlations between two seemingly disparate notions. Sport is not just sport, but through metaphors it becomes framed in a larger perception of good fighting evil, heroes overcoming adversity, and warriors battling enemies on the Warfield.

Narratives

Another way myths are constructed is through narratives. Narratives are stories, or parts of stories, that can be written or spoken. Narratives can become parts of larger myths and they have two rhetorical dimensions: they must advance a moral and they are contingent on audience interpretation (Smith, 1998). In order to be successful, credibility and interpretation must uphold certain requirements. According to Smith:

It must not abide contradiction; it must be coherent and seamless; it must elicit meaning in its audience by relating to their culture; it must speak their language; it must reinforce
their values; it must have credibility; it must be better than the illusions spun by others.

(p. 21)

If a myth does not pass these rhetorical tests then it is doomed.

Research by Fisher (1985) advances the narrative paradigm. By distinguishing the narrative paradigm by other social scientific and humanistic theories, Fisher offers the narrative as a way to help interpret and assess philosophical discourse. This is illustrated through the use of the stories of Socrates and Callicles as a way to show that narratives do not only constrain behavior, but they can also determine it. Ultimately Fishers asserts that his analysis of narrative paradigms suggests that they include material and formal features that make the view necessary to any interpretation and/or assessment of stories.

Lewis’s (1987) research analyzes how narratives create ways to portray individuals differently than the individuals might accurately be described. Explicating the narrative form Reagan used throughout his presidency, Lewis illustrates how Reagan’s discourse created a pristine reputation even though his rhetoric was riddled with inconsistencies. Lewis argues that Reagan implemented narrative forms as a way to portray himself as a friendly and well-motivated leader that will lead the chosen nation to freedom and economic progress. Although the narrative form is effective, Lewis warns that there are potential dangers as the form shapes arguments through moral understanding. Furthermore, it assumes common sense and potentially produces clashing perspectives of standards for evidence and the appropriate basis for judgment.

Sport masterfully uses narratives to portray athletes and sport. Sport broadcasting is a prime area where narratives are communicated. Brummett and Duncan (1990) explain that in televised sports, commentator’s discourse takes the form of narratives that overlap individual stories and visual images of action on the field. This enables fans to conflate hundreds of images, people, and events into coherent portrayals of athletes and sport. Narratives also serve a
role in gendered perspectives of sport. Vande Berg and Projansky (2003) identified six narratives commentators use during professional female basketball games. These include success, adversity, and agency narratives that portrayed the female athletes positively, and discipline, diaspora, and domestic role narratives that portrayed them negatively.

O’Rourke (2003) provides an illustrative example of the use of narratives through his explication of the rhetorical battle for the Cleveland Browns to remain in Cleveland after declaring that the team was moving. O’Rourke hits at how narratives and myth play into larger notions of sport in communities through the following quote:

The battle for the Cleveland Browns was a narrative battle for our collective mythology, for our team and our stories. The rhetorical battle for the Browns also was a victory for any child who has ever hung a poster of a sports hero over her bed. (p. 78)

Narratives, therefore, serve as ways to portray sport and athletes, but also present potential building blocks for myths.

Ideographs and Ideologies

An additional construct of myth is ideologies. Ideologies can be explained as larger constructions of ideas that a particular society holds. All narratives, as Charland (1987) argues, are ideological “because they occult the importance of discourse, culture, and history giving rise to subjectivity […which…] is always social, constituted in language, and exists in a delicate balance of contradictory drives and impulses” (p. 139). Ideologies and myth, therefore, work together to form broader perceptions of cultures and societies that are buttressed through smaller narratives.

Research by McGee (1980) links rhetoric and ideology through the ideograph. According to McGee, ideographs are ordinary language terms that have power to guide and determine group behavior. Ideographs are culture bound and acceptance to the group depends on
acceptance of the ideographs. McGee justifies his argument by using Patrick Henry’s speech to the Virginia House of Burgesses, which utilized the ideographs “freedom” and “patriotism.” Other terms such as “liberty” and “religion” also serve as examples.

Following a precedent by Burke (1950) who used myth to explain concepts of “publics” and “mass consciousness,” McGee (1980) links ideology and myth by illustrating how they work together and how it is problematic when they are thought of as contraries. Both myth and ideology are companions within the interests of symbolism and social construction. Ideologies can form myths and myths are abundant in ideology, but they are both formed through rhetorical discourse. Ideographs form a theoretical framework through which to interpret material and symbolic environments and McGee asserts the role of rhetoric within the creation of the framework: “Insofar as we can explain the diachronic and synchronic tensions among ideographs [...] we can also explain the tension between any ‘given’ human environment (‘objective reality’) and any ‘projected’ environments (‘symbolic’ or ‘social reality’) latent in rhetorical discourse” (p. 16).

There is a lack of research on ideographs in sport, but I argue that sport commentary that uses words such as “underdog,” “warrior,” “hero,” and “champion” are all ideographs that frame the way fans, athletes, and the sports media view the sporting community. The athletes are correlated with these figures, thereby playing into the larger narratives and myths in sport. Furthermore, research by Edwards and Winkler (1997) argues that ideographs can be visual images. Because of the abundance of pictures in advertisements, newspapers, and magazines that depict masculine and physically strong bodies, the images become ideographic portrayals of accepted and expected figures in sport.

Metaphors, narratives, and ideographs stand as constructive parts of myths. These linguistic devices mold and frame perceptions people hold of individuals, communities, and in
the case of this research, sport. Chapter Two delves more into myths in sport – specifically the myth of the moral athlete – but these three concepts offer several ways to illustrate how myths can form.

**How Myths Influence**

Supplemental to the way that myths function and how they are constructed is how they influence. Daniel (1990) lists four characteristics of discourse that account for the influence of myths. First, myths provide a narrative account in order to explain the origins of events, beliefs, or practices. Second, myths extend on the previous understanding of myths to explain how things originate to recognize how they introduce order or harmony into otherwise chaotic situations. Third, myth is a socializing force that brings people, communities, and institutions together. And fourth, for the mythic consciousness, there is no question about whether myths are true or false, only whether they are effective.

Myth’s ability to provide meaning and value to life should not only be viewed as a positive concept. Myth has a dark side. Although myth provides a space for human development, an evil myth may oppress people, stifle creativity, and stop a society from development. A perfect example of this is Adolf Hitler’s rise to power and subsequent dictatorship of Nazi Germany. Burke’s (1989a) essay, “The Rhetoric of Hitler’s ‘Battle’” identifies the rhetorical methods Hitler employed to exploit Germany’s political and social condition. Hitler understood that even when people are unable to identify with one another, they could always find identification through an enemy. When people are confronted with too many enemies, however, people’s objectivity materializes making strong identification difficult. People begin to ask themselves that if there are a number of enemies to choose from, are they choosing the right one. Hitler identified the devil as the “international Jew” and framed it within the “Jewish plot.” When people critiqued Hitler that there were many differences among Jews,
such as the difference between a Jewish worker and a Jewish stockbroker, he repeatedly responded that any differences were due to purposeful manipulation and control. The Jewish stockbroker, therefore, was part of a larger plot that attempted to conspire against Aryans and “seduce” them into an inferior status. Hitler identified the devil and established himself as the cure for Germany’s ails. Burke’s analysis illustrates the extremely problematic nature myths can produce. The power of myth lies in its ability to establish norms, and Hitler’s narratives created myths that dichotomized good and bad.

Additional research by Burke extends on the role between myth and ideology (1989b). Burke explicates the relationship of how cultures move from ideology to myth and how that transference plays into class consciousness and class unconsciousness. Myths, therefore, function culturally, politically, and economically to establish ideas and actions that are accepted or unaccepted. This highlights the power myths have in that they are not necessarily concerned with what is true or false, but also with what is good or bad. Myths create normative behaviors that allow communities to form and function, but as Burke highlights, myths also have the power to oppress and destroy.

Viewing myth as a power that establishes norms is important for research in sport and steroids as it helps explain how athletes justify their use and why fans find it problematic. Although this is dealt with in much more detail in the following chapters, myths in sport are used on a variety of levels. Athletes repeatedly state that their justification for using steroids is because so many other athletes use them. The only way to have any chance of competing on an “equal” playing field is to use steroids because so many other players do. The inherent myth in many athletic communities, therefore, is that steroids are needed in order to participate on a competitive level. Conversely, fan anger about steroids in sport is grounded in its mythic roots that sport builds character and strengthens morals. Steroid use viewed as cheating directly
opposes virtuous qualities. Sport is an area that is seeped in myth and offers an opportunity to analyze how myth functions to destroy bodies, loyalty, and trust along with how they function to build bodies, loyalty, and trust.

**Rituals**

Myths influence and have potential for negative and positive results, but they are performed in society in bigger ways than simple oral communication. Rituals create spaces for mythical enactment. In order to act as a strong working force within societies, myths do not work individually but are an adhesive that join performances and rituals to form social understandings and worldviews. According to Doty (2000): “[…] ritual often implies a license to enact, within a specific spatiotemporal frame, the contents of a myth” (p. 78).

Sport is filled and arguably dependent upon rituals. Examples include team prayer before and after games, teams running onto the court or field, teams shaking hands before or after the game, band participation, the flipping of the coin, the ceremonial first pitch at the start of baseball season, singing the national anthem before the game, chants in European football, and the seventh inning stretch. Rituals might not even have an immediate connection with the sporting event, but points to larger facets of how myths form communities. For example, at Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge, LA, over 90,000 fans fill the football stadium on Saturdays to watch the Tigers play. Part of this ritual is for fans to participate in different cheers and hand gestures depending on what down the football team achieves on a play. These cheers do not necessarily reflect football at all, but instead illustrate being a part of the city and state community through which all of the fans can identify with one another. We are all Tiger fans and we are all in Baton Rouge, Louisiana translates to a unifying cheer of “Go LSU” and “Tiger Bait” as soon as the game begins.
Campbell (2004) describes the role of initiation as a way to interweave individuals into a group. He uses the example of the seasonal festivals natives use in order to control nature. The misrepresentation of this lies in thinking that the natives are doing it in order to control nature. Instead, the ceremonies serve as a form of submission that the myth has created the structures for to exist. In other words, the ceremony ritual is not so much about the desired change in weather as it is for the way that participation in the ritual makes individuals and groups obedient to the myth. This also highlights the consequences of not participating in the myth. Not participating labels you an outsider of the group collective and, according to Campbell, anyone who stands in “exile from the community is a nothing” (p. 356). Participating in the cheers as a Tiger fan at LSU home games takes individuals and makes them part of a community.

This is also one way to justify why the use of steroids is so problematic. Athletes who decide to use steroids are not only standing outside of the group, they are deliberately choosing to do so. Campbell (2004) labels exile as the first step of the quest that each hero participates in, but the steroid using athlete’s exile is based on a grounding that doesn’t match up with the moral myth of sport. This could possibly have some importance for what fans do when the myth of sport is threatened. It is possible that these athletes could be viewed as heroes if fan perception changes. This, however, is not likely as there are already too many other myths in place that counter it.

Rhetorical Nature of Myth

The role of rhetoric is fundamental to myth and Cassirer (1953) asserts that language and myth are so intertwined they are like related family members. Myths that rise above the others or those that have more power are dependent on how myths function as acts of speech. Myths as forms of speech derive from specific sites and power relations but can be articulated and experienced as natural and eternal truths. Hodge and Kress (1988) argue: “Meaning is always
negotiated in the semiotic process, never simply imposed inexorably from above by an omnipotent author through an absolute code” (p. 12).

Rhetorical notions of myth, however, balk from the idea that myths are true or false because ultimately they are neither. Cupitt (1982) argues that myth is a paradigm and he advises against finding or forming concrete observations about myths due to their malleable nature. Myths are always in a state of reconfiguration due to changes in the power of their language (Coupe, 1997). Myths are dependent on language and the myths that become stronger than the others are due to their rhetorical effectiveness. Burke (1968) offers a way to understand the linguistic nature of myths. Symbolic action, according to Burke, asserts that, as humans, we use symbols in order to communicate. Not only does this separate us from animals and help Burke form a definition of man, symbolic action introduces the epistemological role of language. There is a constant struggle over the meaning of symbols, which has ramifications for how we use symbols to shape knowledge and consciousness. Barthes (1957/1972) explicates the role of language within the formation of the myth when he states: “Mythology is in accord with the world not as it is, but as it wants to be” (p. 265).

Barthes (1957/1972) effectively differentiates between rhetorical perceptions of myth as a semiological system, but acknowledges myth’s potential power as the myth-consumer might unknowingly mistake myth for fact or reality. He states:

In fact, what allows the reader to consume myth innocently is that he [sic] does not see it as a semiological system but as an inductive one. Where there is only an equivalence, he sees a kind of causal process: the signifier and the signified have, in his eyes, a natural relationship. This confusion can be expressed otherwise: any semiological system is a system of values; now the myth-consumer takes the signification for a system of facts: myth is read as a factual system, whereas it is but a semiological system (p. 131).
In mythical thought, there is always a requirement of belief. Cassirer states that “[w]ithout the belief in the reality of its object, myth would lose its ground” (p. 101). The language used in myth portrays reality through belief. In other words, Cassirer argues that myth, language, belief, and reality are all intertwined: “For every feature of our human experience has a claim to reality” (p. 103).

Conclusion

Myths give meaning to our lives and help make sense of our surroundings. They span from meaningless and inaccurate to essential and mandatory. Although they have been used since ancient times, myths still hold importance in mainstream society as ways to make sense out of chaos. The discipline’s study has a long history in academic circles spanning areas of science, philosophy, rationality, and truth. Popular conceptions usually relegate myths to something untrue, but academic research identifies the ways myths ingrain themselves so much into cultures that they start to represent “truth.” As Puhvel (1987) and Burke (1989a) explicate, myths can hold both positive and negative power but at times can lead to hate, wars, and killing.

Ultimately, however, a study of myths is a study of their rhetorical construction. Myths are reliant on language to determine their power in society. Linguistic techniques such as narratives, metaphors, and ideographs help create myths that are communicated orally and often performed through rituals. Myths, therefore, are not true or false, but instead are a reflection of the efficacy of their rhetorical constructs.

In sporting publics, the role of myth might not immediately seem to have such a hold or one that is negative. What’s the harm in going to the ballpark and rooting for the underdog – the team or player that has a certain weakness? After all, Burke states that this is the perfect combat myth. What’s the harm with holding on to the rituals of the seventh inning stretch, the band playing at halftime, or tailgating in the parking lot? These are examples of the rhetorical
perpetuation of harmless myths, but others hold more sinister outcomes. The problem is that myths have lead to moral correlations with the players, myths create notions of winning at all costs, and myths effectively create an environment that pushes players to conform or they are ostracized or scapegoated. Myth serves as the reasoning for why steroid use is problematic, but myth also pressures athletes to succumb to using them. The next chapter explicates how myth is inherent to sport – in fact, the basis of sport is found on myth. The interplay of myths within sport frame it as a moral activity and the athletes fall under that same moral code, thereby the myth becomes threatened when athletes use steroids.
CHAPTER THREE: THE TRINITY OF MYTH, SPORT, AND THE HERO

While myths may instruct members of a particular culture how to act and successfully function in a society, sport flourishes on myth. Consistently the hero is used as sport’s central mythical figure, which has been illustrated countless times in sport. For example, ancient sport conflated the athlete with mythical perceptions of Gods and sacrifice. The myth of the hero hangs over the head of any athlete who steps onto a field or up to the plate. Ideas that sport builds character and sport provides skills to improve the lives of those who participate have repeatedly been proven as myths.

This chapter analyzes the interplay of myth, sport and the hero. Although myth might mainly portray one category of the hero as a moral agent, conceptions of the hero in literature and sport establish various configurations of the hero. Simplified views of the hero traditionally relegate the hero to someone who is pure and honest, but research reveals that there are damaged and immoral heroes as well. This chapter, therefore, is divided into four sections to explicate the myth of sport and the hero. It begins by outlining the predominant myths of sport and the hero in literature to illustrate how they create moral views and expectations of athletes and sport. The chapter then analyzes how the perception that athletics builds character and that athletes value and advocate teamwork and social responsibility is not supported by social scientific research that supports the inherent selfishness and single-minded nature of athletes. In other words, there is a strong contradiction between the image of the athlete incarnate in the transcendent rhetoric of the myth and the reality of social scientific findings. The chapter ends by viewing sport through athlete transgressions that rip apart the myth of sport and the resulting dichotomy between the myth and the reality of sport. The immoral nature of sport and the variety of damaged and immoral heroes suggests the power of the rhetorical construction of the athlete as a moral hero and how that facilitates the sporting public’s desire to consistently return to that ideal.
What Is the Myth of Sport?

The myth of sport tends to revolve around notions of character building and sport as a moral and teambuilding endeavor. Kyle (1990) argues that myths are divided into two categories, micro and macro, both of which are repeatedly demonstrated in sport. Micro-myths are minor, specific, or local myths that are communicated through oral traditions, literature, art, and iconography. Conversely, macro-myths are widespread beliefs that are popular and readily acceptable. Similar to micro-myths, these are fallacious and generally inaccurate or unprovable, but they offer comforting stereotypes. Sport macro-myths in the West include an idealization of sport as positive, humanistic, progressive, and “civilizing.” National mythmaking through sport is common across nations and can create stereotypes to mobilize, shape, advocate, and generate habits among communities at both physical and ideological levels (Rowe et. al., 1998). Sport also builds friendships, promotes social mobility, develops liberal viewpoints, and can serve as a deterrent to war. These macro-myths serve as positive and healthy ways to view the role of sport for individuals and society. Sport does not immediately connect itself with destruction, violence, hatred, or negativity. The positive nature of the myth of sport, however, goes much deeper than superficial notions of making its participants good or happy people in society. Instead, the myth of sport becomes conflated with notions of hero worship and morality.

Within the rhetorical myth of sport is a conception that athletes are morally adept. In sporting cultures, there seems to be a clear utopian vision of how sport and morality work together. Kyle (1990) describes this macro-myth, and the subsequent conflation of athletes and morality, in the following manner:

Sport is seen as heroic and its stars as worthy of hero worship. Sport is morally didactic, teaching teamwork, initiative, and self-reliance. Sport is healthy, building body and
character as well as moral well-being. Sport is refreshing – a temporary reversion to noble savagery with cathartic and enduring benefits and lasting moral elevation. (p. 9)

Barthes (1957/1972) explicates notions of morality in sport by looking at sport as a public display of Suffering, Defeat, and Justice and explains the public excitement of seeing an athlete struggle and then succeed. When an athlete succeeds, there is a sort of moral concept associated with the justice of “good” beating “evil.” The mundane success is transformed or sacralized through the lens of the myth. The sudden changes in games through changes in scores, players hurt, teams losing, or teams winning, all present a sort of moral beauty. According to Barthes (1957/1972): “[…] the greater the contrast between the success of a move and the reversal of fortune, the nearer the good luck of a contestant to his [sic] downfall, the more satisfying the dramatic mime is felt to be” (p. 22). Fan participation demonstrates that the public is looking for the construction of a highly moral image and holds a desire for justice and a moral image within the sport world. Barthes’s observations, therefore, provide a frame through which to observe the desire for a moral and just athlete:

In the ring, and even in the depths of their voluntary ignominy, wrestlers remain gods because they are, for a few moments, the key which opens Nature, the pure gestures which separates Good from Evil, and unveils the form of a Justice which is at last intelligible. (p. 25)

The myth of sport offers a realm where positive life enhancing skills can be taught and learned. It serves as a battle between good and evil through which fans desire the “good” side to overcome “evil” and for justice to prevail. This, thereby, offers the frame of what happens on the field as something that is inseparable from larger romanticized narratives of family, love, struggle, success, childhood, and hope. This rescues us from the terror of meaningless extinction and connects us to a world of recurrent rituals, archetypes, and spiritual renewal.
Klapp (1962, 1964) argues that these heroes and heroic narratives serve various social functions such as offering role models that embody values and ideals, unifying social forces that permit audiences to escape their everyday roles and social structures, as well as they serve as symbols to console people for what people think they should be but fall short of that ideal. Central to these narratives is the role of the hero, thereby emphasizing the rhetorical underpinnings of his/her creation.

Rhetorical Constructions of the Mythical Hero

In sport, the hero is typically presented as the traditional hero. The characteristics of the traditional hero include an individual who displays high morals, consummate sporting behavior, courage, loyalty, and bravery (e.g., Horne et. al., 1999; Lines, 2001; Mangan, 1981; Radford, 2005; Trujillo, 1994; Vande Berg, 1998; Walton, 2004; Whannel, 1995). Athletes such as Nolan Ryan (Trujillo, 1994) and Joe Montana (Vande Berg, 1998) are looked at as traditional heroes because of their ability to fit this description. These athletes drank orange juice instead of alcohol after championships, consistently volunteered in their communities, came from small towns, and were never in the news for disruptive behavior. But there is a long rhetorical construction that creates the hero through discourse.

The role of communication is inherent to the hero and heroes are constructed in an interactive process that is based on communication. According to Strate (1994), he states:

[...] as a general rule, members of a society are separated from their heroes by time, space, and social class and therefore know their heroes only through stories, images, and other forms of information. In this sense, there are no such things as heroes, only communication about heroes. Without communication, there would be no hero. (p. 16)

This stresses the rhetorical notion of how heroes are constructed as language determines the type and scope of the hero, as well as how the verbal machinery of hero construction is generally
somewhat below the level of our conscious awareness. One area for where the hero flourished rhetorically is in literature.

The link between myth and sport that is understood today originated and is often circulated through various literary texts. In literature, the combat myth is known as the monomyth and is described in classic stories that illustrate the account of someone going on a perilous journey. Campbell (2004) describes the monomyth in the following manner:

A hero ventures forth from the world of common day into a region of supernatural wonder: fabulous forces are there encountered and a decisive victory is won: the hero comes back from this mysterious adventure with the power to bestow boon on his fellow man. (p. 30)

Jewett and Lawrence’s (1988) research adds to the classic monomyth and similarly states that the classic monomyth revolves around the concept that a young hunter-warrior-hero departs on a solitary journey to kill a wild animal, confront an enemy, or experience a wonder vision, upon returning to his community with full service. Campbell and Jewett and Lawrence’s descriptions, thereby, establish the understanding of what occurs in sport through a literary analysis.

Westbrook (1996) explicates the creation and circulation of the monomyth in literature through her analysis of *The Epic of Gilgamesh* and *The Odyssey*. The story of Gilgamesh describes his journey to a distant land in search of the secret of immortality. After finding and then losing the plant of life, Gilgamesh returns home with wisdom and knowledge to enrich his community and is thus received and reintegrated by society. Similarly, Odysseus goes on a long journey to the underworld, but returns home after rejecting Kalypso’s offer of static and childlike immortality. Both stories illustrate the romantic return of a traveler to his home who is renewed after a long and heroic journey. Westbrook argues that this ancient archetypal plot is
incorporated into the rules of the game as the purpose of the game is to travel out and then return home. Westbrook’s (1996) insight into the journey and home as illustrated through Gilgamesh’s and Odysseus’s travels establishes a link between the understanding of myth, how it is circulated through literary texts, and how the myth transposes onto sport.

Burke (1968) delves into myth by explicating the combat myth. Burke begins with Fontenrose’s (1959) characterization of the combat myth which includes an enemy of divine origin who has a distinctive habitation, has extraordinary appearances and properties, is vicious greedy and conspires against heaven. The enemy is countered by a champion who fights him, nearly loses, and then through either destroying, outwitting, deceiving, or bewitching the enemy, celebrates his victory. Burke was interested, however, in what constituted the perfect combat myth and compared the combat myth to a warrior culture or one that heavily reflects warrior values. For Burke, the most perfect story is “heroic” in scale and the perfect combat situation must have at least two combatants and the champion needs to fight someone his own size or “like the figure he opposes.” Both situations must have origins, habitations, and characteristics proper to their opposite missions according to the imperatives of “artistic consistency” (p. 385). The combatants copy each other, reach for similar weapons, and strike similar blows (Carter, 1996). The drama of the event is heightened as the outcome of the event will be in doubt. Burke illustrates this in the following quote: “Obviously, a story about someone who simply goes out and wins is much less effective (hence less perfect) than a story about someone who nearly loses, then wins at the last moment as the result of a new development” (p. 386).

Burke’s description of a perfect combat myth is a strong illustration of what happens in sport – especially baseball. The players are participants in a “warrior” culture through the reliance on physical strength in order to accomplish a mission around the bases. Burke even acknowledges the relation between athletics and warrior culture when discussing the need of at
least two combatants to be present: “Meanwhile, any athletic contest or war is sufficient evidence, that so far as drama and narrative are concerned, a combat to be ‘perfect’ in form needs at least two combatants” (p. 385). Baseball does just this. In fact, the perfect combat myth is encountered several times throughout a player’s time at bat further highlighting how central the concept is to the understanding of the game. The batter versus the pitcher the batter leaving home base to encounter and “enemy” at each of the three bases, and then a final combat as the batter returns home. Not only does the player have to encounter one combat myth, but there are multiple combats throughout the journey around the bases, thus illustrating how central the myth is the basic formulation of the game.

Mythical notions of athletes constructed through The Epic of Gilgamesh and The Odyssey are further supported by ancient poets who wrote of athletes and Gods. One of the nine lyric poets of ancient Greece, Pindar is regarded as one of the greatest who is widely known for his victory odes to athletic champions. Pindar, however, stands noteworthy in the rhetorical construction of athletes as he is the first writer to describe people who cross the line between mortality and immortality. In the Iliad, Homer adamantly keeps the mortals mortal and immortals immortal. The rule even pertains to sons of gods and goddesses with a clear characterization of gods and men as different races (Currie, 2005). Pindar, however, describes several instances where mortals become immortal. For example in one of his odes delivered to Alcimidas of Aegina, winner of the boys’ wrestling competition at the Nemean Games, he writes:

Single is the race, single / Of men and of gods; / From a single mother we both draw breath. / But a difference of power in everything / Keeps us apart; / For the one is as Nothing, but the brazen sky / Stays a fixed habitation for ever. / Yet we can in greatness
of mind / Or of body be like the Immortals, / Tho’ we know not to what goal / By day or
in the nights / Fate has written that we shall run.

Through athletics men can reach immorality through mind and body. Pindar’s writings
significantly alter the rhetorical notions of athletes as heroes, and his writings mark the first time
where humans and Gods stand together.

