CREATING THE 'PURE' ATHLETE: DISCOURSES ON STEROID USE AND PROHIBITION IN SPORT

by

Bryan Sluggett
B.A., Simon Fraser University, 2004

THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

In the
Department
of
Sociology and Anthropology

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

2007

Approval

Name:	**Bryan Sluggett**
Degree:	**Master of Arts**
Title of Thesis:	**Creating the 'Pure' Athlete: Discourses on Steroid Use and Prohibition in Sport**
Examining Committee:	
Chair:	**Dr. Dara Culhane** Associate Professor of Anthropology
	Dr. Ann Travers Senior Supervisor Assistant Professor of Sociology Simon Fraser University
	Dr. Cindy Patton Supervisor Professor of Sociology/Anthropology & Women's Studies Simon Fraser University
	Dr. Richard Gruneau External Examiner Professor of Communications Simon Fraser University
Date Approved:	July 10, 2007

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY
THINKING OF THE WORLD

STATEMENT OF ETHICS APPROVAL

The author, whose name appears on the title page of this work, has obtained, for the research described in this work, either:

(a) Human research ethics approval from the Simon Fraser University Office of Research Ethics,

or

(b) Advance approval of the animal care protocol from the University Animal Care Committee of Simon Fraser University;

or has conducted the research

(c) as a co-investigator, in a research project approved in advance,

or

(d) as a member of a course approved in advance for minimal risk human research, by the Office of Research Ethics.

A copy of the approval letter has been filed at the Theses Office of the University Library at the time of submission of this thesis or project.

The original application for approval and letter of approval are filed with the relevant offices. Inquiries may be directed to those authorities.

Bennett Library
Simon Fraser University
Burnaby, BC, Canada

ABSTRACT

This thesis questions current anti-doping policy in sport because it is unable to account for the integration of sporting technologies that have rendered the 'pure' body fictional. My research is based on a discourse analysis of World Anti-Doping Agency policies, newspaper articles covering baseball's 'steroid scandal', and interviews with competitive athletes. Discourses about steroids suggest that dangerous health outcomes, coupled with artificial performance boosts, create doped athletes that require surveillance interventions from sporting authorities to protect 'clean sport'. Moral panics are encouraged by media and policy reports through narratives that increasingly depend on a 'war on drugs' logic. Athletes are placed at the center of this paradox between the 'win at all cost' approach of sport and the mantra that only 'clean athletes' count. Consequently, resources are funneled into eliminating doping through antiquated ethics concerned with natural/artificial boundaries; while legal technologies improving performance and causing harm continue unchecked.

DEDICATION

For Jhing

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am deeply indebted to my incredible committee members for their academic and personal support through this process. My senior supervisor, Ann Travers, is responsible for showing me that the sociology of sport could be a life long academic project; and for that I am forever thankful. My second supervisor, Cindy Patton, always had the right question or comment to help me find the right direction.

My external examiner for the defense was Richard Gruneau, and I thank him for the contributions, and considered reading, he gave my thesis. I also owe a great thank you to the administrative staff in the Sociology and Anthropology department. Hal Weinberg, Director of Ethics at SFU, was very resourceful in helping me navigate the ethics board.

The support from many other graduate students – experiencing the same lifestyle of sleeplessness – was an invaluable resource. While it was frustrating to fight through the isolation that characterizes graduate work, their friendship kept my spirits high.

My wife Jhing, family and friends bore the brunt of my stress, and learned graciously to accept my 'availability' (i.e. "I can't go out right now..."). I appreciate their unconditional support, and feel happy knowing they will always be there.

I also wish to thank the athletes who agreed to talk with me about their sport training experiences. Their contribution was truly appreciated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1:

Creating the 'Pure' Athlete:

Discourses on Steroid Use and Prohibition in Sport

Introduction

The 1976 Olympics in Montreal ushered in the modern era of drug bans in athletics: it was the first Olympic competition to prohibit steroids, largely in response to escalating accusations that many athletes – and in particular eastern bloc athletes – were gaining advantages through steroid use (Beamish and Ritchie, 2005a). Despite the inception of drug testing in the Olympics – and its subsequent trickle down to professional, collegiate and amateur ranks – steroid use by athletes persists, and sporting authorities continue their pursuit of 'fair play'. The World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA), International Olympic Committee (IOC), National Anti-Doping Committees (NADO), and Professional/Collegiate institutions are now each working fervently to 'get tough' on doping. The eradication of performance enhancing drugs in sport has been reduced to one policy: drug testing. Although this involves a host of specific decisions – anti-doping rules, prohibited lists, therapeutic use exemptions, drug testing methods, standards of proof, punishments – all drug bans have the same quest: to demand inspecting an athletes' fluids for *purity*. In this context, the athlete must be gazed – not only in drug testing – but also through speculation when something appears 'unnatural' in their appearance or performance. After all, they could be using new, undetectable 'super-drugs'. Against this backdrop, WADA has been established to centralize the governance of the anti-doping movement in sport. WADA Chairman Richard Pound states:

> When governments and the sport movement founded WADA in 1999, they were responding to the urgent need to protect the integrity of sport and the health of athletes. To combat doping in sports effectively, there needed to be a harmonized, global, strategy that combined and coordinated the resources of both sports and governments (Chairman's Message <www.wada-ama.org>).

WADA is mandated to envelop regional, national and international anti-doping systems under their universal set of rules and governance. They have also started establishing global tracking systems and year round unannounced drug testing of athletes to search out drug cheats.

In this particular climate, in which *questioning* any decision is seen as synonymous with supporting doping, it becomes increasingly imperative to question the fundamental principles and consequences of drug bans. Why are athletes' bodies considered a legitimate site for public inspection of purity? Why are some sporting technologies banned and others not? Why is drug testing considered the best solution to doping use in sport? Is doping actually inconsistent with high performance sport? These questions are important because they force a consideration of the underlying paradigm of anti-doping logic. My central concern is how discourses about steroids are used to produce the idea that 'natural' and 'doped' athletes can actually be categorized according to prohibited lists; and identified using chemical tests, which apparently provide insight into the purity of the body. This normalizes the distinction of doper/natural athletes according to the legal definition provided by sporting authorities and reinforces the idea that athletes must submit to surveillance to maintain the integrity of sport. Thus my thesis criticizes current anti-doping logic by charting how this discursive process operates in policy, media reports and athletes voices.

This introductory chapter introduces the main themes and concepts that underpin the remaining three chapters, which cover the findings and discussion parts of the project. Chapter One covers four sections: (1) Literature Review, (2) Research Questions, (3) Theoretical Approach, and (4) Research Design. The Literature Review section contrasts the two dominant research paradigms that are currently used to approach steroid use and prohibition; this serves to situate my project within the academic debate on steroids. The research questions section clarifies the main themes that I explore in this project, and also indicates the particular focus of my analysis. Then I explain how my central theoretical approach – Fausto-Sterling's (2000) Developmental Systems Theory – works to guide my interpretation of bodies and technologies as they relate to performance enhancement in sport. I also theoretically ground steroids as a technology – which Franklin (1990) defines as social practice – to illustrate the socio-cultural context of doping use in high performance sport. The methodology section outlines how my data sources (anti-doping policies, newspaper articles and interviews), sampling decisions and data analysis are guided by critical discourse analysis. The ethical issues involved in conducting interviews with a 'deviant' population are also considered.

Literature Review

The emergence of doping in sport – and subsequent response by sporting authorities – has led to divisions in academia over what to make of steroid use and prohibition in sport. These different approaches relate fundamentally to ontological framing of the topic, reflected in the two major paradigms in the literature: 'Olympic hegemony' and critical cultural studies (CCS). 'Olympic hegemony' accepts the dominant discourse on drug bans and threats to fair competition as legitimate, and

therefore focuses on identifying steroid users and formulating prevention campaigns; alternatively, CCS questions the nature and construction of 'fair' competition, 'natural' bodies, and 'artificial' drugs, and hence focuses on the ideological forces in sport underlying drug testing.

Each approach will be described separately, with reference to key academic works, and then some concluding remarks will be made about what the consequences are of taking each perspective. The most common approach taken within academic research on steroid use in sport falls under what Lenskyj (2000) terms 'Olympic hegemony'. This paradigm refers to the idea that the Olympics (and sport in general) are clean, and that athletes must avoid steroid use to ensure 'fair competition' and 'natural bodies'. I use Lenskyj's phrase as a metaphoric term encompassing epistemologically and ontologically similar works containing certain core features. The ontology of this approach views the social world as divided into clear categories that interact with one another in predictable and universal ways. Researchers also tend to (implicitly) support the Enlightenment logic of dualism, which makes sharp ontological distinctions between spheres in the social world; this includes assuming binaries between nature/nurture, legal/illegal, and human/technology without demonstrating that the categories are actually exclusive. Furthermore, as the phrase implies, the 'Olympic hegemony' approach takes common sense notions of fair play and the authority of sporting bodies to create rules for granted. The epistemology – empiricism – uses the scientific method to collect evidence about social reality to produce theories that accurately depict what is happening. In practice, this means treating past literature as (mostly) synonymous with factual accounts of the

social world and using quantitative surveys to learn new ones. The net effect is a tendency to focus on identifying, predicting and preventing individual steroid users.

Identifying steroid users – with an eye towards 'winning the battle' against dopers – is an important point of interest within this paradigm (Kindlundh et al., 1999; Irving et al., 2002; Miller et al., 2005). Using large scale cross-sectional questionnaires with (American) high school students, researchers are aiming to generalize to the broader population of adolescents. Their aim is to identify a constellation of demographic and behavioral factors related to steroid use that together form a set of 'problem behaviors'. This requires distinguishing steroid users and non-users to tease out the developmental, social and psychological indicators that differ. Each study mentioned above dichotomized the concept of steroid use (user versus non-user) by collapsing a diverse set of 'users'[1] into one category to represent all users. The assumption being made is that *any* steroid use represents a categorical harm worth eliminating.

In this literature, the best predictors of steroid use have been recreational substance use (Miller et al., 2002; Kindlundh et al., 1999; Luetkemeier, 1995); poor lifestyle attitudes and behaviors, such as low self-esteem and health knowledge (Irving et al., 2002); as well as fighting and sexually risky behaviour (Miller et al., 2002). Self-reported surveys from high school students indicate that steroid use is far more prevalent in males (ranging from 4% to 12%) than in females (ranging from 0% to 2%) (Luetkemeier, 1995; Faigenbaum, et al. 1998; Bahrke et al., 2000; Wichstrom and Pedersen, 2001; Miller et al., 2005; Dodge and Jaccard, 2006). The prevalence of steroid use also appears to significantly decline after high school. Berning et al. (2004) criticize

[1] For example, Irving et al. (2002) collapsed "a few times," "monthly," "weekly," and "daily;" and Miller et al. (2005) collapsed the scale 1-2 times, 3-9 times, 10-19 times, 20-39 times, 40+ times into *one category* to represent 'steroid use'.

the use of large scale population studies as 'hard data' because they ignore anecdotal evidence from professional sports that use varies from 20% to 90% among athletes. Considering the illegal and stigmatized nature of steroid use, they believe insider sources like coaches, journalists and drug-testers may be more knowledgeable about actual prevalence.

There is considerable disagreement in the literature on whether participation in sport is a contributing factor to higher rates of steroid use among youth. While some population studies show the prevalence of steroid use is higher in athletes than non-athletes (Tanner, Miller and Alongi, 1995; Luetkemeier, 1995; Bahrke et al., 2000; Irving et al., 2002; Dodge and Jaccard, 2006), others indicate no significant difference based on participation in sport (Naylor et al., 2001; Wichstrom and Pedersen, 2001; Miller et al., 2002; 2005). Notably though, Miller et al. (2001) found that male and female high school athletes participating in three or more sports were at significantly higher risk for steroid use than non-athletes. This raises serious doubts about how applicable population samples of adolescents are to competitive athletes – the people mostly likely to use steroids for an edge in performance.

However, regardless of disagreement over these empirical findings, the broad consensus among most researchers is that steroid use is part of a constellation of 'problem behaviours' like recreational drug use, fighting, delinquent behaviour and sexual intercourse (Miller et al., 2002; 2005; Wichstrom and Pedersen, 2001; Irving et al., 2002; Kindlundh et al., 1999). This approach largely stems from Jessor and Jessor's (1977) 'adolescent problem behaviour' theory that seeks to identify youth exhibiting (statistically) unconventional behaviour; these researchers are theoretically pre-disposed

to see steroid use as part of deviant youth culture rather than sport culture. For example, Miller et al. (2005) argue, "steroid use has far less to do with athletic participation than with substance use and other health risk behaviours in general" (2005: 12). Although there are exceptions (see Dodge and Jaccard, 2006), there is reluctance in the literature to theorize sport as a *risk factor* despite many findings establishing the connection. This appears to stem from an approach that sees sport as part of a 'healthy lifestyle' for youth (Naylor et al., 2001; Shields, 1995).

The 'Olympic hegemony' literature also focuses on improving educational knowledge in health and anti-drug campaigns to prevent future use by youth (Donovan et al., 2000; 2002; Naylor et al., 2001; Faigenbaum, et al., 1998; Anshel and Russell, 1997). Three such programs – Student Athlete Testing Using Random Notification Project (SATURN), Athletes Training and Learning to Avoid Steroids (ATLAS) and Athletes Targeting Healthy Exercise and Nutrition Alternatives (ATHENA) – involve direct intervention into high school (Goldberg et al., 2000; 2003; Goldberg and Elliot, 2005). SATURN is looking for evidence that random drug testing (now commonplace for some American students) dissuades steroid use. ATLAS (male athletes) and ATHENA (female athletes) are each attempting to modify "behavioural intent" and identify risk factors leading to steroid use. To date, the studies have had no success. Gorman's (2002) review of the ATLAS research project (Goldberg et al., 2000) was highly critical of the methodology and lack of evidence underlying the research approach; especially since the program was funded by the National Institute on Drug Abuse as part of their suspect 'evidence based' approach to drugs. The literature on anti-doping education remains certain that the research is important but has yet to produce tangible results for reducing

its use.

A large component of the research underlying educational approaches to steroids involves assessing the attitudes and beliefs of youth (Peretti-Watel et al., 2004; Olrick, 1999; Anshel and Russell, 1997). Peretti-Watel et al. (2004) conducted a large-scale questionnaire to assess the attitudes of French elite student athletes towards doping in sport and recreational drug use. They found that the vast majority of respondents viewed doping as both morally wrong and unhealthy. However, attitudes about the advantages of steroid use varied: cluster 1 (50% of the sample) viewed doping as both dangerous and useless; cluster 2 (30%) viewed it as dangerous but effective; and cluster 3 (20%) viewed it as dangerous but necessary to sporting competition. The authors' conclude that athletes rationally consider the costs and benefits (bodily health versus sporting performance) in deciding whether to use steroids. In contrast, Anshel and Russell (1997) found that athletes failed to connect knowledge of the health consequences of steroid use and attitudes towards steroid use, concluding that educational campaigns are ineffective. After conducting in-depth interviews with weight lifters, Olrick (1999) highlighted the perceived psychological and physical benefits participants' experienced from steroid use. This highlights the problem of not discussing perceived benefits and potential safe use of steroids with youth because it fails to match their experience and knowledge.

The 'Olympic hegemony' approach places steroids into the 'public health risk' model by producing evidence that they are psychologically and physically harmful. Despite this goal, the actual evidence of direct harm from steroid use is inconclusive. Although disputed within the literature, associated psychological outcomes of use – including aggression ('roid rage'), mood swings, psychosis and psychological

dependency (Williamson, 1994) – are also some of the most well known effects. However, the impossibility of disentangling the effects of steroids from heavy training and existing disorders led one researcher to claim that "generalizations about mood and behaviour alterations and their severity in AS [anabolic steroid] users cannot be readily made" (Korkia, 1998: 106, in Keane, 2005: 195). Physical health effects may include liver damage, cardiovascular risk, elevated blood pressure, physical addiction and severe back acne (Cafri, 2005 et al.; Hartgens and Kuipers, 2004). Gender specific effects for males can include shrinking testicles, infertility, development of breasts and reduced sperm count; female users may develop deepening of the voice, clitoral enlargement, and changes in their menstrual cycle (Miller et al., 2005). However, these effects are unknown over the long-term and (especially for males) often subside after initial usage; some research suggests that the long-term impact may be irreversible for women (Hoffman and Ratamess, 2006). Low dosage, moderate use and intermittent use appear to be protective factors against these effects. As Hoffman and Ratamess (2006) point out in a comprehensive review of the literature, "few studies have been able to directly link anabolic steroids to many of the serious adverse effects listed" (8). To date, the crisis remains largely contained to several well reported cases of unexplained deaths and suicides that are, at best, loosely correlated to steroid use.

Another concern is whether steroids actually improve performance. While early research on steroids and performance failed to demonstrate any improvement, a comprehensive review by Boyce (2003) indicates a strong association with increases in muscle size and lean body mass. This has been demonstrated in controlled experimental designs with both athletes and non-athletes. Despite finding that steroid use increased

strength, Boyce states: "there was no difference in the strength of the elite, highly trained athletes between those who used and those who did not use anabolic-androgenic steroids" (ibid: 26). Thus it is unclear whether steroids "enhance the maximum strength that can be attained or merely reduce the time and effort taken to get to that maximum" (ibid: 28).

Taken together, what can the 'Olympic hegemony' position tell us? On the surface, it indicates that steroid use is part of a dangerous constellation of problem behaviours that constitute a public health threat. However, this literature is also part of a larger discursive framework – 'Olympic hegemony' – that has a core set of assumptions sharply distinguishing between the steroid abuser and healthy teenager; as well as healthy sport and doped sport.

Researchers using the critical cultural studies (CCS) approach ask fundamentally different questions that significantly shape the way steroids are understood and therefore described. Rather than take the 'natural' body, 'fair' play and drug bans for granted, researchers interrogate these positions as part of the broader ideological framework of sport. Thus the approaches adopted by CCS researchers studying sport and bodies as a socio-historical construct dominate.

McDonald and Birrell (1999) offer a useful summary of the core components of a critical cultural studies stance. As traditional critical approaches in sport like Marxism and Feminism were rejected for focusing on only one axis of top-down power, cultural critics began searching for "more sophisticated ways to conceptualize relationships of power, particularly those of race, class, gender and sexuality" (ibid: 284). In conjunction with the 'literary turn' in academics, this has led to the increasing interconnection between cultural and critical studies. CCS ontology combines (in a variety of ways)

constructivist and critical approaches to the social world, which "conceptualizes the self as a fragmented subject of culture, constructed through historically specific social and discursive practices" (ibid: 292). It remains critical because the central focus is on (multiple) power relations. This enables links to be made across a matrix of social relations and discursive constructions *within* specific contexts.

CCS reads 'texts' as including actions, words and events that are understood as "ideologically coded and affected by larger political struggles" (ibid: 291). The epistemology assumes knowledge is fragmented, constructed, hidden and contested. It leads researchers to assess underlying ideological forces and consequences of discourses in sport. Common questions using this approach on steroids are: what can 'steroid scandals' tell us about the ideological framework of sport? What are the consequences of doping bans? What does the decision to prohibit steroids, but not other sporting technologies, tell us about the meaning of 'fair play' and 'clean' bodies?

CCS approaches steroid use and prohibition as being produced within specific socio-historical contexts. Beamish and Ritchie (2005b) argue steroid use in athletics emerged along side the development of high performance sport in the post-World War Two period. Advancements in science placing the *body* at the center of perpetual improvement, in conjunction with the propaganda driven culture of Cold War sport, produced a situation in which athletes increasingly engaged with technologies to win. From this standpoint, eradicating steroid use through targeting individual athletes with drug testing removes doping use from its context. Namely, that doping has emerged along side other advancements in weight and cardio training, knowledge of body chemistry, and changes in sporting culture to become *part of elite level training* (for some

athletes) (Butryn, 2003). The implication is that the problem of steroid use is caught up in the logic of sport science and athletic competition; this is seen as hidden by the discursive construction of sport as 'clean' and 'healthy'.

Most CCS researchers collapse the categories biological/cultural/technological in some way because they fundamentally disagree with the common sense approach that conceptualizes them as *independent* from social forces (Davis and Delano, 1992; Cole, 1994; Butryn, 2003; Lock, 2003). This is largely premised on Haraway's (1991) position on technology: that the boundary between the body and technology has become 'polluted' to the point that they are intellectually inseparable. Using cyborg theory, Butryn (2003) explored the identities of seven elite track and field athletes. He found that assumptions of an essentialized 'natural' body – only 'polluted' by illegal drugs – pervaded the self-constructions of athletes. Butryn argues the key indicator of an authentic sporting performance for athletes "relates to the idea that the *sporting body*, as much as the sport itself, *must remain pure* [emphasis added]" (27). Athletes in the study also accepted regulatory definitions of performance enhancing prohibition: they linked natural/legal and unnatural/illegal without questioning the meaning of the 'pure athlete'. This approach to technology/body relations allows one to avoid the problematic position of dominant discourses on steroids as an 'artificial' intruder.

The content of educational campaigns advocating the prohibition of steroids has also been researched using CCS (Davis and Delano, 1992; Burke and Roberts, 1997). Davis and Delano (1992) conducted a content analysis of anti-drug media texts, looking to assess the dominant ideological structure underlying the educational messages. They found anti-doping campaigns largely reinforced the athletic body as 'natural' and drugs

as 'artificial' substances that dirty the otherwise pure body. These assumptions reinforced the orthodox notion of the two-sex system, which maintains that fundamental biological processes mark sharp, visible gender differences. Campaign texts repeatedly presented violations of gender norms purportedly created by steroid use – in particular, men being feminized and women being masculinized – as abnormal and ugly. Thus the *gender effects* of steroid use as abnormal to the 'natural' body were central to the anti-doping message directed at athletes.

CCS literature has also assessed doping scandals in the media, focusing on the gender effects of doping rhetoric by framing the analysis within broader heterosexist discourses surrounding female athletes (Lock, 2003; Plymire, 1999). Lock's central argument is that – despite the rhetoric surrounding doping scandals in sport – lesbians, masculine women, 'ugly' women, and certain female dopers are treated more harshly by the media because they contravene the assumption of heterosexuality. Since sexuality is interpreted through appearance, gender is implicitly policed through the heterosexual framework. Lock asks: 'what counts as feminine'? Being too 'masculine' – as the 6 ft 8 Chinese basketball player Zheng is – renders women in sport 'ugly'; and being openly lesbian in sport – such as tennis star Navratilova – disrupts 'natural' sexual relations. Lock argues that when female dopers are portrayed negatively in the media (much like non-dopers Zheng and Navratilova), it is because their appearance does not match the expected feminine look. The main implication is that anti-doping education and media scripts are caught up in normalizing thinking about the body to reinforce the idea that doping is an unethical behaviour.

