

ABSTRACT

Title of Dissertation: BASEBALL, CITIZENSHIP, AND NATIONAL IDENTITY IN
 GEORGE W. BUSH'S AMERICA

Ryan Edward King-White, Doctor of Philosophy, 2008

Dissertation directed by: Professor David L. Andrews
 Department of Kinesiology

The four separate, but related, studies within this research project seek to offer a critical understanding for how American national identit(ies), and particular forms of (cultural) citizenship are discursively constructed and performed in and through the sport of baseball. More specifically, this dissertation will utilize and expand upon critical theories of neoliberalism, citizenship, whiteness, and (physical) cultural studies to engage various empirical sites, which help provide the context for everyday life in contemporary America. Each chapter looks at various empirical aspects of the Little League World Series and the fans of the Boston Red Sox (popularly referred to as Red Sox Nation) that have historically privileged particular performances and behaviors often associated with white, American, heterosexual, upper-middle class, masculine subject-positions. In the first instance this project also attempts to describe how 'normalized' American citizenship is being (re)shaped in and through the sport of baseball. Secondly, I aim to critically evaluate claims made by both Little League Baseball, and the Boston Red Sox organization, in response to (popular) criticisms (Bryant, 20002; Mosher, 2001a, 2001b, 2001c) of regressive activity and behavior historically related to their organizations, that they are striving for a more culturally diverse and welcoming condition for all through their tournament and fan community respectively.

To best articulate this critical understanding of the cotemporary moment I analyzed the production of the 2003 Little League Worlds Series, the (multi)media discourses surrounding Dominican star/villain, Danny Almonte, the filmic rendering of 'normalized' members of Red Sox Nation within *Good Will Hunting* and *Fever Pitch*, and finally an ethnographic study of Red Sox Nation throughout the 2007 baseball season. In following Andrews (2008) suggestive outline for a Physical Cultural Study I used a multi-methodological, qualitatively based, study to gather evidence through which to best understand the socio-political context of the contemporary moment. In so doing, I hope to clarify the dangerous way neoliberal capitalism is practiced and experienced in America.

BASEBALL, CITIZENSHIP, AND NATIONAL IDENTITY IN GEORGE W. BUSH'S
AMERICA

by

Ryan Edward King-White

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
2008

Advisory Committee:

Professor David L. Andrews, Chair
Professor Michael Giardina
Professor Sheri Parks
Professor Jaime Schultz
Professor Damion Thomas

© Copyright by
Ryan Edward King-White
2008

DEDICATION

To Meghan, my family, and all those that helped get me to this point.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my advisor David L. Andrews for directing me through, not only this dissertation project, but also my graduate school career. In addition I thank my committee – Sheri Parks, Jaime Schultz, Damion Thomas, and Michael Giardina - for their support and direction, as well as, Michael Silk and Elizabeth Marshall for their help early on in the process. At the same time I must not forget Sally J. Phillips for her kind donation in helping me to finish this dissertation in a timely manner, not to mention, all the times she stood up for me during my time at Maryland – many instances for which I probably have no idea. In addition I must thank Jane Clark for not murdering me for doing a poor job of staining her doors a few summers ago, and for her continued support of the graduate students and the Physical Cultural Studies Program.

As for my classmates, Joshua Newman and Bryan Bracey need to be singled out, for the many long phone conversations and emotional, physical labor, “dots” and paper. Along the way I have unduly foisted this project on Perry Cohen, Tan Zhang, and Callie Batts, and, for that, I am especially thankful. For the rest of the Physical Cultural Studies program at Maryland, thanks for putting up with me, and I can only hope that the future of our PCS collective is as promising as all of you.

Finally, thanks to my friends and family, Mom, Dad, Jax and Steve, Megan, Kristin, Dustin, Morgan, Lauren, Kathryn, Grandma Walrath, Kathy, Bill, Bridget, Brian, Deedee, Pop, Frank and Lia, Rich, Mike, Rich, Mickey, Matt and Jess (and little Matt and Jess), Benny and Yael, Eddie, Evan, and Tejas for putting up with me, supporting me, and being there for a lot of “stress relief”.

And, always, thank you Meghan K. King-White – for everything.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction: Baseball and 21 st Century America	1
Baseball Studies	5
National Identity, Sport, and Baseball	8
New Forms of Citizenship: What Does Baseball Have to Do With It? ..	12
Physical Cultural Studies	15
Neoliberalism and Physical Culture	22
Methods of Inquiry: Interpretive (Micro)Ethnography and Critical Discursive Analysis	25
Project Breakdown	36
Chapter I: Revisiting the Networked Production of the 2003 Little League	
World Series: Narrative of American Innocence	42
2003 LLWS: media, spectacle, sovereignty	42
Contextualizing the LLWS	45
Producing the 2003 LLWS	48
Straddling Sovereignties	50
Normalized American (Sporting) Superiority	57
Coda: Conducting Children	67
Chapter II: Danny Almonte: Discursive Construction(s) of (Im)igrant	
Citizenship in Neoliberal America	73
Dominican Dependence on America and (Little League) Baseball	77
Theoretical Orientation and Methodology	81
Almonte the (Almost) All-American Hero	83
Almonte the Dominican	95
Epilogue: “Stay Dominican, Danny”	102
Coda: All Along the Almonte Watchtower	104
Chapter III: Setting the Stage: Constructing ‘Normalized’ Citizenship in	
Red Sox Nation Through Film	107
Film and the Contemporary Moment	110
Reading Mediated Citizenship in Red Sox Nation	113
Red Sox Nation and Class	116
Red Sox Nation’s Straight Men’s Club	123
Red Sox (White) Nation	133
Coda: The Stage is Set	135
Chapter IV: ‘Playing their Part: Red Sox Nation 2007 and the Public	
Performance of Whiteness	138
Commodity Citizenship and the Rise of a [Red Sox] Nation	144
At Home in Red Sox Nation? Performativity and Qualitative Inquiry	148
Sports Bar Nationalism – “You’re Amongst Friends Here”	152
Red Sox Nation Goes Viral	161

CONTENTS (Continued)

Performing Red Sox Nation on the Road – DestiNation Colonization	168
Performing Red Sox Nation At Fenway – “America’s Most Beloved Ballpark”	174
Coda: The Long Road or Terrible Lie?	181
 Conclusion: Here’s to the State of George W.	185
 Appendix: Cultural Studies Past/Present: My (Physical) Cultural Studies Project	195
Context...is everything?.....	198
4 th Moment – Antagonism: Pedagogical, Ethical, Political, and Radically Democratic Physical Cultural Studies.....	202
Becoming a Bricoleuer.....	209
Methodological Chapter Breakdown.....	215
Chapter I	215
Chapter II.....	232
Chapter III	238
Chapter IV	242
Conclusion.....	249
References.....	251

Introduction: Baseball and 21st Century America

On October 10, 2008 Republican U.S. Vice Presidential hopeful, Sarah Palin, ceremoniously 'dropped the puck' in Philadelphia prior to a game between the Flyers and New York Rangers. As she walked onto the ice with her seven year-old daughter, Piper, Palin was loudly booed by the crowd as the stadium's P.A. system turned up music and canned applause to drown out the negative response (Red, 2008). In the aftermath, several fans were questioned about their response to which many replied that they did not think 'politics should be inserted into sport' (Zinser, 2008). This is quite an interesting suggestion, and one that is oft-repeated in the media and general public, given the fact that sport and politics (particularly in regard to Presidential candidates) have long been fused together (c.f. Hargreaves, 1982). In many ways, politicians have come to understand that, in the United States, one of the best tactics they can use to connect with the general public is to demonstrate their American (cultural) citizenship through an interest and understanding of various sporting practices.

For example, in the recent past Ronald Reagan, George H.W. Bush, and Bill Clinton have each used their connection to sports like football, baseball, basketball, and soccer (moms) respectively on their way to election victories (Giardina, forthcoming). Importantly, in each case, the sports they choose to use in an effort to further their connection with the American public by reaffirming normative racial, classed, gendered, and sexual identities. As such, that sport is being used for political ends by Palin, John McCain, and Barack Obama should come as little surprise to the American public. What needs to be addressed then is the ways and

to what ends sport is used to strengthen political ties to particular voting constituencies in order to better understand the socio-political context of contemporary America.

Though it may be too soon to critically evaluate the cultural import of the sports that McCain (Ultimate Fighting, hockey, football) and Obama (basketball, baseball) are using to buttress their political campaigns, it is instructive to look at the recent past, in this regard, to better understand the means and modes of communicating normative national identity and performances of (cultural) citizenship in America. As such, throughout this dissertation project I will demonstrate a critical understanding of the sport George W. Bush used to rise to and maintain his position of power in the United States – baseball. Though his connection to “NASCAR dad’s” (Newman & Giardina, 2008) has often been cited as the key reason for his (re)election, and was no doubt important, this somewhat overlooks the way baseball was used to create Bush’s political career (Lewis, 2000).

More to the point, Bush’s very rise to prominence came through his ability to link his successes as a baseball owner of the Texas Rangers to his ability to lead in state and national government. After failing in his bid to become commissioner of baseball Bush used this strategy to unseat wildly popular Texas state governor, Ann Richards, in 1994, and then to win re-election to the post in 1998 (Farrey, 2000). In one of his first political decisions as President of the United States Bush promoted his ‘investment in youth and creating good young American Citizens’ (Bush, 2001) by becoming the first sitting President to attend the Little League World Series in 2001, and teaming with the organization to introduce “T-Ball on the South Lawn”

(Van Auken, 2003, personal communication). Through this initiative he invited children from around the country to play baseball at the White House several times during his Presidency. Following the tragedy of 9/11/01, Bush reappeared during Game 3 of Major League Baseball's World Series Game 3 in New York's Yankee Stadium. It was here that Bush memorably fired a ceremonial first pitch strike 'signifying that we (Americans) are not afraid' – presumably of terrorists (Williams, 2008). Finally, in his bid for re-election, he again used baseball during the Republican National Convention. This time he was beamed into the audience from a Little League game to demonstrate his connection to the everyday people of America, and was actively supported by Boston Red Sox star pitcher, Curt Schilling (Faraone, 2008).

Given the aforementioned, as Bush's eight-year reign as U.S. President comes to a close, I suggest that it is important to critically evaluate how baseball has been used by the President, and his constituents to promote a particular type of national identity and citizenship in the United States. More to the point, it has been argued elsewhere that baseball in America is tantamount to a "civil religion" (*cf.* Evans, 2002; Price, J. L., 2006), insofar as not just during the Bush era but also throughout its history the sport has become a symbolic paradox of the mythological American claims to democracy, exceptionalism, diversity, and god directed superiority. At its very core, baseball has been and remains a supreme site for the performance and (re)creation of 'normal' American National identity in that despite its seeming waning popularity:

Baseball became the national pastime because those at the upper echelons of the sport as an enterprise consciously, and unconsciously transformed it from a working class, 'rough,' urban sport to a game that simultaneously embodied America's urbanizing commercializing future and the memory of its rural, pastoral past. (White, 1996, p. 319 in: Evans, 2002, p. 14).

By tracing through baseball history, it becomes clear that many of the economic, and moral issues confronting the American nation have been played out in, and through the sport. More to the point, as the "national pastime" of the United States, professional and amateur baseball has struggled with a variety of social issues that have had an effect on America at-large. Given its connection to the everyday lives of many American's, baseball continues to be a key definer of who matters and how they matter as citizens in the imagined community (Anderson, 1983) that is the United States.

With this understanding about the general importance of baseball within American society, **the research question "driving" the current project is: what is the relationship between (American) national identity, (cultural) citizenship and sport?** I aim to offer my answer to this question through recourse to two of baseball's most preeminent nationalistically expressive events and communities: **The Little League World Series** and the **fans of the Boston Red Sox (often referred to as Red Sox Nation)**. The rationale for such a project is to **gain a deeper understanding for how various (counter)hegemonic identities, values, and ways of 'being' are being expressed and, indeed performed in such a way as to normalize and/or "other" American National Identity.**

Further in many ways than the growing popularity of the Red Sox in the United States (White, 2007), and America's continued support of the Little League World Series provides a lens through which a critical understanding of how America and baseball dialectically operate. As such, throughout the project I will use four separate, but related, empirical studies to expand upon critical theories of **national identity, citizenship, whiteness, neoliberalism, and physical culture** which help provide an understanding of everyday life in contemporary America. More specifically, each chapter is designed to clarify how the Little League World Series and the fans of the Boston Red Sox have historically privileged dominant ideas and presentations of the United States. In so doing this project attempts to describe how 'normalized' American citizenship is being (re)shaped in and through the sport of baseball. Simultaneously by offering this critique, I aim to examine claims made by both Little League Baseball, and the Boston Red Sox organization that they are striving for a more culturally diverse condition for all through their tournament and fan community respectively.

By way of introduction, I aim to situate this project theoretically, and demonstrate how it seeks to contribute to the growing bodies of literature from which it is driven. As such, in what follows, I will closely examine various studies that have been conducted on **baseball, national identity, citizenship, physical culture, and neoliberalism** to provide a theoretical outline from which the project is guided by. Second, I will briefly outline the (multi)methodological approach used

to research the four substantive chapters¹. Third, I offer a basic outline of each chapter in this dissertation, which provide a general guide for how this dissertation is organized. Finally, by way of setting the general 'tone' of this dissertation, I provide reasoning why and for whom this project was produced.

Baseball Studies

The unique relationship between baseball and America has not been lost on scholars from a variety of academic disciplines. For instance, over the course of the past fifty years several studies have been conducted on the social-historical relationship between baseball and the American populace (*cf.* Alexander, 1991; Dickerson, 1991; Duval, 1995; Evans & Herzog, 2002; Kahn, 1992, 1993, 2000; Kelly, 2005; Light, 1997; McGimpsey, 2000; Rader, 1990, 1992; Riess, 1999; Seymour, 1960, 1989; Trujillo, 1992, 2000; Trujillo & Krizek, 1994; Voigt, 1971, 1976, 1983; White, 1996). As John P. Rossi, author of *The National Game* (2000, p. vii-ix), suggests this surge in baseball and (American) history studies was initiated by Harold Seymore's, *Baseball: The Early Years* (1960), and David Voigt's *America Through Baseball* (1976). More recently, through the work of Rossi, Benjamin Rader (1990, 1992), Steven Riess (1999), and James Tygiel (2000) the connection of baseball and the American public has been made more explicit. As Rossi further posits, *The Journal of Sport History* and *The International Journal of Sport History*, have been key in forwarding the overall academic project that considers the importance of baseball in shaping (American) history. Perhaps more importantly, in 1991, the historical, and

¹ Importantly, this brief outline of methods is supplemented by a specific methodology section in each chapter, and by a 'confessional tale' for the entire project in the appendix.

cultural import of baseball received even more formal scholarly attention with the inception of *Nine: A Journal of Baseball History and Culture*, which continues to be published biannually today.

While, for the most part, academic studies on baseball have focused on its historical connection and/or a/effect on, in, and through American society other research has considered the devastating effects that the United States, through baseball, has had on poor Caribbean and Latin American countries (Juffer, 2002; Klein, 1988, 1989, 1997; Trevino, 1999), the creation of national identities through the sport in various American and international contexts (Bainer, 2001; Cho, 2008; Hirai, 2001; Howell, 2005; Junwei & Gordon, 2006; Spies, 2008; Sundeen, 2001), and the construction of raced, classed, national, and gendered norms through the discursive positioning of some of the sport's stars like Hideo Nomo, Pedro Martinez, and Nolan Ryan (Hirai, 2001; Klein, 1997; Trujillo, 2000). Aside from discursive research on the dynamic relationship between baseball and (American) society, several ethnographies have been conducted on what baseball means to various communities.

The best known of these research projects in the general academic community, and arguably one of the most respected single authored ethnographies ever conducted, is Gary Alan Fine's (1987) *With the Boys*, which attempted to understand how masculine identities, values, and ways of 'being' are learned through Little League baseball. More recently Sherri Grasmuck's, *Protecting Home: Class, Race, and Masculinity in Boys Baseball* (2005), and Troy Glover's, *Ugly on the Diamonds: An Examination of White Privilege in Youth Baseball* (2007), have

provided further (raced/classed/gendered) nuance to Fine's earlier research. In terms of professional sport there have been two studies conducted on the normative gender roles constructed in and through "baseball wives" (Gmelch & San Antonio, 2001; Ortiz, 2005). Additionally, Alan Klein's *Sugarball* (1991), and his other works on Dominican baseball (1988; 2000) as well as Thomas Carter's, *Baseball Arguments: Aficionsimo and Masculinity at the Core of Cubinidad* (2001), have offered important contributions to understanding how baseball helps particular individuals formulate national identities and value systems. Finally, in terms of American national identities Nick Trujillo and Bob Krizek's (1994) ethnography, *Emotionality in the Stands and in the Field*, and Michael Butterworth's (2005) critical reading of post-9/11 baseball broadcasts provides an account of how individuals come to understand themselves as (an) 'American' through baseball.

Importantly, in terms of this project, through both Little League and fans of the Boston Red Sox this project can add to their contributions. In other words, this project uses Butterworth's suggestion that, "baseball may be used ideologically to define the notion of what is 'American' and, consequently, what is not" (2005, p. 108). In other words, baseball is a key element in the demonstrating an individual's American national identity. More to the point, what each of the aforementioned studies make abundantly clear then is that the normalizing effect of baseball on various social groupings (particularly the United States), and vice versa, is key to understanding the continually shifting, yet contextually specific, forms of belonging in America. However, simply positioning baseball as a determinant of American national identity would run the risk of underestimating the highly influential, and

conflicting literature on the subject. As such, in the following section, I aim to more specifically describe the theoretical influences driving this dissertation in regard to national identity, and how it relates to sport, particularly baseball.

National Identity, Sport, and Baseball

The nation and national identity are very contested concepts that have been argued over for several years (cf. Anderson, 1983; Billig, 1995; Breuilly, 1994; Brubaker, 1996; Delanty & Kumar, 2006; Gellner, 1983; Greenfield, 1996; Hayes, 1926/1933; 1960; Hobsbawm, 1992; Kedourie, 1960/1961; Linklater, 2007; Smith, 1986). While this dissertation does not seek to provide a definitive answer for the questions that have resulted from these debates it will demonstrate an understanding of how the nation, and national identity in the United States are defined, in part, through baseball. Thus, rather than offer answers to the debate I will use this space to describe my understanding(s) of these concepts and how they are used in the dissertation that follows.

More specifically in terms of the connection between the nation and national identity, and following Carlton Hayes (1926/1933; 1960), I adhere to the understanding that suggests a commonality between persons in regard to (1926/1933, p. 4-6) language and historical traditions (religious, territorial/geographical, political, military, commercial, and cultural). As he suggested would happen, the entities that connect individuals together are highly fluid and in a state of constant flux. Since the time of his writings, changes in (inter)national culture like the rise of the 'global marketplace', ease of transportation, and information, has radically transformed the concept of the

traditional geographic nation-state to one that is at once highly localized, yet globally experienced. In other words, the actual common qualities that help delineate the (cultural) differences in nations have stayed relatively the same, but they can be experienced in myriad places, in real-time, and (possibly) with similar effects in each locale.

Given this shift in “national identity”, Benedict Anderson (1983) has suggested that those who identify with a particular nation, whether culturally-based or state-based, are part of an *imagined community*. This concept is a radical departure from Ernest Gellner’s earlier suggestion that there could possibly exist an organically driven ‘true community’ (1964), and states that all nations/national communities are imagined “because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion” (1983, p. 6). Furthermore, and important to this project, is Anderson’s suggestion that the debate between whether or not true communities/national identity exists is less important when compared to understanding “the style in which they are imagined” (p. 6). In so saying, Anderson lends credence to the belief that a critical understanding of everyday ways of communication and ‘being’ is crucial to offering an insightful perspective in the ways people identify with nations.

Following Anderson’s belief that the style in which the nation and national identity is imagined is key, Michael Billig (1995) suggests that the everyday reminders of the nation are important markers for a country’s people to refer to in times where it seems appropriate to celebrate/perform one’s national identity (ie.

Post 9/11, the Olympics, international conflicts). Using Billing's assertion that, banal nationalism, the seemingly "normal" activities, behaviors, and symbols which serve to help individuals identify with a nation need to be critically examined in order to understand a particular nation's culture of belonging. More to the point, by understanding how this nation's people imagine themselves as American through various forms of (popular) culture, the values, beliefs, and social hierarchies in national culture become visible. Oftentimes, this is supplemented explicitly and/or implicitly by positioning the (American) nation as unassailably superior to all 'competitors' through a seemingly blind celebration of 'patriotic' events, athletes, teams, celebrities, and fans.

In terms of sport this idea is not a new one, as George Orwell (1945, ¶6) once wrote that "international sport is war minus the shooting", and can help cultivate, invigorate, and create national identities and rivalries. More recently a veritable deluge of national identity and nationalism studies in regard to sport have been conducted (Bairner, 2001, 2003; Bale, 1986; Jarvie & Maguire, 2007; Maguire, 1999, 2003; Rowe, 2003; Silk, 2001; Silk, Andrews & Cole, 2005; Wagg & Andrews, 2007²). In fact, many sport scholars like Alan Bairner, John Bale, Grant Jarvie, Joe Maguire, David Rowe, among others, have spent their careers considering just how sport has helped us understand the nation and national identities. Further, each of these research projects have helped position sport as an important aspect of how various identities and nationalities are defined in and through sport.

² *Authors note:* This list is by no means exhaustive, but a few of the more exemplary works in the field on sport nationalism, and national identity.

Returning to baseball, and normalized American identities cultivated through the sport, the work of Michael Butterworth, James Tygiel, Nick Trujillo, Alan Klein, John Rossi, Ben Rader, and G. Edward White referenced in the previous section have proven invaluable in demonstrating how American national identities have shaped and been shaped by baseball. Yet few, if any, have tied national identity to the rapidly shifting conceptions of citizenship emblematic of the neoliberal moment. For now, as Hayes (1926/1933, 1960) would have it, the official methods of identifying with the nation and nationality through citizenship are more difficult to discern in the era of global markets, flexible accumulation, and instant communication (Harvey, 1989). In the following section I will briefly describe what makes this project a unique and significant contribution to where the aforementioned research has led.

New Forms of Citizenship: What Does Baseball Have to do with it?

Early conceptions of citizenship proffered by T.H. Marshall (1992), which considered the civil, political, and social rights of national individuals, have given way to new ideas of cultural citizenship which also take into account the representative nature of multi-media communication and markets (cf. Berlant, 1991, 1997; Billig, 1995; Hall & Held, 1989; Hermes, 1998; Miller, 2002; Ong, 1996; Rosaldo, 1994; Stevenson, 1997; Isin & Turner, 2002). Nick Couldry (2006) has recently expanded on the concept of cultural citizenship. He did so by recognizing that contemporary (cultural) citizenship, in some ways, signifies a “decline of politics” (p. 323), and suggests that a ‘culture of citizenship’ needs to be understood.

His claim is important as we, in America, end an eight year presidency that was not reflective of the popular vote, and may, in fact, have not been legal in terms of the American political process (Kranish & Kirchoff, 2001). Moreover, as corporate culture continues to reign supreme, and workers earn less for the same job, employment is outsourced, and the already rich continue to benefit monetarily (Collins & Yeskel, 2003), it becomes necessary to understand how this is reflected in everyday American life. In other words, given the fact that the public in the United States is experiencing an ever-shrinking political voice leading to forms of both “forced” and voluntary” alienation (Olsen, 1969) in the national political process, it is important to try to understand their/our politically charged ways of belonging, primarily through consumption, get understood, practiced, and mediated in everyday life. As such for the purposes of this dissertation **cultural citizenship is the multifarious ways of belonging to a community whether it be through consumption, symbol, affect, and performance on, in, and through the body.** This runs seemingly, but not always, counter to traditional notions of **citizenship** which are the law based connections individuals have to particular nation-states.

Along this line of thinking Aihwa Ong suggests that cultural citizenship: is a dual process of self-making and being-made within webs of power linked to the nation-state and civil society. Becoming a citizen depends on how one is constituted as a subject who exercises or submits to power relations; one must develop what Foucault (cited in Rabinow, 1984, p. 49) calls “the modern attitude,” an attitude of self-making in shifting fields of power that include the nation-state and wider world. (1996, p. 738)

In regard to the present, I aim to explicate the various ways baseball provides a way to understand how citizenship and national identity are defined in the contemporary moment.

Importantly, for this project I focused on two empirical subjects, the Little League World Series, and Boston Red Sox fans in an attempt to get a more complete vision of the fractured and conflictual (Grossberg, 2006, p. 4) nature of American (cultural) citizenship in the contemporary moment. More specifically, in the first two chapters of this project I focus on the Little League World Series, a sporting event tied to amateurism, childhood innocence, and 'friendly' international competition. Given its close association with the Federal Bureau of Investigations, the Army (Van Auken, L. & Van Auken, R., 2001, p. 64), and more recently the George W. Bush administration (White, Silk, & Andrews, 2008a) it is hardly surprising that most of the organization, marketing, and mediation of the event is based on appeals to traditional ideas of national belonging, moral sanctity, and the belief that Little League is creating good young (American) citizens. As such, if Little League is attempting to promote good American citizenship, then it is necessary to try to critically engage their assumptions and beliefs of what makes a 'good citizen'.

Conversely, in chapters 3 and 4, I critically evaluate the fans of the Boston Red Sox (popularly referred to as Red Sox Nation) a corporate media-based community that has emanated from the rise of ESPN, Boston-based media, and on-field team success, in conjunction with sales efforts from new team ownership, management, and (global) marketing. In other words, Red Sox Nation seemingly operates in stark contrast to traditional nationality, and serves as a key contributor

to the nationalization of consumer markets. As such, given their different but related roles in American society the LLWS and Red Sox Nation play an important part in illuminating the conflicting ways that major corporate entities are simultaneously proffering sentimental connections to perceptions of a simpler traditional past, whilst hurtling to the future by embracing corporate capitalist culture. Thus, the critique I offer, which binds the project as a whole, is that while each chapter operates on its own, they all contribute to a broader understanding of the production, consumption, and performance of citizenship in contemporary America.

To this point I have suggested that this dissertation focuses on the way sport spectacles, the body and bodies perform(s) and produce(s) normalized American citizenship through baseball. Importantly, this type of study falls under the general umbrella of a typical (Physical) Cultural Studies project. Given the influence major thinkers in (Physical) Cultural Studies have had over the research, evaluation, and writing process of this dissertation the following two sections will specifically describe how the (Physical) Cultural Studies project was taken up throughout both theoretically and methodologically.

Physical Cultural Studies

The type of (Physical) Cultural Study that I have attempted to produce throughout the following borrows heavily from the Birmingham Center for Contemporary Cultural Studies, but simultaneously recognizes the need to engage other types of cultural studies delineated at length throughout Denzin and Lincoln's (2005) *Sage Handbook for Qualitative Research*. While I can understand the critique

that putting (Physical) in front of Cultural Studies could be seen as a simple perpetuation of British Cultural Studies, I would argue that not only does the (Physical) symbolize the fact that this type of study focuses on the body, but also pays deference to the uneasy evolution of cultural studies within a sporting/physicality framework.

Though early CCCS studies on the body and sport were conducted in the paradigm's early years (*cf.* Clarke, 1973; Critcher, 1971; Hall, 1978) it was not until the 1980s when it became more acceptable in 'sport sociology' circles to do so. The early work of Jennifer Hargreaves (1982, 1986), John Hargreaves (1982, 1987), Robert Hollands (1984), and Richard Gruneau (1983), which utilized Stuart Hall's description of hegemony more explicitly led the way for cultural studies to be used explicitly when referring to the bodily empirical. More recently, in terms of (Physical) Cultural Studies the work of Jennifer Hargreaves and Patricia Vertinsky (2007), Margaret Carlisle Duncan (2007), Alan Ingham (1997), and David Andrews (2002, 2006a, 2007, 2008) have provided direction and definition to the field. Recently David Andrews, in particular, has set out to define what is and is not a Physical Cultural Study. For instance, in 2002, sensing a crisis in the (mis)use of the Cultural Studies label in terms of 'sport sociology', he argued that:

All too often the trite appropriation of cultural studies is manifest in what Gottdiener (2000, p. 7) referred to as the reductive forcing of "complex conceptions into simple catchwords" and the resultant trivialization of the approach to all and sundry. At an even more extreme level of misappropriation, cultural studies is also oftentimes used as an empty

metaphor, a bland descriptor of any study focused on sport as part of the cultural realm. (p. 110)

Given the failure for much of the rest of the academic community to realize that cultural studies is more than a label for studying (popular) culture and sport, even after his “Coming to Terms With Cultural Studies” piece, Andrews has more recently taken an even more overt stance on defining Physical Cultural Studies (cf. 2006b; 2008).

More specifically, he has argued that “Physical Cultural Studies is dedicated to the contextually based understanding of the corporeal practices, discourses, and subjectivities through which active bodies become organized, represented, and experienced in relation to the operations of social power” (2008, p. 54). When conducting such a study there is a call to understand the (physical) body through **ontologically complex ways**, to strongly consider **context and contingency**, and to **articulate how power and politics operate** in/on/through physical culture (2008). Throughout the next two sections I will demonstrate how this project fits and, contributes to the overall Physical Cultural project.

For example, in terms of ontological complexity, and following Ingham’s (1997) belief that there are multiple ways of being physically active, throughout the project I consider various manners that the body, in relation to baseball, can become representative of various types of identificatory (national/raced/classed/gendered) sites. Further adhering to the need for ontological complexity in a Physical Cultural Studies is the fact that I attempt to understand a range of meanings involving baseball and the body from the ‘production and consumption of embodied

performance to the production and consumption of mediated representation of various bodies' (Andrews, 2008, p. 56)..

For example, similar to Samantha King's (2006) *Pink Ribbons, Inc.* this project evaluates a vast empirical subject (in her case Breast Cancer, in mine baseball), and demonstrates how the body can be read as well as perform and play particular ideological functions in society. In so doing it was necessary for me to utilize various forms of methodological and interpretive tools such as ethnography, critical media analysis, film review, interviews, and fieldwork to understand how particular forms of baseball (performance) dialectically engage social society. The interpretive variety in this project is in many ways also influenced by the work of Norman Denzin (2005), Yvonna Lincoln (2005), Joe Kincheloe and Peter McLaren (2005), and Michael Giardina (2005). More specifically, in terms of Physical Cultural Studies this dissertation follows Giardina's lead in *Sporting Pedagogies* through the strong consideration of how sport related (multi)media formations are an incredible source of power in constituting normal national, gendered, raced, and classed culture.

While coming to understand the physical culture of particular baseball related events and communities in an ontologically complex way, I have also taken care to recognize the albeit constantly shifting socio-political context of the contemporary moment. In terms of context and contingency, this requirement in cultural studies forced me to try articulating power dynamics and subsequent iniquitous positions of social ability/mobility in regard to the Little League World Series and Red Sox Nation. Unfortunately, by describing the complexities of social

relations it often becomes easy to ‘speak to the choir’, and not engage those that we are actually trying to reach (cf. Zirin, 2008). For me then the key goal of this project was to make an effort to more accurately create the context from which those involved/invested in the empirical sites that I investigated could begin to make connections/articulations between themselves, others, and ubiquitous and sometimes iniquitous organizations of power³.

Communicating an understanding of *articulation* as a concept and practice is key in addressing both the popular constituencies that this project is trying to reach. Importantly my understanding of articulation is strongly influenced by its earliest purveyors, Erensto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe (1985), and its celebrated ‘torchbearer’, Stuart Hall, who is more readily cited as the originator of the *theory/method* (1985 see also: King, 2005a). Briefly, in the formers’ insightful book, which argued for the co-creation of radical democracy, Laclau and Mouffe argue that articulation is the melding of structural (in)determinism, and cultural hegemony to describe dialectical e/affects of wider societal meanings and individual bodily practices. Using this as a base, Hall expounds on their concept (1986/96) by stating that it should become the ‘core’ of cultural studies work. What is important here is that he explicitly denies both rote Althusarian and Gramscian theoretical structures by tying articulation to the belief that there exists a *non-necessary (non)correspondence* between individual bodily practices and social structures. The nuance Hall adds to Althusser’s and Gramsci’s respective theoretical forays is key in

³ This is outlined much more specifically in the appendix.

that his conception of Cultural Studies requires a twin understanding that both the agent and structure may hold sway in any part of everyday human life.

In other words, while he simultaneously refutes claims for both extreme agential independence and structural determinism, Hall provides leeway to make general claims of (super)structural predispositions, but also allows for the individual choice of the agent. Importantly, sometimes these choices/actions do not necessarily correspond with what the (in)deterministic structure would suggest an individual agents response *should* be. Further, Hall's (1985) article which thinks through Althusser and post-structuralism is most useful in understanding the meaning of articulation, in that he allows that the ideologies and structures of the state exist insofar as they are *contingently determinant* (Andrews, 2004b).

Taking this into account, and regarding the empirical subject of study in Physical Cultural Studies, I further contend that a cultural scholar needs to use their deep, engaged readings of theory, history, and power to help provide a radically contextual (Andrews, 2002, Grossberg, 1997a, Hall, 1992) version of the current socio-political moment. This is, all the more, important in Physical Cultural Studies, because sport and recreational activities tend to be fetishized as apolitical social entities unworthy of critical investigation. The researcher can attempt to work against this simplified view of sport by utilizing an *emergent research design* (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003) while seeking to *articulate* (Hall, 1996) specific cultural formations within "complex social, economic, political, and technological relationships that comprise the social context; recognizing that 'there are no necessary correspondences in history, but history is always the production of such

connections or correspondences' (Grossberg, 1992, p. 60)". Thus I assert that while certain overarching structures do exist, they do not necessarily determine the context and/or effects for every cultural form, or, as Lawrence Grossberg puts it, "the meaning, effects, and politics of particular social events, texts, practices, and structures ... are never guaranteed" (1997, p. 220-21). In other words, it is the duty of the researcher to contextually locate the particular phenomenon that they are studying, and articulate how the structures and agents act on one another to perpetuate a *circuit of culture* (Johnson, 1986/7).

Therefore, and following King (2005a), articulation is not merely a theoretical impulse but a methodological practice. More directly then, when using articulation throughout a cultural studies project, not only is it important to be radically contextual and create the vision from which the author(s) is/are coming from, but it is also "necessary to reconstruct or fabricate the network of social, political, economic, and cultural articulations, or linkages, that produce any particular cultural phenomenon and trace, in turn how the phenomenon (reshapes the formation of which it is a part" (King, 2005a, p. 27). Again this is not an easy practice. As Slack (1996, p. 115) outlines "articulation is not a completely "sewn-up" method but rather a complex, unfinished perspective that continues to emerge genealogically. Second, articulation should not be understood as simply one thing...it has thus emerged unevenly within a configuration of those forces and carries with it "traces" of forces from one piece of scholarly interpretation to another". As such, and following Slack (1996), I would suggest that my dissertation itself, its empirical focus, the language that it uses to critically analyze it, the

articulations I make with particular forms of power, and even the way in which I conducted my research are emblematic of the complexities bourn of aritcularatory research.

Hall's stamp on contemporary physical cultural studies, though at one time considered minimal (Andrews, 2004b, p. 19-20), has expanded quite significantly in recent years. In fact, a significant number of (Physical) Cultural Studies scholars have utilized his general theoretical and methodological approach. For instance, Hall has greatly directed the insightful work by David Andrews (1993) in reference to the use of Foucault, Michael Jordan as a *signifier of transcendent blackness* (Cole & Andrews, 1996), and, the one that perhaps most fits into Hall's image of a cultural study is his work on suburban parenting and schoolchildren (Pitter & Andrews, 1997). (C.L.) Cole has also made theoretical/political strides with her work on Foucault and the body with Giardina and Andrews (2004), and girls involved in the "if you let me play" Nike campaign (1994, 2005). Others who have used the cultural studies influence of Grossberg and Hall (among others) in sport include: Samantha King, on Magic Johnson and AIDS (1993), the politics of Breast Cancer (2006b), and on Pat Tillman and the neoliberal body (2005b, 2006b). Jeremy Howell, David Andrews, and Steven Jackson's (2002) work on the interventionist politics of cultural studies. Michael Silk's reading of the state, ideology, sport, and the body (2002, Silk & Falcous, 2005) (perhaps the child of Hargreaves (1986) and Gruneau et al. (1988, 1989)). Mary McDonald and Caroline Fusco's work on spaces of whiteness (2005b, 2005) have helped open up discussions of the privileged ability of movement. More recently is Josh Newman's work on the University of Mississippi

(2005), NASCAR (2007; 2008), as well as Michael Giardina's pedagogical, (multi)ethnic/national, and political research on Martina Hingis (2001), Bend it Like Beckham (2003), and through his book *Sporting Pedagogies* (2005). Using each of these projects as an (un)official guide to conducting a Physical Cultural Study, I assert that throughout the following, the socio-political context and the way(s) the body is related to and/or part of it in relation to the Little League World Series and Red Sox Nation will be clearly delineated.

Neoliberalism and Physical Culture

Finally, and in attending to the third of Andrews (2008) main tenets of Physical Cultural Studies, this dissertation also considers how power and politics are related to the way we experience everyday life. On that note, cultural studies has a history of delineating popular U.S.-led corporate governmental, economic, social, and individual organizations of power which, as I will address later, allows for more directed articulations between the self and structure. Although this type of work is relatively new it has 'progressed' in a Grossberg/Hallian⁴ sense in that it has gone from simply naming the 'death of the social' (Giroux, 2004b) as symptomatic a/effect of the organizing structure of power in the contemporary moment – neoliberalism - to questioning what neoliberalism is and how it has become manifest in American/Global society.

⁴ In separate articles both Grossberg (1996) and Hall (1989) have argued that cultural studies must use evermore sophisticated theoretical methods to better uncover the pressing social problems of our times. However, in this case progress is less a recapitulatory statement (though it still somewhat is) and more a simultaneous recognition that previous theoretical forays may have been 'right' for that particular moment, and also that that particular moment has passed.

In regard to the study at present **neoliberalism is the global economic shift that has come as a result of a 'hands off' governmental approach to corporate intervention in everyday life, the 'values free' (outside of capital) rise of the 'free market', and the attendant social consequences that has polarized wealth and power in the United States and, indeed, worldwide.**

Simultaneously, as Wendy Brown (2003) surmises, in America this is often competing and/or working with Christian value-laden neoconservatism. In effect, as Brown states, neither should work together, but their non-linear, non-equal twin hold over the United States is undeniable.

More to the point, within academic, political, and, certainly, corporate communities the term neoliberalism is an oft-used concept to describe the dominant socio-political movement of the last 50 years. However, in terms of popular use, neoliberalism is not even recognized by the Microsoft Word spell check just as it is the key social, economic, political, and ideological formation of our times.

In the general public, its use is met with confusion, and misunderstanding. As a former student of mine suggested "neoliberalism must mean more taxes for welfare right?," when nothing could be further from the truth – unless of course he meant corporate welfare⁵. By way of clarification then I will attempt to describe how neoliberalism has risen to the fore, what it means for the people of the United States and the World, and how it has dramatically altered how citizenship is understood and practiced in contemporary American/World society. This, of

⁵ The contemporary Aryan member of neoliberal thought, Ron Paul, may disagree, but it is clear that the way neoliberalism is experienced in America has led to this.

course, will then be articulated to and with (Hall, 1985) the two empirical sites I briefly described above throughout the rest of the dissertation.

Following David Harvey (2005) neoliberalism is the terminology attributed to the general shift away from strict governmental regulation of the marketplace. In America this clearly included a move toward government cooperation with corporate interests. Lawrence Grossberg has further suggested that, “neoliberalism describes the attempt by businesspeople and some economists to make the real world operate according to certain abstract theoretical models” (2005, p. 111-112). This began as a reaction to the fact that “unemployment and inflation were surging” (Harvey, 2005, p. 12) in the United States and other first world countries during the late 1960s and early 1970s.

Since then the downfall of the Bretton Woods agreements, which was designed to prevent international conflict and base national wealth in gold, has given way to the rise of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Trade Organization (WTO) which have assumed power over the modes and effects of trade and financial flows in the contemporary moment (Giroux, 2005a). In so doing, these organizations have been given wide-reaching power over international governance and have subsumed most of the world’s national governments under an international corporate order. Furthermore as Harvey (2005) has delineated some countries have voluntarily taken up neoliberalism, while others have been forced or coerced into it through military incursions, American control over foreign government, and threatened trade sanctions (see: the first 9/11 in Chile, Argentina, Peru, New Zealand, post-Apartheid South Africa, and much of the Middle East).

Regardless of how it has been introduced into various national contexts, generally it is understood that neoliberalism has shifted the power away from national governments (though clearly not all, see Brown, 2003) to the free market and corporations. The general tenants of this type of global rule is that economic policies have been shifted from high value being placed on social welfare, toward the concept that the free market is the most fair way to run the world's society. This form of governance and governmentality (Foucault, 1991) is characterized by: *supply-side economics with little government regulation, every aspect of human life becoming subject to the forces of the market, economic freedom equated with political freedom, and a slide toward radical individualism that is positioned distinctly against collectivity based on the principles of social justice* (Grossberg, 2005).

However, at the same time, in varying national contexts the ruling elite have decided to pose restrictions or devalue particular markets (like child prostitution or work in the household) (Couldry, 2006), while overvaluing entrepreneurial efforts to propel the economy. In terms of the United States the expectation of entrepreneurialism is such that there have been suggestions that "U.S. citizenship be put on sale...to ensure that those arriving are entrepreneurial and will boost tax revenue and capital, rather than seek welfare" (Miller, 2007a, p. 31). In every single (inter)national context the results of neoliberal capitalism have been damning. More to the point I would like to turn the popular arrogant American phrase that

“communism has never worked” around to suggest that “capitalism has never worked” – at least not for the many and particularly not now⁶.

For instance, in the United States, while the stock market has seemingly flourished since the 1970s, it has done so without any actual economic growth (George, 1999, ¶8). In a sense, through mergers, exploitation of overseas labor, and international trade agreements (like NAFTA) corporations have been able to mask the terroristic (Giroux, 2004a; 2005a) reality of this type of governance and governmentality. Public service entities like education, health care, social security, and welfare have been or are threatened by the idea that they should be sold to the highest bidder (George, 1999).

As Debbie Riddle, a current Texas state representative, and Grover Norquist, the president of the Americans for Tax Reform, have suggested, “Where did this idea come from that everybody deserves free education? Free medical care? Free whatever? It comes from Moscow. From Russia. It comes straight out of the pit of hell,” and “My goal is to cut government in half in twenty-five years, to get it down to the size where we can drown it in the bathtub” (Giroux, 2004b, p. 206).

Simultaneous to the retraction of social safety nets, blue-collar and, increasingly, white-collar jobs in America have been shipped to countries offering low-cost labor, which create an attendant, though short-lived, rise in profit for corporations with no

⁶ Perhaps advocates for both rote capitalism and communism need turn to the quality of life provided by the heavily socialist Scandanavian countries, which are among the world’s leaders in technological innovation, lowered crime, and the most advanced social welfare safety nets in the World.

social or political recourse. Coincidentally, the damaging effects of neoliberalism are being felt throughout the country.

For instance, under this type of rule the United States, one of the world's richest economies, revealingly is a society that has a shocking amount of its citizens that are living in poverty (37 million), that suffer from illiteracy (39 million), that cannot become educated by struggling schools, that has no health care coverage (47 million), and that is increasingly difficult to establish rights for laborers (only 1 in 6 are now in a union). Moreover, given the rise to power of corporate constituents who, in turn, fund American politicians (thereby having a huge effect and influence on who gets voted, and their subsequent political choices) often choose to create laws that benefit the rich few over the needs of the many. In short, the (un)written codes of neoliberalism are the underlying reasons why local governments choose to give tax reprieves to businesses like Wal-Mart, or rich owners can create nomadic sports franchises that require taxpayer supported entertainment facilities instead of funneling that money to underfunded schools and social welfare programs (Zirin, 2008).

Despite the fact that the majority of American people are quite literally being "sold out" by the principles of the contemporary socio-economic condition, they often staunchly defend it or do not possess the tools to sufficiently critique it (Miller, 2007b). To be sure, the idea of radical individualism is compelling to the point that there is an implicit belief that each person is worth what they have to offer society. However, this conveniently overlooks the fact that not every person in America has the same *opportunity* to demonstrate/practice their individual self-worth.

Moreover, since those in power are overwhelmingly upper-class, white, heterosexual, men they are often unwilling/unable to offer opportunities to “others”.

Further, since most of the people that find themselves in a position of power in the contemporary moment either got there through the implicit benefits of their original social position, or are one of the rare few to break through the destructive social structure created by neoliberalism, they have become either icons of the system or create (multi)media entities that celebrate it (Andrews, 2001; Cole & Andrews, 2000). In other words, those in or who came to power through neoliberalism, overwhelmingly own the means of (multi)media communication for which the many derive much of their information. As such, unless it will earn them profit, these individuals are highly unlikely to be critical of the corrupt system that has allowed them to reach their current status of power, wealth, and comfort.

I would also argue that the implementation and practice of neoliberalism in America has contributed to an highly individualistic society, that holds little in the way of empathy for raced/classed/gendered/sexual/(dis)abled others. Indeed some individuals from the middle and working class do rise from difficult positions to “make it” in American society, but often they still work in the service of the upper-class (Collins & Yeskel, 2000). Yet through media-based influences, and personal beliefs born of neoliberal ideologies, these people often place the blame on the working poor who do not “make it” as lazy, unwilling, or unlucky (see: Beck, 2007). In other words, through the a/effects of neoliberalism the upper-class has facilitated a situation whereby the middle and lower classes (which have much more in

common with each other than either do with the upper class) continue to blame one another for the country's social ills, while simultaneously the upper-class continues to garner more capital, pay less percentage of their income in taxes (Bawden, 2007), lay off more workers (Uchitelle, 2006), and create more news stories that blame everyone else but themselves (*cf.* Beck, 2007) for the current state of devastation that is contemporary America.

Interestingly, while the American infrastructure seems to be collapsing under the weight of corporations seeking a new way to garner profit, the alluring power of the multi-media coupled with the effects of corporate entities dominating other countries (see: Mexico, Dominican Republic, Cuba, Latin America, and South America), has led to a point where people from those countries are fleeing to the United States hoping for a better life. What these people find is that their opportunities are limited, their presence in America is undesired, and that their chances at any sort of upward mobility are minimal at best (Hernandez, 2004).

Given the influx of Spanish-speaking individuals in the United States, caused, in part, by the international reaction to neoliberalism, everyday life in America has shifted. With a new market to exploit corporations are attempting to appeal to Spanish-speakers by imploring that the language be taught in schools (Ray, 2000), and that the language is included in restaurant menus, bathroom doors, and television channels is good for business (Price, J. H., 2002). Quite hypocritically, given that it is the system that benefits them that has laid the foundation for this situation, the white right openly complains about the loss of American culture due to the influx of immigrants into the United States (*cf.* Berlant, 1997; Woolridge,

2007). Simultaneously, this form of ethnocentrism appeals to the American working class, because they have been convinced, in part, by multi-media entities, owned by the upper-class, that immigrants are taking *their* jobs and culture (Woolridge, 2007).

A few examples of the earlier type of theorizing the neoliberal moment in (Physical) cultural studies can be seen through Allen Ingham (1985), Pierre Bourdieu⁷ (1998), Stuart Hall's (1979) 'Great Moving Right Show', and, perhaps most importantly in regard the project at present are the writings of Henry Giroux (most especially *The Abandoned Generation* (2003)). This type of theorizing has inspired countless articles in the cultural study of sport that cut and pasted the, at the time, nebulous term neoliberalism into their argument for why the world was 'wrong' (see: roughly pre-2005/6 work by Andrews; Cole, 2000; Cole, Giardina, & Andrews, 2004; Fusco, 2005; Giardina & McCarthy, 2004; pre-2006 King; Lowes, 2002, 2004; McDonald, 2005b; pre-2005/6 Silk; White). These works, and others, generally outlined how 'neoliberalism' and its dialectic relationship with sport and society was contributing to a social moment that erased 'real' problems and reified the accumulation of physical, cultural, and social capital at the cost of progressive social change.

However, there was a real need for someone to incisively define (however contingently) what neoliberalism was and how it specifically worked as an

⁷ Though as McRobbie (2005) states Bourdieu has renounced the cultural studies project his work is theoretically useful in thinking through socio-cultural issues.

organization of power on, in and through (sporting) spaces, people, and spectacles. In addressing this general shortcoming, Lawrence Grossberg's (2005) book *Caught in the Crossfire* was one of the key instances where an author specifically outlined what neoliberalism was and how it was becoming manifest in our contemporary social moment. Throughout the text, Grossberg outlined that neoliberalism was not this uncontested political entity that many earlier academic forays had implicitly suggested, and instead argued that these were more complicated times.

Thus, though neoliberalism had a stronghold throughout the United States (and many other countries), it was constantly competing against, working with, and gaining/losing ground to other general categories of dominant socio-political organizations of power like liberalism, conservatism, and neoconservatism (Harvey, 2005). Taking cue from Grossberg, David Harvey's book *A Brief History of Neoliberalism* (2005) even more specifically outlines how neoliberalism came into power and how its power is maintained in different national contexts (i.e. George W. Bush's use of religion to garner the general support of American people, whereas in other countries this could not and has not been employed).

Prior to Harvey's book, Peck and Tickell's (2002), and Brenner and Theodore's (2002) journal articles in *Antipode* also describe how neoliberalism has become manifest in contemporary society, and the importance of demarcating the points where the a/effectivity of neoliberalism dialectically acts on and is acted upon in different spatial situations. Finally, in pulling all of this together, Grossberg's (2006) article in *Cultural Studies* argues that to best work against this myopic social moment (con)textually 'we must be conjuncturally specific when we

are conjecturally discussing the e/effects of neoliberalism on, in, and through the contemporary moment' (p. 13). The arguments posed in America from intellectuals, the media, and politicians from both the left and right on (supporters of) neoliberalism, far from meeting in the middle, actually coalesce (quite unfortunately) to the right of center. Therefore, rather than serve moderate interests, the current regime of neo-liberal dominated political power in the U.S. claims to appeal to the left by being 'democratic', and 'anti-racist/-(hetero)sexist/-classist', while stressing that anyone can be economically successful in this society. However, in its practice, the current socio-political moment effectively perpetuates historical inequities by providing a space for claims that discriminatory practices no longer exist, but refusing to acknowledge that the past has a deep effect on the present – evidenced by the aforementioned if too succinctly put “death of the social” (Giroux, 2004b). Thus neo-liberalism is able to reaffirm the power status and interests of white, heterosexual, men while gaining the consent of the (un)knowing masses who constantly fall for its civically empty ideology (see: Harvey, 2005, p. 38).

Importantly, this type of thinking has very recently found its way into physical cultural studies of sport in the form of the Silk and Andrews (2006) article “The Fittest City in America”. Though not the only physical cultural study to heed this new call for conjunctural specificity (Grossberg, 2006) in regard to the theoretical use of neoliberalism (cf. Newman & Giardina, 2008), it is an important marker for newer ways that the term is used to underpin Physical Cultural Studies. More to the point, throughout the article, which is an update (empirically and theoretically) from Friedman, Andrews, and Silk’s (2004) “Camdenization” article,

the reader can easily discern the theoretical leaps taken in the past few years in regard to the way neoliberal power blocs operate and work on space – particularly the influence that Grossberg (2005, 2006), Harvey (2005), Peck and Tickell (2002), and Brenner and Theodore (2002) have had on the contextually specific and ironic use of space across race/class/gender lines especially in regard to ‘fitness’ and the care of self in Baltimore, Maryland.

The focus on the mediated and performing body is important in terms of this project in terms of the way that it describes the power of the media as a (re)producer of particular forms of ‘common sense’. As such throughout the substantive portion to follow is a consideration of how power and politics is demonstrated through the careful explication of how the messy, often contradictory, ideologies and practice of American neoliberal empire (Pieterse, 2007) work on/in/through the various bodies and communities in relation to the Little League World Series and Red Sox Nation.

Method(s) of Inquiry: Interpretive (Micro)Ethnography and Critical Discursive Analysis

To gather the best possible information in which to view and experience the Little League World Series and Red Sox Nation calls for a creative project which obtains knowledge in multiple, and perhaps, conflicting ways. Like John Amis (2005), “I enjoy the process of exploration, of discovery, of uncovering some of what is happening in the world around us, and trying to understand why it is happening” (p. 104). In order to do so for this project I utilized the multi-method approach advocated by Andrews (2008a) in order to glean information from several different sources and experiences, thereby (hopefully) analyzing the vast empirical setting(s)

through which the LLWS and Red Sox Nation is viewed/understood/lived. As such, for this dissertation my study combined a micro-ethnographic (in terms of time immersed in the research setting) engagement with the empirical settings, and a critical understanding of the dominant discursive constructions offered through a reading of the various (multi)media entities describing both empirical sites.

Through these methodologies I adhere to Samantha King's notion that: Contextual cultural studies analysis makes no pretensions to scientific objectivity or political disinvestment. It assumes that all scholarship is partial (that is, incomplete and partisan) and that our research methods and theories cannot be usefully distinguished from their social origins and institutional locations for these origins and locations shape the research questions that we ask and the processes that we follow. However, research in cultural studies goes further than other methodologies that refuse claims to objectivity in that it is always undertaken – explicitly – as a response to and intervention in political and social conditions. (2005a, p. 28)

Taking this into account I assert that my political and social stances had serious consequences on what, who, and how I engage and interpret my two sites of analysis.

For example *microethnography* (Wolcott, 1995) is one of the ways I recorded human behavior surrounding the Little League and Red Sox Nation communities.

Adhering to Barbara Tedlock's view:

Wherever ethnographic research has been adopted, a key assumption has been that by entering into close and relatively prolonged interaction with

people (one's own or other) in their everyday lives, ethnographers can better understand the beliefs, motivations, and behaviors of their subjects than they can by using any other approach. (2000, p. 456)

This notion is a key one in that following the arguments presented by Denzin and Lincoln (2005), and Atkinson, Coffey, and Delamont (1999), whereby the world is subjectively and socially constructed, then *ethnography* was a hands-on method for observing the 'realities of human social interaction' (Plymire, 2005, p. 147).