Poetry and literature serve as one of the first methods for the rhetorical construction of
the athlete as hero. The poems and descriptions of the athlete as hero and god set foundational
opinions of how the athlete was viewed in ancient times, thereby influencing modern
perceptions. Heroes serve as models for human behavior and community members draw
inspiration from them. Hero myths teach members appropriate attitudes, behaviors, and values.
According to Rosenberg (1994): “These myths are of particular interest and value to us. Not
only are they exciting adventure stories, but in these myths we see ourselves, drawn larger and
grander than we are, yet with our human weaknesses as well as our strengths” (p. xvii). The
myth of sport and the literary constructions of the hero paint an athlete as a savior and as an
individual to pin a community’s hopes and struggles on. The hero offers goodness but it is
always achieved after some sort of struggle. The tension between the achievement and the
challenge presents the perfect combat story since the hero always wins, but the outcome is
always tested at some point. These literary constructions of the hero easily parlay into notions of
the traditional hero in sport.

Rips in the Myth

Rhetorical constructions of the athlete are created through various mediums such as
literature, movies, personal stories, the media, and art that promulgate the athlete as moral.
Narratives perpetuate and create larger myths of sport, revolving around altruistic characteristics
that are automatically bestowed on athletes simply through his/her participation. Whether or not
the athlete deserves or wants the moral association often is irrelevant. Not everyone loves sport, has a desire to participate or watch, or acts as a moral ambassador on and off the field, but there is a constant drumbeat of discourse promulgating the perception that sport holds a positive role in society and people who participate in it acquire positive life enhancing traits.

The perception of all athletes as moral individuals is a powerful myth, but obviously not all athletes are that way. Cheating often goes hand in hand with sport, and athletes have found ingenious ways to justify their actions in the name of winning. Various incidents in sport introduce important concepts about sport, morals, and myth, yet moral characteristics of athletes (especially successful athletes) and the reality of the sport realm lie in stark contrast to the mythical notions they hold. Research indicates that athletes may have to be selfish and self-absorbed in order to succeed in sport (e.g., Goodman, 1993). Simply opening a newspaper reveals numerous stories of athletes who cheat, rape, lie, murder, or commit any number of indiscretions.

Heroes, therefore, should not be construed as one category that fits a moral and high achieving individual. Hook (1969) argues that a heroes moral character or moral contribution should be irrelevant to conceptions of heroes: “[…] we must rule out as irrelevant the conception of the hero as a morally worthy man, not because ethical judgments are illegitimate in history, but because so much of it has been made by the wicked” (p. 154).

Just as soon as one begins to believe that sport is a good and moral endeavor, stories such as Mike Tyson biting off a piece of Evander Holyfield’s ear, the 1951 Giants cheating their way to the pennant, athlete’s using steroids, or teams gang raping a woman counter back. The Baltimore Orioles in 1890 are thought to be the dirtiest team in the history of the league. Players John McGraw, Wilbert Robinson, Hughie Jennings, and manager Ned Hanlon comprised a team that purposefully tripped opposing players, threw equipment in the middle of running paths,
filed the spikes on their cleats until they were as sharp as razor blades (Gutman, 1990). The NFL’s Denver Broncos gave monetary rewards to players who hit their opponents the hardest, and in 1997, a Kansas City Chiefs player related on a radio show that his coach, Marty Schottenheimer, offered to pay off any fines received by breaking the jaws or knocking down any Denver Broncos player (Schefter, 1997).

The reality of sport and the state of modern commercialized sport, therefore, introduce layered conceptions of the traditional hero. One type of hero is the modern day celebrity hero (Boorstin, 1978; Strate, 1994; Vande Berg, 1998). This hero differentiates him/herself from traditional notions of a hero as this hero is constructed by the media as an image, a trademark, or as a name only. These heroes become known superficially by their physical appearance and strength. According to Boorstin (1978), contemporary mediated heroes perform acts far less significant and have characteristics far less idealized than mythological heroes of ancient times. Furthermore, Vande Berg’s (1998) research explicates the changing role of the hero in contemporary sports media. She emphasizes the role of mass media as primary vehicles through which society learns of accomplishments, courage, and the deeds of cultural heroes, and the faults and shameful deeds of the villain. Another type of hero is the sport heroine who is marginalized, trivialized, and objectified rendering them invisible and questionable role models (Lines, 2001). Finally, there is the hero that is the “damaged hero.” Lines defines this hero as: “the male sports celebrity exemplifying contemporary laddishness, drunken exploits, wife and girlfriends beatings and gay relationships […]” (p. 285). Examples of the damaged hero are prevalent in today’s sporting news. One example is the NFL’s Terrell Owens who publicly feuded with his quarterback and coach and then demanded to be traded to another team. Another example is the NBA’s Kobe Bryant who was accused of raping a 19-year-old girl, but just
several years later was in the adoring eye of the public as the league’s 2008 MVP. The damaged hero serves as a standard fixture in today’s sporting arena.

These examples of heroes that stand in contrast to the myth of sport presents what Eitzen (2006) discusses as the paradox of sport. He states:

On the one hand, sport inspires as it fosters the admirable traits of courage, determination, hard work, fairness, respect, sacrifice, and loyalty. But sport also promotes rule breaking, selfishness, greed, contempt for opponents, and violence on the field as well as deviant behaviors off the field. (p. 54)

Many Americans believe that participation molds people with strong characters and morals, but they also acknowledge that sport can also produce deceitful and cruel characters. The conflicting stories and perceptions of sport and athletes create an interesting dichotomy that cannot be easily assessed or sorted. An abundance of evidence might be used to conclude that sport is morally bankrupt and could be used to argue that sport fosters selfishness and brutality (e.g., Beller & Stoll, 1993; Bredemeir & Shields, 1986; Funderburk & Eiland, 2007; Goodman, 1993).

Sport as Morally Bankrupt

The moralizing myth of sport lies in stark contrast to a body of research that concludes that participation in sport promotes moral bankruptcy. These studies suggest that instead of promoting lasting moral elevation, sport often cultivates the exact opposite effect. Not only does sport harbor cheaters, it creates a self-serving counterfeit morality (Bredemeir & Shields, 1986) and argues that one’s moral code declines the longer one participates in sport.

Many athletes are not morally averse to cheating. Research by Funderburk and Eiland (2007) finds cheating commonplace among athletes, and high school athletes admit to cheating more often than their non-athlete counterparts. The gap between the two groups is substantial. For example, 72% of football players and girl’s softball players admitted to cheating. 71% of
girl’s basketball players and cheerleaders did as well, closely followed by 70% of hockey players and 69% of baseball players. This illustrates that it does not matter whether the participants are male or female or are in high or low contact sports, cheating serves as an often-routine component in various sports.

While Funderburk and Eiland (2007) report high rates of cheating in sport, Beller and Stoll (1993) dramatically explicate how sport actively stifles moral development. Comparing athletes to non-athletes, they assessed moral development and moral reasoning. Their findings include the following: 1. Athletes score lower than their non-athlete peers on moral development. 2. Male athletes score lower than female athletes in moral development while the average score for female athletes has been declining over the past few years. 3. Moral reasoning scores for athletic populations steadily declined from the ninth grade through university age, whereas scores for non-athletes tend to increase. In other words, participating in sport lowers moral development and the longer one participates in sport, the lowers one’s moral reasoning decreases.

Additional research concludes that sport does not build morals in its participants, but instead sport attracts people who have or are comfortable with certain values and behavioral traits that can meet the subsequent demands of sport and coaches (Goodman, 1993). Those without the traits either are not attracted to sport in the first place or are removed voluntarily (stop participating) or involuntarily (cut from the team). Athletics does not build character qualities in males and females, but instead sport is an outlet for people who already have characteristics suitable to demanding sports and coaches. Goodman indicates the athlete’s narcissism and narrow focus:

The very qualities a society tends to see in its heroes – selflessness, social consciousness, and the like – are precisely the opposite of those needed to transform a talented but
otherwise unremarkable neighborhood kid into a Michael Jordan or a Joe Montana.

Becoming a star athlete requires a profound and long-term self-absorption, a single-minded attention to the development of a few rather odd physical skills, and an overarching competitive outlook. These qualities may well make a great athlete, but they don’t necessarily make a great person. (p. 103)

This research, therefore, illustrates how involvement in sport, on the whole, does not result in character building moral development, good citizenship, or valued personality traits. Further, involvement in sport does not necessarily affect self-image, reduce prejudice, enhance social judgment, or is it necessary for leadership development. The established contradiction between the reality of sport as immoral and the myth of sport as moral creates a dichotomy. Fans and athletes continually have to negotiate this dissonance. Social scientific research often paints a grim picture that strongly contrasts with the clean virtuous rhetoric of popular sports writers and analysts.

Conclusion

The powerful myth of sport overrides the reality that athletes are not the poster children for morality. Its voice is epideictic, a constant praise of sports, athletes, and the greater community of athletes, coaches, and fans and all the institutions and venues that support them. This myth of the athlete as hero and the ability of sport to represent communal aspiration is an ancient rhetorical construction. It has been retired and renewed over thousands of years, but its counter-reality trumps the banal and sordid day-to-day behavior of the participant. Repeatedly the myth is threatened, but like the moral code itself, routine violation only strengthens our awareness of its centrality.

Heroes become immortal in a way only available for human beings. Heroes are not all the same, and their immortality does not excuse them of faults. In fact, it can be the fault that
makes one’s heroism stronger. We can identify with them. Heroes are forced to make decisions between competing sets of values. These can be the values of the community and the values inherent in the trial.

This research illustrates the depth and ever-changing role of the hero, but Vande Berg (1998) and Boorstin (1978) argue that although few heroes are left, sports remains the one area where they can be found. In sport, although there might be a variety of heroes, athletes are still looked at as people who can fulfill this role. The secularized version of the myth of the hero, however, are all given meaning by the larger archetypal patterns – the “fall” of the hero only makes way for the next stage – the return of the hero. According to the myth, sport is a moral enterprise and its practice builds a virtuous community. Individual athletes are engaged in building a sporting republic of virtues. Sayings such as “sport builds character” mixed with ideals of sport producing leaders, team players, and putting the good of others above their own uphold the perception that sport is a values driven experience. Undoubtedly, there are people who have positively benefited from sport and are morally more aware. News stories often remind us that women can use strategy to compete with men’s power on the tennis court, immigrants can fight xenophobia through baseball, and diving can accept gay athletes (Martin & Miller, 1999). The real world practice of sport, however, is shot through with contradictions.

Various social scientists agree that the myth of sport as moral is inaccurate, they rightly attribute the flowering of the myth to concrete historical events. For example, Miracle and Rees (1994) argue that the idea that sport builds character evolved out of the emphasis on athleticism in British public schools during the mid-nineteenth century and the playground movement in America during the early decades of the twentieth century. Accordingly it may be fruitful to scrutinize the historical circumstances in which the present myth arose in America. It was during this time that the rhetorical construction of the myth was crafted. I argue that the dichotomy
between reality and myth can only be accurately understood by analyzing the rhetorical construction of the athlete as a moral hero – particularly the myth that set the foundation for common perceptions that originated from 1850-1920. From the very beginning the literary, clerical, and entrepreneurial mythmakers had to assimilate contradictions between real behavior and ideal aspirations. Their efforts allowed sport to gain formidable moral ethos in the teeth of a sea of contradictions.
CHAPTER FOUR: THE RHETORICAL CONSTRUCTION OF THE ATHLETE AS A MORAL HERO FROM 1850-1920

The contradiction between the myth of sport and the traditional hero, and the damaged hero and reality of sport, urges insight into how the contradiction arises. The myth seems to hold a particularly strong hold in sport as sport is one of the last realms where people continue to seek their heroes (Boorstin, 1978; Vande Berg, 1998). I argue that the traditional hero in sport holds such power because of its strong rhetorical construction during the beginning of organized sport in America. As sport grew, gained popularity, and became professionalized, the owners of the discourse established a rhetorical frame to view sport as a moral venue and athletes as inherent perpetuators of morality. This rhetorical creation of the athlete as a moral individual ultimately establishes a lens that permits a specific view through which steroids are observed.

This chapter looks specifically at the rhetorical construction of the athlete as a moral hero within the time period of 1850-1920 by looking at five major rhetorical factors: the Young Men’s Christian Association (YMCA), the Muscular Christianity Movement, Theodore Roosevelt, Bernarr Macfadden and his Physical Culture magazine, and the creation of the National Collegiate Athletics Association (NCAA). It is hoped that understanding how these created a foundation for how modern fans rhetorically frame and identify with athletes and sport not only illustrates the power of myth in sport, but also illuminates how the reality of athletes repeatedly becomes buried by the archetypal models and timeless patterns constantly recycled by the myth.

This time period was chosen for rhetorical analysis as the late 1800s and the early 1900s served as a foundational period for the development of sport in the United States. Virtually every sport, training organization, or training principle was founded during this period. According to Coakley (1998), the organizational attributes most Western cultures associate with
today’s high profile organized sports occurred during this time. Elite universities such as Yale, Harvard, and Brown formed rowing clubs in the mid 1800s and adopted other athletic practices that had flourished at elite British universities a generation earlier. Sports such as gymnastics and calisthenics became part of a growing physical fitness regimen, and starting in the 1850s, gymnastic societies promoted bodybuilding (Green, 1988). People such as George Windship and the “Roxbury Hercules” popularized weightlifting and Dio Lewis, S.D. Kehoe, and Samuel F. Wheelwright popularized stretching and the use of balls, beanbags, and wooden dumbbells for physical fitness (Whorton, 1982). In 1852, the first intercollegiate competition started in which Harvard and Yale held a regatta on Lake Winnipesaukee, New Hampshire (Putney, 2001). This historic event spurred other sporting developments such as Amherst building the first gymnasium in 1860; basketball growing in the 1860s; football and track growing in the 1870s; and basketball, tennis, and hockey growing in the 1890s. Professional leagues developed at this time with the formation of the first professional baseball team, the Cincinnati Red Stockings, in 1869. Professional football became established in the 1890s, boxing moved into mainstream acceptance around the same time, and 1903 marked the first World Series. Simultaneously, the introduction of broad newspaper coverage added to the widespread name recognition of athletes (Putney, 2001). Because of the rapid growth of sport in America during this time, its widespread acceptance in mainstream society, combined with the influences of the YMCA, the Muscular Christianity movement, Theodore Roosevelt’s use of sport analogies in presidential rhetoric, the role of Bernarr Macfadden and his Physical Culture magazine, and the creation of the NCAA, created a rhetorical frame of the athlete as a moral hero that still frames modern conceptions of sport.

Morgan (2006) argues that the base moral understanding of sport in America dramatically shifted in the late nineteenth century. Sport found a respectable position in society due to social
and historical factors such as the growing national consciousness of the country. Americans began to feel as if they were part of a community. Within a 50-year period, from the beginning to mid-18th century, America grew from 6 million to 23 million people, and expanded from 16 to 31 states. The growing population, influx of immigrants from foreign countries speaking different languages, a Civil War that divided the nation in half, presented a disjointed and fractured public. Morgan argues that it became evident that the nation needed to find something that they shared in common and that they could rally around in order to give substance to their identity as an American. Sport, therefore, acted as a social and cultural practice Americans pinned their hopes and aspirations as on as members of a national community. A second reason for the shift in the moral understanding of sport in America relates to the resurrection of the ancient Olympic games in 1896. This served as an additional way Americans could frame their national identity, as well as, dialogue about how well or unwell the American athletes performed. A third reason stemmed from the growing secularization of American society and scientific developments. This time period saw the religion displaced from its prominent seat and the body was looked at not only as a source of sin or divine disfavor. Furthermore, with scientific discoveries, there was a move away from an agrarian economy. Sport, therefore, served as a way to develop physically without renouncing science. Finally, the growing secular and scientific movements gave way to a growing influence of pragmatism in early America. Thought and action, therefore, were perceived to be inseparable and thereby catapulted sport into the national spotlight.

Furthermore, it is important to note that there is research that argues for the character logic of sport, along with patterns of positive consequences associated with playing sport (e.g., Beller & Stoll, 1995; Berlant, 1996; Coakley, Miracle & Rees, 1994; Papp & Prisztoka, 1995). These moral studies reveal that maybe the myth of how good sports can be for society is surely
not wholly false. What is of note here is not the actual practice of an abstentious code of
honorable conduct and community virtue, but the persistence of the myth despite widespread
violations and glaring contradictions. For example, according to Beller and Stoll (1995): “While
sport does build moral character if defined as loyalty, dedication, sacrifice, and teamwork, it does
not build moral character in the sense of honesty, responsibility, and justice” (as quoted in
Eitzen, 2006, p. 65). Arguably, what is more interesting to analyze is why does the myth persist
in the teeth of widely publicized practices that undermine its iconic imagery of honest
achievement, team sacrifice, and community service.

The Rhetorical Construction of the Athlete

In the mid-1800s to the early 1900s, sport became increasingly popular in America. As
technology and manufacturing developed, more and more Americans turned toward sport as a
way to fill their newfound leisure time. During this time, there were several national
organizations and important figures that served to frame sport as a moral endeavor. Specifically,
the Young Men’s Christian Association (YMCA), the Muscular Christianity Movement, Bernarr
Macfadden and the Physical Culture magazine, Theodore Roosevelt, and the creation of the
National Collegiate Athletics Association worked together to create an enduring myth of the
athlete as a moral hero. People were exposed to this message if they went to church, listened to a
Presidential speech, or read a magazine; these five factors infiltrated sport and morality into
numerous aspects of society. Modern sport, therefore, was incubated by practitioners of the
social gospel during Protestant Christianity’s time of optimistic missionary revival.

YMCA

The YMCA started in the US in Boston on December 29, 1851 and leaders of the
organization viewed it as the most powerful evangelical force in the modern age (Gustav-
Wrathall, 2000). At the organization’s First World Conference in Paris in 1855, the delegates drafted their first mission statement:

The Young Men’s Christian Associations seek to unite those young men who, regarding Jesus Christ as their God and Saviour, according to the Holy Scriptures, desire to be his disciples in their faith and in their life, and to associate their efforts for the extension of his kingdom amongst young men. (“The Paris”)

The mission of the YMCA was to mold men into traditional notions of manhood. Their mission statement revolved around putting Christian values into practice through programs that build a healthy spirit, mind, and body. The YMCA promulgated notions of caring, respect, responsibility, honesty, and faith and in the 1880s the organization worked sports into their program. The YMCA served as one of the first and largest organizations in America to actively merge Christian principles of morality with athletics. Their organization is characterized by relentless outreach that framed them from a Christian moral perspective.

The YMCA used pamphlets, speeches, and posters to spread a moral Christian message enveloped in the promotion of sport and physical activity. In the early 1900s, the YMCA helped issue books for class study in the Northeast that promoted Christian values (Mathews, 1927). Starting in 1918, the YMCA (in conjunction with the U.S. Public Health Service and the American Social Hygiene Association) started two poster campaigns distributed in schools, libraries, clubrooms, and exhibit halls that promulgated the virtues of physical fitness. The posters combined aspects of sexual education (information on venereal diseases, warnings against sexual promiscuity, the portrayal of seminal emissions and menstrual periods as natural) while stressing moral messages about physical education. The series were entitled “Keeping Fit” for boys and “Youth and Life” for girls. There were 1300 sets of posters that were placed in 13,000 different settings that reached more 750,000 people (“Social Hygiene,” n.d.).
The YMCA worked throughout the United States to spread their moral message and physical fitness regime among disparate groups, social classes, and ages. Moving from college classrooms, to local neighborhoods, to Indian Reservations, the YMCA continually voiced a message that merged Christian principles with sport. The YMCA’s far reach and power, therefore, serves as one major way that the athlete as a moral figure began from a rhetorical standpoint.

Muscular Christianity

Another way sport made serious strides in the moral arena at this time was through the Muscular Christianity movement. Started in the second half of the nineteenth century in Britain, the movement found its way to the United States by the 1880s and had a major influence on the relationship between sport, physical fitness, and religion. The term stemmed from Charles Kingsley and Thomas Hughes who were avid sportsmen, writers, and social critics. They were outspoken about the state of the Anglican Church and its perceived weakening from a culture of effeminacy. Muscular Christianity, therefore, acted as a major force that merged spiritual, moral, and physical development (Watson et al., 2005).

There were three reasons for the promotion of the healthy body and Muscular Christianity during the nineteenth century: 1. The spread of the “Leisure Revolution” after the Industrial Revolution in which poor working conditions and long hours had led to occupational diseases. 2. Major developments in medical sciences illustrated through the separation of physiology from biology and the creation of physiological psychology that emphasized a holistic approach to the mind-body relation. 3. A threat of war from Europe and America. The Muscular Christianity movement acted as a way to produce healthy and well-educated leaders and according to Kingsley:
…in the playing field boys acquire virtues which no books can give them; not merely
daring and endurance, but, better still tempter, self-restraint, fairness, honor, unenvious
approbation of another’s success and all that ‘give and take’ of like which stand a man in
good stead when he goes forth into the world, and without which, indeed, his success is
always maimed and partial. (as quoted in Haley, 1978, p. 119)

Ministers and literary people endorsed the muscular Christian message. For example,
Thomas W. Higginson was both of these and wrote the most effective American work that
supported sport during the ante-bellum period (Lewis, 1970). His article “Saints and their
Bodies” appeared in the Atlantic Monthly in March 1858 and it expounded on the virtues of
athletics and Christianity. He wrote:

   But, happily, times change, and saints with them. Our moral conceptions are expanding
to take in that ‘athletic virtue’ of the Greeks, ἀπερν ὑμαμωριν, which Dr. Arnold, by
precept and practice, defended. The modern ‘Broad Church’ aims at breadth of shoulders,
as well as of doctrines […]. (para. 5)

In 1860, a writer from the New York Tribune attributed Higginson’s influence as primarily
responsible for the changes in the attitudes towards sport among college-aged men (“The Days,”
1860). Oliver W. Holmes (1858), abolitionist, physician, and eventual Associate Justice of the
United States Supreme Court, responded to Higginson’s essay by stating that he was convinced
that sport participation would improve everything in American life from church sermons to the
physical well-being of individuals. This movement was pushed further through Thomas
Hughes’s novel, Tom Brown’s Schooldays, that offered a romanticized version of rugby and
American college men were encouraged to emulate the practices demonstrated in the novel
(Lewis, 1970). The book also launched the international sport of rugby and showed how a good
sport became a school leader and vanquished Flashman – the school bully. Hughes wanted to help Thomas Arnold and Matthew Arnold develop healthy, virtuous middle class youths.

Bernarr Macfadden and Physical Culture

A third influence on the rhetorical construction of the athlete as a moral hero during this time was Bernarr Macfadden. Macfadden, the self-proclaimed “father of the Physical Culture,” was arguably the greatest promoter of healthy living, eating, and exercise in the late 1800s to early 1900s. Although Macfadden did not personally live a necessarily moral life (he was married several times, was very vocal about sex, and promoted nudity), his well-known publication, Physical Culture, had a recurring narrative about using exercise to become stronger. This strength could then be used to defend oneself and counter bullies who tried to beat other people up. Physical Culture stories followed a general pattern: a bully knocks ordinary people off of the sidewalk until he eventually knocks off a wizened man. This man exercises until he is able to knock others off the sidewalk, and eventually finds the bully and knocks him off of the sidewalk. In one story included in Physical Culture, Macfadden (1903) related the story of a girl who was molested on the rooftop of an apartment. The hero, on a rooftop across the street, jumped the distance to where the girl was and simultaneously broke the world’s running-broad-jump record by at least 25 feet. Upon rescuing the girl, the hero did not accept any thanks saying that he could not help what he did (Johnston, 1941). To further the overarching narrative of strength as benevolent, the first editorial in the magazine was entitled “Weakness is a crime.” Starting with the February 1900 edition, however, each issue had the phrase “Weakness is a crime, don’t be a criminal” on the cover (Ernst, 1991).

The magazine served as one of the first and most successful publications for promoting exercise and health. By the third year of publication, the magazine grew from a single desk to a company with 50 workers in eight offices. The January 1900 edition printed 25,000 copies and
the April edition printed 40,000 editions. In December, Macfadden claimed a reader base of 550,000 and in 1902 he doubled the size and price of the magazine. Macfadden also printed a magazine for women in 1900 entitled “Women’s Physical Development” being renamed “Beauty and Health” in 1903 which reached a circulation of 80,000 (Ernst, 1991).

Macfadden strongly believed in the correlation between physical fitness and moral development. He continually asserted that the best way to promote the morals of a community or nation was through athletic exercises. He lived by the idea that physical culturists, in nearly ever case, lead clean lives. They have no other desire than to be moral, because their every action should lead toward morality. He viewed physical fitness to be more important than religion and saw it as a foundation for perfection. For him, athletics contributed to character, discipline, success in business and marriage, courage, morality, and happiness.

Theodore Roosevelt

A fourth influence on the rhetorical construction of the athlete as a moral hero was Theodore Roosevelt. American presidents often reinforce the virtues of baseball as illustrated through Herbert Hoover who once stated: "[…] next to religion, baseball has furnished a greater impact on American life than any other institution" (as quoted in Novak, 1988, p. 1). Today, presidents continue to participate in the ceremonial first pitch at the beginning of Major League Baseball seasons (Trujillo, 1994, p. 9). Theodore Roosevelt, however, listed baseball in his list of "the true sports for a manly race," (as quoted in Kimmel, 1991, p. 288) and differentiated himself by merging sport and morality throughout his presidential speeches in order to connect with the American people.

Roosevelt’s experiences and actions as a child characterized him as an archetype. A weak and sickly boy who suffered from asthma, his father gave him a gym and told him that he must
make his own body. Roosevelt used athletics to strengthen his body through a regimen of training and endurance. He went on to attend Broughton, an all boys boarding school, and loved sports but was not good due to this small frame. Although his mother urged him to avoid contact sports, Roosevelt went on to become a member of Harvard’s varsity boxing team. His experience as a weak boy using athletics to turn him into a strong man fostered a love of sport that followed him into adulthood (Grubin, 2008).