The performance of 'steroid cheats' is also constructed in the media through an ethnocentric lens. The Ben Johnson steroid scandal from the 1988 Olympics is a prime example (Jackson, 2004; Abdel-Shehid, 2005). In this moment of Canadian national unrest – NAFTA was signed, Wayne Gretzky was traded to the Los Angeles Kings to play for lots of money, and people feared US cultural imperialism – Ben Johnson's race against the 'cocky' American Carl Lewis in the 100 meter dash emerged as a site of intense nationalism. After beating the American, and setting a world record, Johnson was instantly called a "Canadian" hero. Johnson's scandal provides evidence of the malleability of his (black) citizenship: after being disqualified for steroid use he was labeled a "Jamaican," "Jamaican-Canadian," and "immigrant" cheater in the media; other newspaper stories started mentioning his stutter, broken English and 'childlike' approach to life (ibid). Jackson (2004) and Abdel-Shehid (2005) each suggest that this response was indicative of broader ethnocentric undertones in Canadian society, in which Ben Johnson's citizenship status as a track and field star was always contingent on his athletic success. They conclude that Ben Johnson remains a metaphorical 'ghost' in Canada that continually requires 'redeeming' from future track stars. In this sense, the image of Johnson as steroid cheat continues to play an important role in constructing Canadian identity and race relations within athletics. Abdel-Shehid (2005) further argues that 'outsiders' in Canada are produced to preserve the mythic boundaries of what it means to be 'Canadian'. Ben Johnson's national malleability, which was determined based on the 'best interest' of Canada, was re-constructed after the scandal to preserve Canadian 'pride' from the 'shame'.

So what can a critical cultural approach to steroid use in sport tell us? Unlike the

'Olympic hegemony' position, this perspective questions dominant narratives and contests certain constructions of the body, athlete and sport. It is also a multidisciplinary approach that grounds research in particular contexts to understand the nexus of power relations – be they about the body, gender, race or nation. However, there has been little research describing the relation between dominant narrative constructions of steroid use and the body/technology connection. Since the CCS approach questions the prevalence of discourses that remain obscured through certain ways of thinking, it makes for an ideal framework to locate my project within.

Research Questions

My central research question is: what are the similarities and differences between discourses on steroid use in competitive sport from the print media, policy documents and competitive athletes? The purpose of this thesis is to 'map out' the way steroid use in sport is talked about in these different arenas – media, policy and athletes – to understand and question the complex, interdependent relations between discourse, technologies and bodies. My sub-questions (see Appendix) further guide my research by focusing specifically on the construction of the body, fair play, performance enhancing drugs and relations of power. I focus on the continuity and discontinuity between each arena of the discursive framework – especially the body and fair play – constructing steroid use. These are contextualized through literature reviews and illustrative excerpts from media and professional texts within important socio-historical moments.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical approach I use to guide my thesis is Anne Fausto-Sterling's Developmental Systems Theory (DST), which is described in *Sexing the Body* (2000). It

was developed as a third alternative to biological and constructionist stances on gender. Fausto-Sterling fundamentally rejects that these processes exist independently of each other, with "one guided by genes, hormones, and brain cells (that is nature), the other by environment, experience, learning, or inchoate social forces (that is nurture)" (2000: 25). In this approach body and culture are understood as co-developing. This allows the *interdependencies* of each previously rendered invisible in dualism to emerge. DST also views gender as inherently *shaped* by broader political and moral conflicts surrounding the cultural meaning of sex and sexuality. Although Fausto-Sterling specifically details the construction of gender through science and biology discourses, this approach equally applies to the idea of bodies as biological. Ideologies (embedded within 'knowledge') come to inscribe themselves on the body because "as we grow and develop, we literally, not just 'discursively' (that is, through language and cultural practices), construct our bodies, *incorporating experience into our very flesh* [emphasis added]" (ibid: 20). For example, doctors impose the idea of the two-sex system on the genitalia of 'intersexed' people to fit the male/female dichotomy, materially reinforcing the gender myth by erasing and/or reconstructing intersexed peoples' genitalia (ibid: 27-28). This makes DST ideal for approaching steroids in competitive sport: anti-doping laws, educational campaigns, media reports – all fundamentally premised on policing the idealized 'natural' body – continue to construct and materially shape athletic bodies.

Fausto-Sterling's theoretical approach is, in many ways, an extension of Elizabeth Grosz's (1994) work in *Volatile Bodies*, which completely reshaped the landscape of gender studies. Frustrated by the infiltration of dualism underlying feminist thought, Grosz challenged the orthodox notion that constructionist (nurture) and biological

(nature) processes were two separate, independently functioning systems. Dualism has led theorists to (falsely) think that the 'body' can actually be separated from the 'mind', that physical sensation can really be separated from cognitive decisions. What is most troubling for Grosz is that binary approaches are hierarchical: through the preeminence of the natural sciences and traditional philosophy, one side has emerged as the "privileged term and the other its suppressed, subordinated, negative counterpart" (ibid: 3). Here the body is oppositional to mind, and by implication not capable of 'reason', 'logic' and 'consciousness'; in short, the body in Western thought is uncontrollable and dangerous. This framework for the body traps its origins to biology, thus removing it from the material world of politics, culture and history.

The conceptual problem with dualism is that there are no easy ways out of its two-system trap. Simply removing the divide is not enough: that just collapses two systems into one, in which "attributes are merely different aspects of one and the same substance, inseparable from each other" (ibid: 11); this just erases the actual *interconnection* between each process. Grosz concludes the only way out is an outright rejection of dualism as a foundation. This means dropping the search for nature/nurture distinctions, and starting instead with the revelation that "bodies [and] individualisms are historical, social, cultural weavings of biology" (ibid: 12). The central purpose of this approach is to create "shifting frameworks and models of understanding, about the opening up of thought to what is new, different and hitherto unthought" (ibid: xiv). DST is an answer to that call: it offers a way of conceptualizing the interconnection between construction and materiality that avoids the separation of dualism or simplicity of reductionism.

As DST implies, discourse not only constructs our understanding of bodies, it also plays a role in its material shaping. Through technology, ideas can become inscribed onto the body. That means technology should not simply be seen as a sum of its parts and prescriptions. It is a system of interconnected objects, procedures, symbols and approaches. Franklin (1990) argues for a definition of technology as *social practice.* This reading of technology enables one to connect "technology directly to culture, because culture, after all, is a set of socially accepted practices and values" (Franklin, 1990: 15); technology does not determine and/or remain independent of culture. Instead it develops "within a particular social, economic and political context" (ibid: 57) through a 'web of interactions' overlapping one another. Mesner and Aronowitz (1996) term this a technoculture, arguing technology, culture and science are embedded within each other to the extent that conceptually separating them would remove them from their material context. This moves beyond viewing science as discourse and technology as object. Thus concerns with determinism and causality are replaced by considerations of how technology *permeates* certain practices, ideologies and bodies.

In *A Cyborg Manifesto* (1991) Donna Haraway takes the notion of technological/cultural integration a step further, provocatively arguing that the borderland between technology and body is thoroughly ambiguous. Using the metaphor of the cyborg – both imagined and materialized through (science) fiction and (Cold War) science – Haraway states that we are "theorized and fabricated hybrids of machine and organism" (150). Haraway, hinting at the US military's development of cyborg weaponry during the Cold War, argues further:

> Technology has determined what counts as our own bodies in crucial ways... At an extremely deep level, nature for us has been reconstructed in the belly of a

> heavily militarized, communications-system based technoscience in its late capitalist and imperialist forms. How can one imagine contesting for nature from that position? (Penley, Ross and Haraway, 1990: 12).

Although clearly technology shapes and alters the material body, positioning technology as the 'problem' returns one back to dichotomous thinking about bodies. For Haraway, this means we should be engaging with technology, rather than resorting to technophobic impulses that assume humans can return to a 'natural' position. There is no natural – that is, purely organic and pre-technological self – because bodies are intimately connected to history, culture and politics.

The idea of Haraway's 'cyborg' (organism/technology) – and the theorization of culture/technology interdependency (Travers, 2000) – has significantly influenced critical cultural approaches to sport. In adopting these conceptualizations, Butryn (2003) argues that within sport the constant intersection of bodies and technologies has rendered the competitive athlete 'cyborgified'. Butryn conceptualizes steroid use *as a technology* that is part of high performance sport training. This avoids the binary trap of the conventional definition of steroids as a banned drug. The conceptualization of performance enhancing substances as one of many technologies rendering the 'natural' body illusory serves to highlight the rampant integration of sports science knowledge and technologies in so-called clean sport.

To sum up, DST looks at the way politics, culture and science shape bodies through certain technologies. Within the context of sport, DST provides an ideal framework for contextualizing the 'web of interactions' between ideas about doping, 'natural' bodies and high performance sport. It rejects the dualism of the nature/nurture split, and so rejects the notion of a boundary between the body and socio-cultural forces.

Hence, rather than peeling away the insidious layers of steroid abuse in sport, in an epic 'war' to maintain the chemical integrity of athletes, I question the way current doping codes hide the cyborgified athlete. This thesis challenges 'common sense' approaches to doping primarily because athletes are being subjected to extensive surveillance practices under the guise of 'purity'.

Research Design

Methodology

I used critical discourse analysis to guide my methodological decisions in this project. Discourse refers to ways of understanding the world – manifesting in speech, texts and products – that are the result of constructions of 'meaning' (Stillar, 1998; Phillips and Hardy, 2002). Thus it is a "set of meanings, metaphors, representations, images and stories, and as an institutionalized use of language which produces *particular versions of events* [my emphasis]" (Burch, 2005: 248-249). Critical discourse analysis is a multidisciplinary approach to the research of language use within particular social, cultural and historical settings (van Dijk, 1991). It focuses primarily on the relationship between 'ways of talking' and the social world, with particular emphasis on "how language constructs phenomenon" (Phillips and Hardy, 2002: 6). The underlying assumption of this approach is that texts respond to the emergence of 'social problems' by constructing concepts, strategies and frameworks that impact how those problems are then understood and acted on.

Discourse analysis rests heavily on a constructionist epistemology that emphasizes the contextual and produced nature of social phenomenon. Following Fairclough's (1992) 'three dimensional' approach, I attempt to draw links across (1)

texts, (2) discourses, and (3) historical and social contexts. Power relations are understood as manifesting through discourses in texts, which in turn construct social relationships. As Foucault puts it, discursive practices "introduce something into the play of true and false and constitute it as an object for moral reflection, scientific knowledge or political analysis" (in Keane, 2005: 3). It is not just a practice of language construction – by privileging certain 'ways of thinking' it also constrains how people act and think – "leading to studies of how grand or 'mega' discourses shape social reality and constrain actors" (Phillips and Hardy, 2002: 21).

The ontology of my methodology is relativist. This means that taken-for-granted social categories – such as culture/biology – are rejected in favour of a more contextually grounded approach. The ability for research to respond to the fragmented, partial and often contradictory nature of post-modern life without simply recasting binary categorizations is an important methodological move (McDonald and Birrell, 1999). As Stuart Hall points out, discourse must be contextualized

> precisely because identities are constructed within, not outside, discourse, we need to understand them as produced in specific historical and institutional sites within specific discursive formations and practices, by specific enunciative strategies (in Jackson, 2004: 123).

In this approach, there is a movement away from letting facts 'speak for themselves' because 'versions of truth' are understood as inexplicably connected to power relations (McDonald and Birrell, 1999).

It should be further noted that several key theoretical assumptions about the nature of reality underpin this thesis. In particular, Fausto-Sterling's (2000) integrative approach to the nature/nurture divide; Franklin's (1990) conceptualization of technology as a social practice; Haraway's (1991) notion human/technological interdependency; and

Butryn's (2003) construction of steroids as a form of sporting technology all form key ontological assumptions about the co-emergence of discourses, bodies, culture and technologies within high performance sport.

Data Sources, Sampling and Collection

The data sources used for this project provide insight into the discursive construction of steroid use and prohibition across three different levels of analysis: policy, media and athletes. I chose these sources to compare and contrast ways of thinking about doping across several influential contexts (Fairclough, 1992). Phillips and Hardy argue that it is the "interrelations between texts, changes in texts, new textual forms, and new systems of distributing texts that constitute discourse over time" (2002: 5). Thus the relationship between anti-doping policy, print media descriptions of 'steroid scandals', and athlete negotiations of 'what counts as doping' reveal the formation of my central themes – bodily purity, fair play and performance enhancement – across my different textual sources.

My analysis of WADA is based on a collection of policy and educational documents produced primarily for consumption by elite level athletes. Policy documents are important to assess because they are the result of a conscious decision making process about how to construct phenomenon such as 'doping'. The central texts that were used for identifying constructions of anti-doping logic were *Play True*, *Spirit of Sport* and *The Playing Field*. These pamphlets summarized the core 'message' that sporting authorities wished to impress upon athletes. Anti-steroid education messages were collected from three campaigns: USADA's (United States Anti-Doping Agency) "Cheating Your Health;" CCES's (Canadian Center for Ethical Sport) "The Steroids and Body Image

Project;" and UNESCO's (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) "Doping" pamphlet. The decision to use these particular campaigns was based on their easy accessibility and target audience (elite level athletes and youth).

My media analysis of doping scandals used print articles from the *New York Times* (*NYT*) and *Sports Illustrated* (*SI*) as the basis for my findings. These two papers were chosen because they are the preeminent publications in American news and sports, respectively. I included analysis of newspaper articles in my project based on their direct impact in shaping the public discourse about steroids and doping in sport (Denham, 1997; 1999); and also the role they play in framing deviant cultural incidents through an ethnocentric lens (van Dijk, 1991; Jackson, 2004). I decided to compare the Barry Bonds and Mark McGwire steroid scandals from Major League Baseball (MLB). This allowed me to contrast two similar events to assess the relationship between social power and the deployment of anti-doping logic by reporters within a specific incident. As a baseball fan, my familiarity with the typical language usage in baseball reporting and knowledge of baseball history enabled me to make analytical connections that would not have been possible with other scandals (such as the Tour de France incident). Although my analysis only covers one sport, it provides insight into the way WADA's approach to doping is adopted and contested by reporters in a heavily mediated event. Articles were found using broad search terms (i.e. steroids and Barry Bonds) on the Lexis-Nexis database.

My interview participants were Canadian competitive athletes willing to discuss their experience in preparing for sport, enhancing their performance and negotiating anti-doping policy. I decided to include in-depth, semi-structured interviews in my project to understand, as Mason put it, how "people talk through specific experiences in their lives"

about sport and doping (2002: 64). My interviews lasted approximately one to one and a half hours long. They provided an exploratory basis to consider how athletes come to understand the relationship between their own training regimes and broader anti-doping policy. Thus, while the methods used in this study could not provide insight into the specific connection between WADA policy, MLB's steroid scandal and Canadian athletes, it did suggest the role particular sporting cultures played in framing ideas about doping and training to athletes. I defined 'competitive athlete' as someone playing a sport at a high level of competition and committed training routine. Potential participants were contacted through the snowball technique, which is ideal for finding 'deviant' populations to talk about sensitive issues.

Data Analysis

My data analysis and write-up were based on a critical discourse analysis of my three data sources. I am particularly interested in the overlapping and contrasting ways in which steroid use is depicted in policy documents, media articles and athletes constructions. My main themes of interest include the natural/artificial body, 'fair play', and 'war on drugs' discourses. Like Davis and Delano, I will make 'preferred readings' that focus on the way texts "consciously or unconsciously help to naturalize dominant ideological assumptions" (1992: 2). My use of particular quotes from my textual analysis will be done to *illustrate* key analytical points, rather than proclaim representativeness. This will enable me to outline central aspects of the steroid discourse through the discussion of micro constructions in texts (van Dijk, 1991). As Fairclough (1992) implores, texts, discourses, and contexts should be analyzed together in order to understand their social relevance. I am mostly concerned with identifying the key ideas

and linguistic phrases that operate on the 'steroid problem' in sport.

The prevailing assumption underlying my approach is that texts inevitably use "political assumptions, ideology, social values, cultural and racial stereotypes and assumptions as well as specific textual strategies" to navigate complex issues (Parisi, in Gardiner, 2003: 234). As van Dijk notes, this means that the use of language and writing style, such as hyperbole, understatement and negative characterization, significantly shape the way certain events and people are constructed (1991: 209-223). I also utilized van Dijk's notion that "precise structures" – such as headlines, thematic organization, selection of topics and use of irrelevant details – are used in texts to normalize broader power relationships and strongly held ideologies. The purpose of using multiple data sources was to assess the convergence and divergence of steroid discourses across a range of texts and contexts to flesh out their broad social meaning.

Navigating the Ethics Board and Ethical Issues

The prospect of interviewing elite level athletes about their illegal and socially deviant doping use presented a particularly difficult set of ethical issues to deal with. This process involved overcoming two quite divergent problems: first, gaining official ethical approval from the Ethics Board; and second, ensuring that my participant's confidentiality was maintained, *without exception*, throughout the project. Although there was certainly overlap between these processes, the clash of the 'rules based' approach of the Ethics Board and my 'ethics based' approach as a qualitative researcher diverged significantly. Thus our basic understandings of what ethical qualitative research should look like with 'deviant' participants came from a different set of values.

The SFU Ethics Board has primarily concerned itself with conforming to the 'law of the land' rather than ethical principles per se. This created a unique challenge for me to navigate because my project involved potentially interviewing people who were using prohibited drugs (steroids) illegally. According to this approach to ethics, participants are only protected to the *fullest extent of the law*, which is extremely problematic for participants breaking the law. In response, my ethical application stated:

> The ethical standpoint taken by this researcher is that participants who reveal information in confidence only do so because of that promise. In other words, if confidentiality was not promised, participants would not have revealed such sensitive information, and would not be in the precarious position of being damaged by the release of information by the researcher. Therefore, this researcher offers absolute confidentiality to every participant... breaking that promise afterward would be highly unethical. Breaking the researcher-participant relationship is tantamount to ending research with people who are involved with or talking about deviant or illegal activities.

This approach was grounded in a well established qualitative research tradition acknowledged by the *Tri-Council Policy Statement*, *Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association Statement of Professional Ethics* and Wigmore Criteria. Furthermore, each of my participants expressed the necessity of full confidentiality. Here is an example of one exchange in an interview.

> *Bryan*: Would you have done this study if I hadn't offered absolute confidentiality?
> *Participant*: No. Because of the sport that I do – the nature of the sport that I do – there are certain things that I would not want to be made public because it would jeopardize my work and my athletic career as well.

My primary concern was protecting participants, who placed themselves at risk for very little in return, in the name of social research. Although my project was ultimately accepted and approved, the Board expressly told me that they were not required to support me beyond the full extent of the law. I took that claim seriously because the

ethics board at SFU refused to support Russell Ogden in the past; they essentially supported the coroner's request, which asked Ogden to reveal names given in confidence (see Palys and Lowman, 2000). Thus, while I received ethical *approval* I did not receive ethical *support* for what many qualitative researchers, including myself, would consider basic ethics: protecting participants confidentiality to the *full extent of ethics*.

Another issue that came up during my application was the board's lack of familiarity with qualitative research. In my face-to-face meeting, several board members expressed concern that I would construct tables and graphs, outlining the number of steroid users in each sport at SFU. However, my application stated that I would interview 8-12 people and my interview script had no questions asking about steroid use by teammates. Since my project was concerned with 'constructions' and 'ways of talking' about steroid use, this particular point of contention was directly related to the composition of the board (i.e. no qualified qualitative researcher). This was particularly frustrating because it was one of the central reasons my project was delayed.

On a lighter note, my exchange with one board member connected to one of the most pervasive discourses about steroid use: 'death in the locker room'. He was concerned that I would not be knowledgeable enough about biochemical processes to 'out' an athlete on the verge of overdosing on a 'cocktail' of drugs. For me, this highlighted the widespread belief that steroids are extremely dangerous, and that athletes are literally pushing themselves to the brink of death to win. Ironically, my project was facing the very discourses it was attempting to disentangle before it could even start.

My ethics based approach to research promised all interviewees absolute confidentiality. I took responsibility for protecting this information, even if it conflicted

with the rule of law, because their conversations were only possible through this promise in the first place. This point was essential to the interviews success since the exposure of steroid use could ruin an athletic career, lead to legal trouble and cause a media scandal. Avoiding this not only involved using pseudonyms, but also considering what biographical factors and incidents could be used in the thesis. In the end, several factors relevant (but not essential) to my analysis were removed to ensure confidentiality. Informed consent was obtained through verbal consent to avoid a paper trail. I went over the form with each participant, reminded them that they could withdraw at any time and briefly went over the issues with them after the interview.

Chapter 2:

WADA Anti-Doping Policy and Education

Introduction

Anti-doping codes are political decisions about how to control athletes' bodies. The current thinking about doping in sport assumes that the prohibition of certain artificial substances through drug testing is the only way to ensure 'clean sport'. However, rather than using this as a starting point to research steroids, I wish to expose key historical moments and discursive shifts that have led to this narrow emphasis on eradicating individual dopers from sport. It is important to question anti-doping logic because sporting authorities base their policy decisions on this approach, which has increasingly forced athletes to submit to surveillance practices if they wish to compete. The ease with which athletes' bodies are considered acceptable for public consumption and inspection is troubling. To this end, I examine the discursive framework upholding 'common sense' approaches to doping by fleshing out assumptions about steroids, bodies and purity underlying anti-doping logic. This chapter adds to a burgeoning critical literature on the social consequences of doping wars (Davis and Delano, 1992; Cole, 1994; 2000; Lock, 2003; Park, 2005) by interrogating the preeminent international anti-doping organization, WADA.

In the first part of this chapter I examine the historical moment that led the international community to 'get tougher' on drugs in sport through the creation of WADA. After outlining the policy changes that accompanied this shift, I discuss why WADA's criteria for doping are ill-equipped to handle the reality of high performance training practices. The remainder of the chapter considers WADA's construction of anti-

doping logic through an analysis of their policy and educational manuals. I argue that the binary approach to doping, which contrasts 'clean' and 'doped' athletes, upholds the idea that 'pure sport' needs to be protected through testing.

The Drug Testing Shift

Prior to 1999 the IOC was responsible for in-competition drug testing for all major international events. This changed when a new international body (WADA) was proposed at the World Conference on Doping in Sport (Lausanne Conference) in February of 1999, and subsequently created later that year. WADA's main purpose is to create a 'doping free environment' in sport through harmonizing anti-doping programs across the globe to detect, deter and prevent doping (World Anti-Doping Code, 2003: 1). To achieve this initiative several new policies were adopted by WADA to better monitor athletes, which I term the drug testing shift. However, before I explain these new policies, a short historical sketch is drawn to contextualize the scandal that led to WADA's formation by focusing on "its point of arrival and its usefulness in what it can bring to the analysis of the present" (Henriques, in Rosenau, 1992: 67).

Despite banning steroids from the Olympics since 1976, the IOC has consistently failed to curb illegal drug use in sport over the past three decades. I would argue that WADA, and the policy shift it entails, formed because of a particular nexus of scandals plaguing the IOC. The moment that splashed rampant doping use across the front pages in 1998 was the Tour de France scandal. At the French border, just three days prior to the race, a Festina Team masseur was caught with a car load of doping substances by police. This urged further police inspection, leading to several mid-night raids of hotel rooms and the arrest of cyclists suspected of using drugs. The riders responded by protesting at

numerous stages through out the competition against such inspection, creating an international spectacle – and the sense the IOC had no control over its athletes. By the end, nearly half the riders had either withdrawn from the race or been arrested due to suspected drug use (Park, 2005). This highly dramatized incident of rampant cheating was revealed through the work of *police investigating drug smuggling*, not the IOC investigating doping in sport.