Furthermore, and following Michael Silk, "this perspective employs 'semi-structured' forms of data collection such as interviews, observations, textual analysis, verbal description and explanation as opposed to quantitative measurement and statistical analysis" (2005, p. 73-74). As such, in conducting this research microethnography required a heavy reliance on "verbal descriptions and explanations" (Hammersley, 1992, p. 161) of specific phenomena, garnered by participating in the lives of those involved with the event(s), studying what happened around me generally, taking note as to what is said and by whom, and posing questions (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995). More recently, the use of video cameras to capture activities has also been a part of qualitative research (Hocking, 2003). Though I certainly understand that the use of video cameras can prompt/elicit/prohibit behavior (Pink, 2001), when used in conjunction with other 'traditional' forms of ethnographic research, this approach allowed for me to better observe and comprehend the interpretively, physically, and expressively fluid cultural intricacies underpinning, and shaped by, the two cultural phenomena (Silk, 2002).

Many also suggest that ethnographic data gathering and collection is emergent, in that data only comes to the fore when the researcher recognizes and takes note of it (Denzin, 2000; Plymire, 2005; Silk, 2005, 2002). Thus conducting what Wolcott (1995) terms *microethnography* allowed for me to enter the setting to observe what I experienced. While deciding between what constitutes a microethnography and ethnography conjures up similar debates between as to what physical activity is a sport and what is ethnography suggests a lengthy engagement with a cultural phenomenon or community without a time limit, whereas a microethnography is temporally bound by constraints on the researcher (Wolcott, 1995). Thus, different from a traditional ethnography, the difficulty in conducting a microethnography is that it is temporarily bound by the events being studied, rather than striving for the 'full immersion' (Smith, 2001, p. 220) guideline suggested for traditional ethnographic research. In the case of the 2003 Little League World Series, my fieldwork was approximately 21 days, and for the 2007 Red Sox season 9 months. Given the constraint of time this often lead to unwieldy, disconnected, information as well as frustrating minutes, hours, and even days of enduring "wild goose chases", where I obtained little or no relevant data in regard to their project (Silk, 2002, 2005). However, to best reflect the somewhat frenetic pace of a baseball tournament and season, and taking into account that a new year and season often brings new narratives to the fore that do not always connected to the previous year I chose to press forward with this form of fieldwork.

Perhaps, even more frustrating, is the stark reality that when pursuing irrelevant information, at the time, I had no idea that it was meaningless to the

project. Thus, during this process I experienced a volatile mix of emotions while coming to terms with the reality that there was a high level of uncertainty, with no safety net to fall back on, when collecting my data. To be sure, while reflecting on my research, many nights were focused on what more I had to do, or should have done, rather than working with what was gathered. The daunting contingency for an (micro)ethnographer is that, while suffering through these periods of self-doubt, I had to continue to observe, write⁸, and maintain a critical view of my surroundings; lest I miss a 'diamond in the rough', or a recording the banal which later becomes important (Silk, 2005).

Another, related problem that created problems when I conducted my micro-ethnographies, was the extreme urgency placed on my ability to enter the empirical setting, and become 'immersed' in the phenomena quickly in order to obtain a thorough understanding of the empirical before it 'vanishes' (Fetterman, 1989; Wolcott, 1995). Immersion has long been the gold standard for describing the breadth and depth that one is attempting to reach when conducting ethnographic research (Fetterman, 1989). Some have even suggested that it takes at least 18 months and up to 3 years to properly immerse oneself in the field, and gain a deep understanding of a culture(al) formation (Andrews, *personal communication*; 2007; Silk, *personal communication*, 2005). As mentioned previously, for the project at hand I spent approximately three weeks at the 2003 Little League World Series and about one full season (2007) in contact with Red Sox Nation. However, this contact

⁸ Though separated by four years, and often unintelligible to other readers, field notes can be gathered and made available for the committee.

in some cases was only media based (internet, books, television), and forced me to make important choices about whether or not to attend games (31 of 32 at the LLWS and 31 games out of 162 for the Red Sox), engage in discussions with key members of the Little League community, meet members of Red Sox Nation at sports bars or community events, or remain at home to watch the live television feed while working on my project. Worse yet, individual, monetary, transportation, and academic forces and responsibilities did not allow me total freedom to be observe, and experience what I would have wanted to.

Thus, in some senses I could not become 'immersed' with a particular sects of either empirical setting, using traditional ethnographic standards. However, since most individuals following the Little League World Series and/or the Boston Red Sox have similar constraints on how they can experience being a member of either community, what I did was gain an understanding of what it might be like to follow the LLWS tournament or the Red Sox as an avid fan. Moreover, to eschew an ethnographic approach merely because of the belief that I was not able to 'completely' immerse myself, would fall into the positivistic notion that if I were able to gather enough data I could ever triangulate (Denzin, 1978, Flick, 1998: in Richardson, 2000) my findings into a recreation of 'the truth'.

Laurel Richardson perhaps best puts to rest the false notion that anyone could 'triangulate' one 'truth' in qualitative research to with her concept of *crystallization* by stating that:

The crystal ... combines symmetry and substance with an infinite variety of shapes, substances, transmutations, multi-dimensionality, and angles of

approach. Crystals grow, change, alter but are not amorphous. Crystals are prisms that reflect externalities *and* refract within themselves, creating different colors, patterns, and arrays, casting off in different directions. What we see depends upon our angle of repose. Not triangulation, crystallization. In postmodernist mixed-genre texts, we have moved from plane geometry to light theory, where light can be *both* waves *and* particles. (2000, p. 934)

Therefore, I would suggest that experiencing the two sites as an actual “tournament attendee” or “Red Sox Nation member” for a season provided a ‘sense’ of what it was like to be a part of the community - particularly by engaging with the multiple and messy refractions of production/consumption/reception of meaning(s) involving both research sites. At the same time, I realize that by not attending all 32 2003 LLWS tournament games, or the full 162 games of the Red Sox Season, either at a sports bar, watching all the games at home, or at Williamsport/Fenway Park and all the away venues (which would have been physically impossible unless I could be in five places at once), the crystal of understanding that I was able to create was far from ‘complete’ – which speaks volumes to Richardson’s (2000) notion that no one *truth* can be culled from ethnographic observation, recording, and presentation. As such, what this means is that I was forced to make use of other avenues of gathering information, like: *multimedia documentation* (Preston & Kerr, 2001); *observations*, and *purposive interviews* with key members of both organizations and the media, the Little League and Red Sox websites; and, records of the broadcasts of games.

Further, through an analysis of (multi)media texts, interviews, field notes, and thorough review of television broadcasts, internet websites, and filmic representations of the Little League World Series, Boston, and Red Sox Nation I was able to uncover a comprehensive account of what it ‘means’ to be a part of the two communities, and used this information in the critical reading, and writing process. In what follows then, is how I will demonstrate the strategies used to interpret the empirical evidence I gathered during the research process.

In addition to ethnographic research, the multi-mediated texts I reviewed were analyzed appropriating a similar qualitative methodology to that of Gruneau, Whitson, and Cantelon (1988), in order to better grasp the preferred discourse(s) surrounding the event. I found their methodology useful in the both research contexts. Moreover the methods in which Gruneau et al. (1988) advocate “reading” (multi)media texts (program flow, sequencing/segmenting, use of graphics) worked well in advancing a qualitative analysis of events/experiences that closely allies itself with my ontological and epistemological underpinnings. To that point they state:

We found that quantitative content analysis techniques actually work against an understanding of many of the most important discursive features of sport programming, precisely because they require that one decontextualize in order to quantify. An appropriate analogy might be the study of a Shakespearian play where the sentence is used as a unit of analysis. Counting instances of literary devices, or even thematic elements (would it really matter how many metaphors there are in Othello?) runs the risk of

losing all sense of the meanings and associations created through the use of specific literary forms, and conjunctures and disjunctures in the text.

(Gruneau et al., 1988, p. 271-272)

Eventually, my initial interpretations of the empirical was carefully constructed by means of *peer debriefing*, *audit trails*, and *member checking* (Guba & Lincoln, 1994; Hanson & Newburgh, 1992; Silk, 2002, 2005) to help uncover any “biases, clarify interpretations, and check the coherence and logic of the interpretations and conclusions” (Silk, 2001, p. 782). In practice, I discussed my understandings of the ‘data’ that was collected with fellow University of Maryland students, checked my interviews, and use of quotes, with all parties cited within the following pages, and conducted frequent discussions on previous drafts of my chapters with family members and friends that held both supportive and conflicting views to my own (special thanks to all who helped with this). Through these actions I was able to elicit new, extra, and missing elements to my existing ‘data’. Simultaneously, it would be shortsighted and, positivistic, to suggest that the aforementioned methods of checking the acceptable nature of my interpretations could produce one valid truth (Sparkes, 1995). Rather, this process was just another attempt to *crystallize* (Richardson, 2000) these interpretations into one version of the ‘truth’.

Thus, what I do have, as a result of my qualitative research on the Little League World Series and Red Sox Nation, is a location of myself in the world defined by:

... a set of interpretive, material practices [I] make th[is] world visible. These practices transform the world. They turn the world into a series of representations, including field notes, interviews, conversations, photographs, recordings, and memos to the self. At this level, qualitative research involves an interpretive, naturalistic approach to the world. This means that qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or to interpret phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them.

(Denzin, 2003, p. 4-5)

Importantly, in terms of adhering to Denzin's (2000) challenging proposal that qualitative research should enact social change, there is a real need to communicate this "world" of information to others. Not surprisingly, like everything else in qualitative methodology, even the expression of the researcher's findings has come under question by (post)modern thinking on the subject (Denzin & Lincoln, 2007). Further, this questioning has led to a three pronged crisis: *legitimation*, *representation*, and *praxis*.

These crisis have led Andrew Sparkes to take the stance that:

No textual staging can ever be innocent. Whose voices are included in the text, and how they are given weight and interpreted, along with questions of priority and juxtaposition, are not just textual strategies, but are political concerns that have moral consequences. How we as researchers choose to write about others has profound implications, not just for how readable the

text is, but also for how the people the text portrays are “read” and understood. (1995, p. 159)

In other words, some newer qualitative research (to which I strongly adhere) has begun to inquire about who determines whether or not the researchers truth is reasonable (see: Clifford and Marcus, 1986), who ‘speaks’ in the texts produced by the researcher (see: Richardson, 2000; Sykes, Chapman & Swedburg, 2005), and, therefore, what the researchers goals should be when communicating their findings (see: Denzin, 2000, Denzin, 2005; Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Lincoln, 2005). Thus the key question(s) becomes, if I claim to be trying to enact progressive social change should I be writing in clear, dare I say, non-academic language, or should I try to communicate complex understandings of the social world in ways that are generally difficult to comprehend? In many ways I attempt to reach both audiences, by allowing my interviewees, family, friends, and academic colleagues to read several versions of this project throughout the writing process, my goal was to create a dissertation that both ‘spoke’ to the general public, and, as a project, push the boundaries of Physical Cultural Studies.

This debate, and even my choices are part of a larger argument in the academy, and in the popular press. Currently this clash rests between those who side with Norman Denzin’s position that “asks how words, texts, and their meanings play a pivotal part in the culture’s ‘decisive performances of race, class [and] gender’” (2002, p. 484), and Peter Manning’s who states “ethnography must now address the sources of experience and context rather than focusing on the abstract

questions of how to represent this” (2002, p. 496). While the argument may seem petty, the issues surrounding it are weighty, to say the least.

In regard to my dissertation, I chose to oscillate between the progressive thoughts, feelings, and actions of Denzin, particularly when conducting research, and the traditional forms of expression advocated by Manning while trying to complete my dissertation. As such I actively engaged in the “intertwined problems of subjectivity, authority, authorship, reflexivity, and process on the one hand and representational forms on the other” (Richardson, 2000, p. 930), while trying to create a project that was a “substantive contribution, has aesthetic merit, is reflexive, impactful, and expresses reality” (Richardson, 2000, p. 937). In what follows I will briefly outline how the substantive portion of my project unfolded.

Project Breakdown

This dissertation project is one that uses a similar theoretical thread, in this case national identity and citizenship, to combine four separate, but related, empirical studies into one complete document. Given this context, the reader may notice that the four substantive chapters are of different length, and are written in slightly different tones which reflect the fact that each were created at different times in my doctoral career and, for different academic audiences. At the same time however, the goal was to use these empirical studies to demonstrate how normalized American national citizenship and national identity have been produced, mediated, and performed in the contemporary moment at the Little League World Series and in relation to Red Sox Nation. In what follows, is a brief outline of how

each chapter is both a stand alone academic journal article, and contributes as an important part of this dissertation.

For instance, the first chapter, *The Networked Production of the 2003 Little League World Series: Narrative of American Innocence*, was accepted into the *International Journal of Media and Cultural Politics* (June 2008). This chapter utilizes a micro-ethnographic (Wolcott, 1995) account of the production practices at the 2003 LLWS, and focuses on the discursive construction as well as dominant meanings created by the producers of the (mediated) tournament. In the post 9/11 context, whereby American media formations were working against the globalizing forces of cultural citizenship in an attempt to (re)create what it meant to be a good U.S. national citizen, this chapter describes the efforts of the producers to situate America as an innocent country in relation to all the world's ills.

The second chapter, *Danny Almonte: Discursive Construction(s) of (Im)igrant citizenship in Neoliberal America*, is an updated version of a paper that was a finalist for the 2006 North American Society for the Sociology of Sport Barbara Brown Student Paper Award, and is being revised for resubmission for the *Sport Sociology Journal* (Fall 2007). This chapter offers a critical evaluation of the discursive construction of former Little League star pitcher Danny Almonte. Almonte was an illegal immigrant to the United States, and pitched for the team from Bronx, New York. During his time as a national superstar Almonte was given the key to New York City, met with President George W. Bush (who's last public appearance at a sporting event pre 9/11/01 was at the 2001 LLWS with Almonte), and was cast as the typical neoliberal American success story. However, when it was discovered

that Almonte had effectively cheated to participate in the LLWS, regressive discourses of 'invading immigrants destroying the fabric of America' resurfaced.

For chapter three, I shift focus to the Red Sox Nation cultural community. This chapter, *Setting the Stage: Constructing 'Normalized' Citizenship in Red Sox Nation Through Film*, is being prepared for the journal *Communication and Critical Cultural Studies*. As noted previously Red Sox Nation is an almost entirely corporately defined media based entity. Thus it is important to understand the discursive construction of a 'normal' citizen in Red Sox Nation. In an effort to do so this chapter looks at two stereotypical members of Red Sox Nation as created through the films *Good Will Hunting* and *Fever Pitch*. The former provides a look at the "true" Sox fan, whilst the latter is a description of the corporate "Red Sox Nation" citizen. By critically evaluating both films I hope to set the context for which actual Red Sox fans could use as a referent which determines (un)acceptable behavior for a citizen of Red Sox Nation.

The fourth chapter, *Playing their Part: Red Sox Nation 2007*, is being submitted to the 2008 NASSS Barbara Brown Student Paper Award competition, as well as, the *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* (pending the award results and critiques⁹). This chapter is the resultant monograph of my season-long ethnography of Red Sox Nation, which was conducted in order to deconstruct/reconstruct the dominant mythologies formulated around the cultural formation. Within the

⁹ Please note that this is not an arrogant expectation that this paper will win the award, but rather an explanation for how I intend to adhere to the rules of submission laid out by the North American Society for the Sociology of Sport.

chapter I outline my experiences following the team at home and away venues, online, and at sports bars around the United States.

My understandings of these experiences are augmented within the chapter through discussions with fellow members of Red Sox Nation, key local and national media members, and various individuals that work for the Red Sox organization. Throughout this analysis I attempted to make key articulations between the discursive construction of the normalized (multi)media Red Sox Nation citizen, and my observations of normalized behavior within the community. Further this articulation is considered in terms of the socio-political context of the city of Boston, its populace, and the fans of the Boston Red Sox.

Finally the (in)conclusive chapter of my dissertation will formulate coherent thread(s) of meaning through which I will have come to understand how citizenship in neoliberal America has had a profound effect on the various ways the Little League World Series and Red Sox Nation is experienced, celebrated, (re)created, and (re)presented. Importantly, this portion of the dissertation will speak to the multiple, fractured, coinciding, and opposing forces within the two sites which speaks to the complexities of white, neoliberal, ethnic, class, gender, sexual, subject-positions; particularly how these different identity formations are normalized and oppositional subjectivities are “othered” both within the cultural formation and, by extension in the (inter)national popular.

Most of all this chapter of the dissertation will in some cases, be (somewhat intentionally) challenging, and (hyperbolically) critical to the reader and/or producers of the Little League World Series and Red Sox fans, but this is because we

are living in a dangerous time (Denzin, 2001; Giroux, 2003) where an intense type of response by critical scholars is required to 'wake up' the (inter)national popular from the general malaise of, and indifference toward the neo-liberal slide (George, 1999). As such this chapter will speak to the social inequities and injustices reified and reinforced through my research focus and that:

It is up to the poets, writers, artists, and scholars in cultural studies to try to make sense of what is happening; to seek nonviolent [sic] regimes of truth that honor culture, universal human rights, and the sacred; and to seek critical methodologies that protest, resist, and help us represent and imagine radically free utopian spaces. *Silence is not an option!* Remaining silent is to be in collusion with this immoral political regime: remaining silent is to allow evil to happen. (Denzin & Giardina, 2007, p. 10)

Moreover, rather than leave the reader with a critical cultural evaluation of the Little League World Series and Red Sox Nation that will more than likely cast doubt as to what 'good' can come from the community, it is my goal to adhere to a Freirean (1974) *Pedagogy of Hope*.

In other words rather than simply criticize the Little League World Series and Red Sox Nation, through the help of others in conjunction with my own socio-political stance, I aim to offer morally and more socially just methods of experiencing, mediating, and understanding Red Sox Nation and the Little League World Series. Thus, following Denzin and Giardina (2006, p. xxii) this dissertation is my attempt at being a *prophetic pragmatist* who "as moral agents understand that the consequences of their interventions into the world are exclusively political,

judged always in terms of their contributions to a politics of liberation, love, caring, and freedom (and) ... an ethic of hope and forgiveness". As such, and by way of closing the opening, the following is intended to be a concentrated critique of Bush-era America, neoliberal corporate capitalism, and hegemonic forms of identity, in the hope that there will be better days ahead.

Chapter I: Revisiting the Networked Production of the 2003 Little League World Series: Narrative of American Innocence

2003 LLWS: media, spectacle, sovereignty?

Despite Richard Johnson's (1986/7) treatise on the importance of understanding the relationships between the political, economic and cultural conditions of television production *and* the actual labour processes involved in the creation of meaning, scholarship has tended to be dominated by analysis of the components of the output: the televised *product*. This aberration has, in part, and with regard to our specific focus on televised sport, been addressed by a burgeoning number of scholars (see e.g. Gruneau, 1989; MacNeill, 1996; Silk, 2002; Silk & Amis, 2000; Stoddart, 1994) who have immersed themselves—through ethnographic oriented methodologies—within the practices of production. While the horrific events of September 11th may not be a teleological fault line (see: Ladson-Billings, 2001), the fallout from this day has created a more complex, disordered, paradoxical, and unexpected social climate that “involves a multidimensional mixture of production and effects of the global economy and capitalist market system, new technologies and media, expanded judicial and legal modes of governance, and emergent modes of power, sovereignty, and resistance” (Kellner, 2002a, p. 293). Among the many ‘entanglements’ (Sassen, 2002) brought to the fore by this day, are the multiple and often competing arguments concerning the imminent demise of nation state politics, an emergent transnational or global politics (possibly guided by a hegemonic superpower), and, of those institutions mediate, or bridge the gap, between trans- and internationalism, that is, between

the emerging globalism and the traditional system of nation states (Dallmayr, 2002; Johnson, 2002; Kellner, 2002b; Sassen, 2002).

Not surprisingly, the ways in which global, national, and local scenes and events intersect in the contemporary world, following September 11th, 2001, have become the fodder on which the national media dine, on the menu as it were in news coverage (see: Butler, 2002, Johnson, 2002) and in the more (un)expected cantinas of entertainment—the nebulous terror threat in Fox’s 24, the treatment of “Arab” characters in WWE’s Summer Slam series, the filmic version of flight United 93, and, the revival of Cold War rhetoric in Disney’s *Miracle* offer a few, yet poignant examples. Indeed, televised sport became what Silk & Falcous (2005) termed a particularly ‘lustrous’ space in which mediated sport was appropriated and mobilized as part of the affective orientation of popular-commodity-signs in regard to the organization and discipline of daily life in the service of particular political agendas. Subsequently, a number of scholars have focused on the texts of mediated sport after September 11th, 2001, arguing, not surprisingly given veritable ‘conditions’ of cultural production, that sport coverage served US corporo-political needs and opined a myopic expression of American jingoism, militarism and geo-political domination (see among others Hogan, 2003; Kusz, 2006; Silk & Falcous, 2005; Silk, Bracey & Falcous 2007). Yet, while the text may have been somewhat foregrounded in these analyses, far less is known about the institutional and social conditions of production and how this impacted upon the labor processes. Indeed, it would be remiss to ‘isolate’ (Williams, 1980) the text or to treat the post-9/11 period as one in which the conditions of production have been static. We would

argue the opposite, and suggest that the conditions of cultural production—the economic, political, and, cultural tensions and ambiguities—are very much transient and subject to change in this period as the current administration came to terms with the terror attack, offered its response, and, subsequently, at the time of writing, reflects on its political and militaristic position. Thus, following Williams (1980) and through a mediated sport spectacle, a space where nationalisms, internationalisms and transnationalisms interact in complex and frequently potent and emotive ways, we offer an analysis that begins to think through how the active relationships that constitute the practice of televised sport production and the conditions of practice interact to constitute the components of the televised product. To do so, we “rethink” (McDonald and Birrell, 1999, p. 295), the media production of the 2003 Little League World Series (LLWS), a seemingly banal youth sporting competition, through the adoption of a methodology that aids our “uncovering, foregrounding, and producing counter-narratives” that allow us to unearth, and “make visible,” the contemporaneous politics of popular representation through which the viewing public was invited to formulate a normalized (yet, inveterately ideological) understanding of, and largely uncritical attitude toward the United States, its government, and its policies. Following Debord’s (1994) broader polemic of a spectacular society in which the spectacle serves, the balance of this paper focuses on the production of the 2003 LLWS media ‘spectacle’, offering analysis of the relationships between the singular spectacular event (Tomlinson 2002)—the LLWS—that cannot be divorced from the society of the spectacle of which it is a constituent and constituting element.

Contextualizing the LLWS

At the end of each summer in Williamsport, Pennsylvania, a group of children gather to play baseball for a two-week long tournament—the Little League World Series (LLWS). The event represents a particularly complex sporting convocation, given that baseball is still positioned as the American national pastime even in the age of *World Series of Poker*, *X-Games*, and *Dancing with the Stars*.

Building upon the growing number of critical investigations into the labor practices and processes associated with televised sport production (see Gruneau 1989; MacNeill 1996; Silk 1999; 2002; Silk & Amis 2000; Silk, Amis & Slack 2000), this study offers an ethnographically oriented account of both the labor, and indeed the laborers, responsible for the production of 2003 LLWS television broadcasts¹⁰. More specifically, this study focuses on the micropolitics of production (the power and ability to represent the televised event emphasizing certain elements while downplaying, or even ignoring, others), and the ways in which they related to the macropolitics of the contemporary American moment (the discursive modes through which America has come to understand itself). Thus, given the wider political, economic, and cultural experience of our present, it is important to locate televised sport production in the United States, and indeed the production of the

¹⁰ In addition to observations, semi-structured interviews (Fetterman, 1989) were conducted with LLC's volunteer "uncles", security members, media and publications departments, ABC's entire features production crew, researchers, the *Lamade* Stadium graphics team, the "A" announcing team, as well as the *Lamade* Stadium game director, producer, and co-ordinator. Further, formal, semi-structured interviews (Amis, 2005), were conducted with key actors (Fetterman, 1989) of LLC and ABC that centred on the dominant meanings ABC wished to advance through the production of the LLWS. Finally, following the event, and to supplement the interview and observation data, the to-air broadcast of the entire 2003 LLWS tournament was analysed using a semiotic methodology advocated by Gruneau et al. (1988).

2003 LLWS, as key space where nationalisms, internationalisms and transnationalisms interact in complex and frequently potent and emotive ways to inform and influence our everyday lives.

Founded in 1947 as a four-team, single-elimination, event featuring four sides from within the United States, by 2003 the tournament had grown to incorporate teams from 105 countries who compete in 16,000 games over 45 days for the privilege of reaching the LLWS tournament in Williamsport. From the outset, and perhaps not unexpectedly, given the ‘moral right’ and ‘superior’ status historically bestowed upon it through proximal contamination by the seeping doctrine of American Exceptionalism (cf. Ferguson 2004; Hardt & Negri 2004; Sennet 1999), the Little League World series has historically been about inculcating Young Americans and their foreign counterparts with hyper-conservative ideals. These principles, characterized by ‘family values, traditional gender roles, youthful innocence, in addition to a love of God, country, and capitalism’ (See: Van Auken & Van Auken, 2001) run distinctly against a Communist-inspired “Godless ideology” of equality, social justice and welfare (Herbert Brownell Jr., Attorney General of the United States, 1954 Little League World Series program, in Van Auken & Van Auken 2001, p. 64).

Over the past half century, the tournament has morphed into the ‘official’ *World Championship of Little League Baseball* (Musburger, 2001; Van Auken & Van Auken, 2001), in which the understanding of the world is prefigured on the centrality and preeminence of the United States and things ‘American’. As such the LLWS has sought to guard its masculinist, hegemonic vision of America, through

initiatives which have served to: protect this sporting space from female intrusion (LLWS had to back down after several court decisions based on Title IX in 1974, allowing girls to compete¹¹); police non-American successes (international teams were banned for one year in 1974 for, of all things, emphasizing winning, while at the time of writing, all 141 award winners found in the Little League Hall of Excellence were US citizens); ban all national anthems except the Star Spangled banner until 2002 (and still only play abbreviated versions of the anthems of international teams); and, alter LLWS rules to ensure a team representing the United States would always appear in the final (following an all International final in 1985¹²) (Van Auken & Van Auken, 2001). The last rule change was strongly suggested by ABC (LLCo, personal communication, 2003) and speaks to the notion that any hope for cultural diversity and respect will necessarily be set aside when national market-value comes in direct contradistinction to it.

Despite its historical pandering to white, Christian, heterosexual, patriarchy, the LLWS, a 'product' of the Little League Corporation (LLCo), draws well over 300,000 spectators yearly, and is televised by the American Broadcast Corporation (ABC) and the Entertainment Sport Programming Networks (ESPN & ESPN2)—each of which is part of the Disney media empire. ABC has owned the rights to broadcast

¹¹ Interestingly Little League Softball –an event usually played by girls- became a sport only after the Title IX court cases, thus preventing the intermixture of boys and girls on the baseball field. This is all the more interesting given the fact that at the ages of 11 and 12 girls are generally physiologically bigger, stronger, and faster than boys.

¹² While records will show that a U.S. team played against a team from Seoul, South Korea, deeper research reveals that the U.S. team was actually from Mexicali, Mexico a team that currently participates in the Mexico region. Furthermore, this final was actually the first LLWS championship game that ABC presented to its viewers (Van Auken & Van Auken, 2001), lending credence to the idea that these changes were under the auspices of a mediated authority.

the LLWS in some capacity since the early 1960's, making it the longest standing relationship between a sporting event and broadcaster in United States history. First aired live in 1989, coverage has expanded to include game coverage from both the *United States* and *International* brackets on ABC, ESPN and ESPN2, and forms a central part of these Disney sport media firms mid-August ratings—a period which is often considered American television's down time and left for re-runs, filler shows, and pilot episodes of programs that critics deem destined to fail. Given the weak competition, by 2003, the LLWS had garnered such a popular following that twenty-six of the thirty-two games held in Williamsport were aired live with the six games not covered being preliminary games from the International bracket; thereby becoming an important event in the minds of many Americans.

Producing the 2003 LLWS

The cultural conditions of production for the 2003 LLWS were set at the 2001 LLWS when President Bush visited Williamsport following his induction into the Little League Hall of Fame:

You know years ago when I was playing on those dusty little league fields in west Texas I never dreamed I'd be president of the United States, and I can assure you I never dreamt I'd be admitted into the Little League Hall of Excellence . . . one of the things I did dream about was making it to Williamsport, PA for the LLWS. Little League is a family sport, I can remember my mother sitting behind the backstop in Midland Texas, telling me what to do . . . she still tells me what to do, and my advice to all the players is listen to your mother. But for all

the moms and dads who take special time out of their lives are able to play the great sport of baseball thank you from the bottom of our hearts. You prioritized your family and that's crucial for a *healthy world* to make sure our families remain strong . . . On behalf of the presidency thank you for what you do, may god bless the teams that play here, may god bless the families represented here, and may god bless the great United States of America thank you very much.

Herein Bush evoked strong family and religious values—although we are careful to note here that not all religions are 'equal', since he is of course referring to Christianity—utilizing the LLWS as a symbolic space in which to parade religious rhetoric as political identity and in which to direct the leadership and policies of a "healthy" world.

On that note, unchallenged Christian (moral-familial) authority at the LLWS is not exclusive to Bush's rhetorical speeches. Prior to *every* sanctioned Little League Baseball game—no matter where it is played throughout the world—the young participants are expected to recite the *Little League Pledge* which states: "I trust in God/I love my Country, and will respect its laws/I will play fair, and strive to win/but win or lose, I will always do my best" (Van Auken & Van Auken, 2001, p. 42). While the use of God in the recitation of the *Little League Pledge* has been questioned in the recent past (see: Kemsley, 2003), the complaints have been viewed as nothing more than the 'liberal attack on right-wing Christianity, morality, and tradition'—bearing in mind this tradition is steeped in the demonization of youth

as well as unequal relations of race, class, gender, and sexuality (Giroux, 2003; Grossberg, 2005).

It is through this lens of understanding that we seek to position our understanding of the 2003 LLWS in that it at once claimed international innocence, and served to provide a space whereby the United States—and only the United States—could host such a benevolent social event for children all around the world. Spectacles such as this therefore act to clarify the notion that America is ‘a morally superior, righteous’ place, and that any critical attacks toward it are misguided at best, and criminally unsubstantiated at worst.

Straddling Sovereignties

Initially formulated by the Vice President of Advertising and Promotion at ABC, the ‘meaning’ of 2003 LLWS was discursively established by a series of commercial campaigns that promoted an “*international pastime*” narrative (ESPN Radio 2003; field notes 2003; ABC, personal communication, 2004) and a promise of cultural diversity. Indeed, somewhat critiquing American Exceptionalism—and the storied roots of baseball therein (see e.g. Dyerson, 1999; Rader, 2005; Riess, 1995)—and espousing a looser displacement of national sovereignty, these promotions suggested that LLWS was the *real* ‘World Series’, given participation from teams representing nations from across the globe (ESPNRadio, 2003). Prior to, and throughout, the mediated event, both in-game producers and ‘features’ producers (as well as their teams that consisted of announcers, researchers, graphics creators, and camera-operators) were instructed to “to put (their) ears to the ground” (ABC, personal communication, 2004) to give the viewers “what they

wanted” (ABC, personal communication, 2004) through the creation of pre-game ‘teases’, in-game stories and information about the teams, players, and Williamsport (field notes, 2003; Gowdy Jr., 2003). Based on post-production research from the 2002 LLWS and pre-production meetings before the event, the producers of the 2003 LLWS decided that ‘what the viewer wanted’ to see were four interrelated narrative storylines: “[great] moments’, ‘kids having fun’, ‘a day in the life of a Little Leaguer’, and, importantly for this paper, the ‘international pastime’” (ABC, personal communications, 2003). Within the context of 2003 America, this could be seen as part of American mediated ‘healing’ through the creation of an event that used a children’s sport tournament to position the United States as a space of safety, international friendship, and innocence. Indeed, given the LLWS formed part of the supposedly innocent, ahistorical and mythical Disney¹³ spectacle—a relentless tide and diversity of Disney products and services that results in Disney’s colonization of many aspects of social life which controls and direct consumers’ emotions and desires in the manner of a tautological system designed to enhance its aura (Andrews, 2006b; Giroux, 2005a)—the viewing public would be forgiven for reading the LLWS as nothing more than a banal, neutral, auxiliary of the Magic Kingdom. Indeed, it is through these spectacular machinations, Giroux (2005a) surmises, that the tools of language, sound, and image are being “increasingly appropriated in an effort to diminish the capacity of the American public to think critically . . . to engage in critical debates, translate private considerations into public concerns, and recognize the distortion and lies that underlie many of the current

¹³ Disney owns ABC/ESPN/ESPN2 each of which are used to broadcast the LLWS.

government politics” (p. 22-23). Thus the intended LLWS narrative was quite easily connected to other forms of media, mentioned previously, which essentially served as internal and external propaganda that made it difficult to position the United States as a source of evil—for the United States was a place where children from all around the world could gather, play baseball, and have fun. Indeed, a producer for ABC concurred with this argument through his statement that that the LLWS:

is about appointment family television in a lot of ways. The goals are so right for what goes on elsewhere in the world where there’s violence and drugs and everything else. This is what’s good about a lot of things in life not just sport (ABC Production Crew, personal communication, 2003)

Framing the aforementioned narratives through youthful, MTV ‘reality’-based filming techniques (ABC, personal communication, 2003), the pre-production of the 2003 LLWS explicitly set out to distance itself from any form of overtly Americo-centric narrative in favor of a storyline that spoke to the supposed cultural diversity found at the event. As one of the marketing personnel for ABC explained:

Aside from it being an angle we’ve never taken, we figured that since it’s the Little League World Series, we could highlight that in the promotion. More often than not, a “World” championship in any major sport is actually just a U.S. Championship. This one is different, and since it’s a U.S. team vs. a team from another country in the finals, we wanted to bring that element to the fore. Furthermore, since there are so many Spanish-speakers in the U.S., we thought we’d have fun with “Take me out to the ballgame” (Sung in Spanish) in one of our

executions (personal communication, 2003).

The smaller, six-person 'features' team followed the same narrative themes throughout the duration of the 2003 LLWS. For example, one of the features producers informed us that their

main goal is basically [to] tell great stories about the kids who come from all over the world to Little League World Series. You know you can have these great transitions and great flashes but if you don't have a story, which you can tell throughout Little League you pretty much have nothing (personal communication, 2003).

As we might expect, the manufacture of such affectively anchoring segments designed to connect the broadcast and the audience, are an integral part in forwarding specific narrative stories during sporting spectacles (Andrews, 1998a; Gruneau, 1989; Silk, 1999, 2001, 2002). At the LLWS these segments played an early role in 'creating meaning' (Hall, 1980; Tomlinson, 2002), offering a narrative through which to understand, and consume, the 2003 productions. By using the following, and oft-repeated, professional strategies: scripting a storyline that was read during each opening *tease*¹⁴, creating several short transition elements to be shown prior to, or during, innings, and, forming short baseball fundamental teaching pieces, the features producers felt they were able to forward the four interconnected narratives. Generally features were underscored by 'emotive' music, and highlights from previous games, to 'inform the viewer about the game's

¹⁴ A tease at the LLWS could be defined as the short 1-3 minute, highly emotive, introduction to each game aired on ABC.

participants, and excite them about the impending contest' (ABC, personal communications, 2003; field notes, 2003). Thus the ultimate goal of the features crew was to get viewers to invest themselves enough to watch the event by making the "contest itself . . . the climax which resolves the curiosity and excitement built up over the day" (Gruneau et al., 1988, p. 272). Indeed, the features crew, who given their mandate by the in-game producers to "treat each game differently" (ABC, personal communication, 2003), and provide a different script with a different angle "on a game-by-game basis" (ABC, personal communication, 2003), had near-total control over whom, or what, they were and were not taping.

In their efforts to construct and maintain a coherent narrative with the features producers, the in-game production crew—through filming, interviewing, and editing techniques—attempted to build an "instant relationship" (field notes, 2003) between the home-viewer and the athletes. To gather information on the domestic and international players, coaches, and participant's immediate family-members, ABC production workers asked the same set of 20-25 questions to each player, while probing for 'unique and engaging stories' (ABC, personal communication, 2004) that would capture their intended audience in 'team-by-team' fashion during the days leading up to the 2003 LLWS broadcast (ABC, personal communications, 2003). Additionally, the in-game graphics creators built visual effects for use on game-specific information¹⁵, and several on-field camera workers set up their locations around both the fields at the LLWS in such a way as to

¹⁵ The current-game's score, inning, base runners, outs, and miles-per-hour the last pitch was thrown at.

give a ‘professional’, yet ‘youthful’ feel to the spectacle (field notes, 2003; ABC, personal communication, 2003). Finally, the in-game production team was in charge of providing the announcers information that they had gathered throughout the week, and conducted meetings helping to ensure that in conjunction with pre-production strategies like feature editing, advertisements, camera-use and positioning, and formulaic research questioning, a consistent *preferred narrative* would be presented to the consumer; one that celebrated the 2003 LLWS as a youthful yet *International* pastime (field-notes, 2003; ABC, personal communications 2003; italics ours). Indeed, such a narrative was a part of the collective affinity between the LLWS and LLCo, as one of the LLWS production staff explained, “in light of the patriotism and the ‘things American angle’, we really never let that enter our thinking. We’re simply trying to make engaging, unique, likeable promotion(s) for our properties. We thought this would be something new and fresh.”

Not surprisingly, these narratives were easier to weave into games involving the *International* bracket, where less pre-game footage was available¹⁶, and less was known about the participants. By contrast, coverage of the *US* bracket focused more on the seemingly innocent and youthful narrative of ‘having fun’—depicted as the ultimate goal for each team. Indeed, and rather than centering the narrative on the United States, there was an explicit effort to maintain a consistent storyline. As one of the production crew explicitly explained: “why would Americans (viewers) be

¹⁶ Prior to the LLWS the regional championship games played in each of the eight United States Bracket regions aired on ESPN and ESPN2. There was no broadcast of any International Bracket regional finals.

excited about sharing its culture? People hate America. We're a selfish country. We have what everybody wants, and it doesn't seem like we'd share. We think our shit doesn't stink. We don't share." Thus while the producers openly admitted that the United States was difficult to defend, they attempted to formulate a televised spectacle that served to emotively reify a safe and benign America.

Moreover, despite this portrayal of innocence, of distance from the aggressive appropriation, mobilization, and substantiation of commercialized sport within the (global) political trajectories of the Bush administration (and thereby resistive Anti-Americanisms [see e.g. Giroux, 2004; Harvey 2003; Sardar & Wyn-Davies 2002, 2004]), the international narrative was itself sliding toward making explicit alliances with the imperialist aims of the Bush administration. In fact much of the coverage espoused one very clear and superior unilateral hegemon (Hardt & Negri, 2000) that dictated this cartographic, if not, epistemological, space of the LLWS spectacle—the United States. In the following section, we outline how, as a 'spectacular' media event, the LLWS was related to the broader society which it serves, and of which it is an extension (Debord, 1994), and was centered on a populist platform that positioned the United States as 'hallowed', 'moral,' 'indispensable;' a "vast inaccessible reality that can never be questioned" (Debord 1994, #12¹⁷). In this sense, we point to the particular slippages, and outright fissures, in the seemingly progressive notions of internationalism, suggesting that the production of the 2003 LLWS was deeply embedded in the reproduction of an

¹⁷ In accordance with Kellner (2001), due to the differences in the many translations of *The Society of the spectacle*, when referencing Debord we use numbered paragraphs from the text.

ever-growing and dangerous ideology fueled by the American government and that has seeped into the public sphere—one that explicitly and implicitly views the United States as economically, militarily, culturally, morally, and politically superior to all other nation-states. This is despite the deeply contradictory fact that Americo-centric neoliberal capitalism sets the lawful parameter of capital accumulation is the only way to achieve success (Grossberg, 2005; Kelly, 2001), thus necessarily eschewing a world promoting ‘democracy’, ‘human rights’ and the ‘international rule of law’ (Hardt & Negri, 2004).

Normalized American (Sporting) Superiority

Embedded within a decidedly regressive form of internationalism then, we argue that the LLWS stands as an exemplar of the supposedly ethically and morally based historical destiny that the United States should lead the world—that is, based in neo-conservative virtue, its exceptional power and ability to dominate the global order (Hardt & Negri, 2004) in our present, the LLWS can be seen as part of the wider cultural and political discourse of American Exceptionalism—a discourse that is at the center of what David Harvey (2003) terms the shift, although not outright replacement, in the dominant US political regime from a neo-liberal state to a neo-conservative imperialism. In other words, the LLWS spectacle was bound with a society which had been urged by the Bush Administration to recognize the “inherent greatness” (Ferguson, 2004, p. 43-44) of US-led corporate capitalism in the instantiation of an imperialist empire in which the “sovereign must stand above the law and take control” (Hardt & Negri, 2004, p. 9). This exceptional role of the United States in the global state of exception is thus not simply about nationalisms or

internationalisms, but about how, in the space of a mediated sporting spectacle based on children, sovereign nation state politics intersect and interact with emergent modes of power, religiosity, moral tyranny and sovereignty. This is particularly evident in case of the LLWS, and we argue that this event was complicit in the placing of the United States at the center of international relations and in the 'language of Empire' (Negri & Hardt, 2000).¹⁸

Throughout the event, the United States, somewhat prophetically, and perhaps predictably given the national baseball mythologizing in Universal Studios *Field of Dreams* (1989), was narratively constructed as the *field of dreams* for international competitors. As was announced prior to the *International* Bracket final, the United States was the place on earth in which dreams (the 'American' Dream) could be realized:

¹⁸ The '*foreign*' policy of American neo-conservatism, embodied in the election of George W. Bush in 2000, and predicated on 'moral' principles based in Christian fundamentalism (9/11 for example, at least according to this 'logic', was a sign of God's anger at the permissiveness of a society that allows abortion and homosexuality) is ground in the 'principles' set forth in *The Project for the New American Century* charter (the project is a non-profit, educational organization whose goal is to promote American global leadership) (Harvey 2003). The project presents distinctly U.S. values (such as American leadership being good for both America and the world, that such leadership requires military strength, and that too few political leaders today make the case for global leadership) as universals through deployment of terms such as "freedom and democracy and respect for private property, the individual, and the law bundled together as a code of conduct for the whole world" (Harvey 2003:192; see also www.newamericancentury.org). Nationalism, coupled with imperialism—and the attendant racism inherent both internally and internationally (Harvey 2003)—has not just become the doctrine of the geopolitical-economic vision of the Bush administration, but, in capillary like fashion, the rhetoric has filtered through the mechanisms of what Giroux (2005) has termed the 'proto' fascism of the Bush administration: the cult of traditionalism, the corporatization of civil society, a culture of fear and 'patriotic correctness', the collapse of the separation between church and state, a language of official 'newspeak', and the ownership and control of the media. Following Hardt & Negri (2004), and viewing the 'perpetual state of war' located within U.S. neo-conservatism as a regime of biopower—a form of rule aimed not only at compelling the population but producing and reproducing all aspects of social life—it is of little surprise that the LLWS spectacle would both serve and extend the neo-conservative agenda.

Across spacious oceans and desert lands, they have traveled to *their field of dreams*. Stories these twelve year olds bring back to their countries of great lessons learned. It's a story of a Russian team that won their first game ever, or a Venezuelan fisherman who sent his son with 4 dollars to play, or maybe even a story of love... We've all come to expect dominance from the *Far East*. When Japan defeated Mexico City, they *earned* their seventh consecutive trip to the International championship. So why has Japan been so successful? Maybe it is been the long practice sections, or *their* ideals of perfection, or maybe the answer is they love, and dream baseball as much as anyone...anywhere. Like the *Far East*, Curacao's heart also beats for baseball. Free willing *spirits* enjoying the warmth of Williamsport, and a passion of a great game . . . But no matter what the outcome, they will return to their countries with stories to tell. But what makes *us* different is what brings the opposite ends of the world together (Gowdy Jr., 2003) [italics added]).

This passage is instructive in many ways—not only is this particular game the culmination of the International bracket and allows the winner to earn the right to get to the game *that matters* (the World Series Championship game against the U.S. representative), but it speaks to America as the hub, the special place, in which others can achieve their dreams. In the *longue durée*, this is perhaps not surprising, the U.S. was founded on the principles of exceptionalism, as George Bancroft (1896) wrote in volume 5 of his classic the 'History of the United States' (1834-1875), the

United States had been designed by God to demonstrate to the world the moral and political superiority of democratic institutions. Further, it is of little surprise that baseball was bound within these principles and, in the second part of the 19th Century, served as a key institution through which to mold the bodies of citizens (men) into productive citizens of a new industrial republic, assimilate certain immigrant populations into the ‘culture’ of the country, mark off ‘others’ both internally (especially African Americans and immigrants from Eastern Europe) and externally (especially the British), and, reconnect, however artificially, the industrial worker back to nature (see e.g. Dyerson, 1999; Rader, 2005; Riess, 1995).

In our present, and given the ontological disruption or rupture (Cocco & Lazzarato, 2002) in imperialist ambition, it was somewhat expected that ABC would discursively construct *us* (U.S.) as a special place for which other cultures can visit, learn, be free, succeed—realize a dream—and, at the same time, continue to mark off the U.S. as different, and superior. Indeed, this narrative formed a consistent theme for the production crews. Framed within a notion of ‘superiority’ ABC “really wanted to play up” (ABC, personal communication, 2003) acts of ‘charity’ to other nations. Under this banner, ABC celebrated teams from Moscow, Russia, Altigracia, Venezuela, Dharan, Saudi Arabia, and Mexico City, Mexico coming to the utopia baseball fields of America, while at the same time offering no critique of the apparent economic, political, and social domination of South American, Latin American, Middle Eastern, and Eastern nation states by the United States (Butler, 2002; Giroux, 2005a; Klein, 1988, 1991, 1995; Zinn, 2003). Indeed, according to Mosher (2001a), many of the children representing teams from the *Caribbean* and

Latin America come to the tournament extremely underfed, and gain several pounds during their ten-day stay, a hunger that is compounded by the extreme jet-lag that many experience after the long trip to Williamsport (field notes, 2003).

Additionally, the features crew produced a series of vignettes to highlight, despite inequalities, that the 2003 LLWS was contested on a “level playing field” (Little League, personal communication, 2003). One such feature focused on Magglio Ordoñez, a native Venezuelan, and an All-Star left fielder for Major League Baseball’s Chicago White Sox, who learned that some of the team from Altagracia, Venezuela, came to the United States without shoes, gloves, or uniforms, and a single bat made out of a wood post (field notes, 2003; Gowdy Jr., 2003; Little League, personal communication, 2003). Upon notification of the team’s economic disparity Ordoñez cut the team a blank check, and told them “to buy whatever they want with it” (field notes, 2003; ABC, personal communication, 2003). Of course, that Ordoñez, a native Venezuelan who was ‘living’ the American Dream, was placed on a pedestal, further reinforced the special place of the U.S. as a *field of dreams*—yet says nothing of the racisms, degraded images of “others” particularly (at that time) those who ‘look Arab or Muslim’, official immigration policies, the directives of the Department of Homeland Security, racial profiling on highways and at airports, or the physical and psychological abuse on the bodies and minds of the abject American (see e.g. Ahmed, 2002; Giroux, 2005a; Harvey, 2003; McLaren, 2002; McLaren & Martin, 2004; Merskin, 2004). Indeed, that the Executive producer would claim the LLWS as “a piece of Americana” hawked through satellite to 105 countries (Gowdy Jr., 2003) further emphasizes the somewhat messier juxtapositions and intersections between

nation-state sovereignty and emergent modes of power, religiosity, and moral tyranny within the neo-conservatism of the Bush regime.

Furthermore, despite ABC's conscious attempts to promote intercultural goodwill during the World Championship game (with repeated shots and announcer narrative of the Japanese and Floridian players congratulating one another after hitting homeruns), advancing the notion of (Disneyfied) innocence at the event by parading Mickey Mouse around the field during the fourth inning (a paradox not lost on us given that Giroux (2001), has helped reveal the oppressive labor conditions of Disney Corporation—not to mention reification/deification of dominant hegemonic dimensions of class, race, gender, and sexual preference), downplay the significance of the United States playing another country (by lowering the volume of its in crowd microphone feed when the throng of 45,000 was chanting "U.S.A., U.S.A." or somewhat more arrogantly "America, America"-which were deafening at the event—and only referring to the U.S. champion as the "team from Florida"), this growing culture of militarism was played out on the diamonds of the LLWS. For example, in an early discussion with a Little League official we were told that Little League had taken steps to join the heightened counter-terrorist police state of post-9/11/01 'America' by implementing a simulated post-attack exercise in June (personal interview, 2003), and installing metal detectors that all people entering the Little League premises had to pass through (field notes, 2003). Further, immediately prior to the final game and following a rendition of the National Anthem by a local State Policeman (another site that is increasingly indistinguishable from the military), there was a 4 Fighter Jet flyover before the final game a while a group from the local

Air Force, Marine Corp held a flag that took up over 1/3 of the outfield during which Dugout (the official Little League mascot) could be seen standing at attention—an act which did not take place during a rendition of the abbreviated Japanese national anthem.

In this sense, and as Gilroy (2001) has contended—somewhat bolstered by the Bush Administration’s frequent use of sporting metaphors (see: King, 2004)—war, in language, has become sport, highlighting the important role of the U.S. sporting media in foreclosing the possibility for critique and vibrant democracy, instead deteriorating into a combination of commercialism, propaganda and entertainment while shrouding the (domineering) realities of the event (Giroux, 2004). At the LLWS, and as discussed above, not only did the crew reify the neo-conservatism of Bush by downplaying the overt police state of this ‘new-America’, but language, national superiority, and, imperialist ambitions fused together to (re)assert the language(s) and success of the colossus (Ferguson, 2004).

Moreover, a central component of each game broadcast on ABC was a segment put together by the features crew titled “Building Blocks”. Working with color commentators Harold Reynolds (who in 2006 was released from ESPN on charges of sexual harassment) and Tom Candiotti, both former major leaguers, these segments, which usually aired before or during the middle of the 4th inning¹⁹, showed the announcers—along with LLWS participants—demonstrating the basic

¹⁹ LLWS games are 6 innings in length, and can end if one team is ahead by 10 or more runs one “hitting” inning for the losing team past halfway through the game. By putting the “Building Blocks” segments 3 ½ innings into the game, the producers ensured that they would air during each game no matter when it ended.

fundamentals of baseball. Most of these segment featured representatives from the U.S. teams, regardless of the teams participating in the game being broadcast. While this may have been part of building the consistent narrative espoused above—offering a pedagogical tool to train the ‘other’ in a piece of Americana—it was at least in part attributable to availability and desire of athletes to participate, ease of verbal communication (since few of the announcers could speak/understand anything besides American-English), and, in many cases, the ‘luck of the draw’ (field notes, 2003). Despite the global reach of the broadcasts, and although there was no concerted effort by producers to displace non-American athletes during “Building Blocks” segments, comments made by announcers during the airtime certainly reinforced the idea that the 2003 LLWS was meant for an American audience. For example, during a game between Willemstad, Curacao, Netherlands Antilles and Tokyo, Japan, Harold Reynolds was working with two young players participating from Curacao to teach the audience how to communicate on a flyball in such a way as to prevent a collision. Instead of calling for the ball with the traditional (read American-English) “I’ve got it, I’ve got it”, the two boys used *laga! laga!* (Meaning: “I’ve got it” in Papiamentu). During the broadcast, Reynolds discussed the use of Papiamentu with commentator Gary Thorne:

HR: *laga! laga!* (laughs)

GT: Speaking blocks (haha) *laga...laga*. How many languages do you speak?

HR: I speak ONE.

Taken alone, it would be a stretch to assert too much from this privileging of the American-English language. However, when seen in conjunction with a number

of other incidents, it became clear that the LLWS broadcasts operated to trivialize any 'other' language than that 'traditionally' spoken within the United States—and here we are of course using traditionally to distinguish those languages that are officially, juridically, the languages of the United States as opposed to the multitude of dialects and languages spoken by those at the margins of the U.S. citizenry. While commentators were “never told exactly what to say” (ABC, personal communication, 2003), and therefore held a significant amount of power in what the home viewer 'got', the in-game producers retained the power to 'lead' the announcers with open-ended sentences to help fill empty air time, and forward narratives that may have been temporarily underdeveloped (field notes, 2003; ABC, personal communications, 2003; MacNeill, 1996). For example, and despite the international pastime narrative outlined above, announcers were directed not to explicitly focus on issues of cultural diversity between players from different nations—this may well have been in an effort to ensure the legitimacy of the international feed or to proffer a bland, if not nationally disembodied, game of baseball for an American audience—yet speaks to the flattening of cultural difference where it quite clearly exists (Williams, 1994).