Vice President from March 4, 1901 to September 14, 1901 and President from September 14, 1901 – March 4, 1909, Roosevelt used sport as a hallmark of his presidential speeches. He hunted, loved football, and was the first president to use football analogies in his speeches. Roosevelt merged moral messages with sport and he correlated the strengthening of men with the strengthening of the nation. Using his prominence and influence as a public figure, he became a vocal proponent of strong men and fertile women. Particularly he stressed sports, outdoor activities, and an embracing of ruggedness. Importantly, however, he also stressed that these activities needed to be combined with the desire to make oneself better through goals and the moral imperative of helping others. One of Roosevelt’s most famous quotes stemmed from his time as the New York Police Commissioner. Roosevelt served this position from May 1895 to April 1897 (Berman, 1987), and during an address to a group of college boys, he delivered the following quote “Aggressive fighting for the right is the greatest sport in the world” (as quoted in Abbott, 1919, p.148)

As president, Roosevelt rhetorically framed morality and sport through notions of being honorable, challenging oneself, using the gifts one has been granted, and sticking up for the things that someone believes in. Once someone attains those characteristics in one’s life, one can live with a rich spirit and hold a valiant life. It did not matter if someone was victorious or
was defeated in the end, for Roosevelt it was the character building concepts one learned through victory and defeat.

Speeches and allusions to sport and living a moral life extended throughout Roosevelt’s presidency. For example, during a commencement speech in May 1900, Roosevelt (1902) told the crowd the following in his “American Boy” speech:

He [sic] cannot do good work if he is not strong and does not try with his whole heart and soul to count in any contest; and his strength will be a curse to himself and to every one else if he does not have a thorough command over himself and over his own evil passions, and if he does not use his strength on the side of decency, justice, and fair dealing. In short, in life, as in a football game, the principle to follow is: Hit the line hard; don’t foul and don’t shirk, but hit the line hard. (p. 164)

Not only does Roosevelt explicitly use football as an example, but he also merges a sport with the moral notions of justice, good, and decency. He acknowledges that people struggle to have good triumph over evil, but sport offers an illustrative way to make the triumph happen.

Roosevelt continues the correlation between sport and morality in 1900 during his “The Strenuous Life” speech. Roosevelt (1902) stated:

Far better is it to dare mighty things, to win glorious triumphs, even though checkered by failure than to rank with those poor spirits who neither enjoy much nor suffer much, because they live in a gray twilight that knows not victory nor defeat. (p. 4)

In this speech Roosevelt focuses on the moral characteristics of competition that sport can provide. The inclusion of sport rhetoric such as victory, defeat, and win, project a symbiosis between sport and a moral life.

An additional example is in “Character and Success,” Roosevelt (1902) emphasized this sentiment further:
Of course this does not mean that either intellect or bodily vigor can safely be neglected. On the contrary, it means that both should be developed, and that not the least of the benefits of developing both comes from the indirect effect which this development itself has upon the character. (p. 114)

This statement reflects the necessity of building both one’s intelligence and body. Improving one without the other produces an imbalanced person. It is when both the mind and the body are strengthened can one’s character be strengthened as well. Again, this example illustrates Roosevelt’s repeated combination of bodily development with character development.

A final example of importance of sport and morality is from Roosevelt’s speech entitled “The Man in the Arena.” Delivered on April 23, 1910 at the Sorbonne in Paris, France, Roosevelt stated:

It is not the critic who counts. Not the man who points out how the strong man stumbled or where the doer of deeds could have done better. The credit belongs to the man who is actually in the arena, whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood; who strives valiantly; who errs and comes short again and again; who knows the great enthusiasms, the great devotions; who spends himself in a worthy cause. Who, at best, knows in the end the triumph of high achievement, and who at the worst, at least fails while daring greatly, so that his place shall never be with those timid souls who know neither victory nor defeat. (para. 9)

The placement of the illustrative figure literally in the arena along with the sporting analogy of fighting through dirt, sweat, and blood for something that is a worthy cause merges sport and morality. This, again, serves to promote sport and the physical development of one’s body as the way to build one’s character.
Through speeches such as these, Roosevelt becomes the preacher of morals consistently framed through the rhetoric of sport. Roosevelt’s rhetoric stands as the first time a president used football analogies, but he also relied on general sports allusions throughout his presidential addresses. These sports references merged athletics and physical activity with the moral standards of virtuosity, fighting for what is right, devotion, working hard, decency, justice, and being fair – all from a very public spotlight.

IAAUS/NCAA

A final example of the rhetorical construction of the athlete as a moral hero is through the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States (IAAUS). Established on March 31, 1906, the IAAUS is the predecessor of the current athlete’s organization the National Collegiate Athlete’s Association (NCAA). The IAAUS developed due to the growing violence in football. In the mid to late 1800s, football resembled a form of rugby and was becoming increasingly more violent. Universities, the media, and fans took notice. Some liked and encouraged the violence, but the majority of people recognized the problems violence was having on the game. Regardless, the game developed and on November 6, 1869, the first collegiate game of was held between Rutgers and Princeton. By the 1870s, football worked its way into schools such as Harvard, Princeton, and Yale. The first Monday of the fall term, Harvard freshmen and sophomores played against each other; the day was known as “Bloody Monday.” Football at this time included violent head on tackles, hits from behind, and the scrummage. In the “scrum,” the ball was placed in the middle of the two teams. The teams would link arms and literally push against the buttocks of their teammates while kicking and punching (Falla, 1981).

The violence of the game, and corollary displeasure, is referenced in newspaper articles and by organizations associated with the sport. In the late 1870s newspapers voiced their frustration. The Lehigh Burr stated that “to make a good football player, one must forget his
position as a gentleman” (as quoted in Falla, 1981, p. 8). In 1883, the Harvard Committee on Athletics says that football is “no longer governed by a manly spirit of fair play” (as quoted in Falla, p. 9). Harvard (and Columbia) eventually dropped football because of the violence and upon leaving, Harvard’s president referred to football as brutal, demoralizing, and extremely dangerous. Football, however, continued to grow on college campus and by 1890, 120 campuses had teams. Tactics such as the “flying wedge,” based off a military formation in which players would combine mass and momentum to form a diamond-shaped, five-man wedge resulting in full-speed collisions, caused more injuries than previous formations. In the “hurdle play,” one member was given the ball and then he would jump on the hands of two teammates who would fling him over the opponents. This play eventually stopped, and prompted more attention to the necessity of regulating the violence in the sport, when in a Princeton/Columbia game, a player was met mid-air by a member from the other team who had figured out how to stop the play. In 1905, the season produced 18 deaths and 149 serious injuries (Falla, 1981).

Due to the increasing pressure for football and universities to quell the pejorative connotations of football at the collegiate level, officials – including President Roosevelt – demanded for changes and regulations on the game. After various attempts to change the rules, eventually the IAAUS was formed in 1905 with the distinct purpose of reinstating football to a respectable and safe position.

The creators of the organization viewed themselves as fulfilling a moral objective by preparing young male citizens (Carter, 2006). The underlying moral aspects of the forming of the IAAUS is illustrated in the Association’s first constitution:

Article 2: Its object shall be the regulation and supervision of college athletics throughout the United States, in order that the athletic activities […] may be maintained on an ethical plane in keeping with the dignity and high purpose of education.
Article 8: The Colleges and Universities in this Association severally agree to take control of student athletic sports, as far as may be necessary to maintain in them a high standard of personal honor, eligibility and fair play, and to remedy whatever abuses may exist. (as quoted in Falla, 1981, p. 21)

At the Association’s first convention in 1907, the President, Captain Palmer Pierce of West Point, addressed the members and reflected this same moral sentiment: “It is intended to exert every effort to increase the membership until all colleges and universities of any athletic importance subscribe to our constitution and bylaws and thereby agree to do their share properly to control and purify college athletics” (as quoted in Falla, 1981, p. 23). The Chancellor of New York University, Henry McCracken, a major factor in the creation of the association and reflected the moral mission of the IAAUS, stated: “When those activities of a young man which most fix his attention, excite his ambitions and stir his feelings are kept on a high moral plane, then a great deal is done towards making his a life of morality” (as quoted in Carter, 2006. p. 230).

The IAAUS originated out of the recognition that violence was bad for the game. The rhetoric from newspapers and the universities with teams were upset about the violence and did not think that it was good for sport or educational environments. The creation of the organization, therefore, held strong moral underpinnings to restore moral concepts to the game. The constitution, and prominent members of the organization delivered rhetoric that portrayed the organization as a moral response to the violence of football that attempted to serve long lasting character building aspects.

Conclusion

The time period from 1850-1920 serves as one of the foundational periods of sport in America that offers a reason for today’s conflicting messages. The start of organized collegiate
sport, the influx of the media writing about athletes, a new found interest in physical activity, combined with the introduction of the YMCA and the Muscular Christianity movement, Bernarr Macfadden and his Physical Culture magazine, the speeches of Theodore Roosevelt, and the creation of the IAAUS/NCAA combined to create a strong rhetorical message that merged sport and morality. These messages were continually repeated through pamphlets, posters, books, newspaper articles, organizational mission statements, magazine articles, presidential speeches, and public statements. The proliferation of this message reached a wide audience and created a rhetorical foundation that framed the way sport was seen in America at this time.

The central institutions of the nation articulated a consistent and coherent vision of sport between 1850 and 1920. The messages came from a variety of sources, thereby adding to the potential impact and widespread reach. These rhetorical messages created a foundation for the myth of the athlete as a moral hero that impacts modern notions of sport. Then, as now, the actual behavior of athletes widely differs from the image of the moral hero. Despite evidence that athletes were often narcissistic and degenerate, discourse about sport merged popular and mythological notions of sport into larger romanticized narratives of family, childhood, working hard, Christianity, and honesty. Sport is more than pleasant distraction for pleasure seeking fans. Instead, sport acts as an interpretive community providing guides for personal and public behavior and a sense of American identity (Morgan, 2006).

In 21st century America, these myths still hold power in mainstream society. The power that sport holds revolves around the myth that sport fosters moral behavior and community idealism. Research reveals that there are a variety of heroes now, and they might not all fit into traditional notions of what a hero is, but sport is one of the few realms left where heroes are still searched out. The basic understanding of sport – that someone works hard to gain success and glory in an honest manner – sits at the rhetorical heart of athletics. The rhetorically constructed
hero holds great power in society through its ability to combine the athlete and sport with larger romanticized narratives of hope, faith, family, and struggle. The athlete as a moral hero becomes easy to accept when fans are bombarded with pictures, stories, movies, books, poems, news broadcasts, and narratives that paint sport as a positive and moral arena.
CHAPTER FIVE: MODERN SPORT AND WHAT KEEPS FANS ENAMORED

The five major rhetorical factors between 1850 and 1920 – the YMCA, the Muscular Christianity Movement, Theodore Roosevelt, Bernarr Macfadden and his Physical Culture magazine, and the creation of the NCAA – worked to frame sport and athletes as moral entities. Today, however, there are still various rhetorical aspects that continue to perpetuate the myth of the athlete as a moral hero. Even though there are constant threats, there is also constant rhetorical discourse that buffers and perpetuates the myth. Modern conceptions of sport still revolve around notions of morality and heroes and the rhetorical discourse reaches millions of fans on a regular basis.

There is no doubt sport is a pervasive activity in contemporary society. According to Burstyn (1999): “The rituals of sport engage more people in a shared experience than any other institution or cultural activity today” (p. 3). One of the most extensive sports surveys conducted, the “Miller Light Report on American Attitudes Towards Sports,” found that 96.3 percent of Americans frequently play, watch, or read articles about sports or identify with particular teams or players and nearly 70 percent follow sports everyday while 42 percent participate daily (as cited in Vecsey, 1983). In July 1997, when the space probe landed on Mars and sent photos back from the planet’s surface, a NASA spokesman stated that the moment was comparable to “winning the Superbowl, the World Cup, and the World Series three days in a row” (as cited in Burstyn, 1999, p. 3). This was the only metaphor that he could find to explain the excitement of the mission’s success. These examples illustrate how sport provides entertainment for millions and how people tend to associate positive characteristics to it. For many, however, the beauty of sport is not about the opportunity for participation as much as its ability to draw people from differing backgrounds to share in a collective excitement. Sport is not just about the game itself;
it is not only about what happens on the field or court. Instead, sport is entwined and enmeshed with overarching narratives of the hero, family, faith, love, and hard work.

Although the myth has years of development and sustenance behind it, there are constant instances where the myth is threatened. This chapter, therefore, analyzes what keeps modern fans enamored with the myth of sport, which ultimately rhetorically creates a sporting public. There are numerous ways the myth has been created and perpetuated rhetorically through commercials, news articles, game commentators, politicians, coaches, players, books, poems, video games and movies. Even sport exhibits portray sport as a repository of American values. For example, the traveling exhibition “Baseball as America” that showcased 500 items from the National Baseball Hall of Fame and Museum presented baseball as a reflection of American culture and values and inextricable from American history (“Baseball as America,” 2005).

This chapter analyzes four areas that perpetuate the myth of sport and athletes as moral enforcers: sports broadcasters and writers, advertising, the movie industry, and popular novels. Although a comprehensive study of the rhetorical devices utilized to project the myth of sport as a moral enterprise would be a difficult, if not an impossible project, this chapter seeks to illuminate a few of the major ways the operators of discourse keep the myth alive and cushion threats.

It is important to note that although there are numerous agents that perpetuate the myth, there is a body of research that portrays a different conception of sport. Chapter Two illustrated this, but there are numerous popular and academic writers who take a critical approach to sport (e.g., Burstyn, 1999; Eitzen, 1996; Rhoden, 2006; Zirin, 2007). This, however, is offset by the plethora of sources that continue to use the myth of sport as a guiding frame for speaking and writing. This is not to suggest, therefore, that writings and commentating is strictly positive, but
there is an overwhelming amount of mythical discourse that keeps the myth consistent and powerful.

**Sports Broadcasters and Writers**

The first major owner of discourse and enforcer of the myth of sport as a moral enterprise is the world of sports broadcasters and writers. Since the beginning of organized sport in America, newspaper writers made athlete’s household names and glorified the opportunities of sport and the actions of athletes. Writers such as Red Smith, George Plimpton, Rick Telander, Grantland Rice, Rick Reilly, Paul Gallico, Roger Angell, Robert Creamer, Ring Lardner, and Stanley Cohen are a few who wrote about sport and created narratives of winning, justice, teamwork, and purity. Similarly, sports commentators such as Vin Scully, Chick Hearn, Howard Cosell, Marv Albert, Tony Kornheiser, Mike Wilbon, Jim Rome, and Kevin Harlan are a few examples of prominent sports commentators that present sport as an arena for similar narratives of sport and patriotism, American values, hope, family, love, and unity. One of the most prolific sports writers of the 20th century, Red Smith (1983), acknowledges the role of the sports reporter in supporting the mythological notion of sport and the athlete: “I won’t deny that the heavy majority of sportswriters, myself included, have been and still are guilty of puffing up the people they write about” (p. 15).

Continuing the myth of sport through discourse occurs in daily newspapers, weekly and monthly magazines, nightly football and basketball games, the Olympics, the World Cup, and other news programs and sports shows. The rise of 24-hour sports coverage such as ESPN, ESPN2, and Fox Sports serves to repeat the narrative of sport as a moral arena. National tragedies, however, offer a unique example of the manner in which sporting discourse maintains the myth of sport on a very large scale. Specifically, two recent national disasters illustrate the ability for sports commentators to merge sport with concepts of unity, hope, and love and keep
the myth powerful. Discourse post 9/11 and Hurricane Katrina offer examples of the rhetorical power that moves sport beyond the playing field into various narratives about patriotism, renewal, and the hero.

The first national disaster that used the myth of sport as a way for America to heal and find purpose was 9/11. In widespread post-9/11 discourse, many commentators argued that the attack signaled a return of the traditional hero and “manly men” (Young, 2002). Sport commentating used the myth of sport in post 9/11 discourse to portray the area as a repository of heroes and as a way to fulfill one’s patriotic duty. An exemplification of this discourse was after the first Super Bowl game post-9/11. The game occurred at the New Orleans Superdome and produced a stage where patriotism and sport combined. Steve Serby (2002), a writer for the New York Post, illustrates the rhetorical merging of sport and patriotism:

Inside a red, white and blue fortress called the Superdome, they let freedom ring last night, and they let freedom sing, and then they played a football game that stands today as tall as the Twin Towers once did, as a defiant statue of liberty. On the night they wrapped a star-spangled banner around the neck of terror and squeezed tight, they played a football game that will be remembered as Patriots’ Day. (p. 70)

Arguably jingoistic, Serby conflates concepts of patriotism and pride within the frame of a football game. The game, the players, and those who watched served as types of soldiers fighting for America through their participation in the sporting arena. His message paints everyone involved in sport as a type of hero fighting for the moral good of American values.

The use of sport as an analogy for patriotism extends to work as a substitute or preparation for war. Sport serves as a way to be patriotic and a way to prepare people for the realities of war in a “similar” environment of challenge, heat, and sacrifice. Neil Ravitz (2005) exemplifies this sentiment in his article aptly named “It’s More Than a Game:”
Over the past four years, however, passion for the Army-Navy rivalry has been rekindled because of the swell of patriotism sparked by the events of 9/11 and the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Americans want to watch again because they know what these young men will face once they leave that playing field [...] In Iraq, we endured so many harsh experiences — challenging missions, soldiers falling in the line of duty, firefights with insurgents, 140-degree heat! Each new assignment solidified that brotherhood just as every tough loss and joyous victory on the football field had bonded my team. In many ways, I was able to lead a platoon in Iraq because of all I had learned through football.

(para. 6-18)

Sport writers and commentators portrayed sport post-9/11 as a way to overcome the grief of that day, show support for America, and show support for the men and women fighting in the war against Afghanistan and Iraq.

An additional example of post 9/11 discourse and the myth of the athletic hero is illustrated through the sports rhetoric promoting Pat Tillman as a hero. The day after the September 11 terrorist attacks, the National Football League’s (NFL) Tillman faced an Arizona camera crew and stated:

My great-grandfather was at Pearl Harbor, and a lot of my family has gone and fought in wars, and I really haven’t done a damn thing as far as laying myself on the line like that. And so I have a great deal of respect for those that have and what the flag stands for. (as cited in Johnson & Murr, 2004, p.3)

This conception of Tillman is well known to the millions of Americans who are familiar with his story; he gave up a $3.6 million contract with the NFL’s Arizona Cardinals to become an Army Ranger. Sports discourse portrayed a man who symbolized a very clear message to the American public. A successful professional athlete who willingly gave up fame and fortune to
put his life on the line as an $18,000-a-year Army Ranger, he became a symbol for American ideals and heroism all within the sporting package.

When Tillman was killed in duty (which, at the time of this writing, is still being investigated), sports discourse again portrayed the athlete as the ultimate hero. His funeral was nationally televised and sports agents grabbed onto the narrative of a war hero and football star who died in battle. Sports writers and commentators reflected the narrative in their writing. For example, sportswriter Joe Concha (2004) states:

Athletes are called heroes all the time by those in the press box. But in terms of the true definition of the word, Pat Tillman was truly brave, truly noble, and most of all, a true American hero that kids and adults alike should look up to. (para. 19-20)

Tillman served as the ultimate athletic hero fighting for the moral good of America. Not only was he a sporting hero due to his professional career, but writers and commentators took advantage of the narrative resulting in a nationally visible perpetuation of the athlete as a moral hero.

A second national disaster that spurred commentators to perpetuate the myth of sport was Hurricane Katrina. Making landfall on August 29, 2005, Hurricane Katrina devastated the Gulf Coast region and flooded New Orleans. In New Orleans, 25,000 people were displaced to the Superdome (home of the NFL’s Saints). Overnight the superdome was transferred from a recreational venue to a homeless shelter (Zirin, 2007). The destruction and eventual evacuation of an entire city placed New Orleans in the national spotlight with many perceiving the federal government’s response as inhumane, racist, and utterly incomplete.

Sports writers and commentators, however, used the Superdome and the Saint’s as hope for renewal and promise for the city. Discourse surrounding the first game (nationally televised and on Monday Night Football) reified the myth of sport as moral and athletes as heroes. Paul
Attner’s (2006) article, “They’re HOME. There’s HOPE” illustrated the refurbished Superdome as a place of renewal:

Now it’s a symbol of a new beginning for the city, its roof shiny white again. ‘If they can get the dome ready this fast, it should inspire folks to come back and build their homes and open their businesses,’ says [Saint’s receiver Joe] Horn. ‘And for a lot of people who will be there, it will exorcise the demons of what they endured inside the dome during Katrina. (para. 10)

This discourse not only offers sport as a return to normalcy, but it plays on the myth of sport to cover up the tragedy and reality of the city that was still in shambles.

National Public Radio’s Chris Rose stated on a September 25, 2006 newscast about the Monday Night football game and used rhetoric such as “a cause for celebration,” “[the Superdome’s] durability is our durability,” “a triumph,” “a community reborn,” and regardless of the outcome of the game, we should “chalk up a big W for the city of New Orleans.”

Commentator Tony Kornheiser also perpetuated the myth of sport as a way for hope and unity. He stated during the telecast of the game:

It means so much to everyone here that the Saints are back in town playing football, and that the Superdome is being used for something other than refugees. This is not housing we’re talking about. It’s football. Housing will take years to rebuild and football will only take a few hours to play. But you rebuild and recover a little at a time, and before you do it with bricks and wood, you do it with symbols, like a team coming back home and a stadium reopening. This night and this game matter dearly to the people of New Orleans, the ones who are scattered and the ones who remain, and if it matters to them it should matter to all of us as well. (as cited in Walker, 2007, para. 6)
Sports writers and commentators are one example of the manner that discourse perpetuates and substantiates the myth of sport. Their articles and broadcasts are read and heard by millions of people and it is their discourse that promulgates a specific version of the role and opportunity sport can provide. Although the sporting public might hear the narrative during the telecast or they might read about it on the front page, even advertising space and time works to reify the myth as well.

Advertising

A second example of an area that owns the discourse of sport is advertising. The rise of television introduced the growth of advertising in the sporting arena. Burstyn (1999) explicates this rise and argues that the 1960s offered a distinct shift in the role of advertising in sport. By this decade, advertisers selling cars, electronic appliances, insurances, clothes, sports equipment, cigarettes, beer and grooming products inundated the airwaves seeking specific male audiences. The use of advertising grew throughout the late 20th century and today not only does advertising bring in millions of dollars a year, but it is an additional arena that perpetuates the myth of sport.

There are numerous advertising campaigns that perpetuate notions of the individual athlete as a moral figure. For example, Michael Jordan was one of the first professional athletes to perfect sponsorship and eventually made millions of dollars more in revenue from advertisers than he did as a basketball player. His image was used in a very specific manner and McDonald and Andrews (2001) argue that Jordan used a media image that capitalized on his “humility, inner drive, personal responsibility and moral righteousness” (p. 26).

Another example of an individual athlete that capitalizes on a moral image, thus maintaining the myth, is Lebron James. A member of the NBA’s Cleveland Cavaliers, James claims “King James” as his nickname. The biblical underpinnings of the nickname are encouraged by a widely popular Nike advertising campaign that identifies his fans as
“witnesses.” Thus, the nickname and the advertisements correlate sport with religion, a player with God, and fans with worshipers. The advertising campaign takes a high profile athlete and situates him in the role of a ruler and the fans who are witnesses to his abilities on the basketball court. The fans, therefore, are correlated with the undertones that “witnessing” to someone holds within religious circles. Additionally, the commercials depict driving into Cleveland and show different city scenes until the commercial ends outside of the basketball arena where James plays. The ability of the commercial to start outside of the city and end at the site where James plays suggests a type of pilgrimage that correlates with the rest of the religious images in the campaign. The Nike advertising campaign and the various religious symbols work to frame James as a religious figure and sport as a religious arena. This results in a transference of moral connotations between the religious symbols and sport itself.

The NBA’s advertising campaign for NBA Cares is an additional example of advertising as a perpetuator of the myth of sport. NBA Cares is the league’s social responsibility commission that uses players to address social issues in the United States and around the world. With the tagline: “The NBA: Where Caring Happens,” the advertising campaign uses various players around the league to offer personal testimony of their actions in the community. For example, Baron Davis of the Golden State Warriors, discusses in one commercial how he and teammates Al Harrington, Monta Ellis, and Kelena Azubuike read books to local school children. In another advertisement, Derrick Fisher of the Los Angeles Lakers describes how he and his teammates Vladimir Radmonovic, Lamar Odom, and Kobe Bryant teach teamwork, reading, and sportsmanship through the program. Not only do the players stress positive issues, but the advertisement campaign portrays the athletes as moral individuals.
Advertising, therefore, serves as an additional way that discourse frames sport and athletes and merges them with notions of morality. These thirty second spots, however, are buttressed by a much longer purveyor of discourse: the sports film.

The Movie Industry

The movie industry is a third factor that perpetuates the mythologizing of sport. Sport is a popular topic for films. Between 1920-1960 there were 119 movies just about football (Oriard, 2001). These movies reached large audiences and used a master narrative that portrayed a hero who overcame an obstacle to win the big game in the final minutes. Examples include The Freshman, Horse Feathers, So This is College, Sweetie, and The Time, the Place, and the Girl. Today a search of the popular internet movie database (IMDB.com) lists over 2,400 sports movies suggesting the repeated use of the narrative to not only sell movie tickets, but the amount of times the narrative has been used. Basketball alone has been the topic for numerous movies. A short listing includes the films He Got Game, Space Jam, Eddie, Blue Chips, Celtic Pride, Basketball Diaries, Hoop Dreams, Heaven is a Playground, White Men Can’t Jump, and Hoosiers (as cited in Olsen, 2003). Regardless of what sport the movie uses as a plot, the use of film to reify the myth of sport is abundant.

Research elucidates how sport films depict sociocultural American issues and serve as a purveyor of values, morals, and customs. Pearson et. al. (2003) examined 590 films between 1930 and 1995 and found a strong relationship between film content and social and cultural relevance. McDorman et. al. (2006) argue that even films that attempt to show a realistically negative portrayal of the sport industry still use morality and ethics as ways to validate the character’s and their role in sport. Their research analyzes the films Jerry Maguire, For Love of the Game, and Any Given Sunday as ways to illustrate a seemingly reliance on the role of morals in sport and the continuance of the myth of sport.
Sporting movies often initiate the myth of sport, and arguably give much more power to the myth by conflating sport with romanticized versions of bigger life issues. For example, *The Field of Dreams*, although clearly a baseball movie, is ultimately a movie about the main character’s relationship with his father. Roy Hobbes in the movie *The Natural* ultimately deals with his first love and a son he did not know he had until right before he stepped on deck to hit the home run to win the World Series. *Rudy* is not just a movie about a boy who works hard enough to achieve his dream of playing football for Notre Dame, but it is entwined with narratives of family, education, and relationships. Furthermore, the movie *Hoosiers* is an additional example of how movies frame the myth of sport. Grossing over $28 million and receiving three Best Supporting Actor nominations and one for Best Score, the film depicts a middle-aged man trying to turn his life for the better through his position as the high school’s head basketball coach. The film combines themes of hard work, discipline, commitment, and helping others all within the frame of Indiana basketball.