For observers knowledgeable about cycling over the past fifty years, this was not new information. Doping is a normalized practice in cycling that emerged in response to the hyper-commercialization of its sport. This led cyclists to use substances to improve endurance and oxygen capacity to tackle the steep, treacherous Alps mountain ranges in record times (Brewer, 2002). Perhaps an unqualified response of shock and dismay by the IOC would have swept the scandal away. But in the lead up to the Lausanne Conference established to 'respond' to it, then IOC President Samaranch took a bold step: he questioned the logic of doping policy by calling for a significant removal of substances from the banned list. This sent the IOC into a tailspin and – sensing blood in the water – the media quickly ridiculed his stance. The *New York Times* called Samaranch's commitment to anti-doping "suspect" and "a bizarre statement that shocked many of his colleagues" (Editorial Desk, 1998: 18). A *Sports Illustrated* article stated:

> They've thrown in the towel. How else to explain the curious ex cathedra pronouncement last week of [IOC] president Juan Antonio Samaranch, who said that the list of drugs banned from the Olympics ought to be "drastically" reduced to exclude performance-enhancing drugs that don't have dangerous side effects? "Doping is everything that, first, is harmful to an athlete's health and, second, artificially augments his performance," Sammy theorized in the Spanish daily El Mundo. "If it's just the second case, for me that's not doping." While the IOC is furiously backpedaling from that statement, the impression remains that Samaranch is ready… to "throw in the towel" in the drug war (Rushin et al.,

1998: 17).

This mentality set the tone for the Lausanne Conference in February 1999, which the IOC claimed was established to coordinate a global crackdown on doping. The appearance of being weak on doping in a time of crisis left the IOC with little option but 'getting tougher'. When the Salt Lake City bribery scandal broke in December of 1998, however, the credibility of the IOC to achieve that goal was fundamentally questioned. Members attending the Lausanne Conference attributed failed policy to systematic problems in the *organizational structure* of the IOC (Houlihan, 1999). Anti-doping logic – which at best was ineffective – was never questioned. What emerged was momentum for a universal and independent organization; there was also willingness to adopt more intrusive tactics to 'win the battle' (Park, 2005). The tools that national governments were using to combat the illicit trade of recreational drugs – which were successful in the Tour de France incident – have gained prominence as the best way to halt doping in sport.

The most significant policy departure from the former IOC approach has been WADA's emphasis on establishing itself as the central, international organization for anti-doping rules, education and testing. This shift from monitoring only IOC athletes to *all* athletes has occurred remarkably fast. The central document harmonizing anti-doping rules and prohibited list is the World Anti-Doping Code, which was established in 2003. IOC and Olympic athletes have had to comply with it since Athens 2004. The first step in bringing other athletes under the Code was the *Copenhagen Declaration on Anti-Doping in Sport* (2003). This was a political commitment by national governments to adopt the Code that has since been ratified by 187 nation states. The UNESCO *International Convention against Doping in Sports*, adopted in 2005, was ratified in February of 2007.

It compels national governments, anti-doping agencies, and professional sporting leagues to adopt WADA's policies and education ideals through international law. Although in practice the application of international law is uneven, WADA actively derides professional leagues in the media that are not coming into alignment. In conjunction with the current moral panic around steroid use in sport, professional leagues are feeling pressure to adopt drug testing. Thus, in the short period from 1999 to 2007, anti-doping policy appears to increasingly becoming universalized under the logic set by WADA.

WADA has also established several new policies indicative of a drug testing shift towards the global surveillance of athletes. Three policies in particular suggest this movement: (1) prioritizing no advance notice, out of competition drug testing; (2) creating 'registered testing pool' lists through the Anti-Doping Administration and Management System (ADAMS) that tracks athletes whereabouts location; and (3) allowing circumstantial (non-analytical) evidence, such as third party testimony, to prove doping violations in lieu of failed drug tests. The first policy, no advance notice testing, enables WADA officers to obtain body fluids from athletes 365 days of the year; athletes that refuse to provide fluids are sanctioned as having failed the test. The second policy, ADAMS tracking system, forces athletes to constantly update their physical location; failure to do so can result in a doping violation. Perhaps unlike any other profession in the world, competitive athletes are compelled to accept constant surveillance of their whereabouts without any previous evidence of guilt. This is roughly equivalent to house hold arrest, in that athletes locations are always known and their body chemistry can always be monitored for purity; they are under WADA's authority until they notify them in writing that they are retiring. The third policy shift, which allows circumstantial

evidence (rather than a positive test result), represents a significant change in the standard of proof required to demonstrate a doping violation. This expands the net of surveillance from chemical 'integrity' to questions about whom they associate with and what third party witnesses are willing to state on the record for reduced sanctions.[2] On top of constant whereabouts and testing capability, WADA can now secure sanctions against athletes based on 'suspect' circumstances that *suggest* they are doping. Once WADA establishes a positive drug test (or testimony) the onus is on the athlete to prove their innocence rather than doping officials to demonstrate the credibility of their tests.[3]

Furthermore, Park argues that WADA's educational programs are used to reinforce surveillance through shaping "athletic conduct by working through their desires, aspirations and beliefs" (2005: 179). WADA educates athletes through programs based on centralized information about the "dangers and consequences" of doping through what it terms a 'global clearing house' (WADA Strategic Plan: 2004-2009). WADA publications express a consistent message to high performance athletes about doping in an attempt to make them accept the necessity of their constant surveillance, even if they are 'clean'. This is primarily achieved by reinforcing positive ethical stances for 'clean' sport against extremely negative constructions of dopers, backed up by apparent health and gender threats of steroid use. As a result, athletes' beliefs and actions are guided by a 'surveillance culture' that produces "disciplined athletic bodies *aware of the gaze of WADA* [my emphasis]" (Park, 2005: 179). In this chapter, I focus on WADA

---

[2] WADA has established a program that encourages athletes to testify against other athletes for reduced penalties (see Code: 10.5.3). This has come under fire for producing unreliable, self-serving testimony. The recent statement by cyclist Floyd Landis that the USADA offered to give him the "shortest suspension they'd ever given an athlete" if he testified against Lance Armstrong raises serious red flags about the reliability of this policy (Pellis, 2007).

[3] The fact that many of WADA's drug tests have not been published in peer reviewed journal articles in the scientific community raises serious questions why they should be assumed to be accurate.

educational and policy manuals to illustrate how doping and drug testing is discursively framed as the only acceptable approach to doping.

What Counts as Doping?

The idea of eradicating drugs from sport presupposes one very important question: what counts as doping? This section explains WADA's criteria for doping, and then provides a critique of the logic used to maintain clear distinctions between legal and illegal drugs.

WADA is authorized to add substances and methods to the Prohibited List if they meet *two* of the following three criteria:

1. use has the potential to enhance or enhances sport performance
2. use represents an actual or potential health risk to the athlete
3. use violates the spirit of sport

In practice, these criteria are unable to clearly establish *why* some sporting technologies are considered 'doping' and others are not (Magdalinski, 2000; Butryn, 2003; Miah, 2006). For instance, altitude tents are legal but they improve oxygen capacity (enhancing performance) and are not equally available to all athletes (violating the spirit of sport); on the other hand, marijuana is a banned substance but it does not improve athletic performance. This uneven application is particularly salient when one considers the wide range of acceptable technological changes in sport that have occurred without any consideration of engaging anti-doping criteria (see Miah, 2006 for an extended discussion). The impossibility of a prohibited list defining 'clean' and 'dirty' substances stems from a larger issue: the drug ban in sport is primarily a *values* based decision that hides behind the rhetoric of fairness, pure bodies, health and scientific objectivity.

However, one might argue that my engagement with WADA's doping criteria ignores the fact that sport – by its very nature – depends on creating rules of play. For instance, it is hard to imagine baseball without a strike zone, soccer without an offside rule, and basketball without dribbling violations. As an organizational body overseeing policy, WADA's anti-doping code could be seen as a vital component of the rules of competitive sport. At its heart this implies that the fair play created by drug testing is integral to what it means to play sport – in the same way that prohibiting a double dribble makes basketball what it is. But, as this thesis demonstrates, the logic behind the drug ban – protecting health and fair play – actually perpetuates several social problems and obscures the training practices of athletes. From this position drug testing and anti-doping codes hardly seem 'necessary' to sport.

Performance enhancement and risk to health are questionable markers of 'doping' because they are fully normalized in 'clean' sporting culture. The very point of high performance sport – encapsulated in the Olympic motto 'faster, higher, stronger' – is to perpetually improve. A whole host of 'clean' sporting technologies used to change the body – such as nutrition, supplements, psychological preparation, weight training and cardiovascular work – clearly enhance performance but they are not outlawed (Butryn, 2003; Miah, 2006). This raises questions about why some methods are banned and others are not. For instance, the former medical chief of the US Olympic Committee (Robert Voy) documented the extensive daily use of "legal drugs" by a national track star:

> vitamin E, 160mg; B-complex capsules, four times per day; vitamin C, 2000 mg; vitamin B6, 150 mg; calcium tablets, four times per day; magnesium tablets, twice a day; zinc tablets, three times a day; royal jelly capsules; garlic tablets; cayenne tablets; eight aminos; Gamma-Oryzanol; Mega Vit Pack; super-charge herbs; Dibencozide; glandular tissue complex; natural steroid complex; Inosine; Orchid testicle extract; Pyridium; Ampicillin; and hair rejuvenation formula with

Biotin (Waddington, 2001: 2).

The idea that legal supplements are somehow any less 'performance enhancing' seems to simply ignore the extensive technological invasions that occur in sport on a daily basis.

The 'sport ethic' athletes adhere to prioritizes maximizing short-term performance ability over long-term health outcomes. Consequently, playing through serious injury and pain is a routine part of athletic participation (Nixon, 1996). Medical practitioners play a willing role in this practice (Waddington, 2001). Despite the full integration of sports physicians into high performance sport, playing through pain at the expense of serious long term injury is normalized by physicians. Malcolm notes that this mentality results from structural and cultural pressures to ignore health:

> [athletes that] complain about pain and injuries risk negative sanctions that include being ignored by teammates and coaches, being ridiculed or otherwise stigmatized, and being dropped from the team (2006: 497).

The singular focus on certain illegal doping substances as dangerous ignores the range of accepted practices in sport that are detrimental to health. Since doping is *part* of the short-term oriented nature of sport, it is unclear exactly how 'health risk' – as a criterion for doping – is a useful marker.

As a result, WADA chiefly relies on the deeply forged connection between sport, morality and purity to promote the credibility of anti-doping logic. This places primacy on the ethics of playing clean: the 'spirit of sport'. The Code outlines that the "spirit of sport is the celebration of the human spirit, body and mind" and that "doping is fundamentally contrary to the spirit of sport" (Fundamental Rationale). But as a policy criterion, it is nothing more than a 'gut feeling' concept about the "universal sprit of sport practiced naturally within the rules and free from artificial enhancements" (www.wada-

ama.org). The ontology of the criteria is that 'objective scientific knowledge' will be able to identify when the imaginary 'level playing field' is threatened by certain drugs. This is based on the idea that illegal performance enhancing drugs *corrupt* the 'pure' sporting body, thereby ruining 'clean' competition (Butryn, 2003). However, Donna Haraway (1991) convincingly argues that – against the backdrop of human-technological integration – the clear distinction between bodies and technologies has been erased. This is particularly the case in high performance sport, which has been at the cutting edge of many technological innovations (Miah, 2006). Butryn notes that competitive athletes are

> always already cyborgified competitors, whose supposedly untainted identities and corporealities have been irreversibly 'polluted' through various degrees and methods of technologization (2003: 18).

WADA's ineffable 'spirit of sport' is thus unable to determine doping substances because vague moral values are not compatible with dichotomous (legal or illegal) categorization. My point of engaging with WADA's anti-doping criteria is to illustrate that 'doping' is fundamentally a social and moral definition. Konig (1995) laments this so-called ethics based approach to doping because it "actually prevents what it pretends to intend" (256) by ignoring a wide range of other problems.

> Who takes care of the army of nameless ones, who ruined their bodies for the rest of their lives by using "normal" technology aids in sports? It seems to me that ethical philosophy on sport is not able to dedicate the appropriate amount of reflections to these phenomena as it tends to marginalize these daily catastrophes as merely ephemeral ones (ibid: 250).

Using Fausto-Sterling's (2000) critique of binary bodies, I apply DST to conceptualize sporting technologies, athletic bodies and doping polices. My main purpose is questioning the 'clean' and 'doped' athlete underlying WADA's approach. I argue three interlocking steroid discourses legitimize current anti-doping policy: (1) the

construction of the 'natural' athlete as using "virtuous perfections" to improve performance with purity; (2) the widespread archetype of the (communist) steroid-infused athlete as ugly, immoral and 'abnormally' gendered from Cold War sport propaganda; and (3) the emergence of teenagers at threat from drug peddling steroid pushers to support a 'war on drugs' logic that reduces the policy options to 'tough' and 'tougher'.

The Clean Athlete: Purity With "Virtuous Perfection"

The original purpose of the modern Olympics comes from Pierre de Coubertin's philosophy of athletics. Sport was seen as a 'civilizing' educational force that would produce moral integrity for upper-class men in their professional careers after athletics (Beamish and Ritchie, 2004). This was based on the idea that values – such as friendship and honour – could be protected in amateur sport from more 'crass' forms of sport for pay. However, rather than seeing the early Olympic movement as an 'amateur' activity, Gruneau (2006) argues the "promoters of amateurism in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries spun a web of historical illusions" (578). In this sense, the discourse of amateurism persists in the popular conception of sport in the past as 'friendly contests' against developments that continue to further entrench corporatization and professionalization.

Despite this disconnect between philosophy and practice, WADA supports its anti-doping policies through the imagery of the 'amateur' athlete. A systematic reading of their documents reveals no indication that they even acknowledge the context of high performance sport. For example, in WADA's *Play True*[4] pamphlet, Adolf Ogi states:

> The power of sport can only be efficient if the image of sport remains clean and respectable. Sports are practiced to improve health, to enjoy an active life and not

[4] All WADA documents, including *Play True*, can be found on their website: <www.wada-ama.org>.

> to deteriorate it. Sport provides the ground for friendly contests not for cheating, nor for promoting the use of drugs (Issue 1, 2003: 4).

The key concern appears to be rhetorical: the "image" of sport must remain clean. This construction of athletics is common in the educational and policy manuals because it situates doping as antithetical to amateur athletics. Sport is described as clean, respectable, healthy, and friendly without doping. The USADA[5] publication – "Joy of Sport" – suggests that high performance athletics is primarily about moral integrity.

> Sometimes athletes forget why they started playing sport in the first place. Instead of playing for fun or because they love their sport, they play only for fame and fortune that comes with winning. If athletes use a narrow win-at-all-costs perspective, they are more likely to take shortcuts to get an unfair advantage of their competition (2006: 3).

Sporting authorities ignore the cultural obsession with winning because it undermines their location of the doping problem in sport as an issue of dysfunctional morality. WADA further downplays the relationship between the socio-cultural environment of sport and doping use by continuing to refer to what sport is supposed to be about in the 'first place'. But is high performance sport really about character development? And is doping actually antithetical to sports science as practiced?

The connection between moral integrity and avoiding (banned but not legal) performance enhancers centers on protecting the biologically pure body from outside influence. However, because an extensive range of technologies are used legally by athletes to enhance their performance, WADA must establish doping substances as a substantially different *moral* category of drugs. In "The Athlete's Challenge: Drugs, Sport and Ethics," Chair of the Ethics Panel, Thomas Murray, states:

---

[5] All USADA documents can be found on their website: < www.usantidoping.org>.

> Natural talents should be respected for what they are: the occasionally awesome luck of the biological draw. Courage, fortitude, competitive savvy and other virtues rightfully command our moral admiration. The other factors – equipment, coaching, nutrition – contribute to an athlete's success but don't evoke the same awe... what we care about most, what gives that achievement its meaning and value, is that ineffable combination of remarkable natural talents and extraordinary dedication. Performance-enhancing drugs disguise natural abilities and substitute for the dedication and focus that we admire. Performance-enhancing drugs cheapen sport, making winners out of also-rans, and depriving virtuous and superior athletes of the victories that should be theirs (*Play True*, Issue 3, 2004: 7).

In an implicit homage to popular racial typologies, the backdrop to this article – which centers on preserving the "luck of the biological draw" – pictures an African long-distance runner across the page. This racial framing of 'natural' through not-so-subtle links to black 'genetic athletic superiority' suggests that illegal drugs enable "also-rans" to unfairly match them. Murray's central argument is that *certain* substances – i.e. whatever is on the prohibited list that year – work as 'magic bullets' that propel second-rate athletes ahead of their biological superiors. Despite reference to "other factors," one is left with the clear impression that superior athletes are biologically pure; equipment, nutrition and coaching "contribute," but – unlike steroids – they do not "disguise natural abilities." However, these 'other factors' enhance ability, and they are clearly not distributed evenly to all athletes. Is that fair? By focusing on doping substances as the *only* enhancers this hides the more nuanced interaction athletes have with technology; this is done by WADA out of policy necessity. The logic of drug testing for purity depends on the idea that 'natural' (legal) and 'artificial' (illegal) substances actually exist.

In response to growing criticisms of its doping criteria, WADA has recently attempted to clear up the meaning of 'natural' performance enhancement (such as nutrition). For the first time, WADA's Ethical Issues Review Panel produced a publicly

available report on their decision whether altitude tents should be prohibited. The report states: "for any particular means for enhancing performance . . . the crucial test will be whether it supports or detracts from sport as the extension of natural talents and their virtuous perfection" (Miah, 2006: 312). According to WADA, the distinction between doping and natural substances comes down to "virtuous perfection" of the body. As a test, this is no more helpful than 'spirit of sport'. However, it does highlight the power of the *language of purity* that WADA has connected with *anything* it prohibits. This leaves the terminology overly vague – to the point where virtually any method could be considered illegal – but the important part appears to be its rhetorical strength in connecting purity and nature in support for anti-doping policy.

Steroid Infused: Cold War Sport and Suspect Dopers

The emergence of steroid use in athletics was accelerated by the conditions of Cold War politics and sport performance science. During this period, beginning roughly in the 1950s, athletic training regimes became highly rationalized; and sport development systems (especially in America and Russia) aimed at identifying and training elite level talent were founded (Beamish and Ritchie, 2005b). This created a context in which performance enhancement of the body was placed more fully within the logic of the scientific method to improve sporting capabilities.

By grounding the narrative of steroid use within this socio-historical moment, as opposed to the de-contextualized paranoia surrounding the drug today, I illustrate the production of images that have locked steroids as evil into the public imagination. This section charts the creation of the 'steroid infused' athlete from its initial imagery – namely the 'suspect' female communist athlete – to WADA's construction of the

"dangers and consequences" of steroid use in current anti-doping literature. I use this as a launching point to contrast the key discursive binary upholding anti-doping logic: the 'natural' and 'doped' athlete.

The Cold War formed the ultimate breeding ground for full fledged nationalist battles at the Olympic Games. International sport replicated the raging propaganda wars, and emerged as a prime site to flex power through athletic prowess. The consequence, in terms of sporting performance, has been the further entrenchment of technologies/bodies, which in certain sporting contexts includes the use of steroids. While athletes of course used technologies to advance their ability prior to this period, training mostly remained focused on improving 'natural capacities' rather than "systematically increase[ing] physical power, speed, endurance, and agility through specific, targeted programs" (Beamish and Ritchie, 2005b: 415-416).[6] Thus what emerged from Cold War sport represents a changing context – fully rationalized, high performance training – in which steroid use and athletic bodies should be understood.

However, coupled with this work by sports scientists to improve performance capacities was a paradoxical discussion about the devolution of 'moral integrity' in the Olympics. Especially following the death of cyclists Kurt Jensen (1960) and Tom Simpson (1967) – each linked to amphetamine use (Yesalis and Bahrke, 2005) – the problem of integrity became focused on drugs in sport. In particular, the IOC's Medical

[6] While Yesalis and Bahrke (2005: 434) note that the "use of drugs to enhance performance has been a feature of athletic competition since ancient times," the use of highly rationalized science and sports development systems to achieve those ends has not. Standard medical information about the body prior to the Cold war was "consistent with the conservation of energy, athletes used substances that maximized output on a given day rather than those that would build and expand performance capacity over time" (Beamish and Ritchie, 2005b: 423); they further note that "after the 1960s, however, systematic programs were developed, and success in cycling, as in other high-performance sports, required highly organized, scientifically based, large and well-funded programs of development" (ibid: 428-429).

Commission was concerned with the health risks associated with certain substances that were being used by athletes; and in response, they created a prohibited list and drug testing procedures to eliminate them from sport. This helped forge the now common connection between 'winning at all costs', illegal drug use and dangerous health consequences. The IOC emerged from the 1970s convinced that the way to save Coubertin's *idea* of amateur sport was an extensive drug testing policy to protect the health and purity of the 'natural athlete'.

So the theatrical stage of the Olympics involved playing this game: do whatever it takes to win behind the scenes but question the integrity of enemy athletes in public. The reality is that both eastern and western bloc nations were involved in steroid use, while simultaneously accusing each other of ruining the integrity of sport. It is worth noting that these nations were involved in a war centrally fought through ideas; and the chance to gain key propaganda points through the world's largest televised cultural event was not missed. As a consequence, the physical appearance and biochemical makeup of athletes were constantly inspected for 'impurity' by reporters and medical professionals.

The sex test was introduced in the 1968 Olympics (remaining IOC policy until 1999) because of the fear that biologically impure women would take unfair advantage of their 'overgrown masculinity' to win records. Drug testing for steroids was introduced in the 1976 Olympics to ensure that only 'clean' athletes were competing. These tests each emerged as key sites in the struggle to strictly contain the boundary line surrounding bodies threatened by rationalized sport science. It is within this context that the archetype of the 'cold and calculated' communist athlete was produced (Cole, 2000; Ritchie, 2003). The drug and sex tests propelled the *body* of the athlete onto the world stage for public

consumption under the particular paradoxes of high performance sport. The legacy of this paradox – that the training routines of athletes involve engagement with technology but its value system remains obsessed with maintaining the pre-technological body – continues today with unquestioning support for drug testing to 'clean up' competition.

In western nations, concern about steroid use in sport started with reports that communist athletes were using them. Sport historians Beamish and Ritchie argue that links between Nazi brutality in World War Two and fears that Communist regimes would use similar tactics on their athletes to win medals were drawn through reference to steroid use (2005a: 783-785). This connection initially came from an undocumented claim made by Wade in an article published in *Science*, which continues to be extensively cited in scientific reports and media stories today.[7]

> The first use of male steroids to improve performance is said to have been in World War Two when German troops took them before battle to enhance aggressiveness... The first use in athletics seems to have been by the Russians in 1954 (1972: 1400).

The location of the first non-medical use of steroids with Nazi atrocities, and then in sport with the 'machine-like' Soviet athletes, provides a demonizing context that steroid use has yet to escape. By implication steroid use was aligned with the dark side of technology because it was birthed by nefarious sources; this initial casting of it has helped to entrench the drug as the most dangerous and artificial doping substance. Within the context of Cold War propaganda, steroid use became a powerful ideological tool to perpetually question the bodily integrity of 'suspect' athletes. As Beamish and Ritchie point out, "rumours quickly spread that [communist] success rested heavily on the cold and calculated use of male hormones" (2005a: 784). Thus anxieties surrounding steroids

[7] See Beamish and Ritchie (2005a: 783-785) for recent examples of Wade's claim in scientific, media and internet sources.

emerged from a set of discourses that connected its use to the immorality of scientific rationalization; and also the context of high performance sport, which encouraged the western media to malign eastern bloc success *through* speculation of use.