Indeed, when taken with the graphics and logo used by the LLWS production—a not to subtle combination of red, white, and blue—the broadcasts did little to suggest anything other than the event was a piece of Americana being played for the largest audience segment: Americans. Furthermore, ABC required that all participants introduce themselves in American-English, a feature that would be inserted into each game. This resulted in a number of the young players

struggling to (Anglo) phonetically reproduce their name in which the players introduced themselves in American-English—the resultant broadcast offering a less than flattering, stumbling, stuttered, or otherwise spoken exceedingly slow, depiction of anyone who could not speak American-English. Finally, and despite the significant presence of Latino/a populations in the United States generally, and the over-representation of these populations in baseball specifically, only one on-field announcer employed at the production, Alvaro Martin, could translate from Spanish to English. Additionally, ABC employed no announcer who could, in real time²⁰, do the same with Dutch, Japanese, Papiamentu, or Russian; four languages used by teams that participated in the event. Therefore no announcer could accurately decipher exactly what was being said during substitutions, mound visits, coach-to-coach, and coach-to-player conversations. In lieu of having a Dutch, Japanese, Papiamentu, or Russian translator present, ABC announcers were left to describe or continue speaking about what they *thought* was being said during these interactions (Gowdy, Jr., 2003). Thus as Bhaba (1994) states “colonial discourse [becomes] an apparatus of power” (p. 70), that serves to reify distinct differences between the home nation, the United States, and the other. Interestingly this affectively ignores “the shifting positionalities of its subjects” (p. 70) evidenced by the ironic fact (since both of the following teams played in the International division) that only 1 team member for the team representing Saudi Arabia was actually a citizen of that country (13 were Americans, and 1 Canadian), and that the team from Guam

²⁰ There were statements that translations were made in the production truck, but they were loose translations at best, and many times outright guesses made by the announcers (field notes, 2003).

consisted of American-English speaking athletes, who live under the rule of the United States (field notes, 2003).

Coda: Conducting Children

We really wanted to bring it back to the kids . . . *integrated with the stories we set out to tell* (ABC, personal interview, 2003)

To this point the 2003 LLWS has been discussed as a spectacular media event that was highly scripted, and controlled by media production workers in an effort to, however, superficially, represent the event as a “celebration” of a truly international youth pastime. In particular, we have pointed to how the narrative provided a telling space in which sovereign nation state politics collided with emergent modes of power, religiosity, moral tyranny and sovereignty—a (fascist) neo-conservatism that at once compels the population and reproduces all aspects of social life. The production data provided herein extends the small, yet growing, work on the (sport) media in what appears to be a shifting yet ‘perpetual state of war’ (Hardt & Negri, 2004) and points to the often unquestioned and insidious, place of sport as part of the powerful economy of affect which serves particular geo-political trajectories (cf. Falcous & Silk, 2005; King, 2006a; McDonald, 2005a; Silk & Falcous, 2005). However and perhaps most worryingly, with its efficient sleight of hand, the LLWS broadcast slips even more under the radar of popular consciousness and critique given that its focus is the seemingly benign realm of children’s baseball.

In this sense, the LLWS productions on ABC & ESPN (both owned and operated by the Disney Corporation) become another space in which we need, as Giroux (1995, 2002a) proposed, to contest and struggle against Disney’s

'trademarked innocence.' Although talking primarily about animated movies, Giroux (2002a, p. 105) suggested that Disney's trademarked innocence often "renders it unaccountable for the diverse ways in which it shapes the sense of reality it provides for children as they take up specific and often sanitized notions of identity, difference, and history in the seemingly apolitical cultural universe of 'the Magic Kingdom.'" We would argue that the LLWS productions not only provides a space for a perverse form of public pedagogy, that conditions, if not trains, American youth in the doctrines of Bush's fanatical, fascist, neo-conservative, visions of geo-political domination, it also does so just as the same administration is waging an internal, domestic war against the poor, youth, women, people of color, and the elderly (Giroux, 2003, 2004, 2005a, Grossberg, 2005).

Thus the LLWS becomes another public space for commercial and political exploitation in the service of a particular political agenda while the very same agenda positions youth in the degraded borderlands of the broken promises of capitalism, projects class and racial anxieties onto youth, polices and governs the very presence of children in our gentrified urbanité, weakens support for children's rights, downgrades social services, creates an increasingly criminogenic public school, and, offers universities that seemingly take on the appearance of corporate training *camps* (Giroux, 2003; Grossberg, 2005). In this sense, the LLWS provides a seemingly innocent space that sneaks into the collective (un)conscious of a captive audience through a powerful pedagogical discourse of geo-political domination, a discourse "sculpted from the spare rib of a world laid waste by America's foreign policy" (Butler, 2002, p. 183).

By furnishing a program featuring youth Disney/ABC/ESPN set an emotive example of what constitutes ‘normal’ and safe nationalism in the United States. As we have demonstrated this nationalism is far from benign, as well as distinctly different from an America that was at one time questioning the use of National Anthems and/or other forms of national sentiment prior to sporting events (Martin & Reeves, 2001). For now it is commonplace to hear the song *God Bless America* during the 7th inning of baseball games—games which often feature more International competitors than Americans. It is *normal* for Americans to accept the placement of the flag of the United States on jerseys and caps, yet raise public furor over the desecration of ‘our’ game when new market logics influence Miramax to buy advertisement on those same bases for the film *Spiderman 2*; while little to no critique exists for the very system which influenced Miramax to do so and which dominates the many in both the United States and internationally (Grossberg, 2005). Indeed, it is still often argued that the United States is the highest form of human civilization, and that alternatives can not nor should not be considered (McLaren, 2002).

While we understand that this is the accepted form of behavior in contemporary American society, we simultaneously assert that this is neither a benign nor an accurate depiction of everyday life in the United States. Unfortunately through spectacular arrangements utilizing the emotive and nationalist aspects of children playing baseball, there is a constant struggle to bring narratives of alternative, critical, and no less important, visions of contemporary society--informed by the recent past—to the fore so that the general public can recognize

and, hopefully, name these overt and simplified visions of American superiority as patently false. It is our hope that our reading of the 2003 LLWS provides but one starting point for thinking—alongside other, perhaps more incisive, and indeed critical cultural elements of our contemporary moment—about exposing and undoing the institutions and structures of shortsighted nationalism couple with global capitalism that shape our lives.

We would be remiss were we not to reflect on our current time of writing—2007. At this juncture, the way the 2003 LLWS was positioned seems ridiculous, given there now exists a general level of popular distrust in the United States' government, particularly for its President, his constituents, and the general trajectory of the neoconservative Republican Party, which is qualitatively and quantitatively different from just a few short years ago. For example, Pollingreport.com (2007), a website which tracks several sources for George Bush's approval rating (including, among others, CBS News/Fox News/NY Times), has found that his average support has plummeted from approximately 88 percent in September of 2001, to around 33 percent in 2007. Further, staunch Republican, Newt Gingrich, characterized Karl Rove's 2004 election strategy as 'maniacally dumb for being so conservative' (Rutenberg, 2007, p. 16), which he said led to a party in 'collapse' following the 2006 elections where the Democrats overtook the majority seats in the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives. The shift in popular sentiment has been felt in popular culture as well. For example the, liberal-minded, satirical television show *The Daily Show with John Stewart* is one of the country's most popular cable television 'news' programs. Earlier this year Rage Against the

Machine lead singer, Zach de la Rocha, was cheered wildly following his comment that George Bush “should be tried, hung, and shot” for committing war crimes during a performance at the Coachella concert festival in Los Angeles (Schou, 2007). Finally, the Dixie Chicks—whose anti-Bush remarks at a London concert in 2003 led to a loss of American public support—returned to sweep the Grammy’s with their album *Taking the Long Way* (2006) which included songs like *Not Ready to Make Nice* that suggested that they were still critical of the current U.S. political regime.

Coinciding with the shift in popular and political sentiment against the conservative American government, today it is possible to voice a general critique of US foreign policy in Iraq and Afghanistan, lack of funding for public schools through the No Child Left Behind Act, and the attempt by Homeland Defense (in)Security/USA Patriot Act to ethnically profile individuals under the guise of terrorist prevention (Denzin & Giardina, 2006) in public and/or the classroom without the same fear of ‘ultra-patriotic’ student/colleague backlash felt in the immediate post-9/11/2001 moment. In other words simple-minded ‘pizza box nationalism’²¹, unquestioned support of neoconservative policies through popular representations of the Nation through television, film, and music (Falcous & Silk, 2006; Silk & Falcous, 2005) has more recently given way to a more complicated time whereby the American popular holds a weary and wary eye toward the War in Iraq, their President, and the now-obviously disastrous policies his administration has

²¹ This is in reference to the addition of American flags to the tops of pizza boxes to demonstrate unquestioning support for the United States.

ushered in while still inanely supporting the corporate neoliberal slide that apparently underpinned the 9/11/01 attacks in the first place.

Clearly then the United States public finds itself in a new socio-political moment which is different from the hyper-nationalism experienced in period following September 11, 2001. Moreover, it is perhaps such periods, when the intensity of the post-9/11/01 context have begun to wane, and the nation becomes attuned to new, and indeed elevated, norms of popular nationalist invective that are often the most interesting and important to understand. In other words, it is not the almost nationalistic irrationality of a moment of crisis, but the normalized nationalism of periods of relative and perceived stasis that are the most instructive in illuminating the relationship between the nationalist policies of a governmental regime and commercial nationalism (for it is a cultural nationalism propelled by economic dictates). Yet, and despite, if not because of, what we think we can term progress, our voices need to get louder and must “never stop criticizing the levels of justice already achieved” and continue to seek “more justice and better justice” (Bauman, 2002, p. 54). Given these politics, it becomes imperative to think through how shifting social condition frame cultural productions, and indeed, the resultant cultural product, in gaining an understanding of, and intervening in, the cultural politics of media discourse.

Chapter II: Danny Almonte: Discursive Construction(s) of (Im)igrant citizenship in Neoliberal America

Following the 2000 Presidential election George W. Bush's first few months in office were checkered by the public belief that he did not actually win the election (Kranish & Kirchoff, 2001), and that he was actually doing very little as sitting President (Blundo, 2001). In response to a distrustful, yet apathetic, republic Bush began to promote several grassroots programs in hopes of garnering American public support which included 'T-Ball on the South Lawn' a joint effort between the Presidency and Little League Baseball Corporation – a sport which has quite overtly attempted to indoctrinate young athletes within hegemonic American norms and mythologies (see: Van Auken & Van Auken, 2000; White, Silk & Andrews, 2007). On May 6th, 2001 the first ever (T-Ball) baseball game was played between D.C. area 5-8 year-olds on the South Lawn at the White House in front of the President and his wife, their families, and Major League Baseball star Nomar Garciaparra (Fernandez, 2001a; Shaughnessy, 2001) followed by two more games between American teams in successive months (Fernandez, 2001b).

In late-August 2001, just two weeks shy of the September 11 attacks on New York and Washington, D.C. Bush became the first sitting President ever to attend the Little League Baseball World Series (LLWS). While in Williamsport, Bush was inducted into the Little League Hall of Excellence, gave an acceptance speech, and threw out the first pitch at the LLWS Championship game. He also had the opportunity to speak with Danny Almonte, the star player of the tournament, telling the young boy that "he hoped to see him pitch in the majors one day" (Lewerenz, 2001).

As others and I have mentioned elsewhere (White, Silk & Andrews, 2008a, 2008b), the Little League World Series is a relatively popular summer television event in the United States, and is the largest organized international youth sporting competition. Since 2000, 16 teams (8 regional U.S. and International) qualify²² to play in a round-robin style tournament in Williamsport, Pennsylvania. In general the 8 U.S. qualifiers have their regional championships broadcast by ESPN in addition to, each of their LLWS tournament games. In 2001, Almonte's pitching exploits made him somewhat of a popular cultural icon in the United States (Mosher, 2001c). During the Mid-Atlantic regional final, and in his team's (Bronx, New York) first LLWS contest, both of which were internationally televised, Almonte threw back-to-back no-hitters²³. The latter being the first perfect game in LLWS competition since Mexico's Angel Macias accomplished the feat in 1957 (Van Auken & Van Auken, p. 100-101, 2001). The media attention, and attendant viewership (both at the stadium and on television) for games Almonte pitched following the first no-hitter, was something "Little League had never seen before" (Van Auken, personal communication, 2003). Indeed, perhaps fueled by the fact that his team came from New York City, record numbers of media credentials were handed out (field notes, 2003), and television ratings for the, already popular summer television event, skyrocketed.

²² While the number varies by region, given the number of leagues competing in the United States, some teams play as many as 20 games just to make it to the regional final. Though records of the Bronx, NY have been erased they played in at least 10 but probably closer to 20 in order to qualify.

²³ A no-hitter is when a pitcher completes an entire game without allowing an opposing team to hit safely, and a perfect game is when a pitcher does not allow a single base runner to reach base. In Major League Baseball only one pitcher has thrown back-to-back no-hitters.

Making Almonte's budding celebrity identity more compelling was the fact that as an extremely poor Dominican immigrant to New York City his story was used to provide more evidence that anyone can become 'successful' in the United States. Not surprisingly ABC, ESPN, and U.S. newspapers capitalized on the opportunity to reinforce the Alger-esque 'rags-to-riches' American mythology by incessantly running stories and features on the young baseball player and nicknamed his team the "Baby Bombers" in reference to one of Major League Baseball's most popular teams, the New York Yankees, who also play in Bronx, NY (*cf.* CBS 48 Hours, 2002; Callahan, 2001; CNNSI.com, 2001a, 2001b; Gowdy Jr., 2001; Mosher, 2001a, 2001b, 2001c; Musburger, 2001; Thomsen & Llosa, 2001). In addition to President Bush, Almonte gained the interest of several Major League Baseball players, and was even given the key to New York City from mayor, Rudolph Giuliani (Callahan, 2001). With all the attention being lauded on the young ballplayer during the 2001 LLWS, it could be argued that Danny Almonte had arrived on the scene of American popular media discourse.

Almonte's star status changed, however, when *Sports Illustrated* sent reporters Ian Thomesen and Luis Fernando Llosa to further investigate rumors that he was over-age in respect to LLWS rules²⁴. Eventually they found evidence that Almonte had two sets of birth documents, one that stated he was 14 and a newer one that had been falsified in order to render him eligible to participate in the LLWS. After a few days of deliberation, Little League Baseball ruled against Almonte and removed the Bronx team's and his records from all official records in addition to,

²⁴To participate in the LLWS one can only be between the ages of 11 and 12; Almonte was 14.

banning his coach Rolando Paulino, and father Felipe Almonte from participation in the 11-12 year old portion of Little League Baseball for life. The significance of what became referred to in the popular media as 'Almonte-Mania' (Johnston, 2001) cum 'Almonte-scandal' was such that it was created as the most important (sporting) news event in the United States in the last two weeks prior to September 11th (Olson, 2001; Woods, 2001).

The date 9/11/01 is key to this project in that it has been argued elsewhere that in the period immediately following the American populace experienced a dramatic shift in the tone of popular media discourse (cf. Butler, 2002; Falcous & Silk, 2005; Giroux, 2004b; Johnson, 2002; Silk & Falcous, 2005; Silk, Bracey & Falcous 2007). Essentially it is generally understood that in the immediate post-9/11/01 moment media entities surged with stories of reactionary American jingoism, and military retaliation. However, by critically tracing the mediated discourse(s) surrounding Danny Almonte's brief place as an (im)migrant celebrity articulated with his contextually specific flexible citizenship (Giardina, 2005, p. 51) this project aims to challenge this assumption to the point that I believe that the American media was *already* and merely continued to be reactionary and jingoistic.

As such, this is part of a political agenda that endeavors to foster a more progressive future where the utopian ideals of 'justice, empowerment, freedom, and love' (Denzin, 2004) are the most important values in American society. In this instance then I will be focusing on the mediated discourses surrounding an (im)migrant male youth baseball player whose multiple, interconnected, and fluid

identities – brown²⁵/male/poverty stricken/undereducated/youth – made him a dually 'representative character of the national symbolic' (Cole, 2001a, p. 71) for both the United States and the Dominican Republic. Given this context I further posit that Danny Almonte's mediated image is also an important site of scrutiny for beginning a systematic demolition of the structures that prevent (minority) women, men, and youth from being treated as equal citizens in the United States.

Dominican Dependence on America and (Little League) Baseball

That Danny Almonte, a Dominican boy, was using the sport of baseball in hopes of upward social mobility should come as no surprise. Indeed, by 2003, 23 percent of Major League Baseball rosters and 50 percent of minor league rosters were comprised of 'Latino' athletes, most of whom were from the Dominican Republic (Gonzalez Echevarria, 2003). Moreover, while most able-bodied young boys from the Dominican Republic harbor hopes of being signed by Major League franchises for \$4-5000, they do not participate in Little League Baseball. As Ithaca College Professor, Stephen Mosher, wrote for ESPN.com "Little League is essentially a middle or working class sport across the world and it is rare that truly poor communities have the resources to run a league" (2001a, ¶10). To be sure the relationship between the United States and the Dominican Republic has left the

²⁵ The hue of an individual's skin is certainly a slippery subject, and it is with much trepidation that I use the hooks (1992) and Giroux (1996) inspired term 'brown' skinned in reference to Almonte's Caribbean origins, rather than 'black' which in this context – to me – suggest an U.S. origin. Moreover, I would be remiss to think that Almonte's relatively light-brown skin that is suggestive of his Dominican heritage did not help his early popular reception in contrast to if he had been a traditionally darker-skinned Haitian. Again this all speaks to the relative ridiculousness, but devastating lived realities, of racial stereotyping.

latter too deprived for many Little League teams, but almost completely dependent on baseball for economic growth.

Further setting the context from which Danny Almonte was operating, Ramona Hernandez (2004) has described how Dominican reliance on the United States has adversely effected its immigrant population in New York City – a group he is part of:

Dominicans [have] left their homeland pressured by economic needs, the desire to improve their lives, and encouraged by a de facto immigration policy that facilitated their exodus. Once in the U.S., most Dominicans encounter an economy that increasingly demands skills and levels of schooling they do not possess. Rather than a prosperous life, in the new land, Dominicans face high unemployment levels and an alarming state of poverty. Paradoxically, while the needs of Dominicans continue to be unmet in the new society, the social policies and the conditions that push them out of their country remain in effect In the end, poor Dominicans are pushed back and forth by both societies whose immigration policies mask their unwillingness to respond to the needs of the group. (p. 87)

Complicating matters further is that the U.S. government continues to give way to neoliberal capitalism, while the future of humanity – [minority youth] – are becoming part of “the abandoned generation” (Giroux, 2003).

Specifically, in the United States, a large population of undereducated, poverty-stricken Dominicans are encouraged to leave their home country and move to urban centers like New York City, and Boston while the U.S. government

simultaneously abuses them through reductions in social welfare, calls for stricter immigration law, and obtuse policies like 'No Child Left Behind' (see Giroux, 2003). Compounding this already dire situation is the fact the U.S. media generally blames the decimation of the inner-city on immigration and poor minorities, not the structural inequalities present through the country's social and economic policies (Cole, 2001a; Grossberg, 2005).

This becomes dangerous when stereotypes – in this case the notion that Dominican boys are lazy, unintelligent, and lawless – created by and through the power structures of predominantly white upper-class men become reified not only through the ambivalence of those who maintain power in mediating information in the U.S., but also through the ambivalent way those who are being dominated also believe and act of that which they have learned to be 'true' about themselves (Bhaba, 1994). Homi Bhaba further charges that we “recognize the stereotype as an ambivalent mode of knowledge and power demands a theoretical and political response that challenges deterministic or functionalist modes of conceiving of the relationship between discourse and politics” (1994, p. 66-7).

In reference to the aforementioned Alan Klein (1988, 1991, 1995), Stephen Mosher (2001a, 2001b, 2001c), and Jane Juffer (2002) have all forcefully argued that this oppressive relationship has lead most young Dominican boys to live a life where success in baseball becomes the only way out of working in predominantly U.S.-owned sugar and sport apparel factories, or the tourist industry for little to no pay. Yet, at the same time, baseball prowess is a valued part of the Dominican male identity. Clearly this poses a problem to the Dominican male population, and by

extension the country as a whole, in that if they do not make it in baseball they are considered failures at home, and unwanted immigrants in the United States.

However, the United States' ascendancy in relation to the Dominican Republic has been veiled by American media sources in that the Dominican-U.S. baseball link is often celebrated for its supposed mutually benefiting (inter)dependence (for examples see ESPN, 2001; Musburger, 2001). Unfortunately this type of mediated programming belies dominant structural issues effecting the future of minority youth in the United States like, "spiraling health crisis such as AIDS, crumbling city infrastructures, segregated housing, soaring unemployment among youth of color, exorbitant school dropout rates among black and Latino youth ..., and deepening inequalities of incomes and wealth between blacks and whites" (Giroux, 2003, p. 125). As these troubling issues are continuously concealed from popular vision, such discrimination in popular culture simultaneously contributes to a prevailing mythology that immigrant (minority) youth are figures that should be subject to overt 'policing, exclusion and oppression' (Giroux, 1994, p. 12). This is evidenced by the fact that while "child poverty rates for blacks and Hispanics ... is an unconscionable 30 and 28 percent respectively" there has been "dramatic increase in black prisoners [factoring] in the growth of the prison-industrial complex" (Giroux, 2003, p. 125).

Further since many of these children are in families reliant on American money in some form of welfare, Mitchell Dean argues that in the neoliberal language of (welfare) dependency there exists a 'central contention that poor people have something more wrong with them than their poverty. Welfare dependency is hence

a syndrome lurking behind the welfare state that can be related to biology, psychology, upbringing, culture, or behavior, or several or even all of these factors' (1999, p. 62). As I mentioned previously, the novelty of having such a poor team from the United States was clearly capitalized on by the media sources covering the team from the Bronx. In many ways Almonte's initial story as a successful youth baseball player helps assuage guilt and responsibility that some American's may feel over the historically based discrepant military, political, cultural, and economic connection between the states and peoples of the U.S. and Dominican Republic (Zinn, 2003).

Theoretical Orientation and Methodology

To best contextualize, interrogate, and 'read' Danny Almonte's celebrity identity I will make use of a Cultural Studies inspired 'anti-disciplinary' (Andrews, 2006a, p. 26) framework; while also promoting a politic of hope, social justice, and structural equality for all in a time when dominant cultural values – stimulated by unfettered capital (Hardt & Negri, 2000) – are such that the needs of our [minority] children are being met less and less (Baudrillard, 2002; Giroux, 1996, 2000, 2003; Grossberg, 2001, 2006). In so doing, this composition will blend interpretations of Michel Foucault with regard to 'governmentality' (Burchell, Gordon & Miller, 1991; Dean, 1999; Lemke, 2000), Henry Giroux's theoretical renderings on youth and popular culture (1996, 2001, 2003), and Aiwah Ong's understanding of flexible citizenship (1999) while making a concerted effort to heed Stuart Hall's (1999) call not to represent Almonte's diasporic identity as an indiscriminant monolith.

In addition I evaluated several U.S. media sources – television, newspapers/magazines, and the internet by following Ong’s assertion that “in the era of globalization individuals, as well as, governments develop a flexible notion of citizenship to accumulate capital and power” (1999, p. 6). In other words, the dominant discourses surrounding Almonte, which country his celebrity *belonged* to, and what his celebrity represented shifted depending on the logics of capital gain. By this I mean, in terms of encoding, American news sources would often present the Almonte story in a way that would have the most affective connection with its reading/viewing audience (Grossberg, 1997b), rather than an ‘objective’ rendering of his person(ality).

Utilizing a methodology formulated by Gruneau, et al. (1988) and used extensively by MacNeill (1996), Silk (2002), and White, Silk & Andrews (2007, 2008), I critically evaluated the televisual renderings of Danny Almonte during five 2001 LLWS broadcasts (ESPN, 2001a), and post LLWS follow-up features segments by ESPN on *Outside the Lines* (2001b), *Sportscenter* (2005), and an interview on *First Take* (2007). Further, addressing the aforementioned and following Roland Barthes’ (1957) idea to combine both the writer/producer’s realism as an ideological substance and as semiological value while not conflating the two, I also intensively searched for *key* and *emergent* themes in popular representations of Almonte on the internet, newspaper, and magazines.

More specifically, I conducted a *Lexis Nexis Academic* search of newspaper stories on Almonte between August 1, 2001 and June 4, 2007 yielding 510 articles (including 300 written very close to the 2001 LLWS), six magazine articles, and a

search of popular sporting news websites *CNN.com*, *ESPN.com*, *Foxsports.com*, *CBSsportsline.com*, as well as the official Little League Baseball website which contained several articles and video clips describing Almonte's experience at the 201 LLWS and his personal/sporting journey since then. Finally, I have also included ethnographic research that was gathered during the 2003 LLWS, as well as, extra 'data' obtained since 2001 on the LLWS beginning with an undergraduate course that I took on youth sport at Ithaca College with Dr. Stephen Mosher, attending the 2003 and 2005 LLWS, and meeting with and/or talking to Little League Corporation's Media Director, Lance Van Auken (the 'voice' of LLCo, on several occasions following the 2001 LLWS (2001, 2003, 2004, personal communication)).

Almonte the (Almost) All-American Hero

As mentioned previously the LLWS is the world's largest youth sporting organization. Though there is an inherent cultural diversity present at Little League, evidenced by the fact that it encompasses over 10 countries and has over 2.7 million participants – the dominant narrative presented by ABC/ESPN (as well as other media sources) and Little League Co. speaks to American white-upper/middle class sensibilities over all others (White, Silk & Andrews, 2008a). The mediated pandering to the consciousness of heterosexual, white, American men can be seen through a constant referral to the innocence of young (generally white, generally upper-middle class) boys playing baseball. Through this narrative, "innocence becomes both a mystifying ideology and a vehicle for commercial profit" (Giroux,

2000, p. 61) whereby the definers of innocence can lay claim to what falls inside and out its realm.

Interestingly, Danny Almonte and his brown-bodied, poverty-bound Dominican identity clearly challenged the dominant mold of Little League innocence which has historically affirmed white, heterosexual, Christian, upper-middle class norms (White, Silk & Andrews, 2008a) since several times during the ESPN broadcasts of Bronx games the announcers referred to the fact that he was a Dominican immigrant to New York City, and spoke very little English (ESPN, 2001). Furthermore, it is important to note that with Almonte's enormous popularity in 2001, both ABC and Little League had an opportunity to use his relative importance to better reveal the structures of domination that force Dominican boys to become dependent on baseball for upward social mobility. With the major exception of Steve Mosher's three articles for *ESPN.com's Page 2* (2001a, 2001b, 2001c) who questioned the popular medias response, the Baby Bomber's success and Caribbean identity was used by ABC to promote the U.S. as melting pot mythology rather than to illuminate the daily struggle many immigrant Dominican's face (see: Gowdy Jr. 2001; Wong, 2001).

For instance, during the Mid-Atlantic championship game, while Almonte was pitching against the all-White team from State College, Pennsylvania, which had (perhaps tellingly) nicknamed themselves "the young Americans" (ESPN, 2001a), lead announcer Jack Edwards, and color commentator, Tom Candiotti, both spent a portion of the broadcast explaining that the mostly immigrant team from the Bronx were so polished because they played 'over 100 games a year between Puerto Rico,

the Dominican Republic, and United States' (ESPN, 2001) – a comment that was repeated again during their LLWS games against Davenport, Iowa and Oceanside, California (ESPN, 2001). Edwards also mentioned several times, particularly in the 6th inning of Almonte's no-hitter, that making it to the Little League World Series would be a "dream come true for all 12 year-olds" (ESPN, 2001a). Yet nothing was said about the fact that while many of the players from State College came from a privileged socio-economic background which afforded the children on the team multiple opportunities at personal 'success', most of the players from the Bronx main hope at upward social mobility came through more than "realizing every 12 year-olds' dream" but rather making it in baseball professionally (Mosher, 2001a).

Prior to the teams' fourth televised game, against Oceanside, California, ESPN (2001) ran a feature created by Jeremy Schaap that described the 'poor conditions' that the team from the Bronx hailed. According to interviews within the short feature this was in direct contradistinction to the three previous teams from New York City, which hailed from upper-class areas in Staten Island. Yet, as the piece continued, Schaap told viewers that "Rolando Paulino Little League received a 3 million dollar upgrade from several corporate sponsors" and that the new field that the children would get to play on should be called "The house that Danny build".

This feature was augmented by perhaps the most exemplary mediated piece promoting a Reaganite neo-liberal 'pull yourself up by the bootstraps' mythology when Brent Musburger, lead announcer for ABC Sports, wrote the following about Almonte and his team in a lengthy review on *ESPN.com*:

This team deserves an enormous amount of credit for what they've overcome. The Little League fields in the Bronx are mainly vacant lots littered with broken glass and discarded cans. The league received a major donation from Merrill Lynch, and the youngsters took it from there. In large part, the Rolando Paulino team represents what's happening to the United States population as a whole. They are the latest wave of immigrants to be welcomed with open arms in the United States . . . Times change, immigration patterns change and the Latino kids now dance to the beat of baseball. When they posed for their team photo the other day, an American flag was proudly displayed in front of the team. They would be a great representative for the U.S. against the champion of the International bracket. (2001, ¶9)

Here Musburger suggests that poor immigrant children to the United States could realize the American Dream of unrestrained socio-economic mobility, not unlike prior underserved immigrant populations, by taking part in the American national pastime. He further implies that this is true even if they do not play under the oft-revered 'big blue skies and grassy infields of Williamsport', and that as long as they 'dance to the beat of baseball' Dominicans like Danny Almonte have a chance at success; even *legitimately* represent the United States. What Musburger ignores, however is that not all brown-skinned, immigrant children are party to the cultural economy of corporate America (Giroux, 2003) like Almonte's team was.

George W. Bush further complicated matters in his 2001 Hall of Excellence induction speech aired during a feature on the 2001 LLWS ESPN broadcast (ESPN 2001e), where his backdrop was quite interestingly (given that they were the only

U.S. team comprised solely of ethnic minorities) Almonte's team from the Bronx. During his speech he stated that "I [sic] equate Little League with *good familites*" (read: families whose parents are able to have a hand in leading the team either as the male coach²⁶ or the mom who organizes team social events and cheers on the sideline, and whole some values " ... that are key for a healthy world" (Bush, 2001). Taken in conjunction with the fact that Little League Baseball is considered "family appointment television" (Gowdy Jr., 2003, personal communication), and often celebrates the male/female nuclear family through awards present and displayed at the Little League Hall of Excellence, a very specific version of a good American family is what Little League and Bush celebrate.

Interestingly Almonte's, and most of his teammates, parents were not in attendance because they could not afford the trip to Williamsport, Pennsylvania²⁷ for an extended period of time (Hermoso & Coger, 2001). As such, the Baby Bombers, not only challenged the lily-white, All-American version of Little League family, but also demonstrated the class divisions between themselves and the other American teams at the event. In other words their mostly-white counterparts were able to publicly display their good parenting skills by being able to afford to miss work, and pay for travel, food, and lodging, while the Baby Bombers (predominantly minority) lower-class parents were absent (Andrews, 1999; Pitter & Andrews, 1997).

²⁶ Only one woman has ever coached a team in the Little League World Series, and she was a bench coach for a team from Tokyo, Japan.

²⁷ Danny's father made it to Williamsport for the US Semi-Final game , but his mother had to remain in the Dominican Republic because she did not receive a visa in time (Martinez, 20001).

This becomes problematic in that Almonte clearly does not represent a “normal” American citizen, because he did not come from a traditional Little League family. Secondly, and following Giroux (2003), by failing to help lower-class parents attend the event, Little League and ABC – both of whom make a substantial windfall from the exploitation of the young participants – contributed to the growing trend in which:

The call for social provisions has been transformed into punitive assaults on the character of the poor; and the struggle for enlarging social entitlements for those suffering under the weight of unemployment, hunger, homelessness, and inadequate health care has given way to policies of containment, control, and criminalization. (p. 123).

Further on that subject, *New York Daily News’s* Jose Martinez and Bill Hutchinson reported that “after every game Danny [was able] to call both parents”, and that “two years ago, the father immigrated to the United States so Danny and his two brothers could have a better life. Now, Danny’s living the good life as a Little League star” (2001, p. 7). Once again Danny’s flexible citizenship comes into play in that the reader is told that the United States is providing ‘a better life’ for Danny Almonte. What the reader could also deduce from this statement is that his family in the Dominican Republic were unable to raise him ‘properly’ in the George W. Bush/LLCo sense, while simultaneously clouding the fact that his amateur star value is being economically exploited by ABC and Little League.

Importantly, it was at this point Almonte was still being celebrated as an example of what is good about the U.S. neoliberal corporate structure for he was

able to pull himself from the terrible conditions of small-town Dominica, and be 'goverened' to become:

An ideal neo-liberal citizen ... not just committed to hard-work but one committed to biological self-betterment – that is, self-responsibility for one's health well-being, quality of life and bodily maintenance. (Cole, Giardina & Andrews, 2004, p. 221)

Thus, though the 'true-American' Danny Almonte got his fleeting moment of popularity, the 'two corporations made a fortune raking in summer ratings' (Lopresti, 2001, p. 12C), but failed to provide measures which allowed his and other working-class parents of team members to attend games.

Although American media sources failed to bring the socio-economic plight of the Baby Bombers to light, for the most part the did help celebrate and cultivate Almonte as a celebrity/star during the event. For instance, in addition to noting that "a LLWS record, 230 media credentials were issued" (ESPN, 2001) at the 2001 event, during Almonte's perfect game in the opening round of the LLWS against Apopka, Florida, announcers Dave Ryan and Tom Candiotti marveled at his performance 'amidst all the media attention and the overflow crowd at Volunteer Stadium' (ESPN, 2001b). During the top of the 5th inning of the game Candiotti reflected on the moment by stating:

Good look at Volunteer Stadium, and how many people are jammed in to watch this superstar in action. This is my fourth year here at the Little League World Series, and I cannot recall anything close in terms of the anticipation to see any one individual player. Some teams get a lot of media

attention, but nothing like this, definitely really groundbreaking stuff ... what we're seeing from Danny Almonte he's certainly worthy of media attention.

Very special kid, and he's performing at a very high level. (ESPN, 2001b)

Moreover, in personal conversations with Little League Director of Media Relations, Lance Van Auken, and Ithaca College Professor Steve Mosher, both of whom have been in attendance at several LLWS tournaments, and were present for Almonte's performance(s) in 2001, it became apparent just how big Almonte was for the event.

Mosher stated (personal communication, 2005) that when the opening round game between the Bronx and Apopka began 'waves of people came running from Lamade (Stadium) to Volunteer (Stadium)' just for the opportunity to watch Almonte pitch. Van Auken concurred stating that the initial media attention and popular following for Almonte was 'just incredible' (personal communication, 2003). Given that those 'flocking to see' Almonte at Williamsport were overwhelmingly white (Mosher, personal communication, 2005), as is nearly always the case for the 300,000+ fans that annually attend the LLWS, Danny Almonte's celebrity status seemingly cleared the way for him to transcend normalized minority status in America.

As such, and following Andrews (2001), Almonte - like other minority celebrities before him -, allowed for the reification of the belief that "personal resolution that, according to Reaganism's doctrine of conservative egalitarianism and color-blind bigotry, was all that was required to achieve in American society" (p. 115). In other words, through the way he was treated as a superstar celebrity, Danny Almonte, became the embodiment of a true American citizen. Unfortunately,

and again using Andrews (2001), his brief success serves as defense for critique against the continued rollback of social provisions in the United States. In other words if he, a poverty stricken, Dominican, (im)migrant, can become successful in this country without equal opportunity then other working class minorities should be able to as well.

Moreover, while Almonte was able to become a celebrated minority athlete he never completely overcame the fact that he was not a 'normal' Little League star (read: one that was white, male, middle-class, and an American citizen by birth). Therefore, though there was no denying the appeal of a young athlete performing at such a high level, there was a distinct level of unease amongst the predominantly white media members covering the 2001 LLWS. For instance, in direct reference to Danny Almonte and the Baby Bombers, this started 'innocently' enough in early round games, when announcers made note that 'it was difficult to verify the age of players on teams who came from countries outside the United States', but that "there was no better way to stay out of trouble in the summer than playing Little League Baseball" (ESPN, 2001). In positing this statement the narrative seems to be that in coming to the United States to play Little League Baseball kids are being 'rescued' from their home lives, when, in fact, it was Almonte's choice to play the sport that would eventually lead him to trouble.

The implicitly jingoistic comments took a turn for the more ridiculous during the game between Bronx and Oceanside (Game 2 of the LLWS), when announcer, Orel Hershiser, commented that the children from the latter team 'knew' about Danny Almonte and the Baby Bombers, "because all these kids speak English, read

English so all the hype around the New York team – these kids have found out about” (ESPN, 2001). This was a puzzling comment, particularly since earlier in the broadcast the viewer learned that “all but two” (ESPN, 2001) of the brown-skinned children from the Bronx were born and raised in the United States, and only Almonte (who had moved to America three years prior) had trouble speaking English (though he understood spoken word). On its own, this could be attributed to looking too deeply into a throwaway comment during a Little League game, but the fact that speaking and reading English was in Hershiser’s stream of consciousness is a bit troubling to say the least.

Moreover, when coupled with a *New York Times* article written by Richard Sandomir (2001) entitled, “*Hey ABC, It’s not a One-Team Tournament*”, similar sentiments were published. Within the article, which was written following the Bronx team’s loss in a rematch against Apopka, Florida in the U.S. Finals the author suggested that ABC wanted the Bronx team to win and that their:

Attitude was bizarre, given that it is owned by the Walt Disney Company, which owns Walt Disney World in Orlando, of which Apopka is a suburb. Despite the synergy, ABC made no attempt to venture into the real-life Mayberry (a comparison cited by ABC’s Brent Musburger] to balance the introduction or for a live shot of some of its 26,000 citizens celebrating their team’s 8-2 victory over the Bronx. So it was a sheer delight, during the third inning, to hear Shelly Brewer ... skewer those who had ignored the Florida team to focus on the Bronx team as if it were the 1998 Yankees. “All we’ve

heard about is Danny Almonte,” Shelly Brewer said. “In our opinion the other teams didn’t get any respect. Its all been about Danny Almonte.” (2001, 2D)

In some ways, tiring over the adoration of a star athlete is a common theme for rival fans and sportswriters in general, particularly in the era of ESPN sport argument television, but when looking at who was and how they were being (re)presented in the previous two statements it could be argued that a dangerous mode of implicit ethnic struggle is taking place. For through the comments of Hersher and the aforementioned article the teams from Apopka, Florida, and Oceanside, California, full of white middle/upper-class kids, became the United States latest ‘great white hope’, insofar as they were positioned as the defenders of white American innocence who, ultimately, helped rid the tournament of its ‘unworthy’ brown boys – who were never quite American enough.

This type of thinking becomes even more dangerous when it is coupled with the fact that during Mosher’s ethnographic work at the 2001 LLWS the Apopka, Florida parents could be overheard referring to their doubt in Almonte’s age by saying things ‘in full voice’ like “if that nigger²⁸ is 12 then I’m ...” (Mosher, 2001, personal communication), and my ethnographic research during the 2003 LLWS where LLCo workers openly stated that they “hated when teams from New York participated” (only Almonte’s Bronx team, and a team composed of minorities from Harlem in 2002 had made it in recent years at the international event in Williamsport, because they “feel like they should have everything handed to them”

²⁸ I contend that the conflation of this terrible, racist term, which primarily is used to degrade African-Americans, in reference to a Dominican boy sheds a fair amount of light on the general level of racial ignorance that I have experienced while in Williamsport (field notes, 2003, 2005).

(field notes, 2003). Statements like these only serve to reinforce dominant myths about the poor (immigrant) brown (male) in need and the innocence of the white, upper/middle-class (male), and are consistent with previous research on minority based studies about Michael Jordan (Andrews, 2000, 2001), Nike's P.L.A.Y. campaign (Cole, 2001a), urban school students (Giroux, 2003; Grossberg, 2005) and midnight basketball (Pitter & Andrews, 1997).

Moreover, while I do not argue the omnipresence of the media focus on and around Danny Almonte and the Baby Bombers – as I have described they did take more than their share of the limelight at the event – Sandomir, and Shelly Brewer's arguments would have had more foundation if this type of coverage were not typical of how ABC attempts to formulate Little League programming (White, Silk & Andrews, 2008a, 2008b). I could also see their point if similar deference was not given to other transcendent young performers prior to or since 2001. While, perhaps not exactly promoted at the same high level due in large part to the number of media members following them, one need only look at the likes of then-future NHL and MLB players Chris Drury (1989), and Sean Burroughs (1992-3), and, more recently, Michael Broad (2003), who (not) coincidentally were each white, upper middle-class and male, to see that this is simply not the case – Almonte just happened to come from New York City, while these young boys came from much smaller towns like Trumbull, Connecticut, Long Beach, California, and Boynton Beach, Florida respectively.

Further on the point, as Joanna Zylińska writes, if an individual committed to progressive social change were to view these and other similar comments through what Levinas (1998, p. 38) would describe as ‘the listening eye’ they:

Would hear the traces of imperial history and its consequences in [there words], it would pick up the signals about the distribution of capital according to the lines of power established and protected by the colonial institutions ... the listening eye would also grasp inner-city divisions in which some ‘subcultures’ are established along racial as well as financial lines. And it would attempt to avert the gaze in order to stop the (well-meaning, perhaps) journalist (but also the cultural studies practitioner) from fixing, i.e. totalizing, the other’s otherness in an account that speaks of ‘cultural difference’ without reflecting on its socio-historical structuring. (2005, p. 59)

In other words, even as a supposed “All-American” success story, Almonte’s multifarious identities were used to propagate myths of (white) innocence as well as reinforce ideologies (both liberal and conservative) about the economic, political, cultural, and moral superiority of the United States particularly when compared to the Dominican Republic.

Almonte the Dominican

Noted in the aforementioned is that while Almonte was consistently lauded as the prototypical American immigrant that should be celebrated for his hard work and success there was a certain amount of unease coming from his competitors. In fact, prior to the *Sports Illustrated* investigation, which took place two weeks after the 2001 Little League World Series concluded, another inquiry into Almonte’s age

had already taken place. Unconvinced by his birth records the parents for teams from Staten Island, New York and Pequannock, New Jersey, two squads that the Baby Bombers has defeated in the earlier rounds of the LLWS tournament, funded a \$10,000 private investigation on the young star, and found nothing (ESPN 2001a; Hickey, 2001; Woods, 2001). Interestingly, and as I will outline, Almonte remains a vilified figure in terms of the LLWS whilst relatively little is mentioned about the wealthy parents of youth baseball teams spending thousands of dollars on failed age investigations.

More to the point, following the *Sports Illustrated* report Almonte's identity as a welcomed U.S. immigrant shifted back to a poverty stricken Dominican who attempted to circumvent the neoliberal capitalist system. In other words, Almonte became that which a few short weeks earlier he had seemingly overcome – a typical immigrant. The 'moral panic' (Cohen, 1972; Hall, et al., 1978) about the state of immigrant youth in America that the Almonte story instigated is illustrative of this.

For example, when Little League President, Steve Keener, responded to the controversy he stated that:

Adults have used Danny Almonte in a most contemptible and despicable way, their actions are reprehensible. We are certainly saddened and angry that we were deceived. In fact, millions of Little Leaguers around the world were deceived. The charter committee unanimously voted to forfeit all the victories won by the Rolando Paulino Little League team in 2001 including the championship titles won at the district, sectional, regional play as well. In addition, the 3rd place game won by the Rolando Paulino Little League in he

Little League World Series has been forfeited in favor of the team from Curacao representing the Latin American region. (CNNSI.com, 2001b). Thus, through the press conference Keener presented the notion that Almonte and the two adults involved in altering his age had somehow cheated ‘millions of Little Leaguers around the world’.

Popular media sources followed suit by disparaging Almonte’s coach, Rolando Paulino, his father Felipe, and, in some cases even 14 year-old Danny himself using ‘various forms of racism’ (Mosher, 2001c, Thomsen & Llosa, 2001; Van Auken, personal communication, 2003), while lamenting the fact that the ‘innocent children’ – nearly all of which were white, boys, and upper class – from State College, Pennsylvania, Staten Island, New York, and Pequannock, New Jersey had lost out on a ‘chance of a lifetime’ (Becker, 2001).

President Bush even commented that:

I’m disappointed that adults would fudge the boys age. I wasn’t disappointed in his fastball and his slider, guy was awesome ... I mean he’s a great pitcher, but I was sorely disappointed that people felt like they could send in a false age particularly when it comes to Little League Baseball of all places.

(CNNSI.com, 2001a)

The irony of George W. Bush criticizing anyone for ‘fudging’ anything – particularly so soon after the 2000 Presidential election – notwithstanding, these criticism from white male power figures seemed to open the door for far more critical mediated renderings of Danny Almonte. Now, as his identity flexed back to a Dominican migrant, Almonte became a Latino cautionary tale who was part of *their* ‘constant

attack' of white interests, and innocence (cf. Becker, 2001; Crouch, 2001; Hamill, 2001).

Moreover, when it became known that Almonte had not attended school in the '18 months that he had been in the United States' (Vulliamy, 2001, p. 19) because 'it would have blown his cover' (Caple, 2001, ¶5) it paved the way for more condemnation towards immigrant Dominican (male) youth (see: Crouch, 2001; Gendar, 2001). Steve Keener declared that the fact Almonte had not been enrolled in school was "the most deplorable act that has been committed to date" (Gendar, 2001, p. 2). Through this and similar statements popular discourse would have it that not only had Almonte taken away his white counterpart's innocence, but he further perpetuated the notion that without the help of (white) Americans, brown-skinned youth and their parents cannot govern themselves (Dean, 1999; Finney, 2001; Kelley, 2001; Paige, 2001; Shaw, 2001).

Even the September 1st, 2001 ESPN broadcast of *Outside the Lines* (2001b), which initially started out as an explanation for why Almonte, and his adult contemporaries may have chosen to falsify his age and making it "easier to understand and harder to condemn" helped position the young boy as a stereotypical Dominican. While through a series of interviews the viewer found out that this choice was likely made, because this was the 'only way Almonte could possibly ever provide for his father, mother, brothers, and sisters', but eventually degenerated into more moral panic over what *sneaky* Dominican's do to make it to Major League Baseball. At one point a Dodger's scout was interviewed, and he

stated that ‘almost all players in the Dominican falsify their age’, thereby helping critics further perpetuate moral assaults on Dominican minorities.

Importantly Danny, his father, and Rolando Paulino have refused to revisit the situation with American media sources following the revelation of his age. However his stepmother, Marisol Maria Inoa Sanchez de Almonte, did plea for forgiveness stating “we had to commit this little fraud to give this opportunity to this child” (ESPN.com, 2001, ¶9). Given the context whereby a young Major League prospect signed in the Dominican Republic earns \$4-5000 whereas a top draft pick (which Almonte almost surely would have been had he not been caught) in the United States receives \$1 million or more Almonte’s and/or his parents decision to ‘fudge’ his age seems quite simple. Despite this argument being posited on the ESPN *Outside the Lines* segment, and on its website through Steve Mosher’s article (2001c), the criticism continued.

At one point it became so overwhelming that fellow Dominican baseball superstar, Pedro Martinez, came to his defense by stating:

This kid has been through so much, he comes from the mountains, he goes to New York, he gets the opportunity to play and then he gets all of this crap just because he does good ... It’s just because he kicked everybody’s ass that people complained ... It’s good that he doesn’t have to deal with all the crap they’re trying to do to him; all the crap that America has to offer.

(Horrigan, 2001, p. 108).

It was hardly surprising, however, when Boston Herald columnist Gerry Callahan (2001) retorted:

So, Pedro, the Almonte's basically cheated their way to Williamsport, and then got caught. They might call that crap in the Dominican, but up here we've got another word for it. It's called justice. As far as we can tell, all the crap was provided by Danny and daddy Almonte Real kids -12 year-old kids – in the biggest game of their lives were made to look silly by a 14 year-old bully. They were victims of the Full Almonte – a sleazy little con game that got found out. (p. 92)

More to the point, while Danny Almonte and the adults implicated in changing his age were being blamed for robbing the 'real' kids of their innocence, in their quest for (American) "justice" Keener, Bush, Callahan, and other assenting media sources were taking part in some convenient forgetfulness.

They are neglectful in the first instance by refusing to acknowledge the fact that ABC, who never returned the advertising money they made while garnering a 4.2 television rating (high for an American summer sport broadcast) for the U.S. bracket Championship game²⁹ that included Almonte (Sandomir, 2001, p. 2), and Little League, already rob these children of their innocence. They do so by making them commodities to be bought and sold by corporate interests (Hamill, 2001), argued over by (mostly white) adult men on ESPN television shows like *Pardon the Interruption*, *Around the Horn*, and *Sportscenter*, and otherwise treated as adults while offering little in return – besides 10 days of baseball in Williamsport, Pennsylvania. Secondly, the predominantly upper-class white men organizing and

²⁹ This included a 6. Rating in New York City, and 17.7 in Orlando, and was part of raising the tournament's overall rating more than 129 percent in 2001.

producing the LLWS are also guilty of overlooking the power structures governing Almonte's life had in shaping his and/or his handlers decision to cheat – structures that the United States under George W. Bush's neoliberal policies and neoconservative values have only served to fortify (Butler, 2002; Dean 1999; Grossberg, 2001, 2005).

More to the point, incessant coverage by the U.S. media condemning 'cheating' Dominican baseball players for their moral failings, perpetuates this system. Specifically, and similar to strategies used to promote American Empire around the world, the American public is generally ignorant of the fact that the United States has systematically destroyed any hope for Dominican national economic growth outside of baseball (Hernandez, 2004; Mosher, 2001c). In many ways the Dominican Republic remains a 'simple' country, because the American government has fashioned it in that way. Initially this was constructed through the empowerment of American-friendly dictator, Rafael Trujillo (Zinn, 2003), then through the aforementioned influx of U.S. owned corporations.

In wholly blaming Danny Almonte, Little League Baseball and U.S. media sources are partaking in what I would call convenient justice that is typical of American hegemonic power, and should come of little surprise. For on the one hand, it was wrong for Danny, his family, and his coach to cheat for the chance at a million dollars, which is probably the main reason they have decided never to speak about it to the American media. On the other hand however, any chance of American empathy for this choice has been limited by "Americans ... [who] have not been informed by their news sources of the societies that have been undermined by

covert U.S. military operations and U.S. economic policies (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2005, p. 330-331). Moreover, in the section to follow, it is not just the initial 'blip' on the radar screen which allows for this form of American hegemony to perpetuate, but rather through incessant reminders from the media that U.S. citizens come to understand that America=good and Others=bad.

Epilogue: "Stay Dominican", Danny

In the years following the 'Almonte scandal' several media outlets have followed Danny Almonte's life and career trajectory. Most reports have focused on critically evaluating his supposed personal failings/immaturity, thereby helping to cement Almonte as a case study in how minority (im)migrants are ruining America. For example through several newspaper reports, those following Almonte have learned that: his mother survived a cancer scare (Ortega, 2004), but that it was 'only a ruse to get her into the United States' (Montero, 2004, p. 9); that at 19 – and 'not even a high school graduate' (Bode, Garcia, Yaniv, Connor & Standor, 2006, p. 3) – he 'secretly' married his 30 year-old girlfriend; then in 2006 went undrafted in the Major League Baseball Amateur Draft (Garcia, 2006a).

However, despite not being drafted, Almonte has had success on the baseball diamond by leading Monroe High School in New York to two PSAL high school state championships in 2004 (Rodriguez, 2004) and 2006 (Garcia, 2006b), and signed with the South Illinois Miners of the Frontier League in 2007 (Begley, 2007). Still, Almonte faces long odds of ever being a Major League Baseball player, a fact not lost on popular American media sources. More to the point, numerous websites (ESPN.com, Foxsports.com to name a few) have run stories describing Danny as one

of the top 10 sports cheaters of all-time, while ESPN television has aired features and interviews on Almonte in recent years (2005, 2007) outlining his life, while simultaneously serving to absolve themselves (LLCo/Disney/America) of blame in his (almost certain) personal socio-economic shortcomings.

During the 2005 Little League World Series ESPN revisited the Almonte scandal as part of their special '50 states in 50 days' travelogue throughout the United States. On *Day 37: Pennsylvania*, ESPN chose to follow up on Danny Almonte, for which announcer Chris McKendry lead into with the following statement:

Well Ben Franklin, one of our countries founding father's lived, died, and he's buried in Philadelphia. You know the baseball world could have used his wit, and his wisdom over the years ... Franklin would have crafted a way to explain the 1919 Black Sox, Peter Rose, or maybe the current steroid situation to the kids ... or better yet the scandal that hit this tournament in 2001 – Steve Levy catches up with Danny Almonte. (ESPN, 2005).

As the story began the viewer finds out that Almonte was the winning pitcher in the 2004 PSAL title game, 'against people his own age', and that he had moved to Florida with his father to play in an elite summer league team.

Unfortunately Almonte was kicked off the team, because he did not attend enough practices and games. His coach stated in an interview, "you know he's obviously gotten away with murder, and at some point you have to face responsibility, and he hasn't done that". Throughout the short feature however, there were allusions toward the fact that he was estranged from his family, had no money, internet access, or transportation to get to practice (ESPN, 2005). It was

never elaborated on how much of a factor that this played in Almonte's individual (ir)responsibility.

ESPN again revisited the Almonte story in 2007, when Danny was interviewed by Jay Crawford for the show *First Take* following his first start for South Illinois. Visibly uneasy with the American media, even six years after his 'scandal', Almonte refused to answer questions based on his past experience with Little League Baseball (ESPN, 2007). However, when asked why he was not drafted, Almonte responded that 'he thought' that it was because of his past (a left-handed pitcher that throws over 90 mph would typically be regarded as a Major League prospect). Thus the viewer again is reminded that Almonte is still experiencing 'justice' for his personal inability to follow the rules.

Coda: All Along the Almonte Watchtower

Like previous studies conducted on racial and ethnic media discourse (Andrews, 2001; Cole, 2001a; Giardina, 2005) this project has been an overt attempt at representing an alternative version of the 'truth' about a minority subject to the reader. In following Giardina's (2005) composition on Martina Hingis, it is clear that Danny Almonte's celebrity identity is instructive of the ways that the subject, the state, and the media attempt to use one another for capital gain and the perpetuation of the ideology of America as the land of opportunity and justice. Moreover, this project is also part of the project to reveal how powerful the media is in determining how an individual is understood in the American populace.