The use of movies to frame sport seems to be a growing concept. In May 2008, ESPN announced the first film fest for sports movies as a part of New York’s Tribeca Film Festival. In conjunction, ESPN Classic is running a sports movie marathon the same weekend. ESPN also plans to air 8-10 documentaries a year and has recruited filmmakers such as Spike Lee and Davis Guggenheim to create films about sports in the last 30 years. Furthermore, ESPN plans to release its first theatrical release about Branch Rickey, Jackie Robinson, and the integration of baseball in 2008 ("ESPN adds movies," 2008).

The movie industry illustrates the ability of a film to rhetorically frame sport in mythological and moralizing manners. Typically the films take sport and correlate it to narratives of love, hope, unity, family, and success in the standard frame of the hero that struggles and is challenged at some point. The use of films is a giant industry that reaches
millions of people and ultimately serves as an additional purveyor of discourse to perpetuate and bolster the myth of sport.

**Popular Novels**

The growth of mass media and technological advances, gave rise to the fourth purveyor of discourse to spread the myth of sport: novels. The profusion of books in American society and their role to impact the public suggests their ability to frame sport to a large audience through a powerful medium. The popular internet book buying service Amazon implies their reach to a widespread audience. A search on their website reveals over 470,000 books related to sport.

Children books are one proponent of the myth of sport that reaches a young audience. Dagavarian (1987) analyzed children’s baseball literature between 1880 and 1950 and found five major themes among their content: interpersonal support, individual responsibility, sacrifice, modesty, and fair play. These themes, however, are not limited to children’s literature but permeate numerous books on sport as well.

Oriard (1982) researches the role of the athlete hero in American fiction between 1868 and 1980. Although he analyzes short stories, weeklies, and dime stories, Oriard spends the majority of his research analyzing novels. Oriard defines the athlete-hero as a natural and a self-made man, a character from humble, small town origins who comes to the city with his ability, humor, deserved good luck, and his breezy confidence. and argues that the stereotypical character of the athlete hero in American fiction can be traced to the Frank Merriwell stories between 1896 and 1915.

Two widely regarded classics in sport literature are the book, Bernard Malamud’s (1952) *The Natural* (later turned into a movie), and W.P. Kinsella’s (1982) *Shoeless Joe* (later turned into the movie *Field of Dreams*). Both novels use baseball as the central plot feature and both
use sport as the vehicle through which the main protagonists find hope, purpose, and life changing experiences. All of this, of course, happens within the mythic frame of sport.

Bernard Malamud’s, *The Natural*, is more than just a sports novel. Oriard (1982) argues that the novel marks a distinct turning point in American sports fiction. He argues:

Malamud was our first writer to clearly see that the character of the hero, and the relationship of country and city, youth and age, masculinity and femininity in American sport are explicitly mythic concerns[...] It was not until *The Natural* that any American novelist recognized that the major concerns of sport do, in fact, define the essential myths of the American people and related them to the timeless myths of Western civilization (p. 211).

The novel follows Roy Hobbes on his unlikely journey of playing on a professional baseball team. Although originally a young baseball protégé, Hobbes had to work to secure a position after being shot by a young woman. Hobbes, however, not only made the team, he helped the team make it to the World Series.

Interestingly, Malamud’s depiction of Hobbes illustrates the constant infusion and recycling of the hero, thereby suggesting the unending cycle of the myth. Mirroring the ability of the mythic cycle to constantly reinvigorate itself, the characters of the novel invoke the same mythic cycle. Hobbes overtakes the heroes the Whammer and Bump, and then he is replaced by Youngberry – the new king and hero. Oriard (1982) relates what happens in the novel to myth and the larger role of sport in contemporary society:

The athlete-hero must age and retire – his skills are clearly diminished at the end of his career, as Malamud would have observed in the final seasons of Joe DiMaggio and other aging heroes of the early fifties, and as we more recently have recognized in the last seasons of Willie Mays, Hank Aaron, and others. Sport provides heroes who temporarily
infuse spirit into their world, and as such it performs an invaluable service for contemporary society [...but T]he game continually renews itself – raises up heroes who temporarily reign and then are replaced. (p. 219)

Malamud’s novel, therefore, not only relates the myth of sport to larger myths of society, he underscores the ability of sport heroes to constantly be reinscribed. The mythic cycle ceaselessly provides new heroes to fill the role of past heroes, thereby illustrating an unending cycle.

A second novel that perpetuates the myth of sport in literature, is W.P. Kinsella’s *Shoeless Joe*. In *Shoeless Joe*, the main character Ray Kinsella attempts to understand, as well as validate, his decision to build a baseball field in the middle of his Iowa cornfield. This attempt leads him on a cross-country road trip, and numerous conversations with ghosts of past players, to ultimately lead him to a new discovery about his own father.

The novel consistently testifies to the mythological notions of sport. The characters and the plot merge the game of baseball with broader narratives of family, hope, doing the right thing, and love of neighbor. For example, Kinsella states:

The play reaffirms what I already know – that baseball is the most perfect of games, solid, true, pure, and precious as diamonds. If only life were so simple. I have often thought, If only there was a framework to life, rules to live by. (p. 78)

Kinsella continues to describe, and thus rhetorically frame, how baseball is larger than the game itself: “It wasn’t just the baseball game. I wanted it to be a metaphor for something else: perhaps trust, or freedom, or ritual, or faithfulness, or joy, or any of the other things that baseball can symbolize.” (p. 82). At times Kinsella even conflates baseball with a religious conversion:

‘Can you imagine? Can you imagine?’ His voice is filled with evangelical fervor. ‘Can you imagine walking around with the very word of baseball enshrined inside you?
Because the word of salvation is baseball. It gets inside you. Inside me. And the words I speak are spirit, and are baseball.’ (p. 192)

The book, therefore, rhetorically portrays sport as an opportunity for freedom, faith, and joy and serves to perpetuate the myth of sport as a moral and positive arena.

Novels illustrate a final way that the discourse surround sport perpetuates the myth of sport. Books have an ability to shape discourse through the development of plots and characters and have been doing so since the first dime store novels and books.

Conclusion

This chapter analyzes the manner in which writers and commentators, advertising, movies, and novels produce discourse that perpetuates the myth of sport. Often these factors merge the mythological notions of sport with larger romanticized narratives of family, childhood, innocence, love, and second chances. Arguably, this is what makes the myth so strong in sport. It is not necessarily about the game, but it is about the events and emotions related to the participation in the sport. Sport is not just an important part of American folklore, popular culture, or private pastimes that transformed themselves into highly organized visible public practices in a relatively short period. Instead, sport acts as interpretive vehicles through which Americans enthusiastically avail themselves to ponder the various issues and questions they face as a nation (Morgan, 2006).

All of these factors work together to keep us enamored with the athlete. They present sport as the way to truth, love, and happiness. Sport is a way to overcome tough backgrounds filled with hate or unlucky incidents. These rhetorical devices also frame athletes as moral beings who rise above us – even reaching comparisons with holy figures.

The staged and produced versions of the hero are staged through the mass media and advertisements, but fans do not like to see the machinery, the illusions, the script, the body
changes, the surgeries, or the drugs that go into making the product. As modern mass sport grew up after the frontier closed in the United States and the British Empire finished expanding, the athletic hero became an urban myth for an increasingly sedentary nation. Today it is sustained by mass media, promoters, agents, advertisers, and sports writers. It is a giant industry in which the original hero has been beauracratized – the hero is produced by a vast system that nurtures, winnows, trains, selects, and scripts. The original hero sustains (i.e., the fire fighter who goes into a building and does not know what will happen), while the athlete is a performer sent into a structured game by a coach to perform a specific role. Like actors, fans want an illusion of belief and with the athlete, the machinery (steroids, training, and recruitment) are heavy and obtrusive. Fans are always glimpsing it just when we want to believe.

The history and widespread reach of the huge sports industry threatens to wear out the myth. The sporting public sees that the athlete is not a free agent like the old fashioned hero – he or she is a created product (in huge numbers) by an industrial process. The media, marketing, and the huge industrialization of sport have given fans headaches that will not go away. This reveals the manufactured and scripted charisma of the so called sports hero and the noise and exposure is beginning to rip at the edges of the myth, yet the rhetorical construction of athletes as moral heroes remains.

Steroids present a unique threat to the hero due to the strong contradiction they present to the myth of the moral athlete and are one major way the myth is wearing thin. The myth of the moral hero may never die, but steroids make the athlete myth fragile – especially the mass mediated version of the hero. Over the past few years, the use of steroids in sport presents a serious threat to the myth of sport. Steroid use by track athletes such as Marion Jones, baseball players such as Jason Giambi, and many others, fill the headlines. When stories of steroid usage began in early 2000, the media and fans reacted in shock. The contradiction between the
The infiltration of steroids results from the culture in place that forces the myth of the athlete. We live in a society that glorifies winning at any cost. Second place is not good enough as exemplified by Vince Lombardi’s famous quote: “Winning isn’t everything, it’s the only thing.” The push to win at all costs introduces options that are illogical or simply stupid. Steroids are one option for athletes desperate to find the edge on competition and to give them that one small push beyond their teammates and opponents. The opportunities vary depending on the situation. Gains or advantages for athletes can come in the form of more playing time, increased attention at school or in the community, positive attention from fans, family, and friends, or even huge monetary gains. The opportunity for financial rewards is a huge draw for athletes, thereby urging them to resort to anything that will make them better players. The average salary of an NBA player in 2004 was $3.7 million. The ten highest paid athletes in the NBA range in salary from $25.2 million to $14.34 million excluding endorsements (Eitzen, 2006). Once athletes see the gains from steroids as more beneficial than not using them, more athletes do not care about the side effects. Once fans stop caring about athletes being moral, it forces a reconceptualization of the myth.

Because athletes were constructed as moral individuals – through the combination of five major factors when organized sport first began in the US, and the reification of the myth by sports writers, commentators, advertising, movies, and novels – the myth still drives the way fans sees athletes today. This myth is so strong that fans are often willing to overlook the athlete who uses drugs, gambles, cheats, rapes, steals, or any other moral transgression that can arise. Steroids, however, may present a transgression too large to dismiss or ignore.
The next chapter, therefore, explicates the role of steroids in sport to illustrate how they threaten the myth of sport and how fans are reacting to their use. It is believed that steroids present the threat that will ultimately offer a new way to understand how myths function when they are threatened.
CHAPTER SIX: THE THREAT OF STEROIDS TO THE MYTH OF THE MORAL ATHLETE

This chapter analyzes how steroids present a threat to the myth of sport that forces fans to reconceptualize what sport means to them individually and as a society. The chapter explicates how steroids affect athletes’ bodies, the history of steroids in sport, and what has lead up to the current state of steroids in sport. Ultimately this chapter establishes steroids as a unique threat to the sport body politic in order to illustrate how fans reaction to the threat offers a new method of mythical analysis.

In the 1983 Summer Pan American games, several gold-medal winners were disqualified after they tested positive for the use of performance-enhancing drugs. As news of the suspensions spread, other athletes withdrew when they realized that they would have to take drug tests as well. In the 1988 Summer Olympics in Seoul, Korea, Canadian Ben Johnson challenged American Carl Lewis in a greatly anticipated 100-meter race watched by millions. Johnson won the race only to have it taken away after urinalysis tests revealed that Johnson had used the steroid stanozolol to enhance his performance. In the early to mid 2000s, Major League Baseball faced allegations and admissions of steroid use by the league’s most famous players. In 2006, Floyd Landis’s Tour de France championship was revoked after drug tests found extraordinarily high levels of testosterone. In 2007, after years of denial, track star Marion Jones admitted to using steroids and willingly returned her Olympic medals (Simon, 1991).

Examples of elite athletes using performance-enhancing drugs are abundant. Sports pages are filled with stories of athletes failing drug tests. Despite athletes routine claim, that the results are inaccurate, it is increasingly apparent that many are guilty of using supplements to enhance their performance. Extensive media coverage has evoked broad and mixed responses. ESPN The Magazine’s April 24, 2006 article on Barry Bonds and steroid use drew more reader mail than any other story in the magazine’s history (“Batted Around”).
Steroid use presents a threat to the myth of sport that fans are forced to resolve. This threat is unlike any other in sport’s history. It is a direct frontal assault, a clear contradiction to the myth of sport’s narrative of fairness and individual achievement shorn of artificial aids of class, caste, and other distinctions. It is one thing to overlook an athlete who makes a mistake or involves himself or herself in a questionable activity, but quite another thing to discover a widespread practice that undermines the basic premise of the enterprise – competitors in a struggle that has been stripped of special privileges and the trapping of unequal social status. In fact, fans can and have overlooked entire teams cheating (e.g., MLB’s Black Sox) and even disregarded teams going into the stands to fight fans (e.g., NBA’s Detroit’s Palace Brawl). These events can be justified as anomalies or simply accepted as people being caught up in the competitive nature of sport.

Steroids, however, are fundamentally different in their effect on the game and fans. With steroids, fans must accept that a large number of their favorite athletes used them – their use not relegated to a select few. Fans must accept that the biggest records in sport fell to doped-up stars – track and field, swimming, the homerun record (although as of this writing Bonds, who broke the record, still has not admitted steroid use, popular perception disputes this). Fans must justify their genuine excitement of following sport only to realize athletes duped them – their memories of games, championships, and what sport means are not what they thought they were. Sports writer Gary Smith (2005) illustrates this deception upon realizing that his excitement of following the homerun race in the late 1990s was completely false:

I was there, that June at Wrigley, when the fever caught Sammy. See that’s me and the three kids in the bleachers that weekend he rocked five out of the cathedral and the great home run chase was on. I was there, that July in San Diego, when Big Mac took one into the second tier. Look, that’s the lawyer I met up there, the guy proud to own the head
struck by Mark McGwire’s 43rd. I was there that September in St. Louis, when the fever caught us all. There, handing out hundred-dollar bills like sticks of gum just to get inside the coliseum and sit where the record long balls would land. There, alongside a Korean housewife, who’d dreamed she would snag number 62 off Big Mac’s bat, and a scrap-metal salvager and a psychiatric nurse and a Japanese chef and an 87-year old guy in a wheelchair, wearing an oxygen mask and a baseball glove…When that magical summer of ’98 ended I went home, put all these photographs into an album, etched captions beneath them so that one day someone else would understand the significance of what I’d seen and felt…then sealed my moments beneath protective plastic so they’d never be smudged. (p. 41-42)

Smith’s memories of the homerun race lead by players Sammy Sosa and Mark McGwire depict a romanticized narrative of sport, as well as emotions and feelings he associates with these athletes and that moment in sport history. Most revealing, however, is Smith’s conclusion to this memory: “What am I going to do with this scrapbook full of memories and the stories I used to tell? Another summer full of moments will soon begin the biggest homerun record of all ripe to fall. What will we do, each of us, now that we know?” (cover). Smith is forced, like the majority of fans, to reevaluate his memories of sport, the athletes who participate, and what sport means in his life. This paradigm shift offers a new way to understand what happens when myths are threatened. Smith’s sentimental account might serve as a representative anecdote of baseball’s fall from innocence. After the loss of Eden, we face remorse and guilt and seek a scapegoat for purification and redemption.

**What Is a Performance Enhancer and Why Is It Bad?**

When fans, experts, and medical personnel scrutinize the use of performance-enhancing drugs, familiar questions arise. Is a cup of coffee that provides an energy boost due to caffeine
acceptable? Is the notion of blood doping in which athletes inject vials of their own blood back into their system to enhance their oxygen levels acceptable? Is there a difference between natural enhancers such as blood and synthetic enhancers such as steroids?

Within the sports realm, there are two classes of sports drugs: restorative and ergogenic (Goldman & Klatz, 1992). Restorative drugs are taken in response to an injury or a stress that allows the athlete to continue to compete. Drugs in this category include painkillers, muscle relaxants, tranquilizers, sedatives, anti-inflammatories, enzymes, and topical anesthetic sprays and ointments. Ergogenic drugs are used to increase performance to levels unachievable through normal training. This class contains the most controversial and dangerous drugs such as amphetamines and anabolic steroids. Some argue that because anabolic steroids is the most commonly used and has the greatest potential for health complications, they should be focused on the most (Fuller & La Fountain, 1999, Simon, 1991). The fact that all major sport organizations prohibit the use of anabolic steroids bolsters this argument. The “goodness” and “badness” of drugs is socially constructed. It is not a unilateral or universal matter. Thus, the consequence of sport organizations, however temporary, is a symbolic act of considerable weight and significance. Steroids and performance enhancing drugs, as presently discussed, are defined in the colloquial way that is used in sport culture: synthetic high-octane cocktails that have been developed or used for enhanced athletic performance. These drugs typically are anabolic steroids or human growth hormone.

Anabolic steroids are a family of drugs that stimulate muscle growth and tissue repair and are a synthetic derivative of the testosterone hormone. Steroid use can be appropriately administered by trained physicians to treat numerous health conditions and disorders. There are various arguments, however, about whether steroid use is dangerous when controlled and supervised and major medical organizations, including the American College of Sports
Medicine, warn that there are serious side effects. These side effects include liver damage, arthrosclerosis, hypertension, sterility, heart attacks, ulcers, and psychological and emotional instabilities (Fuller & La Fountain, 1999). The psychological and emotional instabilities are commonly referred to as “roid rage” and can include violent mood swings, aggression, explosive temper, and an insatiable lust. Not all of the effects of steroids are necessarily bad. Steroids do help stimulate bone, muscle, and skin development, and also help overcome fatigue, pain, and emotional exhaustion. Steroids can treat testicular insufficiency, promote growth after debilitating diseases, and during World War II, they were given to starvation victims as a way to restore their nitrogen levels (Donohoe & Johnson, 1986).

The obvious issue with the drug, however, is what happens when athletes use them in extremely large doses? Steroids allow athletes to train harder and recover faster from the consequent stress on the body. Furthermore, they are more beneficial than other drugs such as amphetamines and cocaine as they can be used in the pre-competition stage; cessation just before the competition greatly reduces chance of detection (Lenehan, 2003).

Conversely, steroids plague athletes with chronic pain, disability, and early death (Burstyn, 1999). The benefits from steroids occur when their use is medically supervised and they are taken in appropriate quantities. This, however, is rarely the case when amateurs and athletes with no medical education are “prescribing” the drug to themselves. Thus, they often ingest extreme levels in an attempt to “max” out on the effects. An illustrative account of what people can expect when using performance enhancers is exemplified in the following advertisement:

Wow, is this great stuff! It is the basic drug for permanent muscle gains. It is the best pituitary hormone that makes your whole body grow. People who use it can expect to gain 30 to 40 pounds of muscle in ten weeks if they can eat around 10,000 calories per
day. It is about $600-$800 per 4 vials, and we think this to be another best buy. It has been very hard to get in the past as it was made from the pituitaries of rhesus monkeys and is illegal for general sale in the USA. It is now being made from ‘smart’ E-coli bacteria at Baylor Medical School in Texas. Usual dosage has been two units every three days. This is the only drug that can remedy bad genetics as it will make anybody grow. A few side effects can occur, however. It may elongate your chin, feet and hands, but this arested [sic] with cessation of the drug. Diabetes in teenagers is possible with it. It can also thicken your ribcage and wrists. Massive increases in weight over such a short period of time can, of course, give you heart problems. We have heard of a powerlifter getting a heart attack while on GH. GH use is the biggest gamble an athlete can take, as the side effects are irreversible. Even with all that, we LOVE the stuff. (as cited in Todd, 1987, p. 102)

This description suggests the many potential problems from steroid use. It does not, however, suggest that the side effects should be avoided or that the negative consequences outweigh the benefits. Summarizing the advertisement with “we LOVE the stuff” simplifies and overlooks the destruction steroids can have and instead glorifies the effects. This is what many are willing to subject themselves to in order for a competitive edge. It is not simply popping a pill every so often; steroids require major shifts in eating habits and working out, as well as an acceptance of what it does to one’s body.

Steroids do not only affect the physical body, but they also dramatically affect one’s mental state. A Harvard University study conducted by Dr. David Katz and Dr. Harrison Pope on the psychological effects of steroids on users found that 12% were overtly psychotic, 10% were subthreshold psychotic, 12% suffered manic episodes, and 30% experienced mood swings. Additionally the researches found that there were also symptoms of explosive behavior,
irritability, mania, hallucinations, and grandiose beliefs (as cited in Goldman & Klatz, 1992). Steroids, therefore, affect both physical and mental states that exemplify the detrimental consequences of their use. A disregard for the physical and mental effects of performance enhancers is a trend that revolves around the desire to gain a competitive edge. Steroids can be used positively to treat certain medical conditions, however, athletes do not use them in medically accepted manners – they aggressively use unsafe levels of doses to acquire physical results that cannot be attained otherwise.

Do sports fans have a general understanding of the harmful effects of steroid use? Schneider and Butcher (2000) analyzed ways steroids were perceived from a fan perspective. They categorized four ways steroids are problematic: cheating and unfairness; harm to users, clean athletes, society, and sport; perversion of sport; and unnaturalness and dehumanization. Miah (2004) offered a revised categorization that better accounted for sub-arguments that Schneider and Butcher (2000) gloss over. Miah’s research identified the following categories: 1. Coercion, 2. Unfair, 3. Health Risk, 4. Unnatural, 5. Rule Breaking/Cheating/Respect, 6. Unearned Advantage, 7. Contrary to/Does not promote the internal goods of sport 8. Contrary to the Nature of Sport, and 9. Contract Violation. These findings reflect how fans view steroid use as a form of cheating as well as their displeasure with their use do to what it does to people’s bodies.

Interestingly, the use of performance enhancers is not new to sport. What many sport fans do not realize is that they have been used in some form for thousands of years. The following historical account demonstrates the use of enhancers as a growing trend and the increasing exposure to the effects of steroids on sport and how fans accept them. Furthermore, the history emphasizes how and why steroid use now holds such unique ramifications unlike previous times.
History of Drug Use in Sport

Supplement use in sports such as football, track and field, baseball, and weightlifting are not uncommon at elite levels of amateur and professional sports (Simon, 1991). Although steroids in the United States did not reach mainstream exposure until the 1990s, performance enhancers have permeated sport since ancient times. Athletes have universally desired a competitive edge. Resort to complex and downright stupid techniques is a hallowed athletic tradition.

Terry Todd’s (1987) article offers one of the first comprehensive accounts of the historical development of drug use in sport. His findings illustrate how performance enhancers are not a twentieth century phenomenon but have been found in sport since classical times. For example, wrestlers during the classical period developed the “high protein diet” in which they would eat up to 10 pounds of lamb a day. Greek athletes in the third century A.D. used hallucinogenic mushrooms to mentally prepare for their events, and Nordic “Berserkers” could increase their fighting strength by eating amanita muscaria, a type of psychoactive mushroom. In ancient Egypt the rear hooves of an Abyssinian ass were ground up, boiled in oil, and flavored with rose petals and rose hips in order to boost performance. Roman gladiators and knights used stimulants after being injured in order to continue fighting (Donohoe & Johnson, 1986).

The first reported cases of performance enhancing drugs involved athletes taking stimulants and narcotics. One of the first cases occurred in the 1865 Amsterdam canal races. The races spanned several days and participants were known to suck on sugar cubes dipped in ether, black coffee laced with cocaine or strychnine, and heroin (Donohoe & Johnson, 1986). One of the most famous cases of drug use, however, occurred in the 1904 Olympic Games in St. Louis when marathon runner Thomas Hicks collapsed after he won the race. An ensuing investigation found that the members of his team, who followed him in a motorcar, repeatedly
gave him doses of strychnine and brandy to keep him going. When Hicks was revived he told
the reporters, “I would rather have won this race than be president of the United States” (as

Hicks’s experience is a strong illustration of a trend among athletes and performance
enhancers in the early to mid-1900s. Amphetamines became widely popular in the 1940s and
1950s and athletes using them occurred with more frequency. Cyclists in the 1950s were known
to carry amphetamines while they competed and syringes and ampules covered the locker room
of speed skaters in the 1952 Oslo Games. In the 1960s, Danish cyclist Kurt Jensen died at the
1960 Olympic Games in Rome due to nicotinic acid and amphetamines. A fellow Olympian at
the same games, 400-meter hurdler Dick Howard died from heroin. In 1963, boxer Billy Bello
died from heroin poisoning and in 1967 cyclist Tommy Simpson died from speed while
competing in the Tour de France. In May 1966 and September 1967 Jacques Anquetil forfeited
cycling titles rather than submit to drug tests. In 1968, Yves Mottin died two days after winning
a cross-country race, and soccer player Jean-Louis Auadri collapsed and died while on the field.
Both were in Grenoble, France and both were attributed to amphetamine use (Goldman & Klatz,
1992). These examples illustrate the use of drugs by athletes in the twentieth century, as well as
the increasing numbers of deaths. Although these cases involve the use of stimulants and
narcotics, rather than muscle enhancers, they establish the history of drug use as performance
enhancers in sport and demonstrate the growing trend of athletes willing to destroy their bodies
in order to win.

Leading up to the 1960s, however, the use of performance enhancers in sport seemed
relegated to random incidents half a world away. Exposure in the United States at this time
introduced steroids into mainstream discourse. For example, the June 23, 1969 cover story of
Sports Illustrated featured the silhouette of an athlete surrounded by drugs. Included on the
cover were anabolic steroids and a syringe with the heading, “Drugs – A Threat to Sport.” Over the next thirty-six years, this same publication printed eight cover stories that focused on steroid use. In 1988 American Olympic sprinter Carl Lewis was featured with the headline, “Busted!” In 1991 the National Football League’s Lyle Alzado accompanied the headline, “I Lied.” These articles heralded the awareness of steroids within sport and additional cover stories ran in 1997, 2002, 2003, 2005, and 2006 correlating steroids and sport.

Recent drug raids illuminate the depths the steroid rings run nationally and internationally and the ease of acquiring them. In September 2007, the Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA) ran a four day long series of raids that shut down 26 labs and made more than 50 arrests. Dubbed the largest performance-enhancing crackdown in the history of the United States, the raids finalized an 18-month probe. The culmination revealed 124 arrests in 27 states, closed 56 labs, seized $6.5 million, and 532 pounds of raw powder. One lab in the Midwest had so much steroid powder throughout that officials left footprints when they walked through the house. Also implicated in the investigation were 37 Chinese factories found to supply raw materials to the labs. Chinese factories are responsible for 70-80% (approximately $480 million worldwide) of an annual $600 million earned each year on the black market for human growth hormone (Assael, 2007).