Concern about steroid use also spread because of the apparent gender effects testosterone could have on female athletes. Although early knowledge about the importance of the hormone to human biology varied, the (male) scientists researching it were particularly fascinated with its effects on the male sex organs (Fausto-Sterling, 2000: 170-232). This created a lasting link between testosterone and masculinity that crystallized with the decision in the mid-1930s to term it a "male sex hormone" in the scientific literature. Consequently, this centered its role in male sexuality above the other hormonal functions testosterone performs for women and men in the brain, heart, liver, kidney, bones and blood (ibid). Public knowledge about testosterone continues to focus on male virility, and this significantly alters how steroid use by women is perceived. As female communist athletes gained success, particularly after the stunning success of the East German swim team in the 1976 Montreal Olympics,[8] media reports strongly implied that steroid use was the culprit for their 'manly' appearance and performance.

Their appearance seemed to provide visual confirmation of two intersecting suspicions: that Communist success came from steroid use and that testosterone use produced ugly gender effects in women (Cole, 2000; Ritchie, 2003). Initial news stories and scientific reports strongly implied that their 'abnormal' appearance stemmed from steroid use. For example, turning back to Wade's influential article, one can see the conscious effort to make this link.

[8] Prior to 1976, American women dominated the sport (see: www.olympic.org.). In 1968 they won 11 of 14 Gold medals; and in 1972 they won 8 of 14 Gold medals. However, in 1976 the East German women shocked the swimming community, taking Gold medals in 11 of 13 events.

> The Russians were also using it on some of their women athletes, Ziegler [US team physician] said. Besides its growth-promoting effect, testosterone induces male sexual development such as deepening of the voice and hirsuteness [excessive body and facial hair], which might account for the manifestation of such traits in Soviet women athletes during the 1950s (1972: 1400).

The problem for many reporters in the west was that these women failed to conform to normative femininity for an audience deeply familiar with a strict heterosexual script of the 'girl next door' (Plymire, 1999). Steroid use became a compelling explanation for this deviation from nature, especially when their performance was compared to the men's medal count. Unlike American Olympic teams, the majority of eastern bloc athletic success rested on their female athletes. In the west, with entrenched connections between sport and masculinity (Messner, 1992; 2002; Pronger, 1992), this gender inversion served as evidence *in and of itself* that something unnatural was occurring.[9] However, as Plymire (1999) points out, eastern bloc nations focused heavily on high performance training for their female athletes because it was as an effective way to pick up medals. The western media ignored this particular point – that they were training the women like the men – and instead focused on their appearance.

This linking of steroid use and masculinity in female athletes informs anti-doping policy because it is seen as threatening to the gender orthodoxy (Davis and Delano, 1992; Burke and Roberts, 1997; Lock, 2003). Davis and Delano conducted a qualitative analysis of 40 anti-doping media campaigns, and argued that they were

> problematic because they encourage readers to assume that bodies naturally fit into unambiguous bipolar categories of gender, and that steroids are artificial substances that disrupt this natural gender dichotomization (1992: 1).

[9] For example, the success of female Chinese athletes in the early 1990s – and relative lack of Chinese male success – has been taken as evidence that they are using steroids to distort the 'natural order' of male dominance (Riordan and Jinxia, 1996).

Anti-steroid campaigns in particular emphasized the threat steroids posed to proper gender: namely that they can masculinize women and feminize men. One of the poster campaigns used by Davis and Delano to demonstrate this point pictures a women with a large genital bulge, accompanied by the phrase "steroids: they'll make a man out of you yet." Another educational poster shows naked breasts with the statement: "the obscene thing is, this is a man." Uncharacteristic gender qualities were consistently attributed to steroid use under the assumption of a strict gender binary. In this sense, anti-doping rhetoric is premised on the idea that steroids *interrupt* innate biological gender differences, and this is seen as highly problematic. This is similar to the logic of sex tests, which rely on a construction of being human that is concerned with maintaining clear boundary lines around natural men and women for 'fair play'.

Anxiety about maintaining the integrity of biological gender emerged as a powerful discourse about steroid use within WADA educational documents. For example, in an interview with *Play True*, former American Olympic swimmer (and current WADA Athlete Committee member) Janet Evans was asked to comment on the difficulties of competing clean.

> *Play True Interviewer*: In your competitive career, you must have seen a lot of doping (or heard whispers of it). How did you handle that as an athlete?
> *Janet Evans*: My first Olympics was in 1988 in Seoul, when the East German women swimmers were dominating my sport. As a 17 year old who weighed 100 pounds, their size was daunting, to say the least! And of course, there were people from the swimming community who wanted to remind me of how tough it would be to beat them (Issue 2, 2005: 14).

Through reference to her (properly American) size – "as a 17 year old who weighed 100 pounds" – Evans establishes her femininity in contrast to "their size" – the burly East German women with the "daunting" appearance. This linking of steroid use with their

domination of the sport *through* their 'big' stature is implied to the reader, especially considering that Evans is being asked to recall incidents of doping. Although this particular recollection is seventeen years old, the narrative of muscular, steroid using communist women remains powerfully evocative today. As Cole (2000) points out, even in the post-Cold War context, the "gender deviant" communist athlete continues to play the imagined other to the sexy and slim American athlete. It is noteworthy that Evans establishes 'clean' women through their look – feminine women are natural (and thus clean of steroids) while masculine women are artificial drug cheats. Cindy Patton terms this "looking as policing," and argues it plays a central role in

> separating our women from their women, our natural and all-American femininity from their half-men-women gender aliens unnaturally produced through communism and hormones (2001: 131).

This also connects to the idea that bodies are split into two biological types according to gender: on the one hand, muscular and large masculine bodies, and on the other, petite and slim feminine bodies. The reader is left with the real fear surrounding female use of 'male sex hormones': do women have to look like *that* to win?

Gender policing in anti-doping educational material often situates itself within other intersecting discourses about the health effects of doping. WADA and USADA's educational mission is to "inform both elite athletes and those participating in sport at a young age of the dangers and consequences of using prohibited substances."[10] But what are the "dangers and consequences"? And what discursive frameworks do they rely on? Although I emphasize analysis on how naturally gendered bodies are scripted in these

[10] This quote is from the USADA educational mandate: www.usoc.org/12696.htm. WADA has made similar statements about targeting youth and elite level athletes (e.g. *Play True*, Issue 1, 2007:11). It uses "dangers and consequences of doping" as their core educational message (see WADA 2004-2009 Strategic Plan: 6).

campaigns, three other health discourses have also been prominent: 'roid rage', 'reverse anorexia nervosa', and death (Keane, 2005; Beamish and Ritchie, 2005b).[11] The USADA anti-steroid campaign "Cheating Your Health" is a particularly compelling example of how these various health consequences are used together to dissuade potential users. It targets elite athletes through the dissemination of physical, psychological and gendered health risks. In the 'psychological changes' section it states steroids are associated with:

> Increased aggression and in some cases 'roid rage'. Psychological and physical dependence, similar to the properties associated with addictive drugs... Anabolic steroid withdrawal can be associated with depression, and in some cases, suicide. There is a disease, muscle dysmorphia (also commonly known as 'reverse anorexia nervosa'), that drives young people to be obsessed with body appearance and composition (October-December, 2006: 6).

Keane (2005) argues that these descriptions of steroid use depend on discourses about recreational drugs and the 'crisis of masculinity'. Although aggression, dependency and withdrawal (leading to suicide) fit awkwardly with the actual biochemical properties of steroids, when categorized as a drug they appear very dangerous. Keane states:

> The consequences of the construction of steroid users as drug abusers, and steroids as dangerous, intoxicating and addictive drugs is the production of a threat to public health which justifies increased control... the construction of individual steroid users as addicts brings them into a well-established discourse of disease and recovery, in which the restoration of health demands submission to psychological and medical expertise (ibid: 197).

This construction implies that normal, law abiding users can be chemically altered into dangerous flashes of rage and depression through steroid use. The concern with 'reverse anorexia nervosa' uses the language of body image issues familiar to women. It claims that men now face the same problem: they want to be large and muscular, like women want to be thin and feminine. Steroid use is seen as a culturally dysfunctional response

[11] Because of space restrictions only limited consideration can be given to these other three health discourses.

from men – recast as victims in the 'crisis of masculinity' – who have been traumatized though cultural 'feminization' (Keane, 2005). These users desperately wish to regain their right to masculine appearance through an illegitimate and dangerous means.

This is a common theme that other anti-steroid campaigns have focused on as well. The Canadian Centre for Ethics in Sport (CCES) has produced a series of educational tools to tackle the male body image problem.[12] One pamphlet is called: "Body Image: Why are so many young men turning to steroids to change their bodies?" It challenges young men to avoid being seduced by "the look" because of the dangerous health consequences. While steroid use in women produces unattractive 'manly' appearances, for men it is a seductive gendered body dysfunction that is a dangerous way to achieve a properly muscular form. The pamphlet suggests that, while it is acceptable for most men to want "bigger muscles," this should be achieved through natural means: it notes that "weight training, working out, and wanting to build a healthy, strong body are good things." Unwilling to question the "healthy, strong body" complex for men, the campaign suggests that 'natural' techniques are safe and the only 'real' way to achieve masculine bodies in the long-term. It counters the perception that steroids increase size by linking it to its addictive properties that only produce 'fake' results. This point is highlighted in the "Using Steroids?" pamphlet:

> You know what happens when you end your cycle – you lose mass and gain fat, you feel weak and tired, you get depressed, maybe you get injured – and you can't wait to get back on the juice to keep your gains. So even if you're not addicted to the drugs, you're hooked on the look.

This suggests a gendered *reversal* of intended steroid effects, which might actually feminize the body – "you lose mass" and "you feel weak" – once a user ends their cycle.

[12] The CCES administers Canada's Anti-Doping Program. The pamphlets and posters used for this analysis are not available online. They can be requested through the CCES website: <www.cces.ca>.

Hence the accompanying anti-steroid poster, which pictures a muscular man with a 'weak' body in his shadow proclaiming "Steroids Make You Smaller." The statement implies that the muscularity gained through steroids is categorically different than that achieved through legal means. It appears the only way to keep 'steroid muscle' is to become addicted and risk serious long term risk. This suggests the overriding assumption of normative masculinity and femininity as a framework through which 'unnatural' steroid use is deployed.

While the 'body image problem' focuses on dysfunctional male appearance primarily through steroid use, the "Cheating Your Health" campaign continues with several other medical threats to the feminization of the body.

> The testes generally shrink and sperm production is diminished. In some individuals, total lack of sperm results in infertility, which is permanent in some cases. Some anabolic steroids are converted into estrogens in the body, which can result in the permanent development of breast tissue in men (ibid: 5).

This section is careful to point out that "testes generally shrink" and "breast tissue in men" develops from steroid use. This centers panic about feminine appearance that is clearly intended to be threatening to the male jock. Similar to the findings by Davis and Delano (1992), WADA anti-doping information continues to reinforce the gender binary through discourses about proper gender. Male breasts are presented as an indication of femininity from steroids that assume normal men do not appear that way; this reinforces the pervasiveness of the two-sex system, which is seen as corrupted by doping.

In a similar vein, the section covering 'physical changes in women' directs attention to what it terms the "embarrassing" gender effects of steroid use.

> *Since anabolic steroids are responsible for the appearance associated with maleness, steroid use in females can result in embarrassing physical changes* that can be irreversible, including: lowering of the voice; cessation of breast

> development; growth of hair on the stomach and upper back; baldness at the temples and crown of the head; growth of the clitoris; serious disruption or cessation of the menstrual cycle [my emphasis] (ibid: 6).

It is notably that perhaps the most serious health effect for women – cessation of the menstrual cycle – is placed *after* 'abnormal' voice, breast, hair and clitoris development. This suggests – as it states in the preface – that the overriding problem with steroids concerns the embarrassing "*appearance associated with maleness*." These descriptions rely on the idea that normal women all have a strictly feminine body. As fears about steroid use expand, masculine traits in women move from simply being undesirable to *signs of steroid use*. For example, small breasts in women are contrasted with large breasts in men as gendered side-effects of steroid use, but this sidesteps the (unacknowledged) overlap that exists. This indicates that the construction of 'natural' genders in anti-steroid campaigns depends on reinforcing the idea of two distinct sexes (Davis and Delano, 1992; Lock, 2003). Since policing through looking is encouraged in sport, this perpetually casts doubt on the authenticity of athletes not fitting their assigned masculine/feminine gender norms.

This appears to stem from long standing anxieties about women in sport. The emergence of successful female athletes in the 20th Century has been coupled with fears that they will become 'too manly'. Krane et al. term this 'living the paradox' – female athletes live in the masculine world of sport but their bodies are supposed to remain feminine – so that "ideally, sportswomen have toned bodies, yet they also must avoid excessive, masculine-perceived, muscular bodies" (2004: 317). WADA uses this imagery to pursue its vision of clean sport through the idea that steroid use can be identified by looking. When one considers that WADA's steroid test assesses endogenous testosterone

(produced naturally in the body) for "deviat[ions] from the range of values *normally* found in humans" (Prohibited List, 2007: 3), drug testing can also be seen as a more legitimate (and overlapping) form of sex testing. The history of the sex test demonstrates that testing hormone levels for 'naturalness' (estrogen versus testosterone) is highly problematic because the "classification does not allow for alternative conceptions of the sex-gender system, nor does it account for human bodies that do not conform to these expectations" (Wackwitz, 2003: 554).

The "Cheating Your Health" program has also produced several anti-steroid posters directed at youth in general. The College World Series (Baseball) poster states: "with steroids, getting up to the plate is the least of your worries." By implying off the field problems with 'getting up', the (clearly male) reader is supposed to feel concern about their next sexual conquest.[13] Although health concerns about sexual functioning and sperm production are legitimate, the threat appears to be one directed more at *jock status* (especially since it is directed at male collegiate athletes) than long-term health. From this vantage point, steroid use can be seen as a threat to hegemonic masculinity in sport (Messner, 1992; 2002; Pronger, 1992). On the right side of the advertisement in a small box, these themes are further reinforced:

> And if that's not bad enough, steroids can cause severe acne, growth of male breasts and female body hair, heart and liver disease and certain cancers. They can even cause violent mood swings and can shorten your time at the plate... permanently.

These concerns pick up with threats to proper masculinity, through reference to 'embarrassing' feminine appearance – male breasts and female body hair – and then

[13] It is ironic that doping abstinence relies on threats to sexual conquest, given the prominence of abstinence based sex education in America. This further reinforces the idea that jocks in particular are expected to seek out sex with young women, especially since sexual health is 'supposed' to come from not having sex.

overlap with other health issues. The recurring references to 'roid rage' and death indicate the importance of creating intersecting threats that invoke sexual, gender and health problems simultaneously.

Although WADA produces educational guides to spread information about the whole Prohibited List, the reality is that steroids remain the central focus in publications about health. This is partly related to anxieties stemming from a Cold War past, but I think it also has something to do with the research literature. The fact is no substantiated *gender effects* have been found with other doping substances. As a result, WADA tends to use the terms steroids and doping interchangeably for rhetorical purposes, despite the unwieldy number of substances "doping" refers to. For example, the UNESCO anti-doping leaflet begins with this definition of doping:

> 'Doping' refers to an athlete's use of prohibited drugs or methods to improve training and sporting results. Steroids are the drugs that often come to mind when we talk about doping, but doping also includes an athlete's use of other forbidden drugs (such as stimulants, hormones, diuretics, narcotics and marijuana), use of forbidden methods (such as blood transfusions or gene doping), and even the refusal to take a drug test... (2).[14]

The initial impression is that the manual covers the health risks of all banned drugs. However, as it moves on to the "bad side effects" of 'doping', this inclusive definition is quickly abandoned. The featured health information is about steroids.

> *Some drugs* can lead to obvious changes in appearance. For example, *steroid use* can cause acne, particularly on the back. In boys it can shrink testicles, cause impotence and baldness, and girls can develop a deeper voice and facial hair. There can be even more serious side effects. *Doping* can cause heart, liver and kidney problems and has even killed some athletes [my emphasis] (UNESCO, page 4).

Starting with "some drugs" to preface the discussion, then moving into the specific health

[14] Access to the pamphlet can be found on the UNESCO website: www.unesco.org.

risks of "steroid use," and closing the paragraph with reference to "doping" structurally blurs the gender threats of steroid use with *all doping* substances. This serves the agenda of anti-doping crusaders because it enables them to repeatedly imply throughout the publication that doping carries extreme risks to sexual functioning, proper appearance and death. The USADA "Cheating Your Health" campaign also uses a similar 'slippage'. On their website the link to the campaign is titled "performance enhancing drugs – health risks and resources." However, the program deals *exclusively* with steroids. I would argue that 'doping' information centers on steroid use, and not other substances, because of the popular mythologies surrounding its troubling gender and psychological effects.

The connection between 'impure' body outcomes with steroid use appears to stem from a series of interlocking discourses that have formed against the backdrop of high performance sport: (1) the early categorization of testosterone as a 'male sex hormone'; (2) images of steroid-infused eastern block female athletes as unnaturally 'muscular'; and (3) research findings connecting steroid use with appearances of masculinization in women and feminization in men. The key thread that connects each construction of steroid use is the subversion of the biologically pure body. The dichotomization between the 'clean' and 'doped' athlete is summarized below.

'Clean Athlete'	**'Doped Athlete'**
Is Natural	Is Artificial
Has a biologically pure body	Has a corrupted biological body
Uses legal substances	Uses illegal substances
Has elite abilities primarily from genetics	Has elite abilities primarily from drugs
Works hard to improve using 'virtuous perfection' with legal supplements	Uses doping as a 'magic bullet' to move from being an 'also-ran' to elite talent
Is very healthy; appears normally gendered and sexually virile	Faces dangerous health risks; threatened gender and sexuality
Plays with integrity win or lose	Cheats to win; makes unethical decisions
Plays sport primarily for enjoyment	Plays sport to win at any cost

As I illustrate in the next section, covering the adoption of a 'war on drugs' logic in anti-doping rhetoric, the steroid infused athlete is contrasted with the clean athlete to support ever increasingly inspection of *all* athletes.

Clean Athletes Have Nothing To Hide

The particular historical circumstances created by Cold War sport have thrust steroids into the spotlight as the demon drug of athletics. WADA constructs their anti-doping educational campaigns around steroids through a series of interlinking health messages that focus on its dangerousness. These images of steroids serve as key rhetorical justifications for the drug ban and increased drug testing. However, since the end of the Cold War period, concern about steroids has increasingly become more focused on the *internal* concern of use by (western) teenagers. The imagery of the innocent, at-risk teenager being threatened by aggressive drug peddlers has emerged to (mostly) replace the 'cold and calculated' communist doper. I argue this mimics America's 'war on drugs', which has successfully achieved expansive drug testing in schools and work spaces despite a mountain of evidence demonstrating how destructive and ineffective the battle has been.[15]

WADA anti-doping literature demonstrates an American style 'war on drugs' approach to eliminating doping through the use of several interlocking discourses that demand athletes submit to drug testing to protect elite sport and youth-at-risk. For example, Scott Burns – WADA Board Member and Deputy Director of the White House Office of National Drug Policy – states in *Play True*:

[15] It is noteworthy that many American's can now expect to be drug tested from middle school to retirement; steroid testing has been seamlessly incorporated into many of these programs. See Erickson et al. (1997) for background reading on the devastating effects of the drug wars.

> It's particularly disturbing that athletes are starting to use performance enhancing substances at a younger age. If you had told me a couple of years ago that 12-year-olds would be using steroids, I would never have believed it (Issue 1, 2004: 6).

This mentality about steroids is similar to the classic 'reefer madness' like anxiety surrounding drugs and kids. The imagery of youth in trouble as young as "12 years old" highlights the broader trend in WADA to construct the doping problem as a *serious public health threat*. Steroids are no longer just for elite level drug cheats. As Scott Burns suggests, "sports on all levels, from Little League Baseball to high school soccer to the National Football League" are implicated.

WADA makes a conscious effort to align the threat of doping in competitive sport to recreational use of steroids through the idea that athletes directly impact broader usage rates. An excerpt from a *Play True* article titled "A Tough Stand" by IOC President Jacques Rogge illustrates this point:

> We have a tremendous responsibility toward the youth of each country and of the world. Doping is not only an issue for elite sports. It attacks also the recreational sports and it attacks the youth as such when we see there is a wider use of anabolic steroids outside the organized sports movement (Issue 1, 2003: 9).

In this oft-repeated scenario, failed doping policy is made synonymous with increased usage rates in youth. As Jacques Rogge puts it, "if the sports movement implements the final version of the Code... then the future is bright" (ibid). This creates a strong moral impetus to support drug testing for athletes, which moves beyond the 'fair play' argument to protect the 'youth of tomorrow'.

Steroids are also consistently cast as an outside criminal threat rather than a social behaviour emerging from within the culture of competitive sport. In many ways, this connects with the overwhelming assumption that 'clean' sport is healthy; and only dopers

are at risk of health problems. Thus WADA shifts emphasis from the socio-cultural context of sport, which produces steroid use (Waddington, 2001), to portraying users of steroids as being duped by 'drug pushers'. The *Play True* publication – "Beyond the Athlete: the fight against doping arms itself against large-scale doping schemes and trafficking with new strategies and partnerships" (Issue 1, 2007) – stresses thinking about performance enhancing substances as illegal drugs. WADA is altering its policies to match this approach. They have placed primacy on developing relationships with international and national law enforcement agencies. The best example of this is the agreement recently signed between WADA and Interpol, the world's largest police agency, to collaborate in the fight against doping in sport and illegal drug use.[16]

Anti-doping material emphasizes the nefarious nature of drug trafficking to convince readers that steroid use in sport is no different than illegal drugs being peddled on children. In an article called "The Way Forward," WADA Director General David Howman argues that trafficking of doping substances comes from "organized crime and its sophisticated distribution networks, who find it a particularly high-profit low-risk business" (ibid: 7). Howman connects this to the wider spread of steroids, stating we are "beginning to understand that what happens at the elite level of sport has a trickle-down effect on their children, who want to emulate the sports stars" (ibid: 11). This rhetorical link is bolstered in the *Play True* publication with a WADA commissioned report by Alessandro Donati, which assessed the flow of trafficking in doping substances. The publication states:

> [The results of this study] sound the alarm to the international community, and particularly to those governments that have yet to commit to outlawing the

[16] See the press release, "Interpol and WADA Team Up to Fight Cheats" (October 2, 2006) on the WADA website (www.wada-ama.org).

manufacture, supply and possession of doping substances (ibid: 12).

Although, up to this point, WADA has focused on establishing standardized international agreements on banning doping substances in sport this quote suggests that they will also seek to standardize *national drug laws* in the future. WADA has expanded its agenda from merely trying to 'clean up' sport to engaging with the broader goal of creating *clean global citizens* free from all (illegal) drugs. The article goes on to state that "significant overlaps" exist between doping and drugs because "for drug dealers, there is no difference between doping substances and drugs" (ibid: 13). Hence, WADA is incorporating anti-doping logic within the broader international crackdown against trafficking cartels and national 'just say no' campaigns.