Though this project coincides with Giardina's findings in that dominant hegemonic discourses about America are being proffered through Almonte, but

different from Giardina's 'global Hingis' (2005), Almonte's story has no semblance of a happy ending. For through his status as a hero and villain Almonte was appropriated by the U.S. media into dominant neoliberal discourse about the 'great melting pot' that is the United States – while celebrating the 'opportunities individuals have within it. Simultaneously, these overarching notions take part in a collective forgetfulness which leaves out the 'real' struggles that poverty stricken minorities, primarily of color, have to endure as second-class citizens in this world (Giroux, 1996; Baudrillard, 1988). This erasure only serves to heighten popular opinion that brown male youths are only looking for government handouts, and, without the help of 'benevolent white folk' (hooks, 1992) cannot take care of themselves.

Moreover, I believe that through the excavation of the mediated discourse surrounding Almonte the boundaries on which (American) citizens are innocent and which typically operate outside the margins of innocence are clearly being set. To best criticize this projection of innocence it is important to conduct further research on the ways that popular American media sources create celebrity. In other words, there is a real need to understand how (minority) athletes become stars in America, whose regimes they benefit, and how they serve to reify dominant beliefs about the ability to become successful in the United States. In this project, by demonstrating how dominant neoliberal discourse is shielding the inherent inequalities attendant in our current governmental system from the eyes of those who would benefit most from its change my aim is to help foster a more democratic, socially just society by

helping to wrestle with the Algerian mythologies that prevail through popular discourse and governmental rhetoric.

In using Danny Almonte to do so I think Lauren Berlant (1997, p. 220) puts it best with her statement that:

One person, one image, one face can only symbolize (But never meet) the need for radical transformation of national culture, whose sanitary self-conception these days seems to require a constant cleansing of the nonnormal populations – immigrant, nonconjugal, poor, Hispanic, African American – from the fantasy scene of private, protected, and sanctified “American” life.

Getting back to my original point about the U.S. media already being reactionary and jingoistic before 9/11/01, it seems as if both Danny Almonte and the terrible events of that day are merely instances through which American media sources can continually (re)produce the United States as the ‘land of opportunity, freedom, and justice’ while simultaneously committing acts that are just the opposite (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2005).

In terms of this project then, by greeting Danny Almonte as a positive story about the opportunity that immigrant citizens have in the United States, then leaving him behind as an unworthy Dominican when he failed to live up to exceptional American expectations is a typical American strategy. As such, I will leave you with this. Found within the Little League Museum is a stone plaque engraved with a quote from George W. Bush stating that: “Perhaps nothing is more

American than Little League Baseball". Unfortunately, he may be more correct in that statement than he will ever understand.

Chapter III: Setting the Stage: Constructing 'Normalized' Citizenship in Red Sox Nation Through Film

In recent years fans of the Boston Red Sox, who have come to be known as Red Sox Nation (Shaughnessy, 1996), are experiencing an unprecedented rise in popularity in the general American popular (White, P., 2007). The Red Sox brand has saturated local as well as global markets and has been sutured to various forms of charity, popular music, and television (see: Chapter 4). In addition, there has been no shortage of films that have directly or indirectly referenced fans of the team (cf. Ardolino, 2007). Further, as the Red Sox (Nation) brand infiltrates more markets and, in turn, encourages more disparate populations to join it is become ever more important to critically evaluate the normalizing influences popular culture has on the community.

More to the point, as I have outlined elsewhere (see Chapter 4), official citizenship into the Red Sox Nation fan community is a relatively new phenomena, yet speaks to the shifting away from citizenship in the nation-state to a form of neo-tribalism (Maffesoli, 1996) based on the seductive nature of brand marketization, and representations of community through symbols. In this sense then, since inclusion into a cultural nation is 'imagined' (Anderson, 1983) then many of the influences behind what it means to be a member of Red Sox Nation are dictated by the choices made by Red Sox management, and/or cultural intermediaries (Negus, 2002). In other words through various commodities and popular culture many citizens of Red Sox Nation are given very specific messages about who matters and how they matter as members/citizens of this community. This, of course, is not to say that all people are mindless dupes that blindly follow the conventions of what

popular culture dictates, but rather takes note of the power popular culture has on delineating normal national culture (Berlant, 1997) – or in this case cultural citizenship in a commodity nation (Miller, 2007a).

More to the point, and following David Harvey's (1999) claim that we are living in an ever-shrinking world due, in part, to the increase of time-space compression through globalization, the ability for an individual to actually physically experience different communities can be a difficult undertaking. As such, mediated sporting events, television shows, and Hollywood films have long served to create and define lived spaces and communities under dominant societal ideologies (cf. Birrell & McDonald, 2000; Falcos & Silk, 2005; Klein, 2003). Thus, given the fact that we exist in a world where few people actually are able to experience all of the spaces and communities described in and through visual media these events, shows, and movies – which exist in the hyper-real – actually become reality for much of the viewing audience (Baudrillard, 1994).

Given then that most people's connection to people and places are through mediated, hyper-real formations it is important then to understand that the meaning made for and about community through the media is dominated largely by the few individuals who spend time behind the camera lens (Jhally, 1995). Their ability to highlight, erase, and reify dominant and subversive ideologies through the creation and presentation of film and television shows are a form of power and dominance over particular sites of meaning (Silk & Falcos, 2005). My aim then is to explicate the dominant, oft-unspoken meanings of what it means to be a citizen of

Red Sox Nation through a careful evaluation of two films, *Good Will Hunting* (1997) and *Fever Pitch* (2005) that serve to define membership in the community.

Writings about Boston and the Red Sox have long lamented its conservative, and decidedly whitened past. Briefly, one need only look at the public bussing issues of the 1970's whereby ethnic minorities were left to find their own transportation, or forced to ride through racist areas, yet were blamed for not being able to get to work/school (Alberts, 1978; Formisano, 1991). When taken in conjunction with the increasing economic disparities between men and women, rich and poor within the city, as well as the spatial separation of the white, upper-class to suburbs and the gentrified downtown, pitted against the urban poor (which includes those that would identify as white), it offers a revealing lens with which to see Boston's decidedly divisive social landscape.

In addition, the Red Sox themselves have been criticized for being the last team to racially integrate (Bryant, 2002), raising ticket prices which has created implicit class divisions between those in Red Sox Nation that can attend games and those that cannot (Klein, 2000), and even the (re)construction of Fenway itself (Benjamin, 2007; Lowry, 2006) has helped divide along class and inextricably ethnic lines. As such, over the remainder of the paper at present I will investigate and uncover the hyper-real Red Sox Nation experience as a space of (neo)conservative and neoliberal class/gender/sexual/race divide in our perplexing social moment (Grossberg, 2006). Through the following then I will attempt to critically evaluate two films that I feel best characterize typical members of Red Sox Nation. As such it is through *Good Will Hunting*, and the American version of Nick Hornby's *Fever*

Pitch, that I will be able to describe how these forms of popular culture function as a pedagogical formation in relation to Red Sox Nation.

At the same time, this project is more than a film review, but rather a cultural studies project that sets out to contextualize a form 'of human group life' (Denzin, 1991, p. x) and position the power of these two films on defining the socio-political ideologies that play out in and through the (Red Sox/American) Nation. Finally, while understanding that not all members of Red Sox Nation have watched these two films, have internalized them in the same way, and that these two forms of popular culture are but a meager part of a person's everyday life (cf. Grossberg, 1997b), I still firmly assert that *Good Will Hunting* and *Fever Pitch* provided many with a 'shared experience' (hooks, 1996, p. 2) which is instructive in describing normalized citizenship along race, gender, class, and sexuality axis in Red Sox Nation.

Film Study and the Contemporary Moment

The study of film, and its relation to society has a fairly long history (cf. in Denzin, 1995: Blumer 1933; Cooley 1902/1922, 1909; Frankfurt School; Mead 1925/1926/1964; Mills, 1956; Park, 1926/1967). However, much of the early work on film theory "viewed the movies with distaste and disdain" (Denzin, 1995, p. 13). In America, film schools began to proliferate throughout the country in the 1960's and 70's which led to more nuanced approaches in film appreciation and critique. According to Turner (1993, p. 40-42), the understanding of film as a social practice and a key space for representative identification had its key influences in the rise of

the Birmingham Center for Contemporary Cultural Studies (BCCCS) combined with their use of French theorists Barthes and Althusser.

It is through the influences of the BCCCS and the further inclusion of French social theory (Debord, Foucault, Baudrillard, and Deleuze to name a few) that some of the most pertinent studies influencing the project at present was born. Cultural Studies scholars in particular (cf. Denzin, 1991, 1995; Dyer, 1997; Giardina, 2005; Giroux, 2001a, 2001b; 2002b; hooks, 1996; Rocchio, 2000; Turner, 1993) have written about the productive relationship between film, the contemporary socio-political moment, and representations of race/class/gender/sexuality. More recently likeminded research has critically evaluated how sport film has been used to emotively connect with particular audiences, and reproduce dominant notions of who matters, how they matter, and under which dominant socio-political regimes they operate (Giardina, 2005; Kusz, 2001; Silk, Bracey & Falcou, 2007).

More to the point, Henry Giroux has suggested that film more than any other form of multi-media is so important to place under a critical lens, because “it is a compelling mode of communication and form of public pedagogy – a visual technology that functions as a powerful teaching machine that intentionally tries to influence the production of meaning, subject positions, identities, and experience” (2001b, p. 587). As the rise in purchasing single popular songs on platforms like iTunes, and this being the era of the post-video on MTV, the ability for musical artists to convey a consistent story through an album has be reduced to de-politicized popular singles that appeal to a wide reaching audience. Coupled with the aforementioned is the fact that television is still a relatively short-lived, and

often nation-based medium to evaluate despite the rise in DVD sales of entire seasons of television shows, the advent of digital video recordings which allow for multiple viewings of episodes, and the rise of commercial free HBO programming (*Sex and the City*, *The Sopranos*, and *The Wire*) (Grossberg, 1997b). Finally, while the internet is a valuable, arguably more democratic and sustainable site for gathering information it still does not, at present, match Hollywood film on a mass experiential level.

Following Giroux again film has the ability to capture an audience by 'oscillating between the lure of film as entertainment and the provocation of film as a cultural practice' (2001b, p. 589). The power then of Hollywood film to be a part of the re-creation of normal national identities is palpable. In regard to the United States, building on the rhetorical tradition of Leni Riefenstahl's *Olympia* (1938), more recent films like *Black Hawk Down* (2001), *Jarhead* (2005), *Seabiscuit* (2003), *Cinderella Man* (2005), and *Miracle* (2004) have been used to ideologically position the United States as an imagined nation-state that is to be unquestioningly revered. However, as the real a/effects of Americo-centric neoliberal capitalism and empire (Pieterse, 2007) have taken hold throughout the world, new cultural nationalisms based on cultural and commodity based loyalties have risen to the fore. Thus, as Graeme Turner would have it, increasingly (as always perhaps), "identifications with 'the nation' are completely arbitrary ... and [one] cannot hope to construct 'national allegiances' easily with a line drawn across a map" (1993, p. 135).

Given this context where, despite the Bush Administration's best efforts, the ideological connection to political nationality is fast being surpassed by cultural

connections formed around consumption-based communities. Yet the symbolic and corporeal understandings of (cultural) citizenship (Miller, 2007a) garnered from the mediated depictions of these communities is still embedded in the social and political context of the contemporary moment. Thus, no different then from (c)over American efforts to re-create normal national ideologies, in films depicting members of Red Sox Nation dominant (national) ideologies and behaviors within that cultural construction are consistently being shaped and reinforced for the viewing public. As such this project is an effort to understand the cultural referents from which (non)members of Red Sox Nation use to form ideas about normative behaviors and values in the community.

Reading Mediated Citizenship in Red Sox Nation

In terms of Red Sox Nation, over the past 15 years approximately 13 feature films (cf. Ardolino, 2007), which directly or indirectly depict social aspects of membership in Red Sox Nation, have been released for public consumption. For this project I will focus on two feature films *Good Will Hunting* and *Fever Pitch*, because I found that they reflected my ethnographic experiences in Red Sox Nation during the 2007 baseball season. Moreover, when taken in conjunction with the fourth chapter of my dissertation *Playing their part: Performances of whiteness in Red Sox Nation 2007* (forthcoming), the project as a whole forms part of the context at the nexus of normalizing media descriptions and public performance of cultural citizenship. In Grossberg's words this part of the project seeks to understand the "relationship between social position, meaning, and experience" (1997a, p. 202) in everyday (mediated) life.

In reference to the aforementioned, after spending a year immersed in Red Sox Nation, I found that *Good Will Hunting* and *Fever Pitch* elicited the most accurate filmic depictions of what I experienced in a day-to-day manner while in contact with the community. As one of my interviewees, Dr. John Bracey Professor of Afro-American History at University of Massachusetts – Amherst said about *Good Will Hunting*, “that’s them that’s Red Sox Nation” (2007, personal communication), the film becomes a key referent when it comes to normalized visions of what the Red Sox Nation community values and how to behave.

The critically acclaimed film, directed by Gus Van Sant, featured Matt Damon (Will), Robin Williams (Dr. Sean Maguire), Minnie Driver (Skylar), and Ben Affleck (Chuckie) was nominated for seven academy awards, winning three, and grossed \$138 million in the United States (\$225 million worldwide) (Internet Movie Database, 2008). Using a classic narrative ‘boy coming of age’ plotline (cf. *Dead Poets Society*, 1989; *Scent of a Woman*, 1992; *The Skulls*, 2000)) the film set out, in part, to depict everyday life in South Boston (popularly referred to as “Southie”). Historically the area has been quite literally a site of racial discord (Forminsano, 1991), and treated as a forgotten community of white people that as a population are amongst the highest in the United States in murder rate, drug use and related death, poverty, and under-education (MacDonald, 2000). In quite a real way then *Good Will Hunting* set out to depict life in an area that most leaders of neoliberal influenced corporate companies would prefer we forget, because Southie is a fantastic case study in showing how structurally based under privilege manifests

itself in a community of white Americans – seemingly the most privileged group in American society (MacDonald, 2000).

Interestingly, if *Good Will Hunting* shows the devastating effects of neoliberalism on an underprivileged and underserved community, then *Fever Pitch* provides a description of what it means to be privileged during the contemporary socio-political moment. Billed as a romantic comedy (Ebert, 2005), the film follows Jimmy Fallon’s character (Ben), a middle-school teacher, and Drew Barrymore’s character (Lindsay), a corporate success story, through the beginnings of a relationship troubled by occupational responsibilities and an undying love of the Boston Red Sox. Though less well received at the box office (grossing \$43 million in America and \$50 million worldwide) (Box Office Mojo, 2008) and critically (all its award nominations came from the Teen Choice Awards), the movie was filmed at an opportune time – during the 2004 baseball season when the Boston Red Sox won their first World Series in 86 years. As such, the main characters were actually taped on the field celebrating with the 2004 World Championship team. Thus while this was not universally accepted as a positive choice by the filmmakers (Simmons, 2005, p. 343-344), it does place *Fever Pitch* in a position to describe membership in Red Sox Nation during the first taste of success in Major League Baseball since 1918.

To best read the “filmic narratives” (Giardina, 2005, p. 87) in the aforementioned these media forms were viewed and analyzed using a formal semiotic methodology similar to that of Gruneau, et al. (1988) in order to better grasp the preferred and dominant discursive meanings found within these two versions of normalized citizens in Red Sox Nation. Through this careful explication I

initially intend to provide a critical understanding of Red Sox Nation, then articulate how that community has become popular in contemporary America – a moment lamented as being part of the rightward shifting of U.S. politics (Giroux, 2003, 2004a; Grossberg, 2005).

Red Sox Nation and Class

As I alluded to in the aforementioned, the main reason I chose to interrogate the two movies *Good Will Hunting* and *Fever Pitch*, was because they represent two poles of class Habitus (Bourdieu, 1978) – and by extension raced/gendered/sexed – life within Red Sox Nation. As such these two films operate as separate but connected ways of experiencing the mediated Red Sox Nation. In *Good Will Hunting* Will Hunting is a ‘hidden genius’ living a traditional working-class lifestyle. Throughout the movie the viewer sees Hunting, and his friends, experience Boston as relative social outcasts due to their class positionality. More to the point, since 2001, the Red Sox have, by far, Major League Baseball’s highest ticket prices (Isidore, 2006), thereby providing an obstacle for entrée to Fenway Park for those from a working class background. Importantly however, for this project, in *Good Will Hunting* through a few different references, like wearing a Red Sox hat, watching Sox games on television, or Will speaking in awe of his therapist attending Game 6 of the 1976 World Series, the viewer understands that Hunting and his friends are people who identify themselves as part of Red Sox Nation.

Through the film’s narrative the viewer learns the relative worth of the working class in the contemporary moment as members of the (Red Sox) national community. For example, one moment where class division became apparent in the

film was when Chuckie and Will go to a 'Harvard' bar. Chuckie, the stereotypically undereducated 'Southie' resident, pretends to be a matriculated student at the University in order to 'impress the hotties at the end of the bar'. He is immediately 'outed' as a non-student at the University by a first-year graduate student. The student attacks Chuckie by stating that the History class he supposedly enrolled in at Harvard was taken between "lunch and recess". Will then comes to Chuckie's rescue by exposing the Harvard student as an unoriginal academic fraud that wasted "150 grand on a fucking education that (he) could have got for \$1.50 in late fees from the public library". Quite interestingly the embarrassed student responds by stating "yeah but I will have a degree and you will be serving my kids fries at a drive thru on our way to a skiing trip". As such, despite their outward appearances as white, male, heterosexual, educated (in)equals and part of Red Sox Nation, Hunting's and Sullivan's working class status marked them as less desirable members of the (Red Sox) nation.

Social class in the film also leads to romantic discord between Skylar and Will. Early in the film narrative it is easy to understand that Will comes from one of the poorest areas in Boston, whereas Skylar later reveals that she comes from inherited wealth, attended private school, Harvard, and is looking forward to going to medical school at Stanford. Immediately after stating this, she exclaims that one day "my brain's going to be worth \$250,000, bring me another Mai Tai" then immediately repents given their differing class levels. Though their relationship verifies a contemporary trend whereby 'women are increasingly marrying men from a lower class standing' (Lewing, 2005, p. 53), in a few more scenes it becomes

easier to understand how class difference is a major division line in American society in general, in romantic relationships in particular, and by extension speaks to normalized class-differences within Red Sox Nation.

In the first instance Will, clearly worried about how Skylar will react to seeing his living space, works at all costs to never let her experience his friends and Southie. Instead of taking her there Will meets Skylar in Harvard, and brings her to a dog track (itself a working class activity) before he finally relents in a later scene. In that scene again distraught about her possible response to his house Will never allows Skylar to see it, because as Chuckie said, “once you see that shithole he knows you’ll drop him like a bad habit”. Following this scene Skylar and Will nearly end their relationship when she proclaims her love for him and an argument ensues – centered primarily on their class differences.

During the verbal sparring Will calls her a “trust fund baby”, says she is merely ‘slumming’ with the kid from Southie who has had cigarettes put out on him and stabbed by foster parents, and that ultimately the relationship cannot work because of these differences. Skylar, being the more privileged of the two in terms of class, does not understand Will’s class and experiential based embarrassment, because she’s “trying to help”. This scene is key in that it quite overtly displays the strife between the privileged few that are allowed to have aspirational goals in regard to education, occupation, and housing, whereas the working class who have more modest goals of day to day living (Rees, 1999). More to the point, while Will Hunting lives in a space of relative under privilege his desire not to leave becomes particularly lucid when Hunting claims that he wants to “live, work, and die in

Boston”.

However, his friends, probation overseer, and therapist all encourage Will to become part of the Regan/Thatcher-led neo-liberal movement (Harvey, 2005) and ‘pull himself up by the bootstraps’ in order to be a productive member of society that is able to overcome his horrible class experience. At the film’s penultimate moment, Hunting does leave, presumably for a job and better life in California with Skylar. Despite this seemingly overdone and banal success story of a working-class man making it out of his terrible conditions into a realm of higher-class living the film further contributes to a growing trend in the United States where those in need of social welfare are either blamed for their misfortune or looked at as being unlucky (Dean, 1999).

Following Richard Rees’s focused critique of class in the film *Good Will Hunting* serves as another “imaginary resolution to class contradictions through an extraordinary individual’s flight from oppressive class circumstances, rather than the abolition of those conditions by collective action” (Dean, 1999, p. 238). In other words it was only Will, through his extreme intelligence and extraordinary luck that enabled him to escape the socially stunted Southie. Conversely, his best friend Chuckie is resigned to ‘doing the same thing for 50 years’, and requests that Will leave with no notice, or recourse to returning home.

Quite interestingly, former Southie resident Michael Patrick MacDonald, who has autobiographically outlined life in Southie (MacDonald, 2000, 2004) argues that people in general must work across race and class lines to “hold all of our elected officials and candidates accountable, at all levels of government...All families and

children in our neighborhoods deserve equal access to the middle class through the best education and job opportunities....only then will we have truly arrived” (2004, p. 107-108). Returning to Rees then, *Good Will Hunting* while lightly critiquing class but proffering no alternatives, serves to ‘sell the status quo beneath its rebellious, “independent” trappings’ (1999, p. 239).

Though different in class representation, through the film *Fever Pitch*, the viewer receives very similar class-based messages to those conveyed in *Good Will Hunting*. In *Fever Pitch*, the viewer is introduced to the middle-class life of Ben Wrightman (Jimmy Fallon), an elementary school teacher who holds dugout level season tickets to Fenway Park, and his eventual girlfriend Lindsay Meeks (Drew Barrymore), an upper-class business executive. Again during their courtship period both characters admitted that they were attracted to one another to their friends, but recognized that their social class standing was a key reason why they should not begin dating.

For instance following a rejection to his request for a date, Ben rationalized during a game of touch football that Lindsay did not want to pursue a romantic relationship with him because he “wasn’t in her class”. Simultaneously, while participating in aerobic workouts with her friends, Lindsay and they agreed with Ben’s assumption. One friend, Robin, stated that it was because as a teacher he had a “small...income”, and throughout the conversation another friend, Sarah, wondered if it might be difficult for Lindsay “to be more successful than him...financially”. Unlike Will Hunting, who achieved class ascendancy through his intelligence, for Wrightman it was through his inherited season tickets to the Red

Sox, and apparent connections with the parents of upper-class students that, at two key points within the film, he was able to connect with Lindsay and her privileged counterparts. One example of this is when Ben introduced to her girlfriend's male companions. Though he is dressed in a decidedly proletariat casual crewneck sweater and sneaker combination while awkwardly holding a glass of cognac – both of which are noticeably out of line with the other men in the room who are considerably more professionally dressed and comfortably situated in this scene – he is able to hold their undivided attention while recounting his past experiences at Fenway Park as part of Red Sox Nation. This awes admiration is earned even to the point that Chris, Robin's husband, quite disturbingly actually offers his wife's sexual services in return for Ben's season tickets.

Clearly, in the first instance this is clearly a troubling performance of hyper-masculinity, whereby a dominant male figure unquestioningly holds ownership over his wife's sexuality (Butler, 1993). Secondly, this scene also speaks to the illusionary class-erasure emblematic of the neoliberal moment (Giroux, 2005). *Fever Pitch* serves to erase class by making it seem as if Ben, who obviously does not fit in conventionally with the group of upper-class white men, becomes their social equal through ownership of Red Sox season tickets. This is problematic given that “class consciousness is the crux of the international struggle for the emancipation of *all* from the exploitation of global capitalism” (Ebert, 2001, p. 410). In other words, despite the ever-widening chasm between the upper and working-class within American society (Collins & Yeskel, 2000), *Fever Pitch* makes it seem as if material commodities are the great class equalizer. As if season tickets make up for a

staggeringly poor record of health care provisions, immense disparities between urban public, and private schools, and the overtly classist, and by extension, racist prison industrial complex in the United States (Baker, 2005, p. 252).

Secondly, according to original release and the extra text (Fiske, 1987) provided by the DVD extra scenes, when Ben is introduced to Lindsay's parents, they go out to an expensive dinner and discuss their disappointment at not being able to golf at a nearby country club. Ben, who, according to the deleted scenes, had disappointed Lindsay and her parents all evening with his plebian clothing and overly dramatic reaction to nearly hearing the score of the Red Sox game, earned their mutual respect by using a connection with the parent of one of his students to gain entry onto the golf course. Thus through these forms of social capital (Bourdieu, 1978) Ben is able to maintain his monetary middle-class level, without downgrading Lindsay's social class standing.

Clearly this is a troubling form of pedagogy in that through *Fever Pitch* the viewer learns that to be a part of Red Sox Nation they can identify as middle or working class, but to "matter" (or actually go to games) they necessarily have to eschew their 'actual' class identity and become a part of white upper-class gentility (hooks, 1990). As such the Red Sox Nation community, and the city of Boston are situated within *Good Will Hunting* and *Fever Pitch* as Hollywood-ized mythical spaces of white upper-class sensibilities. This is particularly dangerous, because more obvious difference like race and sex often provide the space for scholarly critique while the relative privilege afforded along these identity axis is almost always made concrete by the individual's class standing. In other words through

these two films “the marker of class positionality...can remain unseen, go [sic] unnoticed eclipsed by our fascinations with sex and race.” (hooks, 1996, p. 91-92)

Red Sox Nation's Straight Men's Club

Compounding the disconcertingly flippant treatment of class through *Good Will Hunting* and *Fever Pitch* is the fact that also found within these two films are regressive themes of gendered hetero-normativity which in the contemporary social condition are linked to conservative ideologies of the past. As Harvey says “the preservation of myth” (Harvey, 1989, p. 85) acts as a powerful erasure of historical differences and helps the general populace view history through a lens of white masculinity. Interestingly, on the surface, each film is difficult to critique for reinforcing gendered stereotypes given that Skylar is a hopeful pre-med student and Lindsay is a (soon to be) corporate CEO. Further, in the case of *Good Will Hunting*, Will actually leaves his friends, and the city of Boston behind to follow Skylar to Los Angeles. Yet again, however, this situation falls into the neo-liberal malaise that erases historical dominance for gendered subject positions (Coburn, 2004). Most notably in the fact that while in each film the respective female leads, Skylar and Lindsay, hold positions of relative (academic and earning) power over their (future) male partners, this power is ultimately usurped by Will and Ben through acts of normative masculinity and subservient femininity.

Early in *Good Will Hunting*, Will, despite being the intellectual superior to most ‘normal’ people is still unwilling to aspire to lawful norms. He engages in fights with Italian elementary school rivals, causes trouble at a Harvard bar, and even holds a few blue-collar jobs throughout the film. Each of the latter three

activities, based in brute physicality, clearly position Will into the realm of normative masculinity. Following Judith Butler, however 'this 'being a man' ... is an internally unstable affair' (Butler, 1999, p. 339). Specifically Will is able to transform his hyper-intellectuality, often cast as feminine or homosexual throughout the film, into another source of his heterosexual masculinity – particularly in his relationship with Skylar.

Though Skylar is cast as bright, academically talented, and an upper-class student at Harvard for whom Will eventually leaves Boston and his friends behind for, Skylar still relinquishes her power to Will through a few key connected scenes. The first moment where this happens is the aforementioned scene when the couple meets for the first time at a Harvard bar. Will and Chuckie are teased for their working-class, and presumably lower-educated roots by another one of Skylar's suitors. Skylar and her girlfriend are mesmerized by the war of words between Will and the Harvard graduate student (eventually 'won' by Will), and later Skylar gives her phone number seemingly as a prize for winning the verbal academic pissing contest. Clearly this act of 'to the victor go the (sexual) spoils' serves to reify the distinctly masculinist ideology that by acting the part of an alpha-male one will be more attractive to a heterosexual woman.

A second point of interest is that following this scene the viewer never again sees Skylar with the girlfriend that she brought to the bar, or any other friend for that matter. Thus Skylar seemingly willingly eschews her friends and other social acquaintances thereby submitting her time to Will, his friends, and sometimes her academics. Moreover, even Skylar's commitment to personal academic success is

called into question when she allows Will, who is actually her intellectual superior, to complete her homework assignments so that she can spend more time with him. The juxtaposition of a seemingly underserved male from Southie, with a female pre-med student from Harvard is interesting in that it helps reinforce the mythic idea that men are still more intelligent than women no matter the circumstances.

Interestingly, while in *Good Will Hunting* the viewer is given the flimsy illusion that the needs of the male lead do not take precedence, in *Fever Pitch* the illusion that Lindsay has any power over Ben does not last long. In fact, much of the film centers on the theme that Lindsay has dated ‘poodles’ that clung to her in a feminine manner, rather than a man that could ‘take care of himself’. Ben, through his zealous fandom of the Boston Red Sox, has no issue being the type of man that Lindsay desires, and thus is an individual that Lindsay is ultimately willing to give up her friends to submit to his needs – namely by following the team as part of Red Sox Nation. Interestingly besides class differences it is through his fandom of the Red Sox that causes the most conflict in their relationship.

For example, Ben refuses to travel with Lindsay to France for a romantic getaway weekend, because the Red Sox are playing at home, whilst planning all of the romantic trips around Red Sox away games. Further, their relationship comes to an end the first time when after agreeing to attend Lindsay’s birthday party instead of a Sox home game, the team completes a 10-run comeback in the 9th inning to defeat the Yankees. Ben, after previously suggesting that he was happy not attending the game, reacts by saying that this was “the worst night of his life” leading to a fight. During the argument Lindsay stands up for herself and explains

that she has given a lot in the relationship, in the way of following the Red Sox with Ben, and that she can no longer take it thereby ending their partnership.

Moreover, after initially refusing Ben's advances to reprise their relationship Lindsay is told at a lunch with her friends that he is about to sell his tickets to Robin's husband Chris. Before Lindsay can react she is whisked back to her office to celebrate her surprise promotion to CEO of the company. However, rather than celebrate with everyone Lindsay comes to the surprising contention that it is she who was selfish all along by asking, "what have I given up for him?" Lindsay then runs away from the party to Fenway Park to reconcile with Ben, thereby giving up celebrating her job promotion for his season tickets, is arrested for running on the field, and ultimately submits to Ben's needs. For all of this he replied with the ridiculous question, "what does the field feel like"? As such the entire crux of the film *Fever Pitch* is centered on the fact that through submission to Ben's sporting needs Lindsay serves to reify the idea that to be a 'real woman' she must forgo her personal aspirations for him (Marcuse, 1974, p. 281).

When taken in conjunction with the scene referenced earlier where Ben is taking his frustration from being rejected by Lindsay out during a game of male-only touch football the viewer is given very direct messages about normative male behavior in Red Sox Nation. Throughout the film it is clear that Wrightman privilege baseball (particularly the Red Sox) over any other sport, or team. Though he does play golf with Lindsay's parents, in part, to win their approval, this is the only other scene where he is engaged in another sport. In response to his disappointment over Lindsay's rejection Ben violently runs through and over four other participants as a

means of 'getting over' his disappointment. While the basis of his anger is rooted in their class differences, his violent behavior toward other men helps position Ben (who is cast in a feminized role as an elementary schoolteacher) as a hypermasculine male whose physical body is capable of violent behaviors – not unlike Will Hunting trying to 'fuck up some smart kids' to combat his feminizing intellectuality.

In gendered contrast, the film traces Lindsay's sporting choices at a local gym with her three close friends. During their discussion of class differences the film depicts the women participating in several different sports – rock climbing, spinning, and boxing. Each of these sports have the potential to be read as liberating towards women through the performance of an active female body. Interestingly however is the fact that the methods in which these women are participating in sport help position the female form as an object. For example each of the sports shown are aerobic exercises (even the boxing was intended to be non-contact), and when physical contact did take place – culminating with Robin punching Viv out – it ended with Sarah stating that they were 'no longer going to the gym'. As Krane, Choi, Baird, Aimar, and Kauer would have it these women are negotiating gendered norms in the context of sport in such a way as to maintain a physical active and able body, as well as, a feminized body that is neither too large (in terms of muscle and fat) nor too small (in terms of being able to participate successfully in physical activity) (2004, p. 316). This, of course, is something that the men in *Fever Pitch* are never depicted wrestling with.

Complicating the normative gender and sexual ideologies pervasive in Boston and by extension Red Sox Nation within these two films, is the constant referral to or hinting at the presence of homosexuality in the community. In fact, Boston is often considered a space of liberal thinking, feeling, acting, and being particularly when it comes to alternative couplings. Moreover, the Red Sox have even been host to Out at Fenway Park, an event for the local LGBT community, for the 2004 and 2005 seasons (attracting 500 and 1000 fans respectively). Monne Williams, part of the Red Sox diversity initiatives program, has indicated that more recently the Red Sox have attempted to make even bigger strides with those who identify as LGBT in order to make the Fenway experience more welcoming and positive for all. I argue however, that despite the (somewhat open) acknowledgement of homosexuality present in Boston and Red Sox Nation, it is often dealt with regressively by either/and demonizing those who identify as LGBT or making it a form of humor that does nothing to reveal the depth of LGBT individuals.

In *Good Will Hunting*, for instance, Will uses negative connotations of male homosexuality in an attempt to get out of therapeutic sessions on three separate occasions. Additionally, the manner in which this was written dialogically into the script makes these negative feelings toward homosexuality a form of humor that seeks to lessen the negative reaction to heterosexism. In the first scene Will verbally embarrasses his therapist Henry by stating:

Will: Do you find it hard to hide the fact that you're gay?

Henry: What're you talking about ... what?

Will: Look buddy two seconds ago you were ready to give me a jump.

Henry: A jump? (Laughing) I'm terribly sorry to disappoint you Will but ...

Will: Hey look I don't have a problem with it ... I don't care if you putt from the rough.

Henry: What are you ... Pu-Putting from the rough, what on earth are you talking about?

Following the (humorous?) exchange Henry charges out of the office and refuses to meet with Will any further, thus making it quite obvious that even being accused of homosexuality is an undesirable identity formation (Brookey & Westerfelhaus, 2002). In the next session with a vaguely gay hypnotist named Rich, Will again plays on the negative connotations homosexuality to successfully chase off therapy:

Rich: Ok you are in your bed Will ... now how old are you?

Will: Seven.

Rich: What do you see?

Will: Something's in my room.

Rich: What is it?

Will: There's a figure and it's hovering over me.

Rich: You are in a safe place Will.

Will: It's touching me.

Rich: Where is it touching you?

Will: It's touching me down there ... I'm nervous

Rich: You don't have to be nervous Will.

Will: We start dancing and dancing it's just beautiful ... because we can make a lot of love before the sun goes down. Sky rockets in flight, afternoon delights, afternoon delights, skyrockets in flight ...

Here, quite problematically, Will conflates pedophilia with homosexuality, a practice popular in the sporting realm, despite the fact that an overwhelming majority of pedophiles are heterosexual (Giroux, 1996, p. 29). Finally, at the end of the scene sequence, Will again attempts to use negative assumptions about homosexuality in a third attempt to subvert therapy during a meeting with the film's other protagonist, Dr. Sean Maguire.

While the two were meeting on a park bench Will asked Sean "so what's this a Taster's Choice moment between guys? This is really nice ... got a thing for swans is this like a fetish that maybe we need to devote some time to?" Again, as if an individual's sexual identity can be a source of humor, Will uses a popular commercial referent in a dual effort to get the audience to laugh, and escape from a third therapist. This time however, Sean stands up to Will by ignoring the comment, and, though Sean (and nearly every other male character in this film) is seen only in homosocial situations (Brookey & Westerfelhaus, 2002), he does not react negatively. Moreover, Sean's possible homosexuality is "beaten back" (Brookey & Westerfelhaus, 2002, p. 29) when he reveals a story about his wife who lost her life to cancer. Interestingly throughout the whole Will/therapist exchange this is the only time a therapist's sexuality was overtly revealed and confirmed throughout the sequence – and Sean happened to be heterosexual.

Working in concert with the overt and regressive communication of homophobia within *Good Will Hunting*, is the way *Fever Pitch* traverses homosocial, and sometimes homoerotic, community of males that follow the Red Sox. Throughout the film men and women are generally segregated into homosocial “support groups” for Lindsay, Ben, and/or the Red Sox. Not surprisingly in each “support group” normative gender roles were again performed (Butler, 1993). In this case Lindsay’s friends generally played the role as nurturer to help further her relationship with Ben. Conversely, Ben and his acquaintances come together around baseball and the hyper-masculine world of the Boston Red Sox in which Lindsay’s entrée was often viewed as intrusive.

Interestingly, it is through the male homosocial community that the viewer encounters what Michael Wilke would term *gay vague* (Hamilton, 2000). Hamilton, influenced by Wilke, states that gay vague essentially speaks to advertisers’ newer choice to appeal to “both gay and straight audiences ... And conveniently where mainstream audiences see ambiguity, gay audiences see a direct sales pitch (2000, p. F1). While it could be said that nearly every male character in the film could be read as bi- or homo-sexual as well as heterosexual, the character that could most easily be read as gay was Kevin, the anesthesiologist. Kevin could easily be read as homosexual through two main scenes – ticket day, and his (in)appropriate contact with a depressed Ben.

In the first scene, ticket day, five of Ben’s friends congregate in his apartment to decide who gets to attend games with him during the upcoming season. Kevin is dressed in an extremely tight baseball uniform, complete with what Brookey and

Westerfelhaus (2002) might read as an extremely phallic baseball bat. At the scene's key moment, Ben offers Yankee tickets to the best dancer in the group, while he shouted sexual innuendos through a megaphone. Kevin starts the dance using the bat as an extremely suggestive prop. The moment concludes when Lindsay enters the room to awkward silence and, in a very real sense, rescues Ben's heterosexuality while leaving the sexual orientation of the others in the group to the viewer's interpretation.

Later in the film, when Ben and Lindsay briefly break-up, the male group intervenes by breaking into Ben's apartment to find him un-showered and deeply depressed. After managing to get Ben to his feet his three friends take him into the bathroom for a shower. While the other two quite homoerotically soap him down, Kevin is seen in front of Ben's uncovered waist leading to the following conversation:

Ben: What are you doing?

Kevin: Relax I'm a doctor.

Ben: Well not to pry doc, but why are you shaving my balls?

Kevin: Well if you don't want me to ...

Ben: No I don't want you to.

Kevin: Whatever!?!

This scene, which to many may quite obviously situate Kevin as homosexual, still leaves room for a heteronormative audience to read him as heterosexual given that the character is a doctor whose occupation may lead him to regularly trim other men's pubic area. This is troubling in two senses. The first being that even in our

contemporary moment a male baseball fan cannot be depicted as clearly and openly gay. Secondly, even as an ambiguously homosexual character, Kevin, reinforces Ramsey and Santiago's statement that "homosexual characters often provide a measure against which lead characters appear more masculine" (2004, p. 353), thus equating being gay with weakness and femininity. The conflation of homosexuality=weak/undesirable and heterosexuality=strong/desirable is highly problematic at best and/or physically and mentally dangerous at worst –thereby revealing some of the most distasteful aspects of American society and Red Sox Nation. More importantly, throughout the two films in terms of gender and sexuality the normative citizen of Red Sox Nation is clearly depicted as male and heterosexual.

Red Sox (White) Nation

Clearly through film, Boston and Red Sox Nation has been situated as regressive along class, gender, and sexual continuums, but where *Good Will Hunting* and *Fever Pitch* most overtly show their regressive nature is through an erasure of 'otherness' in terms of ethnicity. On that note, Michael Giardina has inferred that film has entered a general age of '*stylish hybridity*' (Giardina, 2003, p. 66-67) in which there is an "influx of performative representations of hyphenated persons and cultures occupying lead spaces in mainstream media ... the majority of these popular iterations commonly wash over and efface harsh realities in the everyday interactions between and among diverse segments of population". This is a step beyond bell hooks *stylish nihilism* (1990), whereby minority actors and actresses provide a "colorful and exciting backdrop, included in a way that stimulates (just

seeing all the black people on the screen is definitely new), yet often their reality is submerged, obscured, deflected away from, so we will focus our attention even more intensely on the [white] characters whose real reality matters” (1990, p. 158).

In *Good Will Hunting* and *Fever Pitch*, however, I assert that the depictions of Boston revert to pre-hooks times through a near absolute removal of any minority character. This thereby (re)affirms the regressive notion that the only reality that ‘matters’ is necessarily white, male, heterosexual, with aspirations towards class ascendancy. For instance, during *Good Will Hunting*, which is a 126 minute Hollywood film set completely in Boston, one minority actor spoke one line, and ethnic minorities were visible on screen in only two scenes. Moreover, by removing otherness, and making Will’s heterosexual love interest his economic superior, the creators of the movie make it easier to identify Will and Chuckie as ‘others’, since, besides their compulsory heterosexuality, through this film their relative privilege in comparison to the rest of society has been usurped in any racial-economic sense. The problem with this is two-fold. First, by denying and/or erasing blackness from the movie screen *Good Will Hunting* contributes to a tendency to reify dominant white, upper/middle class ideologies as those that *all* Red Sox Nation citizens should aspire too (Giroux, 1996). Secondly, *Good Will Hunting* lends credence to the notion that Boston and Red Sox Nation, is meant to be an experience for those with middle to upper class sensibilities since, in the end, Will leaves Boston behind to follow a love interest and a better job.

Unfortunately, *Fever Pitch* was even more demonstrative in the denial of otherness in Red Sox Nation, particularly because its intention was to depict typical

fans within the community. In this 103 minute film, aside from dialogue-free scenes depicting players (many of whom are racial/ethnic minorities), there are only three scenes with minority characters and two spoken lines from those individuals.

Clearly, again, by removing race from Red Sox Nation, and in this case, the upper-class sect of the community, *Fever Pitch* demonstrates who matters racially in Red Sox Nation. Further, the disappearance of otherness with this film makes any in-depth criticism on racial depictions within filmic renderings of Red Sox Nation difficult, because racial difference does not exist. I find the removal of racial diversity in both films interesting for a few reasons.

In the first instance, unlike many Hollywood films set in other places like Los Angeles which, however superficially, confront racial and classed diversity (Kutz, 2001; Massood, 1996) *Good Will Hunting* and *Fever Pitch* ignore the highly multi-racial demographic population found in the city of Boston (US Census Bureau, 2000). Secondly, this is indicative of nearly all the films (*50 First Dates*, 2004; *A Few Good Men*, 1992; *The Departed*, 2006; *Dreamcatcher*, 2003; *Game Six*, 2005; *Mystic River*, 2003; *Rounders*, 1998; *She Hate Me*, 2004; *Spartan*, 2004; *Stuck on You*, 2003; *Summer of Sam*, 1999), and even others forms of (multi)media (ESPN; NESN; *Cheers*; bostondirttdogs.com; sonsofsamhorn.com) that come to represent Boston and Red Sox Nation to its viewers. It is clear then that, in terms of media depictions of Red Sox Nation that the normalized citizen is decidedly white.

Coda: The Stage is Set

As systems of belonging continue to stretch through cultural realms, particularly in terms of sport community membership, the power of the mass-media

to delineate the terms of citizenship is astounding (Hermes, 2006; Miller, 2007a). Again whilst the internet, television, print media, and (sports) radio each play an important part in providing reference points for which community members to refer, Hollywood film provides the most widely used and easily referred to forms of material culture for the general public (Denzin, 1991). Moreover as Ryan and Kellner state “Hollywood film, which seemed to us to be gaining in importance as a mobilizer of public energies, [is] actively promoting the new conservative movements on several fronts, from the family to the military to economic policy” (1988, p. xi).

I believe that many of these neo-liberal and neo-conservative ideologies were reinforced through *Good Will Hunting* and *Fever Pitch*. As expressed in the aforementioned these films have served to reinforce dangerous myths and ideologies within the community known as Red Sox Nation. They have served to remove difference along class/race/gender/sexual axis, and have helped define citizenship in Red Sox Nation as a space of homogeneity – one that attends to the needs, values, and aspirations of upper-middle class, heterosexual, white men above all others. Thus rather than “do good and make profit” (Powers, Rothman & Rothman, 1996, p. 4) *Good Will Hunting* and *Fever Pitch* have depicted Boston and its most passionate sporting community as a celebrated space of segregation rather than a welcoming community for all.

More to the point, while the actual members of Red Sox Nation may not ever choose to view and/or behave in the same way as the characters on *Good Will Hunting* and *Fever Pitch* these two forms of material culture are important in

creating popular referents from which people understand as norms of behavior in the community. In effect they provide a portion of the basis of the stereotypical member of Red Sox Nation. Following Charles Ramirez Berg unlike an individual mental construct of a/the stereotypical member of Red Sox Nation “in contrast the mediated stereotype is always public and, in the case of Hollywood cinema, has a global reach ... whoever sees the film sees the stereotype” (Ramirez Berg, 2002, p. 38).

Given the relative ubiquity of the mediated member of Red Sox Nation versus an actual member of Red Sox Nation then, these images provide powerful representative signifiers to the general viewing public. Moreover, while discursive stereotypes are necessarily contextual, and as a site of representation is/are “continually under threat from diachronic forms of history and narrative” (Bhaba, 1994, p. 71) in the contemporary moment *Good Will Hunting* and *Fever Pitch* are two forms of popular culture which serve to define Red Sox Nation.

Thus, in a very real way these two films cull from the lived Red Sox Nation community to produce popular cultural artifacts that are transmitted to a worldwide audience who in turn receive/perceive these messages as being the reality of citizenship in the community. Quite simply this project has outlined but a small portion of the *circuit of culture* (Johnson, 1986/7) that is (cultural) citizenship in Red Sox Nation, and, while there exist other popular cultural referents, I believe do so quite accurately. Thus the stage for heteronormative, middle-upper class, white masculine behavior has been set in Red Sox Nation, but do the citizens of the community play their part?

Chapter IV: 'Playing' their Part: Red Sox Nation 2007 and the Public Performance of Whiteness

"You don't see a lot of race in Red Sox Nation" (field notes, 2007) one of my acquaintances, Pete, said as he looked around the room during Opening Day of the 2007 Major League Baseball season. On that particular afternoon I was sitting at the Rhino Bar in Washington, D.C., a popular pub for Boston Red Sox supporters, and watched their game against the Kansas City Royals. While the bar was not large it was packed with about 30 other fans of the Red Sox. Being a partial supporter of the Red Sox myself over the course of the past decade, and also a critical scholar, I too had come to understand that the community is fairly mono-ethnic. Thus while I briefly rearticulated what Pete had said by stating that "white is a *race* too", it was very clear that we both had a similar conception regarding the ethnic makeup of those that cheer on the Red Sox – they are overwhelmingly WHITE. A few days later, this contention was reasserted when during the response to my presentation on Boston-based films *Fever Pitch* (2005) and *Good Will Hunting* (1997) at the 2007 Popular Culture Association/American Culture Association conference in Boston a black woman revealingly joked that when she attended games at Fenway Park (the Red Sox home field) if a "photo was taken from the blimp you could point out exactly where I was sitting" (field notes, 2007).

She is not alone in her appraisal given that a recent study on Red Sox fans has stated that:

Until 2002, the Sox commissioned Marketing Information Technologies, of Little Rock, Arkansas, to regularly analyze and profile attendees. Among the 2002 findings: 61 percent of the fans surveyed were male, 95 percent were

white, 64 percent came from Massachusetts, and a whopping 78 percent of those identified as heads of households were college graduates.

(Shaughnessy, 2006, p. 8)

In brief then, the majority of Sox supporters are representative of the most (in)visible forms of power and privilege in American society along race, class, and gender axis.

More to the point, the complicated connection of race and Boston sports teams, the city, its population, and its fans is something that has long been discussed in academic and popular arenas (cf. Bryant, 2002, 2004; Formisano, 1991; MacDonald, 2000; Shaughnessy, 1996, 2006; Stout & Johnson, 2001). For the city is a place that, at the turn of the 20th century, allowed interracial marriage (Miletsky, 2005), but also was a key area for racial strife in regard to 'forced busing' (Formisano, 1991) and the (post) Civil Rights movement. Boston-based teams were the first to desegregate in basketball (Bill Russell of the Celtics being the first black coach in the NBA), yet its baseball team was the last (Pumpsie Green in 1959 a full 12 years after Jackie Robinson). With further regard to the Red Sox, team ownership and management (which purchased the team largely from wealth garnered from a 25,000 acre rice plantation (Stout & Johnson, 2001, p. 180-1)) was long understood as the most racist in Major League Baseball, popularly referred to as "the plantation" (Bryant, 2002, p. 139) well into the 1980's, and its fans have been charged with shouting racist remarks by opposing players even during the 2007 season (DiGiovanna, 2007; Hunter, 2007).

All this would suggest that Boston has a conflicted history which, at times, can point to forward thinking progress worthy of celebration (Bryant, personal communication, 2007). Unfortunately as the hub of what others have termed “apartheid Massachusetts” (Piepzna-Samarasinha, 2002, p. 5) it has a regrettable racial past no different than some of the worst cities in the American South. The uneasy negative connotation between Red Sox fans and race has led to a point where as Howard Bryant (2004) puts it:

[A Red Sox fan] doesn’t want to be associated with the uncomfortable social dynamic, part of the subtle barricade that separates black and white, a divide that defines the city as surely as the Longfellow Bridge. We all want to be above those individuals and not always flattering ingredients that nourish sports in Boston, to somehow claim the passion and not the shadows. In short, some of us want to be a clean fuel, the energy that can drive a locomotive without creating air pollution. Whether that is possible? Who knows. (p. 154)

To best respond to Bryant’s musings about whether fans in primarily white sport communities can divorce themselves from their historical socio-cultural impulses I will use relatively new theories of whiteness to understand where Red Sox Nation stands in the contemporary moment. Specifically I will be evaluating how the Red Sox organization and their fans physically and symbolically position themselves and are positioned within American society, and also how the “community formation is marked by contradictory symbols and effects” (Grossberg 1997b, p. 149) that are not always flattering and often coincide with Boston’s poor

history in regard to race, class, gender, and sexuality. Moreover, while as University of Massachusetts – Amherst Professor of Afro-American History, John Bracey, stated there is nothing inherently wrong with “white people congregating with other white people to be white” (personal communication, 2007) given that Red Sox fans are fast surpassing New York Yankees in number/popularity (White, P., 2007) I argue that they are an increasingly important community with which to view critically in order to understand how unspoken privilege and power operates in contemporary society.

Karyn McKinney (2004, p. 10-11) has argued that while studies on whiteness and white communities have been conducted in the past, particularly by minority authors (cf. Cox, 1976; Du Bois, 1935; Morrison, 1992; Jacobs, 1861), this form of inquiry has enjoyed a recent revival in social scholarship. More to the point, projects on whiteness, and how it operates in contemporary society, is a growing field of study in which there are concerted efforts to redirect the ideological invisibility of the white majority in America. The main thrust of these inherently political projects is to uncover the various (un)spoken levels of social privilege white people have (Kincheloe et al., 1998).

Influenced by the legacies of Raymond Williams and Stuart Hall, among others, Critical Cultural Studies is an academic field which has taken up the call to further evaluate how race and racism operates in everyday activities. Initially these Cultural Studies projects looking at race focused on cultural constructions of blackness (cf. Andrews, 1996, 2006b; Carrington, 1998; Giardina & McCarthy, 2005; Grossberg, 1989; Grossberg, et al. 1992; Hall, 1986, 1996; Hall, et al. 1978; Sparkes,

2006; St. Louis, 2004). More recently, within the field, problematic visions of race have been connected to wider issues of class, gender, and sexuality (cf. Bulter, 1993; M.A. Hall, 1996/2006; Hall, 1992; Hill-Collins, 2000; hooks, 1982; McRobbie, 1981; McRobbie & Garber, 1976; Willis, 1974; Zylinska, 2005). In that vein, sport studies involving the contemporary racial politics 'bourne of the dominant economic structure of the moment' - neo-liberalism (Giroux, 1996; Grossberg, 2005; Harvey, 2005) -have evolved to reflect this shift towards a more nuanced approach in understanding how and where race/class/gender/sex/sexuality intersect.

These studies focus not only the way the aforementioned socio-political elements shape how sport figures, institutions, spectacles, and communities have been (re)produced for the general public, but also the pedagogical import that these respective elements have had on directing the taken for granted beliefs of American society (Andrews, 2001). I believe that this type of sport (cultural) study, with specific deference to Birrell and McDonald (2000), Andrews (2001) and the special edition on 'whiteness' of *Sociology of Sport Journal* (2005 no. 3), has elicited newer, more incisive, visions to approach the way race/generation/gender/sexuality operates in and through our society, and provide the theoretical underpinnings for this critical engagement with Red Sox supporters. As such, I believe that not only can this project utilize the aforementioned studies on racialized (sport) cultural studies, but also provide another important angle with which to view and understand the contemporary socio-political moment.

While it would be shortsighted to argue that any form of ethnographic research has specific starting and ending points (Denzin & Lincoln 2006) in regard

to this project I conducted a year-long participant-observation of Red Sox fans officially starting in March of 2007 and culminating with the team's World Series victory that October. The project that follows has a two-fold commitment. First, it attempts to examine the linkages between the need for contemporary corporate culture to expand into new markets, and be made available for consumption by as many consumers possible with no recourse to actual social equity (Harvey, 2005; Kelly, 2001). To briefly illustrate, Dr. Charles Steinberg (Red Sox Vice President of Public Affairs) outlined to me in an interview, when he signed on to work for the Red Sox team owner, John Henry, handed him a book. It was Howard Bryant's (2002) *Shut Out: A Story of Race and Baseball in Boston* which delineates the sordid racial history of the Red Sox, to which Henry pointed at and stated "you see this book, it is your job to rewrite it" (personal communication, 2007). In response, I aim to critically examine whether or not palpable a/effective progressive change has come from the organization through its fans by rewriting/re-righting the past.

Second, and building from the commodification of culture and citizenship (Giroux, 2004), by way of ethnography, this project will also make explicit connections between what the Red Sox organization and fans want their image to be, and the ways that cultural citizenship (Miller, T., 2007a) in Red Sox Nation (see below) is actually practiced. I will do so by outlining my research project, then describing my multiple experiences with Red Sox fans in sports bars, over the Internet, at road games, and at home game in Fenway Park. In so doing, and following the tradition of Alan Klein (2000), I hope evaluate the actual public performance of Red Sox fandom in reference to its mediated commercial image.