Steroids do not present a simple nuisance to sport – they pervade sport. Although performance enhancers have been used for thousands of years, their use has changed from eating large amounts of protein, to the use of narcotics, to steroids and human growth hormone. They are problematic in the eyes of the President, investigators, and league administrators. Steroids present a threat to the moral perception of sport and present a clear threat to those who desire to emulate professional athletes.
Steroids are not limited to elite athletes, but their popularity with younger amateur athletes stands as one of the most feared realities for many. According to Eitzen (2006), 7% of high school male athletes and 2.4% high school female athletes admitted to using steroids (58). In 2004, 40% of 12th graders stated that it was fairly easy or very easy to obtain steroids, and the perception that steroids are harmful dropped from 71% in 1992 to 56% in 2004 (“Restoring Faith,” 2007). In 2005 statistics found that 500,000 high school students have used steroids, tripling numbers found just 10 years prior. Furthermore, a 2005-2006 Josephine Institute of Ethics surveyed 5,275 high school athletes and found 6.4% of males and 2% of females admitted to using performance-enhancing drugs in the past year. Michael Josephson, president of the Josephson Institute and founder of the national program did not express surprise over the findings: “They see how many people are using them in the Tour de France and in baseball. Young people are going to model what they see” (Funderburk & Eiland, 2007, p. 18C).

Statistics from college athletics show even higher numbers – 15% of male college athletes and 6% of female college athletes admit to using steroids (Eitzen, 2006). Additional research suggests that viewpoints regarding steroid use change depending on age. A 2004 New York Times Poll found that 41% of people under 30 do not simply look down on steroid use, but instead they are “not bothered at all by the idea that pro athletes use steroids” (as cited in Longman, 2004). Young fans, therefore, seem totally accepting of steroid use.

The ramifications of this are further illustrated through research by Smith (1976) and Harris (1986) that argues individuals in their late teens to early twenties hold the highest rates of having heroes. Original research by Smith found that adults were less likely than children to have heroes. Ten years later, Harris took the information and created a more accurate graph. The resulting inverted-U curve illustrates that young children have relatively few heroes, but the numbers increase until they hit around 20 years of age. After 20 years of age, the chart depicts a
correlation between older age and fewer heroes. People in their late teens and early twenties, therefore, have more heroes than young children or adults. Research illustrates that athletes are viable choices for children to hold as heroes (e.g. Harris, 1994; Wallis, 1999). The resulting conclusion suggests that young adults would be most open to having athletes as heroes, thus desiring to follow the messages they promote. If athletes communicate steroid use as an accepted norm, research suggests that young adults become susceptible.

These findings demonstrate the number of young athletes who use steroids, the ease that high school students find in obtaining them, and the potential crossover between athletes steroid use and young adults. The changing perception that steroids are not harmful, however, suggests a trend that reflects the worries of government officials, fans, parents, and law officials. It also illustrates a distinct shift in popular perceptions about what steroids can do to the body and if that is bad, worrisome, or even something that should be avoided. If steroids are not perceived negatively or harmfully, what ramifications does this hold for their use in the overall sport realm, and ultimately how does the myth of sport change or adjust by the threat?

**Acceptance and Rationale for Steroid Use**

The story of Tam Thompson, a 27-year-old physical education graduate student and competitive powerlifter, depicts one woman’s experience using steroids. Thompson was interviewed in 1987 (Todd) after using steroids for three years. She describes the subsequent effects on her body in the following manner due to her use of anabolic steroids:

I started on Anavar and decided it didn’t work, so I switched to injections of Equipoise—you know, the new veterinary steroid everyone’s using – and decadurabolin. Then I added some Dianabol on top—generally five to six a day, and then, when I was about five weeks out from the U.S. Women’s Nationals I started a cycle of testosterone, too. I started off with one half cc [sic] a week, then one cc the next week, then to one and one-
half, then two cc’s, and finally, the week before the meet, I took three cc’s I was pretty well tanked.

And then three days before the meet I started taking shots of aqueous testosterone-the real nasty stuff that hurts when it goes in. I mean you put that thing in your hip and it feels like it’s dripping all down the back of your hamstring. It makes the hamstrings cramp really bad. I took one cc in the morning and one cc at night for the first two days, then the day before the meet one cc in the morning and two cc’s at night and the morning of the meet I took two more cc’s, and then three more right before the meet started. And during the meet I took some of those sublingual testosterones-I don’t remember how many-and right before the deadlifts I took an injection of adrenalin backstage-about one-half cc, I guess.

How did I feel? Like I was on top of the world. Not high, just a very super feeling. I thought I could do anything.

Unwanted side effects? I didn’t really notice anything the first cycle. So I figured, “OK, we’re safe, this isn’t going to do anything to me.” And it didn’t, not the first time. But the second cycle, my voice started getting lower, and I noticed these strange hairs showing up. I thought, “Well, that’s no big deal. A hair here, a hair there. Big deal, I can live with it.” Some of it was on my face, some on my chest, And [sic] the next cycle it got worse. But by then, I figured the damage had already been done, and I went ahead with the full cycle of steroids because I had a meet coming up. It’s hard to explain to people that once you’re on the drugs you lose sight of everything but winning. That’s one thing they don’t understand. I mean, I could look at myself, back then, and I could sort of see what was happening, but I didn’t care. I don’t feel that way now. I’ve been off the drugs for almost two years now, but I still have to shave every day. (p. 88)
Although this account is understandably extraordinary to an outside observer, it is not an unusual consequence of heavy drug use. After three years of using steroids, Tam was left with noticeable hair on her chest, enough hair to produce a moustache and a beard, the beginning of male pattern baldness, clitoral enlargement, and a significantly lowered voice. These athletes seemingly disregard how much they are taking and justify the physical effects by focusing on how it propels them towards victory.

Steroid use does not only affect football players who presumably need power to tackle or for weightlifters who need to be huge. Steroid use by players, who many fans might assume would not benefit from the drugs, is illustrated by members of the 2004 Carolina Panthers’ Super Bowl team. Implicated in a steroid scandal with a West Columbia, SC practitioner, Dr. James Shortt, one of the players indicted was punter Todd Sauerbrun (“Report,” 2005). Sauerbrun’s steroid use emphasizes the perceived need by players to use steroids even if they barely have any contact with other players. Typically punters are only required to kick the ball off and return to the sidelines. On rare occasions, the punter might have to make a tackle if there is a unique set of events that finds the other team’s player breaking free of repeated tackle attempts. It is only at this point the punter would be required to participate in any contact with players. Even punters, therefore, feel it is necessary to take steroids in order to compete. The perceived notion of competition and the desire to beat others physically, finds steroids making their way to the players where it does not make sense for their use. Sauerbrun’s example highlights the extent of steroids in the NFL among different types of positions, as well as the perception that their use is necessary in order to succeed in the NFL.

Steroids also affect other non-contact sports such as cycling and even golf. Bjarne Riis, a Dane who won the Tour in 1996, admitted use along with several former riders for the cycling group Telekom. The International Cycling Union developed a stringent anti-doping charter that
commits riders to paying a year’s salary in combination with a 2-year ban if caught (“Sinkewitz Tests,” 2007). Probably the most well known case of performance enhancers in cycling is that of Floyd Landis. Winner of the 2006 Tour de France, Landis had his title taken away after officials found high levels of testosterone inconsistent with the body’s natural ability to make the hormone. Repeated denials and appeals by Landis were only refuted by additional blood tests that found the same results. Landis eventually handed over his title to the runner-up Oscar Pereiro. On June 8, 2007, a month before the start of the Tour de France, T-Mobile rider Patrik Sinkewitz tested positive for high levels of testosterone. Sinkewitz’s test revealed a testosterone level six times over the limit. He participated anyway until a crash forced him to drop out.

Spokesman of the telecommunications giant, Christian Frommert responded to the allegations: “We’ll sit down after the Tour and calmly analyze the situation,” he told ARD [Germany’s broadcasting and radio organization]. “It’s a hard blow. We’ll have to think about sponsoring now. We are angered, disappointed, shocked” (“Sinkewitz Tests,” 2007, p. 1). Two television stations, ZDF and ARD dropped coverage of the tour in response.

Steroids even find their way onto the golf course. On July 18, 2007, professional golfer Gary Player, admitted he knows players in associations who use steroids: “We’re dreaming if we think it’s not going to come into golf” (“Player Says,” 2007, p. 1). The Ladies Professional Golf Association (LPGA) starts drug testing next year, and the European Tour and PGA Tour are moving toward drug policies. These examples demonstrate how individuals have used and been effected by the use of performance enhancers. Athletes in power sports and even athletes in non-contact sports or positions feel the need for them. Steroid use, therefore, is becoming engrained in sport. Their use extending from more obvious sports and positions who need power and speed, to lesser understood sports such as golf or positions such as punters. As steroids become normalized, how do athletes justify their use?
Smith (1991) argues that competition can be understood as a mutual quest for excellence and that competitors should want to compete when their opponent is at his/her peak. Winning, therefore, would be significant because the opponent was beaten by being outplayed. He develops this, however, and gives insight into one possible explanation of what occurs with the use of illegal supplements in sport. Smith believes that competitors in athletic contests must respond and react to the choices and actions of fellow competitors. For Smith, these actions and decisions consist of how individual athletes decide to develop their skills or make decisions while competing. He states: “The good competitor does not see the opponent merely as an obstacle to be overcome but as a person whose activity calls for an appropriate response” (p. 32). This statement sheds light on how some view the use of illegal supplements in sport. For them, competing with the use of supplements is simply a response to what other athletes are doing.

Ben Johnson’s use of steroids is one illustration of how athletes justify their use of steroids as a dilemma. When the Johnson scandal broke, the Canadian government approved the Commission of Inquiry into the Use of Drugs and Banned Practices Intended to Increase Athletic Performance to investigate Johnson’s actions and their context. Committee members met in Toronto and Montreal and their inquiries were broadcast live on the national all-sports television network (TSN). Viewers saw Canadian elite athletes confess to using steroids and other banned substances along with sports medicine experts, coaches, and Olympic and government officials. The commission’s findings resulted in 122 interrogations and 15,000 pages of evidence (Burstyn, 1999). Most compelling is that all of the procedures and findings revealed the same information. Johnson and his fellow Canadian colleagues, when taking steroids and other banned substances, were all in agreement that they were merely following the norms of elite athletes worldwide. According to Burstyn: “He may have broken the official rules, but he played by the much more powerful unofficial rules when he took steroids. At least during the months of inquiry, the flood
of evidence made it evident that steroid use was institutionalized in every competitive Olympic nation” (p. 222).

Fuller and La Fountain (1999) conducted one study into the rationale and motivation of athletes who admit to steroid use. Fifty athletes who ranged in age from 15 to 40 years and participated in weight lifting, football, wrestling, and bodybuilding revealed how they rationalized participating in deviant behavior such as taking unfair advantage in sport through performance-enhancing drugs, breaking the law, and exposing their bodies to health risks. Their findings corresponded to research by Sykes and Matza (1957) that found juvenile delinquents use certain techniques to rationalize their crimes. These include denial of victim, denial of injury, condemnation of condemners, and appeal to higher loyalties.

Conclusion

Over the years steroids have implanted themselves firmly into the sporting world. The depth that steroid use plunges effects power sports such as weightlifting and football, but also extends to sports and positions that one might not immediately associate with steroid use. Punters on football teams and golfers are facing more and more scrutiny.

The use of steroids presents a large and unique threat to the myth of the moral athlete. This threat is unique because of their widespread use and the amount of media attention the scandal garners. Almost every day there are new allegations and another huge star being taken down either through factual evidence or simply an accusation by the media or other athletes. Fans, therefore, consistently have sport and the myth questioned.

The widespread use and athletes’ ability to find justification raises important questions: Is the only option for fans to accept them? If this is the only option, how can fans accept them? What must fans accept or reconceptualize in order to save the threatened myth? In the next
chapter, I rhetorically analyze two main stream sport magazines to identify how fans accept steroid use.
Establishing the long and deep history steroids hold within sport introduces their current role in sport. Even though there is a long performance enhancing saga in sport that the previous chapter explicates, the media obsession with steroids in sport only entered mainstream awareness in the late 1990s. Up until this time, steroids typically were seen as only used by subcultures and foreign Olympic opponents. Their introduction to mainstream sport, however, questions the foundational underpinnings of the myth of the moral athlete by a wide and diverse audience.

This chapter interrogates steroids in sport through a case study of steroids in Major League Baseball as a way to demonstrate the overall role of steroids in sport through this microcosm. The chapter then explicates the rhetorical analysis of two mainstream sports magazines to determine how fans and the media are rhetorically framing their use. Findings suggest that mainstream media reactions, fan justification, and player rationalization occurs through three major methods: arguing that it does not affect an athlete’s talent level, a reconceptualization of the athlete’s body, and scapegoating players to repudiate guilt. Findings demonstrate that although fans might express outrage or disappointment over steroid use, fans overwhelmingly rationalize and accept their use. This implies that even though the myth is threatened, it is shifting to still allow for fans to worship their athletes.

Analysis stems from using the steroid scandal within Major League Baseball as a case study for several reasons. Although steroids affect various sports on a variety of levels, as illustrated throughout this research, steroids in baseball provides an illustrative example of the attention and disruption they can cause. Steroids in baseball have garnered the most media attention than other sports arguably because it involves America’s favorite pastime – itself filled with mythical notions of nation and sport. The trickle down effect of steroids in baseball has
resulted in considerable attention from governmental interlocutors, grand juries, congressional hearings, and proposed legislation to curb their use. Steroids in baseball, therefore, do not just affect the fan or player, but instead illustrate the impact steroids have in the larger American society and the mythic notion that society holds.

Rhetorical analysis was conducted on articles in Sports Illustrated and ESPN the Magazine between January 1997 and February 2008. These are the top two sports magazines subscribed to in the United States. Sports Illustrated has the 15th largest circulation of all US consumer magazines; they sell over 3 million magazines for each issue. ESPN the Magazine has the 38th largest circulation of all US consumer magazines; they sell over 1.8 million magazines for each issue (“Top 100 Consumer Magazines,” 2005). Magazines play an important role in creating the sport audience, the mythology, and the culture of sport. It has been referred to as “America’s sport bible” and is arguably “the single most important sport communications medium” (Burstyn, 1999, p. 119).

Furthermore, in order to assess any difference between pre-steroid perceptions and post-steroid perceptions of athletes, 1997 – 2003 frames the pre-steroid accusations and 2003 – 2008 frames post-steroid accusations. The 2003 BALCO case stands as the defining moment that introduces the steroids era.

As a caveat to this chapter, it is important to assess the role and validity of magazines in their rhetorical framing of sport. Magazines are one attempt among many, e.g. newspapers, television, radio, blogs, etc., that hold a vested interest in the sports industry. Magazines such as Sports Illustrated and ESPN the Magazine are part of an increasingly marginalized print industry in which the objective often is to frame or spin sports in such a way as to make them culturally significant. There is also the role of revenue to consider when assessing a magazine’s ability to accurately gauge public reactions. A company’s need and desire for profit can compromise
stories and research. It follows, therefore, that magazines may fail to gauge or shape public opinion, and can become extensions of the owners of franchises rather than a reflection of fans. For the purposes of this dissertation, however, these two magazines will be analyzed due to their role as the most prominent repository of print reactions and responses to the steroid scandal. As a starting point to determine how the steroids scandal has been rhetorically framed, these magazines will be used but their questionable role in genuinely reflecting public opinion is acknowledged. Furthermore, the historical analysis of steroids in baseball is not meant to act as a naïve description of how ignorant fans and the media were in their responses to the use of steroids. The use of drugs in sport, and various other transgressions, is not a foreign concept. What this account attempts to interrogate is the disconnect between the myth and popular perception of sport as a moral endeavor with the reality of sport and steroid use in MLB. Finally, the use of the term “fans” in this chapter acknowledges that “fans” are only a portion of the larger culture and are affected by attitudes of non-fans. The use of this term is not meant to portray the overall public reaction, but instead serves as those who are readers of writers for these two magazines.

**MLB’s Steroid Scandal**

Reports of steroid use in Major League Baseball were almost unheard of until the late 1990s and early 2000s. Although stories would periodically surface, baseball remained relatively unscathed by scrutiny. Once the media, ex-players, and fans began to take notice, however, the scandal exploded on a national level. The scandal set off a national dialogue about whom was to blame, what effects steroids actually produced, and how the league should proceed now that it knew. The scandal quickly became defined by three major factors: the history of steroids in the league, the homerun race during the 1990s, and the Bay Area Laboratory Co-Operative (BALCO).
History of Steroids in the League

The first factor that characterizes the steroid scandal involves the history of steroids in MLB. Although many might have been totally unaware of steroids in the league until the mid-2000s, MLB players have a long history of using steroids. One of the first most in-depth articles is the November 21, 2005 edition of ESPN The Magazine devoted its cover story to the history of steroids and MLB (Assael & Keating). Described as a “Special Report,” the main story was entitled “Turning a Blind Eye to Steroids” and explicates how steroids have been a mainstay in the league since the 1970s and how fans, the sports media, and players chose to look the other way. The cover states: “Because the people who depend on baseball for livelihood and amusement wanted so much to believe in the essential goodness of the game and the greatness of the players, we missed or ignored the signs: the larger biceps, the back acne, the outsized statistics.” The article delivers a condemning account of how the league was fully aware of steroids in the league for years. Whereas the public response to steroids in the league was “Who knew?” the article describes that players, general managers, trainers, doctors, the player’s union, and the commissioner of the league knew.

One experience is from Larry Starr who was a trainer with the Cincinnati Reds and worked closely with the legendary Reds’ player Pete Rose. His stories from the league included removing a candy jar filled with uppers from the team’s training room in 1973 and seeing first hand players turn from average athletes to muscular superstars. Although Starr stood firm on his premise of weight lifting and a healthy diet to reach an optimum athletic level, he was fully aware of gyms where lifters used steroids and the increase in the amount of products that offered dramatic weight increases. In the training room with the Reds he once was asked by a player if he should do steroids, and even overheard Rose telling journalists, “Tell them what steroids can do for you” (p. 72). Rose, one of the most loved and hated players in the history of MLB, held a
positive image of what steroids could do for a player and was not timid to encourage their use to others. Rose did not keep his comments to users and potential users, but he promulgated their use to media outlets. Starr’s experiences in the training room and contact with players and other trainers exposed him to the growing use of the drug from the 70’s into the 80’s. A second experience comes from Steve Phillips who is now an analyst for ESPN. His career in sports, however, started with the New York Mets as director of minor league operations. As an executive he had constant contact with players who fed into the major leagues. One compelling example of steroids in the league was in 1987 when he arrived early at a minor league game in Jackson, Miss. Walking into the clubhouse one player greeted him while injecting another teammate in the upper body. As Phillips looked, the players simply smiled and made no effort to conceal what they were doing.

Steroid use was not limited to the 80’s and increased in the 90’s. The FBI began investigating steroid trafficking in the early 1990’s which led to the U.S. Attorney’s office indicting 37 people in 1992. A main witness, Curtis Wenzlaff, was a seller who had a link to a major player inside MLB. Wenzlaff described to investigators how he supplied the Oakland A’s Jose Canseco with steroids and firmly believed that Canseco was dealing to other players in the league. Although the evidence was provided to indict people within the league, the FBI did not pursue it as they were solely going after suppliers. Furthermore, in 1989 body builder Jeff Scott became friends with the Philadelphia Phillies’ All-Star outfielder Lenny Dykstra. Dykstra, frustrated with the a 15 pound weight loss due to diabetes, turned to Scott for steroids that would help him gain the muscle back. By the end of the 1993 season, Dykstra became the first player to ever lead the National League in at-bats, hits, walks, and runs, and finished second to Barry Bonds in the Most Valuable Player voting.
In 2002, the 1996 MLB Most Valuable Player (MVP) Ken Caminiti admitted to Sports Illustrated that his MVP year stemmed from steroid use. In 2003, MLB conducted an anonymous drug-testing program and found that 5% of the players tested positive. In 2004, Jose Canseco, an ex-player with the Oakland A’s released the book Juiced that acknowledges his use of steroids for the majority of his career.

All of these examples illustrate that steroids in Major League Baseball had been in the league since the 1970s. Their use was not always vilified, but often promulgated and normalized in baseball clubhouses. The history of steroids in the league, therefore, acts as one way to frame their reception in 2008. Rhetorically the league argues that they are doing what they can to fix the use of steroids in the league, but as illustrated in the second event that characterizes the steroid scandal, the rhetorical utterances are complicated by events during the Homerun Race of the late 1990s.

**The Homerun Race**

The second factor that characterizes steroids in baseball is the Homerun Race of the late 1990s. Homeruns have always been one of the most exciting elements of baseball, but MLB’s race at this time created a national frenzy that helped the league recover from the controversial strike in 1994. From September 14, 1994 – April 25, 1995, the MLB season was canceled due to owner’s demanding a salary cap for each team which players were adamant against. An entire season was lost and fans were disheartened and angry over the perceived selfishness of players striking about money. Led mainly by the St. Louis Cardinals’ Mark McGwire, Chicago Cubs’ Sammy Sosa, and the San Francisco Giant’s Barry Bonds, the Homerun Race brought fans back to the ballpark and the media embraced the sport again.

The attention given to the race illustrates the ability of baseball to unify fans on the national and local level, as well as a way the league could recover from its bruised image from
the strike. The joy that fans experienced through watching their heroes compete in one of the most beloved aspects of baseball (if not sport) brought a renewed faith in the ideals of sport after a tumultuous strike in the off season. The highest levels of MLB administration, however, knew of steroid use during this time. The evidence comes from a journalist who provided quotes about steroid use from MLB’s commissioner Bud Selig that acknowledged steroid use in the league in the late 1990s.

In 1998, during the height of the homerun race, a feature writer for the Associated Press, Steve Wilstein, began following the race and found himself in front of Mark McGwire’s locker waiting for him to come out of the training room. Wilstein wrote what he saw around him such as a photo of McGwire’s son, sugarless gum, and a brown bottle labeled with the word “androstenedione.” Wilstein’s research revealed that andro was one metabolic step from testosterone and considered a steroid by the National Football League. The NFL, the NCAA, and the Olympics already had banned the substance from their organizations. Wilstein called the Cardinals’ front office to confirm McGwire’s use of the drug. The team’s spokesperson denied use, but McGwire stated that he had taken andro for more than a year and added, “Everybody I know in the game of baseball uses the same stuff I use” (p. 77). Wilstein wrote an article entitled, “Drug OK in Baseball, Not Olympics,” on August 21 and reaction to the article was immediate. Blame turned to Wilstein instead of McGwire as McGwire accused the reporter of snooping and his manager, Tony La Russa, responded: “A player’s locker isn’t something that you should snoop around and see what you can find out. That’s a clear invasion of privacy. And it’s causing some real garbage here” (p. 78).

Bud Selig’s responded to the article about the accusation that McGwire was using steroids the Monday after Wilstein’s article ran. Selig stated: “I think what Mark McGwire has accomplished is so remarkable, and he has handled it all so beautifully, we want to do everything
we can to enjoy a great moment in baseball history” (p. 78). Selig’s response to a rumor that MLB would outlaw andro was, “It’s not only premature, but very unfair. None of this should ever diminish from Mark McGwire’s extraordinary season” (p. 79). Selig’s reaction translates to an acceptance of steroids in the league by MLB. As the acting head and ultimate spokesperson for the league, Selig frames the reception of steroids in the league if it is wrapped in the blanket of a homerun. The act of the homerun, therefore, supersedes steroid use.

**BALCO**

The third factor that characterizes steroids in baseball is the 2003 federal raid of BALCO. The raid spurred a media frenzy around illegal supplements used by high profile players and created a distinct shift in the perception of steroids in the league and how MLB’s administration needed to respond. BALCO, founded by Victor Conte, conducted chemical analysis for athletes and sold legal supplements. In 2003, however, three events put the company in the middle of a steroid scandal: an anonymous tipster turned over a sample of a new steroid THG, a federal investigation led to a raid on BALCO on September 13, and the United States Anti-Doping Agency publicly announced its knowledge of THG to the Justice Department and identified Conte as the source of the drug (“BALCO Investigation”).

Three sources link player involvement with BALCO: a *Sport Illustrated* interview with the New York Yankee’s outfielder Gary Sheffield; alleged grand jury testimony published in the *San Francisco Chronicle* which included admissions from Giant’s player Barry Bonds and Yankee’s player Jason Giambi; and a government memorandum obtained by the *San Jose Mercury News* (“BALCO investigation”).

The raid of BALCO and the subsequent evidence found from the investigation opened up accusations against numerous sports stars. For baseball, the events surrounding BALCO acted as a springboard for the media and the US Government to launch criminal charges against players.
Since 2003, the BALCO case has led to jail time for Conte and his associates, Grand Jury testimony, and Barry Bonds being charged with perjury in his testimony about his association with BALCO.

The ramifications of this one investigation ripped the sports world apart; its effects felt by all sports with increased media attention and increased drug-testing procedures. Subsequent polls showed Americans wanted steroids out of sport: A December 2004 USA Today/CNN/Gallup poll found 86% wanted MLB and the player’s union to develop a tougher drug testing policy (as cited in Brady et. al., 2005b). In 2004, however, the government took a clear stand on the issue when President Bush included steroids in his January 20 State of the Union Address. Bush highlighted the moral aspect of steroid use, the obligation athletes hold towards children and fans, and the ramifications steroid use present. He stated:

To help children make right choices, they need good examples. Athletics play such an important role in our society, but, unfortunately, some in professional sports are not setting much of an example. The use of performance-enhancing drugs like steroids in baseball, football, and other sports is dangerous, and it sends the wrong message – that there are shortcuts to accomplishment, and that performance is more important than character. So tonight I call on team owners, union representatives, coaches, and players to take the lead, to send the right signal, to get tough, and to get rid of steroids now. (para. 58)

Bush’s inclusion of steroids in his address can be attributed to being a former owner of the Texas Rangers or a ploy to gain votes among women and those concerned with children and drug use (Fainaru & Allen, 2004), but Bush’s call to action to eradicate steroids from sport echoed an overall message vocalized from prosecutors, fans and the government.