The emerging 'threat' of teenage suicide from steroid use has formed a compelling narrative to cast the drug as dangerous. One *Play True* article called "Attacking Source and Supply: A Parent's Perspective," re-tells the tragic story of a young American teen: "Taylor, a baseball player at Plano (Texas, U.S.) West Senior High School, took his own life at 17 as a result of the abuse of anabolic steroids" (ibid: 16). The article further states that steroid use remains a menace because "young people and their parents are generally ignorant of the real dangers of this powerful drug." In response to his son's death, Don Hooten (Taylor's father) established a foundation to fight steroid abuse through education about its harms. The article quotes Don Hooten stating:

> I hate it when the term "performance enhancing" is used in front of the word "drug" because it dilutes the fact that we are talking about *drugs*—chemicals and compounds that can do serious harm to the user … But, most people in the general public don't think about steroids and other "performance enhancing drugs" as *drugs*. They think about them as one step up from the protein or creatine shake that they can purchase at their local health food store! Just ask any athlete or young person if substances like steroids are akin to cocaine or [meth] and they will look at you like you're insane… Many countries including in Eastern Europe,

> Russia, and China have reputations for being places where these drugs can be easily obtained. A uniform approach to control performance enhancing drugs by all countries will help us gain control of this problem (ibid: 13-14).

Through the passionate words of a father trying to come to terms with his own son's tragic suicide, apparently triggered by steroid use, WADA presents a convincing emotional appeal for constructing doping/steroids as hard core drugs. By contrasting the definition of drugs as "chemicals and compounds that can do serious harm" with the (apparently false but widespread) view of performance enhancers from the "local health food store," steroids are categorized with two familiar 'problem drugs'. This movement to a drug discourse, which has also been noted by Keane (2005) in the anti-steroid academic literature, broadens the definition of 'doping' to anything criminally illegal.

In addition to this new mapping of performance enhancing substances, the origin of steroid production is said to be in several ominous totalitarian regimes – Eastern Europe, Russia and China. By shifting attention to 'international distribution' and drug cartels steroid use is not only presented as antithetical to sport – especially since athletics is a key 'anti-drug' in 'just say no drug' campaigns – but also *outside* the west. Here, old (but not vanished) Cold War fears surrounding communist steroid use are established by recasting them as the new drug peddler. The "reputations" these countries have for easy access to steroids is used to underlie the imperative of universalizing anti-doping policy within the broader international policy of 'getting tough' on drugs. At the same time, young (western) teenagers are read through discourses of victimhood that need protection through 'law and order' approaches. It is revealing that fears about steroids, which centered on *use* by communist athletes in the 1950s-1980s, now focuses on how post-communist countries are capitalizing on *supply* of drugs to our children. This highlights a

broader point about steroid discourses: they are highly successful because of their ability to shift according to a variety of changing cultural and political situations. I would argue this stems from its engrained cultural status as self-evidently evil, which creates paranoid reactions in the public that are easily exploitable. The linking of steroid induced suicide – through the problem of international trafficking – is a particularly compelling emotional connection between doping, gangsters and death that urges the reader to accept (perhaps even demand) a 'war on drugs' approach.

Aside from constructing performance enhancing substances as recreational drugs, WADA also follows the logic of drug wars by presenting chemical surveillance as something the model 'clean athlete' accepts. WADA Chair Richard Pound argues:

> I can tell you that more than ever before, young athletes are responding to the anti-doping message, and are glad to know that there are people, organizations, and nations doing their part for athletes' right to clean sport. In these conversations, athletes consistently tell me of two things. First, doping is rarely accidental. And second, *clean athletes have nothing to hide, nothing to fear, and fully support anti-doping efforts*. WADA's Athlete Committee's recent public call for stronger sanctions embodies these sentiments (*Play True*, Issue 1, 2006: 1).

This statement is illustrative of WADA's construction of the clean athlete as docile and unconcerned about testing. By turning the invasive nature of anti-doping logic on its head, through the idea of "athletes' *right* to clean sport," those disagreeing with WADA's current policy direction are framed as being against athletes who play with integrity. The message to the athlete is that part of being 'clean' means supporting drug testing because, as Pound states, "clean athletes have nothing to hide, nothing to fear, and fully support anti-doping efforts." This is consistent with tactics in the 'war on drugs' that portray dissenting opinion as tantamount to supporting drug use. One may ask: is it *possible* for an athlete to object to WADA without being called a doper?

'Clean athletes' are often used to promote anti-doping efforts in a way that naturalizes the surveillance of their body fluids as a legitimate site of public consumption. WADA's Level the Playing Field campaign uses the "voice of the Clean Athlete" to promote them as the real heroes of sport. In a similar fashion, USADA's Clean Sport Campaign uses well known American athletes in public service campaigns to promote 'fair play' and integrity in sport. In these campaigns a small number of 'model citizens' – almost all of whom are part of Athlete Committees responsible for knowing WADA's public relations techniques – are used to contrast the 'doped athlete' in the media. Good athletes are expected to follow these 'clean athletes' in the battle against doping in sport; failure to do so is a sign of support for doping. Here are three illustrative examples from Olympic athletes David Douillet, Justin Wadsworth and Stephane Diagana.

> *David Douillet*: I had no problem with the urine tests, nor would I have had a problem had testing been extended to include blood sampling for certain substances. It is a question of mind-set: an athlete, who does well in a test, participates in the fight against doping, and it is in this spirit that I took the whole matter... It is true, [out of competition testing] is rather restrictive. I was tested during training and it is not always great fun... get the athletes to understand fully that thanks to all this they are fighting, indirectly, for clean sports... Then, athletes will see things differently and will accept the restraint of their 'freedom' more willingly" (*Play True*, February, 2002: 17).
>
> *Justin Wadsworth*: Elite athletes can be open and willing to be tested, even if it seems invasive, or inconvenient (Issue 1, *Play True*, 2004: 12).
>
> *Stephane Diagana*: I think that clean athletes have to explain that they want to be tested more often. A strong stand can help people understand that most athletes want to get rid of doping in sport (WADA Brochure: 9).

These three quotes by self-proclaimed 'clean athletes' cleverly position the fight for pure sport as something that all good athletes, supporting the level playing field, will accept. Because 'fair play' is only breached by the use of illegal substances the competitor with integrity should willingly accept the expansion of out of competition drug testing to

protect them. The use of model athletes is compelling: it shows they understand the issue of drug testing (it is invasive) but ultimately know that you either support WADA or you are enabling a tainted playing field. This polices athletes in a way that "naturalizes the process in which athletes become the constant object of WADA drug testing officials by stressing the *voluntary cooperation of athletes* [my emphasis]" (Park, 2005: 182). Thus support for anti-doping measures is simplistically dichotomized between those that encourage 'clean sport' and 'doped sport'. The most striking effect of making obedience to drug testing the only acceptable option is that it signals a shift from thinking of *athletes as citizens* with the ability to make decisions to *athletes as objects* with the narrow option to comply with WADA (or leave competitive sport).

Against the backdrop of false-positive test results, such as Silken Laumann's positive doping violation from cough medicine, WADA actively seeks to present the laboratory procedures for drug testing as objective and unquestionable. This is primarily achieved by discursively framing anyone (but especially lawyers) who raises questions about WADA testing methods as troublemakers that support doping. Dr. Martial Saugy, who is the Director of Swiss Doping Analysis Laboratory, states:

> All my colleagues, including myself, who have appeared in court have noticed this 'judicialising' trend. Increasingly the professionalism of people with vast experience is being questioned, and this is becoming increasingly difficult to accept. There are lawyers, who for the sake of oratory, insult the Heads of laboratories... I believe that the majority of my colleagues believe in the benefits of the anti-doping fight and continue to believe in the results they will defend in court, but if it becomes too difficult, if the slightest error throws a case out of court and ultimately drives the federations to not follow through, this may take the wind out of the sails (*Play True*, December, 2002: 12).

This statement implies that the appeals process is being used to undermine the overall anti-doping effort. The impression painted by the Dr. Saugy is that lawyers are crafting

technical defenses – using the "slightest error" to get dopers off – because experts with "vast experience" are being undermined. However, it appears that constructing athletes' legal right to appeal as a 'judicialising' trend is a clear attempt to minimize their already limited ability to demonstrate innocence.[17] It also situates anyone who has legitimate concerns about testing procedures as implicitly promoting unhealthy and unfair sport.

Athletes that have experienced accidental positive test results are used by doping authorities to highlight the personal responsibility that each athlete must take ingesting substances into their bodies. The disheartening stories of Erica Watts (*Playing Field*, January-March 2006: 1), Zach Lund (*Spirit of Sport*, April-June 2006: 5), and an unidentified accidental positive result from a glucose pill (*Playing Field*, July-September 2005: 3) were re-told to reinforce individual culpability. What is most notable in the USADA publications is that these examples are used to reinforce the legitimacy of WADA's strict liability rule rather than protect American athletes against unfair suspension.[18] For instance, reflecting on the Zach Lund case, the publication states "The Court of Arbitration for Sport – while believing Lund did not cheat – ruled he should serve a one year suspension." However, more critical comments about WADA policy made by Zach Lund and the Court of Arbitration for Sport were ignored (Zinser, 2006: D3). This illustrates the extent to which anti-doping logic is protected even in a clear case when an athlete "did not cheat," as the Court of Arbitration put it.

[17] WADA drug tests are not required to go through peer reviewed journals to demonstrate credibility; furthermore, the Code presumes their validity in court and WADA accredited technicians are barred from testifying on behalf of athletes'. Many of the new tests – such as that for EPO – depend on 'subjective interpretations' rather than standardized measures but penalties remain without discretion.

[18] Strict liability does not consider an athletes intension; a positive test cannot be absolved, even if an athlete can demonstrate it was unintentional (i.e. cough medicine).

Doping authorities also try to bring them on as 'good athletes' that made mistakes to further support WADA policy. Erica Watts was asked to offer advice to other athletes, stating: "I would say educate yourself! You can't expect anyone else to do that for you" (ibid: 3). Athlete responsibility – for knowing what goes into their body and being knowledgeable of the ever-changing Prohibited List – was the sole emphasis of the publications. The impression created throughout was that athletes supported strict liability and the anti-doping rules *without exception*. However, this dissuades an important question: is it really unreasonable to question a system punishing athletes that did not cheat? These examples demonstrate that anti-doping authorities are primarily concerned with promoting obedience to WADA policy regardless of the actual ethical nature of the outcome to an athlete.

But why has drug testing emerged as the only acceptable policy option for dealing with doping? WADA consistently argues that the health effects and 'level playing field' can only be maintained through a vigorous drug testing regime that eliminates all doping. This is consistent with 'just say no' anti-drug campaigns, as well as the 'Olympic hegemony' paradigm, which considers the use of steroids once to be dangerous. However, within the medical community, there is a small but emerging critical literature that questions the utility of abstinence based doping policy. For instance, Kayser, Mauron and Miah (2007) argue for medically supervised doping:

> Current anti-doping strategy is aimed at eradication of doping in elite sports by means of all-out repression, buttressed by a war-like ideology similar to the public discourse sustaining international efforts against illicit drugs. Rather than striving for eradication of doping in sports, which appears to be an unattainable goal, a more pragmatic approach aimed at controlled use and harm reduction may be a viable alternative to cope with doping and doping-like behaviour (1).

WADA's response to this proposal for harm reduction is similar to 'law and order' discourses that portray needle sharing programs and safe injection sites as tantamount to promoting drug use.[19] In an "Open Letter to Those Who Promote Medical Supervision of Doping," WADA Medical Director Dr. Alain Garnier states:

> Should a physician confronted with torture propose medical support in order to make it less detrimental to the individual? Certainly not, but those who propose medical supervision for doping are following exactly the same distorted logic... Contrary to what the physicians defending doping pretend, accepting the idea of medical supervision of doping would immediately and irredeemably lead to a generalization of doping and an exclusion from sport of all clean athletes who are opposed to using unnecessary drugs and want to defend the spirit of sport... It would mean the end of merit for athletes. It would mean that prizes and medals would no longer be awarded to athletes but to pharmaceutical companies and research teams (*Play True*, Issue 1, 2007: 17-18).

In short order, this article presents medically supervised doping as synonymous with torture; immediately leading to a sharp and irredeemable rise in doping use; the end of competition for the clean athlete; and a dramatic shift from competition between 'pure' athletes to 'machines' controlled through drug companies. Clearly WADA sees medically supervised doping as a serious challenge to their authority to perpetually expand testing based on a vague notion of purity. Rather than engage with the ideas presented by medical supervision, which directly challenge antiquated doping ethics, WADA reads it through the tired 'magic bullet' thesis: that it would lead to the "exclusion from sport of all clean athletes who are opposed to using unnecessary drugs." This is a classic slippery slope argument that 'clean' sport is always one step away from doctors winning races rather than hard working (pre-technological) athletes. It also distorts their position by re-

[19] The primary difference is that harm reduction proponents focus on reducing harm from use (i.e. overdose deaths, curbing the spread of disease) while police emphasize abstinence of use (Erickson et al., 1997). Anti-drug crusaders claim that any policy not supporting increased sentencing and policy crackdowns *support* ever expanding drug use. This conscious distortion of harm reduction approaches has been seamlessly carried over to anti-doping rhetoric.

phrasing harm reduction practices as a thinly veiled pro-doping movement led by corrupt physicians. This highlights the pervasive rhetoric and approach of a 'war on drugs' logic in anti-doping efforts.

Is Testing the Only Option?

Drug testing has expanded remarkably fast to become the only acceptable policy response to doping. The establishment of WADA has led to several key changes in drug testing procedures that suggest the athlete is coming under increasing surveillance. Furthermore, the movement to centralize the anti-doping regime under one universal system of governance and rules significantly reduces the opportunity for local and national opposition to its policies. Let IOC President Jacque Rogge's statement be a reminder of the options: "there should be no place in the Olympic Games for international federations and national Olympic committees who refuse to implement the Code" (*Play True*, Issue 1, 2003: 9).

The success of several mediated police investigations into doping – such as the Tour de France and the BALCO scandal – suggest that as doping use in sport becomes caught up in the logic of the 'war on drugs', athletes will continue to be treated as objects for inspection rather than citizens. As C.L. Cole notes:

> The history of the multiple sites that constitute sport is one in which routine surveillance practices have been legitimated, including the *overall* increased scrutiny of pure body fluids, especially as increased surveillance has been legitimated through a 'war on drugs' rhetoric. In this case, we might consider the now familiar arguments about drugs invading the "pure space" of sport that remind us that sport serves as society's uncontaminated immune system; [and] the arguments proposed in the name of "fair competition" that normalize and make clear "the need" to subject athletes to increased surveillance (1994: 14).

The overwhelming focus on steroids in media stories and medical reports as the scourge of safe and fair sport, however, ignores the integration of sports science and technologies

that help athletes win. This development did not occur from evil pharmacists attempting to trick athletes into using drugs. Steroids emerged in sport in concert with cultural shifts that demanded performance enhancement to even qualify for elite sporting competitions. In the next chapter, I consider the role of the media in perpetuating the 'common sense' view of steroids as dangerous. By comparing two mediated doping scandals in baseball, involving Mark McGwire and Barry Bonds respectively, I illustrate the importance of *social power* in the deployment of the 'clean' and 'doped' athlete archetypes.

Chapter 3:

Race in the Home Run Chase:

Clean and Doped Athletes in the 'Steroid Era'

Introduction

The fiction of the uncorrupted natural body has culminated in a fascination with ridding sport of doping in the hopes of keeping competition and athletes 'clean'. In North American professional leagues, steroids have become the main concern of doping narratives. Steroids are often understood as 'magic bullets' that make a fundamental difference in performance, which is in turn considered 'unnatural' and ruining the 'level playing field'. This chapter considers the media's role in constructing 'doping scandals' by contrasting two incidents in baseball: Mark McGwire's use of androstenedione (andro) and Barry Bonds use of steroids during each of their historic home run chases. The purpose of this analysis is to document how the media reinforces, adopts and contrasts with WADA's construction of doping in sport. To achieve this end, I contextualize each incident within the culture of baseball, race and drugs in America. The key points of discussion center on the construction of the 'natural' and 'doped' athlete through an ethnocentric lens.

During the 1998 baseball season, Mark McGwire smashed the historic single season home run record (61) in MLB, finishing with an astounding 70 home runs. *Sports Illustrated* (*SI*) placed Mark McGwire six times on their cover page that year. They also named Mark McGwire and Sammy Sosa as joint "Sportsmen of the Year" in recognition of their epic home ran battle. The media consistently praised McGwire as a modern-day Paul Bunyan or "red-whiskered Ruth" reviving baseball from its cancelled 1994 season

(Reilly, 1998). Even after a report surfaced late in the season that McGwire was using andro, a 'natural supplement' banned by the Olympics and considered a 'precursor' to steroids,[20] the mood remained joyous. But the euphoria of 1998 was short lived. In 2001 Barry Bonds shocked observers by hitting 73 home runs to overtake McGwire's total. As the *New York Times* (*NYT*) sports columnist Selena Roberts observed, "somehow, Bonds' chase for the same record has not generated the same feel-good energy" (2001: D9). *SI* placed him only once on their cover page and awarded the 2001 "Sportsman of the Year" to two other baseball players, Curt Schilling and Randy Johnson.

Speculation about his steroid use emerged incrementally with revelations from the Bay Area Laboratory Co-operative (BALCO) steroid scandal. USADA revealed in October 2003 that BALCO was providing athletes with a "previously undetectable steroid" as part of an illegal distribution ring under the guise of a 'nutrition center' (Longman, 2003: D2). Barry Bonds was a client of BALCO, so he was called to testify before a grand jury in December 2003 as part of the federal investigation into BALCO. In late 2004 *San Francisco Chronicle* reporters Fainaru-Wada and Williams quoted (illegally) from Bonds leaked grand jury testimony that he 'unknowingly' used steroids. This resulted in an explosion of media condemnation and extensive efforts by federal prosecutors to indict Bonds on perjury charges for lying about his steroid use in his testimony (Henry, 2006). The book *Game of Shadows: Barry Bonds, BALCO, and the Steroids Scandal that Rocked Professional Sports* (2006) by those same reporters was seen by many in the 'court of public opinion' as the final piece of proof that Bonds was cheating the record books. A new baseball narrative also emerged along side the Bonds

[20] The *Anabolic Steroid Control Act* (2004) classifies andro as a banned steroid.

scandal: sports writers began referring to the home run boon as the 'Steroid Era' to denote its artificiality. As Bonds passed Babe Ruth's home run totals, and continues to march towards Hank Aaron's record mark of 755, Bonds authenticity continues to be challenged on a daily basis.

In MLB, steroid use is directly attributed to the ability to hit home runs, and little else; the extra 'juice' is thought to push what would normally be fly ball outs at the warning track over the fence. The recent explosion of single season home run totals is often correlated with the apparent upshot in steroid use in the league, especially after revelations that Barry Bonds was likely using them.[21] Therefore the interactions athletes have with *legal sporting technologies* that alter bodily composition, such as food supplements and training regimes like core strengthening, remain unchallenged.

Although anti-doping policy suggests that a clear binary exists between 'clean' and 'doped' athletes, actual media coverage of 'doping scandals' reveals the role of underlying social tensions in their depiction (Jackson, 2004; Abdel-Shehid, 2005). For example, the response to the Ben Johnson steroid scandal – which included intense, often racist, media scrutiny – was indicative of the status of black men in Canada as 'outsiders'. In America, black masculinity continues to be depicted through national social problems such as drugs and gang violence (Ferber, 2007; Tucker, 2003). I argue that against the backdrop of cheaters being publicly vilified and imagined as *the* corrupters of fair competition, more pernicious myths of race framed the focus of the steroid scandal in baseball. Bonds and McGwire were selected for comparison because,

[21] From 1961 to 1997, Roger Maris maintained the single season record with 61 home runs. However, just over the brief period from 1998 to 2001, that mark was surpassed *six times*. Prior to the steroid scandals, this was attributed to a number of factors (bad pitching, juiced balls, smaller parks, smaller strike zones, better training and nutrition, and steroids); but these other factors quickly dissipated from the discussion in favor of steroids following the scandals.

while they went through similar situations, the public reaction to each was quite distinct. Neil Henry points out:

> Of all the bulked-up major league baseball players suspected of using steroids in the mid-to-late 1990s, how is it that Barry Bonds, baseball's pre-eminent black player, came to be Target No. 1 of federal investigators? Is Bonds really the fraud he is made out to be by the steady leaks of grand jury records? Or is he instead only the latest in a long line of black athletes in American history wrongfully targeted for destruction by zealous government officials determined to put them in their place? (2006: 45).

Henry's essential observation – that the reason Bonds has become Target No. 1 is actually because of the broader social position of black athletes in America – looms large in attempting to account for the prominence of the Bonds/BALCO scandal in news coverage. This relates to my focus on the constructed nature of 'natural' and 'doped' athletes in *SI* and *NYT* articles.

Public perceptions of divergent groups of people in society tend to rest on a small number of cultural events depicted by a (mostly) white media. The critical cultural perspective emphasizes "particular incident or celebrity as a site for exploring the complex interrelated and fluid character of power relations" so that one may say at "this historical moment, in this particular place, these discourses... are produced around this particular incident" (McDonald and Birrell, 1999: 284). My analysis uses this framework to provide insight into the way the media produces and/or challenges anti-doping logic in a steroid scandal.

Modern Racism and the 'Crisis of Whiteness'

Ideas about the meaning of 'race' are historically grounded in narratives of colonialism and slavery, which justified white supremacy by portraying non-European peoples as sub-human. The primary intellectual ideology naturalizing the civilized/savage

dichotomy of Eurocentric thought was scientific racism (Miller, 1998). These initial observations helped form the crucial connection between "external signs and innate abilities" used to demarcate racial groups (Spencer, 2004). The ontology of stable racial categories assumes that each person is a racial type, with a series of 'objective' physical, psychological and social characteristics (St Louis, 2003; Miller, 1998). Following the Enlightenment dichotomy between nature/culture, which aligned the body with nature and mind with culture, each race was also ranked in a hierarchy; white bodies were placed closer to 'civilization' (e.g. intelligent) and black bodies closer to 'nature' (e.g. aggressive, hypersexual) (Abdel-Shehid, 2005). The consequence of scientific racism today is the remaining connection between the "pseudoscience of racial difference and the pernicious social policies it both inspires and informs" (Miller, 1998: 121).

However, the preservation of white power has altered in concert with the gradual legal acceptance of the ideals expressed in the civil rights movement. As critical cultural scholar Kelly Madison summarizes,

> while the white backlash was originally marked by overt coercion and brutal repression, in order to regain legitimacy the more mainstream "racist politics of resentment" has, from the late 1960's, had to work within the framework set by African American movements for equality (1999: 404).