Commodity Citizenship and the Rise of a [Red Sox] Nation

Red Sox Nation, the name given to the group of fans who support the Boston Red Sox, was originally bestowed upon the fan community in a 1986 *Boston Globe* article by Nathan Cobb. Four years later, this terminology was used by *Boston Globe* reporter and book author, Dan Shaughnessy (1990, 1993a, 1993b, 1996) who in his words “beat it to death” (personal communication, 2007), while other *Globe* reporters soon followed suit. The use and ambiguousness of Red Sox Nation expanded further when the Jean Yawkey trust sold the Red Sox to a group headed by Larry Luchinno, Tom Werner, and John Henry in 2002. To illustrate, given the auspices of an American economy which requires that corporate entities make a profit at all costs (Kelly, 2001), the new ownership moved quickly and began marketing the idea of a Red Sox Nation (Steinberg, personal communication, 2007).

This strategy was executed to compete on the field and for *market share* (Outside the Lines, 2007) off the field with the hated New York Yankees, and has ‘utilized the passion of their fans to do so’ (Cafardo, personal communication, 2007; Steinberg, personal communication, 2007). More specifically, under the direction of, among others, Dr. Charles Steinberg³⁰ (Vice President of Public Affairs), and Sam Kennedy (Senior Vice President of Sales/Marketing) the team “picked up on [Red Sox Nation] officially pretty quick ... and now it’s an absolute marketing corporate monster” (Shaughnessy, personal communication, 2007). This is evidenced by the fact that since 2002 the team has saturated local and global markets through television (ESPN, NESN, *Queer Eye for the Straight Guy*), film (*Fever Pitch*), popular

³⁰ Steinberg left his position for a similar job with the Los Angeles Dodgers in 2008.

music (Hot Stove Cool Music, Fenway Park Concert Series, Pearl Jam Inc.), book authors (The Great Fenway Writers Series), newspapers³¹ (USA Today, Boston Globe, Boston Herald) and the internet (redsox.com, bostondirt dogs.com, sonsofsamhorn.com, 38pitches.com), as well as suturing its name to various sporting organizations (Rousch-Fenway Racing), charities (Red Sox Foundation), and communities in a massive undertaking to –in their words- support Red Sox Nation “going global” (field notes, 2007; Mnookin, 2006; Westerfelhaus & Lacroix, 2006). Given its influence on the American media’s ubiquitous –Nation tag (for example: American Idol Nation, Raider Nation, Nike Nation, ESPN SportsNation, and WWE Fan Nation) it could be argued quite convincingly that Red Sox Nation has arrived in popular (American) culture “as part of the language” (Shaughnessy, personal communication, 2007), or, more specifically, a discursively constructed community through which the media, personal experience, and historical e/affective actions can help define who matters and how they matter as cultural citizens (Miller, 2007a).

The infiltration of Red Sox Nation into everyday American (sporting) life has been so effective that it has reached a point where Shaughnessy claims that Red Sox Nation is ‘its own country and governing body’ (personal communication, 2007). Following Ingham and McDonald’s (2003) assertion then there is an attendant superficial ‘nation-building’ that has taken place in regard to the Red Sox. Much of this has been based on the organization’s capitalization of consumption within Red Sox Nation. As such, and coinciding with the fall of traditional national citizenship in

³¹ Along with nearly every newspaper in the New England area

the age of globalization (Berlant, 1997) and the rise of new forms of (sport) cultural citizenship characterized, in part, by the ‘commodification of subcultural identities’ (Miller 2007a, p. 3) the team has inauspiciously sold citizenship into Red Sox Nation.

For example, in conjunction with the contemporary socio-political landscape whereby there has been a seeming collapse between public service and privatized ownership (Giroux, 2004) *official* citizens of Red Sox Nation *earn* their status by purchasing the Red Sox Nation Membership Card. Furthermore, the Red Sox organization officially differentiates its followers as card-carrying *citizens* and non-card holding *members* (Fuller, personal communication, 2007). For official *citizens* the card costs an individual \$14.95 at the introductory level with the ability to purchase more access (referred to as the benefits of citizenship on the team’s official website) to the team and games with increasing levels of monetary output. In many ways reinforcing the political atmosphere of the contemporary neoliberal moment, it was only 35,000 members that reside in 12 different countries (White, 2007) of the corporate Red Sox Nation that were allowed to elect a “President of Red Sox Nation”³² in 2007 (NESN, 2007; Redsox.com, 2007). This, of course, is in addition to the fact that any team supporter “can buy an array of material goods with Red Sox logos from authentic game hats and jerseys, to string bikinis, lunch boxes, and thong underwear, to myriad videos, books, and artifacts which serve to public mark their inclusion into (Red Sox) Nation” (field notes, 2007).

³² The candidates actually had plans of action and campaign platforms (see: Redsox.com, 2007) which were debated through American political moderator, Tim Russert on NESN in September of 2007. Former infielder and NESN announcer Jerry Remy won in 2007.

Importantly, as Richard Giulianotti (2002) has outlined, there are degrees of *citizenship* in sport organization fan communities. For example, not all people who consider themselves supporters of the Red Sox believe that they need, or have the ability, to purchase their citizenship into Red Sox Nation. Clearly if only 35,000 people own the card, and the team is as popular as *USA Today's* research (White, 2007) suggests, then the majority of fans in Red Sox Nation do not own one. While Dr. Steinberg intimated that the organization 'does not wish to encroach on longstanding *members* of the community who do not own the card' (personal communication, 2007) the fact that *citizens* are the only individuals with a political voice in the Red Sox Nation has caused some controversy.

More to the point, in 2004, *bostondirttdogs.com*, a popular Red Sox website, ran an article suggesting that 'true members' of Red Sox Nation should not have to purchase their citizenship into the community, and that they should be able to "root free or die" (November 9, 2004). These *members* have fought back against card-carrying members by referring to them as pink-hat fans (more on this later), who exist as *citizens* in Red Sox Nation only on the superficial rather than a pseudo-organic level. The fissures within Red Sox Nation further suggests that most powerful elements within the community still lies within what Giulianotti (2002, p. 31) would define as *supporters*. These are community members who have attended, and followed Red Sox games, and information for years, and while they may purchase Red Sox goods or enjoy the fact that the team receives so much media coverage would have considered themselves *citizens* of Red Sox Nation card-carrying or not.

Importantly for the purposes of this paper, since it is nearly impossible on a macro-observational level to differentiate between *members* and *citizens* (most *citizens* do not publicly display their card) my forthwith referrals to Red Sox Nation's cultural citizenship/membership will encompass both groups. The reasons for this are two-fold. First the mass-media often refers to Red Sox Nation in the same sense, and popular conversations referring to the community rarely engage in the ideological difference between *members* and *citizens*. Secondly, while the politics between these two factions of Red Sox Nation are important, I also believe that critically engaging the social implications specifically in reference to the performance of Red Sox Nation – in the grand sense – is also vital. I feel this is particularly significant given that, as a whole, this is predominantly a white male community that has long been charged with being degrading to “other” identities.

At Home in Red Sox Nation? Performativity and Qualitative Inquiry

In the case of the project at present *ethnography* was the way I took on, and recorded, human behavior in Red Sox Nation. Adhering to Barbara Tedlock's view:

Wherever ethnographic research has been adopted, a key assumption has been that by entering into close and relatively prolonged interaction with people (one's own or other) in their everyday lives, ethnographers can better understand the beliefs, motivations, and behaviors of their subjects than they can by using any other approach. (2000, p. 456)

This notion is a key one, in that, if I am to adhere to the qualitative ontology presented by Denzin and Lincoln (2005), and Atkinson et al. (1999), whereby the world is subjectively and socially constructed, then this is certainly a hands-on

method for observing the ‘realities of human social interaction’ (Plymire 2005, p. 147).

To do so, I spent one full season (2007) “living it” (Bryant, 2004, p. 162) as a community member/citizen of Red Sox Nation. Throughout my experience I found myself traversing the constant contradictions that most committed critical social scholars face on second-to-second basis in our daily lives. Following Henry Giroux’s (2004, p. 150) lengthy remarks on Edward Said by ‘living it’ in Red Sox Nation I:

was always on the border – one foot in, and one foot out, an exile and an insider for whom home was always a form of homelessness daring to go into different worlds, use different languages, and ‘understand a multiplicity of disguises, masks, and rhetorics’.

For example, as what Giulianotti (2002, p. 31) termed, a *follower* of the Boston Red Sox for the previous six years I believe that my prior experience with Red Sox Nation brought a particular level of insight that a purely *outside observer* (Babbie, 2004) might not bring to a research site already fraught with divisions based on ‘insider knowledge, and social hierarchies pertaining to an historical understanding of trivia, books, and pop culture about the Red Sox’ (field notes, 2007). In addition to the above, just the fact that my name is Ryan White a traditional Irish name³³, that I self-identify as heterosexual, white, college educated, and middle-class I was easily able to pass as a citizen of Red Sox Nation without critical evaluation about whether or not I belonged to the community. I also believe

³³ Interestingly, in the crass sense, a quick trace of my ethnic heritage would suggest that I am from French Canadian, and Native American decent.

that this may have allowed for more free flowing conversation and personal information during my research experience.

More critically however, was the difficulty of being an identifiable member of a community for which I set out to critique – particularly since to another observer I could easily be considered no different than a *true* citizen of Red Sox Nation. As such the critiques and interpretations I made of others as they laughed or stood by idly while crass jokes about and performances of nationality, race, gender, sexuality, and so on were executed they could have just as easily been directed at myself. Given this context whereby there was a relentless examination of myself and others which was not very different than my everyday life as a critical social academic (Giardina, 2005, p. 171), I warily pressed forward with the project at hand by attempting to immerse myself fully in a ‘Red Sox Nation experience’.

As the project unfolded sometimes the connection with Red Sox Nation was merely media based (internet, books, television), while at other moments I attended games or experienced fans outside of Fenway Park or road stadiums while the Red Sox were in town³⁴, met/observed members of Red Sox Nation at sports bars (Red Sox specific bars were located through the internet) or community events (Specifically Washington D.C. “Red Sox Nation” MeetUP events which were organized over the internet), and sometimes remained at home to watch the live television feed while working on my project. Further, through an analysis of

³⁴ More specifically I attended 2 Red Sox spring training games, 10 home games, 14 away games (10 Baltimore, 1 Los Angeles, 2 New York, and 1 Seattle), observed fans outside Fenway Park for the home opener and second game in April, watched 12 games in Washington D.C. area sports bars, and viewed 4 games at 3 other “Red Sox” sports bars around the country (2 in Endicott, N.Y., 1 in Seattle, 1 in Los Angeles).

(multi)media texts, interviews, field notes, and thorough review of television broadcasts, internet websites, and filmic representations of Boston and Red Sox Nation I believe that the information gathered uncovered a comprehensive, yet necessarily incomplete (Kincheloe, 2001, p. 690) account of what it ‘means’ to be a part of the community with which to refer to in the self-reflexive critical research, and writing process.

Importantly, my choice in using various forms of media to collect ‘data’ for this project, given that these are spaces primarily run by and for upper-middle class white people (Collins, 1994; Dyer, 1997), certainly shaped the versions of class, ethnicity, gender, and sexuality that I utilized in conducting this study. However, in attending to Henry Giroux’s belief that “these technological sites produce public pedagogies and must be engaged seriously as knowledge-producing technologies and spheres” (2000, p. 30), I would argue that to best understand the context of this particular empirical setting gathering information from Boston.com, bostondirttdogs.com, sonsofsamhorn.com, 38pitches.com, Washington D.C. MeetUps, as well as watching televisual coverage of the Red Sox was absolutely necessary. At the same time to further help illuminate that context, it must be noted, that with the exception of Howard Bryant, Michael Holley, Michael Smith, and Hazel Mae nearly all the mediated voices in the Boston-based media for Red Sox Nation were white, and with the exception of Jackie Smith, Tina Cervasio, and Hazel Mae all were men. Thus in a very real way I (and the general public) was/is generally getting the white male mediated message of a generally white, male community.

Further shaping my study was the fact that the personal effects of the American experience with neoliberalism has forced many to uproot from their homes and search for labor around the United States and indeed the Globe. This, coupled with a fan base whose interest in baseball oftentimes starts while attending the over 50 colleges and universities in the Boston area, has led Red Sox Nation to become quite a diasporic community (Bracey, personal communication, 2007; Bryant, personal communication, 2007; Cafardo, personal communication, 2007; Fuller, personal communication, 2007; field notes, 2007; Shaughnessy, personal communication, 2007; Steinberg, personal communication, 2007). Thus my choice to follow Red Sox Nation through the media and in cities other than Boston was in some ways made for me since oftentimes many members of Red Sox Nation, who cannot attend games in Boston or on the road, perform their citizenship in the community simply by watching games on the television, through the internet, and/or at various sports bars around the country. The following explication of my experiences is a travelogue, of sorts, that attempts to better describe the various performances of citizenship in Red Sox Nation during the 2007 Major League Baseball season.

Sports Bar Nationalism – “You’re amongst friends here”

Given the diasporic spread of Red Sox Nation many individuals who consider themselves citizens have relocated to other cities throughout the United States. In several large urban centers sports bars have opened and been marketed to entice fans of New England sport teams to enjoy events in the company of other likeminded fans. In regard to Red Sox Nation I was able to locate various “Red Sox”

bars around the country by consulting a few websites³⁵ that offered descriptions of these various sporting spaces, and organized community meetings where fans could congregate and watch games with other Red Sox fans. Over the course of the 2007 season I joined the local Capital City Sox Fans MeetUp³⁶, which met for ‘important’ games throughout the season at various bars in the Washington, D.C. area (The Rhino Bar, Cleveland Park, and Mr. Days), and watched games at several other ‘Red Sox Bars’ around the country (The Galley in Endicott, New York, Sonny McLean’s in Santa Monica, California, and Spitfire in Seattle, Washington) to participate and observe ‘normal’ behavior in these various settings.

Perhaps the main draw for Red Sox Fans to attend games at noted ‘Red Sox Bars’ around the country is the idea that an individual could experience the Baudrillardian simulation (1991) of home (Boston), amongst other like minded individuals. As Jean Baudrillard has (in)famously asserted, in many cases, for expatriated Bostonian citizens, purely virtual contact with the Boston Red Sox, is the reality of their experience in the community. In other words, many in Red Sox Nation are engaging in a sort of Red Sox “simulacrum, a hyperreal scenario in which events lose their identity and signifiers fade into one another” (Patton, 1991, p. 2). Thus congregating at Red Sox Bars is where many citizens of Red Sox Nation go to perform their fandom of the team, basing their behavior on what they had, for many years, only witnessed on the television, film, or through the internet.

³⁵ <http://www.redsoxconnection.com/fans/hangouts.html>, <http://redsox.meetup.com/108/?gj=sj5>

³⁶ According to Dr. Steinberg, similar organized groups have arisen in New York, New York, Atlanta, Georgia, Omaha, Nebraska, Los Angeles, California, and the Dominican Republic.

On that note, generally my personal experience in each of the Red Sox bars was welcoming and positive. In fact, as I sat to watch an early season game between the Texas Rangers and the Red Sox at The Galley in Endicott, New York, the owner of the establishment tapped me on the shoulder and stated “you’re amongst friends here” (field notes, 2007). He proceeded to re-seat me at a table in front of the bars big screen television, handed me a few free t-shirts, and, as one of my companions noted, ‘treated me as royalty’ (field notes, 2007) throughout the game. In addition, during most games other fans would welcome me to their table, and ask general questions about where I was from, and what drew me to the bar to watch each particular game. During my time in Washington, D.C. I met a couple, Pete and Sue, on opening day that enjoyed keeping up with my progress as the research wore on, though often teasing me by asserting that this “was a bullshit project” (field notes, 2007) – a critique often levied on those studying everyday human interactions (Kincheloe 2001, p. 680).

Further, as I alluded to in the opening, the Capital City Sox Fans group was with whom a majority of my time investigating the Red Sox Nation sports bar diaspora in person was spent. Meetings for the events were organized online through a Website (MeetUP) which specializes in organizing events for various communities interested in various activities throughout the country, and were sometimes planned well in advance while others were frustratingly hastily put together at the last minute. During the season I was able to attend about seven of these meetings given constraints of academic responsibilities, travel throughout the country, funding and time. Still despite my relatively low rate of attendance (seven

out of approximately 30 meetings), I was one of the highest attending members at these events. Moreover, speaking to the ritualistic nature of watching a game with(in) Red Sox Nation during my experience at these meetings, I made several observations that were often repeated nearly every time there was a game which in many ways served to normalize the performance of citizenship in Red Sox Nation at sports bars.

The first and most noticeable observation was that there was seemingly an extreme lack of diversity at these events. While the consumption of alcohol, sports viewing, and even the privilege of taking time off for leisure activities during the 'normal' workday have been discussed as activities of white male privilege elsewhere (cf. Peralta, 2007; Peralta & Cruz, 2006), its place as a white activity became readily apparent through my experiences with Red Sox Nation in sports bars. Though not always, in the course of a discussion during the event when I would discuss my research tract the opportunity often arose for fellow attendees to claim to be an ethnic minority. In fact, during my entire time at the Capitol City MeetUp there was only one self-identified ethnic minority out of the approximately 100 people that attended these events - an Indian-American whose family originated in Boston. The only time that "other" bodies were easily identifiable as present at these events was when three men's basketball players from the Georgetown University team came to eat at the Rhino Bar on opening day, and openly jeered Red Sox Nation as their team was being defeated by the Kansas City Royals (field notes, 2007). Additionally, I found similar populations of Red Sox fans when watching games at all the other sports bars around the country as well. Thus,

while there may very well be minority fans that attend games at sports bars, their outward presence in these public spaces to consume and be consumed as part of Red Sox Nation was virtually non-existent.

Despite the relative dominance of white bodies supporting the Red Sox at these sports bars, when the topic of race and racism in Red Sox Nation came up most members claimed that they 'knew about it, but that the community was over it' (field notes, 2007), or that 'it was something that was currently being dealt with' (field notes, 2007). More to the point, when I engaged in discussion with the fan that identified as Indian-American (Ari), and two other acquaintances (Mike and Sam) some of the troubling ideological foundations of whiteness (Dyer, 1997) that Red Sox Nation has long been critiqued for arose through the following argument:

Sam: That's (racism) just in our history, look at our most popular players today, we are over racism. Besides we have come to accept that Dominicans are naturally better than we (white people) are at baseball.

Ari: No race is naturally better...

Mike: Yeah there is, I mean haven't you heard that in India they can't give out condoms because they are too big to fit on Indian men's penises? And we all know about black men...

Ari: That's not true, there really is no such thing as race you know we all come from Africa anyway.

Sam: Yeah but that was thousands of years ago, things have changed now with Darwin and all that.

While not all conversations with fans were as disturbing as this one, many fit into a similar ideological sphere, whereby just because the members of Red Sox Nation cheered for minority Red Sox players and management hired minority players they assumed that racism and racist thought were a thing of the past (see:

Duquette: in Laurilla 2005, p. 265). As Lauren Berlant might say ‘this is part of national vanity’ (1997, p. 196) which positions the [Red Sox] Nation as a place of utopian diversity, but does little to question the economic and cultural effects of white Americo-centric dominance throughout the world.

Furthermore, at another bar in Los Angeles during which Japanese pitcher Daisuke Matsusaka was on the mound and performing well, a young woman proclaimed that the Red Sox were finally ready to compete with the Yankees because “we finally figured out that we should get those Jap players ... without the Japs we just aren’t as competitive” (field notes, 2007). Following Francis Rains (1998, p. 78) then “the dialogue on racism [in Red Sox Nation] becomes the front, symbolizing perceived concern. In the process of developing this perceived concern, however, symbol has too often been confused for substance”.

Though the topic of racism in Red Sox Nation was often deemed taboo, or a non-issue, by those that I discussed the topic with some older members were willing to admit that race had an effect on the makeup of the community. Building from the conversation in the opening of this paper, Pete agreed that part of the reason “we didn’t see a lot of race” in Red Sox Nation was due to the poor history in regard to racial diversity on the Red Sox themselves who, as a team, were the last to sign a black player, and free agent well after allowing black players to play was the norm. In fact, to date, with the exception of Jim Rice, the Red Sox have ‘never had a black player last more than 8 years with the team...and it never ends well between management and the player’ (Bryant, personal communication, 2007). Interestingly many of the older members still often claimed that Red Sox fans “were over racism”

or that “things were better now” (field notes 2007). They pointed to the fact that their favorite players were David Ortiz (Dominican), Manny Ramirez (Dominican), and Daisuke Matsuzaka (Japanese) as part of the progressive features of being in the community. However, David Roedigger (1991) has argued quite forcefully that these “tastes [do] not supplant racism. Most of them [are] decidedly prepolitical” (p. 4) particularly when cheering for these individuals were a means to an end on the baseball field.

Moreover, through my experiences, most Red Sox Nation members at the bars seem to accept minority players as part of the team if they perform well, and speak only of their on-field experiences³⁷. In fact, minority players who did not play well, or who, as a result of their culture, behaved in non-normative ways were often chided by fans. For example, Joel Piñero was nicknamed “the Piñata” because of his poor pitching performance while he was on the team, Hidecki Okajima’s surname was altered to “Okie-dokie”, and Manny Ramirez, who is known for silly on and off-field behavior, was often referred to as the childlike “Manny being Manny” (field notes, 2007). Whilst teasing or having ‘Whitened’ nicknames (see also: changing Japanese pitcher Daisuke Matsusaka name to Dice-K for marketing³⁸ and ease of pronunciation purposes) for members of any sports team is not a unique happenstance, I do believe that it was interesting that this only happened for minority members of the team since white players like Jason Veritek and Dustin

³⁷ Part of, former Red Sox pitcher, Pedro Martinez’s downfall in the eyes of the Boston media and their fans was the fact that in 2001 he spoke out against the atrocities the American government is playing out in the Dominican Republic (see: White, 2008).

³⁸ In baseball the letter “K” is shorthand for a strikeout. Matsusaka came to the United States known as a strikeout specialist.

Padroia³⁹ -both of whom struggled at various points during the season- were not reduced to racist (Dyer, 1997) nicknaming. Though the racism that emerged from my experience with members of Red Sox Nation was quite prevalent I also observed other oppressive forms of white masculine behavior within the community – particularly sexism.

This started on opening day, but occurred repeatedly throughout the season. For example, at many of the games bars had several televisions, and also had dedicated projector screens and audio where community members congregated to watch the event on the Boston based New England Sports Network (NESN) feed. In regard to sexism, during the games many of the reactions were based on how the team performed in the game, an interesting ‘ritual’ of sorts happened when Hazel Mae, a Hawaiian female sportscaster, and Tina Cervasio, a white female sportscaster⁴⁰, would give ‘human interest stories’ about the team “the attendees exploded in a celebration of catcalls that outlasted the report that either of these two women gave” (field notes, 2007). This type of behavior was not repeated when male sportscasters (Don Orsillo and Jerry Remy) gave similar information about the team. When I inquired about why this happened the attendees often replied incredulously “can’t you see that she is hot?” or “it doesn’t matter what she said anyway” (field notes, 2007). In addition, following their brief appearances most discussion centered, not on what they were talking about, but on an ongoing debate

³⁹ Padroia eventually righted his struggles to win the American League Rookie of the Year.

⁴⁰ During a typical Red Sox broadcast these are the only female voices/faces heard or seen.

over which Red Sox Nation member would rather have sexual relations with (field notes, 2007).

Given the contemporary conditions of employment in the sports broadcast industry, whereby the most likely job a female can get is as a sideline reporter designed to titillate viewers with beauty rather than offer thoughtful interpretations of the game Mae and Cervasio were, in many ways, directed into normative roles for women. In some ways it could be argued that while these women are active members for progressively breaking into the sports broadcast industry, they were simultaneously 'playing their role' (Berlant, 1997) as meaningless objects of desire for which the masculinist community members of Red Sox Nation could cast their privileged male gaze. This type of behavior did not necessarily come as a surprise since, as Peralta and Cruz (2006) outline, alcohol consumption and sport tends to encourage white hyper-masculinity, but is emblematic of white masculinity being performed in a supposedly welcoming community.

I mentioned previously that many of the gatherings at sports bars were scheduled and organized through the use of the internet. Further, as the proliferation of Red Sox fans has taken hold across the United States, and indeed, throughout the world there has been an attendant rise in new forms of (virtual) citizenship (Hermes, 2006) in the Red Sox Nation community. In what follows I will critically engage the internet as a site for the public performance of Red Sox nationality.

Red Sox Nation Goes Viral

Throughout the season, I engaged with Red Sox Nation as an observer and participant-observer on various websites (bostondirtdogs.com and boston.com), messageboards (sonsofsamhorn.com and pearljam.com), and Red Sox weblogs (Bill Simmons writings on ESPN Page 2, 38 pitches.com, letsgosox.blogspot.com, sethmnookin.com) which were either solely dedicated to news and talk about the team or had specific threads based on the Red Sox that were found through searches on various topics⁴¹. Recently it has been forcefully argued that the internet has the “power to facilitate and intensify connection and communication between large groups of people” (Hermes 2006, p. 306) which “combines an exchange of information and evaluation, in which emotion and experience are not discounted but an accepted part of the processes of opinion formation” (Hermes 2006, p. 305).

On that note, Vicki Carter (1998), using the theoretical thrusts of Ruth Frankenburg (1993) and Toni Morrison (1992), has outlined elsewhere that “Cyberspace, viewed as ownerless but ideologically Western and White, is ripe for shaping and sustaining the same underlying oppression as that which constituted America’s pioneer days” (p. 271). In other words there is also an attendant privilege, associated with being a white American that encourages the use of technology in the cyber-spatial ‘white flight’ of [postmodern] cultural resegregation. This assumption rings true in regard to the way Red Sox Nation is often experienced and performed in and through the internet. In the first instance, most of the website

⁴¹ In terms of readership, and ease of accessibility *Bostondirtdogs.com* and *Bill Simmons* are easily the two most popular sources for information and commentary on the Red Sox and Red Sox Nation.

authors are white males, and normative white masculinist assumptions about race, class, gender, and sexuality in Red Sox Nation that I found in sports bars were incessantly brought to the fore. Secondly, and perhaps more importantly, the dialogue between those who responded to various actions throughout the season also often reinforced these simplistic ideologies.

For example, on three separate occasions (April, June, and August) throughout the season the topic of racism pertaining to the Boston Red Sox⁴² and their fans was brought up through various media outlets (DiGiovanna, 2007, Hunter 2007, Patrick, 2007). As mentioned earlier Torii Hunter, Gary Mathews Jr., and Michael Wilbon each claimed to have been called “nigger” in Boston at various times throughout their playing and sports writing careers respectively. In an internet-based interview with Bill Simmons which was put together in response to Wilbon’s claims of Boston-based racism Wilbon stated:

“Boston earned its distinction...for being unfriendly to Black people, people of color....Black people have these conversations all the time about various places . . . Black people don’t watch *Friends*, we don’t celebrate *Seinfeld*, and we are not anxious to go to Boston” (Simmons, 2007a).

The responses to these claims that players and media personalities still hear racist comments while playing at Fenway Park (home field of the Red Sox) and/or in Boston were oft-repeated dismissal strategies which served to assuage guilt for being involved in a community that features many overtly racist members. For

⁴² For purposes of clarity Michael Wilbon’s comments were directed toward the city of Boston as a whole, and were in response to whether or not a black basketball player, Kevin Garnett, would willingly sign with the Boston Celtics.

example Steve Silva, content producer for the popular bostondirt dogs.com website, argued:

Boston was considered a racist city years ago, like many other cities in the Northeast. Tom Yawkey may have been racist. Otherwise the Red Sox and Boston is like most any other cities. The [criticism] is really outdated and a reach. (personal communication, 2008)

In the aforementioned interview with Michael Wilbon, Simmons claimed that the three key characters to changing the perceptions of Boston in regard to race were the Celtics players Reggie Lewis, Dee Brown, and the Red Sox Mo Vaughn – all black athletes. He further stated that “I lived in the city for 10 years after college from ’92 to 2002, and I just wanted to discuss what you said because I think what you (Wilbon) meant that it was a perception that Boston was racist because I don’t think it is anymore” (2007a).

In a sense then, and following Giardina (2005, p. 84), both Silva and Simmons are contending that because members of Red Sox Nation support minority stars of various ethnicities and nationalities the community has now reach a state of relative color-blindness whereby individual effort and performance are the sole determinants for self-worth in the community. The dangerous ideologies that inform and are informed by these types of comments from relatively powerful members of the sports media serve to erase the realities of the contemporary condition in Boston when evaluating ethnic relations. For instance, in a recent study on experiences and perceptions of Massachusetts regarding race conducted by the UMass-Boston McCormack Graduate School of Policy Studies in December 2006,

Carol Hardy-Fanta and Paul Wantanabe found that levels of personal discrimination on the job and with police between blacks, Latinos, and whites in Massachusetts are still at an unconscionable 18/17%, 26/20%, and 1/1% respectively. As Henry Giroux (2004) states:

Color-blindness, then, is a convenient ideology for enabling whites to disregard the degree to which race is tangled up with asymmetrical relations of power, functioning as a potent force for patterns of exclusion and discrimination including but not limited to housing, mortgage loans, health loans, health care, schools, and the criminal justice system (p. 65).

Thus the fact that black athletes, and later Dominicans (Pedro Martinez, Manny Ramirez, and David Ortiz) have “made it” in Boston as celebrity superstars create a seeming color-blindness amongst Red Sox Nation while the lived realities of those non-celebrity minorities are still similar to the Boston known historically for being a white supremacist town.

When taken in further conjunction with the overarching support on the internet for players referred to as *Dirt dogs*, athletes who ‘learned to grind and battle through adversity... these are guys that keep competing and not hit the wall and give up’ (Quantrill, 2002) some of the underlying elements of racism in Red Sox Nation are again brought to the fore. Since its inception as a popular terminology in 2002 players celebrated as dirt dogs have been Trot Nixon, Brian Daubach, Johnny Damon, Jason Veritek, Dustin Padroia, and Jacoby Ellsbury. Upon reflection and critical evaluation then, as Howard Bryant stated in an interview, it is pretty clear that a dirt dog is merely a ‘thinly-veiled racist code word’ (personal communications,

2007) for Red Sox Nation's great white⁴³ hope ballplayers. Rooting for the likes of Daisuke Matsusaka, Manny Ramirez, David Ortiz, and Pedro Martinez (the latter two have been voted the greatest Red Sox players of all-time) merely serves as a means to an end. In other words, their superstardom is not a symbol of progress, but rather a sign that racist members of Red Sox Nation are willing to overlook the "otherness" of successful athletes if they perform well on the field (Andrews, 1998b).

Importantly, and following Ithaca College Professor of Sport Management and Media, Stephen Mosher's, contention that "not all Red Sox fans are Irish-Catholic racists" (personal communication, 2007) is the relative level of progressive argument against this type of colorblind thinking. Perhaps emboldened to 'fight the good fight' behind a pixelated screen, community members have argued against the racist posturing found in the prose of Silva and Simmons. In a pearljam.com forum thread dedicated to the Red Sox, another citizen of Red Sox Nation stated that "I realize it's a racist thing to have a term "dirt dog". I don't like it at all" (rearviewmirror, 2007, #1389). Jere, the writer for the weblog *Red Sox Fan from Pinstripe Territory*, denounces the celebration of "dirt dog" players and the bostondirt dogs.com website as being faux-patriotic, homophobic, sexist, and racist. In other words he believes that those members of Red Sox Nation that only fully support dirt dogs are people "who enjoy the Red Sox, so long as they're clean cut and white to off-white" (2004).

⁴³ It should be noted that Damon and Ellsbury are not "white", but Native American (at least partially). Still their skin color is clearly lighter than many other minorities that play or have played for the team.

Importantly, particularly regarding the latter, his site was not integrated into the boston.com multi-news conglomerate that collates all the major Boston based newspaper websites into one convenient source as bostondirttdogs.com was. Given the contemporary context whereby the free market dictates which voice(s) hold sway in the popular sense this type of white masculine communication is the most profitable in the 'sale of a [Red Sox] nation' (Felt, 2005, ¶1), and therefore maintains its place of dominance in popular [multi]mediation. Of further note on sexism and the internet, bostondirttdogs.com and Bill Simmons, the two most popular voices of Red Sox Nation in that arena again speak to the same relative worth[lessness] of females in that community that I found in the sport bar population.

For example, the disparagement of newer Red Sox fans as "pink hats" (field notes, 2007; Simmons, 2007b) by several members of this community, the place of women within Red Sox Nation is firmly set as being less than man. To illustrate, "Pink hat" fans are generally defined as the group of people (often official citizens) who have joined Red Sox Nation around 2003/4, when the team started having its latest run of on-field success, and are typically referred to in derogatory terms because they did not "suffer" through key disappointments as a community member in the past. The designation, firmly set in uneven gender relations, whereby pink=women=less than a 'true' member of Red Sox Nation is perhaps best defined by 'internet maven' (Miller, 2007a) Bill Simmons who states:

And yet it's been surreal to watch the Sox evolve into a bandwagon superpower like the 1970s Cowboys, one of those successful ubercontenders that everyone in Boston has always despised. Home games have been

overrun by pseudo fans, cute females and families in green jerseys and pink caps. (2007b, ¶ 4)

When coupled with a bostondirt dogs.com ran an interview for Red Sox Nation Presidential hopeful, Rick Swanson, who critically described the “pink hat” fan as “the young females that are now in the stands. In the old days, it was only fathers and sons that followed the Red Sox. Back then few females had any passion for the Red Sox” (Swanson, 2007, ¶4), it becomes plainly obvious that women are intruders to a majority of this white male community.

Again though this type of thinking from the two most popular Red Sox internet sources helps to ideologically place women below men, they are not blindly followed by all internet sources. Following Swanson’s interview, bostondirt dogs.com ran a response to his statement from a female member of Red Sox Nation that is worth quoting at length:

I have been a Red Sox fan all my life. I cried at age 9 in 1978, went to game 7 of the ALCS in 1986 with my Dad (a season ticket holder), was crushed 1986 watching game 7 of the World Series with my now husband in college, spent my 10th wedding anniversary watching Jason Varitek stuff his glove into A-rod's face in the Right Field Grandstands in July 2004, cried on the phone with my Dad in October 2004 when they finally won it all and just last night took my 9 and 7 year old DAUGHTERS to their first game. (Yes, they wore pink hats and looked great!) Tell Mr. Swanson that back in the day there were many of us in the stands watching and loving the Sox just like he was,

and his attitude about us "ladies" certainly does not represent me or my many female friends and relatives who ARE Red Sox Nation.

(Connelly, 2007, ¶3)

In other words, just because the most powerful voices in the internet community espouse white, masculinist ideologies not all members of Red Sox Nation chose to agree with their beliefs (cf. *A Red Sox Fan from Pinstripes Territory*). Still, the fact that these voices serve as the domineering popular opinion of Red Sox Nation is part of the performance of white masculinity in the sense that it is “through probing the bodies of the population a boundary between legitimate and illegitimate members of the community is established” (Zylinska, 2005, p. 86). Clearly, in the case of the internet Red Sox Nation is a virtual realm where normative white masculinity still rules the day.

Performing Red Sox Nation on the Road – DestiNation Colonization

Throughout the previous two sections I have outlined how Red Sox Nation has grown as a community in a virtual sense, both at sports bars and through the internet, but perhaps the most palpable physical evidence for the rise in Red Sox Nation’s relative importance in everyday life is their presence during games at opposing team’s stadiums. The ascendancy of Red Sox Nation at road games has been so bothersome to others (Silva, personal communication, 2007) that even rival New York Yankee ownership, seeing their prominence on the American national scale and viability on the market dwindling, was prompted to comment:

Red Sox Nation? What a bunch of shit that is. That was a creation of the Red Sox and ESPN, which is filled with Red Sox fans. Go anywhere in America and

you won't see Red Sox hats and jackets, you'll see Yankee hats and jackets.

This is a Yankee country. We're going to put the Yankees back on top and restore the universe to order. (Steinbrenner, 2008, ¶1)

Despite these protestations, in September of 2007, *USA Today* ran a front page article proclaiming that “Red Sox Nation is the New King of the Road” (White, 2007, p. 1) which outlined the fact that the team led the league in road game attendance by approximately 2,000 fans per game. Given their overwhelming physical presence at other teams’ ballparks, in order to gather a more encompassing context of the public performances in Red Sox Nation I followed the team around the country.

More to the point, while traveling to see the Red Sox play in Baltimore, New York, Seattle, and Los Angeles I actively participated in and observed the performances of and in Red Sox Nation. In Zylinska’s (2005) words this enabled me to ‘think through the regulatory mechanisms that were involved in producing, or performing, legitimate citizenship’ (p. 95). Again, like in sports bars and on the internet, these behaviors were oft-repeated and served to normalize particular behaviors in the community.

To illustrate a typical game experience, prior to each contest Red Sox Nation fans often colonized each of the cities “in droves, piling into local bars, eateries, and reveled in performing their New England-ness” (field notes, 2007) which is largely based on a hypermasculine aesthetic, overconsumption of alcohol, and a combative attitude toward one another and opposing fans (field notes, 2007). Most stadiums and local businesses looked to capitalize on this easily spotted incoming crowd rather than ‘defend’ their home team by advertising “Red Sox Nation” specials, and

raising prices to attend games, eat, and stay while the team is in town (field notes 2007). In Seattle and Baltimore I spoke with local bartenders and taverns just outside the two ballparks who claimed that they earned around \$1000 (approximately three times their normal weekend-night income) when the Red Sox came to their city and looked forward to these visits (field notes, 2007).

As for the citizens of Red Sox Nation prior to and during these games many dressed their part and 'marked' themselves as part of the community by wearing the team's uniform, hats, along with other emblemized products. Prior to most of these games I would often engage members of Red Sox Nation in conversation, and observed their (inter)actions at these various sites – particularly as the crowd would spill out from local bars and eateries. Again, their behavior could also be characterized as adhering to the norms ascribed to most white masculinist groups. Often, even when women were present, they were subordinated immediately. One member even found it fit to tell me his partner could "sure suck a dick" (field notes, 2007) which seemingly made her worthy of presence in this 'male dominated' (hooks 1992, p. 62) space.

The pre-game festival atmosphere created by citizens of Red Sox Nation prior to games continued throughout each contest through the perceptible consumption of high levels of alcohol and generally belligerent behavior. One beer vendor at Camden Yards even stated that during Boston's August visit he broke a record for most sales during a weekend (Fenstermaker, personal communication, 2007). At the 10 games in Baltimore, I often sat in the Eutaw Street bleacher section where beer bottles would be lined up on the outfield fence, serving as a veritable public

display for how much each individual had consumed. As Peralta (2007) notes public consumption of alcohol and deviant behaviors associated with it is often part of the active reproduction of hegemonic white masculinity which does little to alter the regressive connotations being a member Red Sox Nation has historically conjured up.

Given this context coupled with the overwhelming dominance of Red Sox Nation at each of the different away games that I attended, through informal interviews, many fans stated that they felt that the aura produced at these events reflected what it would be like to attend games at Fenway Park. In fact they often referred to Baltimore's Camden Yards, and Los Angeles' Edison Field as "Fenway South" and "Fenway West" respectively (field notes, 2007). More to the point, during games in Baltimore and Los Angeles, the scoreboard operators would replace home team trivia with questions and information about the Red Sox and/or Boston thus deferring to the crowd majority. In effect, for the three to four days that the team was in town Red Sox Nation was briefly able to colonize, and dominate the social landscape of whichever city that they were in.

While on the road, I noticed that the crowds were largely populated by white people rooting for the Red Sox. These members of Red Sox Nation, at this point many influenced by copious amounts of alcohol, would aurally mark the ballpark as Red Sox Nation territory with incessant "Let's go Red Sox" chants throughout the game, then often revert to various forms of verbal and physical abuse of others as the event wore on. During my experience following the ball club this often led to

abhorrent behavior captured by other attendees and myself on videotape or in field notes.

For example, prior to my first road trip, youtube.com had a highly viewed video of a Red Sox fan in Toronto dumping beer on a Blue Jay supporter, and leaving to a chorus of cheers from fellow Sox faithful⁴⁴. At Yankee Stadium, in May, I personally witnessed several hundred members of Red Sox Nation being removed from the ballpark for physical confrontations with Yankee fans (field notes, 2007). Finally in September, at a game in Baltimore, I witnessed an Orioles fan, whom had apparently fallen asleep due to the overconsumption of alcohol, become the subject of abuse from members of Red Sox Nation. While he was asleep the fan was drawn on, positioned for group photos, and generally derided by the other attendees. Further, those who asked to check on his health, or instructing other fans to stop were also verbally abused for 'not having a sense of humor' (field notes, 2007).

While these are but a few brief snapshots of my experience on the road, the general performance at away ballparks by members of Red Sox Nation was repeated at every game that I attended (field notes, 2007). Given that most of the people partaking in the previously mentioned activities were white and male again speaks to the public (re)production of normative white masculinity. Thus while on the road with(in) Red Sox Nation I came to understand that the community members 'earned' praise through their ability to lead cheers, consume alcohol, cleverly deride others, fight, and/or be forcibly removed from the ballpark (field notes, 2007). Building from Perralta and Cruz (2006) then much of this performance of Red Sox

⁴⁴ <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XJlrNCqGt9A>

fandom often based in the first instance on the consumption of alcohol, “is a vehicle used to express a form of embodied masculinity ... not only about “drinking to get drunk,” but also about constructed racialized and sexualized status (p. 754)”.

Through my observations and interactions with the various individuals attending road games then I believe that this portion of my ethnography further served to define Red Sox Nation as a community based on the performance hegemonic norms of white masculinist behavior (Connell, 1995). Different from the internet and sports bars however, is the fact that rather than have avenues to deny the white privileges inherent in being a part of the community, these members unquestioningly reveled in it (field notes, 2007). As Bhaba might say Red Sox Nation members performing in stereotypically brutish fashion “is a form of knowledge and identification that vacillates between what is always ‘in place’, already known, and something that must be anxiously repeated” (1994, p. 66).

Interestingly, despite the questionable behavior of Red Sox Nation members on the road, the Red Sox organization has chosen to capitalize on their fans presence at road games. More specifically, since 2006, the Red Sox have capitalized on their newfound popularity outside of Boston by purchasing tickets and hotel rooms to road ballparks throughout the league and marketing them as Red Sox DestiNations (Talcott, 2006). “The packages, part of what Harvard Business School professor Stephen A. Greyser claims is ‘brand extension’ start at \$499 and can top \$1,000, include hotel and game tickets, and autograph sessions with a player, a Red Sox jersey, and a baseball used in a game” (Talcott, 2006, ¶2). Although those prices do not include airfare, according to the organization, DestiNations have “sold out every

season since they were created” (Fuller, personal communication, 2007). As such, I would argue that no matter what strides the organization has attempted to make, in terms of diversity, they still fall prey to the neoliberal requirements of capital accumulation at all social costs (Kelly, 2001). Thus in a very real sense, even if the Red Sox organization has progressive ideals behind marketing to “other” consumers, they still pander to the Neanderthallic and obsessive segments of Red Sox Nation. Sadly they do so, even if it is against their moral fibers, because it will help the team accumulate more capital.

This form of ‘selling out’ became more obvious when I shifted my attention to the way(s) Red Sox Nation was performed and experienced at Fenway Park. In many ways then the Fenway Park experience reflects the conflicted nature people in America have had in remembering the past. As Zinn (2003) has written elsewhere through Fenway Park, the Red Sox organization and fans have been presented ‘a judgment of history through which the present is understood about what *facts* are important and unimportant’ (p. 684). Through the following I will do the same.

Performing Red Sox Nation At Fenway - “America’s Most Beloved Ballpark”

With their newfound popularity and supposedly more welcoming atmosphere towards minorities, whereby several black ex-players have made amends with the team and Red Sox Nation (see: Edes, 2006), coupled with a league-low capacity of around 35,000 (Benjamin, 2007), tickets for games at Fenway Park are often hard to obtain. In fact, during my research I found that single-game tickets had to be purchased from the team almost as soon as they go on sale in February otherwise attendees have to purchase entry to the stadium through various forms of

ticket brokerage (Ace Tickets, StubHub), or “scalpers” for up to 1000% of face value⁴⁵.

Despite the difficulty in attaining tickets, I was able to attend nine Red Sox home games between June 30th and July 14th in 2007, in addition to spending time outside of Fenway for two games - during their home opener, and Dasiuke Matsusaka’s first home start as a Red Sox pitcher in April. During these 11 events, what I witnessed was an oft-repeated, seemingly scheduled performance, by fans prior to, during, and following games again serving to normalize performances in Red Sox Nation. Moreover, perhaps the most interesting aspect of my micro-ethnography at and around Fenway Park was the spectacularized (Debord, 1994) ‘choreographed experience’ (Cafardo, personal communication, 2007; field notes, 2007) that each game had. In other words, as an observer I found that members of Red Sox Nation seemingly behaved in drone-like fashion during every single game, because as one member simply put it “this is what we do” (field notes, 2007).

To illustrate, the combination of low supply, high demand, and a competitive baseball team has contributed to an atmosphere in Fenway which *Boston Globe* sports columnist and NESN anchor Nick Cafardo (personal communication, 2007) described as “a football game mentality”. The experience which can perhaps best be describe as a wild amalgamation whereby a ‘working class history combines with upper-middle class privilege’ (Mosher, personal communication, 2007) in a “spectacular blend of heavy alcohol consumption, hyper-masculinity, hyper-

⁴⁵ In the first instance then, class privilege moves to the forefront of being able to attend a game (Benjamin 2007).

femininity, and a seeming desire to ‘perform’ various levels of racism, sexism, and physical masculinity” (field notes, 2007). For example, the typical Fenway Park experience as a member of Red Sox Nation begins approximately 1 ½-2 hours before the game begins. During this time large crowds would congregate at various local bars like *Game On*, *The Cask ‘N Flagon*, and *Boston Beerworks* just outside the ballpark. During this time ‘thousands of Red Sox uniformed people would begin to consume massive quantities of beer for \$4-6 a pint, and engage in fervent discussion of the team’s current performance and future possibilities’ (field notes, 2007). While this was often as innocent as discussing the futures of various different players, or excited chatter about the impending contest, sometimes fans would engage in more despicable behavior.

For example, prior to the two Daisuke Matsusaka pitching starts that I attended in Fenway Park the “sea of white” (Shaughnessy, 2006, p. 11) people that attend games dressed in kimonos, headbands emblemized with the Japanese rising sun symbol, and rattled swinging drums marked with the Red Sox logo and a Japanese character that were given to them as they walked into the ballpark (field notes, 2007). On opening day one individual, a very drunk white male, in full traditional Japanese dress (kimono and headband) stood outside the *Cask ‘N Flagon* and ‘welcomed’ an Asian television crew by placing his hands together, bowing, and repeatedly saying “herro, herro⁴⁶” while a large crowd of Caucasian onlookers stood by and laughed⁴⁷.

⁴⁶ Racist humor that depicts Asians attempting to communicate in American-English often dictates that these people replace L’s with R’s in stereotypical speech patterns. However, that an obviously

Just as disturbingly, in another case a letter to the editor in the *Boston Globe* John Wilhelmi described his experience as follows:

HAVING HAD some spare time last Saturday while in Boston on business, a colleague and I took an evening stroll in search of legendary Fenway Park. To our delight, not only did we find the ballpark, but we encountered thousands of excited fans as they funneled their way toward the park's Yawkey Way gates. To our left, in the street, five or six elementary-age kids rode by on bicycles. They were African-American. A Red Sox fan, who was white, yelled toward the young cyclists for all within earshot to hear, "Where's my stereo?" Everyone around him laughed as the kids kept riding.. I suppose the implication is that young black children on bicycles go around stealing stereos from white adults. This stereotyping made me shudder, as I reflected on the walk I had taken just the previous evening along the historic Freedom Trail. I happened upon the site of the Boston Massacre where, among other brave souls, African-American Crispus Attucks gave his life in the name of freedom 237 years ago. Perhaps it will take another 237 years for that freedom to be realized. (July 20, 2007)

These two devastating performances of whiteness serve to further push the idea that white people are dominant in a "colorist" (McKinney, 2004, p. 101) Red Sox Nation community that seeks to degrade, not just blacks, but all people 'of color'.

drunk white male felt it safe to disguise the form of humor as 'playing' someone else's race/ethnicity, speaks to the broad privilege white people have in 'disguising' their privilege. Moreover, that alcohol, a disinhibitor meant to an individuals hidden feelings elicited this response is even more frustrating.

Turning attention back to the ‘Fenway Experience’ I would argue that this kind of behavior continued, and magnified while inside the park. To illustrate, once inside, members of Red Sox Nation were often regaled with a pre-game introduction complete with flyovers, military parachute landings, and a large American flag covering the Green Monster⁴⁸. As the games began an incessant, deafening roar of “Lets Go Red Sox” would start and continue throughout the game. Members of Red Sox Nation often booed other team’s best players, as well as almost every minority that came to the plate (field notes, 2007). Similar to my encounters in sports bars, and consistent with Bryant (2002) and Updike (2002), I also found that underperforming players on the Red Sox were also booed or teased for their recent play.

For instance, during this portion of my ethnography, Julio Lugo (a Dominican), was mired in a deep hitting slump, and when it was his turn to bat most fans would boo, chide, and even shout out remarks about his performance. Most times these statements would be banter typical of sporting contests, but as the games wore on would sometimes be filled with racist invective whispered to neighboring fans – even to someone taking notes in a notebook for their dissertation (field notes, 2007)! Additionally, Manny Ramirez, was often shouted at for mistakes he made in the field, or made fun of for being a simple-minded Dominican. Of course “they never realize the joke’s on them, because he (Ramirez) knows exactly what he’s doing ... they’re just too racist to see it” (Bracey, personal communication,

⁴⁸ This took place on “special” occasions like Opening Day and July 4th, but also more crassly was used to cover to unveil new signage on the Green Monster for various corporate sponsors.

2007). This has contributed to an atmosphere in Fenway that is a space that, even in 2007, 'black people don't even consider as a place to go ... particularly older black people' (Williams, personal communication, 2007).

It must be noted, however, that while some of the behavior was abhorrent, my experience at Fenway Park was still somewhat more positive than those that Howard Bryant (2002) wrote about, or my interviews with various members of Red Sox Nation had recalled. To that point many members of the community argue that, because there are no longer chants of "You're Not Irish" (Bracey, personal communication, 2007) or "Uncle Ben and worse" (Mosher, personal communication, 2007) to former black outfielder Troy O' Leary and Jim Rice respectively racism in Fenway, and Red Sox Nation by extension, has disappeared. Again this is not an effort to disregard the fact that black outfielders Torii Hunter and Gary Mathews Jr. both claim to have heard "nigger" shouted at them and the fact that I personally witnessed the homophobic terms "faggot" and "queer" being spoken during the 2007. Rather this speaks to the general level of disrespect that fans had for all players on the field during the game.

As John Updike (2002) wrote about in the 1960's many members of Red Sox Nation seem to believe that they have the privilege of berating anyone, perhaps especially members of their own team, by purchasing admission to the ballpark. For example, in early an early season game between the Red Sox and Angels two fans were ejected for throwing pizza at another member of Red Sox Nation while NESN

announcer Jerry Remy and Don Orsillo laughed uncontrollably for several minutes⁴⁹. After ejection, and confirmed by employees of the tavern, several fans claimed to see the two individuals enter *Game On!*, and receive a rousing ovation (field notes, 2007). Additionally, in early June, after news that Yankee 3rd basemen, Alex Rodriguez, was seen walking hand-in-hand with a woman who was not his wife several members of the crowd 'dressed in drag' and made mercilessly taunted him about being his next girlfriend (MacMullen, 2007).

Each of these actions, and their subsequent positive reinforcement as 'good humor', by members of the media serve to reinforce the notion of the stereotypical member of Red Sox Nation, as arrogant, combative, racist, sexist, and homophobic. Whilst this version of a Red Sox Nation member, "is a one-sided description which results from the collapsing of complex differences into a simple 'cardboard cut-out'" (Hall et al. 1996, p. 212) it does speak volumes of who matters in the community. In other words there are citizens of Red Sox Nation that reject the negativity that the utterance of the community brings to mind, but they have been pushed to the back and silenced in favor of their ridiculous brethren.

Interestingly, despite these historical and contemporary actions and activities the Red Sox organization markets Fenway Park as "America's Most Beloved Ballpark". By way of closing this section I turn to a field note that I wrote following my Fenway Park tour on July 11, 2007:

⁴⁹ <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oCHge7a-PmY>

I find [the claim that Fenway Park is “America’s Most Beloved Ballpark”] interesting given that historically and according to my observations this was/is a space where:

1. The words “nigger”, “fag”, and “queer” are freely used to berate players, fellow attendees, or as embellishment in various ‘humorous’ speech.
2. That Fenway was the place where Jackie Robinson’s infamous first tryout took place and ended with a member of the organization yelling “get those niggers off the field”. Yet his number is ironically memorialized in right field, while the man who may have said it, Tom Yawkey, is memorialized on the left field wall.
3. That Fenway was the place where Ted Williams was jeered for years, and again, ironically memorialized in right field.
4. That only white people go to games here.

In other words, and following Howard Zinn (2003), by making such a bold statement about Fenway Park, and simultaneously proffering only one type of history, one that does not mention these legacies of racism, classism, sexism, and homophobia, the Red Sox organization is make very real ‘judgments on which facts are important and unimportant’ (p. 684). Not surprisingly, while the media, and members of Red Sox Nation continue to support and perform unruly, hyper-masculine behavior the organization helps make it possible, by not consistently reminding/reprimanding them of/for their terrible historical and contemporary behavior.

Coda: The Long Road or Terrible Lie?

The rise of Red Sox Nation in the contemporary moment is emblematic of the complexities borne of an increasingly neoliberal society. The symmetry with the business methods of its organization's upper-management, and the subsequent fissures within the citizenship of Red Sox Nation provide a clear lens with which to understand both the performance of members within it, and its dialectical engagement with the social structures which influence the way it is experienced, viewed, and performed. On the one hand Red Sox management looks forward to attacking a past of repulsive behavior by prior owners and fans by embracing a more diverse population or (Williams, personal communication, 2007).