The resulting uproar from news outlets and fans climaxed in hearings before the
Committee on Government Reform in Washington DC. The hearings addressed the role of steroids in young female athletes, the National Football League, the National Basketball League, and Major League Baseball – the latter garnering the most media attention. For this hearing, the Committee met on March 17, 2005. Entitled “Restoring Faith in America’s Pastime: Evaluating Major League Baseball’s Efforts to Eradicate Steroid Use,” six current and former MLB stars appeared before Congress to address the issue and better understand the depth of the problem in the league. The main issue at hand was not only the illegality of drug use, but the moral message that was sent to the fans of baseball – especially children. Additional testimony offered that day by the Garibaldi and Hooton families centered on how amateur athletes used steroids as a way to emulate what they saw professional athletes accomplish through drug use. Both the Garibaldi and Hooton families lost sons to suicide; both families attributed the deaths to their use of steroids. Their testimony emphasized the role of athletes as role models and the ramifications of their actions on others.

In June 2005, Congress held hearings to discuss political options for monitoring and cleaning up the professional leagues from drugs. Representative Tom Davis (R-VA) compared steroids in sport to a “national public health crisis” and stated that it would be irresponsible if the government did not join the national discussion. Representatives introduced three bills to congress; two bills to take testing away from the four major pro sports leagues and turn it over to an independent agency, and one bill to require leagues to consult with an independent agency on testing procedures. Senator Jim Bunning (R-KY), an ex-professional MLB player, argued Congress needs to take an even firmer role in ridding the leagues of steroids. He is working on resolutions that would urge professional leagues to invalidate records if players were proven to have used steroids (Brady et. al., 2005a). The issue of steroids in sport, therefore, is not relegated to the sports field and locker room. The ramifications for their use reverberate beyond
to become major governmental issues that take up time in the State of the Union Address and even result in government legislation.

An additional significant step in the development of steroids in sport involved the Mitchell Report which revealed the findings of a 19 month long investigation into the use of performance-enhancing drugs in Major League Baseball. George Mitchell, former majority leader of the US senate, holds the chief investigator position for the report (Grossfeld, 2007). The 311-page report was released on December 13, 2007 and offered an explanation of how steroids entered the league through distributors and manufacturers. The report identified players who used steroids and concluded that each of the thirty clubs in MLB has had players who used or were involved with performance enhancing substances at some point in their career (Mitchell, 2007). The report was received with mixed reactions – curiosity about whom would be included in the report and skepticism about Mitchell’s ability to be an impartial investigator with no subpoena power. Regardless, the report resulted in considerable media attention and prompted yet another congressional hearing.

The biggest reaction resulting from the Mitchell report involved former major league strength and conditioning coach Brian McNamee and 24 year league veteran Roger Clemens. Clemens propelled himself to heroic status through his accomplishments on the field which included seven Cy Young Awards. On February 13, 2007, Congress held a special hearing to question the two men. McNamee claimed that he injected Clemens with steroids and HGH on multiple occasions, but Clemens vehemently denied the charges. The Congressional Hearing produced clearly conflicting stories, as well it served as an additional factor that produced messages that fans had to navigate. The hearings were filled with rhetoric adulating Clemens as a hero – even though he was exhaustively accused of being a liar and a cheat.
Although the steroid scandal exploded in 2003, it remains a front line story for numerous media outlets. The seemingly unending revelation of new reports of players involved, how many players were using, and the level of stardom that users held within the league, prompted a variety of reactions from newscasters, fans, players, and league administrators. The myriad of responses reveals that reactions are disparate and complex, but rhetorical analysis suggests that there are common trends among how people react to their use in the league.

**Rhetorical Analysis of Steroid Use in MLB**

Between January 1997 and February 2008, *Sports Illustrated* ran 248 articles on steroids; 150 of those articles focused on steroids in baseball. *ESPN the Magazine*, launched in 1998, has also run hundreds of articles on steroids and baseball – devoting several of their cover stories to the issue. Within the articles, several themes present themselves that depict how fans, players, and the sports media react to steroid use. For some, responses are as simple as being adamantly against them or simply accepting their use with little rebuke.

The reaction of some is to simply rebuke steroid use and to portray it as a purely negative inclusion to sport. Sportswriter Mark Mravic (2000) wrote in his article, “Ban It, Bud,” that andro needs to be banned in the league. He states: “Inaction gives tacit approval to the ingesting by thousands of teens of a product that works like an anabolic steroid, with unknown long-term side effects. If for no other reason than that, baseball must outlaw andro” (p. 2). This sentiment is echoed by Atlanta Brave’s pitcher John Smoltz who was quoted in 2004 and voiced his opposition to steroids: “It’s a matter of right and wrong. And [steroids] are wrong” (quoted in Verducci, 2004, p. 2). These examples illustrate the reasoning for being against steroids: they are bad for teens, bad for one’s health, and/or simply wrong. This negative reception, however, is opposed by some who simply accept their use.
In both ESPN the Magazine and Sports Illustrated readers wrote in with various responses and Baxter Cepeda of Punalu’u, Hawaii offers an illustrative reply: “But fans will always watch because the games are still fair, as every team has to have its juiced players. Only disparities in payroll unbalance the competition.” (as cited in “Growth,” 2007, p. 18) In the same article, Cliff Bell of Douglassville, PA responded:

Competition in sports at an elite level is intense. When you’ve worked long and hard to be the best but you’re just a shade too slow or a pound too light, taking that next step for a shot at glory can seem like a good idea. Add in multimillion dollar deals, and you have a perfect storm that makes steroids a fact of life that I don’t see going away anytime soon. These people are only human. (“Growth,” 2007, p. 18)

According to these responses, therefore, steroids are not a factor for some people not to watch and the reality of sport correlates to the reality of steroids. In a “Letter to the Editor,” Bobby Mueller of Bothell, WA acknowledges the futileness of attempting to view steroids as an anomaly or something that states:

If we put an asterisk on today’s power numbers, then let’s put an asterisk on all pitching statistics for pitchers who threw spitballs before they were made illegal in 1920. In fact, take it a step further and put an asterisk next to all pitching stats before the mound was lowered in 1969. We could end up with a record book full of asterisks; stats achieved pre-1947 (when baseball was all white); stats achieved when baseball was made up of 16 teams, 20 teams, 24 teams, etc.; stats achieved after the DH was introduced; all hitting numbers achieved at Coors Field; and all pitching stats for Dodger Stadium. (2004, p.2)

Not only fans seem to simply accept their use, but players do as well. In 2005, Adam Dunn, a leftfielder for the Cincinnati Reds, responded in a Sports Illustrated article addressing suspicions that baseball players on are steroids: “That doesn’t bother me[...] I hope baseball
doesn’t get to the point where everyone’s saying, ‘He takes it! He takes it! He takes it!’ because not all of us do” (as quoted in Kennedy et. al, 2005, p. 2). Dunn’s response, therefore, suggests that for some players their use is not that troublesome and the simple reality is that there are both users and non-users.

Within the dichotomy between simple revulsion and acceptance, however, lie intermediate layers of justifications. Rhetorical analysis over a nine-year period of Sports Illustrated and ESPN the Magazine articles between 1997 and 2008 suggests three major ways fans react to steroid use: steroids do not affect an athlete’s natural talent level, athlete’s have the right to do whatever they want to their bodies, and the scapegoating of certain players to repudiate guilt.

**Steroids Do Not Affect an Athlete’s Talent Level**

One way fans justify the use of steroids is by arguing that steroids do not affect an athlete’s talent level. This reasoning implies that although athletes might get bigger muscles, they still have to hit the ball or make judgment calls during the game. Athletes still have to have proper technique and agility that steroids cannot provide. This justification has a long history of being used. For example, former East German sports physician, Dr. Alois Marder, used this reasoning to justify their use. He argued that drug use by athletes provides only a small advantage to athletes and stated: “Seventy to 80 percent is talent. Twenty of 25 percent is training, and maybe 5 percent is attributable to other influences, including drugs. True, if you can improve by one or two percent, you can go from sixth to first place” (Goldman & Klatz, 1992, p. 2). Marder suggests that using supplements do aid a small amount, but drug use should not be understood as the main reason for success. The majority of an athlete’s success comes from their natural talent, while the drug use simply pushes them over the edge.
In MLB, responses in the magazines illustrate the same reasoning that no matter how many steroids a player takes, he still has to be able to hit the ball. Because hitting the ball is dependent on hand-eye coordination, fans overlook the use of steroids as having any “true” effect on the quality or state of the game. For Father Jim MacDonald, a 65-year-old San Francisco Giants season ticket holder, writer Gary Smith (2005) asked how he responded as a fan to steroids in baseball. He states: “I don’t know the medical effects of steroids. They do not increase bat speed from what I know[…] Anybody who hits 756 home runs, baseball should celebrate” (p. 4). In one Letter to the Editor, Bill Kte’pi of Bloomington, IN states: “Steroids[…] have nothing to do with Derek Jeter’s diving into the stands and make a catch. Steroids didn’t suture Curt Schilling’s ankle so he could pitch.” (2005, p. 2). For Dr. Greg Scott, a cardiac surgeon, he responds to Barry Bonds hitting the record breaking home run in the following manner: “I’ll be up cheering[…] Because I still say hitting a 90-plus-mile-an-hour fastball 340-plus feet 756 times is a great feat” (As quoted in Smith, 2005, p. 12).

Former and current players also use this type of justification. Florida Marlins reliever Matt Perisho illustrates the nature of steroids as a form of cheating, but acknowledges his ability to overlook their use through the lens of “greatness”. He states: “As far as I’m concerned [Bonds and Giambi] cheated. Anything they’ve done in their big league career is tainted…but Bonds is still the best player in baseball” (as quoted in Dohrmann, 2004, p. 3). Suggesting his acceptance of Barry Bonds using steroids, Giants president and managing general partner Peter Magowan states: “I’ll say this about Barry Bonds that not enough people realize: He’s a winning ballplayer. He makes everyone around him better” (as quoted in Verducci, 2006, May, para. 9).

Ken Caminiti, a former player with a long history of steroid use who eventually died of a drug-induced heart attack states: “Clearly, the players who choose to use steroids do so because they believe the drugs work. ‘It’s still a hand eye-coordination game, but the difference [with
steroids is the ball is going to go a little farther,’ Caminiti says. ‘Some of the balls that would
go to the warning track will go out. That’s the difference.’” (Verducci, et al., 2002, p. 4).

According to former MLB all-star and Hall of Famer Tony Gwynn: “[…]ou hear innuendo.
You would hear the rumors about guys, but…when he gets in the batter’s box, whether he is or
he isn’t, he’s still gotta hit it” (quoted in Verducci, 2007, p. 7). Furthermore, an anonymous All-
Star in 2002 stated that: “I just don’t think [steroids] are a distinct advantage” (as quoted in
Verducci, 2002a, p. 1).

Not just fans and players assert this type of justification, but administrators in the league
do as well. For example, Gene Orza, the Player’s Union Associate General Council, supports the
notion that steroids do not alter one’s talent level. He states: “If the association decides that
steroids alter the playing field, […] or that there’s a health and safety hazard – then we reserve
the right to vote for testing. But there’s been no hard evidence of that” (as quoted in Reilly,
2000, p. 2). The Player’s Union has a consistent message that the health risks associated with the
use of steroids is overemphasized and exaggerated in the popular media (Verducci, 2002, p. 2).

The contribution to one’s talent and how that makes for a more exciting game is also the
justification for some writers. For example, Habib, Bechtel, & Stephen (2005) write: “Despite
Bonds’s copernican view of self, his occasional boorishness and his proximity to the BALCO
mess, he remains undeniably compelling. Without him standing out there on a cold night in
September, a game isn’t half as exciting” (p. 2). This illustrates how the sports media is able to
push aside the steroid scandal in order to enjoy the game and the home run hero.

Acknowledging the implications of steroid accusations, for some writers it all comes down to the
ability and talent to swing the bat:

Bonds, with one home run in his previous 66 plate appearances, could no longer keep
people in their seats or in front of the TV or tuned in to a broadcast the way he used to,
but he proved with one more flash of that familiar swing that he still has a sense of
timing. (Verducci, 2006, June, para. 2)

According to writer Rick Reilly (1999):

I don’t think a single dinger McGwire hit last year can be directly traced to andro, the
testosterone-producing supplement that he takes before workouts and is banned by the
IOC, the NFL, and the NCAA. It think it was a raptor’s eye, a killer’s swing and al XXL
heart, not andro, that produced all those homers. (p. 1)

These reactions illustrate one way fans, players, and the sports media accept or justify the
use of steroids by arguing that the players still have to have natural talent and agility that no
amount of steroid use could ever provide. This reasoning is buttressed by another type of
justification: athlete’s ultimately have control over their bodies and what they decide to do them
is their right.

Athletes Have Control Over Their Bodies

Acceptance of what steroids do to the body stands as a second way fans reconcile their
use in sport. Fans often overlook the use of steroids by acknowledging that athletes have
ultimate control over their bodies. If athletic bodies can win, provide entertainment, and feed
into the overall culture of winning, steroid use becomes a secondary issue.

Academic research explicates the changing notion of how people perceive bodies within
a mediated context. For example, Kuppers (2004) discusses the body in terms of recognizability
and identification, pleasure, knowledge, and education. Although his research is not specifically
about sport, his findings can be used to understand how images recreate images/understandings
of the body when people watch sporting events on television. Kuppers focuses on the inside of
the body as represented through medical machines such as X-rays, microscopic views, patients’
charts, and ultrasound scanners how these images are illustrate the popular cultural
representations of the body in shows such as ER and CSI: Crime Scene Investigation. These popular cultural representations create and maintain narratives about ideas of selves, bodies, death, and life. Exposure to medical images serve to make our senses unreliable in relation to our bodies and changes the way we know “the body.” The unreliability of the body, the loss of control, the number of people exposed to changes of the body results in a reconceptualization of what the body means. Kuppers’s research suggests that images do indeed effect how we see the body and the duality the body serves as corpse and representation. Images of athlete’s on television and in advertisements illustrate this duality on a public level virtually unattainable in other realms.

24-year-old chef Ernie Eldridge illustrates the ability to reconceptualize the athlete’s body in terms of a “sacred vessel” in his response to a question regarding Barry Bonds and his homerun record in the following manner: “Hey, it’s his body. And he still hit homers” (Smith, 2005). Eldridge’s comment portrays a way to separate oneself from the negative perception of steroids and reconcile their use with an acceptance of what it does to the body. In an interview with a baseball fan from Montgomery, NJ, Dr. Greg Scott recalls a story of how some are willing to overlook the negative health consequences:

The integrity of the game, the old records – that’s a non sequitur to these kids. So I tell my son, ‘Your balls will shrink, you’ll get acne. Don’t do it, because we don’t know what it’ll do to you.’ And I bought the Canseco book to show them. All they said when they looked at it was, ‘Wow, look at the change in Canseco’s size! (Smith, 2005, p. 12)

Baseball fan Todd McFarlane echoes the ability to ignore what happens to one’s body for the sake of sport. McFarlane bought Mark McGwire’s 70th homerun baseball during the Home Run race. He states:
I was a little skinny guy playing centerfield at Eastern Washington University, and if someone had said, ‘Pop this and we’ll get you a major league contract,’ I’d have said, ‘Gimme two’ and not asked questions till I was bleeding from the rectum. (As quoted in Smith, 2005, p. 6)

People argue that it doesn’t matter if one’s body falls apart. This reaction seems to mirror the current era of America that is characterized by a general rejection of our normal bodies. Television illustrates this trend through the numerous reality makeover shows that use incredible weight loss, plastic surgery, and body building techniques to completely transform people’s bodies. An additional perspective within the body justification is that the consequences from their use will be the “ultimate payback.” According to Birmingham orthopedist James Andrews:

I see so many body changes – one season they’re average, the next season they’re massive – that [steroid use] is obvious […] More athletes are carrying more muscle than their frames can support, and therefore the trauma is greater. You wouldn’t believe that Achilles tendon ruptures, the quadriceps ruptures, the hamstring tears, the massive rotator cuff tears, the tearing of the biceps muscles at the elbow joints. There’s just too much mass for the body to handle. (as quoted in Verducci, 2002b, p. 2)

The justification for steroid use in this case, therefore, is that it does not matter what athletes decide to do to their bodies. The resulting body changes are either welcomed in the name of winning or that athletes will get their payback when their bodies fall apart. Either way, steroid use is ultimately accepted. This second type of justification is buttressed by a third reasoning: scapegoating.
Scapegoating

A third way fans, players, and the media react to the steroid controversy is through scapegoating. The notion of ridding oneself of a community’s guilt through the projection of that guilt on one or several individuals is echoed in magazine rhetoric. For example:

But something different was afoot in 2007, the year of such grim comeuppances. Whereas cheating has always been recognized as part of the athlete's repertoire—to be broken out in the case of last resort (or moral collapse)—it no longer seems so human, not with all this pharmacological exaggeration. Roger Clemens stands accused of doping in his baseball dotage, but it does not feel like some offhand folly, does it? As he, and other players accused of taking performance-enhancing drugs, have become less real, less authentic, we now have a distance we can't bridge. We might be a little like Ruiz, but given our own pedestrian blood chemistry, we are no longer anything like Clemens. Bonds does not invite scorn, or asterisks, only for his supposed willingness to cheat but also because he's passed beyond our realm of humanity. He's not one of us, or, worse yet, his historical cohorts. Hank Aaron did not stick needles in his butt. (Hoffer, 2007, p. 2)

The best players in the league, such as Bonds and Clemens, serve as individuals through which to cast the baseball community’s guilt. Fans still want to go to the ballpark and enjoy the game, but it becomes difficult to do so if the entire sport is deemed guilty and tainted. Fans can draw a distinction between themselves and those accused of using steroids – in other words, “they” are no longer like “us.”

The notion of scapegoating is backed through academic research primarily through Burke (1965) and Girard (1986). They argue that society is not a total bystander and they react through scapegoating to purge themselves from the guilt and as a response to threatened myths. Specifically, Burke sees guilt, purification, and redemption as representative of the effects of
acceptance and rejection of a hierarchy. All social institutions, whether they are family, church, school, clubs, relationships, political systems, or professional sports leagues, have their own hierarchy. Burke tends to view hierarchies as perpetually engaged in dramas and dramatic action occurs because people object to the functions and relationships that hierarchies impose. When the rejection of the hierarchy occurs, the person feels as if they have failed and start to feel guilt. Burke compares this rejection of the hierarchy to original sin and believed guilt is inherent in society because people cannot accept all the traditional hierarchy placed on them. When conditions change, rejection of some of the traditions occurs. When the demands imposed on one hierarchy conflict with those of another, rejection is inevitable.

In order to deal with rejection, society uses two forms of purification: mortification and/or victimage as an attempt to get rid of the guilt. Mortification involves a personal sacrifice by the guilty. The individual or group experiencing guilt makes a symbolic offering to appease society and therefore restore balance and social order. The accused person acknowledges the wrongdoing publicly and may offer an explanation or remorse. There are endless examples of this in the sport realm. For example, in 2003, Sammy Sosa’s corked bat exposed after the bat cracked in a game prompted an explanation to the media immediately after the game (he stated that he had made a mistake and picked up one of the bats he uses in batting practice instead of a game regulation bat). Former Indiana University basketball coach Bobby Knight delivered his apologia to a field full of Indiana basketball supporters after grabbing a student by the arm. His violation of a zero-tolerance policy forced his resignation, thereby prompting the subsequent explanation to his supporters.

The second type of purification involves victimage, which is the purging of guilt through a scapegoat that symbolizes the guilt (Scott & Brock, 1972). Often the scapegoat is an outsider. In scapegoating, Girard (1986) argues that the process allows participants to remove themselves
from the situation and become an observer rather than a participator. This distancing and separation allows for the clear line to be established between the guilty and the innocent. Girard connects the relationship between society, culture, moral reasoning, and blame. He states:

Men feel powerless when confronted with the eclipse of culture; they are disconcerted by the immensity of the disaster but never look into the natural causes; the concept that they might affect those causes by learning more about them remains embryonic. Since cultural eclipse is above all a social crisis, there is a strong tendency to explain it by social, and especially, moral causes. After all, human relations disintegrate in the process and the subjects of those relations cannot be utterly innocent of this phenomenon. But, rather than blame themselves, people inevitably blame either society as a whole, which costs them nothing, or other people who seem particularly harmful for easily identifiable reasons. The suspects are accused of a particular category of crimes. (p. 14)

Girard argues that when a myth loses its aura, it is recast and descends “several steps on the social ladder.”

The act of purification must be appropriate to the sin of the guilty for the drama to succeed as an act of redemption. The extent of self-sacrificing must equal the degree of guilt caused by the rejection of the social order, otherwise redemption is not achieved (Scott & Brock, 1972). The removal from office or loss of position may be insufficient or excessive due to the level of disruption suffered by the social order. Once the rite of purification commensurates with the guilt, the individual feels redeemed or made acceptable again. Burke (1965) views this guilt, purification, and redemption as a process, therefore, after the individual is redeemed, he functions in the hierarchy until the level of guilt becomes overbearing again and the process repeats itself.
The notion of scapegoating is evident in rhetorical messages about steroids in baseball. This is most evident with the highest profile player in the league who is accused of using steroids: Barry Bonds. Bonds illustrates the notion of scapegoating as he acts as a token player. Rhetorical analysis reveals that in this case scapegoating is done by reappropriating Bonds as a sports figure and results in racial ramifications.

Classic ideological research looks at discourse as a vehicle for promulgating the power of the dominant or ruling class. According to Therborn (1980), the social structures of speech place restrictions on who may speak, on what topic, on what occasion, and how much may be said. This does not necessarily mean censorship of opposing ideas; however, socially approved boundaries are created that the people of the community uphold. Ideologies work together with hegemonic structures to create stable social orders. Cloud (1996) argues that hegemony generates “consent to [the social order’s] parameters through the production and distribution of ideological texts that define social reality for the majority of the people” (p. 117).

Cloud (1996) looks at the way popular culture appropriates and uses images and stories of black Americans to form a rhetoric of tokenism. A token figure is the cultural construction of a successful person who represents a larger cultural group. Tokens act as a medium of exchange that can be traded for economic and cultural gains within popular culture spaces. As the homerun race ignited in the 1990’s, it was led by the white American Mark McGuire, the African-American Barry Bonds, and the Dominican Sammy Sosa. Bonds, therefore, became the token black man representing African Americans.

Acting as a token figure, therefore, the rhetoric surrounding Bonds often took a racial undertone in the magazine depictions of him. These depictions resulted in Bonds being portrayed through the brute stereotype. Lombardo (1978) identified the “sambo” and the brute as two dominant stereotypes that are associated with African American athletes. These
stereotypes originate from historical roots in American slavery and serve to relegate African Americans to an inferior status. The “sambo” stereotype is depicted as an African American who is benign, childish, immature, exuberant, uninhibited, lazy, comical, impulsive, fun-loving, good-humored, inferior, and lovable. Modern criticism identifies the Harlem Globetrotters as one group who upholds the “sambo” stereotype. Conversely, the brute stereotype depicts the African American athlete as primitive, temperamental, over-reactive, uncontrollable, violent, and sexually powerful. This stereotype separates the African American male from intellectualism and mental control and instead works to subordinate the African American. Whites, therefore, maintain their superior status while African American males are denigrated (Sailes, 2005).

Bonds’s depiction in the media upholds the brute stereotype. Bonds is now seen as a violent, over-reactive, and uncontrollable man and is even referred to at times in relation to wild animals.

Pre-Steroid Portrayal

Between April 1997 and September 2003, Sports Illustrated wrote 53 articles that mentioned or featured Barry Bonds. While the homerun race gained the attention of the sports world in 1998, Bonds was understood as an overlooked player. Sports Illustrated’s September 14, 1998 article entitled “The Best of the Rest,” picked Barry Bonds’s 400 homeruns and 400 stolen bases as one of the top 10 overlooked stories of the year (McCallum & O’Brien). Bonds was regarded as a hero and a respected person. For example in 1999, the Sporting News magazine named Bonds the Player of the Decade. In the July 12 edition, the magazine reported that he was the complete player who “was worth every penny” (Ladson, p. 14).

Five years later, sentiment among journalists was that Bonds was an exceptional player who deserved media attention and should be understood positively. This is illustrated at the height of Bonds’s success and popularity when journalists wrote articles praising Bonds as a
player that needed to be thanked and appreciated as a force within the league. Rick Reilly wrote in his September 15, 2003 article entitled, “Say Hey Again,” the following about Bonds:

Maybe later I'll deny I ever said this, but it's time to thank Barry Bonds. Thank him for being 11 feet tall and achingly human at the same time. Thank him for pulling off feats that make not only our pulse race but his—to the point that he had to be hospitalized. How does a man keep breaking windows and fences and records while his own heart is breaking? (p. 100)

Reilly’s article portrays Bonds as God-like but still as average and human as every fan. Bonds is “like us” because he is experiencing the hurt that accompanies having an injury, as well as having a loved one in the hospital. At the same time, however, Bonds is still beyond what “we” will ever be because of his ability as a player. He is untouchable but touchable at the same time.

This same sentiment and depiction of Bonds is illustrated further in a September 2, 2003 *Sports Illustrated* article by Tom Verducci entitled “More Valuable Than Ever,” which portrays Bonds as a compassionate son who spent 5 days away from his team to spend time with his father who was dying of cancer. In Bonds’s absence the Giants were winless and Bonds called a team meeting to explain how he wanted to help the team to win even while dealing with his sadness. Verducci depicted Bonds in the following manner:

Even for a player who has made extraordinary feats routine, Bonds's week was an epic one—containing both heartbreaking poignance and the definitive testament to his greatness as a hitter. Ever patient for the rare pitch to hit, Bonds kept his focus despite his anguish. And when he connected, the Giants, who at week's end held a 10 1/2-game lead in the National League West, were whole once again. (p. 59).

This depiction presents Bonds as patient, talented, focused player who serves as the central link to the unity of the team.
Articles such as these depict Bonds in a positive and appreciated manner. Bonds is seen as a token player who deserves respect through his actions on and off the field. He cares about his team and wants to make sure they succeed as a unit, but he is also an extremely gifted individual player who is patient for the right moment to show his true athletic talent. Furthermore, he is a family man who would never let his success as a player get in the way of his devotion to his father. Bonds has his priorities in order by leaving the team to be with his family, but he would never let his team or the fans down by not giving his everything when he returned. This positive and welcoming depiction, however, changed within an extremely short amount of time as news of the steroid scandal began to leak.