Social theorists have variously termed this change to a more subtle, sometimes even unintentional form of prejudice, as modern, colourblind and symbolic racism. These concepts refer to conservative discourses and policies that reinforce inequality based on race *without* relying on overt expressions of prejudice and violence (Gabriel, 1998; Madison, 1999). Theories of biological inferiority have (mostly) been replaced by two approaches: neo-liberal policies that ignore systematic patterns of racial inequality; and conservative intellectual theories that identify pathologies in black culture. Racism

increasingly expresses itself in resentment against progressive policies by claiming they represent a new form of prejudice: 'reverse discrimination' and 'preferential treatment'. Scholars have identified subtle defense of white advantage in policy discussions such as 'political correctness', 'war on drugs', 'immigration', 'quotas' and 'urban crime' (Omi and Winant, 1986; Gabriel, 1998). Claiming race 'no longer matters', intellectual conservative forces such as Dinesh D'Souza's *The End of Racism* (1995), argue that "black failure" and "black cultural pathology" are responsible for their social position. The implication is that 'special status' reinforces cycles of victimhood and interferes with meritocracy.

This backlash occurs in tandem with the continuation of popular mythologies that encourage the continuation of racial typologies. Nancy Spencer observes:

> what obscures the reality of racism for most (Whites) is the creation of sincere fictions that enable Whites to resolve the dissonance between beliefs in equality and participation in a racist society. This form of White racism is usually predicted on the "belief that White prejudice is no longer a factor" (2004: 119).

That is why a vital underpinning of modern racism is the idea that it is a 'thing of the past', where "any continuing inequality is caused by the fact that people from subordinated groups do not have what it takes to take advantage of existing 'opportunities'" (Madison, 1999: 404). This is coupled with a "racist ideology whose viability depends on the fact that it does not display overt racism" (Omi and Winant, in Madison, 1999).

The most repeated mythology is the obsession with the athletic prowess of black men. This links innate black physically with the predominance of black athletes in sport through implications that black bodies are closer to 'nature' (Andrews, 2001; Hoberman, 1997). The visible *physicality* of athletics, along with the mythology of sport as a 'level

playing field' (Abdel-Shehid, 2005), removes athletes from the socio-cultural context that produced them (James, 2005). Stephen Gould lamentingly refers to the obsession with locking athletes into innate racial stereotypes as the "sports version" of human diversity (Miller, 1998).

With the acceptance of athletes of colour into the formally white only spaces of sport, there has been a perceptible backlash of white anxiety (Walton and Butryn, 2006; Spencer, 2004; Kusz, 2001). This has centered the *focus* on current white stars, the search for the next 'great white hope', and lamenting historical white heroes. These expressions of white anxiety in sport are symptomatic of a wider

> conservative backlash politics developed that used a number of strategies to resecure the structural privileges of White masculinity just as it simultaneously disavowed the existence of these privileges (Kusz, 2001: 395).

Heterosexual white males are increasingly being recast as fragile victims of the "complaints of a small group of militant multiculturalists, feminists, and other 'minority' groups [that] threaten the traditional values the United States was founded upon" (Kusz, in Walton and Butryn, 2006: 7). Kusz suggests that white anxiety overlaps with fears that *masculinity* is simultaneously being displaced from its 'natural' position. Hence, despite widespread rejection of overt prejudice, white privilege is often naturalized through the overriding assumption that white men are simply more capable. Richard Dyer argues that because 'white' is often not seen as a racial category privilege reproduces itself "overwhelmingly because it is not seen as whiteness, but as normal" (1997: 10). Bringing in the 'crisis of whiteness' as a concept thus represents an "epistemological shift to place attention squarely on the hegemony of whiteness" (McDonald, 2005: 2).

King et al. (2007) suggest that although white power may be reinforced through (1) persistent, (2) resurgent and (3) veiled formations of racism, these constitute a "shared discursive field, in which variations in language and grammar have more to do with contexts and strategies yet produce shared effects, namely *distinction and domination* [my emphasis]" (4). Sport is an important cultural site to consider expressions of racial tension because it is one of the few spaces where black men form a majority.[22] Furthermore, the tension within baseball as both America's white national pastime[23] and racially progressive sport[24] provides a fascinating context to assess contesting discourses about (racialized) 'natural' bodies.

Racializing Sporting Authenticity

Mark McGwire and Barry Bonds both went through a remarkably similar set of events. They were each superstars accused of using steroids during a home run chase of a historically significant MLB record. According to the 'level playing field' argument pushed by WADA, all dopers are treated with the same disdain. However, comparing depictions of each athlete provides unique insight into the way racial power is articulated in micro-level news reporting within these incidents. The first article published by *SI* after McGwire's reported andro use was titled "48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53..." (Verducci, 1998). It focused heavily on his pursuit of the home run record, noting his "universal fan

[22] Although this is not the case in every sport (e.g. hockey), the National Basketball Association, National Football League, and Track and Field have predominately black athletes. MLB has relative ethnic parity, which plays into its contesting racial mythologies. However, advancements have not been made to nearly the same degree in coaching, management and ownership.

[23] I say *white* pastime because players from the Negro Leagues (where black players competed during segregation) are usually excluded from the media's depiction of baseball's national past time of 'lost innocence' and 'purity'.

[24] African American Jackie Robinson broke the white only colour barrier in MLB in 1947, a full 18 years prior to the end of Jim Crow laws; this is widely celebrated in baseball for its progressiveness.

support" and compassion as a father, "who displays a picture of his son, Matthew, 10, in his locker." The last paragraph of the article states:

> McGwire is under such scrutiny that the Associated Press broke a story last week – Flash: Baseball player uses a legal supplement banned by the NFL that's available at your local mall! – by "snooping in my locker," McGwire says, and spying a bottle of androstenedione, a natural substance that raises a man's testosterone level (33).

Only a patient reader would actually find out about the andro report. The thematic placement at the end of the article, after extensive positive characterization, portrays McGwire as a hero that (some) reporters were trying to slander unfairly. McGwire's voice is also privileged: this places emphasis on his privacy violation as a victim above the actual finding of drug use. Andro itself is described innocuously as a legally available "natural substance." This removes andro from the purview of anti-doping rhetoric; and legitimates McGwire's purity. Thus McGwire's sporting authenticity is protected by de-emphasizing the incident as an issue of overzealous reporting.

Another strategy used to maintain McGwire's 'clean' image was to focus on the overriding impact of his 'reviving' season for baseball. This apparently made it impractical to start a scandal. For example, *NYT* columnist Kettmann concedes that andro is a steroid, yet states:

> Some observers have been critical of baseball's reluctance to take action on andro just after McGwire's record-setting season, but this is an unfair criticism. That would have been terrible public relations, and no major sport can afford that. Baseball badly needed the boost it got from McGwire's and Sammy Sosa's home run show. It was clear at the time that baseball would need to wait until a tasteful interval passed before it could take on andro (2000: 13).

The author is unwilling to consider his home run record tainted because "baseball badly needed the boost." In other words, McGwire's incident is special, requiring a uniquely tailored response. This is premised on the insinuation that "terrible public relations"

could face MLB if it treated McGwire like a doping cheat. However, this appears to be a strategy concerned with preserving McGwire's status as a hero more than anything else.

In "Swallow This Pill," which is sub-titled "Big Mac's super-sizing supplements shouldn't taint his super season," *SI* reporters McCallum and O'Brien explicitly make the case that, whatever happens from the andro incident, McGwire's record *must* be seen as clean. They do this by framing it as a media created scandal.

> In the relentless search for an asterisk, sportswriters have come upon a bottle of pills that your Uncle Barney can buy without a prescription, pills that Mark McGwire keeps in plain view of America, which these days means on a shelf in his locker stall. Get this straight: McGwire's use of androstenedione, which he may not have advertised but didn't try to hide, should not taint his achievement if he breaks Roger Maris' single-season home run record (1998: 17).

Andro is described in an innocuous, natural phrasing to argue that McGwire's use "should not taint his achievement." In fact, rather than a drug cheat, *SI* actually depicts McGwire as a *victim* of ruthless reporters looking to create a scandal out of nothing. This aligns broadly with the backlash anxiety in sport that increasingly portrays white athletes as underdogs. In this case, the "relentless search for an asterisk" can be read as a 'sincere fiction' to portray McGwire as a good guy. This appears to be why reporters covering the andro incident avoided reading the event through the doping scandal narrative.

MLB authorities responded to the andro incident by establishing a study to consider the enhancing potential of 'nutritional supplements'. This placed MLB in a position to avoid condemning andro as a performance enhancer. Commission Bud Selig stated that "it seems inappropriate that such reports should overshadow the accomplishments of players such as Mark McGwire" (Chass, 1998a: C1); and that "whatever baseball does... the *only thing that concerns* me is none of this should ever diminish what Mark McGwire did this year [my emphasis]" (Chass, 1998b: D7). Perhaps

unlike any other sport, baseball players are worshipped primarily through their statistical accomplishments. The only way to maintain McGwire's credibility as pure, and by implication his rise to American hero status, was to avoid calling the ingestion of andro doping.

Mark McGwire's fall from grace would actually come seven years later, during the congressional hearings into steroid use in MLB in 2005. Entering the hearing, McGwire had largely avoided being labeled a steroid user, despite admitting that he used andro during his record setting season. But when pressed under oath in the hearing about steroid use (other than andro) McGwire remained silent. As *SI* writer Price put, "Mark McGwire, once baseball's Paul Bunyan, [was] deflated and weeping" and "by the end of the testimony McGwire's reputation was smashed" (111). In Reilly's article, "Choking Up at the Plate," he pleads with McGwire to "Be that big man again. Tell the truth" (2005: 76). In that moment McGwire lost his hero status, and since then has not been protected from harsh criticism. Perhaps most notably, concern seemed to center on his *reputation* – from 'good guy' to 'wimp' – as much, if not more, than his actual (apparent) steroid use. It seems without a likeable, Paul Bunyan imagery to preserve the media was much more willing to deploy the more negative doping narratives; especially since the context created by BALCO/Bonds at this point encouraged harsh criticism of steroid users.

Ultimately it appears that McGwire will be remembered as much for his appearance at Congress as his record breaking season. It seems that this particular turn of events may cost 'Big Mac' a spot in the Hall of Fame, as his first attempt to be voted in failed by a large margin in 2007. Although this post-hearing reaction from the press (who

also vote on the Hall of Fame) is noteworthy because it demonstrates the complexity of the event, the more immediate reaction to the andro incident (which my analysis focuses on) relates more directly to how steroid scandals are constructed. I would argue that the recasting of McGwire in a negative light post-hearing was mostly a response to his failure to live up to his (media created) status as a hero.

It is impossible to disconnect the *overriding* assumption in the media coverage that McGwire's record should remain untainted during the pre-fallen period. Three of the most common "sincere fictions" guiding this framing include: (1) andro is a 'natural' substance; (2) overzealous reporting unfairly targeted McGwire; and (3) the special season McGwire had made a scandal impractical. At a historical moment when anxiety surrounded the status of white stars, preserving McGwire's record – especially in America's most nostalgic sport – became a dominate agenda underlying coverage of the story. In 1997 *SI* published a Special Report asking "What Ever Happened to the White Athlete?" A quote from the article illustrates the fermenting 'crisis of whiteness' in the run up to McGwire's record breaking season.

> Unsure of his place in a sports world dominated by blacks who are hungrier, harder-working and perhaps physiologically superior, the young white male is dropping out of the athletic mainstream to pursue success elsewhere... 50 years after Jackie Robinson broke major league baseball's color barrier, white Americans have come to embrace black sports heroes in ways unimaginable in 1947. That a white majority calmly accepts minority status in one of its most cherished social institutions is itself a measure of progress... Whites have in some respects become sports' second-class citizens. In a surreal inversion of Robinson's era, white athletes are frequently the ones now tagged by the stereotypes of skin color... As some of today's young white males harbor doubts about whether they are good enough to compete with blacks, they find fewer white superstars than ever to emulate... [and] you'd be hard put to name a current white baseball player with the name recognition of Ken Griffey Jr. or Barry Bonds (Price and Cornelius, 1997: 30-42).

The fact this question was even asked by *SI*, and six months were devoted to researching the report, indicates the explicit concern surrounding the 'uneasy' place of white athletes in progressive sport. The article manages to reproduce theories of biological superiority; position white athletes as victims; exaggerate the progress of racial egalitarianism; and highlight the importance of finding new white stars. I would argue that these tangible themes interlocked to produce descriptions of McGwire as a positive role model to counter the 'problem' of having "fewer white superstars than ever to emulate." Thus as McGwire lost his hero status the deployment of whiteness to protect his image no longer made sense. In some respects – within the panic driven context of anti-steroid rhetoric – there was little goodness left to fight for about McGwire. By this time other non-steroid using white stars, easily fitting the nice guy script – such as Steve Nash, Tom Brady and Sidney Crosby – had arrived on the scene.

The scenario facing Barry Bonds was quite different. For one, he was already disliked by the media. As early as 1993 *SI* ran a cover story about Bonds, pictured on the front cover in a classic 'prima dona' stance with the title "I'm Barry Bonds, And You're Not," which painstakingly detailed his arrogant personality and petulance towards reporters. It is fair to say that, even without a steroid scandal, the response towards Bonds would be laced with derogatory portraits. This partly explains the media feeding frenzy surrounding Bonds. His steroid use was unequivocally seen as tainting his performance. Unlike the episodic coverage of McGwire there has been a steady stream of articles discussing Bonds since his initial appearance in the BALCO trial. Furthermore, despite the tenuous connection between Bonds, BALCO, and steroid use, the media was quick to situate Bonds at the center of baseball's doping problem. The March 15, 2004 *SI* cover

story – "Is Baseball In The Asterisk Era? New questions about steroids have cast doubt on the legitimacy of the game's power hitting records" – plasters a disgruntled picture of Barry Bonds on the cover page. What becomes immediately clear is that these so-called "new questions" that "cast doubt" – six years removed from McGwire's acknowledged doping use – are actually reports from leaked jury testimony that suggest Bonds is a *potential* steroid user. Nevertheless, the article begins with ominous consequences:

> The three greatest home run hitters have remained the same, in varying order, for 35 years: Hank Aaron, Babe Ruth and Willie Mays. That holy trinity of sluggers, however, will be no more once Barry Bonds belts his third homer of 2004... the historic event will engender as much debate as celebration. Bonds will reach the milestone with his personal trainer, Greg Anderson, under indictment for the illegal distribution of steroids and human growth hormone (HGH). The San Francisco Chronicle reported last week that federal agents discovered that Bonds was among the athletes who received those substances from Anderson (Verducci, 2004: 36).

The thematic focus clearly places baseball's doping issues around Barry Bonds even though it is premised on suspicion. Bonds physical appearance, ability to hit home runs and personal relationships are mapped alongside the burgeoning BALCO scandal as reason enough to focus media attention on him. In dramatic contrast to McGwire, Bonds impending success was constructed as a threat to the religious-like purity ("holy trinity of sluggers") of baseball's past.

Another article titled "BALCO Blows Up" focuses on Bonds role as one of the "central figures in baseball's steroids era" who is "cocksure, dismissive of the media, seemingly unconcerned with the public's perception of him as arrogant and aloof" (Dohrmann, 2004: 50). The 'Steroid Era' and 'Asterisk Era' – which are derogatory phrases to depict the increased home run production (roughly 1995 to 2004) as due to rampant steroid use – emerged from initial reports connecting Bonds to steroids. A search

of those terms reveals that the first time they appear in *SI* and *NYT* is in direct reference to the Bonds/BALCO connection. The fact that this phrasing did not emerge after McGwire's incident and "Totally Juiced" (Verducci et al., 2002) – the *SI* article explaining former player Ken Caminiti's admission of steroid use and claim that over half of MLB players were using – suggests that *national doping scandals* often converge around imagined outsiders. In America black athletes are widely represented as constantly testing the 'patience' of a "white majority [that] calmly accepts minority status in one of *its* most cherished social institutions," as the *SI* white anxiety report puts it. This not only reinforces the link between black masculinity and 'problem' more generally, but it also enables the status quo – such as MLB executives – to remain untouched because the attention is on the 'trouble maker'.

Another theme that emerged was a discussion about what role the media should play, knowing that Bonds was probably on steroids. Many articles engaged in commentary that actively attempted to discredit Bonds so-called assault on the record books. For instance, this *SI* article quotes a University Professor approvingly:

> We can't prove that Bonds intentionally took steroids, even though everyone knows he did... So how do we, as a society, address the result here? Bud Selig won't act. Congress can't do much about the records. It's up to the fans and the media. We shouldn't even talk about home run record holders anymore. No one holds the records now. With Bonds, since he's still playing, we should use the Amish approach. Shun him... Just asterisk his ass. This is what you wanted so badly, Barry? O.K., you got it. But guess what, Barry. Maybe it's not what you thought (Smith, 2005: 41).

This mob mentality to "asterisk his ass" overtook much of the coverage and concern surrounding his historic home run chase. The article above is typical of the coverage in its use of inflammatory comments clearly meant to muddy Bonds already tarnished image. The release of *Game of Shadows* confirmed – at least in the media's coverage of events –

that Bonds used steroids. *SI* writer Verducci argues that the book saves the integrity of baseball because it "destroys the reputation of one of baseball's most accomplished players... he never can be regarded with honor or full legitimacy," adding that this "challenges us to reflect not on the greatness of Bonds but on his unworthiness" (2006a: 52). Another article titled "73*" – denoting that his single season home run record is artificial – by *NYT* writer Sokolove states Bonds is a "baseball superstar, suspected drug cheat, possible perjurer and pariah" (2006: 12).

The illegally leaked grand jury testimony, which forms the central evidentiary claim made in *Game of Shadows*, resulted in the subsequent charging of those *San Francisco Chronicle* reporters. The media responded to this event with perplexing disbelief and outrage. This is perhaps unsurprising considering the extent to which the national media used the book's claims to feed their news cycle. Rick Reilly argues:

> It's the best sports reporting in our lifetime, so impressive that in April 2005, when Fainaru-Wada and Williams met President Bush at a correspondents dinner reception, he shook their hands and said, "You've done a service." ...And they may still be locked up next summer when Bonds – a man who, according to their reporting, may have committed tax fraud and lied to a grand jury – breaks Hank Aaron's home run record. That, my fellow Americans, will be sickening (2006: 78).

This contrasts sharply with Reilly's reaction to andro, when he quoted McGwire as saying a reporter was "snooping in my locker," which Reilly depicted as "spying a bottle of andro." However, unlike the Bonds case, the 'snooping' reporter was not breaking any laws (although perhaps it was unethical journalism). The media, George Bush and MLB all, in some fashion, supported the tactics used to obtain information about Bonds because it resulted in his public persecution. Thus knowledge about the chemical make-up of Bonds body takes precedence over his constitutional right to privacy. This

highlights the broader logic of drug wars that prioritize 'outing' dopers to further the agenda of sporting authorities; and the role the media willing plays in creating public scandals around them.

A lot of the anger with Bonds fed into the media's hope that he would be removed by the Commissioner or a criminal trial. For many, the integrity problem facing baseball implicating a *number* of players, managers and owners could only be fully purified by getting rid of Bonds. Chass illustrates this concern:

> He may feel he has fixed the general problem, but Selig knows baseball faces a specific problem, a huge one, in the coming months. He won't talk about it, declined to as recently as yesterday, but it has a name: Barry Bonds (2006a: D8).

Eradicating Bonds took on significance as a way to preserve the historic records and wash away the broader institutional doping problem in MLB.

Creating Steroid Infused and Natural Bodies

The imagery used to describe McGwire and Bonds further supports the idea that the production of 'doped' and 'natural' bodies is imbued with racial power. This suggests that mediated doping scandals reflect broader socio-cultural tensions in deploying the rhetoric of 'purity' and 'artificiality'. 'Dopers' are not discursively framed using one master doping scandal framework; although this does not mean that they challenge anti-doping logic in any serious way.

Bonds body was established as artificial through reference to his shift from a 'small body' (clean) playing for Pittsburg to his 'massive' (dirty) body playing for San Francisco. Sokolove states that the "once lean-muscled Bonds had bulging biceps, a thickened neck and a head that seemed to have grown a hat size or two" (2006: 12). Bonds' increase in size was *exclusively* attributed to steroid use, despite the normalization

of highly regimented nutrition and strength plans in baseball. The use of hyperbole to indicate disdain with his fake body was a common linguistic approach. For example, a *NYT* reporter quotes from *Game of Shadows* that he "looked like a WWE wrestler or a toy superhuman action figure" (Kakutani, 2006: E1). Evidence of Bonds' 'unnatural' body was repeatedly established through reference to his cartoonish proportions, especially his apparently 'growing head'. Bonds is characterized as "so gigantic his head looks like it's going to pop off" (Sandomir, 2004: D4) and having "no trouble adding bulk and muscle... especially in the forehead area" (Reilly, 2004: 96). Attributing freakish appearance changes to steroids through outlandish descriptions bolstered the more tamed down claim: that Bonds had gained some weight and increased his muscle capacity. Thus primacy was placed on depicting Bonds as *sub-human* rather than simply using steroids as one among many aids to boost muscle development. This is a particularly important point to establish in baseball because of the complex factors involved in hitting. Size alone is a rather minimal factor when one considers the hand-eye coordination, reaction time, fluidity of swing and pitch identification involved in the split-second decision to swing at a pitch. The linking of Bonds steroid use with extreme artificiality, acting as 'magic bullets' that chemically produced his home run ability, creates a clear boundary between the fictional clean/doped athletic body.

Alternatively, McGwire's body was depicted in relatively innocuous language. No equivalent artificial images describing his body emerged that were connected to his andro use. This was primarily achieved by situating McGwire's body as always being naturally large. *NYT* reporter Boffey (1998) notes that the

> Paul-Bunyan-like character with his Popeye arms generally propelled the balls far into the stands, or lined them with such velocity there was no doubt of their

> authenticity... McGwire has always been a well-muscled slugger, hitting 49 homers in his first major league season and more than 50 in another season before he reportedly started taking androstenedione (A16).

Here McGwire's body is situated as always being 'big', implying that his present body type, though perhaps bigger, closely aligns with his 'natural' body type. In the article "Over Fence Came Before Over Counter," McGwire's 'natural athletic talent' for hitting home runs is foreshadowed through his first at bat in Little League: he hit a home run. This natural talent, however, did not stem from his biology; it came from his "continued [effort] to work on it, and his body, with, apparently, an uncommon devotion" (Berkow, 1998: C1). This is typical of sporting narratives that attribute white athletic success to 'hard work' (Abdel-Shehid, 2005). Descriptions of McGwire walked the fine line between calling him a 'genetic freak' that was always large and a 'drug cheat' using steroids to boost muscle mass, by arguing that through honest and hard work he achieved an authentic body. On the whole though, McGwire's bodily integrity was mostly maintained simply by not focusing on it as a site for discussion.

The specter of gender transgression and loss of sexual prowess raised by steroid use also appeared in discussions about Bonds and McGwire. These ideas often play out in the subtext of public scandals relating to steroids as part of the media's fascination with investigating the potentially feminized sex organs of users. Scheft comments:

> Come on. This is a health issue. The side effects of steroid use are well-documented. And speaking of shrunken testicles, when is Bud Selig planning to reprimand Barry Bonds? (2004: 24).