Indeed, after already having made inroads with the Dominican(-American) population through the signings of Pedro Martinez, Manny Ramirez, David Ortiz, and Julio Lugo (Klein, 2000) and taking the 2007 World Series trophy to the Dominican Republic (Steinberg, personal communication, 2007), they have attempted to make amends with the Japanese who for several years had held the Red Sox in contempt (cf. Bradford, 2007) for disreputable business decisions by adding Daisuke Matsusaka and Hidecki Okajima to the team and opening the 2008 baseball season in Tokyo. Moreover, they have created signage inside Fenway Park welcoming Japanese players, fans, and members of the media. Under the direction of the post-2002 ownership they have reached out to black, Latino, LGBT, women, and the

under-class through marketing, creating minority specific “days” at the park⁵⁰ (ie. Jackie Robinson Day) and charitable foundations that help inner-city schoolchildren attend college in an attempt to help create a welcoming atmosphere at Fenway and in Red Sox Nation where one did not exist before (Bryant, personal communication, 2007; Williams, personal communication, 2007; Steinberg, personal communication, 2007).

Yet, in some cases, this has made the divisions within Red Sox Nation more pronounced, or at least more excusable. For now Red Sox fans can claim that they are “over” racism/classism/sexism/homophobia, without ever having to face the past. Moreover, these claims to progressive, forward thinking, and diverse ‘global’ futures in Red Sox Nation do not explain why ownership has teamed with NASCAR’s Rousch Racing. Long a part of the good ole’ boy network, which is credited with helping George W. Bush ‘win’ his elections (Newman & Giardina, Forthcoming), NASCAR and the Red Sox are two entities that should have been kept apart if both are interested in promoting a more welcoming atmosphere for a socially diverse community. A veritable match made in racial/sexual/class diversity hell, the Rousch-Fenway collaboration and signage at Fenway Park signifies where Red Sox organization’s real loyalty lies and, indeed, under the rules of American corporate capitalism, where their loyalty *must* lie.

For while their employees may well be searching for minority populations for altruistic reasons, the “prophets of profit” (de la Rocha, 1997) that make up the

⁵⁰ To be sure minority specific “days” are not unique to Boston, but emblematic of many sport marketing activities. However, the fact that they pride themselves on holding these ‘days’ is troubling to say the least.

Red Sox ownership are likely seeking more money – whether it be by extracting capital from new populations of “pink hats”, ethnic minorities, or joining forces with another organization with a terrible racial history in NASCAR. The disingenuousness toward real diversity and progressive actions borne from the demands of never-ending capital accumulation is striking – and unfortunately true. Charles Steinberg’s response to my inquiry over this relationship reveals as much when he stated that:

John Henry’s choice to join with NASCAR as a business venture was due to revenue sharing in Major League Baseball. If he sells 100 dollars worth of products for the Red Sox he has to split it 30 ways, with his partnership at Rousch-Racing he only splits it two ways. (personal communication, 2007).

In other words, while the Red Sox organization (ownership included) is hoping for change in Red Sox Nation, because the current American capitalist system requires that they attain profit at all costs, they ultimately cannot care about the current performances of their fans as long as they spend money on the team along the way. In response and following Joanna Zylińska (2005) I implore that we members of Red Sox Nation along with the organization partake in an “act of self wounding, of probing beneath the scabs of national identity and national self-image that cover up the unnameable. Meandering between discomfort, guilt, shame and a push to give ‘it’ a name” (p. 105), we need to understand the history upon which Red Sox Nation was built, the contexts in which it operates, and seek to fight back and make this a community for all people to experience and enjoy equally.

Conclusion: Here's to the State of George W.

~America exists in a virtual sea of materialism. Here, one sees material excess in the midst of utter poverty. Here, in the cradle of global capital power, one finds more food, more clothing, more creature comforts, more material wealth than almost anywhere on the planet We are greedily eating the very heart of our tomorrow and our children's tomorrows. And meanwhile our god – the dark force of international corporate power – decides hour by hour, how destructive the day's economic engine will be; how much long-term gain will be destroyed in the race for short-term profit. (Abu-Jamal, 1996, p. 32-33)

Throughout the substantive portion of this thesis I have traced how an assemblage (Malins, 2004) of American (cultural) citizenship (media production, discursive media celebrity, filmic representation, and 'lived reality') is reproduced and actualized through sport in the contemporary moment. I hope that my critical engagement with the Little League World Series and Red Sox Nation demonstrates how citizenship has been altered by and through the media, corporate constituents, and individual behavior. Interestingly, the two empirical nexuses of focus in this project seemingly serve two very different functions in the American popular. As I have established whereas the Little League World Series is part of the Bush-right's reclamation of American nationhood (Denzin & Giardina, 2007), Red Sox Nation is in many ways a supposed reflection of the Clintonian celebration of neoliberal global capitalism (Harvey, 2005).

The popular belief then is that the LLWS, based in Williamsport, plays the role of rural, morally incorruptible, and conservative, while Red Sox Nation, based in Boston, represents global cosmopolitanism, urban political progressiveness, and (uneasy) acceptance of diversity. In other words these two cultural entities are dialectically entwined within the supposed right/left, republican/democrat divide that exists in America today. However, and following Lawrence Grossberg, what I

have found through my research project is that, “such accounts oversimplify the complex relations between social (education, geography) and cultural identities” (2005, p. 316). Thus, while their function of creating normal (cultural) nationhood differs, *vis a vis* the nation-state versus cultural nationality, both the LLWS and Red Sox Nation serve to ideologically and practically reinforce the same interests. In simple terms they reflect the ideals and needs of “stupid, white, men” (Moore, 2002).

By now, in America, this should come as no surprise. Over the course of the last 60 years we have been bombarded by “neo-liberals and their funders [who] have created a huge international network of foundations, institutes, research centers, publications, scholars, writers and public relations hacks to develop, package and push their ideas and doctrine relentlessly” (George, ¶9). More specifically, as Toby Miller has pointed out (2007b), ‘300 “coin operated” right wing think-tanks based in Washington’ (p. 127) which are supported by some of the world’s richest corporations have definitively and devastatingly shaped American popular attention, discourse, and interest.

They are the driving force behind a country that has no problem debating how Little League and ABC uses kids to promote god, country, and capitalism, and Red Sox Nation’s acceptance of global diversity (however cursorily) through the unabashed promotion of the community to whichever consumer will purchase a Red Sox Nation card on ESPN and NESN, but pays little attention to the fact that the United States system of global, neoliberal capitalism has been crumbling under the weight of its submission to the powerful few (cf. Denzin & Giardina, 2007; George,

1999; Giroux, 2005; Grossberg, 2005; Harvey, 2005; Miller, 2007a, 2007b). Like lemmings lining up to leap off a cliff to their death, most of the American public happily relents to corporate interests just as they are destroying the social, cultural, and economic fabric of our country. Unfortunately, if one is to step out of line, and suggest that there has to be a different way they are referred to as un-American hypocrites and silenced – no matter how compelling the evidence (Chomsky, 2003).

In other words, sickeningly and swiftly, corporate rule, which has been proffered as the last viable economic system (Fukuyama, 1989), effectively replaced any form of actual engaged citizenry in America (Giroux, 2004a). As each of my chapters has outlined any corporate calls for diversity and progressive social change in Little League and Red Sox Nation are not actually looking to help those in need, rather, they are considered good business practices (Grossberg, 2005). Social change for dollars in the form of having “the year of the woman” at the LLWS while continuing to be a sexist organization or giving 25 Boston city school students college scholarships through Red Sox Scholars while also joining in business ventures with racists from NASCAR is no different than companies “going green” while giving their employees Styrofoam cups to drink from, or joining the Breast Cancer Awareness corporate conglomerate while making products that have been linked to cancer (King, 2006b).

The frustrating part in all of this is not just that the LLWS and Red Sox Nation continue to practice various forms of racism, American jingoism, sexism, and classism, while claiming otherwise but that this study could have been conducted on almost any other American cultural entity and I would have come to a similar result.

As one of my interviewees, Monne Williams, of the Boston Red Sox, stated during our discussion that my criticism of Red Sox Nation, and also Little League, is a one 'that is endemic of the American social and political system' (personal communication, 2007). Susan George articulates this a bit more incisively with her assertion that, "no matter how many disasters of all kinds the neo-liberal system has visibly created, no matter what financial crises it may engender, no matter how many losers and outcasts it may create, it is still made to seem inevitable, like an act of God, the only possible economic and social order available to us" (1999, ¶7).

Moreover, while it seems as if the American public has tired of being considered the world's bully, on the whole, it has only tired insofar as they do not like a spade being called a spade. Rather than actively work to change this perception through diligence, care, and respect all too often American's react by, as Toby Miller's polemic (2007b) *The American people cannot be trusted* suggests, becoming more belligerent and ignorant of how the past has helped create the present and just how devastating the present is for most people in America and, indeed, the world. More to the point students, family, and friends despise the rest of the world's supposed 'hatred of America', but often pass it off as 'jealousy' for our system of prosperity. What they do not understand however is that America, and neoliberal capitalism, is a farce that has *never* been prosperous for the American people without the help of military, media, and governmental intervention (Stiglitz, 2008).

As Howard Zinn (2006) suggests history, in America, has been 'airbrushed' to (re)present the policies and decisions of the government, and corporations running

the government, in the best possible light. In terms of the micro-focus of my dissertation this is easily seen in the way that youthful innocence is part of the commercialized LLWS, but the historical exploitation of these children for the purposes of promoting the inherent greatness of the American political system (see: Van Auken & Van Auken, 2001) is never portrayed. Likewise, in Boston, the Red Sox Organization is attempting to create a more diverse fan base, but has effectively erased its history to the point that “many fans didn’t know that the Red Sox were overt racists in the past” (Bryant, personal communication, 2007). These same strategies of altering/erasing/forgetting the past, and even contemporary ‘truths’, are often how the privileged few can operate with the support of the American people despite simple common sense revealing that these privileged individuals are benefitting at the extreme cost of the general public.

In other words, my hope is that the critiques offered in the previous chapters are not taken to just the LLWS and/or Red Sox Nation. What I am getting at here is that ending racism, sexism, classism, and jingoism in both of entities are admirable goals, but they will continue to fail at exacting long-term change if we do not direct that change at the source of power – global corporations, their benefactors, and their ideologues. Without that result as an end goal my dissertation is in many ways a failure, a wasted six years of graduate school, and quite simply an act of joining the corporate educational structure (Giroux, 2003).

The problem with this lofty goal is that most of the American general public does not possess the theoretical, social, or lived toolkit to critique these entities and people. As Lawrence Grossberg puts it:

Even capitalist markets work only when everyone involved has the best possible information. That is why the most fundamental market is the marketplace of ideas. The course of our humanity depends on the ability to intelligently and rationally produce and choose the best descriptions, interpretations, explanations, theories, ideas, and so on, where “best” understood as implying at least a vision of objectivity. This ability, which is at the heart of modern education, depends upon the production of certain kinds of individuals ... capable of making such discriminations for themselves, and of putting the necessary resources and information before them. (2005, p. 274)

We, as an American public, clearly do not have the best possible information when it comes to cultural, social, economic, and international policies.

Once again the reason for this is simple, the overwhelming sources of our information comes from a small handful of rich white people who control the (multi)media, the individuals that are voted into office, the way tax laws are dispersed, the decisions made on what is criminal and what is ‘good business’ (Grossberg, 2005). I am not suggesting that all the rich, white people in America meet once a year to see how they can more effectively exploit the many, but rather it is through their power to (mis)represent, ignore, and create ‘truth’ through the aforementioned sites that their needs, ideals, and beliefs become ‘normalized’ and positioned squarely against any (other) ‘ways of being’ – only the former holds the privilege and power to incessantly bombard the public with (mis)information while the latter has to find niche markets and/or back channels to be heard.

Given this myopic way to progress as a country we are careening down a dangerous path that only ends in disaster. In fact, as various markets have deregulated over the past 50 years under the belief that 'free markets' will create the best competition in the world, the United States has already faced several economic disasters - oil in the 1970's, savings and loans in the 1980's, dot com's in the 1990's, Enron in 2001, and oil again today - (Frazier, 2008). Each time, high-ranking politicians (like Ronald Reagan, the entire Bush family, and John McCain as part of the 'Keating Five' (Pizzo, Fricker & Muolo, 1991)), and funders of those politicians have been implicated in illegal activities, and each time the United States has entered into conflict to both artificially stimulate the economy and deflect attention away from the real criminals in American society.

To be sure, this comes across as a massive conspiracy theory, and in some ways it is, but only insofar as it suggests that a relatively small number of people have systematically used the same strategies to obtain wealth and power in America. In so doing they have altered and created quite a rigid conception for what constitutes a good American citizen (Berlant, 1997). Generally this means a politically silent, god-fearing, heterosexual, who readily inserts themselves into the machinations of corporate capitalism, and 'understands' their attendant loss of employment and income to citizens of other countries as part of the hyper-competitive world of the free market. At the same time "the marketplace continues to move people away from few, modest needs to the creation of many false needs, through the use of advertising and the belief that consumption equals happiness ... such an ideology results in the deceptive belief that money is everything, capital

rules, and that all aspects of life are open for the making of profit” (Darder & Miron, 2007, p. 148).

Little League Baseball and Red Sox Nation are clear sporting examples of the effect that market fundamentalism has had on the citizenship of American society. For just as those that are being taken advantage of, exploited, and dominated by the corporate leaders of these two cultural formations they readily join forces with both communities despite the devastating a/effect both contribute to in the social, economic, and political foundation of American society. Instead of being a ‘critically engaged citizenry’ (Giardina, 2005, p. 180), the people of America still suggest that free market capitalism is the best way of life against all the overwhelming evidence that states otherwise. The problem with this general belief is that there are clearly other successful systemic alternatives that would help America climb out of the hole that it has created for itself.

For instance, the United States boasts that it is the richest country in the world, but it has a poverty rate in rural and urban populations that rivals 3rd World countries, while other countries like the heavily socialist, and less economically viable, Iceland, and/or Norway continues to provide the best standard of living for its citizens⁵¹. Conveniently, of course, the political think-tanks and pundits overlook the success of Scandanavian-socialism when proffering the idea that corporate capitalism is the only way of life. As such, rather than “get out of this country” as those who tire at my beliefs are wont to say, I would like to argue that there is a better way of living in America.

⁵¹ <http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/>

There has got to be something better than a country that has a difference in pay between CEO's and the average worker of 419 times (Collins & Yeskel, 2000). There has got to be something better than a country that sends its poor to underfunded schools that cannot retain its own teachers, then install corporate charter schools (Giroux, 2003). There has got to be something better than a country that sends its poor to die in Iraq and Afghanistan, but provides nothing for them when these American heroes return home (Calica, 2008). There has got to be something better than a country that lets uninsured patients die untreated or in massive debt (Kall, 2008). There has got to be something better than a country that continually bails out its morally and economically bankrupt corporations through tax breaks, kickbacks, and laws designed to artificially stimulate profit (Harvey, 2005). There has got to be "an end to neoliberalism" (Stiglitz, 2008). Following the charge of other likeminded (physical) cultural studies scholars, without the belief that this could actually happen we have truly lost.

While I am probably less "partly sunny" (Giardina, 2005, p. 179) than others about the possibility of a (re)newed, (re)engaged American citizenry that cares about itself and others, there are glimmers of hope. There are cultural workers and people out there that are attempting to make this life better. I began and will end the conclusion of my dissertation with the poetry of Mumia Abu-Jamal, a political prisoner wrongfully incarcerated for the murder of a Philadelphia policeman. He continues to be critical of the contemporary American system though his jail experience becomes more difficult because of it. His struggle is emblematic of the

war American's are fighting everyday amongst themselves and with the very wealthy:

Just because your body is in prison doesn't mean your mind isn't free, and even though this thought might be trite, there is some truth to it, because we *are* our minds. In the deepest sense we are our spirits. When you think of a person, or your own body – is this not a prison in some sense? Are we not in a prison of time? We age, we lose our faculties, but that doesn't mean we can't overcome, and we do that with power of mind and spirit. **We reach beyond.** (1996, p. 43)

Appendix A: Cultural Studies Past/Present: My (Physical) Cultural Studies Project

Given the style of this dissertation which is to align four separate, but related, 'publishable' academic journal articles the opening of the project necessarily fails in sufficiently demonstrating the epistemological, ontological, and methodological positions from which it is influenced, and indeed, directed by. As such, and in an attempt to exhibit the knowledge(s) required to create a physical cultural studies project, the first part of this appendix will more specifically outline my conception of where (physical) cultural studies stands in the contemporary moment. After providing this context, through which I will be articulating where my personal stance is on various theoretical, methodological, and praxical issues, the second part of the appendix will provide an autoethnographic account that seeks to situate the four substantive chapters of my dissertation as a Physical Cultural Studies project. In so doing, I aim to articulate the various ways I struggled with the various 'goals' of Physical Cultural Studies throughout the research act.

On that note, I have argued with others engaged in radical social progress, that the dominant organizers of the cultural studies project have long stated that a political insurgency was at the center of its (academic) purpose for existing (Carrington, 2001/6). I also assert that unfortunately the a/effectivity of this academic and political uprising has held little sway in the face of the dominant structures of (Western) power throughout the world. In other words, while in some ways, as cultural studies has become more sophisticated in uncovering modes of oppression, repression, and domination (Hall, M.A., 1996) those in power have

become equally sophisticated and much more effective at maintaining their levels of privilege while feigning ‘politically correct’ innocence (Grossberg, 2005).

For example, one need only look at the rise of the neoliberal corporate Empire (Negri and Hardt, 2000), and the pervasiveness of a ‘civically empty’ (Giroux, 2004a, p. xvi) world economy of haves and have-nots that has come to the forefront of our ‘lived’ realities over the past 30 years (Harvey, 2005) to see that to this point the cultural studies project has failed miserably (Denzin, 1991) in its attempt to facilitate a “peaceful, justified, and socially reformed” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p. 13) society. As Lawrence Grossberg (2005, 2006) and Henry Giroux (2002b, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006) have outlined in their often overlapping empirical, social, and theoretical arcs evidence of a socially/economically regressive, and ethically deficient (Zylinska, 2005) worldwide society can be seen through the rising poverty levels, lack of health care, astoundingly large incarceration rates, and highest prenatal death rates from the national collective that would seem to benefit the most from neoliberal capitalism – the United States (Collins & Yeskel, 2000).

However, while I do firmly suggest that the sky is falling on the cultural studies project and, in many cases, the world, the heartening (yet dangerously calming) thing about this field is that it is fluid, and can flow towards the most critical conjunctures (Grossberg, 1997a) we face in the contemporary moment. Further, following Giroux (2004a, 2005), neoliberal thought has not gone wholly unquestioned by contemporary youth (and adults) as evidenced by protests against the IMF, World Bank, and WTO. Given this fractured and socially myopic conjunctural moment, the near-simultaneous emergence of neoliberalism and

cultural studies, combined with the fact that, thus far, cultural studies has fallen short of co-creating a publicly accepted critical insurgency in response to the rise of neoliberalism (in its myriad forms), perhaps it is time to rethink this project in order to become a more structurally penetrating, effective, and known public entity in the contemporary moment (Grossberg, 2006).

Before proceeding, I will note that throughout the course of my graduate career, under the direction and influence of David Andrews, Michael Silk, Sheri Parks, Jaime Schultz, Michael Giardina, and Elizabeth Marshall I have traversed through the general history of (Physical) Cultural Studies (for a more detailed explication of the following please see: Andrews, 2006a, 2006b; 2006c; 2008; Carrington, 2001/6; Cole, 2001b/6; King, 2005a; Miller, 2001/6). This history of Cultural Studies journey started with the Levinasian break by Williams, Hoggart, and Thompson, the subsequent broadening, understanding, and academic appreciation of the term 'culture' through the formation of the Birmingham School, the popularizing and updating of Gramscian hegemony, and ending at 'Hallsian' articulation (Andrews, 2008).

Though, in some cases, cultural studies has progressed to a point that is 'somewhere better' (Grossberg, 1995, p. 14) than it was in previous incarnations, the project is far from complete – and, given its ever-evolving nature, necessarily should become even more convoluted. Further, as many have written previously (see for example: Andrews, 2002, 2004a, 2004b, 2006a; Carrington, 2001/6; Cole, 2001b/6; Hall, 1986, 1992, 1996; Giroux, 1994; Grossberg, 1992, 1996, 1997a, 2006; King, 2005a, King 2005b; McLaren, 1994; Miller, 2001/6) cultural studies is

not a singular theoretical and methodological design with one simple framework that each cultural studies project can apply to an empirical context, but the complexity of the field should not 'preclude definitional efforts' (Andrews, 2002, 2006a, 2008).

Rather, and following Hall (1992), cultural studies is an ongoing project which forces us to "wrestle with theoretical angels" (p. 280) in order to best contextualize, and articulate particular, contingently and culturally specific power dynamics, formations, and 'lived realities' (Johnson, 1986/7, p. 47). Through this 'unity-in-difference' (Clark, 1991, p. 17), or anti-/post-/inter-disciplinarity (Andrews, 2006a, 2006a), cultural studies scholars distinguish themselves by "an orientation to research and writing processes that seeks to capture the relationality of culture" (King, 2005a, p. 24). Given cultural studies stated purpose of constant evolution in order to find better and more perceptive methods of contextualizing, politicizing, and mobilizing I will attempt to delineate how through a detailed examination of how social, political, and personal social life in America has changed and that a fourth cultural studies 'vector' (Atkinson, et al., 1999, p. 465), antagonism, has emerged in recent years through an increased call to the radical contextualization of social settings thereby more specifically revealing (in)equitous power relations.

Context...is everything?

Though more recent, and perhaps overly idealistic, cultural studies students would somewhat disagree (Dickerson, Giardina, Newman, and White, *personal communication*, November, 3, 2006), the project's dominant voices reject McLaren's

(1994) call to ‘totalize everything’⁵², in favor of a mode of theorizing/methodology that is *radically contextual* (Grossberg, 1997a, p. 7). Radical contextualization speaks to the attempt to uncover and describe as many visions of and from the crystalline (Richardson, 2000) form that all individual, institutional, and political structures help shape and are shaped by in the contemporary social moment. Moreover, regarding radical contextuality, it would be hard to find another cultural studies scholar in the United States who has appropriated this into their personal academic trajectory more than Lawrence Grossberg who has argued that “context is everything and everything is context in cultural studies” (1997a, p. 7-8).

By taking on this seemingly Atlas-like goal Grossberg has vehemently maintained that contemporary cultural studies needs to be *disciplined, interdisciplinary, self-reflective, politically, theoretically, and contextually driven* (1997a, p. 7) in order to enact and direct progressive social upheaval. Given the rise of corporate neo-liberalism during the growth of cultural studies⁵³ at some levels I can see McLaren’s point that this hefty responsibility has come at the expense of radical social change, particularly in the way many scholars in the field go about making a good life for themselves publishing and teaching – but offering little else to raced/classed/gendered/abled/aged “others”⁵⁴. While this type of work is often thoughtful, thought provoking, revered, and in many cases, looked on as “the way” to conduct cultural studies, when viewed from a critical angle it can also quite easily

⁵² His argument was more nuanced than this, in that he said that it was necessary to do so to enact social change, but I would argue most cultural studies scholars would find his assertion problematic.

⁵³ Hall would have it that the rise of cultural studies was necessarily because of the emergence of neoliberalism, while Freire (1970) would argue that this type of work is not exactly stopping neoliberalism, and as a result of inactivity by radical thinkers, is actually contributing to it.

⁵⁴ As of this point in my personal life, I feel as if I am currently a part of this critique.

fit into Rojek and Turner's (2000) belief that it is through this vulgar reproduction of a once highly charged, and emotive genre, cultural studies has been 'de-politicized, especially in the United States ... and has displaced the concept of the organic intellectual with careerism' (p. 635).

However, on the other hand, to enact positive radical social change for as many people as possible I tepidly agree with Grossberg, that –though impossible– we need to attempt to consider individual points at all *conjunctures* (2006, p. 5). By conjunctures, and following Grossberg I am referring to the 'importance of the contingently determinant meaning, effects, and politics of particular social events, texts, practices, and structures' (Grossberg, 1997x, p. 220-221). In other words, the structures, issues, and meanings that help shape our life chances and choices every moment of every day.

For example, and perhaps most pertinent to my personal project, Grossberg has asserted, and I concur, that those conducting cultural studies need to become more nuanced in spelling out how the damning effects of neoliberalism act upon different spaces (see for example: Brenner and Theodore, 2002; Harvey, 2005; Peck & Tickell, 2002), as well as across and within individual and group identities. By taking note of the complex nature of radical contextualization it must, at this point, be clear that cultural studies is not (nor should it be) 'clean' hard-science, nor does it suggest that for each empirical situation a pre-given theory can be applied to it (Grossberg, 1997b). Further, since every (aspiring) cultural studies practitioner emerges from their own particular contextual and conjunctural circumstance, each persons's context, conjunctures, and conjectural sway will differ, often quite

oppositionally, from other like-minded academics. Thus, getting back to Samantha King's (2005a) argument that cultural studies is necessarily relational this situation, I believe unique to cultural studies, means that every empirical/theoretical project maintains a high level of individuality while often hoping to serve the collective good of many.

Simultaneously, as Jonathan Rutherford (2005) so aptly describes, the academic/institutional context from which contemporary cultural studies projects emerge is making it far more difficult for those working in Universities to be 'permanent persuaders' (p. 298). Rather 'in this new context of market-based reform and resurgence of liberal capitalism' (p. 298) these individuals are forced to bend/bow to the increasingly dreadful results of market logics – lack of spending in low-profit educational departments, movement towards larger classes at the expense of better individual learning, the advent of adjunct lecturers and, worst of all, 'purchasable' University degrees and jobs (Giroux, 2004a; Parks, 2006; Rutherford, 2005). Thus in Universities, the very places which "ideally in a healthy society, ought to be subversive institutions...challenging things, asking: 'is what we believe correct?'" (Chomsky, 2001), has upsettingly seen a replicable churning out of students, and dare I say academics, who want to or have learn(ed) how to work, and not praxically think.

While lamenting this disturbing trend I can also see that the socio-political climate of the moment has helped shape their/our/my lack of engagement with praxical critical thinking. In other words it is difficult to place blame on those individuals who blindly 'follow the leader' when as Giroux (2003), Grossberg (2001,

2005), and Zylinska (2005) have outlined, these students were often demonized or exploited as children, positioned as dangerous and therefore incessantly feel the a/effects of near-complete Foucaultian *surveillance* (1978), treated as customers throughout their (educational and working) lives and, more generally, and whose only form of self-actualization in this socio-political context is through consumption (Klein, 1999). Thus the frustrating and potential fissure line in how to conduct a politically progressive cultural study comes from finding the most effective way to reach these children, 'others' who may not have reaped the benefits(?) of 'corporate' education, as well as pushing the cultural studies project into further contextual complexity. As such, I argue that we need to do more than demonstrate social inequities through articulation to exact the changes I believe are necessary for a better (American) society. More specifically, through articulation, we need to inspire those who are (not) benefitting from the contemporary social environment through antagonism (Laclau & Mouffe, 1985).

4th Moment – Antagonism: Pedagogical, Ethical, Political, and Radically Democratic Physical Cultural Studies

In the opening of this dissertation I outlined the rise of articulation within cultural studies, where it has become manifest in scholarly readings, and how it has been appropriated by physical cultural studies – particularly in its most recent forms. Further, while I agree with Carrington's (2006) argument that we needed to bring the front-line political back to cultural studies, we also need to do so in a more articulate, conjuncturally specific and subject-position conscious ways (Freire, 1970). To do so, and following Grossberg (1994, 2001, 2005) and Giroux (2003, 2006) I assert we need to bring pedagogy back to cultural studies (or cultural

studies back to pedagogy) using new and heretofore unimagined/unused methods (Giroux & McLaren, 1994 is a good place to start). I feel that this may, in some part turn away from the literary and towards the popular, the more easily accessible, and the more emotive. Concurrently, and in agreement with Carrington (2006), not all cultural studies need to make this move as it would not be effective nor desirable if everything in cultural studies were the same, had the same exact political project, and/or tried to reach the same people.

What I am proposing then with my work is a radically democratic, *antagonistic* (Laclau & Mouffe, 1985; McLaren, 1994) project which is also attendant to Grossberg's (1997) claim for disciplined, interdisciplinary, self-reflexive, politically, and contextually contingent sensibilities. The antagonism described by Laclau and Mouffe (1985) that I am seeking is not just to question for questioning sake (see King (2005) on random contextualization), but rather an attempt to provide more in-depth and opposing viewpoints on cultural studies research and the contemporary social world.

With the move to more performative and narrative responses to neoliberalism in the (qualitative cultural studies) academy, questions have been recently raised as to how to ethically conduct this type of work. The first main question is how to engage in the fight against conservatism and Truth (Denzin, 2004, Lincoln, 2005), and the second is a demarcation of an *ethical cultural studies* (Zylinska, 2005), one that questions even some issues that the most progressive academic may have difficulty traversing through. As Denzin and Lincoln (1994/2000/2005) have long argued the search for objective Truth has been a

difficult battle that progressive qualitative scholars have fought against. Though Atkinson, Coffey, and Delamont (1999) assert that this fight has not been as completely perilous (Christopher Robins (2006) intro to the *Giroux Reader* might provide a good argument against this claim) and linearly progressive as the former articles would have it, the search for diverse truths has long been an issue in qualitatively based Physical Cultural Studies inquiry (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003). Thus how to gain, present, and reciprocate (Frisby et al., 2004) in meaningful and interpretively sufficient (Denzin, 1989) ways are constantly at play when creating a cultural studies project.

Further, in a neoliberally dominant moment in which schools are receiving less public funds for schooling (the haunting “who deserves free education and health care argument” from Giroux, 2004b comes to mind here), and professors have to compete for corporate funding which often searches for replicable and objective truth (Andrews, 2008; Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Lincoln, 2005), radical, independent, and (multi)voiced texts are difficult to create and receive (departmental and economic) support for. To make matters worse conservative forces in the country led by Lynne Cheney have tried to destroy any and all critical research and deify the IRB as the only and correct way of creating knowledge (Lincoln, 2005). As such, to create a conscience raising, and co-created radical political project may seem impossible.

However, in *The Ethics of Cultural Studies* (2005), Joanna Zylińska effectively argues that despite the difficulties in doing so an ethical cultural studies is exactly what we need to engage in. Relying heavily on Laclau and Mouffe (1985), Zylińska

uses their argument that we must antagonize everything from the micro to the macro in order to insert some form of ethics in cultural studies and to understand the *limits* of our choices (Zylinska, 2005).

Ethics, for sure, is a loaded, complicated, historically sensitive, and highly personal term – and clearly implicates cultural studies as a politically charged element of the academy. What many members of the scholarly community do not understand is that, politics, whether foregrounded in the project or not, always plays a role in the creation of a (academic) text. Thus good contemporary Cultural Studies lays no claim to objectivity in its expressed form. In that sense I adhere to Samantha King's notion that:

Contextual cultural studies analysis makes no pretensions to scientific objectivity or political disinvestment. It assumes that all scholarship is partial (that is, incomplete and partisan) and that our research methods and theories cannot be usefully distinguished from their social origins and institutional locations for these origins and locations shape the research questions that we ask and the processes that we follow. However, research in cultural studies goes further than other methodologies that refuse claims to objectivity in that it is always undertaken – explicitly – as a response to and intervention in political and social conditions. (2005a, p. 28)

By claiming to be a deeply political project, Physical Cultural Studies blurs the realm of objectivity to the point of claiming that there is none. However, to maintain a level of rigor, credibility, and meaning to the subject (Physical) Cultural Studies uses

its political underpinnings to expose injustices, and attempt to help encourage progressive thoughts, feelings, and actions (Denzin, 2000).

Not surprisingly, this is quite controversial in the 'academic community' in that most practicing scholars are out to find one definitive Truth, whereas (Physical) Cultural Studies scholars are content with many truths depending, of course on which part of the crystal (Richardson, 2000) the researcher decides to view the empirical phenomenon through. Furthermore, Smith (2005) argues that just the term *research* brings up thoughts of Western political, economic and individual domination against "others" in that traditionally this meant going into the field and telling stories about simplistic and morally, ethically, and technologically stunted Native societies. This type of work clearly continues today at the University of Maryland, as one need look no further than the research presented at Black History Month in 2005 (Ennis, Chin, & Zimmerman, 2005). Its main intention is to explicitly or implicitly assimilate 'other' cultures into or reinscribe the greatness of dominant culture (Freire, 1970) - in the contemporary moment that is generally the ideals of white, upper-middle class, fit, able, neoliberally minded males.

By admitting to being an overtly political project looking to uncover truths from a *crystalline* (Richardson, 2000), cultural studies seeks to combat and work with several different cultures (Laclau & Mouffe, 2000, argue that to leave dominant cultural ideals out or to not engage with those perceived to be from dominant culture leaves out part of the equation) in order to, again, "get somewhere better" (Grossberg, 1996). This type of scholarship clearly runs against the norms set up by

Lynne Cheney and is one that, even our possible allies, figurational scholars, often scoff at (Hargreaves & McDonald, 2000).

However, the most recent *Handbook of Qualitative Methods* (2005), has outlined several ways in which the relinquishment of authorial symbolic power (though ultimately incomplete) can be part of the academic realm through *testimonios*, the internet (itself a form of Western power), public ethnography, participatory research, and street performance in order to more effectively engage 'other' cultures in their words, using their forms, and ultimately to make their change (Freire, 1970). In further conjunction with Zylinska's reading of radical democracy, and as evidenced by the constant referral to his work in the most recent edition of the *Handbook of Qualitative Studies* (2005), a reincarnation of Paolo Freire's (1970) revolutionary and praxical effort, *The Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, has provided an avenue to combat the devastating a/effect neoliberalism has had on our lives.

Following Freire, conscientization is a part of the process of critical pedagogy which brings generative themes to the fore are 'iconic representations that have a powerful emotional impact in the daily lives of learners' (Freire, 1970, p. 96-97). In this way, individual consciousness can help end the "culture of silence" in which the socially dispossessed internalize the negative images of themselves created and propagated by the (upper-class, white, male, hetero) oppressor in situations of extreme social and cultural poverty. In this sense, I contend that more Physical Cultural Studies has to move past its somewhat introverted shell, and become what Norman Denzin (2000), Henry Giroux (2002b) would describe as 'performative'.

By performative I want to call for more than just the performance of teaching, and writing for academic journals - though an engagement with both must be the very minimum requirement to being a Physical Cultural Studies *scholar*. As a Physical Cultural Studies academic I want to move more ideas out to the frontline, and help communicate the field's progressive ideals with those in power. I want it to be more confrontational than quiet rumblings. I want people to know what Cultural Studies is, and that it is important. I want to "conjoin identificatory pleasure with ideological resistance" (Farred, 2003, p. 1). Therefore I want my personal Physical Cultural Studies project to be a 'substantive contribution, have aesthetic merit ... [and be] reflexive, impactful, and express reality' (Richardson, 2000, p. 937).

In regard to my position in cultural studies I understand that the most difficult hurdle that scholars in the field have to get past and/or come to terms with is its self-reflexivity. In other words, if as Cultural Studies practitioner one is not respectful/questioning of their own power, then they risk falling into the same trap that those powerful individuals they are exposing have already fallen into. Despite this tenuous position cultural studies scholars are in I argue that while maintaining a level of self-criticism we also:

need stories about what it is like to hate and feel despair, anger, and alienation from a world that has gone insane. We need pedagogical discourses that make these feelings visible, palpable, or stories and performances that connect these emotions to wild utopian dreams of freedom and peace (Denzin, 2004, p. 140).

In the following section of this appendix I will outline how this dissertation attempted to adhere to Denzin's 'call to arms' in the methodological sense – philosophically and in practice.

Becoming a Bricoleuer

Over the years, qualitative research has been met with serious reservation by positivist and post-positivist researchers who feel that the only good science is hard science subjective in nature, free of individual bias, and primarily quantitative. Researchers with positivist backgrounds feel that postmodern theory is “an attempt to legislate one version of truth over another” (Denzin & Lincoln, p. 12, 2003), and dismiss qualitative research as a less rigorous, soft science. Qualitative researchers counter with the idea that purely positivist or post-positivist theorists:

reproduce only a certain kind of science, a science that silences too many voices. These (qualitative) researchers seek alternative methods for evaluating their work, including verisimilitude, emotionality, personal responsibility, an ethic of caring, political praxis, multi-voiced texts and dialogues with subjects. (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994, p. 5)

Using the aforementioned description of the research landscape as a base, Denzin and Lincoln (2003) map out seven specific paradigmatic “moments” through which qualitative data gathering and evaluation has evolved. They further argue that these seven shifts have taken place over specific time periods, and take great pains in demarcating the exact moments when they occurred.

While I strongly agree with Denzin and Lincoln's idea(s) that qualitative study is a worthwhile endeavor, there are some important questions raised about

the unassailability of the paradigmatic definitions set forth in their introductory essay. One particularly problematic concept is their belief that qualitative study can be described as primarily (post)modern and performative in the current moment. According to Denzin and Lincoln the shift involves a change from a type of study where the researcher attempts to find positivistic causal relationships, remove(s) herself from the setting, and observes from a “Gods-eye view” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005), to one where the researcher deeply enmeshes herself in the research setting, analysis, and in some cases performs the research and findings (Denzin, 2000; Giroux, 2001).

Using Atkinson, et al. (1999) I would argue that the notion that we have reached this point through some sort of enlightened linear inevitability is questionable at best through the use of their statement that:

We take issue with Denzin’s (1997) suggestion that the “dividing lines between a secular science of the social world and sacred understandings of that world are now being challenged and, in some cases, erased” (xviii). The point is that these dividing lines were never so starkly drawn in the first place. Furthermore, given the highly personalized nature of anthropological fieldwork and authorship, it is far from clear that any major practitioner ever subscribed to a purely scientific or positivist perspective. (p. 466)

Therefore, according to Atkinson et al. (1999), the belief that researchers ever fully subscribed to one particular scientific moment or paradigm is reductionist in the first instance. Secondly, Denzin and Lincoln’s (2003) argument is also reductionist through the idea that shifting moments ever occurred in a complete linear, and even

manner. Rather “such a change in intellectual fields is almost always uneven – rarely marked by wholesale and radical transformations (Atkinson et al., 1999, p. 469).

Perhaps then it would be better to think of the changing landscape of qualitative research as one that works in *vectors* (Atkinson, et al., 1999, p. 465). Thus “rather than (use) the temporal metaphor of *moment* to describe the historical development of ethnography,” the word *vector* “impl(ies) the directionality of forces in an intellectual field” (Atkinson, et al., 1999, p. 465). In thinking this way, I was allowed to oscillate in and through paradigms, in such a way as to best portray and provide solutions for a social issue.

To this point Denzin and Lincoln (2003) state that the current qualitative scholar is somewhat of a bricoleur, or “jack of all trades” (Levi-Strauss, 1966, p. 17) researcher, who “produces a bricolage, that is a pieced-together, close-knit set of practices that provide solutions to a problem in a concrete situation” (1994, p. 2). The bricoleur utilizes many different types of theories, research methods, and forms of analysis in order to radically contextualize the current moment and best comment on it (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003; Grossberg, 1997a; Kincheloe, 2001; Lincoln, et al., 2001).

The bricoleur is interdisciplinary in nature, and:

As researchers draw together divergent forms of research, they gain the unique insight of multiple perspectives. Thus, a complex understanding of research and knowledge production prepares bricoleurs to address the complexities of the social, cultural, psychological, and educational domains.

Sensitive to complexity, bricoleurs use multiple methods to uncover new insights, expand and modify old principles, and reexamine accepted interpretations in unanticipated contexts. (Kincheloe, 2001, p. 687)

By becoming a bricoleur, the scholar is required to learn a lot about a lot. Therefore “many maintain that such an effort not only leads to superficiality but madness,” and that by “attempting to know so much, the bricoleur not only knows nothing well but also goes crazy in the misguided process” (Kincheloe, 2001, p. 681).

(Un)Fortunately it is between the points of superficiality and insanity that the researcher must reside as a bricoleur practicing Cultural Studies. Further compounding this condition is the fact that to remain a “good” bricoleur the scholar must not only know a lot about a lot, but also continue to know a lot about a lot. In other words, they must keep up with newer, emerging theories, methods, and forms of analysis as possible, because the knowledge base that informs a particularly “good” bricoleur today may not make a good one tomorrow.

For example, and following Kincheloe and McLaren’s (2005) updated version of the bricoleur my project could not only “focus on the production of meanings” but also had to look for ways “to resist and transform the existing conditions of exploitation” (p. 318). Thus, as Andrews (2000) argues though, “cultural studies has never been dominated by a single theoretical or methodological position, rather its growth can be described as a perpetual ‘unity-in-difference’ (Hall, 1992)”, it must be “distinguish(ed) ... through the employment of particular intellectual sensibilities (p. 111). Kincheloe (2001) seconds this consideration with his statement that:

The point need not be made that bricolage should take place – it already has and is continuing. The research work needed in this context involves opening an elastic conversation about the ways such a bricolage can be rigorously developed. Such cultivation should not take place in pursuit of some form of proceduralization but an effort to better understand the beast and to realize its profound possibilities. (p. 683)

In review, the landscape of qualitative research, particularly for a scholar practicing Cultural Studies, is far from a taken-for-granted mode of inquiry. Rather Cultural Studies is “always a contested terrain – among its own – as well as external. Cultural Studies is an open-ended and ongoing theoretical struggle to understand and intervene into the existing organizations of active domination and subordination, within the formations of culture” (Grossberg, 1989, p. 114-15). For example, as can be seen through the differences in the published works of Norman Denzin and Yvonna Lincoln and Paul Atkinson, Amanda Coffey, and Sara Delamont, competing assumptions and dialogues about how one actually conducts their research exist within the field.

Upon examination of the aforementioned argument, I suggest that Denzin and Lincoln’s framework proves useful in that it maps out several specific types of research paradigms within qualitative research, where it fails however, is in its tendency to reduce these paradigms to “moments” in time rather than areas of continued use by all qualitative researchers; these areas heretofore will be referred to as *vectors* (Atkinson, et al, 1999). Moreover, as many others state (see: Andrews, 2001; Grossberg, 1997a; Hall, 1996; Kincheloe, 2001) the cultural studies scholar

must use each *vector* to create the context through which we understand the world. Thus, to properly provide the context for a research project the scholar is required to become a bricoleur, and attempt to understand all the forces shaping a phenomenon. This means that some or all vectors of qualitative study can and should be used to gain a better understanding of the political underpinnings at the moment in order to create a method of study that can best elicit access and information about that phenomenon.

In short, qualitative research in Cultural Studies is disciplined against relativism, interdisciplinary, self-reflective of institutional and relational structures, driven by political organizations of power, committed to theory, and radically contextual (Grossberg, 1997, in: Andrews, 2003, p. 9). Through an *emergent design* (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003) it seeks to *articulate* (Hall, 1996) cultural forms within “complex social, economic, political, and technological relationships that comprise the social context; recognizing that ‘There are no necessary correspondences in history, but history is always the production of such connections or correspondences’ (Grossberg, 1992, p. 60, in: Andrews, 2003, p. 16)”.

Thus, while certain power structures do exist, they do not necessarily determine the context for every cultural form, or, as Grossberg would have it, “the meaning, effects, and politics of particular social events, texts, practices, and structures ... are never guaranteed” (1997, p. 220-21). In other words, it is the duty of the researcher to radically provide the contextual location for the particular phenomenon that they are studying, and to articulate how the structures and agents act on one another to perpetuate the *circuit of culture* (Johnson, 1986). Throughout

my project I believe that each chapter sufficiently provides the socio-political context through which each research act was conducted and understood, but may have been undercontextualized in locating myself within each chapter of the project. I would defend this shortcoming in that each substantive chapter has been created with the aim to be published in a scholarly journal which influenced my decision to leave out particular issues when producing the final product. More to the point, in final section of this appendix I aim to rectify this shortcoming in the substantive portion of this dissertation.

Methodological Chapter Breakdown

The type of dissertation format that I chose to complete the requirements for a PhD at the University of Maryland is different than a traditional single subject dissertation in that I used four separate, but related projects that were conducted throughout my PhD career at the school. In a way I feel that this type of dissertation better reflects my growth as a student in the program, because, in many ways, it was written throughout the entire time I was a student at the University. Though each chapter was completed over the course of the past year, it may have been obvious to the reader that each chapter began at a different time, with different personal/academic influences, and this section of the appendix will attempt to better describe the ontological, epistemological, and axiological similarities and differences found in and through the methodologies used in each chapter.

Chapter 1 - Revisiting the Networked Production of the 2003 Little League World Series: Narrative of American Innocence

The first chapter is an extension of my Master's Thesis project, and had its inception in February 2003. As a second semester Master's student at the

University of Maryland my advisor, Dr. David Andrews, would often ask what my thesis topic would be based on. Each time my response was that I was not quite sure what to do it on, but that I had an interest in critically evaluating any number of research sites. Given my undergraduate sociology of sport influence from Ithaca College professors, Dr. Ellen Staurowsky and Dr. Stephen Mosher, my main academic focus had been based on things like gender representations in sport, Native American mascots, media and film representations, and global mega-events. Yet, nothing seemed to capture my interest quite as effectively as youth sport had.

Perhaps some of this was influenced by my own success as a Little League Baseball player, then as a baseball/basketball coach of my brother who was 10 years younger, coupled by my naïve idea that Little League could be an innocent and safe place for kids from around the world to congregate – if done ‘right’. As such, when three fellow students and I produced a very cursory group project on the Little League World Series in his graduate class, it was with much excitement that I presented this as the topic for my thesis to Dr. Andrews. I can still remember the feeling of relief, inspiration, and then quickly fear when, in the middle of class (which is where I suggested it as my topic – very professional I know), he pointed to the sky and stated, “that is what you will write your thesis about”.

Driven by this new focus I swiftly made my way back to the graduate student office, and started reading the Little League Baseball website. On the site I noticed a familiar name, Lance Van Auken, head of Little League Corporations media department, who had come to my Youth Sport class at Ithaca College in 2001 for a presentation following the Danny Almonte scandal. The following day I sent him an

e-mail asking if I could spend some time with the company while researching the 2003 Little League World Series.

Much to my surprise, within 15 minutes, Van Auken had responded with an e-mail stating that it would not be an issue at all, as long as I agreed to hand out media credentials during the first few days of the tournament. Though I was not versed in terms like *gatekeepers* (Silk, 2002) and *reciprocation* (Sykes et al., 2005) this was exactly the relationship that was formed. More importantly Van Auken and his wife Robin who are perhaps the leading historians on Little League Baseball (see: Van Auken and Van Auken, 2001; Van Auken, R., 2002), was able to provide me with nearly unlimited *access* to the grounds at the Little League World Series, near instant recitation of historical ‘facts’ about Little League, and introduced me to the incoming ESPN and ABC production crews.

In early June 2003, I met with Lance Van Auken for a preliminary interview where we discussed various ‘ground rules’ for my study (I was not allowed to research the children in “the Grove”, but could audio/visually record any other aspect of the event. During the interview I also discussed the various post-9/11/01 alterations to the event, which included the addition of metal detectors prior to entry, an organized response to a possible terrorist attack, and heightened security on the grounds (Van Auken, personal communication, 2003). Finally, Van Auken instructed his assistant to give me a tour of the grounds at Williamsport to me become familiar to the spatial organization of my research area. The tour ended at the Little League Museum and Hall of Excellence, where I was able to gain a better understanding of who “mattered” to the Little League Organization.

At around the same time I was also able to acquire a place to stay in Williamsport through a college friend who offered his parent's basement as a home 'base' for the duration of the Little League World Series. Obviously this was important in terms of finance, since my form of *reciprocation* was merely to discuss my research and present the family with a parting gift upon my departure. Simultaneously the first form of reciprocation provided me with intelligent (non)scholarly discussion of my research on a daily basis. Thus, in terms of *member checking* (Guba & Lincoln, 1994), the family I stayed with was very helpful because they knew a lot about the Little League World Series, and viewed my empirical research with a decidedly more conservative bent than I did. As such, much of the discussion was spirited, to say the least, and provided me with multiple points of view on the same set of 'data'.

Following this initial visit to Williamsport, I returned to Baltimore, Maryland to discuss my initial entrée to Little League with Dr. Andrews, and the newly hired Dr. Michael Silk – who, at that point, had gained respect in the scholarly community for his ethnographic media production research at the 1998 Commonwealth Games (2001, 2002). With what little information that I had on my research topic at the time, Dr. Silk was able to give a few helpful hints and direction on what scholars to read, what to look for, who to try to speak with/interview, and offered general encouragement on the project as a whole.

With about a month to prepare for my *microethnography* (Wolcott, 1995), I began to read as much about methodological theory possible. Of course, as a qualitatively based research project, this meant reading the 1st and 2nd editions of

Norman Denzin and Yvonna Lincoln's *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (1994/2000), and other books on ethnography (Fetterman, 1989; Hammersley, 1992; Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995; Wolcott, 1995). In addition Dr. Silk had directed me to sports based media production work by Richard Gruneau (1989), and Margaret MacNeill (1996), as well as his own, to gain a better understanding of what I *should* be trying to do while immersing myself in the field.

Through my readings, and discussion with Dr. Silk, I decided that it would be best to try to have a video recording of each (inter)nationally broadcast game (23 of the 32 at the event), meet with the various producers and directors from ESPN and ABC to gain *rapport* (Silk, 2001), and generally observe as much of the LLWS event production as possible. As the media coverage of 2003 LLWS began, two days before the beginning of the event, I met back up with Lan Van Auken's assistants to perform my first act of reciprocation by handing out media credentials to incoming newspaper writers, photographers, and television crew members. Through this act, and with the assistance of Van Auken, I was able to meet and gain rapport with the entire production crew (game/features/research) from ABC and ESPN.

Though the LLWS is a youth sporting enterprise ABC and ESPN clearly take its role as a summer television sports broadcast seriously. From top-of-the line announcers like Brent Musburger, Gary Thorne, and Harold Reynolds, to Emmy award winning producer, Curt Gowdy Jr., it is obvious that, while the players are amateurs, the media crew is very professional. In fact, its' broadcast and features production of a game played between Texas and Massachusetts that year was nominated for an Emmy award and ESPY award respectively (ABC production

worker, personal communication, 2004). As such, I would argue that the information gathered at this event is generally regarded as the standard method for which American sporting events are covered by the televised media.

Following my readings, and even the professionals themselves, who argued that the narrative “story is the most important thing” (ABC production member, personal communication, 2003) in a sports television broadcast I chose to follow the features crew around during much of my time at the LLWS. By ‘tagging along’ on their various taping, and production excursions, I gained valuable insight into the construction of a cohesive narrative (outlined in chapter 1) that runs throughout a sport broadcast on a game-by-game, and entire tournament basis. Following Gruneau et al. (1988), the goal of this type emotional manipulation is to connect with as many viewers possible so that they become invested enough to watch the culmination of the event(s).

In terms of what I saw this meant taping each team as they arrived at the game, creating distinguishable differences between the teams by asking about team superstitions, cheers, and so on, and even artificially ‘staging’ emotive scenes to gain the interest of a casual viewer (field notes, 2003). The latter was no more evident than when the features crew was alerted that a young boy from the Washington state team had yet to meet his 11 day-old baby sister. Upon hearing this information the features crew was effectively able to delay the young boy meeting his sister for several minutes so that their film and sound crew could record a 15 second clip for a broadcast later in the week (field notes, 2003).

Besides following this form of ‘emotional labor’ from the features crew, I was

allowed to sit in the production truck and research truck for two separate games during the event. To put it succinctly the scene in these two settings is wildly chaotic (field notes, 2003). There are speakers set up for the producer, director, announcers, camerapeople, and research teams to converse in real time without the home viewer ever being aware of this communication. Consequently the production and research truck is often the site arguments, scolding, as well as positive encouragement throughout the production of a single event (field notes, 2003). During this observation period I was able to gain a deeper understanding for how the features crew's work is seamlessly integrated into a broadcast, the difficult job an announcer has given that most of their conversation is actually started by the director, and how camera angles are quite literally staged for seconds/minutes then used at specific times to elicit the most emotion in a home viewer.

In and around the games, and my observation of the various production crews, I was able to interview both features producers, the tournament producer, and hold several off-the-cuff (Amis, 2005) ethnographic interviews with ABC/ESPN workers at the event. The official interviews were audio/video taped then transcribed, and sent to the interviewees to check accuracy of statements made during the interviews. More importantly these interviews elicited more new information about the production of the event, and, indeed the event itself, with which to then ask the workers at Little League Corporation about the history of their relationship with the media.

Unfortunately, for me, on August 18th, three days into the 2003 LLWS, and one week after my initial discussions with ABC/ESPN, a *New York Times* article

threatened to undermine all the rapport that I had earned with the features and production crew. Mike Wise's (2003) article *Little League Innocence Fade's in TV Glare* offered a semi-critical take on the fact that 'five satellite trucks sit outside Lamade Stadium' and that the cameras sometimes 'linger on children crying' during the LLWS was enough to raise the ire of ABC's upper-management as they placed a moratorium on talking to 'outsiders' over the next few days. In fact, the features and production crew became so wary of any research being conducted on their work that they actually accused me of *being* Mike Wise (field notes, 2003).

Though the furor over the article died down, and I eventually proved myself as being Ryan White (actually taking out my drivers license at one point), it did become much more difficult to conduct research on the production crew(s) during the event (field notes, 2003). However, following the event, I was able to continually contact those who were involved in its production to clarify assumptions that were made, and discuss any possible shortcomings of my research. My perseverance proved useful in that it actually elicited e-mail interviews with the ABC marketing department and provided further information into why certain decisions/actions were taken by the production crew.