Post-Steroid Accusation

Between October 2003 and April 2006, 109 *Sports Illustrated* articles have been written on Bonds. Therefore in half the amount of time, approximately twice the amount of articles have been written or mention Bonds. Although Reilly’s September 15, 2003 article had only been written six weeks earlier, the next article the magazine ran began to show the potential impact the steroids scandal could have on the perception of Barry Bonds. The October 27, 2003 article entitled, “A Spreading Scandal” (Layden et. al) was the first article printed after Reilly had glorified Bonds as a player. In this article, however, the authors question how the use of steroids within sports will affect Bonds’s career and perception. Throughout 2003 and 2004, titles of articles in the magazine such as Phil Taylor’s (2004) “No Taboo to Boo” suggested that a reappropriation of Bonds as a player was occurring.

Particularly revealing is Rick Reilly’s September 20, 2004 article “The Goods on Barry,” which describes Bonds in the following manner: “Bonds is a suspected steroid cheat, has the personality of an unfed water buffalo and treats his teammates like Jehovah's Witnesses at the door. He is three of my least favorite people” (p. 96). Bonds is effectively being taken from
being understood as a token player to being understood as a savage, uncontrollable wild animal who is consumed with primitive thoughts and desires.

Even more compelling is the Atlanta Journal Constitution’s columnist Terrence Moore who stated in Gary Smith’s March 28, 2005 Sports Illustrated article, “What Do We do Now?” that Bonds should be treated in the following manner:

My grandmother's leather strap; he might get that first. Then my grandfather would come in from the farm and thump him with one big finger--I mean, thump him so hard, he'd fly across the room. Then my mom would get her switch from the willow tree. Then Dad would come home from work with his belt. If Barry Bonds sat at our dinner table on a Sunday afternoon, oh ... my ... goodness. (para. 19)

Bonds, again, is depicted as a violent, uncontrollable individual who needs to be controlled and disciplined. Furthermore, the quote’s use of words such as “leather strap,” “farm,” “switch,” and “willow tree,” scream with the visualization of a plantation owner who needs to punish and correct his slave. Through this quote the media becomes the master while Bonds is relegated to the slave.

In the book, Game of Shadows, by Mark Fainaru-Wada and Lance Williams (2006), Bonds again is illustrated through the brute stereotype. For example, descriptions include the following: “Bonds became more quick-tempered. When his anger at [his girlfriend] flared now, he would grab her, stand close to her and whisper intimidating hurtful things…If he couldn’t find her, he would become enraged, and he told her he would kill her if he found she was seeing someone else” (p. 45). Emotional outbursts such as this, combined with the physical gain of 50 pounds of muscle since his rookie year in 1986 and accusations that Bonds’s head seemed to be getting larger and the plates of his skull bones stood out, worked together to portray Bonds through the brute stereotype.
In order to deal with the steroid scandal and its effect on the myth of baseball, Barry Bonds serves as a scapegoat to purge society’s guilt. Bonds has undergone a transformation from the accepted and respected player from the homerun race of the 1990s to a hated player who serves as the scapegoat for the entire steroid scandal. He stands as the most prominent player in the league who arguably receives the most media attention in relation to steroids. This example, therefore, serves as an illustrative way that fans, players, and the sports media has reacted to the use of steroids in MLB.

Conclusion

Steroids threaten the myth of athletes as moral and worthy of hero worship. Athletes are perceived as cheaters since steroids present users with an unfair advantage. Athletes can recover quicker and develop muscles and power much larger than naturally possible. Any achievement that athletes receive while using them is illegitimate. This is illustrated by the polls that show people want tougher drug testing procedures or think an asterisk should be put beside the records that suspected steroid users obtain. On the flip side of this, however, are the athletes who have no regard for the myth or desire to be perceived as ethical, fans who do not care if athletes use steroids, and the media and advertisers who continue to provide coverage and money to athletes who succeed and win.

Whether it is a fan that will never go to a ballpark again because the use of steroids taints the game, or it is someone who does not care, every fan is forced to deal with steroids on some level. The depth or the amount of time spent contemplating this differs from age groups, with seemingly different conclusions, but the power of the myth and the clear threat that steroids presents forces a reconceptualization on some level.

Steroids within MLB stands as a case study due to the widespread media coverage that their role has procured, as well as the mythic underpinnings that baseball holds. Baseball as
America’s National Pastime projects a strong response to steroids in the league as it clearly refutes mythical notions of home run kings and the narrative of a hero venturing out to return home. Steroids frame the kings and the heroes as cheaters.

Rhetorical research, however, illustrates that there are three ways fans justify and accept steroid use in the league: steroids do not affect an athlete’s natural talent level, athlete’s have the right to do whatever they want to their bodies, and the scapegoating of certain players to repudiate guilt. This suggests that fans can still keep their notion of the athlete as hero and that the myth of the hero morphs in order to keep the myth alive. If fans accept their use, and the above illustrations portray, then what does this mean for the overall notions of how myths function? The next chapter addresses possible implications that the acceptance of steroids in sport holds for methods of mythical analysis.
CHAPTER EIGHT: HOW ACCEPTANCE OF THE THREATENED MYTH OFFERS A NEW METHOD OF MYTHICAL ANALYSIS

Sport’s existence for thousands of years and continual ability to redeem itself from scandal illustrates the fans capacity to forgive. Even as the steroid scandal simmered in sport and MLB, a strong sense to discard the problem and latch onto a “pure” version of sport remained. The redemption of the myth and the desire for fans to fall back onto the myth of sport is illustrated in the following quote:

Baseball is too big […] to think it will not have big problems. Just when you get comfortable there is, maybe, gene manipulation, designer steroids or a labor impasse to smack you upside the head. Not this season, though. Not when a new generation of stars takes the stage in a new age – an era to be named later. All those tickets sold, cash down on the anticipation of action, say we are, all of us, ready to move on. Ready to love again. (Verducci, 2006, April, para. 24)

Even though fans acknowledge that sport will always have its share of scandals, the unwavering myth of sport remains. Fans repeatedly ignore the problems and grasp onto the mythical notion of sport full of heroes, purity, and hope.

The rationalization of steroids in sport, as illustrated through the case study of MLB in the previous chapter, offers a new understanding of what happens to a threatened myth. The previous chapter illustrated three ways that steroids are accepted in sport. In this chapter I focus on one of those justifications – the argument that athlete’s ultimately have control and agency over their own bodies. In this justification it does not matter if athletes use steroids or if athletes’ bodies fall apart. I argue that this justification sheds a unique perspective on how myths function as the threatened myth of sport ultimately offers a new method of analyzing how myths work on a broad level.
The use of illegal supplements and the destruction to one’s body, therefore, is the central link to this analysis. Traditional models portray the development of myth through linear projections (e.g., Campbell, 2004; Doty, 2000; Parker, 1988), and as a result, are remarkably lacking in their discussion of what happens when myths are threatened. Viewing myth development in stages does not adequately assess or explain what occurs when myths are threatened. Linear phases of myth need to be adjusted to make space for a cyclical method. Although previous models of history offer this model, such as Vico’s notion of the rise and fall of nations, myth studies have not delved deeply enough into how cyclical methods can illuminate how myths develop.

Using Doty’s (2000) terms for the stages of myth -- Primary, Implicit and Rational – I argue that the use of illegal supplements moves the myth of sport as moralistic from a Rational stage back to a Primary stage. In ancient sport, willingly killing oneself for the sake of sport was accepted through sacrifices. Broadly looking at myth, sport at this time was in the Primary stage of development. Societal development led to different views of sport’s impact on the body, as harming bodies moved from the accepted destruction of oneself to a focus on the destruction of others. In this middle stage of sport, sport no longer had death as a part of its mythical state. Broadly looking at myth, sport at this time was in the Implicit stage. In modern sport, the Rational stage of myth, the use of illegal supplements forces people to reanalyze the role of athlete’s bodies. Illegal supplements, specifically steroids, destroy bodies and the willingness to use them illustrates athlete’s return to a Primary stage of myth in order to accept the use of steroids in sport and the destruction of one’s body. Sport allowed for athletes to willingly kill themselves in the Primary stage of sport myth, and the use of steroids may indicate a return to that stage. Evidence of growing acceptance of steroids should therefore be accompanied by a mythic shift.
In this chapter, I will outline the historical development and relationship of sport and death in order to argue that there is a pattern within the rhetorical portrayal of death and destruction of the body in sport. More specifically, I argue that by looking at ancient, middle, and modern stages of sport, a long-term pattern emerges. This research illustrates how athletes and fans rely on what Doty (2000) would refer to as the “Primary” understanding of killing one’s own body willingly in order to continue with the myth. The chapter begins with an outline of perspectives on how myths develop, explicates the nature of evolutionary models in other disciplines, looks at the historical role of the body in relation to sport and steroids, and ends by proposing how the acceptance of steroids offers a new method of myth analysis. It is important to note, however, that this research is not to suggest that all myths can be viewed through a cyclical method, but this formation is an additional way to view the development of myth in order to access a more understandable and clear view of myths when they are threatened.

The Body as a Rhetorical Text

Sport illustrates the centrality of the athlete’s body, but the role of the body has been looked at extensively in many fields. For example, Judith Butler explicated the performativity of the body, Deleuze and Guattari researched the relationship between bodies and capitalism, and Foucault positioned the body as a site for cultural inscription and social regulation. Other findings span fields such as critical studies, history, anthropology and sociology. Within the past ten years, however, study of the body as a rhetorical text has garnered interest. Crowley and Selzer (1999) argue that rhetoric is articulated through and by bodies, while Patterson and Corning (1997) focus on how bodies are rhetorical and how body studies can aid the rhetorical discipline.

The relationship between body, sport, and rhetoric is masterfully approached in Hawhee’s (2004) book *Bodily Arts*. In this research, Hawhee analyzes how the body historically...
functions as a site of rhetorical production, education, and performance. Looking at sport in ancient Greece, Hawhee argues that athletic and rhetorical practices overlapped since they were based on the same values of arête and agonism. The bodies in athletic contests served as modes of knowledge production through their emphasis on habituation, imitation, and response.

Additional research focuses on the role of the body in athletics but uses modern sport as an example. According to Selzer (1999), in the early 1900s, human mascots acted as the precursors to batboys and the bird and tiger costumes traditionally seen at sporting events. The human mascots, however, were usually midgets, hunchbacks, or black men. Selzer describes their role in the following manner:

Ty Cobb […] sponsored ‘Lil’ Rastus’ (real name, Ulysses Harrison) as the Detroit Tigers’ good-luck charm in 1909: hitters would rub his black head for luck before going to the plate. Many mascots were hunchbacks, their humps serving as the thing to rub for good fortune. Dwarf hunchbacks were especially appreciated: Louis Van Zelst followed Connie Mack’s Philadelphia A’s for many seasons, and the Yankee’s batboy Eddie Bennett appears next to Babe Ruth in photos from the late 1920s. (p. 6)

The mascots were rhetorically portrayed in various novels including Yale Murphy, the Great Short (Boxer, 1894), The Shortstop (Grey, 1909), and Pitching in a Pinch (Mathewson, 1912). Selzer argues that the real life mascot bodies came to bear ideological power when writers translated their stories into text for additional social purposes. The rhetorical role of bodies in sport and their ability to bear ideological power, thereby suggests the power of bodies in sport and their capacity to play into larger myths.

Development of Myths

There are various perspectives on how myths develop over time. For example, Campbell (2004) describes a myth’s development as a gradual decline. He describes the transformation of
the hero in the following manner: “The heroes become less and less fabulous, until at last, in the final stages of the various local traditions, legends open into the common daylight of recorded time” (p. 291). When myths are fully developed in society, they cease to have power or function and they seem to gradually evolve out of cultural awareness.

Myths, however, do not simply “appear” and “disappear;” instead myths are enacted by societies. This can happen at a variety of speeds, but myths traditionally go through an evolution. Parker (1988) argues that the evolution of myths should not be viewed as moving from myth to non-myth, but instead they should be viewed as a series of periods or styles that develop out of one another. Moving out of one another depicts the reliance that myths have on each of the stages, as well as the ability myths have to morph as they develop.

The malleability of myth is reflected in mythological study by Cassirer (1953). According to Cassirer:

The mythical world is, as it were, at a much more fluid and fluctuating stage than our theoretical world of things and properties, of substances and accidents […] We cannot reduce myth to certain fixed static elements; we must strive to grasp it in its inner life, in its mobility and versatility, in its dynamic principle. (p. 102)

Cassirer, therefore, acknowledges the inherent nature of myths to move and fluctuate and the need to account for this ever-changing nature of myth.

These understandings of myth, however, do not provide much of a concrete visualization of how myths develop. Doty (2000) offers some much needed specificity to how models work by explicating three phases through which a myth can pass. The phases move from the myth in its most primary and powerful form to its most rational. The first phase is known as the Primary Myth. During this phase a new cultural model and mode of self-understanding begins assimilation. Rough edges and inconsistencies still exist during this time of the myth. The myth
is believed to be true, but all of the ramifications of the myth have not been explored and there is still discord between it and other myths. The second phase is known as Implicit Myth. Here the story inherent to the myth become widespread and accepted and the inconsistencies have been smoothed out. Now the myth becomes accepted by more and more people and the myth becomes such a seamless part of culture that its terms are conceived as the “natural” way of understanding the world. Lastly, the third phase is known as the Rationalized Myth. Here competing myths attack the mythic perceptions created during the Primary and Implicit phase. The myth, therefore, is threatened and concern is placed on preserving the original myth by using interpretations of the myth. At this stage, the myth can be rewritten so it does not conflict with the new knowledge and understanding.

A close analysis of sport and myth and how the use of illegal supplements threatens the myth, offers a new way of understanding Doty’s (2000) linear phases. As Doty suggests, the concern when myths are threatened is preserving the original myth. In order to preserve this original myth now that athletes are using steroids to artificially become champions, fans and athletes may be returning to sport’s Primary mythic phase. The important conclusion to this, that previous research has overlooked, is that although people are adhering to Doty’s belief that when the myth is threatened they come up with new interpretations (conclusion #1), I argue that another aspect occurs within the phases of the myth. In accepting that illegal supplements are a part of sport (conclusion #2), it returns both the athlete and the spectator to the original understanding of sport as a fight to the death. This returns the myth to the Primary stage and also allows for a different understanding of how myth works within societies. Instead of viewing myth from a linear perspective with the third phase spiraling in different directions, this view provides a clearer understanding of what happens to the threatened myth. Yes, there are some aspects of the myth that are simply changed or altered to adhere to the myth that was developed
during the Implicit phase, but I argue that there are also parts that return to the Primary stage. This cyclical nature allows for the myth to be kept in the stagnate and accepted view developed during the Implicit phase.

**Evolutionary Method of Mythical Analysis**

Cyclical methods of analysis are not unique and history is one discipline that has used the cyclical approach for hundreds of years. History, by definition a story of events, opens itself up to mythical underpinnings due to its narrative nature. One application of the evolutionary view of history, therefore, is to use it as a way to study the evolution of myths.

Giambatista Vico is one scholar who applied the cyclical model to the rise and fall of nations. While Vico was alive, his work was relatively unacknowledged and when it was, it was misunderstood. His earliest publications were poetry and in 1693 he published “The Feelings of One in Despair” and “Ode on the Death of Antonio Carafa.” After he became Professor of Rhetoric in 1699, Vico began to address philosophical themes along with metaphysics, jurisprudence, and rhetoric. Vico took these two concepts of ideas and history and put them together to form the central thesis of his doctrine *The New Science*. In this he argues that there is a "philosophy and philology of the human race" which produces all nations experiencing a rise, development, acme, decline and fall.

The text of *The New Science* constitutes Vico's attempt to analyze the history of civil society and its development through the progress of war and peace, law, social order, commerce, and government. Vico found common themes by tracing human society back to its origins in order to reveal a shared human nature and a genetic, universal pattern through which all nations run. Vico sees this common nature reflected in language and customs in which the wisdom of successive ages accumulates and is presupposed in the form of a "mental dictionary" by subsequent generations. The result of this, in Vico's view, is to appreciate history as at once
"ideal" – since it is never perfectly actualized – and "eternal," because it reflects the presence of a divine order guiding the development of human institutions. Nations need not develop at the same pace, but they all pass through the same stages. Vico combines both the ancient and modern conceptions of history in that society is both cyclical and progressive. In Vico’s rising cycle, society and its myths are inherently unstable.

Plumb (2004) differentiates between “the past” and “history.” According to him, the past is informal and oftentimes deliberately misrepresented with an ulterior goal in mind. The past can be understood as an ideology that has a purpose to control individuals, exploit men and women, motivate societies, or inspire classes. Conversely, history is a description of something that has happened free from deception or manipulation. The historian’s job is to not simply relay information about events, but to relay information in a way that offers profound knowledge and awareness that can help mold human attitudes and actions. An historian, therefore, does not only describe progress in history but he/she should contribute to it. This leads to what Plumb refers to as a “true history,” which Plumb defines as “the attempt to see things as they were, irrespective of what conflicts this might create with what the wise one’s own society make of the past” (p. 14). Plumb’s description of the past can also be a description of myth. Plumb argues that there is a distinct difference between the past and history and few historians have been able to disentangle their descriptions from the past, its myth, and its social use. The great imperial myth that history is whole, meaningful, and progressive has died; we are left in a fragmented sense of the world.

Seemingly, Plumb’s notion of the past versus history mirrors genealogical history that is characterized by where and how history locates itself in material phenomenon. A genealogist, therefore, does not look at history as a linear progression through time, but instead understands history as a combination of disparate and disjointed events. History is not a sequence of stable
events that work together to form a solid and structured society, but a complex interweaving of actions and events. Foucault and Nietzsche argue that genealogy deals with the inherent fallaciousness of origins and Foucault (1977) believes that there is a traditional and an effective understanding of history. Nietzsche mirrors what Lakoff and Johnson (1980) say about metaphor. Historical myth arises from a desire to control what we really cannot control except in a reactive and retrospective way. In other words, myth and history writing arise from a will to power. A traditional view of history is portrayed as linear and compact, while an effective view of history deals with the various events and actions that come together at different times to create a view of history that helps us understand how forms of domination and identity are created and restored.

A notion of history, specifically genealogical history, offers a way to understand how myths develop. History acknowledges that a “true” understanding should not be viewed linearly as that model ignores how events work together and that a stable a structured version of history is ultimately flawed. Myths act the same way. Linear models or suggestions that myths simply die do not necessarily reflect an accurate view of what happens when myths are threatened.

Burke is one critic whose cycle of affirmation, challenge, and reaffirmation applies to myth and seems to account for the evolving nature of myth. The cycle that Burke offers accounts for the malleability of myth as well as the opportunity to restore itself when the myth is threatened. Burke’s cycle presents, however, but it seems to only apply to smaller myths or ones that explain only apparent contradictions. Burke suggests that when a myth goes back to affirmation that the myth has a new meaning. Affirmation is perceived as much different than the primary understanding. This is not the case for the myth of sport returning to its Primary stage as this research will illustrate.
How do the linear and the evolutionary natures of sport work together? The linear progression of myth is evident in the development of sport. Over thousands of years, sport’s cultural influence changed as societies grew. The myth of sport, specifically in relation to differing views of the body, also changed as societies developed and modernized. Along with the modernization, modifications in accepted morals and the accepted killing or the destruction in sport also morphed to fit into the differing stages. The linear progression brings us to the current stage of the Rationalized myth where steroids are threatening the myth of sport and the moral athlete.

But an evolutionary progression of myth is evident in the development of sport as well. Sport has an undeniable ability to transform itself from tragedy or scandal. Similar to religion, this ability is built into its structure with its inherent nature for redemption. Because sport revolves around the idea of the underdog or “good” overcoming “evil” (i.e., Barthes, 1957/1972), when an athlete transgresses, redemption is only a win or good performance away. There are countless examples of this in sport. In 1999, Latrell Sprewell, a player in the National Basketball Association, choked his coach P.J. Carlisimo. Sprewell was traded to the New York Knicks, helped lead the team to a few wins, and fans embraced him again. The rise and fall of the athlete constantly has the ability to reinvigorate one’s faith and love in sport. The example of Sprewell illustrates the use of the mythic pattern: an athlete fails but the inherent nature of myth allows for his/her redemption. Myths have power to provide meaning, but this example illustrates that we can invoke myth, use myth, and modify myth for one’s advantage.

Viewing steroids in sport, and the justification that steroids are okay because athletes ultimately have agency over their bodies, offers a merging of linear models, historical models, and evolutionary models of myth to better gauge the development of myths when they are threatened.
Historical and Mythical Outline of Sport

Bodily destruction and death have a long history in sport. In ancient times death and sacrifice were normalized aspects of sport. As civilizations modernized, notions of death and sport shifted to the destruction of others. The use of steroids, however, changes the avenue of destruction against others and presents a shift back to the accepted destruction of one’s own body. I will argue, therefore, that the historical and mythic development of sport correspond to changes in the death or destruction of one’s body. In this section, I will outline the way sport was included and perceived within the major civilizations of ancient to modern times in order to illustrate the changing perceptions of the body.

Primary Stage/Ancient Sport

Sport has existed for thousands of years and studying sport from ancient times can be difficult due to the lack of information from early periods. Over time, however, scholars formulated theories and ideas about sport from vases, mosaics, drawings, inscriptions, reliefs, and equipment. Researchers vary on exactly what the first sport was, but generally there is agreement that sport developed out of hunting. Out of necessities for survival, prehistoric man had to learn how to run, swim, jump, and climb in order to protect his own life and find food. Hunting involved similar characteristics to sport in that hunters were required to have strength, endurance, agility, and ingenuity in order to avoid extinction. Man and his hunting skills had a million years to mature as brain development and language evolved. During this time, human beings gained the experience to learn that staying together and forming communities aided in protection, child rearing, and food procurement. This communal understanding led to hunting groups that learned to surround prey and drive them into ravines where they could be slaughtered. From this we can understand the beginnings of teamwork and how characteristics of hunting are seen as characteristics of sport. Teamwork was not the only thing that came from
hunting, however, as man began to gain prominence in his community by being a more successful hunter than others.

It is surmised that running was the first sport. Drawings of prehistoric runners found in Zimbabwe show them superimposed into a scene of hunters with natives carrying bows and arrows. Running, an easy transition to take from hunting simply required the dropping of one’s weapons and a will to race. Races were a part of New Year festivals in Akkadian (2500 BCE) and Hittite civilizations (1200 BCE), and running was the first event recorded for the Olympic games in 776 BCE (McComb, 2004).

Organized games, however, introduced the first conceptions of sacrifice and bodily destruction. Games that revolved around using rubber balls started at least around 1500 BCE in Mesoamerica and were played for more than 3000 years (Day, 2001). It was at this time that sport and the destruction of one’s own body became accepted. The ballgames were played the most fervently with the most spectacle and elaboration in Mexico, Guatemala, Belize, and Honduras, but a simpler version of the game was played as far north as Arizona. Additional versions of the game were also played in the Caribbean, Haiti, the Dominican Republic, and Puerto Rico (Whittington, 2001).

The Mesoamerican ballgame, therefore, marks the first team sport played and was started by the Olmec, Mexico’s first great civilization. The Olmec settled along the Gulf Coast of Mexico and developed the sport by creating the foundation for the progression of formalized teams, protective equipment, religious rituals, and ball court architecture. The fundamental concepts spread throughout Mesoamerica into the American southwest and the Caribbean. Over 1,500 ball courts have been found in Mesoamerica and it is believed that there are many more courts buried beneath modern cities in Mexico and Guatemala (Day, 2001). Participation in the game stretched over a million square miles and its popularity is highlighted by the Aztecs who
imported over 16,000 rubber balls annually from the lowlands where rubber trees abundantly grew (Scarborough & Wilcox, 1991).

The Mesoamerican ballgame was more than a hobby or extracurricular activity to the Mayan culture. In fact, the game is mentioned in the Popol Vuh, the Maya story of creation, and establishes the game as inextricably linked with Maya mythology and life. Divided into three parts, the Popol Vuh describes the creation story, the feats of the god Hero Twins, and the history of the Quiché Maya nobility. Two of the first humans were the Hero Twins, Hunahpu (Hunter) and Xbalanque (Jaguar Deer), but they were not mere mortals. As the twins grew up, they discovered the ballgame and realized they played it better than their forefathers. The Lords summoned the twins to the Underworld to challenge them to a ballgame and several tests. The twins proceeded to win the game and outwit the Lords, eventually retrieving their father’s and uncle’s bodies from the ball court and placing them in the sky as the sun and the moon (Whittington, 2001). The ballgame and the Mayan culture are interwoven so that the two become inseparable. Sport was embedded in the basic fabric of the culture and athletic ability is correlated with greatness and power. This illustrates the importance of sport to the culture and ways the Mayans and Aztecs made sense out of their worlds. Understanding and participating in the ballgame had deep cultural meanings, thereby suggesting that the outcomes of games could have just as deep a meaning as the sport itself. This period of sport’s history, as illustrated through the Mesoamerican ballgames, merges the myth of sport with death. Relief carvings from various ball courts demonstrate this union in ancient Mesoamerica. The sites of El Tajín, El Baúl, Vegas de Alatorre, and Izapa have the most dramatic relief representations as they illustrate decapitation, sacrifice, and mutilation. Winners of the ballgame were placed on altars and offered as willing sacrifices to the Gods.
It is the willingness that sets this history of sport apart from sport in the following centuries. Athletes were willing to kill themselves within the context of sport and fans accepted it as part of their understanding of the purpose of sport. For people during this stage, therefore, death was part of sport. Within a modern perspective of Doty’s (2000) linear perspective of myth, this acts as the Primary stage of myth. Sacrifice and death were accepted within the sport realm as participants were willing to die or mutilate their bodies. This resulted in a very distinct notion of the body in sport at this time. Over thousands of years, however, fans and athletes moved away from this view of bodies in sport and a clear distinction between sport and death started to emerge that distanced death and destruction from sport. In the Implicit stage, therefore, sport was not about killing oneself, but it was about harming the other.

**Implicit Stage/Middle Stages of Sport**

In the middle stage of sport, the sport began to drift away from religious associations and became more of a form of entertainment. This shift, along with civilization modernizations, brought sporting bodies away from the willing sacrifice of oneself and focused on the destruction of the opponent. At this time, sport predominately revolved around the Olympic games in ancient Greece. During this middle stage, sport transitioned to new understandings of it as a form of entertainment and leisure. The *Odyssey* and *Iliad*, written during the eighth century, portrayed sport as part of funerals and as entertainment. Sport at times was also used as an alternative battleground where civic disputes were determined (Newby, 2006). Sport was not, however, only pacifistic.