The coverage of the 'health issue' with steroids mimics WADA's educational information in their descriptions of Bonds by focusing primarily on his loss of manhood. For all the talk about the health problems associated with steroids, other side-effects –

such as liver damage, cancer and physical addiction – were simply not discussed with Bonds. Scheft uses the façade of science to slip from popular mythologies about 'shrunken testicles' and alleged steroid use by Bonds to the 'obvious' conclusion that they actually are. The double meaning behind the statement – which also refers to Selig not being 'man enough' to rid baseball of Bonds – belies the different position each holds as Commission and player. The use of the phrase "reprimand" shows that it is Selig who holds the *power* over Bonds. He can fully strip Bonds of his manhood, thereby restoring his own. This unintentional racial script – involving the anxiety surrounding black men's sexuality, coupled with the public demasculinisation of Bonds – informs the obsession with Bonds sexual organs. Another author explicitly questions Bonds sexual performance because of his steroid use.

> [Bonds] former mistress told the authors [*Game of Shadows*] that his back was pocked with acne, a telltale sign of steroid use, and that he suffered from *impotence*, another marker (Sokolove, 2006: 12).

Although the above quote is based on hearsay, the underlying effect of the message is clear: Bonds is metaphorically castrated. This can clearly be located within discourses about the anxiety of steroid use to hegemonic masculinity. Anti-doping campaigns in the media appear to use a similar framework to understand steroids as unhealthy. This underscores the rhetorical power of the natural body to control for 'proper' gender and sexuality, which – perhaps unsurprisingly – are expressed through the public consumption of a black man's sexual organs. Reporters covering Bonds presented his suspected steroid use as legitimate grounds for 'journalistic' discussion and investigation of his genitalia.

When contextualized within descriptions of McGwire's sexuality and andro use, the racialization in the Bonds case appears more evident. Verducci reports:

> The supplement's most salubrious side effect (related to performance off the field) may explain why he has been smiling so much lately. "Put it this way," [McGwire] says, "the company that supplies me says most of its repeat business is coming from wives and girlfriends who are very satisfied" (1998: 33).

This serves two related points: first, it confirms McGwire's status as a heterosexual stud, a framework often used to establish 'being a man' and of course being a good American hero (Messner, 1992; 2002). And second, it counters worries that andro could threaten his gender status and/or sexual performance. In a confusing turn of framing, andro is simultaneously cast as a 'natural supplement' that does not enhance McGwire's performance enough to challenge his sporting authenticity yet it is infused with enough testosterone to boost his sex life. This particular McGwire quote was often repeated in media reports, indicating the importance of maintaining hero status through stories that confirm sexual prowess. It is also notable that McGwire's voice is centered in this article as a primary source of positive information. It seems Bonds voice is only ever used to insinuate a derogatory characteristic.

Descriptions of Barry Bonds 'doped' body were consistent with the intertwining of anti-doping rhetoric and racism that harshly denigrates 'outsiders' on the fringes of the national imagination as extremely artificial. On the other hand, the positive construction of McGwire's body as 'natural' preserved his recording breaking performance from being tainted. In dissecting constructions of Bonds body, comments from Cole and Mobley (2005) seem appropriate. They observe that repeated references to black bodies in sport are "symptomatic of America's preoccupation and fascination with African American bodies, the cultural anxieties surrounding those bodies, and the use of black

bodies in interpreting US drug scandals" (6). Through the interlocking narratives on steroids, drug problems and black athletes, it becomes clearer why Bonds became the site of retribution for the 'Steroid Era'. Perhaps this explains, at least in part, why contrasting discourses about Bonds as a 'doped athlete' and McGwire as 'all-natural' occurred. A key point from this section is that the media constructs doping scandals through a series of other socio-cultural influences, such as 'sincere fictions' and the 'crisis of whiteness', to produce the doped villain.

Deploying the 'Race Card' to Save Purity

"They're just letting [McGwire] do it because he's a white boy" – Barry Bonds[25]

A fundamental operating principle of 'modern racism' is the idea that it is a 'thing of the past' and therefore anyone who claims they are experiencing it is using it as an excuse. This viewpoint was widespread in the media's portrayal of Barry Bonds. As the above quote indicates, Bonds is quite forthright with the media that his treatment – especially compared to McGwire – is racist. However, since any incident that is seen as prejudice would ruin the credibility of baseball's (and America's) mythology of racial progression, reporters preserve it by being highly skeptical of *any* claims of racism. In stories discussing his steroid use the 'race card' emerged as a narrative strategy to justify avoiding the topic of systematic racism while simultaneously focusing on Bonds as 'target number one' to purify baseball's doping problem. As he approaches the historical home run records held by Hank Aaron and Babe Ruth the urgency to 'get rid' of him pervades the media's coverage. This section outlines how issues of race in the coverage of Bonds were sidelined through the deployment of 'modern racism' to continue

[25] This quote comes from an excerpt in *Game of Shadows* repeated in the *NYT* and *SI*.

constructing him through the evil-doper archetype.

In 1974 an African American player named Hank Aaron passed baseball legend Babe Ruth on the all-time home run list. Throughout his chase of the record Aaron faced a barrage of nasty racist taunts and death threats. On the day he broke the record the MLB Commissioner did not even show up – a clear sign of MLB's disapproval with a black athlete 'invading' baseball history. However, now thirty years removed from that context, he is celebrated universally in baseball circles as an American hero. This change in perception is important because, in articles about Bonds, Aaron is routinely contrasted as a 'good guy' (non-doping black player) the media celebrated. *NYT* writer Chase states:

> Bonds has raised the specter of race, as in white officials, the white news media and white fans not wanting him to pass Ruth. A black player, however, has already passed Ruth (2006b: D4).

Hank Aaron is used the same way that Michael Jordan often is: as evidence that racism no longer exists because the public has accepted their greatness (Andrews, 2001). This comparison relegates Bonds potential racial abuse as unfounded primarily through the observation that a white majority *now* feels comfortable cheering for Aaron. The fact Aaron emerged successful and is now seen in a positive light serves to position Bonds as his opposite in character. This centers Bonds *doping use* as the primary reason for the media's harsh coverage of his record chasing pursuit.

But what should we make of the acceptance of Hank Aaron? Obviously racial construction is more dynamic than simply hating all black players; many are exuberantly celebrated. However, in comparison to whites, depictions of black athletes in the media are controlled through a restricted binary lens. Media stories rarely provide much space to be complex characters, which means "we miss out on seeing the diversity of everyday

successes by African American men" (Wenner, 1995: 228). Consequently, black masculinity is often portrayed as either 'good' or 'bad'. A 'good black', such as Hank Aaron, must accept certain rules to continue this status: "not be angry, politicized, ungrateful, greedy, mean, or talk the talk or walk the walk of the streets" (ibid: 229). Because black stars need to appeal to white middle-class values, Andrews argues that to maintain an accepted image "if you're black, you are not supposed to harp on it... African Americans are tolerated, even valorized, if they *abdicate their race* [emphasis added]" (in Wilson, 1999: 241). The opposite of this script, the 'bad black', is portrayed as angry, political, unclean and threatening. The polarity of these images leaves little space in between. In practice, 'cubbyholes' are used to locate what in reality are a wide variety of personalities and experiences into an either/or position. Thus when Bonds raises the issue of race, which he often does with the almost exclusively white reporters covering him, he is understood negatively as being political and openly black. This is a combination that has historically been perceived as threatening to white America. A lot of Bonds' well documented problems with reporters' stems from his unwillingness to 'play the game' and pretend they are colourblind. This particular interaction between Bonds and the media is not described to the readers, but it certainly alters how he is produced as a public figure; in turn, this alters how readers understand the issues of doping in sport as it is described through the Bonds scandal.

The media tends to focus heavily on Hank Aaron's ability to overcome extreme racial barriers as an *individual*. This avoids the more difficult question of examining the repercussions of the (still existing) racist context of sport. In an article headlined "Past

Glory Versus Today's Suspicions," Roberts depicts Hank Aaron as a "pure legend" and Bonds as a "murky slugger," stating:

> Bonds has openly blamed racism for his troubles as an escape route from personal accountability, but Aaron confronted the reality of hate mail piling up in his box and the supremacists who vowed to kill him for arching No. 715 over the wall... The night touched so many people because of what it meant to society, to Aaron and to baseball fans who simply appreciated the joy of accomplishment. "It was pure," said House, who handed the ball to Aaron at the plate. "It was a kinder, gentler era" (2005: BB1).

By positioning Bonds claim of (covert) racism against the vicious taunts Aaron faced, he is contextualized as a 'whiner' who does not know how good he has it. Defining racism as "supremacists who vowed to kill" makes Bonds claims appear like a paltry excuse for his deviant drug use. Thus, through the re-imagining of extreme prejudice faced by Aaron, readers are assured that race is no longer a factor; that Bonds is simply getting what he deserves as a doper.

Bonds is further contrasted through the idea that Aaron played in a "kinder, gentler era." This is a perplexing construction because, while the reader is told Aaron faced death threats, Bonds steroid use is presented as a larger social problem. In this sense, the characterization of the overtly racist era that Aaron endured as 'gentle' is used to justify mistreating Bonds for being a 'murky slugger' in the present. Banet-Weiser (1999) argues that reporters often claim to be 'colourblind' to race while simultaneously reinforcing racial tensions without personal culpability:

> Many of the (mostly) White sports journalists have stated, either implicitly or explicitly, that sport stories should not be about race, yet the Black players themselves 'play the race card' by accusing managers, journalists and sponsors of racism. Thus, the media coverage denies any responsibility in perpetuating racist narratives by transferring the issue of race to the players (409).

This discursive strategy is especially prevalent in the Bonds steroid scandal because the purity of baseball itself is at stake. The anxiety around dopers breaking historically significant records can be seen as crossing with concerns that 'bad blacks' are ruining the 'good old days' of (white) sport by being trouble makers. The overlap is significant because the purity at stake in other doping scandals, such as the Ben Johnson incident in Canada, imply a similar mix of racial and national cleansing through derogatory news stories of the black doper.

Roberts continues in her article, stating that "without Bonds around as a daily distraction, the *reparations* can begin before the next record falls" (ibid). Here, the traditional terminology of reparations as the compensation sought for slavery by African Americans is turned on its head to refer to Bonds *owing baseball* for the taint he created. This connects with more deep seeded convictions that 'bad blacks' (and especially Bonds) threaten the institution of MLB. As Neil Henry observes, "then, as today, few figures in our national consciousness provoke as much public controversy as the gifted, arrogant, and rich black athlete – especially one who threatens our most cherished national myths" (2006: 46).

As a success story, Aaron proves that it is possible to be brilliant in the face of oppression. This reassures the (white) audience that, even against obstacles, eventually those that work hard and utilize the opportunities afforded to them will prevail. Gardiner (2003) argues that in postcolonial nations non-white athletes are provided insider status when they can serve as role models of national unity, provided they "remain silent about racism and racial abuse" (237). Hank Aaron serves the interests of both baseball and country because his success actually upholds modern racism through his status as a 'good

black' contrasted against Bonds. This overriding nostalgic depiction of baseball inevitably glosses over deeper racial divisions to depict the (now predominately non-white sports world) as 'troubled'. Furthermore, Bonds is seen at the center of tensions about doping that actually involve a series of socio-historical developments in sport science and high performance sport practices. The idea that eliminating Bonds from baseball will solve the 'doping issue' is rather naïve when one considers this context. Media depictions of doping scandals as individual problems reinforce WADA's vision of the *athlete* as the site of impurity; this de-contextualizes the reality of technological/human interaction in training for sport, which steroid use is a part of.

While the depiction of Hank Aaron is read through baseball's mythology of being racially progressive, Babe Ruth, MLB's very first power hitter, is intimately connected to its past glory days. He played from 1914 to 1934 during the Dead Ball Era, where he became famous for hitting home runs before power hitters existed. Despite playing so long ago, he remains one of the most recognizable sporting figures in American sport. When Ruth played, however, people of colour were barred from the league under racial segregation. In response, black communities established their own parallel Negro Leagues, but these are not generally included in narratives of baseball's nostalgic past. The film *Field of Dreams* is a prime example of the "mythic vision of America and its national pastime which... has extended into millions of American imaginations" (Garman, 1994: 1). Film critic Harlan Jacobson observes that it

> wishes aloud that America could return to the innocent days of white baseball. When there were no stains on the American honour, no scandals, no dirty tricks, no surprises. When everything was pure and clean and simple, and, well, white (in Garman, 1994).

Images of purity and whiteness interlock to uphold the deeply embedded fascination with baseball and Babe Ruth. An 'impurity', such as a doping scandal involving a black athlete, disrupts this narrative. As Bonds approached and then passed Ruth's home run total, there was a perceptible anxiety surrounding this moment reminiscent of the initial treatment Hank Aaron received as he passed Ruth. I would argue that this focus on Ruth as Bonds passes his record is embedded within overlapping discourses of the 'crisis of whiteness', obsessions with bodily purity and white nationalist myth making in baseball.

In May 2006 *SI* ran the cover story "Barry Bonds: The Long, Strange Trip to 715*" with an ominous picture of him swinging at the plate for Ruth's record. The underlying message was that Bonds was threatening the purity of the national pastime. The media consistently used negative imagery or dismissive statements in headlines to denote Bonds lack of credentials to 'really' pass Ruth. A sample of the headlines used to depict the incident is revealing: "Crowding Baseball's World Stage, A Story of the Game's Dark Side," "Bonds Will Pass 714, But Not the Legend," and "Barry Who?" There was a palpable anger that explicitly positioned Ruth's record as superior. *SI* writer Verducci states:

> On his way to eclipsing Babe Ruth's iconic total of 714 home runs, Barry Bonds has made history – and a lot of people angry. Deep into the final chapter of the Steroid Era, the lingering question is, what do we make of the slugger's feats? For many, the numbers just don't add up... It will be a long time, if ever, before the kind of happy delusion that was 1998 can take us on a blissful, unquestioning joyride again. We know and suspect too much now (2006c: 39).

Thus Bonds is positioned as both destroyer of Ruth's number and the reason (reporters at least) can no longer have a "happy delusion that was 1998" when McGwire took us on a "blissful" journey. Baseball's 'loss of innocence' is primarily seen as a loss to Ruth and McGwire who are 'good guys' that played clean. What is interesting in this particular

depiction is the seeming inability of the media to connect the way they targeted Bonds with the emergence of the doping scandal as a national disgrace.

The article "Bonds Will Pass 714, But Not the Legend" begins by reminding readers that the "Babe has been on everybody's mind lately, as Bonds approaches his lifetime home run total of 714." Vecsey continues:

> Ruth transformed his sport more than any other American has done... coming on strong after the 1919 Black Sox gambling scandal, saved what used to be considered the national pastime, and may still be, deep down. Bonds cannot save baseball from anything, certainly not himself, in the wake of his possible perjury in the Balco case... He has tried to play the race card by saying "they" – whoever "they" are – didn't want a black man to pass the Babe, but that is just plain desperate. The *only racial angle* with Ruth is that he was never able to compete against the great black athletes who were barred from the 1880's to 1947 [my emphasis] (2006: D1).

This reads like a desperate attempt to conceal contempt for Bonds, much of which is premised on his being a black athlete in the first place, especially when contextualized within the McGwire scandal. The statement is laced with the themes of innocence and re-birth, which are attributed to Ruth through reference to him 'saving' the game compared to Bonds dragging the sport through a scandal. By using the 'race card', Vecsey scoffs at Bonds claim as "plain desperate," despite rather obvious indications (i.e. headlines) that the media is in fact targeting him. The notion that the "only racial angle" involves Ruth's legacy appears to also be recast through 'reverse racism'. This turns the history of segregation in baseball on its head: the *privilege* provided Ruth (he was actually allowed to play MLB) is recast as a damper on his record. The images of Ruth – in an innocent, doping free past – suggest that eliminating Bonds from the picture can help reestablish baseball from this blemish.

The impossibility of teasing out the 'bad black' and 'doping cheat' from one another in the Barry Bonds scandal suggests that they each depend on a similar set of interrelated ideas about purity. The assumption of artificiality – both in terms of race and drug use in this case – also appears to overlap in America around discussions of the drug problem. This goes a long way to explaining the targeting of Bonds as enemy number one in comparison to McGwire. He was actively described through the typical white hero narrative that dominated the media's coverage. For example, a 1998 *SI* cover story pictured a smiling McGwire embracing his son with the title "The Good Father" (Reilly). The article depicts McGwire as sensitive, family oriented and modest. A *NYT* article called "A Reluctant Home-Run Hitter, A Reluctant Hero" describes him as having difficulty in the spot light; as well as being a good father and donating money to help abused children (Curry, 1998). Unlike articles about Bonds, irrelevant details and positive tone were used to portray McGwire as innocent and friendly. Given that McGwire was caught doping, and did not face negative characterization until his meltdown at Congress, it appears that the media's coverage of doping scandals depend on other factors beyond the legal/illegal drug binary.

Converging Discourses

The contrasting media coverage of Bonds and McGwire during their doping incidents demonstrates that social power impacts the way media scandals are interpreted. The alignment between the 'bad black' and 'doped athlete' seemed to perpetuate a common narrative: 'unclean' black men being read through troubling stories of drug use to support a (racialized) 'war on drugs'. A key component of drug narratives in America centers on the interlocking image of black men and drugs (Gabriel, 1998). As Neil Henry

suggests, the targeting of a successful, outspoken black athlete in the doping scandal can be seen as the "latest in a long line of black athletes in American history wrongfully targeted for destruction" (2006: 45).

The protection McGwire received from the media during his andro incident should not be read as a counter doping narrative. Once McGwire was constructed as a 'clean athlete' – which my analysis locates within the 'crisis of whiteness' in search of heroes – andro, the home run record and his body were all considered 'pure'. This indicates mediated doping scandals reflect broader socio-cultural tensions in deploying the rhetoric of 'purity' and 'artificiality'. When a doper/clean athlete is framed, the discourse employed is relatively consistent with WADA's anti-doping logic. The contrasting way in which McGwire and Bonds' body, sporting performance and health were presented along the binary archetype attests to this convergence.

However, the recent fallen hero status of McGwire post-Congressional hearing further illustrates that these incidents require nuanced interpretation. While my analysis focuses on racial construction, once McGwire was exposed for refusing to talk about steroids truthfully, the deployment of 'sincere fictions' to protect his record dissipated. Furthermore, by 2005 the BALCO scandal and President Bush's State of the Union address had altered the context in which MLB and steroids were perceived in the media. Thus, seven years removed from his initial andro scandal, media coverage shifted the construction of McGwire from 'good guy' to steroid cheat and/or fallen hero. Clearly race and racism are not the only factors at play in the construction of the scandal. I emphasized race in the coverage because I believe it remains the most compelling factor differentiating the initial media response to each incident.

In the next chapter I consider the implications of overlapping media and policy steroid discourses. I also describe how competitive athletes in my in-depth interviews navigated doping policy as people experiencing the contradictory nature of performance enhancement. Unlike the strong alignment between media and policy constructions of doping, the athletes in my project often described 'doping', 'fair play' and preparation for sport in a number of contradictory and partial ways. This provided unique insight into how athletes who experience 'win at all cost' sport science deal with the tension between doping policy and sporting culture.

Chapter 4:

Performance Enhancement in the Age of Moral Panic

Introduction

So far I have not considered the interpretation of anti-doping policy from the perspective of competitive athletes. In this chapter I discuss my interviews with athletes in an attempt to understand how they engage with performance enhancement and doping. While the previous two chapters – covering WADA policy documents and mediated steroid scandals in MLB – illustrated the emergence of steroid discourses, they cannot shed light into how athletes actually interpret these ideas. My conversations with athletes provide insight into how they trained full-time to boost performance (using 'artificial' technology), while simultaneously engaging with anti-doping logic that constructs fair sport as 'clean'. I am particularly interested in their negotiation of the clean/artificial dividing line in relation to their sporting culture experience. In this sense, my interviews suggest ways in which athletes incorporate (or not) discourses about doping based on their personal training routine.

After describing my interview findings I then link back to the main points of interest from the previous two chapters. Following my central research question, I consider how similarities and differences in media, policy and athlete constructions of steroids converge to produce support for drug testing as the only way to eradicate the 'doped athlete'. Constraining ways of thinking about steroids reinforces the status quo, and thus the problems that anti-doping efforts purportedly attempt to eliminate. I consider the continuation of health problems in sport, the targeting of 'doped athletes' in an age of

technologically integrated sport and the naturalization of drug testing through an expanding 'war on drugs' logic.

Talking With Athletes: What Counts As True Performance?

During the course of my interviews with competitive athletes one point became very clear: their understanding and explanation of anti-doping logic was partial, contradictory and contextually driven. By this I do not mean that they were uninformed. On the contrary, their knowledge about how sport works, and how doping fits into that, is far more practical than the facetious Athlete Committee created by WADA. What I mean is that the 'master narrative' of doping – presented so consistently in anti-doping pamphlets and media scandals – was only partially 'picked up' by my participants. They deployed some aspects of it in fragmented and contradictory ways; while at other times they utilized WADA's logic through a different set of assumptions. Athletes' viewpoints differ from reporters – who reinforce anti-doping logic from the vantage point of a moral crusader – because they actually *experience* performance enhancement. This knowledge shapes how they engage with WADA's construction of doping.

I will begin this section with a brief explanation of my participants by placing special emphasis on the sporting cultures they compete in. Then a consideration of WADA's notion of sport as healthy is contrasted with the experiences of my participants. This contextual backdrop sets the stage for an interrogation of their performance enhancement practices using cyborg theory. My main discussion centers on the tentative relationship athletes have between engagement with technology and their understanding of clean sport. Although participants seemed perplexed by the concept of the 'clean

athlete' underlying anti-doping rhetoric, they appeared to utilize a different set of ideas to support a similar logic to doping.

Who Are My Participants?

I interviewed three competitive athletes as a basis for this section. Although this formed a small sample size, the different sports and experiences they each had contributed a significant amount of exploratory data about athletes' engagement with performance enhancement technologies. To maintain the anonymity of my participants their names have been replaced with pseudonyms. I have also limited the amount of biographical data in this project to avoid their detection. One participant told me that their sporting community was quite small, and it would not be too difficult for someone to identify them with a full description of their identity. In response to this ethical consideration, my analysis focuses on the participants' sporting culture rather than biography. My participants competed in three different sports: martial arts, rugby and synchronized swimming. I will briefly explain each sport and participant.

Beth is a martial artist who has been competing for over ten years in the sport. She fights in full-contact sanctioned competition under mixed martial arts rules, which allow a range of fighting techniques: kick-boxing, boxing, grappling/wrestling and submission are the primary disciplines. The rounds last between three to five minutes long, with a one minute break. As the sport itself has evolved, Beth has incorporated new skill sets in addition to her start in kick-boxing. Thus she actually trains in a number of different fighting disciplines that are combined together, spontaneously, in reaction to the opponent in competition. The sport requires strength and supreme cardiovascular shape; without these basic conditioning levels a martial artist will be quickly overpowered and

worn out, regardless of fighting ability. Because there are weight divisions, Beth must 'peak' at the right time physically during the pre-competition period, and then drop about 15-20 pounds of weight prior to the fight. This is common practice in boxing, wrestling and martial arts fighting that have strict weight cut-offs that must be met; if a fighter chooses to not take off weight they will likely end up in the cage against a significantly larger opponent.