While my observation of the features and production crew was temporarily on hold, I shifted my focus to what was happening at the event itself. Luckily, at around this time, Dr. Stephen Mosher attended the aforementioned game between Massachusetts and Texas and further helped me think through the information that I had gathered. Being a veteran attendee of this event, Dr. Mosher also directed me to the nationalistic elements of the color schemes (red, white, and blue), the

ridiculous painting of foreign flags on trash cans around the grounds by Williamsport area 3rd and 4th grades so that they could learn about 'other cultures', and made note of the fact that the national anthems played for international competitors were abbreviated versions (field notes, 2003).

As my two-week microethnography came to a close, I left the Little League World Series confident that, while necessarily incomplete, my research was thorough and had engaged most of the important parties in created the LLWS spectacle. I made sure to thank the production and features crew, as well as, Lance Van Auken before leaving so as to continue contact during the writing process. Finally, as noted previously, I thanked the family who let me stay in their basement during the event and provided me with valuable information and discussion surrounding the 'data' from field notes that I came home to 'record' on the computer each day.

Following this experience, I obtained the video recordings that my parents had made of each ESPN/ABC broadcast during the 2003 LLWS, and began the arduous task of watching each of the 23 games they covered. However, and as noted in chapter 1, rather than transcribe each event word for word, I followed the methodology described by Gruneau et al. (1988), and searched for key and *emergent* themes promoted throughout the event. More specifically, I made key connections between what the features and production team's were setting out to make a part of their narration of the event, and what was actually said 'on air'.

The first finished product of this research project took the form of my Master's Thesis *Staging the (America) Nation: Production Practices at the 2003 Little*

League World Series (2004). While, at the time, I believe that this was the best paper that could have been produced by myself there was much work to be done on it for the paper to be considered publishable. Thus while the two published articles (2007, 2008) that culminated from the research conducted at the 2003 LLWS, they provide clear evidence of my growth as a PhD student – particularly the article in the *International Journal of Media and Cultural Politics* (2008) which serves as chapter 1 of this dissertation.

Of final methodological note on this project is the, perhaps misguided, attempt that I had at reciprocating my findings with ABC/ESPN and Little League. At this time, I still believed that Little League would be responsive to suggested change in their organization, for the people that worked there seemed to agree with some of my more subtle criticisms (field notes, 2003). As such, after completion of my Master's thesis I believed that it was a good idea to thank those who had allowed me to interview them at ABC/ESPN and Little League by e-mailing a draft of my project somewhere in between the thesis (2004) and the book chapter (2007).

The response I got was swift and angry as one of the ABC/ESPN workers wrote back:

Ryan

After reading your thesis, I believe all of us at ABC/ESPN and Little League baseball felt deceived and taken advantage of. The spirit of cooperation during our initial conversations and planning didn't include a "negative" story regarding the world's largest youth organization. If your professor's directive was to be negative, then he has no conception

nor understanding of Little League Baseball. Hopefully you will get better direction in the future and make intelligent decisions based on what you believe.

Signed, XXXX (April 29, 2005)

Though I understood that a media member would possibly be upset at my project, the response irked me in that it suggested that I did not understand the Little League World Series after having conducted a fairly exhaustive microethnography of the event. Furthermore, having taken Michael Silk's course on qualitative research in the Fall 2004 semester, I felt that despite this negative response from the media worker I had a responsibility to make my work 'performative' (Giroux, 2001c), and 'vital' (Richardson, 2000). In other words, if they were going to try to disregard my 'findings', I was not going to let them die silently. So I responded with an angry email of my own:

XXXX,

No one is a bigger fan of the possibilities that the Little League World Series brings to the table than I. It truly is a wonderful event and a fantastic opportunity for children from all over the world to share their culture through baseball. A quick walk into International Grove would show anyone this wonderful miniature 'melting pot' that you have been able to formulate. Additionally, I had an enlightening time working so closely with you, your producers, and LLCo. I completely appreciated and enjoyed the experience, and it is one that I will never forget. Keeping this in mind, I also adhere to the Jeffersonian (sic) belief that "dissent is the greatest form of patriotism".

Thus, as a believer in Little League and our founding fathers I feel that continuing to reiterate all the great points about your event would do nothing to change its shortcomings. In other words nobody is perfect, but there is nothing wrong with striving for perfection.

Further, while I agree that the “pure intent” of Little League Baseball is to share culture and the enjoyment of sport with children at a young age I do NOT believe that you, at ABC, or LLCo fulfill it to the degree you could. In response, I ask whether you are upset at my writing and direction because it is “off base” or because it points out ideological shortcomings in your broadcast? I would like to think it’s the former, but I believe that you are upset at me because I wrote an article that you feel will make your company less money – and, if that is so, I ask where your heart truly lies.

So often you at ABC point out the innocence and fun of the LLWS. I must ask then what’s innocent and fun about painting the Jewish Star of David on a trash can? What’s innocent and fun about playing abridged versions of other country’s national anthems while having military flyovers for the Star Spangled Banner? What’s innocent and fun about 45,000 people chanting U-S-A while 12 year old children are playing a baseball game⁵⁵? What’s innocent and fun about making the final game have to be U.S. vs. the ‘World’? What’s innocent and fun about only playing ‘American’ music over the loudspeakers? What’s innocent and fun about having an announcer in

⁵⁵ The history and repeated use of the popular American chant “U-S-A, U-S-A”, started at the 1980 Winter Olympics when the American hockey team, full of white males, physically and symbolically defeated Russia on their way to a gold medal. In its subsequent incarnations the chant cannot or should not be understood outside of the context that this was and as a racially coded terminology.

Brent Musburger who once described Olympic Heroes Tommie Smith and John Carlos as “Black-Skinned Stormtroopers”? What’s innocent and fun about having no one from “International” areas represented in the Little League Hall of Fame?

Mr. XXXXX, I ask you to help turn a “negative” (my critical understanding of the LLWS) into a positive by truly taking into account the multicultural values inherent in an event such as the LLWS. You have an opportunity that few of us do, and I do not feel like you should get upset because I’m criticizing your ways – that was NEVER my intent. I do not think that you at ABC or Little League Co. consciously promote unabashed Americanism, it’s just something that happens because we, as Americans, are not taught to think about other countries and cultures. What I really wish to happen Mr. XXXXX, is for you to take my criticisms to heart and ask yourself if it is worth those few extra dollars to produce a program that reinforces American cultural superiority rather than one that truly celebrates innocence and cultural diversity. If you really cared about the kids you would.

Sincerely,

Ryan White (April 30, 2005)

Though perhaps a bit (im)mature and ‘about as subtle as a brick through a windshield’ (Andrews, personal communication, 2003) my response did reflect what I felt needed to be addressed by the two organizations. While clearly both are trying to portray images of innocence, and cultural diversity, they do not always achieve this goal. Moreover, they could quite easily overcome these issues, by, for

example, having children cook nationally specific foods, rather than paint trash cans, recognizing women, international athletes, and so on. Regardless, when a high-ranking official from Little League Corporation received a copy of the e-mail conversation his response was:

Mr White --

I have no interest in debating this with you. You came to the 2003 LLWS with an agenda hidden from everyone who agreed to assist you. Had you bothered to speak with me while you were here, many of the misconceptions you wrote could have been explained. But I also know this is perhaps a testament to being young and ambitious, however misguided.

In your recent email to Mr. XXX you make several statements, in the form of sarcastic questions about innocence and fun, all with relatively logical explanations. Again, had you bothered to ask?

One example, the trash cans were part of a local elementary school project to educate fourth graders about geography and foreign cultures. I guess you didn't notice all of the other countries (about 75) portrayed on other cans, including the US. Kids worked very hard to learn about the countries in which LLB is played and then the assignment was to portray something about the culture and geography by painting the can. Unbelievable that you would insinuate that there is some form of bias or "what is innocent and fun?" in this. For this reason I must dismiss virtually everything you've written as your own personal agenda to disgrace the good people at ABC/ESPN and the extraordinarily professional staff at LLB International.

Therefore I will not take valuable time to debate or refute your many wrong assertions and characterizations.

There is no need to respond to this as I will not take more time on this matter.

Signed, XXXXXX (May 3, 2005)

The media worker added, "Terrific response xxxxx" (May 3, 2005). Interestingly the Little League response was *not* actually accurate. I did attempt to speak with the person who wrote this e-mail, but that individual was *never* available for an interview. I was always told that he was too busy to speak with me (field notes, 2003) which was very frustrating given that his explanations may have helped clear up any more of my 'innaccuracies'. Moreover, this person's claims, in terms of painting trash cans with international flags, were patently false. I searched and viewed each of these trash cans following Dr. Mosher's suggestions. While some states were represented, there were neither any American flags nor were there any Christian religious symbols anywhere to be found on them (field notes, 2003). Again, feeling a sense of desperation in the form of the idea that all my work would go to waste I formed a final letter to both Little League and ABC/ESPN:

To Whom It May Concern:

I sincerely apologize for the tone of my earlier e-mail to Mr. Curt Gowdy. It was written in haste, and its contents held a high level of disrespect towards him personally. In retrospect I do not think it was right of me to espouse a belief in the hope of respect, equality, and social justice on the one hand, while being quite disrespectful to another human being on the

other.

Additionally, I truly felt that I followed all the rules set forth by LLC, ESPN/ABC, and the University of Maryland when conducting this research. Clearly, in your opinion, I did not. In my future academic endeavors I will work to ensure that this does not happen again, because I did have a rich, enlightening, and interesting experience working so closely with all of you.

That said, I do firmly stand by my interpretations of the 2003 LLWS afforded by the nearly two years of in-depth ethnographic, visual, and textual research. I also continue to believe in the message of Little League Baseball, and will personally continue to work toward helping it achieve that goal. As such, it was my hope that by sending the finished product back to those who helped inspire it, I would spark an open dialogue with others who also care deeply about the message of Little League Baseball. Thus, in the future, I will always welcome any questions, comments, or critiques that you may have of my thesis project.

Best Regards,

Ryan White, M.A. (May 5, 2005)

The aftermath and extended response for my project on the Little League World Series has had profound effect on how I would treat future ethnographic experiences (see chapter 4), my thinking on academic responsibility to both the researcher and the researched, as well as what counts as a proper political and ethical response to someone who disagrees with my work.

More specifically, when sharing news of this e-mail conversation most of my fellow classmates were proud of what I had done. Some sent e-mails of encouragement, while others suggested that this was a good way to be a 'performative', politically-minded scholar in phone and in-person conversations. A former professor even sent an e-mail on May 6, 2005 stating:

Ryan,

I've been incredibly busy . . . but I wanted to tell you, that you have nothing to apologize for. . . . there are a great many people in positions of power who abuse that power. . . . XXXXX had no right to treat you the way he did. . . any damn fool could see you were honest and up front about your study and there's a firm line between public relations and research . . . too bad XXXXXX hasn't reach the point where he can discern between the two.

XXXX

Yet not all responses from colleagues and professors were positive. Some argued that I should have toned down my initial e-mail, that I was testing the scientific limits of the rules of the IRB (Lincoln, 2005), and that I should have at least conferred with my advisor/professors before responding so harshly.

The ethical dilemma posed by the culmination of my research is something that I often reflect on. Clearly Little League and ABC/ESPN were *never* going to like what I was going to write, in terms of politicizing their space of Disnified (Giroux, 2001a) innocence. So when confronting the people in power in such a setting what is the proper response?

In some ways I think what I did was right but, as will be outlined in my second ethnography, there were some improvements to be made. By way of closing this section what Little League and ESPN has done following my sharing of findings is a bit telling. Following my research Little League has enshrined three women, a Mexican man, a Canadian man, and two black American's into their Hall of Excellence⁵⁶. ESPN/ABC allows the children participating from international regions to introduce themselves in their native language, and they have inserted field announcers who can speak more languages than *just* English and Spanish. The 3rd and 4th grade trash can painting competition, however, steadfastly remains (field notes, 2005).

Chapter 2 - Danny Almonte: Discursive Construction(s) of (Im)igrant citizenship in Neoliberal America

I feel as if the second chapter of my dissertation, focused on the discursive construction of Little League star/villain, Danny Almonte's, celebrity is the most comprehensive in terms of my academic growth. I believe this to be true, because this project follows my academic arc from undergraduate to PhD student. In fact, versions of this paper, and the research for it were completed at every level of my scholarly career. The following will outline how I became interested in studying the Almonte celebrity, and the methods used to research and write the project in present form.

In 2001, the Major League Baseball International – London (MLBI) office accepted three interns from Ithaca College (of which I was one) to work for them

⁵⁶ <http://www.littleleague.org/museum/hallofexcellence.asp>

between January and July. Throughout the experience MLBI would often utilize my baseball playing abilities (during my time in England I even played for the Windsor Bears of the British National Baseball League – the country’s highest level of baseball competition) to teach children around England how to play the game. Towards the end of my experience my boss, Jenny Fromer, asked if I would like to extend my time through August to work in Germany for the MLB-Roadshow during the European Baseball Championships.

I accepted the assignment, and, in the brief two-week period in England following my work in Germany and heading home to the United States the biggest baseball events to take place were the continued good play of Seattle Mariner’s rookie, Ichiro Suzuki, and the 2001 Little League World Series. That Ichiro was still being discussed in the office should come as little surprise, for he lead the Mariners to the American League playoffs while winning the league’s Rookie of the Year award. However, the fact that the LLWS had captured the interest of my English counterparts caught my attention.

More specifically, throughout my experience most of our work discussions would center around Ichiro and the Mariners, then shift toward talk of either the office softball team or the recent success of Liverpool football/soccer (during my eight months in England I believe they had only given up a single goal in competition on their way to earning a coveted ‘treble’). In fact we talked more about Liverpool soccer in one average day than we had about any American sporting contest/tournament combined. The death of NASCAR’s Dale Earnhardt, NCAA

Basketball tournament, NBA and NHL playoffs, and even Major League Baseball (outside of Ichiro) were of seemingly little interest to my officemates.

However, Danny Almonte's outstanding on-field performances during the 2001 LLWS were enough to unseat Liverpool's pre-season warm-up games from the dominant focus of our discussions. Incredibly, while we had all read about Almonte, what he had done, and the controversy surrounding his age (he was still a star at this point), not a single one of us in the MLBI office had actually seen his performances on television. As such, the only thing we knew about Almonte was his mediated celebrity. In other words he was to us only what the media had described him as.

I returned to the United States on August 28, 2001, a mere two weeks before September 11, 2001, and enrolled in Dr. Stephen Mosher's Youth Sport in America course. For the course, Dr. Mosher had recorded every broadcast of that LLWS and our assignment was to transcribe one of the games, then write an essay on the dominant themes and messages that emerged from the broadcast. At the end of the first class Dr. Mosher had all the tapes lined up on the front desk and there was to be a 'lottery'-system to choose the one that we got to transcribe.

Immediately, my hope was to get the Bronx, NY vs. Apopka, FL game so that I could see Almonte's perfect game, but realized that the chances of getting this were slim – particularly since most teachers hold lotteries like this by last name and/or letting whoever sits up front to go first (my last name was White and I always sat in the back right of the room). Miraculously, on many levels, considering how this would effect my future scholarly direction, Dr. Mosher decided to switch things up

for the 'lottery' – basing it on how we voted in the 2000 Presidential election. When he said, "whoever voted for Ralph Nader goes first" I immediately rose and walked quickly to the front to get that coveted tape – only realizing after picking it up that I was the sole Nader supporter (so much for Ithaca being a liberal-minded college).

Regardless, after returning home, I got to see Almonte pitch for the first time, and was mesmerized, not only by his performance, but also by the reaction(s) of the fans and announcers at the game. It was obvious to any marginally knowledgeable observer that Almonte was already a celebrity that Little League had not experienced since future MLB third basemen, Sean Burroughs, dominated the Williamsport media coverage in 1992 and 1993 (Burroughs & Hennesy, 1994). Unfortunately, it was that very evening that the *Sports Illustrated* investigation into Almonte's age revealed that he had illegally participated in the tournament.

Dr. Mosher, who had written three oft-cited (by me) articles for ESPN.com on the 2001 LLWS, and had forged a good relationship with the Little League Organization, worked quickly and was able to get Lance Van Auken to come to class for a talk at the end of September. Van Auken's speech was revealing in that, outside of trying to present Little League in the most positive light possible, he was also very aware of the negative ways that Danny Almonte was portrayed in the media and by fans in Williamsport. He would intimate during his presentation at Ithaca, that Almonte had faced various forms of overt and covert 'racism' even as a star in Williamsport (personal communication, 2001), which, in many ways, endeared me to the Almonte celebrity. Following completion of the course, and handing in my

short essay in Almonte these initial lessons on racism in America, even toward youth, never left my conscious.

Three years later, following the first attempt at writing what would later become Chapter 1 of my dissertation, Dr. David Andrews asked me what my next project on Little League would be – for he ‘would never forgive me’ (personal communication, 2004) if I only wrote one publication from that research. Given my past interest in Almonte, coupled with a renewed interest in youth culture (inspired mainly by Giroux, 2003) and studying under an advisor who, at that point, was perhaps best known for his work on Michael Jordan’s mediated celebrity (cf. Andrews, 1998b, 2001), my choice was, in many ways made for me.

The balance of the empirical research and writing for this project was conducted in the summer of 2005. My friend, Josh Newman, had moved back to Baltimore after taking a job at Towson University and was alternating between finishing his dissertation and repairing his new home. After taking a break from stripping and sanding his hardwood floors to write, Josh asked what I was working on over the summer. To that point, I knew the topic was Almonte, but the research and writing had yet to start because I had just finished indexing the *Qualitative Methods in Sports Studies* (Andrews, Silk & Mason, 2005) book. During the break I made a cursory *Lexis Nexus Academic* search for articles on Danny Almonte, which yielded about 700 articles, and began reading.

With the benefit of three more years of critical theoretical training on the subjects of nationalism, neoliberalism, ethnicity, and class the (mis)use of Danny Almonte as a youth celebrity became more clear. As I was reading the newspaper

and magazine articles on Almonte various *emergent* themes (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003) came to the fore in discursively creating his celebrity. Furthermore, there was a clear break in the way he was portrayed before and after his illegal participation in the 2001 LLWS was known – which, of course, helped structure the project from the outset. Finally, after returning home to Baltimore that evening I searched for old files on my computer and found the transcript from the 2001 game between the Bronx and Apopka still there.

Throughout the rest of the summer I would write my first attempt at Chapter 2 in hopes of having a presentation for the 2005 International Sociology of Sport Association conference in Buenos Aires, Argentina at various area coffee shops while Josh worked on finishing his dissertation on the University of Mississippi. This initial writing period proved very useful in that Newman would often help shape my arguments, and, more importantly, direct me to valuable theoretical resources in terms of neoliberalism/youth/sport/celebrity/race (cf. Andrews, 2001; Bourdieu, 1998; George, 1999; Giroux, 2003, 2005; Grossberg, 2005). I presented my summer project in a journal club meeting at the University of Maryland that fall, and received generally positive feedback with one further suggestion – more empirical evidence was needed.

While I believed that the mediated accounts of Almonte in various written forms had been exhaustively reviewed, the key to strengthening this chapter was to see how he had been portrayed on television during the 2001 LLWS broadcast(s). Once again, Dr. Mosher proved invaluable to this project, because he had saved all of the tapes, in addition to *ESPN Outside the Lines* segments on Danny Almonte. In

early 2006, Dr. Mosher gave me these tapes to review for more *emergent* themes, issues, and commentary which helped situate Danny Almonte, first as a hero, then as a villain in the eyes of the American popular. Once again, I utilized the methodological outline of Gruneau et al. (1988) to do so. Following Giroux's (2000) suggestion that we use all forms of information (internet, written, televised) in order to *radically contextualize* (Grossberg, 1997a) our empirical focus I believe that the aforementioned steps to researching this project did so, for this project has utilized almost everything publicly available on the subject of Danny Almonte.

However, as Richardson and St. Pierre (2005) have outlined, writing is an often under-criticized element of the research act. As such, I would be remiss to leave out the multiple revisions, and added elements that this chapter has undergone. For instance, following feedback from my ISSA presentation, I revised the article for the 2006 *Barbara Brown Student Paper Award* for NASSS and was a finalist for the award. Using the criticisms of that version of this chapter, I again revised, and re-theorized the project by focusing more on critical theories of citizenship (Berlant, 1991, 1997; Ong, 1996, 1998) and submitted that paper to the *Sociology of Sport Journal* where it was designated as a reject and resubmit. The critical comments from the last semi-public presentation of this project, in addition to, Michael Silk's suggestion that I more specifically use citizenship theory to drive the paper are the key influences on shaping Chapter 2 as it stands.

Chapter 3: Setting the Stage: Constructing 'Normalized' Citizenship in Red Sox Nation Through Film

Much like the second chapter the third chapter of my dissertation evaluates citizenship on the discursive level. However, this chapter is substantially different

in two key ways. The first is that this chapter more specifically outlines the shift from identifying as a citizen of a nation-state to a more recent turn for individuals to build 'cultural' communities through (mediated) consumption (Miller, 2007a) – in this case Red Sox Nation. Secondly, it focuses on the meaning and power of film to define who matters and how they matter in that community rather than all forms of multimedia. My reasons for doing so are more outlined in the chapter itself.

As noted in both the 3rd and 4th chapters the second half of my dissertation work hand-in-hand to create a particular understanding of what it *means* to be a member of Red Sox Nation. In this particular chapter, through a critical reading of two emblematic media forms which served to create celebrityized subjectivities, and in some ways normative embodiments of the Red Sox and Red Sox Nation, this chapter evaluated *Good Will Hunting* (starring Matt Damon and Ben Affleck), and *Fever Pitch* (Jimmy Fallon as representative of a die-hard Red Sox fan, and Drew Barrymore as part of the 'pink hat brigade'⁵⁷). In so doing, this project is necessarily a focused version of what two films contribute to the (multi)media representation of the normalized Red Sox Nation member.

In other words I attempted to demonstrate how these popular mediated texts are pedagogical representations (Giroux, 1996) that have the profound ability to create meaning (Hall, 1980) for its viewers. While these texts are in no way definitive descriptors of Boston/Red Sox Nation, nor can they monolithically define,

⁵⁷ In some of my preliminary research I have come across this term which is in reference to newer fans (circa 2003/4) of the Red Sox who know little the team's history, and follow the team solely because they have become successful. Pink hat is used, because a 'gendered' female, pink Red Sox cap is now being sold to the general public, and since this hat is never worn during games – it is assumed those wearing it are obviously unknowledgeable females or males emasculated by their perceived lack of sporting knowledge.

from a reception standpoint (Ang, 1985), I believe that through these sites many people come to intrinsically understand who belongs, who does not, and the important elements in relation to its popularly defined communal identity.

There are several reasons that I chose these two films out of the several that focus on members of Red Sox Nation were based. The first is that I felt that they offered the most accurate depictions of fans that I had researched, observed and, indeed, become a part of during the 2007 season. More specifically, in evaluating both *Fever Pitch* and *Good Will Hunting* I relied on previous cultural studies (Gruneau et al. 1988) and film studies (Giroux, 2001a) to inform my understanding of these popular descriptors of Red Sox Nation. Further in the sport and cultural studies tradition of Carrington (2000), Koh, Andrews, and White (2007), Silk and Falcous (2005), and Giardina (2005) it is through film that important connections can be made between their representative ability, and the actual 'lived experience' of Boston and Red Sox Nation.

Given this context *Good Will Hunting* and *Fever Pitch* were the two films that I was drawn to by (non)members of Red Sox Nation prior to conducting my official ethnographic project. More specifically, while I came to *Good Will Hunting* later through my perceived relationship that it had with *Fever Pitch*, Dr. David Andrews suggested that the latter become a new focus of study when the film opened in 2005. Following his lead, I attended *Fever Pitch* on its opening weekend with pen and notebook in hand, hoping to put to use the strategies for critically engaging film that I learned in Dr. Michael Silk's *Sporting Hollywood* course.

Throughout my initial viewing of the film I took notice of the various ways the Red Sox Nation community was depicted. Key themes of class, gender, sexuality, and the erasure of race were noted during my experience in the theater. At the same time, even then, I realized that this film was not how *all* members of Red Sox Nation experience the community. As such, I searched for an alternative version of the community that was left out of *Fever Pitch*, which depicted a type of fandom that not all individuals in Red Sox Nation could experience. In terms of class, *Good Will Hunting*, provided this alternative depiction. Though I put the writing of this chapter off until Dr. Myron Lounsbury's class, *Film in the City*, in the spring of 2006 my empirical focus had been set.

The first writing of this project took into account what I had learned in both film courses that I took as a graduate student. Moreover, it is important to note that at this time I began to understand that no one (or two) film(s) can completely represent a space, or community, but that they are powerful definers in shaping popular perceptions (Grossberg, 1997b). As such the first writing of this chapter sought to demonstrate how both films normalized various class, gender, race, sexual performances, while dismissing/demonizing others. At this point, and rightly pointed out by Dr. Lounsbury, the key weaknesses in my paper was its cursory reading of the empirical (personal communication, 2005). In other words, theoretically I understood the key and emergent themes portrayed in both films, but did not engage the films deeply enough for a convincing argument.

Over the course of the next year I watched, and re-watched both films several times which elicited newer angles of understanding, and, in many ways, helped

inform how I 'entered the field' (Tedlock, 2000) for chapter 4. With my closer and repeated engagement with the empirical, I was able to create a more defensible argument for how these films represented a regressive Red Sox Nation. This version culminated in a presentation at the *American Cultural Association/Pop Culture Association* conference in the spring of 2007.

Though the presentation was fairly well received, once again, I needed to theoretically rework this chapter to more specifically demonstrate how it helps to normalize/marginalize cultural citizenship (Berlant, 1997) in Red Sox Nation. At present, I do believe that this chapter effectively engages both the films and various cultural theories to create a coherent argument for the representative nature of these films. More importantly, this chapter seeks to show how *Fever Pitch* and *Good Will Hunting* are key reference points in the (self)definition of Red Sox Nation.

Chapter 4: *Playing their Part: Red Sox Nation 2007*

In many ways if the 2nd chapter followed my arc as an university student, then the final substantive chapter of my dissertation demonstrates where I am as a young scholar at the present moment. Throughout the following I will describe how my experience as a student and researcher has had a profound effect on the way I actually proceeded with this chapter. In many ways this chapter utilized the various methodological strategies and concerns in the previous three chapters in an attempt to understand the diversity of experience within Red Sox Nation by, in Howard Bryant's terms, "living it" (2004, p. 137).

To best understand what it might be like to be a member of Red Sox Nation, I operated at a 'participant observer' (Babbie, 2001) throughout the season. With

reservations about conducting this type of ethnography, I believe that this was the best way to glean important information about what it means to be a “member” of Red Sox Nation. To do so I attended a number of Red Sox games, purchased Comcast's extra innings package which allowed me to watch nearly every Red Sox televised game on the internet, joined local (Baltimore/Washington) fan MeetUps that will take place at local sports bars and pubs in order to meet other fans of the team, engaged various websites and messageboards focused on the Red Sox, and attempted to interview key members of the media and the organization to better understand how they wish to portray experiences within the community. Finally, in an effort to have a better experience ‘exiting the field’ I have taken measures to be more effective in terms of reciprocation (Roulston et al, 2003).

Through this extensive ethnography, and the connections made through it, I essentially experienced a ‘year in the life’ of a Red Sox Nation member. By experiencing it on multiple levels - at games, in bars, television, the internet, and engaging key actors (Amis, 2005) - I argue that this research put me in good position to comment on what it is like to “live” Red Sox Nation. In practice, once I gained IRB approval I entered the field in the March of 2007 by attending two spring training games in Fort Myers, Florida. The choice to attend spring training games, which for fans of many teams seems inconsequential, was because, for Red Sox Nation, some of its members use this opportunity for an early-spring vacation (field notes, 2007).

I attended the games with my then fiancée, Meghan King, and took note of the banal, everyday activities of those in attendance. During this initial immersion in the field (Fetterman, 1989), various identities, performances, codes, and norms of

behavior were recorded by video tape, photograph, and with field notes (Fetterman, 1989). Following these games I would discuss the various observations with Meghan, who has been a member of Red Sox Nation for 'as long as she can remember' (personal communication, 2007) in order to discern which actions were 'normal' and which were not, thereby helping to direct what I should look for when entering the field on my own.

On opening day of the regular season, I attended the first of nine Red Sox MeetUps in Washington, D.C. in an effort to better understand the public performances of Red Sox fans. At this initial congregation I again observed behaviors through film, photographs, observations, and ethnographic interviews (Amis, 2005). The latter helped provide a deeper understanding of what Red Sox Nation members think of themselves, issues that they saw within their own community, and what they thought I should take note of throughout the season (field notes, 2007). I became friendly with a couple who originated from New York City, and they suggested other places to go and observe Red Sox fans in New York, Boston, and Washington, D.C. (field notes, 2007). This proved invaluable in terms of determining what were 'important' Red Sox Nation 'spaces', and in terms of saving time from attending places that were not deemed important.

This initial research act was put to use immediately following my presentation of an early version of chapter 3 at the *ACA/PCA* conference in Boston that spring. While there, I spent time at various bars outside of Fenway Park during their home opener against the Seattle Mariners taking note of normative behaviors being performed by the attendees. During this period I was also able to familiarize

myself with the surroundings at Fenway Park, which helped in terms of transportation.

Around this time I also attempted to make contact with various media members who had written about, and/or currently mediate the Boston Red Sox. In the early going this effort proved fruitful, as I procured an interview with Howard Bryant of the Washington Post (he has since moved on to ESPN). In 2002, Bryant wrote *Shut Out: A Story of Race and Baseball in Boston*, a critical take on race relations in Boston and how it was exemplified by the Red Sox. Through this interview Bryant acted as both a *gatekeeper* for various members of the Boston media, and a key informant in helping to (re)shape my understandings of the community. Between my trip to Yankee Stadium, and Fenway Park I was able to procure meetings with Dan Shaughnessy, and Nick Cafardo who cover the Red Sox for the *Boston Globe* and *New England Sports Network*. He also suggested that I could meet with the highly respected journalist, David Halberstam, who unfortunately died in a tragic car accident before we could meet.

Through these meetings with key media members I realized that other angles of understanding Red Sox Nation were necessary. As such, I believed that interviews with academic members of Red Sox Nation and/or those who are critical of the Red Sox was also necessary. Although, not all my inquiries yielded results, I was able to interview Dr. Stephen Mosher, professor of Sport Management and Media at Ithaca College, and Dr. John Bracy, professor of Afro-American History at the University of Massachusetts – Amherst, which both helped further my

understanding of the community in its contemporary form, but also provided first-hand historical referent points of Red Sox Nation from an academic standpoint.

Each of the aforementioned interviews were conducted in person during my second trip to Boston in late-June, early-July of 2007. During this trip, I attended nine games at the Fenway Park, and again took note of the pre- and post-game activities of the members of Red Sox Nation, as well as, what happened inside the stadium. Moreover, I collected artefacts, and newspaper articles which provided more information about the normal performance of a Red Sox Nation 'citizen'. Each night, I would return to my future in-laws house, all of whom identify as members of Red Sox Nation, and discuss what I saw, the assumptions that I drew from these observations, and some preliminary conclusions made.

These conversations were very helpful in that, while they were supportive of my project, the King's did not always agree with my 'findings' (field notes, 2007). In fact, their critical readings of my observations and assumptions, helped provide another level of understanding and nuance to this project. Following my experience at Fenway I returned home to conduct more research at the local Washington, D.C. meetups, constantly refer to key internet websites, and watch more games on the television.

Between mid-July and mid-August I attempted to make contact with internet personalities who write about and/or organize websites dedicated to the Red Sox and Red Sox Nation. During this period I was granted access to the semi-private *Sons of Sam Horn* website, procured an e-mail interview with Steve Silva, the organizer for the *Bostondirtdogs* website which is part of the Boston.com

multimedia conglomerate, and attempted to make contact with Bill Simmons of ESPN.com's Page 2 – which turned out to be unsuccessful. Importantly, while the (multi)media personalities that made themselves available for interview were helpful, at this point I worried that my research into the organization had hit a dead end. However, this changed on my trip to the west coast.

While in Seattle, for the three game series between the Red Sox and Mariners, I attended the games in quite the same way that I had in Boston, New York, and Baltimore. Often this would involve arriving at the park several hours before the game began, and observing the performances of individuals attending the game. I would also go to local 'Red Sox' bars, speak to bartenders, Red Sox and Mariners fans, in order to understand how so many would be attending games 3,000 miles from Boston (field notes, 2007). Again this work clarified many assumptions made prior to actually being in Seattle.

Following the series I boarded a plane to Los Angeles for the Red Sox series with the Los Angeles Angels of Anaheim. On this flight I decided to wear my Red Sox hooded sweatshirt, which provided initial entrée into a small experience of serendipity. While taking my seat on the flight, my rowmate noticed the sweatshirt and asked if I was going to Los Angeles for the series. As most doctoral candidates are wont to do, I explained my project to him in three minutes. Luckily, far from putting this stranger off, he showed interest and introduced himself as Rob Bradford, Red Sox beat writer for the *Boston Herald*.

During the flight Bradford allowed me to listen to his interviews of players, managers, and owners over the past few days, and explained that he had to put

them together for a big story (field notes, 2007). Even more helpful, was the fact that Bradford helped me get in contact with the sales, marketing, and community relations members of the Red Sox organization. Surprisingly, the organization was quite receptive to my requests for interviews with Dr. Charles Steinberg (then Vice President of Public Affairs), Mardi Fuller (Manager of Community Marketing and Fan Clubs), and Monne Williams (Manager of Multicultural Marketing and Diversity Initiatives) at the end of the 2007 baseball season.

As the season and my participant-observer ethnography came to a close, I attended three games in Los Angeles and six in Baltimore to conclude the 'data gathering' aspect of this chapter. Once again, during this time I would go to local 'Red Sox' Bars, and the games themselves to further cement my understanding of the performance of citizenship in Red Sox Nation. Following the Red Sox World Series Championship, I conducted the three interviews with the various members of the Red Sox organization.

Wary of my past experience with Little League, yet still wanting to create a vital project, I fully explained what my project was focusing on. Surprisingly, Monne Williams, in particular, seemed very receptive to the work I was conducting. Williams, a young black woman who graduated from Duke University, had worked previously for NASCAR – another organization with a terrible history in terms of race (Newman, XXX) – and explained that she took these occupations to 'create positive change in minority communities' (personal communication, 2007).

As such, when she indicated that the organization was interested in seeing the final project I responded that it would be possible for me to reciprocate, but that

I was wary of the Red Sox response. She replied that the new management 'was aware of the organization's own poor history in terms of race, and that they were constantly looking to improve' (personal communication, 2007). Given her support, I agreed, and also was able to procure internship opportunities within her department for my future students. Though there is no conclusion to this, as I have yet to share the project, it is my hope that the steps taken in this instance will actually help this chapter to be performative and political (Giroux, 2002b).

Throughout the research process for this chapter I believe that the methods taken to acquire and analyze the data are exhaustive, and interpretively sufficient (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003). While there was no possible way to collect all the mediated data offered by the Red Sox, and Red Sox Nation, to interview every *key actor* (Amis, 2005), or be everywhere at once what was able to accomplish was a contextually specific, and wide-ranging 'set of data' from the most prominent sources possible. Moreover, as this chapter has been written since the Fall of 2007, its various versions have been read by several different individuals. In attempting to make this chapter 'impactful' to the general public, as well as, adding to the physical cultural studies project I have shared it with my family, my in-laws, my interviewees, fellow students, and professors. While the writing is invariably my own, the goal in trying to co-create this chapter in such a way that makes the most effective project in my graduate career. How successful it is will have to wait.

Conclusion

Within this appendix I have attempted to delineate how exactly I took on each chapter of my dissertation in terms of methodology. As has been requested,

the goal of this section was not to 'wax poetic' (Andrews, personal communication, 2008) about the philosophical underpinnings of my research. While this is clearly important, and was still discussed at some length within these pages, the aim of this appendix was to describing how, what, and why each chapter was researched. Moreover, I believe that by fully outlining the research processes that took place in creating this dissertaion the reader can better understand the choices I made in selecting the information that was used in each chapter, and why some was left out or not even considered.

In the end, one chapter, or even one dissertation alone, cannot ever hope to completely describe the social world. Even if many voices are considered and used, there are millions more that were not. Hopefully this project will inspire, antagonize, or even enrage the reader to the point that they offer their own critiques, angles of understanding, and add to the dialouge that this project has only been a part of.

References

- 50 First Dates (2004). Columbia Pictures.
- Abu-Jamal, M. (1996). *Death Blossoms: Reflections from a prisoner of conscience*. Boston: South End Press.
- Achbar, M. & Abbot, J. (2004). *The corporation*. Zeitgeist films.
- A Few Good Men (1992). New Line Cinema.
- Ahmed, M. (2002). Homeland insecurities: Racial violence the day after September 11. *Social Text*, 72, 20(3), 101-115.
- Alberts, W. (1978). The White magic of systemic racism. *Crisis*, 85(9), 295-308.
- Alexander, C. (1991). *Our game: An American baseball history*. Bel Air, CA: MJF Books.
- Amis, J. (2005). The art of interviewing for case study research. In, D. Andrews, D. Mason, and M. Silk (eds.). *Qualitative methods in sports studies*, (pp. 104-138). New York: Berg.
- Anderson, B. *Imagined communities*. New York: Verso.
- Andrews, D.L. (1993). Desperately seeking Michel: Foucault, genealogy and critical sport sociology. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 10, (2), 148-167.
- Andrews, D.L. (1996). The fact(s) of Michael Jordan's blackness: Excavating a floating racial signifier. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 13(2), 125-158.
- Andrews, D.L. (1998a). Feminizing Olympic reality: Preliminary dispatches from Baudrillard's Atlanta. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 33(1), 5-18.
- Andrews, D.L. (1998b). Excavating Michael Jordan: Notes on a critical pedagogy of sporting representation. In G. Rail & J. Harvey (Eds.), *Sport and postmodern times: Culture, gender, sexuality, the body and sport*, (pp. 185-220). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Andrews, D.L. (1999). Contextualizing suburban soccer: Consumer culture, lifestyle differentiation, and suburban America. *Culture, Sport, Society*, 2(3), 31-53.
- Andrews, D.L. (Ed.). (2001). *Michael Jordan Inc.: Corporate sport, media culture, and late modern America*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

- Andrews, D.L. (2002). Coming to terms with Cultural Studies. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 26(1), 110-117.
- Andrews, D.L. (2004a). *Lecture III: Sport without guarantees*. University of Maryland.
- Andrews, D.L. (2004b). *Lecture IV: Sport without guarantees*. University of Maryland.
- Andrews, D.L. (2006a). *Toward a physical cultural studies*. Inaugural Alan G. Ingham keynote address. Annual Conference of the North American Society for the Sociology of Sport: Vancouver, Canada.
- Andrews, D.L. (2006b). Disneyization, Debord, and the integrated NBA spectacle. *Social Semiotics*, 16(1), 89-102.
- Andrews, D.L. (2006c). *Culture, Hegemony, Articulation*. KNES798P Course.
- Andrews, D.L. (2008). Kinesiology's inconvenient truth and the physical cultural studies imperative. *Quest*, 60(1), 45-62.
- Andrews, D.L., Silk, M. & Mason, D. (2005). *Qualitative methods in sports studies*. New York: Berg.
- Ang, I. (1985). *Watching Dallas: Soap opera and the melodramatic imagination*. London: Routledge.
- Ardolino, F. (2007). From the curse to its reverse: Red Sox Nation in films 1992-2005. *Nine: A Journal of Baseball History and Culture*, 16(1), 108-128.
- Atkinson, P., Coffey, A. & Delamont, S. (1999). Ethnography: Post, past, and present. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 28(5), 460-471.
- Babbie, E. (2001). *The practice of social research*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Bairner, A. (2001). *Sport, nationalism, and globalization*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Bairner, A. (2003). Sport, nationality and postcolonial Ireland. In J. Bale & M. Cronin (Eds.) *Sport and postcolonialism*, 159-174. Oxford: Berg.
- Baker, A. (2005). Global lockdown: Race, gender, and the prison industrial complex. *Women and Environments International Magazine*, 68/69, 252.
- Bale, J. (1986). Sport and national identity: A Geographical view. *British Journal of Sport History*, 3, 18-41.

- Bancroft, G. (1896). *History of the United States of America, from the discovery of the continent* (Volume 5) New York: D. Appleton and Co.
- Barthes, R. (1957). *Mythologies* (Trans. Annette Lavers). New York: Hill and Wang.
- Baudrillard, J. (1988). *America*. (Trans. Chris Turner). London: Verso.
- Baudrillard, J. (1991). *The gulf war did not take place*. London: Verso.
- Baudrillard, J. (1994). *Simulacra and Simulation* (Trans. Sheila Faria Glaser). Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan University Press.
- Baudrillard, J. (2001). Why theory? In C. Kraus and S. Lotringer (Eds.) *Hatred of Capitalism*, pp. 128-131. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Baudrillard, J. (2002). *Screened Out*. (Trans Chris Turner) London: Verso.
- Bauman, Z. (2002). *Society under siege*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bawden, T. (June 7, 2007). *Buffet blasts system that lets him pay less tax than secretary*. Retrieved July 15, 2008 from <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/money/tax/article1996735.ece>.
- Beck, G. (2007). *An inconvenient book: Real solutions to the world's biggest problems*. New York: Threshold Editions.
- Becker, M. (2001, September 2). Bomber Rivals: We Wuz Robbed. *Daily News*, 5.
- Begley, I. (2007, May 27). Almonte takes hill with major dreams. *Daily News*, 64.
- Benjamin, A. (November 15, 2007). A Pricier home of champions. *The Boston Globe*. Retrieved February 15, 2008 from http://www.boston.com/sports/baseball/redsox/articles/2007/11/15/a_pricier_home_of_champions/?p1=email_to_a_friend,
- Berlant, L. 1997. *The queen of America goes to Washington city*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.
- Breuilly, J. (1994). *Nationalism and the state*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bhaba, H. (1994). *The Location of culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Billig, M. (1995). *Banal nationalism*. London: Sage.
- Birrell, S. & MacDonald, M. (2000). *Reading sport: Critical essays on power and representation*. Boston: Northeastern Press.

- Black Hawk Down (2001). SonyPictures.
- Blundo, J. (2001, August 23). It's hard work to pretend you are working. *Columbus Dispatch*, 1G.
- Bode, N., Garcia, J., Yaniv, O., Connor, T., & Standora, L. (2006, May 19). Glove struck: Teen pitcher and bride of 30. *Daily News*, 3.
- Bostondirt dogs.com. 2004, November 9. No thanks I'm already a member. http://bostondirt dogs.boston.com/Headline_Archives/2004/12/red_sox_nai_on_1.html, date accessed May 5, 2006.
- Bourdieu, P. (1978). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgment of taste* (Trans. Richard Nice). Cambridge: MA.
- Bordieu, P. (1998). The essence of neoliberalism. *Le monde diplomatique*. Retrieved December 10, 2006 from <http://mondediplo.com/1998/12/08bourdieu>.
- Box Office Mojo. (2008). *Fever Pitch*. Retrieved May 23, 2008 from <http://www.boxofficemojo.com/movies/?id=feverpitch.htm>.
- Butterworth, M. (2005). Ritual in the "church" of baseball": Suppressing the discourse of democracy after 9/11. *Communication Critical/Cultural Studies*, 107-129.
- Bradford, R. (2007). The Transcontinental courtship of Daisuke Matsusaka. *Red Sox Annual 2007*, 25-28. Hingham, MA: Maple Street Press.
- Brenner, N. & Theodore, N. (2002). Cities and the Geographies of "Actually Existing Neoliberalism." *Antipode*, 349-379.
- Brookey, R. & Westerfelhaus, R. (2002). Hiding homoeroticism in plain view: The Fight Club DVD as digital closet. *Cultural Studies in Media Communication* 19(1), 21-43.
- Brown, W. (2003). American nightmare: Neoliberalism, neoconservatism, and de-democratization. *Political Theory*, (34)6, 690-714.
- Brubaker, R. (1996). *Nationalism reframed: Nationhood and the national question in the new Europe*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bruce, T. (1998). Postmodernism and the possibilities for writing "vital" sports texts. In G. Rail (Ed.) *Sport and postmodern times*, pp. 3-20. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

- Bryant, H. (2002). *Shut out: A story of race and baseball in Boston*. New York: Routledge.
- Bryant, H. (2004). Living it: Boston and sports. In E. Hiestand and A. Zellman (eds), *The Good city*, pp. 117-131. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Burchell, G., Gordon, C, and Miller, P. (1991). *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Burroughs, J. & Hennesy, T. (1994). *The Little team that could: The Incredible, often wacky story of the two-time Little League world champions*. Santa Monica, CA: Bonus Books.
- Bush, G.W. (2001). Little League Hall of Excellence Induction Speech.
- Butler, J. (1993). *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. Routledge, New York and London.
- Butler, J. (1999). Gender is burning: Questions of appropriation and subversion. In S. Thornham (Ed.) *Feminist film theory: A reader*. New York: New York University Press.
- Butler, J. (2002). Explanation and exoneration, or what we can hear. *Social Text*, 72, 20(3), 177-188.
- Calica, L. (Ed.) (2008). *Warrior writers: Re-making sense*. Barre, VT: L. Brown and Sons Printing.
- Callahan, G. (2001, August 31). Here's a lot of crap from Pedro. *The Boston Herald*, 92.
- Caple, J. (August 30, 2001). Nobody wins when the winners cheated. Retrieved August 17, 2005 from http://espn.go.com/mlb/columns/caple_jim/1246591.html.
- Carrington, B. (1998). Sport, masculinity, and black cultural resistance. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 22(3), 275-298.
- Carrington, B. (2001). Decentering the centre: Cultural studies in Britain and its legacy. In: T. Miller, *Companion to cultural studies*, 275-297.
- Carrington, B. (2006). Decentering the centre: Cultural studies in Britain and its legacy. In: T. Miller, *Companion to cultural studies*, 275-297.

- Carter, V. (1998). Computer-Assisted racism: Toward an understanding of "cyberwhiteness". In J. Kinchelo et al. (Eds.), *White Reign: Deploying whiteness in America*, (pp. 269-284).
- Carter, T. (2001). Baseball arguments: Aficionismo and masculinity at the core of Cubanidad. *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 18(3), 117-138.
- CBS 48 Hours (2002). *Truth and consequences: Foul play*. Date Aired May 31, 2002.
- Cho, Y. (2008). Broadcasting Major League Baseball as a governmental instrument in South Korea. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 32(3), 240-254.
- Chomsky, N. (2001). Interview with Zack de la Rocha. *Rage Against the Machine: The Battle of Mexico City*. Sony.
- Chomsky, N. (2002). *Understanding power: The Indispensable Chomsky* (P. Mitchell & J. Schoeffel eds.). New York: New Press.
- Chomsky, N. (2003). *Hegemony or survival: America's quest for global dominance*. New York: Macmillon.
- Cinderella Man (2005). Universal Video.
- Clarke, J. (1973). Football hooliganism and skinheads. *Center for Contemporary Cultural Studies Stenciled Occasional Series*, 42.
- Clarke, J. (1991). *New times and old enemies: Essays on cultural studies and America*. London: Harper Collins.
- Clifford, J. & Marcus, G. (1986) *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- CNN.com (2001a). *Presidential Censure*. Retrieved August 1, 2005 from http://sportsillustrated.cnn.com/more/news/2001/08/31/almonte_14_ap/#null.
- CNN.com (2001b). *Unhappy Ending*. Retrieved August 1, 2005 from http://sportsillustrated.cnn.com/more/news/2001/08/31/almonte_14_ap/#null
- Coburn, D. (2004). Beyond the income inequality hypothesis: Class, neoliberalism, and health inequalities. *Social Science and Medicine* 58(1), 41-56.
- Cocco, G. & Lazzarato, M. (2002). Ruptures within Empire, the power of exodus: Interview with Toni Negri. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 19(4), 187-194.

- Cohen, S. (1972). *Folk devils and moral panics: The creation of mods and rockers*. New York: Routledge.
- Cole, C.L. (1994). Resisting the canon. In S. Birrell and C.L. Cole (Eds.), *Women, sport, and culture*, pp. 1-24. Chicago: Human Kinetics.
- Cole, C.L. (2000). Body studies in the sociology of sport. In J. Coakley and E. Dunning (Eds.) *The handbook of cultural studies*, pp. 439-460.
- Cole, C.L. (2001a). Nike's America/America's Michael Jordan. In D. Andrews (Ed.), *Michael Jordan inc.*, (pp. 65-106). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Cole, C.L. (2001b). Close encounters: Sport, Science, and Political Culture. In: T. Miller, *Companion to cultural studies*, pp. 341-356.
- Cole, C.L. (2006). Close encounters: Sport, Science, and Political Culture. In: T. Miller, *Companion to cultural studies*, pp. 341-356.
- Cole, C.L., & Andrews, D.L. (1996). Look, its NBA showtime!: Visions of race in the popular imaginary. *Cultural Studies: A Research Annual*, 1, (1), 141-181.
- Cole, C.L., & Andrews, D.L. (2000). Tiger Woods: America's new son. *Cultural Studies: A Research Annual*, 5, pp. 107-122.
- Cole, C.L., Giardina, M.D. & Andrews, D.L. (2004). Michel Foucault: Studies of power and sport. In: R. Giulianotti (Ed.), *Sport and modern social theorists*, 207-224. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Collier, P. & Horowitz, D. (2004). *The anti-Chomsky reader*. Boston: Encounter.
- Collins, C. & Yeskel, F. (2000). *Economic apartheid in America: A primer on economic inequality & insecurity*. New York: New Press.
- Collins, A. (1994). Intellectuals, power, and quality television. In H. Giroux & P. McLaren (Eds.), *Between borders: Pedagogy and the politics of cultural studies*, (pp. 56-73). New York: Routledge.
- Connell, R.W. (1995). *Masculinities*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Connelly, T. 2007. Fan not happy with Swanson's 'pink hat' answer. http://bostondirt dogs.boston.com/Headline_Archives/2007/07/biel_for_pre sid_1.html, date accessed March 5, 2008.
- Couldry, N. (2006). Culture and citizenship: The Missing link?. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 9(3), 321-339.

- Cox, O.C. (1976). *Race Relations: Elements and Social Dynamics*, Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- Critcher, C. (1971). Football and cultural values. *Center for Contemporary Cultural Studies Working Papers*, 1, 113-119.
- Crouch, S. (2001, September 3). Raising race in Almonte case is disgusting. *The New York Daily News*, 27.
- Dallmayr, F. (2002). Lessons of September 11. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 19(4), pp. 137-145.
- Darder, A. & Miorn, L. (2007). Critical pedagogy in a time of uncertainty: A call to action. In N. Denzin & M. Giardina (Eds.), *Contesting empire/globalizing dissent: Cultural studies after 9/11*, (pp. 136-151). London: Paradigm.
- Dead Poets Society (1989). Touchtone Pictures.
- Dean, M. (1999). *Governmentality: Power and rule in modern society*. London: Sage.
- Debord, G. (1994). *The society of the spectacle*. Trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith. New York: Zone Books.
- Delanty, G. & Kumar, K. (eds.) (2006). *The Sage handbook of nations and nationalism*. London: Sage.
- de la Rocha, Z. (1997). Memory of the dead (Land and liberty). *Rage Against the Machine DVD*. SonyMusic.
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (2001). Capitalism: A very special delirium. In C. Kraus and S. Lotringer (Eds.) *Hatred of Capitalism*, (pp. 215-220). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Denzin, N.K. (1978). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods* (2nd ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Denzin, N.K. (1989). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods* (2nd ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Denzin, N.K. (1991). *Images of a postmodern society: Social theory and contemporary theory*. London: Sage.
- Denzin, N.K. (1995). *The Cinematic society: The Voyeur's gaze*. London: Sage.

- Denzin, N.K. (2000). The practices and politics of interpretation. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Studies* (pp. 897-921). London: Sage.
- Denzin, N.K. (2001). *The American tradition in qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Denzin, N.K. (2002). *Interpretative interactionism*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Denzin, N.K. (2003). *The landscape of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Denzin, N.K. (2004). The war on culture the war on truth. *Cultural Studies<=>Critical Methodologies*, 4(2), 137-142.
- Denzin, N.K. & Giardinia, M.D. (eds.) (2006). *Qualitative inquiry and the conservative challenge*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Denzin, N.K. & Giardinia, M.D. (eds.) (2007). *Contesting Empire, Globalizing Dissent: Cultural Studies After 9/11*. London: Paradigm Press.
- Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S. (Eds.)(1994). *Handbook of Qualitative Studies*. London: Sage.
- Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S. (Eds.) (2000). *Handbook of Qualitative Studies*. London: Sage.
- Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S. (2003). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Landscape of Qualitative Research: Theories and Issues* (pp. 1-47). London: Sage.
- Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S. (Eds.) (2005). *Handbook of Qualitative Studies*. London: Sage.
- Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S. (2006). *The landscape of qualitative research*. London: Sage.
- Dickerson, G. (1991). *The Cinema of baseball: Baseball films 1929-1989*. London: Meckler.
- Duval, J. (1995). Baseball as aesthetic ideology: Cold War, history, race and "Pafko's at the wall," *Modern Fiction Series*, 41(2), 285-313.
- DiGiovanna, M. (August 14, 2007). Angels are set to revisit two houses of horror; Toronto's Dome and Boston's Fenway Park have not been kind to the AL West Leaders. *LA Times*, D1.