Greeks saw athletics as key to their identity. Sport was essential part of education, a way to establish social status, individual pre-eminence, manliness, an outlet for aggression, preparation for warfare, and an appropriate way to honor gods and heroes at festivals. They competed for honor, not material wealth, as illustrated through the prize of a wreath – the only
prize in Olympia. Ancient Olympic Games lasted from 8th century BCE to 400 CE and provided inspiration for the Modern Olympics of 1896 (Newby, 2006). Boxing and pankration were the most brutal sports in ancient Greece and death was a normalized consequence. For boxing bouts, participants would wrap leather straps with metal spikes around their hands. The match would end when the opponent was knocked unconscious – the opponent, however, would often die.

The most brutal sport in ancient Greece was known as pankration and clearly illustrates the nature of sport to destroy others. This sport combined wrestling and boxing and became so popular that it was the first sport in ancient Greece to be taken over by professionals. Interestingly, biting and gouging were not allowed, but breaking bones was permitted. Participants fought until incapacitated, forced to submit, or died. Popular stories about the sport discuss one pankrationist who specialized in breaking fingers and another who enjoyed twisting legs out their sockets. One story involves Arrachion who died while fighting in an Olympic bout in 564 BCE. In the contest, his opponent wrapped his legs around Arrachion from the back while simultaneously strangling him. Arrachion forced his opponent to surrender by dislocating his toe, but Arrachion died at the same time. Although dead, the judges crowned Arrachion as the victor and placed an olive wreath of victory on his corpse (McComb, 2004). What is important about pankration is that it illustrated violence as part of sport, but the distinction is that the destruction to the body is done from one person to the other. Although each individual is hurt, no athlete intentionally hurts themselves.

Greeks had the Olympics and the pankration games, while Romans had their shows. In Rome, sport also was embroiled in a notion of the death of the other. For example, Roman leaders provided “circus” celebrations which featured chariot racing, fights with animals, and bloody gladiatorial contests. Restless and largely unemployed crowds watched these
celebrations and at times decided the fate of the gladiator who lost -- a thumbs up meant life, while a thumbs down meant death (Kyle, 2007).

The development of sport, and the rhetorical combination of sport and myth/death, is consistent in various communities where sport began. Egyptian sports included combat sports, running, hunting, strenuous dancing and acrobatic performances, and ball and board games (Decker, 1992). Evidence of participation in sport and rituals comes from hieroglyphics, wall paintings, sport equipment, tombs of kings and nobles, and temple monuments. In the 3rd millennium BCE, The Sed (or jubilee festival) involved a pharaoh who ran around markers as part of a ritual that demonstrated the king’s physical ability as a way to reinscribe the king’s power. The Sed festival presents the first “sports facility” in approximately 2600 BCE and the track was part of Djoser’s royal funerary complex. For 1500 years, Egypt continually participated in sport through Sed runs, wrestling, hunting, and fishing.

Fishing, usually only a brutal concept for the fish, took on an unusual aspect through a contest known as the Fisherman’s Joust. Teams of four stood in papyrus boats and attempted to knock the other team members out of their boat. The participants would often brutally beat one another with their poles furthering the brutal nature and even though Egyptians relied on the water for their livelihood, few knew how to swim. The contest, therefore, often ended in death due to drowning or attacks from crocodiles. A relief drawing on a grave sculpture depicts a man having his leg bitten by a crocodile. This rhetorical depiction illustrates one way the notion of death was perpetuated in sport.

Etymological changes also demonstrate the change in how athletics were perceived. According to Newby (2006), the Greek words associated with sport at this time suggests how sport was seen at this time as compared to the English words for “sport” and “games.” The Greek word for an athletic competition is “agon” (contest) and the verb “athleuo” which both
carry connotations of struggle and competition along with physical activity. Conversely, a modern understanding of sport and games is connoted by leisure and fun. The different connotations of these words suggest that the move from ancient Greece to modern sport and the words used to refer to sport began to take on a different understanding within each time period.

This middle stage of sport corresponds to Doty’s (2000) Implicit stage of myth. During this time there is a transition from notions of sport and death to understandings of sport as more of a leisurely activity. Athletes who fought until the death – Greek boxers, pankrationists, Roman gladiators, Egyptian fishermen – did so with the intent of hurting or killing their opponents. Death and destruction of bodies, therefore, made a distinct shift from the willing sacrifice of oneself to the killing of others. This is reflected rhetorically through relief carvings, sculptures, and etymological changes.

Sport’s acceptance as a more civilized and participatory arena began to infiltrate more parts of society. In modern times, sport as leisure and entertainment continues to grow. Technological advances and social improvements allow for more time to watch and participate in sport. During this modern time, however, as understandings of sport’s fixture in society changes, the use of steroids begins to threaten sport. This paper now turns to discussing modern sport and steroid use as a way to illustrate how they affect the myth of sport.

Rational Stage/ Modern Sport and Steroids

There is some debate when the modern era begins. Although historians teaching Western Civilization typically mark the beginning of the modern era at 1500 AD, sports historians focus on the modern period mainly as the nineteenth and twentieth century (McComb, 2004). Elias (1986) developed the “civilizing process” which states the people gradually learn to control emotion and aggression. This is reflected as societies changed during the Industrial Revolution and sport seemed to mimic the social changes the Revolution introduced. This time period for
modern sports evolved out of industrial and scientific revolutions, urbanization, and the growth of capitalism, thus correlating with the development and spread of modern sports around the world.

The first modern sport to develop was horse racing (McComb, 2004). The development of modern sports has its moments of extremely combative and brutal sports as illustrated in the 18th and 19th century American frontier. This “rough and tumble” fighting was characterized by men who would gouge, choke, scratch, kick, dismember, wrestle, and box without interference until someone gave up. Men were not allowed to use weapons, but their fingers proved brutal enough. The ultimate accomplishment was to gouge out an opponent’s eyeball and fighters would spend time sharpening and hardening their nails for that purpose. According to McComb (2004), places such as “Fighting Creek” and “Gouge Eye” were battlegrounds that received their names after they were littered with noses, eyeballs, and ears. Explanations for the sport derive from the dangerous frontier life and the understanding of fighting as a necessity of survival. Class differences, lack of family, and personal male pride when there was little else to be proud of also played into the popularity of the sport (McComb, 2004).

It was during the modern period of sport, however, that the use of performance enhancers became more widespread. As chapter three discusses, the use of performance enhancers has a long history in sport. Athletes have always looked for the competitive edge and some have resorted to bizarre techniques such as eating up to ten pounds of lamb before a contest or grinding up donkey hooves as part of a concoction. In modern sport, many athletes have turned to the use of drugs and amphetamines to gain a competitive edge. MLB players admit to taking “greenies” (combinations of amphetamines) and steroids are widespread. The use of steroids threatens the myth and moves it into the Rationalized stage in which there are attempts to
preserve the myth. It is at this point that the willing destruction or death of one’s body starts to pull the myth back to an ancient/Primary understanding.

Steroids have an obvious destruction to the body. Bodies become larger, rib cages thicken, acne develops, the plates of the head become bigger, hormone levels drastically change, females develop male characteristics such as lower voices and facial hair, males develop female features such as larger breasts and higher voices, athletes run the risk of liver damage, heart disease, heart attacks, and ulcers. Statistics suggest that the combination of the perceived benefits from steroid use (e.g. muscle gain, better sports performance) and the constant media images of successful athletes and their societal value provide strong motivation for their use. For many, however, the heart of this issue is that steroids destroy the body and can lead to death. The Hootons and the Garibaldis testified before Congress in order to represent young adults who died from steroid use. Steroids and destruction of the body often coincide.

The acceptance of destroying one’s body to the point of death is illustrated by several polls probing the extent athletes will go to in order to win. For example, in the early 1980s, Dr. Gabe Mirkin asked more than a hundred top runners the following question: “If I could give you a pill that would make you an Olympic champion—and also kill you in a year—would you take?” Results from the poll found that more than half of the athletes responded that they would take the pill (as cited in Goldman & Klatz, 1992). Dr. Bob Goldman extended on these findings and conducted a poll in the mid and late 1980s on participants in combative and power sports such as weight lifting, football, and track and field. His question asked 198 world-class athletes the following question: “If I had a magic drug that was so fantastic that if you took it once you would win every competition you would enter, from the Olympic decathlon to the Mr. Universe, for the next five years, but it has one minor drawback—it would kill you five years after you took it—would you still take the drug?” Goldman found that 103 of the athletes, 52%, would
take the drug (Goldman & Klatz, 1992). Polls such as these illustrate how far athletes are willing to go – death – and how many athletes are willing to commit to such extreme measures in order to gain an advantage.

Lyle Alzado, a former NFL player, serves as a symbol for steroid death in sport. Alzado played fifteen years for the Denver Broncos, Cleveland Browns, and Los Angeles Raiders and was named to the All-Pro Team twice. Alzado retired from the NFL in 1985 and in 1991 was diagnosed with a rare form of brain cancer – T-cell lymphoma. Alzado eventually admitted to years of substantial steroid use and adamantly argued about the correlation between his use of steroids and the cancer. Alzado attributed his entire college and professional career to steroid use. According to Alzado:

When I went to the Raiders in 1982, I took more and more doses and different combinations. Orally and injecting, I felt I had to keep up[…] My system was running so fast. I was taking the whole spectrum now. I’d feel my body close up on one drug, and I’d switch to another until my body would open up to the first one again[…] I kept progressing into stronger things, the last stuff I remember taking was something called Bolasterone and Quinolone – very dangerous. Steroids can raise your cholesterol level and one point late in my career my cholesterol was over 400. I was warned but I wouldn’t listen. I had injected so much that a few years ago a plastic surgeon operated on my butt. I had these lumps under my skin from where the needles went in. He went in and removed one baseball-sized mass of tissue and then found a bigger one underneath. (as quoted in Smith, 1991, p. 24).

Alzado’s use of steroids, and eventually human growth hormone, lasted for more than twenty years. Dr. Robert Huizenga, one of Alzado’s physicians and a Raiders team doctor while Alzado was on the team, asserts that steroid use caused the cancer. Huizenga responded that
there is no question that Alzado’s cancer was caused by his use of anabolic steroids due to their cancer forming ability (Smith, 1991). Both he and his doctor attribute the drugs as the cause of his cancer that he died from on May 14, 1992. Alzado’s death is one illustration of what drugs do and their effects.

Additional examples stem from professional wrestling. Links between steroids and professional wrestling deaths have peppered news reports in recent years. Professional wrestler Chris Benoit strangled his wife and suffocated his son in 2007 before killing himself. Benoit placed a bible by each of their bodies and then hanged himself by a pulley system constructed from a weight lifting machine. There was no motive offered for the killings, however, prescription anabolic steroids were found in the house and authorities suspect “roid rage” played a role. Benoit received deliveries from MedXLife.com, a Florida business that sells steroids, human growth hormone, and testosterone. In 2005, one of Benoit’s best friends, Eddie Guerrero, died from heart failure attributed to long-term steroid use. Curt “Mr. Perfect” Hennig’s father blamed steroids and painkillers for his son’s death in 2003, and Davey Boy Smith, the “British Bulldog,” died in 2002 from heart failure a coroner credited to steroids (Fish, 2007).

Although not every athlete who takes steroids is going to die, steroids present clear dangers to the body. There are some who might take steroids for a short period and then stop, but steroids present a threat to the natural or organic body. This conclusion leads to the notion of a “steroid culture” that values physicality over right, wrong, or healthy. The subsequent “steroid culture,” however, offers opportunities for the threatened myth of sport to be redeemed.

Conclusion

Doty’s (2000) research on myth is in valuable to this research and mythography as it offers a specific model through which to understand the development of myths. Myth research opens up the riches of the past and can teach us about our present. Doty states: “Mythographic
study changes lives. It opens up to the present the riches of the past[…Myth]funds recoveries of
new meanings for the present from precisely the old meanings of the past” (p. 84).

Doty’s (2000) linear model, however, illuminates a gap in myth research. This gap is
proclaimed by Trubshaw (2003) who identifies the fundamental weakness among mythology
research. He argues that the majority of critics look at myth with a narrow focus. This prevents
a firm grasping of what myths do on a broad level. Few modern-day scholars attempt to mesh
the micro views to formulate larger meanings of myth. Looking at how myths function across
time in order to account for societal changes, affords a broad view of myth that to this point is
missing. We have political myths and sacred myths, and myths are generally studied about
people who are separated from “us” in either space and/or time. This ignores the abundance and
strength of myth in modern “Western” cultures. Furthermore, Campbell argues for the
application of mythic systems specifically to modern societies in order to appreciate and grasp
the cultural value traditional mythic orientations convey.

That is why looking at myth through sport offers so many opportunities to fill the gap in
research. Sport is one of the few constants throughout the history of mankind. Because sport
has existed for most of humanity, it affords an opportunity to look at a very broad development
of myth. Furthermore, sport is so integrated into “Western” culture, it provides a lens that isn’t
focused on “us” and “them.” Also, sports influence and position in modern culture is a prolific
area to focus. Sport has existed for thousands of years, but the increase of leisure time in modern
times allows for more participants. This provides a strong influence on societies and
opportunities for mythic development.

Doty (2000) argues that myths pass through Primary, Implicit, and Rational stages of
myth. Sport has passed through all of these stages, but now I argue that sport is returning to a
Primary understanding of sport. During ancient times, athletes would willingly offer their bodies
as a sacrifice to the Gods. Sport acted as a space where the voluntary destruction of one’s body was a common place. Social and technological advances move sport away from these Primary notions into the Implicit and Rational stages where sport was viewed as leisure and entertainment. Violence to bodies was not accepted if it was to others and not to oneself. The introduction of steroids and the publicity of their use in mainstream news outlets, however, move fans athletes away from the Implicit and Rational stages of myth back to Primary understandings in which the destruction of one’s own body is accepted. This acts as a way sport can adjust to the threatened myth that it is moral and altruistic. Overall, however, a cyclical method of mythical analysis offers additional opportunities for better understanding of how myths develop over long periods of time and how myths can continue to operate when they are threatened.
CHAPTER NINE: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

Research on the hero in sport, the rhetorical construction of the athlete as a moral hero, and the manner that steroids threaten this myth offers several implications for various areas. In this chapter I will develop the implications of steroids in sport and suggest future areas of research.

Summary of Subject, Rationale, and Method

This dissertation has elected to study an institution in crisis. When an institution is in crisis, it reigning symbols are under attack. Long held images become muddy and conflicted, consensus breaks apart, bedrock tropes are held up for examination, and even the institution’s definition of itself and its mission are up for alteration. The threat can force an institution to face new challenges, new situations, and new demands for alterations.

This research proceeded on the assumption that rhetorical transformations of long held myths can serve to gauge institutional validity and that discourse serves as a way myths are recycled and reinscribed. The discursive frame makes the myth invisible in that it normalizes and tells us which information about any event is relevant. In other words, the myth is just a highly coherent and powerful piece of ideo-topoi and when we employ it as a frame it acts as symbolic action.

Myth, therefore, is an intentional piece of material. The myth is performed through discourse and gradually reshaped like other intentional materials. History presents numerous examples. For example, in the Middle Ages people used allegory and folk tale for sermonic aesthetics. Kipling’s myth of the imperial adventure has undergone symbolic transformation to frame the white adventurer as an exploiter, racist, or sinister. The myth of the yeoman farmer has turned into a technical expert and the farm as a mass of resources that must be managed rationally and systematically to maximize production.
Sport offers a prolific area to study the discursive shaping of events, individuals, and myths. Sport existence for thousands of years and the level to which it infiltrates modern western culture presents myth in a way that is common and mainstream. Sport myths are not relegated to ancient mythology and distant societies, but are alive on television, at the movies, in books, in advertisements, in the ballpark, and on the game field. This research offers a way to understand myth from a long historical development, as well as the way myth works within a mainstream and pervasive environment. Agents, spokespersons, and custodians of sport impose a tacit rhetorical frame on events and constantly reinscribe myths of morality, heroism, success, and sacrifice.

Discourse about sports, however, can no longer give us coherent patterns of thinking, feeling, or acting in the sporting arena. Legal and moral transgressions by numerous athletes, research that argues for the inherent immoral aspect of sport, and the unending role and use of steroids presents an arena of conflicting messages that force the sporting public to untangle. Ultimately, our sports agents attempt to make sense out of the world but stumble over their rival frames.

Findings

This dissertation outlined the role of the hero in myth and the rhetorical construction and perpetuation of the athlete as a moral hero. The myth of the athlete as a moral hero has a long and complex history through its rhetorical construction. The rhetorical construction of the athlete as a moral hero articulates the area of sport as a repository of signs and value. The construction occurs through a variety of ways. Rhetorically, athletes became associated with gods and heroes starting with Pindar’s poems to the winners of athletic contests in ancient Greece. Whereas before his writings, humans and gods were kept separate, Pindar is regarded as the first writer to make comparisons between the two – all within the realm of sport. Since
Pindar’s poems, poems, books, plays, relief carvings, and art for hundreds of years perpetuate the notion of athletes as worthy of worship and moral individuals.

The athlete as a moral hero has a particular rhetorical construction in the United States. Organized sport began during the mid-1800s as universities such as Harvard and Yale began rowing and football teams, and widespread newspaper coverage made athletic stars household names. Professional sports also began during this time and the construction of stadiums and gymnasiums worked to solidify sport’s place in mainstream American culture through permanent structures. The beginning and growth of organized sport in America teamed with larger rhetorical movements to deliver a strong message of sport and morality. The merging of these two principles to support the larger myth of the athlete as a moral figure was produced through five major factors: the YMCA, the Muscular Christianity movement, Theodore Roosevelt’s use of sport analogies in presidential rhetoric, the role of Bernarr Macfadden and his Physical Culture magazine, and the creation of the NCAA. These factors all portrayed sport as a way to attain a moral life and participation held implications for religious and ethical livelihood. Furthermore, these combined to reach a wide and diverse audience through religion, politics, recreation, and academia to augment their rhetorical reach.

The resulting myth of the moral athlete becomes threatened through athlete’s use of steroids. Steroids present a serious threat to the myth due to the perception that they are a form of cheating. The inherent nature of sport in which the hero, who in Barthes’s (1957/1972) research is portrayed as “good,” defeats the opponent who is portrayed as “evil,” becomes disrupted. The hero is no longer similar to the figure he opposes (as Burke portrays the hero in the classic monomyth), nor is he/she fighting with “equal weapons.” The athlete on steroids has a clear advantage that is attained through a manipulation of his/her body through synthetic means. The moral hero is now immoral, thus the myth is threatened.
The threat of steroids acts differently than any other scandal or transgression because now it is “our heroes” who are using them. In the past, perceptions of steroids were relegated to the East Germans and international contests such as the Olympics. It was easy to disregard their use because it didn’t necessarily affect the sports that Americans watched or cared about. The steroid scandal, starting with their widespread use in MLB, puts their use in the face of American sports fans. It is America’s heroes who are using them – not only using them, but doing them for a number of years while fans cheered them on – and now the threat takes on a different dimension because it cannot be easily dismissed but has to be confronted and rationalized.

Furthering this sentiment, the steroid use was most pronounced not just in any sport, but in America’s pastime. Baseball, itself filled with mythical notions of the how the sport originated, its place in America folklore, and the homerun king, tried to rescue its reputation after the strike in the 1990s. The homerun race helped cement its place back in mainstream adoration, but the leading figures of the race, Barry Bonds, Mark McGwire, and Sammy Sosa, all fell under suspicion of steroid use. Arguably, the steroid scandal affected fans even more because it fell within the very sport that fans mythically hold the closest.

Rhetorical analysis of MLB as a case study proposes ways that fans reacted to the steroid scandal, as well as ways sports fans, media, and players rhetorically portrayed their use. An examination between 1998 and 2008 of articles from the two largest circulated sports magazines, Sports Illustrated and ESPN the Magazine, illustrates a variety of reactions to steroid use. When reports of steroid use began to circulate in mainstream media, the overwhelming response from people seemed to be immediate disgust and irritation. As more articles, accusations, and failed drug tests surfaced, rationalization of their use also emerged. Within the various responses, three themes emerged among media reactions, fan justification, and player rationalization: arguing that it does not affect an athlete’s talent level, a reconceptualization of the athlete’s body, and
scapegoating players to repudiate guilt. These findings illustrate ways a diverse conglomeration of sports followers rhetorically justify their sport heroes and move past the threat steroids pose.

This research chose one of the rationalizations as a way to show implications for the myth of the moral athlete and myth studies. The rhetorical justification of steroid use through a reconceptualization of the athlete’s body plays into larger notions of how the myth of sport correlates with changing perceptions of the body throughout history. An historical analysis of sport reveals a slowly changing view of destruction and death to the body within the realm of sport. In ancient times, sports such as the Mesoamerican ballgame held sacrifices for the winners of the games. These sacrifices, often through decapitation, were willing acceptances of death within the realm of sport. Thereby, sport and death were linked and the willing destruction of one’s body was regarded as a conventional method. Technological advances and improved social conditions lead to changing perceptions of the body. Sports such as pankration in Greece, Fisherman Jousting in Egypt, and fighting on the Western Frontier in the United States, illustrated a distinct shift in sport’s acceptance in communities. Whereas in ancient times killing or destroying oneself for sport was accepted, middle stages of sport focused on hurting the other person or team. Although individuals undoubtedly were injured as part of sport, the original purpose or intention was not to do harm to oneself. Modern sport introduces another change in the body and sport dichotomy. Using steroids in the manner that modern athletes do (often in extremely large and frequent doses) reintroduces the notion of the willing destruction of one’s body for sport. The use of steroids in modern sport and the way that they are accepted through the destruction of one’s body returns to an ancient understanding of how the body is viewed in sport. Fans, the media, and players accept steroids through the lens that an individual has the right to destroy his/her own body, thus fans are able to rationalize steroid use and uphold the overall myth and belief in the morality of sport.
Implications

The findings from this research suggest several implications. The first implication is how this research offers a new method of analyzing threatened myths. There are relatively few methods to explain how myths develop and there is especially a dearth of explanations for what occurs when myths are threatened. The cyclical method of mythical analysis attempts to provide specificity for one way that myths can survive. Cassirer (1953), Parker (1988), and Campbell (2004) offer additional explanations for the development of myth, but these also are remarkably vague where myths are threatened and lose their power within society, does not offer much depth in understanding the threatened myth. The cyclical method, therefore, offers a way to account for threats as well as a way to allow for rhetorical shifts.

This research also holds implications for myth studies. Specifically, the research offers a bridge between the sociological and rhetorical traditions of myth study. The rhetorical and the sociological research present different views of sport in society – rhetoric creates the athlete as a moral hero while sociology unveils the inherent immoral aspects of sport. While rhetoric has a long tradition of the ways symbols and language create and perpetuate myths, sociology studies have a long history on the ways myths affect individuals and communities. Research such as this dissertation attempts to draw the two histories together to illustrate how they can draw from one another, or to show discrepancies between the creation of myths and the constructed results of myth. The sociological versus rhetorical notions of myth leads us to the next implication of this research.

A third area in which this research holds implications is within sport communication. Critical studies of sport often miss or ignore the rhetorical creation of sport and the sporting public. Specifically, the majority of sport communication often substantiates their worth in numbers (i.e., how much money is earned or how many people watch sport) or sport study looks...
at sport from a solely critical framework. Firstly, the seemingly persistent substantiation of sport study through numbers ignores the ways sport works at a communal and societal level and the possible implications sport holds for issues ranging from alienation to xenophobia. Secondly, although this critical lens is needed to illustrate accurate depictions of the way sport works in communities, this lens often ignores the manners in which sport draws its power from a rhetorically constructed ethos. I argue that it is not enough to view sport as something that does not build character or has various harmful aspects, but more attention needs to be applied to the disconnect between the reality of critical studies of sport and the rhetorical perception that fans traditionally hold. What this research hopefully illustrates is that sport is mythically viewed as a morality building and overall positive event and that discourse perpetuates and reinscribes the myth. Followers are overwhelmingly forgiving and want to view their athletes as the celebration of good over evil. Sport studies, in an attempt to portray sport outside of myths and perceptions, falls short of an adequate examination by ignoring the role of signs and language in creating perceptions which followers adamantly hold onto. It is not enough to show the discrepancy between reality and myth; sport communication studies need to also address rhetorical constructions of sport and how that influences followers’ perceptions.

Future Research

This research hopes to act a springboard for future analysis and findings in how sport and rhetoric work together and how that can address larger issues of hermeneutics, symbols, and myth. One area for future research could be to analyze the continuing threats to the myth through steroids and the discourse that shapes the crisis. The steroid scandal, starting in early 2000 with BALCO, has been ongoing since the initial federal investigation. New stories and athletes are being accused and the ramifications are everywhere from public admonishment, suspension, the loss of Olympic medals, to serving time in jail. Professional organizations are
scrambling to develop new steroid testing policies and the threat of new “undetectable” performance enhancers which are entering the market. The ongoing nature of steroids in sport offers long-term analysis of the manner in which discourse frames their use along with a second opportunity for future research.

A second area for future research is to analyze the hermeneutical changes and developments with the key symbols of sport. This research looks at how a crisis effects the changes in the symbol of the hero, but there are several archetypal symbols associated with sport: identification with the everyman, an ideal of fair play, as a training ground for business, and as preparation for the military. The depths that the steroid scandal reaches and the perpetual nature of the scandal offers an excellent possibility for other examples of symbolic change.

A third area for future research would be to compare different sports discourse to analyze if similar accommodations are made for the use of steroids and the role of the hero in other sports. Baseball was used a case study in this dissertation, but football is another sport that has struggled to control the use of steroids by its players. Future research, therefore, could compare and contrast the two areas to analyze the types of reinterpretations that are given to old and new sports symbols and practices.

Finally, future research can analyze additional threats to the myth that explicate other rhetorical avenues than magazines. There is a plethora of sports discourse through newspapers, live sports broadcasts, sports shows, and commentary that offers a multitude of voices and perceptions of steroids in sport and the portrayal of sport and the athletic hero. This dissertation offers a small analysis of very specific rhetorical discourse and acknowledges the various opportunities for similar or new findings from other areas. Also, this dissertation offered three ways for the rhetorical justification of steroid use in sport and used one of the justifications to
suggest implications for bodies and myth. Obviously the two other areas of justification can be used to offer additional implications for myth and sport.

This dissertation attempts to answer questions about the role of steroids in sport, the threatened myth, and the role of the athlete hero. Sport in society is pervasive and the discourse often supports and perpetuates a specific view of the moral and character building nature of the sporting arena. Sport provides an unimaginable amount of rhetorical venues for rhetorical analysis and this research hopes to fulfill a small addition to the discipline.
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