- Dixie Chicks (2006). *Taking the long way*. Sony Music.
- Dreamcatcher (2003). Warner Brothers.
- DuBois, W. E. B. (1935). *Black Reconstruction in the United States*, New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.
- Duncan, M.C. (2007). Bodies in motion: The Sociology of physical activity. *Quest*, 59(1), 55-66.
- Dyer, R. (1997). *White*. New York: Routledge
- Dyerson, M. (1999). Nature by design: Modern American ideas about sport, energy, evolution, and republics, 1865-1920). *Journal of Sport History*, 26(3), 447-469.
- Ebert, R. (April 8, 2005). *Fever Pitch*. Retrieved May 23, 2008 from <http://rogerebert.suntimes.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20050407/REVIEWS/50323004/1023>.
- Ebert, T. (2001). Globalization, internationalism, and the class politics of cynical reason. *Nature, Society, and Thought* 12(4), 389-410.
- Edes, G. (February 1, 2006). Harper finally at home in Red Sox Nation. *The Boston Globe*. Retrieved January 19, 2008 from http://www.boston.com/sports/baseball/redsox/articles/2006/02/01/harper_finally_at_home/
- Ennis, C., Chen, L-C., Zimmerman, J. (2005). *UMCP Black History Month Lecture*.
- ESPN (2001a, August 13-26). *Little League Baseball World Series* [Television Broadcast]. New York: American Broadcasting Company.
- ESPN (2001b, September 1). *Outside the Lines* [Television Broadcast]. New York: American Broadcasting Company.
- ESPN (2005, August 17). *50 States in 50 Days: Day 37, Pennsylvania* [Television Broadcast]. New York: American Broadcasting Company.
- ESPN (2007, June 4). *First Take* [Television Broadcast on ESPN2]. New York: American Broadcasting Company.
- ESPN Sportsradio. (2003) *International pastime promotion* [Radio Advertisement]. New York: WFAN

- Evans, C. (2002). Baseball as civil religion: The Genesis of an American creation story. In C.H. Evans & W. R. Herzog II (Eds.), *The Faith of 50 million: Baseball, religion, and American culture* (pp. 13-34). Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Evans, C. & Herzog W. (2002). *The Faith of 50 million: Baseball, religion, and American culture*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Falcous, M. & Silk, M. (2005). Manufacturing consent: Mediated sporting spectacle and the cultural politics of the War on Terror. *International Journal of Media & Cultural Politics*, 1(1), 59-65.
- Falcous, M. & Silk, M. (2006). Global regimes, local agendas: Sport, resistance and the mediation of dissent. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 41(3), 317-338.
- Farred, G. (2003). Thinking in the vernacular. In *What's my name: Black vernacular intellectuals*, (pp. 1-25). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Farrey, T. (November 1, 2000). A Series of beneficial moves. Retrieved October 17, 2008 from <http://espn.go.com/mlb/bush/timeline.html>.
- Faraone, C. (2008). The Ultimate schill?. *The Providence Phoenix*. Retrieved October 17, 2008 from <http://theprovidence.com/Providence/RecRoom/68417-ultimate-Schill/?rel=inf>.
- Felt, H. (2005). The Selling of a Red Sox Nation. Retrieved May 20, 2007 From <http://www.popmatters.com/sports/features/050713-redsox.shtml>.
- Ferguson, N. (2004). *Colossus: The Price of America's empire*. New York: Penguin Press.
- Fernandez, M. (2001a, May 7). In a League of Its Own; Bush's Backyard Ballgame A Hit for Players, Parents. *Washington Post*, B1.
- Fernandez, M. (2001b, July 14). T-Ball on the President's turf; game 3 of white house series to feature disabled youths. *Washington Post*, p. B4.
- Fetterman, D. (1989). *Ethnography: step by step*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Fever Pitch. 2005. 20th Century Fox.
- Field of Dreams (1989). Hollywood: CA. Universal Studios.
- Fine, G. (1987). *With the boys: Little League Baseball and preadolescent culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Foley, D. & Valenzuela, A. (2005). Critical ethnography: The politics of collaboration. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Studies* (pp. 217-234). London: Sage.
- Formisano, R. (1991). *Boston against busing: Race, class, and ethnicity in the 1960s and 70s*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Foucault, M. (1978). *Discipline and Punish: The birth of a prison*. London: Vintage.
- Foucault, M. (1991). Governmentality, In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, and P. Miller, (eds.). *The Foucault effect*, pp. 87-104, Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press.
- Finney, P. (2001, September 3). Little League intrigue is tale for ages; Almonte is a victim of hi-jinks by adults. *Times-Picayune*, 1.
- Fiske, J. (1987). *Television Culture*. (New York: Routledge).
- Frankenburg, R. (1993). *White women, race matters: The social construction of whiteness*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Frazier, W. (2008). The Savings and loan scandal and public accounting. Retrieved July 28, 2008 from <http://www.ahealedplanet.net/savings.htm>.
- Friere, P. (1970). *The pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Freire, P. (1974). *Pedagogy of hope: Reliving pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Coninium.
- Friedman, M.T., Andrews, D.L., Silk, M.S. (2004). Sport and the façade of redevelopment in the post-industrial city. *Sociology of Sport Journal* 21(2), 119-139.
- Frisby, W., Reid, C.J. & Hoerber, L. (2004). Putting 'participatory' into participatory forms of action research. Submitted for *Journal of Sport Management*.
- Fukuyama, F. (1989). The end of history? Retrieved July 28, 2008 from <http://www.wesjones.com/eoh.htm>.
- Fusco, C. (2005). Cultural landscapes of purification: Sports spaces and discourses of whiteness. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 22 (3), 283-310.
- Game Six (2005). Kindred Media Group.
- Garcia, J. (2006a, June 8). Almonte gets left out of draft. *Daily News*, 80.

- Garcia, J. (2006b, June 10). Monroe wins for Danny. *Daily News*, 67.
- Gellner, E. (1983). *Nations and nationalism*. London: Blackwell.
- Gendar, A. (2001, September 1). Soon to be a be middle-schooler. *The New York Daily News*, 2.
- George, S. (1999). *A short history of neoliberalism*. Paper presented at the Conference on Economic Sovereignty in a Globalizing World, March 24-26. Retrieved June, 17, 2004 from <http://www.globalpolicy.org/globaliz/econ/histneol.htm>.
- Giardina, M. (2001). Global Hingis: Flexible citizenship and the transnational celebrity. In D. Andrews and S. Jackson (Eds.) *Sport Stars*, (pp. 201-217. New York: Routledge.
- Giardina, M. (2003). 'Bending it like Beckham' in the global popular: Stylish hybridity, performativity, and the politics of representation. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues* 27(2), 65-82.
- Giardina, M. (2005). *Sporting pedagogies: Performing culture & identity in the global arena*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Giardina, M. (forthcoming). *From soccer moms to NASCAR dads: Sport, culture, and politics since 9/11*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.
- Giardina, M. & McCarthy, C. (2005). The popular racial order of urban America: Sport, identity, and the politics of culture. *Cultural Studies & Critical Methodologies*, 5(2), 145 - 173.
- Gilroy, P. (2001). Foreword. In B. Carrington & I. McDonald (Eds.), *Race, sport and British society*, (pp. xi-xvii). London, UK: Routledge.
- Giroux, H. (1994). *Disturbing Pleasures: Learning Popular Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Giroux, H. (1995). Animating youth: The Disnification of children's culture, *Socialist Review*, 24(3), 23-55.
- Giroux, H. (1996). *Fugitive cultures: race violence & youth*. New York: Routledge.
- Giroux, H. (2000). *Stealing Innocence : Corporate Culture's War on Children*. New York: Palgrave.
- Giroux, H. (2001a). *The mouse that roared: Disney and the end of innocence*. New York: Lowman and Littlefield Publishers.

- Giroux, H. (2001b). Breaking into the movies: Pedagogies and the politics of Film. *JAC*, 21(3), 583-598.
- Giroux, H. (2001c). Cultural Studies as Performative Politics. *Cultural Studies<=>Critical Methodologies*, 1(1), 5-23.
- Giroux, H. (2002a). Terrorism and the fate of democracy after September 11th. *Cultural Studies<=>Critical Methodologies*, 2(1), 9-14.
- Giroux, H. (2002b). Public intellectuals and the politics of education. *Revista Praxis* (1) pp. 1-7.
- Giroux, H. (2003). *The abandoned generation: Democracy beyond the culture of fear*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Giroux (2004a). *The terror of neoliberalism: Authoritarianism and the eclipse of democracy*. London: Paradigm.
- Giroux, H. (2004b). War talk, the death of the social, and the disappearing children: Remembering the other war. *Cultural Studies<=>Critical Methodologies*, 4(2), 206-211.
- Giroux, H. (2005a). The terror of neoliberalism: Rethinking the significance of cultural politics. *College Literature*, 32(1), 1-17.
- Giroux, H. (2006a). *Beyond the spectacle of terrorism: Global uncertainty and the challenge of the new media*.
- Giroux, H. (2006b). *The Giroux Reader*. C. Robbins (Ed.). London: Paradigm.
- Giulianotti, R. (2002). Supporters, followers, fans, and flaneurs: A taxonomy of spectator identities in football. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 26(1), 25-46.
- Glover, T. (2007). Ugly on the diamonds: An examination of white privilege in youth baseball. *Leisure Science*, 29(2), 195-208.
- Gmelch, G. & San Antonio, P. (2001). Baseball wives. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 30(3), 335-356.
- Gonzalez Echevaria, R. (August 12, 2003). American dream, Dominican nightmare. *New York Times*.
- Good Will Hunting. 1997. Miramax.

- Gowdy Jr., C. (Executive Producer). (2003, August 11-25). *Little League Baseball World Series* [Television Broadcast]. New York: American Broadcasting Company.
- Grasmuck, S. (2005). *Protecting home: Class, race and masculinity in boy's baseball*. Piscataway, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Greenfield, J. (1996). *The Return of cultural treasures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Greenwald, H. (2005). *Wal-Mart the high cost of low price*. Brand New Films.
- Grossberg, L. (1989). The circulation of cultural studies. *Critical studies in mass communications* 6(4), 413-420.
- Grossberg, L. (1992). *We gotta get out of this place: Popular conservatism and postmodern culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Grossberg, L. (1994). Bringing it all back home: Cultural studies and education (an introduction). In Henry Giroux and Peter McLaren (Eds.) *Between Borders* pp. 1-25. New York: Routledge.
- Grossberg, L. (1995). Cultural studies: What's in a name (one more time)? *Taboo*, (1), pp. 1-37.
- Grossberg, L. (1996). Identity and cultural studies: Is that all there is? In S. Hall and P. du Gay (Eds.) *Questions of Cultural Identity* pp. 87-107. London: Sage.
- Grossberg, L. (1997a). *Bringing it all back home: Essays on cultural studies*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Grossberg, L. (1997b). *Dancing in spite of myself: Essays on popular culture*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Grossberg, L. (2001). Why does neo-liberalism hate kids? The war on youth and the culture of politics. *The Review of Education/Pedagogy/Cultural Studies*, 23(2), 111-136.
- Grossberg, L. (2005). *Caught in the crossfire: Kids, politics, and America's future*. Boulder, Co: Paradigm Press.
- Grossberg, L. (2006). Does cultural studies have futures? Should it? (Or what's the matter with New York?): Cultural studies, contexts and conjunctures. *Cultural Studies*, 20(1), 1-20.

- Grossberg, L., Nelson, C. & Treichler, P. (Eds.) (1992). *Cultural Studies*. New York: Routledge.
- Gruneau, R. (1989). Making spectacle: A case study in television sports production. In L. A. Wenner (Ed.), *Media, Sports, and Society*, (134-156). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Gruneau, R., Whitson, D., & Cantelon, H. (1988). Methods and media: Studying the sports/television discourse. *Society and Leisure*, 11(2), 265-281.
- Guba, E.G. & Lincoln, Y.S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Studies* (pp. 1-18). London: Sage.
- Hall, M. A. (1996/2005). *Feminism and sporting bodies*. Champaign, Ill.: Human Kinetics.
- Hall, S. (1978). The Treatment of football 'hooliganism' in the press. In R. Ingham (ed.) *Football hooliganism in the wider context*, 15-36. London: Inter-Action Imprint.
- Hall, S. (1979). The great moving right show. *Marxism Today*, 14-21.
- Hall, S. (1980). Encoding/Decoding. In S. Hall, (ed.) *Culture, media, language: Working papers in cultural studies, 1972-1979*. London: Hutchinson.
- Hall, S. (1985). Signification, representation, ideology: Althusser and the post-structuralist debates. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* (2), 91-114.
- Hall, S. (1986). Gramsci's relevance for the study of race and ethnicity. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 10(2), 5-27.
- Hall, S. (1988). *The hard road to renewal*. London: Verso.
- Hall, S. (1992). Cultural studies and its theoretical legacies. In L. Grossberg, C. Nelson & P. Treichler (Eds.). *Cultural Studies*, pp. 277-285. New York: Routledge.
- Hall, S. (1996). The problem of ideology: Marxism without guarantees. In D. Morley & K.H. Chen (Eds.), *Stuart Hall: Critical dialogues in cultural studies*, pp. 25-46. London: Routledge.
- Hall, S. (1999). Thinking the diaspora: Home thoughts from abroad. *Small Axe: A Caribbean Journal of Criticism*, 6(1), 1-18.
- Hall, S., Critcher, C., Jefferson, T., Clarke, J. and Robert, B. (1978). *Policing the crisis(Critical social studies)*. London: Palgrave MacMillon.

- Hall, S. & Held, D. (1989). Citizens and citizenship. In S. Hall & M. Jacques (Eds.), *New times: The Changing face of politics in the 1990* (pp. 173-188). London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Hall, S., D. Held, D. Hubert, & Thompson, K., (Eds.) (1996). *Modernity: An Introduction to modern societies*. London: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Hammersley, M. (1992). *What's wrong with ethnography?*. New York: Routledge.
- Hammersley, M. & Atkinson, P. (1995). *Ethnography: Principles in practice*. London: Routledge.
- Hamill, D. (2001, September 2). Why Danny's my role model. *The New York Daily News*, 2.
- Hamilton, W. (June 20, 2000). When intentions fall between the lines. *New York Times*, p. F1.
- Hanson, T. & Newburg, D. (1992). Naturalistic inquiry as a paradigm for doing applied performance enhancement research. *Contemporary Thought on Human Performance Enhancement*, 1, 71-105.
- Hardt, M. & Negri, A. (2000). *Empire*. Cambridge: MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hardt, M. & Negri, A. (2004). *Multitude*. New York: Penguin Press.
- Hardy-Fanta, J. and P. Wantanabe, (2006). Conflict and Convergence: Race, Public Opinion and Political Behavior in Massachusetts. The University of Massachusetts McCormack Institute Poll. An Occasional Paper.
- Hargreaves, J. (1982). *Sport, Culture, and Ideology*. London: Routledge.
- Hargreaves, J. (1987). Sport and hegemony. In: *Sport, Power, and Culture*, pp. 205-223. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Hargreaves, J. & Vertinsky, P. (Eds.) (2007). *Physical Culture, power and the body*. London: Routledge.
- Hargreaves, J. (1982). Sport, culture, and ideology. In: J. Hargreaves (Ed.) *Sport, Culture, and Ideology*, pp. 30-61. London: Routledge.
- Hargreaves, J. (1986). Sport and hegemony. In *Sport, power and culture*, pp. 205-223. New York: St. Martin's Press.

- Hargreaves, J. (1987). The Body, sport and power relations. In: J. Horne, D. Jary, and G. Jarvie (Eds.), *Sport, Leisure and Social Relations*, pp. 139-159. London: Routledge.
- Hargreaves, J. & McDonald, I. (2000). Cultural studies and the sociology of sport. In J. Coakley and E. Dunning (Eds.) *The handbook of cultural studies*, 48-60.
- Harvey, D. (1989). *The Condition of postmodernity*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Harvey, D. (1999). Time space compression and the rise of modernism as a cultural force. In Frank J. Lechner and J. Boli (Eds.), *The Globalization reader* (pp. 134-45). London: Blackwell.
- Harvey, D. (2003). *The New imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Hayes, C. (1926/1933). *Essays on nationalism*. New York: Macmillon.
- Hayes, C. (1960). *Nationalism*. New York: Macmillon.
- Hermes, J. (1998a). Cultural citizenship and popular fiction. In K. Brants, J. Hermes & L. van Zoonen (Eds.), *The Media in question*, (pp. 157-167). London: Sage.
- Hermes, J. (1998b). Citizenship in the Age of the Internet. *European Journal of Communication* 21(3), 295-309.
- Hermes, J. (2006). Citizenship in the age of the internet. *European Journal of Communication*. 21(3), 295-309.
- Hermoso, R. and Coger, L.P. (2001, September 5). Baseball: Two countries, two stories. *The New York Times*.
- Hernandez, R. (2004). On the age against the poor: Dominican migration to the United States. *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Services*, 2 (1), 87-107.
- Hickey, P. (2001, August 27). Little League loopiness. *Montreal Gazette*.
- Hill-Collins, P. (2000). *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. New York: Routledge.
- Hirai, H. (2001). Hideo Nomo: Pioneer or defector? In D. Andrews and S. Jackson (eds.) *Sport Stars: The Cultural politics of sporting celebrity*, 187-200. London: Routledge.

- Hobsbawm, E. (1992). *Nations and nationalism since 1780: Programme, myth, reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hockings, P. (2003). *Principles of visual anthropology*. New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Hollands, R. (1984). The Role of cultural studies and social criticism in the sociology of sport. *Quest*, 36, 66-79.
- hooks, b. (1982). *Ain't I a woman?* London: South End Press.
- hooks, b. (1990). *Yearning: Race, gender, and cultural politics*. London: South End Press.
- hooks, b. (1992). *Killing rage: Ending racism*. NY: Owl Books.
- hooks, b. (1996). *Reel to real*. New York: Routledge.
- Horrigan, J. (2001, August 30). Pedro: Back off the kid – Ace goes to bat for Little League Pitcher. *The Boston Herald*, 108.
- Howell, J.W., Andrews, D.L., & Jackson, S.J. (2002). Cultural and sport studies: An interventionist practice. In J. Maguire & K. Young (Eds.). *Theory, sport and society* (pp. 151-177). Oxford: JAI Press.
- Hunter, T. (April 15, 2007). His courage changed everything. *Twin Cities Press*, C3.
- Ingham, A.G. (1985). From public issue to personal trouble: Well-being and the fiscal crisis of the state. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 2(1), 43-55.
- Ingham, A. (1997). Toward a department of physical cultural studies and an end to tribal warfare. In J. Fernandez-Balboa (Ed.), *Critical postmodernism in human movement, physical education and sport* (pp. 157-182). Albany: SUNY Press.
- Ingham, A. & McDonald, M. G. (2003). Sport and community/communitas. In R. Wilcox, D. L. Andrews, R. L. Irwin, & R. Pitter (eds.), *Sporting dystopias: The making and meaning of urban sport cultures*, 17-34. Albany: State University of New York.
- Internet Movie Database. (2008). *Good Will Hunting*. Retrieved May 23, 2008 from <http://www.imdb.com/boxoffice/alltimegross>.
- Isidore, C. (April 3, 2006). Ticket prices going up, up, up... Retrieved May 23, 2008 from http://money.cnn.com/2006/04/03/news/baseball_tickets/index.htm.
- Isin, E. & Turner, B. (2002). *Handbook of citizenship studies*. London: Sage.
- Jarhead (2005). Universal Video.

- Jarvie, G. & Reid, I. (1999). Sport, nationalism and culture in Scotland. *The Sport Historian*. Retrieved October 17, 2008 from <http://www.la84foundation.org/SportsLibrary/SportsHistorian/1999/sh191h.pdf>.
- Jhally, S. (1995). Image based culture: Advertising and popular culture. In G. Dines & J. M. Humez (Eds.), *Gender, Race, and Class* (pp. 77-87). London: Sage.
- Johnson, R. (1986/7). What is cultural studies anyway? *Social Text*, 16, 38-80.
- Johnson, R. (2002). Defending ways of life: The (anti-)terrorist rhetorics of Bush and Blair. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 19(4), pp. 211-231.
- Johnston, R. (2001, September 5). *Media has blown Almonte saga way out of proportion*. Retrieved August 8, 2005 from <http://media.www.dailygamecock.com/media/storage/paper247/news/2001/09/05/Sports/Media.Has.Blown.Almonte.Saga.Way.Out.Of.Proportion-88859.shtml>.
- Juffer, J. (2002). Who's the man? Sammy Sosa, Latinos, and televisual redefinitions of the "American" pastime. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 26(4), 337-359.
- Kahn, R. (1992). *Games we used to play: A lovers quarrel with the world of sport*. New York: Ticknor and Fields.
- Kahn, R. (1993). *The Era 1947-1957, when the Yankees, the Giants, and the Dodgers ruled the world*. New York: Ticknor and Fields.
- Kahn, R. (2000). *The Head game: Baseball seen from the pitcher's mound*. New York: Harcourt.
- Kall, R. (July 6, 2008). Libertarian legacy? Ron Paul's campaign manager, 49, dies uninsured, of pneumonia, leaving family \$400,000 of debt. Retrieved July 28, 2008 from *The Huffington Post*, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/rob-kall/libertarian-legacy-ron-pa_b_111079.html.
- Kedourie, E. (1960/1). *Nationalism*. London: Hutchinson and Co.
- Kelly, J. (2005). Integrating America: Jackie Robinson, critical events and baseball black and white. *International History of the Journal of Sport*, 22(6), 1011-1035.
- Kelly, M. (2001). *The Divine right of capital: Dethroning the corporate aristocracy*. San Francisco: CA: Berrett-Koehler.

- Kelley, S. (2001, September 3). Nothing little about the pressure children face. *The Seattle Times*, D1.
- Kellner, D. (2002a). September 11, social theory and democratic politics. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 19(4), 147-159.
- Kellner, D. (2002b). Theorizing globalization. *Sociological Theory*, 20(3), 285-305.
- Kemsley, J. (April 16, 2003). Godless little league?: Coach objects to trust in god pledge. *Santa Cruz Sentinel*. Retrieved December 12, 2003 from <http://www.santacruzsentinel.com/archive/2003/April/16/local/stories/01local.htm>.
- Kincheloe, J. (2001). Describing the bricolage: Conceptualizing a new rigor in qualitative research, 7: 679-692.
- Kincheloe, J. & McLaren, P. (2005). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Studies* (pp. 303-342). London: Sage.
- Kincheloe, J. Steinberg, S., Rodriguez, L. & Chennault, R. (eds.) (1998). *White reign*, New York: St. Martin's Press.
- King, S. (1993). The Politics of the Body and the Body Politic: Magic Johnson and the Ideology of AIDS. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 10(3), 270-285.
- King, S. (2004). *War games: The Culture of sport and militarization of everyday life*. Spotlight paper presented at the 5th Biannual International Crossroads in Cultural Studies Conference. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.
- King, S. (2005a). Methodological contingencies in sports studies. In, D. Andrews, D. Mason, and M. Silk (eds.). *Qualitative methods in sports studies*, (pp. 21-38). New York: Berg.
- King, S.J. (2005b). *Sport culture, the "War on Terror", and the emergence of jockocracy*. Paper Presentation given October 26-29 at the North American Society for the Sociology of Sport in Winston-Salem, NC.
- King, S.J. (2006a). *Sport, culture and a neo-liberal state*. Paper Presentation given January 20 at the University of Toronto.
- King, S. (2006b). *Pink Ribbons Inc.: Breast cancer and the politics of philanthropy*. Minneapolis, MD: University of Minnesota Press.

- Klein, A. (1988). American hegemony, Dominican resistance and baseball. *Dialectical Anthropology*, 13, pp. 301-312.
- Klein, A. (1991). *Sugarball: The American game, the Dominican dream*. New Haven, CN: Yale University Press.
- Klein, A. (1995). Culture, politics and baseball in the Dominican Republic. *Latin American Perspectives*, 22:3, pp. 111-130.
- Klein, A. (2000). Latinizing Fenway: Examining media, race, and fans of Pedro Martinez. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 17(4), 403-429.
- Klein, N. (2002). *No logo: No space, no choice, no jobs*. New York: Macmillan.
- Klein, N. (2003). *The History of forgetting Los Angeles and the erasure of memory*. London: Verso.
- Koh, E., Andrews, D. & White, R. (2007). Performing America's past. In S. Wagg & D. Andrews (Eds., *East plays west: Sport and the cold war*, (pp. 314-329). New York: Routledge.
- Krane, V. Choi, P., Baird, S. Aimar, C. & Kauer, K. (2004). Living the paradox: Female athletes negotiate femininity and muscularity. *Sex Roles* 50(5/6), 315-329.
- Kranish, M. & Kirchoff, S. (2001). Thousands protest 'stolen' election. *Boston Globe*.
- Kusz, K. (2001). I want to be the minority: The Politics of youthful white masculinities in sport and popular culture in 1990s America. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 25(4), 390-416.
- Kusz, K. (2006). From NASCAR nation to Pat Tillman: Notes on sports and the politics of white nationalism in post 9-11 America. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 31(1), 77-88.
- Laclau, E. & Mouffe, C. (1985). *Hegemony and socialist strategy: Towards a radical democratic politics*. London: Verso.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2001). *Crossing over to Canaan: The Journey of new teachers in diverse classrooms*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Laurilla, D. (2005). *Interviews from Red Sox Nation*. Hingham, MA: Maple Street Press.

- Lemke, T. (2000). *Foucault, Governmentality, and Critique*. Paper presented at the Rethinking Marxism Conference, University of Amherst (MA), September 21-24.
- Levi-Strauss, C. (1966). *The savage mind* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Levinas, E. (1998). *Otherwise than being: Or beyond essence*, (trans. Alphonso Lingis). Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.
- Lewerenz, D. (2001, August 26). President Bush throws out first pitch at series championship. *Associated Press*.
- Lewin, T. (2005). Up from the Holler: Living in two worlds, at home in neither. In Correspondents of the New York Times (Eds.) *Class matters* (pp. 63-72). New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Lewis, C. (2000). *The Buying of the President 2000*. New York: Harper Perennial.
- Light, J. (1997). *The Cultural encyclopedia of baseball*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland.
- Lincoln, Y. (2005). Institutional review boards and methodological conservatism: The challenge to an from phenomenological paradigms. In, N.K. Denzin and Y. Lincoln (Eds.). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 165-182). London: Sage.
- Lincoln, Y.S., Pinar, W.F. & McLaren, P. (2001). An emerging new bricoleur: Promises and possibilities – A reaction to Joe Kincheloe’s “Describing the Bricoleur”. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 7(6), pp. 693-705.
- Linklater, A. (2007). *The Fabric of America*. New York: Walker & Company.
- Lopresti, M. (2001, August 31). An age of innocence forever lost. *USA Today*, pp. 12C.
- Lowes, M. (2002). *Indy dreams, urban nightmares: Speed merchants, spectacle, and the struggle over public space in the world-class city*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Lowes, M. (2004). Neoliberal power politics and the controversial siting of the Australian grand prix motorsport event in an urban park. *Society and Leisure*, 27 (1), 69-88.
- Lowry, P. (2006). *Green cathedrals: The Ultimate celebration of all major league ballparks*. New York: Walker & Company.
- MacDonald, M. (2000). *All souls: A family story from Southie*. (Boston: Beacon Press).

- MacDonald, M. (2004). There goes the neighborhood. In E. Hiestand & A. Zellman (Eds.). *The Good City* (pp. 98-108). Boston: Beacon Press.
- MacMullen, J. (June 2, 2007). He's a lightning rod for fans. Retrieved March 4, 2008, from *The Boston Globe*.
http://www.boston.com/sports/baseball/redsox/articles/2007/06/02/hes_a_lightning_rod_for_fans/?p1=email_to_a_friend.
- MacNeill, M. (1996). Networks: Producing Olympic ice hockey for a national television audience. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 13, 103-124.
- Maffesoli, M. (1996). *The Time of tribes: The Decline of individualism in mass society*. London: Sage.
- Maguire, J. (1999). *Global sport: Identities, societies, civilizations*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Malins, P. (2004). Machinic Assemblages: Deleuze, Guatarri and an ethico-aesthetics of drug use. *Janus Head*, 7(1), 84-104.
- Manning, P. K. (2002). Framing the ration in fieldwork. In T. May (Ed.) *Qualitative research in action*, (pp. 73-98). London: Sage.
- Marcuse, H. (1974). Marxism and feminism. *Women's Studies*, 2(3), 279-288.
- Martinez, J. & Hutchinson, B. (August 21, 2001). Stars dad finally to see game. *New York Daily News*, 7.
- Marshall, T. H. (1992). *Citizenship and social class*. London: Pluto Press.
- Martin, C. & Reeves, J. (2001). The whole world isn't watching (but we thought they were): The Super Bowl and United States solipsism. *Sport in Society*, 4(2), 213-126.
- Massood, P. (1996). Mapping the good: The Genealogy of city space in "Boyz n the Hood", and "Menace II Society". *Cinema Journal* 35(2), 85-97.
- McDonald, M. (2005a). Imagining benevolence, masculinity and nation: Tragedy, sport and the transnational marketplace. In Silk, M., Andrews, D. & Cole, C. (Eds), *Sport and Corporate Nationalisms*, (pp. 127-142). Oxford: Berg.
- McDonald, M. (2005b). Mapping whiteness and sport: An introduction. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 22(3), 245-255.

- McDonald, M. & Birrell, S. (1999). Reading sport critically: A Method for interrogating power. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 16, 283-300.
- McGimpsey, D. (2000). *Imagining baseball*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- McKinney, K. (2004). *Being white: Stories of race and racism*. New York: Routledge.
- McLaren, P. (1994). Multiculturalism and the postmodern critique: Toward a pedagogy of resistance and transformation. In Henry Giroux and Peter McLaren (Eds.), *Between borders: Pedagogy and the politics of cultural studies*, (pp.192-224). New York: Routledge.
- McClaren, P. (2002). George Bush, apocalypse sometime soon, and the American imperium. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 3(2), 327-333.
- McClaren, P. & Martin, M. (2004). The Legend of the Bush gang: Imperialism, war and propaganda. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 4(2), 281-303.
- McRobbie, A. (1981). Settling accounts with subcultures: A feminist critique. In T. Bennett, G. Martin, C. Mercer & J. Woollacott (Eds.), *Culture, ideology and social process* (pp. 111-124). Milton Keynes: Open University.
- McRobbie, A., & Garber, J. (1976). Girls and subcultures. In S. Hall & T. Jefferson (Eds.), *Resistance through rituals: Youth subcultures in post-war Britain* (pp. 209-222). London: Hutchinson.
- Merskin, D. (2004). The Construction of Arabs as enemies: Post September 11 discourse of George W. Bush. *Mass Communication and Society*, 7(2), 157-175.
- Miletsky, Z. (2005). "City of Amalgamation: The Struggle Over Interracial Marriage in Boston and The Nation, 1900-1915" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of African American Life and History, Hyatt Regency, Buffalo, New York USA, Oct 05, 2005. Retrieved February 2, 2008 from http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p36789_index.html
- Miller, M. (September 20, 2007). *The Forbes 400*. Retrieved June 10, 2008 from http://www.forbes.com/2007/09/19/richest-americans-forbes-lists-richlist07-cx_mm_0920rich_land.html.
- Miller, T. (2001). What it is and isn't: Introducing cultural studies. In: T. Miller, *Companion to cultural studies*, pp. 1-20.
- Miller, T. (2002). Cultural Citizenship. In E. Isin & B. Turner (eds). *Handbook of citizenship studies*, (pp. 231-244). London: Sage.

- Miller, T. (2006). What it is and isn't: Introducing cultural studies. In: T. Miller, *Companion to cultural studies*, pp. 1-20.
- Miller, T. (2007a). *Cultural citizenship: Cosmopolitanism, consumerism, and television in a neoliberal age*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Miller, T. (2007b). The American people cannot be trusted. In N.K. Denizin & M. Giardiana (Eds.) *Contesting empire globalizing dissent: Cultural studies after 9/11*, (eds. 121-135). London: Paradigm.
- Miracle (2004). Disney Home Video.
- Mnookin, S. (2006). *Feeding the monster: How money, smarts, and nerve took a team to the top*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Montero, D. (2001, June 20). Ma's illness probed as a trick pitch. *New York Post*, 9.
- Moore, M. (2002). *Stupid White Men*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Moore, M. (2004). *Fahrenheit 9/11*.
- Morrison, T. (1992). *Playing in the Dark: Whiteness and the Literary Imagination*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Mosher, S. (August 15, 2001a). *A Hotbed of Talent, but Not For Little League*. Retrieved March 1, 2003, from <http://espn.go.com/moresports/llws01/s/2001/0815/1239786.html>.
- Mosher, S. (August 25, 2001b). *What's in a flag?* Retrieved March 1, 2003, from <http://espn.go.com/moresports/llws01/s/2001/0825/1243905.html>.
- Mosher, S. (August 31, 2001c). *Innocence lost? hardly*. Retrieved March 1, 2003 from <http://espn.go.com/moresports/llws01/s/2001/0831/1246412.html>.
- Musburger, B. (2001). *Bronx team bedazzling the crowds*. Retrieved March 1, 2003 from http://espn.go.com/abcsports/columns/musburger_brent/2001/0822/1242568.html.
- Mystic River (2003). Warner Brothers.
- Negus, K. (2002). The Work of cultural intermediaries and the enduring distance between production and consumption. *Cultural Studies*, 16(4), p. 505-515.

- NESN (2007). Red Sox Nation Presidential Debate. Retrieved October 10, 2007 from http://boston.redsox.mlb.com/bos/fan_forum/redsox_nation_president.jsp.
- Newman, J.I. (2005). *Dixie's last stand: Ole Miss, the body, and the spectacle of Dixie south whiteness*. ProQuest <http://hdl.handle.net/1903/3231>.
- Newman, J. & Giardina, M. (2008). NASCAR and the "Southernization" of America: Spectatorship, subjectivity, and the confederation of identity. *Communication & Critical Cultural Studies*, 8(4), 479-506.
- Olsen, M. (1969). Two categories of political alienation. *Social Forces* 47(2), 288-99.
- Olson, L. (2001, September 15). Losses far reaching out West, tragedy hits home. *New York Daily News*, pp. 82.
- Olympia. (1938). Leni Riefenstahl.
- Ong, A. (1996). Cultural citizenship as subject making. *Current Anthropology*, 37(5), 737-762.
- Ong, A. (1999). *Flexible citizenship: The Cultural politics of transnationality*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Ortega, R. (2004, June 24). Danny Almonte's mom dodges disease; not worries cancer curveball. *New York Daily News*, 6.
- Ortiz, S. (2005). The Ethnographic process of gender management: Doing the "right" masculinity with wives of professional athletes. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 11(2), 265-290.
- Orwell, G. (1945). *The Sporting spirit*. Retrieved October 17, 2008 from http://orwell.ru/library/articles/spirit/english/e_spirit.
- Outside the Lines (October 24, 2007) Entertainment and Sports Network, Vince Doria producer.
- Paige, W. (2001, September 3). Why can't adults stay out of it? *The Denver Post*, D-1.
- Parks, S. (2006). *Pop culture and marginality*. Spring 2006 course.
- Patrick, D. (2007). The Dan Patrick Show: Michael Wilbon Interview. Retrieved July 12, 2008 from <http://espnradio.espn.go.com/espnradio/clipArchive?showID=danpatrick>
- Patton, P. (1991). Preface, in J. Baudrillard *The Gulf war did not take place*, 1-6. London; Verso.

- PBS. (2004). *The new Americans: Dominican ball players*.
- Peck, J. & Tickell, A. (2002). Neoliberalizing Space. *Antipode*, 380-403.
- Peralta, R. (2007). College alcohol use and the embodiment of hegemonic masculinity among European American men. *Sex Roles*, 56, 741-756.
- Peralta, R. & J. Cruz. (2006). Conferring meaning onto alcohol-related violence: An analysis of alcohol use and gender in a sample of college youth. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 14(1), 109-125.
- Piepzna-Samarasinha, L.L. 2002. Browngirlworld: queergirlofcolor organizing, sistahood, heartbreak. In D. Hernandez and B. Rehman (Eds.), *Colonize This!*, (pp. 3-16). Emeryville, CA: Seal Press.
- Pieterse, J. (2007). Neoliberal empire. In N. Denzin & M. Giardina (Eds.), *Contesting empire/globalizing dissent: Cultural studies after 9/11* (pp. 78-94). London: Paradigm.
- Pink, S. (2001). *Doing Visual Ethnography: Images, Media and Representation in Research*. London: Sage.
- Pitter, R. & Andrews, D.L. (1997). Serving America's underserved youth: Reflections on sport and recreation in an emerging social problems industry. *Quest*, 49(1), 85-99.
- Pizzo, S., Fricker, M. & Muolo, P. (1991). *Inside job: The Looting of America's savings and loans*. Princetown, NJ: McGraw Hill.
- Plymire, D. (2005). Qualitative methods in sport-media studies. In, D. Andrews, D. Mason, and M. Silk (eds.). *Qualitative methods in sports studies*, (pp. 139-164). New York: Berg.
- Pollingreport.com (2007). President Bush: Job ratings. Retrieved August 14, 2007 from <http://www.pollingreport.com/BushJob1.htm>.
- Powers, S., Rothman, D. & Rothman, S. (1996). *Hollywood's America: Social and political themes in motion pictures*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Preston, P. & Kerr, A. (2001). Digital media, nation-states and local cultures: The case of multimedia 'content' production. *Media, Culture & Society*, 23, 109-131.

- Price, J.H. (June 24, 2002). *Habla Espanol; the Spanish language is becoming part of everyday life in America*. Retrieved July 15, 2008 from http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1571/is_23_18/ai_87917230.
- Price, J. L. (2006). *Rounding the bases: Baseball and religion in America*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press.
- Quantrill, P. (2002). The Origin of the dirt dogs. Retrieved February 29, 2008 from <http://www.bostondirtdogs.com/Miscellaneous%20Pages/Origin%20of%20the%20Dirt%20Dogs.htm>.
- Rader, B. (1990). *American sports: From the age of folk games to the age of televised sports*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Rader, B. (1992). *Baseball: A History of America's game*. Champaign, IL: Illinois University Press.
- Rader, B. (2005). *American sports: From the age of folk games to the age of televised sports* (5th Edition). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Rage Against the Machine. (2001). *Rage against the machine: The Battle of Mexico City*. Sony.
- Rains, F. (1998). Is the benign really harmless?: Deconstructing some "benign" manifestations of operationalized white privilege. In J. Kincheloe, et al. (Eds.) *White Reign: Deploying whiteness in America*, (pp. 77-102).
- Ramirez Berg, C. (2002). *Latino images in Film: Stereotypes, subversion, and resistance*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Ramsey, E. M. & Santiago, G. (2004). The Conflation of homosexuality and femininity in *Queer Eye for the Straight Guy*. *Feminist Media Studies* 4(3), p. 353-355.
- Ray, N. (2000). *Beyond Spanish for business: Teaching marketing issues in the Spanish speaking world*. Retrieved July 15, 2008 from <http://64.233.169.104/search?q=cache:QVrhiSwMSEEJ:www.mgmt.purdue.edu/centers/ciber/publications/gbl/GBL%2520-%25202000/2i.Ray.doc+corporations+suggest+spanish+in+us&hl=en&ct=clnk&cd=16&gl=us&client=safari>.
- Rearviewmirror. (2007). Boston Red Sox. Retrieved October 31, 2007 from <http://forums.pearljam.com/showthread.php?t=179654&page=93&highlight=boston>.

- Red, C. (October, 11, 2008). Palin drops puck at Flyers-Rangers game to boos. *New York Daily News*. Retrieved October, 20, 2008 from http://www.nydailynews.com/news/politics/2008/10/11/2008-10-11_sarah_palin_drops_puck_at_flyersrangers.html.
- RedSox.com (2007). Vote for President of Red Sox Nation. Retrieved September 15, 2007 from http://boston.redsox.mlb.com/bos/fan_forum/redsox_nation_president.jsp.
- Red Sox Fan From Pinstripes Territory (2004). Race Ya. Retrieved February 29, 2008 from http://letsgosox.blogspot.com/2004_12_01_archive.html.
- Rees, R. (1999). Good Will Hunting or wild goose chase?: Masculinities and the myth of class mobility. *Journey of Narrative Theory* 29(2), 228-240.
- Richardson, L. (2000). Writing: A method of inquiry. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Studies* (pp. 923-948). London: Sage.
- Richardson, L. & St. Pierre, E. (2005). Writing: A method of inquiry. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Studies* (pp. 959-978). London: Sage.
- Riess, S. A. (1995). *Sport in industrial America*. Wheeling, IL: Harlan Davidson
- Riess, S. A. (1999). *Touching base: Professional baseball and American culture in the progressive era*. Champaign, IL: Illinois University Press.
- Robins, C. (2006). Introduction. In H. Giroux *The Giroux Reader*, pp. 1-30. London: Paradigm.
- Rocchio, V. (2000). *Reel racism: Confronting Hollywood's construction of Afro-American culture*. New York: Perseus.
- Rodriguez, G. (2004, June 12). Almonte leads Monroe High to 'A' title. *The New York Times*, 5.
- Roedigger, D. (1991). *The Wages of whiteness: Race and the making of the American working class*. London: Verso.
- Rojek, C., & Turner, B. (2000). Decorative sociology: Towards a critique of the cultural turn. *The Sociological Review*, 48(4), 629-648.
- Rosaldo, R. (1994). Cultural citizenship in San Jose, California. *Polar*, 17, 57-63.
- Rossi, J. (2000). *The National Game*. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee.

- Rowe, D. (2003). Sport and the repudiation of the global. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 38(3), 281-294.
- Roulston, K., deMarrais, K., & Lewis, J. (2003). Learning to interview in the social sciences. *Qualitative Inquiry*. 9(4), 643-668.
- Rounders (1998). Miramax.
- Ryan, M. & Kellner, D. (1988). *Camera politica: The Politics and ideology of contemporary Hollywood film*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Rutenberg, J. (30 May, 2007). President and Rove under attack by Gingrich. *New York Times*, Retrieved August 14, 2007 from <http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9F03E1D91430F933A05756C0A9619C8B63&n=Top/Reference/Times%20Topics/People/R/Rutenberg.%20Jim>.
- Rutherford, J. (2005). Cultural studies in the corporate university. *Cultural Studies*, 19(3), 297-317.
- Sandomir, R. (August 27). Hey ABC it was not a one-team tournament. *The New York Times*, 2.
- Sardar Z. & Wyn-Davies, M. W. (2002). *Why do people hate America?* New York: Disinformation
- Sardar Z. & Wyn-Davies, M. W. (2004). *American terminator: Myths, movies and global power*. New York: Disinformation.
- Sassen, S. (2002). Governance Hotspots: Challenges we must Confront in the Post-September 11 World. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 19(4), 233-244.
- Saukko, P. (2005). Methodologies for cultural studies: An integrative approach. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Studies* (pp. 343-356). London: Sage.
- Schou, S. (30 April, 2007). Rage Against the Machine rages at Coachella music festival. Retrieved August 14, 2007 from Associated Press. <http://www.signonsandiego.com/news/riverside/20070430-0440-ca-coachellamusicfestival.html>.
- Schradie, J. (1999). *The golf war*.
- Scent of a Woman (1992). Universal Pictures

- Seabiscuit (2003). Universal Pictures.
- Sennet, R. (1999). Growth and failure: The New political economy and its culture. In Featherstone, M. & Lash, S. (Eds). *Spaces of Culture: City-Nation-World*, (pp. 14-26). London & Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Seymour, H. (1960). *Baseball: The Early years*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Seymour, H. (1989). *The People's game*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Shaughnessy, D. (1990a). *The curse of the Bambino*. Boston: Penguin Press.
- Shaughnessy, D. (August 19, 1990b). A slump? Joe says it isn't so. *Boston Globe*, 45.
- Shaughnessy, D. (September 3, 1990c). It may be a sneak preview of an October blockbuster. *Boston Globe*, 45.
- Shaughnessy, D. (April 3, 1992). The Impossible dream. *Boston Globe*, 40.
- Shaughnessy, D. (1996). *At Fenway: Dispatches from Red Sox Nation*. Boston: Penguin Press.
- Shaughnessy, D. (2001, May 6). Lawn work for shortstop. *Boston Globe*, pp. F1.
- Shaughnessy, D.. (June 18, 2006). Fandemonium. *Boston Globe*, 45.
- Shaw, B. (2001, September 1). Adult indifference is the biggest fraud. *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, D1.
- She Hate Me (2004). Sony Classics.
- Silk, M. (1999). Local/global flows and altered production practices: Narrative constructions at the 1995 Canada Cup of Soccer. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 34(2), 113-123.
- Silk, M. (2001). Together we're one? The "place" of the nation in media representations of the 1998 Kuala Lumpur Commonwealth games. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 18(3), 277-301.
- Silk, M. (2002). Bangsa Malaysia: Global sport, the city & the refurbishment of local identities. *Media, Culture & Society*, 24(6), 775-794.
- Silk, M. (2005). Sporting ethnography: Philosophy, Methodology and reflection. In D. Andrews, D. Mason, and M. Silk (eds.). *Qualitative methods in sports studies*, 65-103. New York: Berg.

- Silk, M. & Amis, J. (2000). Institutionalized production practices: The Case of Kuala Lumpur 98. *Journal of Sport Management*, 14(4), 267-293
- Silk, M.L., & Andrews, D.L. (2006). The fittest city. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues* 30(3), 1-13.
- Silk, M., Andrews, D. & Cole, C. (Eds.) (2005). *Sport and Corporate Nationalisms*. Oxford: Berg.
- Silk, M., Bracey, B. & Falcous, M. (2007). Performing America's past: Cold War fantasies in a perpetual state of war. In Wagg, S. & Andrews, D. *East Plays West: Sport and the Cold War*, (pp. 297-321). London: Routledge.
- Silk, M. & Falcous, M. (2005). One day in September / One week in February: Mobilizing American (sporting) nationalisms. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 22(4), 447-441.
- Silk, M., Slack, T., & Amis, J. (2002). An Institutional approach to televised sport production. *Culture, Sport & Society*, 3(1), 1-21.
- Simmons, B. (2005). *Now I can die in peace: How ESPN's sports guy found salvation with a little help from Nomar, Pedro, Shawsbank and the 2004 Red Sox*. New York: ESPN Books.
- Simmons, B. (2007a). The BS Report. Retrieved September 15, 2007 from <http://sports.espn.go.com/espnradio/podcast/archive?id=2864045>
- Simmons, B. (2007b). There's room for everyone in Red Sox Nation. Retrieved September 15, 2007 from <http://sports.espn.go.com/espn/page2/story?page=simmons/070829>.
- Slack, J.D. (1996). The theory and method of articulation in cultural studies. In D. Morley & K.H. Chen (Eds.), *Stuart Hall: Critical dialogues in cultural studies* (pp. 112-127). London: Routledge.
- Smith, A. (1986). *The Ethnic origins of nations*. London: Blackwell.
- Smith, L. T. (2005). On tricky ground: Researching the native in the age of uncertainty. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Studies* (pp. 85-108). London: Sage.
- Sociology of Sports Journal (2005). 22(3).
- Sparkes, A.C. (1995). Writing people: Reflections on the dual crises of representation and legitimation in qualitative inquiry. *Quest*, 47, 158-195.

- Sparks, A.C. (2006). *Qualitative Research in Sport, Human Movement, and Physical Education*. London: Sage.
- Spartan (2004). Warner Brothers.
- Steinbrenner, H. (2008). Hank Steinbrenner, in another outspoken moment, denounces Red Sox Nation. Retrieved March 4, 2008 from <http://sports.espn.go.com/mlb/news/story?id=3271124>.
- Stevenson, N. (1997). Globalization, national cultures and cultural citizenship. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 38(1), 41-66.
- Stiglitz, J. (2008). The End of neoliberalism? Retrieved July 28, 2008 from <http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/stiglitz101>.
- Stoddart, B. (1994). Sport, Television, Interpretation and Practice Reconsidered: Televised Sport and Analytical Orthodoxies. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 18, 76-88.
- Stout, G. & R. Johnson. (2001). *Red Sox century*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- St. Louis, B. (2004). Sport and common-sense racial science. *Leisure Studies*, 23(1), 31-46.
- Stuck on You (2003). Fox.
- Summer of Sam (1999). Buena Vista.
- Swanson, R. (2007). The Fan who would be President. Retrieved March 4, 2008 from http://bostondirt dogs.boston.com/Headline_Archives/2007/07/the_man_w_ho_wou.html.
- Sykes, H., Chapman, J. & Swedberg, A. (2005). Performed ethnography. In, D. Andrews, D. Mason, and M. Silk (eds.). *Qualitative methods in sports studies*, (pp. 185-202). New York: Berg.
- Talcott, S. (May 3, 2006). Hit the road and get... Retrieved January 19, 2008 from *The Boston Globe*.
http://www.boston.com/sports/baseball/redsox/articles/2006/05/03/hit_the_road_with_sox_and_get/?page=2.
- Tedlock, B. (2000). Ethnography and ethnographic representation. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Studies* (pp. 455-486). London: Sage.

- The Departed (2006). Warner Brothers.
- The Skulls (2000). Universal Pictures.
- Thomsen, I. & Llosa, L.F. (2001). One for the ages. *Sports Illustrated*, September 3, 2001.
- Tomlinson, A. (2002). Theorizing spectacle: Beyond Debord. In J. Sugden and A. Tomlinson (eds.). *Power Games: A critical sociology of sport*. London: Routledge.
- Trevino, A.J. (1999). Baseball, nationalism, and the two laredos. *Qualitative Sociology*, 22(3), 269-274.
- Trujillo, N. (1992). Interpreting the work (and talk of) baseball: Perspectives on ballpark culture. *Western Journal of Communication*, 56, 350-371.
- Trujillo, N. (2000). Baseball, business, politics and privilege: An interview with George W. Bush. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 14, 307-316.
- Trujillo, N. & Krizek, B. (1994). Emotionality in the stands and in the field: Expressing self through baseball. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 18(4), 303-325.
- Turner, G. (1993). *Film as social practice*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Tygiel, J. (2000). *Past time: Baseball as history*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Uchitelle, L. (2006). *The Disposable American: Layoffs and their consequences*. New York: Knopff.
- US Census Bureau. (2000). *Boston*. Retrieved July 28, 2006 from http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/SAFFPopulation?_event=ChangeGeoContext&geo_id=16000US2507000&geoContext=&street=&county=boston&cityTown=boston&state=&zip=&lang=en&sse=on&ActiveGeoDiv=&useEV=&pctxt=fph&pgsl=010&submenuId=population_0&ds_name=null&ci_nbr=null&qr_name=null®=null%3Anull&keyword=&industry=
- Van Auken, L. & Van Auken, R. (2001). *Play Ball!: The story of Little League baseball*. University Park, PA.: The Penn State University Press.
- Voigt, D. (1971). Reflection on diamonds: American baseball and American culture. Retrieved October 3, 2008 from <http://www.la84foundation.org/SportsLibrary/JS/JS1974/JS0101/jsh0101b.pdf>.

- Voigt, D. (1976). *America through baseball*. Chicago, IL: Burnham Inc. Publisher
- Voigt, D. (1983). *American baseball: From the gentleman's sport to the commissioner system*. State College, PA: Penn State Press.
- Vulliamy, E. (2001, September 2). Bronx's baby pitcher on the run from truancy charges. *The Observer*, 19.
- Wagg, S. & Andrews, D. (Eds.) (2007). *East plays west: Sport and the Cold War*. London: Routledge.
- Westerfelhaus, R. & C. Lacroix. (2006). Seeing "straight" through *Queer Eye*: Exposing the strategic rhetoric of heteronormativity in a mediated ritual of gay rebellion. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 23(5), 426-444.
- White, G. E. (1996). *Creating the national pastime: Baseball transforms itself, 1903-1953*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- White, P. (August 23, 2007). Red Sox Nation new king of the road. *USA Today*, p. 1.
- White, R., Silk, M. & Andrews, D. (2007). The Little League World Series: Spectacle of youthful innocence or spectre of the American new right? In M. Giardina & M. Donnelly (Eds.) *Youth, Culture and Sport: Identity, power, and politics*, (pp. 13-32). New York: Routledge.
- Wilhelmi, J. (July 20, 2007). Racism on the way to the ballgame. Retrieved March 4, 2008 from *The Boston Globe*.
http://www.boston.com/news/globe/editorial_opinion/letters/articles/2007/07/20/racism_on_the_way_to_the_ballgame/?p1=email_to_a_friend.
- Williams, E. (2008). A Look back at Bush's first pitch. Retrieved November 19, 2008 from http://www.reporter.net/opinion/local_story_303122609.html.
- Williams, J. (1994). The local and the global in English soccer and the rise of satellite television. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 11(4), 376-397.
- Williams, R. (1980). *The sociology of culture*. Chicago: Schocken Books.
- Willis, P. (1974). Performance and meaning: A socio-cultural view of women in sport. *Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies Stencilled Occasional Paper Series*, 17.
- Wise, M. (August 18, 2003). Little league innocence fades in TV glare. *New York Times*, F1.

- Wolcott, H. (1995). Making a Study More Ethnographic. In J. Van Maanen (ed.) *Representation in Ethnography*, (pp. 79-111). London: Sage
- Wong, E. (2001, August 22). Multicultural Bronx stars strike nationalistic chord. *The New York Times*, D1.
- Woods, M. (2001, August 27). Little League is innocence already lost. *The Florida Times-Union*, D1.
- Woolridge, F. (2007). *How to destroy America*. Retrieved July 16, 2008 from <http://www.goofigure.com/UserGoofigureDetail.asp?gooID=7604&>.
- Zinn, H. (2003). *A people's history of the United States 1492-present*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Zinn, H. (2006). *Original Zinn: Conversations on history and politics*. New York: Haper Perennial.
- Zindser, L. (October 11, 2008). Palin met with boos at Flyers opener. *The New York Times*. Retrieved October 17, 2008 from <http://slapshot.blogs.nytimes.com/2008/10/11/a-misplaced-hockey-mom-moment/>.
- Zirin, D. (2008). *Grand theft hoops: The Stealing of the Sonics*. Retrieved July, 20, 2008 from <http://www.edgeofsports.com/2008-07-02-359/index.html>.
- Zirin, D. (2008). Calling sport sociology off the bench. Retrieved October 28, 2008 from <http://contexts.org/articles/summer-2008/calling-sports-sociology-off-the-bench/>.
- Zylinska, J. (2005). *The ethics of cultural studies*. New York: Continuum.