Robert is a rugby player who has played at a competitive level in high school, provincial and semi-pro club teams. The position he plays – prop – is reserved for the biggest players on the team. However, as someone who is slightly undersized for the position, he utilizes his ability to "read the play and understand what is going to happen and anticipate more than just raw size or strength" to compensate. The play in rugby is continuous, with brief periods of stoppage during scrums; games consist of two forty minute halves. Therefore his training focuses on maintaining the right body to continue successfully at prop. His position requires a high degree of size, strength and endurance to be able to compete for the ball against other opponents throughout the game. Unlike some sports, such as basketball, rugby players often play without ever substituting out of the game. Currently Robert is recovering from a serious injury, and believes he will be playing again later this year.

Jessica is a former competitive synchronized swimmer. She competed in the sport for over ten years. As an elite level athlete, Jessica competed in several national championships with her teammates at a level just below Olympic competition. The sport combines artistic movement along with lifts and throws in (and often under) the water; synchronized routines last four minutes long. Hence the sport requires excellent lung

capacity, lean muscle mass (to lift and throw athletes in the water but remain light) and endurance. Currently Jessica is retired from competitive synchronized swimming because of sport related concussions.

Is Sport Healthy?

A primary justification of WADA's anti-doping agenda is to preserve sport as a healthy institution in which athletes compete safely. Although certainly being physically active is a healthy practice for a range of bodily functions – as well as being extremely rewarding and enjoyable – the nature of *elite sport* produces injuries on a regular basis. When asked if injuries were common, Jessica noted that "we take our bodies so close to that line of breaking versus doing really well that some things are going to break eventually." In a similar sentiment, Beth believes that "whoever trains more than six or seven hours a week, you tend to walk around with an injury." All of the participants agreed that injury was a normal, institutional aspect of sport that was an inevitable outcome of full-time training and competition. I gained no sense or response in words from the participants that this was a problem. Their rather matter of fact descriptions of personal injuries indicated it was something they had accepted. This is perhaps unsurprising given the sheer number of high speed, full-contact incidents that occur on a regular basis in competition and practice.

Participants also stressed that playing through injuries was necessary because – as competitive athletes – they were never actually 'fully healed'. For example, when asked if athletes compete while injured, Robert stated: "consistently – every season everyone on the team is always nursing some sort of injury, compensating for it, no one waits until

they're fully heeled until they come back." I followed up by asking if he felt pressure to return before being fully healed, and he replied:

> I didn't feel any pressure at all other than the fact that everyone else is training when I'm not, so it's a very internalized pressure. But the constant questions – you know, when are you going to be back – as an athlete you feel that pressure, you put that pressure on yourself.

To me, this indicated a high level of personal responsibility for being injured, as well as feeling guilty for something that was clearly not his fault. Although Robert felt he was not pressured back too soon, the "constant questions" from coaches suggests that a subtle culture of pressure (which becomes internalized) may exist. This is consistent with ethnographic descriptions of coaches that punish athletes who are 'injury prone' and delay returning to the team through derogatory comments and actions (Malcolm, 2006).

The image of preserving sport as healthy – which is one of WADA's primary concerns – is premised on the idea that doping is the prime cause of casualties. But as Konig (1995) asks: "do we hear of an unmistakable accusation of those irreversible damages, not caused by doping but by "classical" training of numerous former high performance athletes"? (250). Athletes in my study experienced a wide array of serious injuries that speak directly to Konig's criticism of anti-doping 'ethics'.

> *Beth*: Yeah, chronic knee injury, I still have it; elbow injury which I have right now and getting worse all the time; ankle, broken leg, concussion, knocked out. So yeah, quite a few injuries – shoulder injury.

> *Robert*: Separated my shoulder... and I had nerve damage to the arm... I've torn ligaments in my ankle. I've damaged the ACL on my right leg before. Tears, strains, bruises – the usual. I've had rib heads pop off the spine before and sprains – the usual – dislocated fingers that sort of thing.

> *Jessica*: I had tears with my rectus abdominus top to bottom and that led to arthritis... I had [several concussions] from hitting my head on the bottom [of the pool].

The fact that these injuries were directly related to sport as practiced indicates that health consequences are a *part* of high performance sport. This undermines WADA's simplistic construction of 'clean athletics' as always being healthy and safe. Broken bones, concussions and muscle tears will have serious long-term impacts on these athletes' bodies in the future. Despite this reality, the underlying message from my participants was that they were more concerned with *not playing* than *being injured.* It is this seemingly unconscious normalization of everyday injuries in sport that makes the consequences from doping stand out as unusual. There was no indication from my participants that they viewed everyday injuries in the same light as steroid abuse. The next section explores my participants' engagements with sports science and performance enhancement by utilizing cyborg theory.

Cyborg Athletes?

Butryn (2003) argues that the nature of high performance sport produces 'cyborg' athletic identities. This refers to the idea that athletes now regularly engage with a range of technologies in their training to the extent that the pure, "original I" is a fabrication. Although at some level each participant in my study utilized 'outside influences' to improve, this seemed to vary significantly depending on the demands of their particular sport. The actual extent of this integration ranged from mixed martial arts at the high end, to synchronized swimming on the low end. My interpretation of this difference in engagement with technology was that each sport demands certain types of bodily manipulations that require specific sorts of equipment and supplements. As I noted in the description of each sport, athletes rationally tailor their preparation for optimal performance. For example, we would expect that both a rugby and long-distance runner

would train in both cardiovascular and weight training, but for different ends: runners would emphasize improving endurance capacities within a relatively stable frame of lean muscle mass; while the rugby player might maintain a suitable level of conditioning and focus more on improving optimal strength. This recognition of rational training, grounded in particular sporting cultures, suggests that athletes learn to accept certain forms of performance enhancement as normal through their everyday routines. The diversity of practices across such contexts as weight lifting, track and field and ballet cautions against a presumption that sport is a homogenous concept.

Although each participant split their preparation time between practice (skill and strategy development), weight training and cardiovascular conditioning, the breakdown of time differed. As a whole, Jessica spent the majority of her time drilling the synchro routine, while Beth and Robert split their time evenly between improving body capacity and skill development. Thus rugby and martial arts produces athletes that are more attuned to their bodily capacity through *biochemical* awareness; whereas synchronized swimmers – who focus less on an exact 'peak' body capacity – reach their ideal weight and size through the 'right' *appearance.* I found that a relationship existed between an athletes' awareness of technological integration and their general understanding of doping. Perhaps unsurprisingly then, Beth and Robert appeared more comfortable expressing sport performance as a fluid activity (rather than a rules based approach to purity); and Jessica held reservations about portraying doping as tied up in the logic of sporting performance.

As a martial artist, Beth's training depends on whether she is in pre-competition or competition mode. She states:

> If there is no competition or no fight then I tend to walk heavier than when I am competing. It's not a particular body type per se but it is a particular weight and conditioning that I am striving for [competition].

The further need to gain optimal muscle and endurance capacities for the fight, and then lose 15 to 20 pounds for the weigh in, means that she is particularly attuned (and very knowledgeable) about her bodies internal functioning. She was intimately aware of how to optimize her nutritional intake of carbs, proteins and calories to match the needed output. It seemed the ability to manipulate the body in such an extreme fashion – yet still see it as a normal practice – led Beth to perceive her training from a different perspective. In particular, she rejected the legal/illegal distinction in favour of understanding her performance enhancement as a rational process to help her train harder, recover faster, relieve pain and lose weight rapidly when appropriate. Beth used a variety of technologies to reach peak form:

> Any kind of supplements like glucosamine, Advil, Tylenol 3, strong kind of muscle relaxants... glutamine, creatine, protein powders, multi-vitamins, vitamin C, ephedrine, stacked ephedrine caffeine aspirin [25 milligrams of ephedrine, 250 grams of caffeine, and one aspirin pill] if I need to lose weight fast... I have used steroids... I did half a cycle of that [several years ago], and I did see a difference.

Along with her skills training, weight lifting, mental preparation and cardiovascular work, Beth portrayed these substances and methods as interdependent processes to reach the ideal state of mind and body on fight day. It was not so much a question of what technology was 'ethical' or 'immoral', but what worked together. Each aspect of her preparation played a specific role: for instance, creatine helped boost ATP production[26] enabling her to push harder in training; Advil reduced sore muscle pain to continue workouts; and proper nutrition fueled her body with energy to perform. One way of

[26] ATP (adenosine triphophate) is a chemical that is the main energy source for cell functioning in the body needed for virtually all activity; during strenuous exercise ATP production drops so the ability to replace it enables an athlete to continue working with less rest time between work outs.

interpreting this description is connecting the culture of marital arts to her perception of enhancement: she saw reaching peak capacity as an interdependent process involving technologies, experts and motivation; this is consistent with the way training in martial arts is seen as depending on sound mind and body. Thus I would term Beth a 'cyborg athlete' who embraces modern performance enhancement techniques, regardless of legal/illegal labels.

As a rugby player, Robert's engagement with technology was similar in the sense that he drew on a wide array of technologies to reach optimal capacity. He noted that rugby has "become more aware of position specific nutrition and training," and this has helped him tailor his training more effectively. Robert controlled his diet closely using an online fitness diary; on a daily basis he monitors the correct carb, protein and fat ratios. Much like Beth, he also used a range of performance enhancers that suggest the clean/artificial distinction is meaningless:

> Multi-vitamin protein powder, two liters of water a day, creatine, as well as vitamin C supplements as well... cortisone shots... prescription anti-inflammatories such as Advil, Aspirin – like A535 that sort of thing. Tylenol 3's... Ephedrine ... ECA stack [which he recently stopped using].

These substances, many of which are similar to the ones used by Beth, help with pain relief and maximizing weight training sessions. This is an important, if poorly understood point: athletes mostly use drugs to increase endurance capacity through pain relief; this allows them to recover faster and therefore pump more iron. The pervasive accessibility of legal pain relief medications from doctors and friends further demonstrates the extent to which technology is used to perpetuate playing through injury.

The irony is that while anti-doping 'ethicists' claim to promote health – even though many illegal substances are not harmful – a range of legal drugs *encouraged* by

medical professionals can have serious long-term consequences. For example, cortisone shots are powerful anti-inflammatories derived from naturally occurring steroids in the body. They are often taken by athletes to block pain from an injury that has not healed. This enables an athlete to continue playing, but because pain signals from the body are numbed, injuries can worsen under this 'medical procedure'. As the last section indicated, athletes are unlikely to express concern about medical interventions because of their driving motivation to compete. In this sense, the continued obsession with steroids as the most dangerous drug obscures harms from normal sport.

I would characterize Robert as a 'cyborg athlete' as well. However, unlike Beth, he expressed a slightly more uncomfortable relationship with the idea of fluid training (i.e. no legalistic framework). This is because, at least implicitly, he aligned the normal rugby preparation techniques as not affecting his "original I."

In comparison, Jessica was not nearly as attuned to her biochemical functioning because it was simply not as necessary. Although she used some sporting technologies, she did not use a specific nutritional plan, legal supplements (other than vitamins) or illegal drugs. This suggested that, unlike Beth and Robert, she did not experience 'cyborg' sport in any meaningful way. The main body manipulation that was required occurred several weeks prior to competition. She was expected to lose about three to five pounds (to be easier to lift in the water), although this was only a rough guide because they did not use scales. The 'ideal' body type was not explicitly clear, although Jessica noted that coaches judged their 'competition readiness' based on a certain look.

> I found that most of my – not that I have body issues around weight cause I do not weigh myself ever – but it really hit me when I started rowing [semi-competitively] and I was considered lightweight but I had to be on 130 or under all the time and being weighed all the time. Which is something we never did in

synchro, *we just went by how your body looked in synchro* [my emphasis].

The consequence of this meant that Jessica did not see the few technological engagements she did have (i.e. audio-visual, Advil) as 'artificial', outside influences. Instead she perceived them as normal and legal because there was less focus on specific body manipulation. However, this seemed to hide the more subtle disciplinary techniques that are used to control female appearance in sports like synchronized swimming and gymnastics. The unwritten rule was that you remain thin.

The training regimes described by my participants (especially Beth and Robert) indicate what Butryn and Masucci charge as the

> hopelessly ridiculous and hypocritical attempts by doping agencies, both international and national, to police elite athletic bodies as if there existed uncontestable boundaries between the natural and unnatural (2003: 139).

Their experiences suggest a twist: anti-doping crusaders (as well as athletes, coaches and reporters) ignore the wide range of legal substances that enhance performance and create harmful effects. A model responsive to harm reduction that seamlessly crosses the legal/illegal technology terrain in sport might actually be in a better position to make sport healthier; as it stands, the paradigm of moral purity undermines this possibility. In the next section I consider the connection between cyborg identities and constructions of clean sport and fair play.

Protecting Natural Athletes?

In Butryn's (2003) seven interviews with elite track and field athletes, he found that the protection of pure bodies was an essential component of their understanding of doping. This occurred despite the extensive experience these athletes had with legal drugs and technologies that seemed to contradict an easy distinction between legal/illegal. In

contrast, the participants in my interviews expressed reservation with the idea of purity. Although two of the three supported drug testing, they all rejected a clear definition of the 'natural athlete'.

This appeared to primarily stem from unfamiliarity with the term. Although Canada's "True Sport Campaign" contains numerous references to purity, and the media uses this terminology regularly in steroid scandals, none of the athletes seemed familiar with the argument. That made a direct comparison between my WADA documents and media scandal with my Canadian athletes impossible because they were using different sources of information about training and anti-doping policy.

However, there did seem to be some awareness that 'clean' meant *drug free*, and so those that supported anti-doping policy in general formulated their own ways around this contradiction. For example, I asked Jessica: "If someone takes a drug on the banned list, is that a fine line between a clean body and something else?" She replied:

> But then you could have called me an unclean body when I was swimming cause I was on [legal technology]. I don't think there is such a thing as somebody who is not taking anything at all at an elite level. You're gonna take a Tylenol. I don't know any athlete who doesn't take anything. So I think the fully clean body doesn't exist anymore... I think clean is just a relative term – clean in that I'm not using steroids and blood enhancers and that sort of stuff.

This highlights the awareness of cyborgification in sport – "the fully clean body doesn't exist anymore" – that suggests her personal experience as an elite level athlete provided insight into the 'blurry' concept of what it means to be human. Instead of defining the 'clean athlete' as pre-technological, however, Jessica linked the question of cleanliness to use of steroids and blood enhancers; two of the most discussed illegal drugs in sport. This can be read simultaneously as a partial acceptance of WADA's policy (clean is not being on steroids) *and* rejection of the 'clean athlete' (it does not exist). This confusion about

absolute purity being fictional, against the idea that steroids are *not clean*, more than anything else highlights the vague and slippery logic WADA uses to support its policies. As this thesis suggests, discourses of steroids as dangerous do not require one to accept the 'spirit of sport'. The adaptability of the dividing line between someone being drugged and someone being clean (not on harmful substances like steroids) remains even without the concept of 'purity' per se.

On the other hand, Beth and Robert offered full condemnation of the term. In particular, they each suggested that it was simply a rhetorical tool that was connected to a fictional version of sport that has never existed. Asked if the idea of clean and artificial athletes made sense, Robert argued:

> No, I don't because apart from fair play, as far as being clean or impure or not a true result – I don't see it that way. There is always athletes who are better informed than others so if you are able to afford a nutritionist does that make your success against someone who couldn't afford that true or untrue?... It's the same thing they used to say about whether you're an amateur or a professional athlete. Amateur sports was pure sports whereas professional was not and those who played professional were then banned from sports.

The athletes I talked with all had at least some reservations with the idea of the 'level playing field' being about purity rather than 'fair play'. Robert also picked up on a point I made in the WADA chapter: that the amateur as pure and professional as artificial was a *political* distinction. This appeared to stem from a rejection of the 'magic bullet' thesis: the idea that illegal drugs propel also-rans to elite level performance ability. Without this framing of doping, they each rejected the artificial/clean distinction.

This ambivalence toward the concept of protecting 'purity' did not match my initial expectation from Butryn's findings. The athletes in my study (although notably a smaller sample) did not show near the same degree of attachment to the idea of 'natural

bodies'. It is possible the cultural context (Canadian versus American), sporting context (its not track and field) and lower level of competition (and thus less exposure to Olympic style literature) could explain this different construction. Nonetheless, I do think that it demonstrates the *tension* athletes face trying to come to terms with a doping policy based on something that, as Jessica astutely pointed out, "doesn't exist anymore." I say this because when it came to the issue of 'fair play' – which is grounded in the idea of moral purity – they did not hold the same kinds of reservations.

Although Jessica disputed the idea of absolute 'purity', her acceptance of WADA's definition of the 'spirit of sport' underscores her vision of athletics as premised on the 'level playing field'. Thus she articulated a partial framework of anti-doping similar to WADA's – apart from her rejection of clean bodies. When asked if she agreed with the 'spirit of sport' criterion for doping, Jessica stated:

> I don't know, it's just something that I've always felt, it's hard to define... it's that you're wanting yourself to do well but that you're wanting all you're competitors to do their best as well so it really is the best person who wins. Fair play, sportsmanship, congratulating people from other teams – just making it a safe community atmosphere to compete in.

This idea that competitive sport is about friendly contests seems to replace the protection of biological bodies as the overarching reason drug testing is important. Although Jessica's acceptance of sport as primarily being about sportsmanship is admirable, in some ways it relegates harm in sport to outside forces like steroid use. Unfortunately, the status quo that produces serious injuries as acceptable outcomes of sport continues to perpetuate this way of thinking.

Since Jessica had no experience with doping (she said no one dopes in synchronized swimming), and her identity as a 'cyborg' athlete was limited, it makes

sense that she would see doping substances as categorically different. This became apparent when I asked Jessica 'what counts as doping'.

> [Doping is] something that in one dose or two doses would significantly improve your competitive ability... Doping would be something that is proven scientifically to significantly increase to improve your chances.

This response can be seen as similar to the 'magic bullet' thesis, which suggests doping substances can turn an average athlete into an elite performer. Jessica's understanding of doping stems from a belief that dopers "significantly improve" very quickly using illegal drugs. This is considered unfair because – as her experience in synchronized swimming indicates – her engagement with sporting enhancement was limited. At least in this case, the relationship between her non-cyborg identity shaped how Jessica viewed doping in relation to legal substances.

Robert expressed several reservations with the anti-doping agenda: he was against widespread drug testing in sports with low rates of doping; he referred to Richard Pound's comments about steroid use in professional leagues, such as hockey, as indicative of a 'reefer madness' approach; and he disagreed with WADA's vague criteria for doping. I bring these points up because it illustrates the convoluted way in which anti-doping logic is actually negotiated by athletes. Ultimately, like Jessica, the overriding issue of 'fair play' justified drug testing for Robert. He stated:

> The legality of it doesn't make it fair or unfair to me. It's the fact that, especially if it's a competitive sport where you're playing against each other, then I think the use of illegal supplements is unfair because you're competing against each and not yourself, so that's a big part of what makes it unfair. I've had teammates and played against guys who I knew were juicing and it bothered me... And I see that as unfair, not because it is illegal, but because its illegal and they're taking something that we cannot. And it's something we've chosen to not take but its something that isn't available to everyone. I mean, if they want a separate league where everyone is juiced, go ahead, go play in your separate league, that's fine.

But the only reason they're playing is because we don't have the resources to test. These comments are revealing because they seem to (unconsciously) switch between several justifications for anti-doping: drugs that are illegal are unfair; drugs are unfair because they are not "available to everyone;" and doping is fundamentally an unethical practice. Seemingly contradictory statements like this should be expected because the underlying justifications for drug testing – which Robert ultimately offers as a way out of the problem – are convoluted. However, the broad underlying assumption appears to be that doping substances are fundamentally different than legal enhancers. That is why Robert suggests that juicers should establish their own 'doping league' to preserve clean sport. Although this relies more on the fair play argument, it is similar to WADA's dualistic vision of sport enhancement. In the interview, this exchange followed.

> *Bryan*: What is it about steroids that make it different than legal performance enhancers like creatine?
> *Robert*: Other than the legality? (laughs) It's something where – it's a matter of degree – the health risks are greater. It's the legality of it and the fact that the recovery is insanely higher if you were to take something like D-ball, an oral steroid, the results are – in a week – some will put on twenty pounds and you know when they stop they lose most of that anyway so it shows a lack of understanding of their own physiology.

This shifts between health risks, legality and unfair performance. It seems the ability for anti-doping logic to slide between ideas about steroids as dangerous and unfair reinforces high levels of support for drug testing among athletes with varying opinions. By deploying a series of discourses about steroids that link it to health risks and 'magic bullet' effects, athletes only need to 'pick up' partially on WADA's arguments to actually support their policy positions. In this project, two athletes with a widely divergent set of viewpoints on performance enhancement ultimately each supported surveillance of body fluids. This occurs because anti-doping policy is caught up in overlapping boundary

making claims that attempt to contain a certain vision of 'human led performance' that has long since passed.

The only athlete to openly link the illusion of 'purity' in sport to justifications for 'fair play' and the prohibited list was Beth. She did not support drug testing, and was highly critical of the basic premise underlying it: the idea that a 'level playing field' exists without drugs. This stemmed from her understanding of sport as a fluid process involving training, conditioning, drugs, nutrition, mental preparation and pain relief; in conjunction with her awareness that not all athletes had equal access to these resources. Her comments on the illegal/legal drugs divide were particularly revealing. As the only steroid user in my sample, Beth's insight into the *lack of logical distinction* between clean/artificial drugs was significant. In our conversation, Beth expressed that her trial run with steroids (for only one half cycle) to "put on some mass" made a difference.

> It helps you train harder. It helps you train more often by becoming stronger. By having the extra muscle mass, it allows you to out perform your opponent... The recuperation time was reduced dramatically.

Ultimately the other side effects she experienced – skin irritation, sleep disruption, hair growth and menstrual disruption – ended her brief usage of steroids. But this experience did not convince Beth that steroids were categorically different than other supplements. It appears instead that she perceived them as the most *effective* substance within the same general 'tent' of practices.

> *Bryan*: In the ring did you see a performance difference [with steroids] as well, with harder kicks or more explosive lifts?
> *Beth*: Honestly I can't attribute that to the steroid use but I think when your body heals a lot faster and you can hit the gym a lot harder each time obviously you're going to see those results. So I think steroids is a precursor to for having those outcomes. But if there was some sort of 'legal drug' [participants quotes] to achieve that, for my body to recuperate faster, to have those muscle gains then I'd see it as the same thing... Training is half of the game, and being able to come

> back to the gym. And I think steroids allows that [faster recuperation], supplements in general allow that.

Beth was unwilling to claim 'juice' had special powers. This more nuanced approach avoids partitioning steroids as uniquely unfair. Like Butryn (2003) advocates, she constructed steroids as one of many potential enhancers. It seems this viewpoint stems from her general understanding of performance enhancement is an essential function of sport. Furthermore, her personal experience with steroids provided insight into the arbitrary nature of the illegal/legal divide. Hence the comment that steroids and supplements are both attempting to achieve the "same thing": enhanced capacity.

The interviews that I conducted with my participants highlighted, in quite understated and partial ways, Beamish and Ritchie's (2004; 2005b) main contention with current doping policy: it cannot deal with the critical 'gap' between the logic of 'clean athletics' and sport as practiced. Athletes *live* in the center of this mess: they are expected to continue breaking records and winning medals; yet, in cruel contradiction, they must navigate a vague set of morally constructed ideas to avoid artificiality. This is all done so that we – the viewer – can 'know' the natural talent won the race.

Media and Policy Convergence

I would like to briefly turn back to the watershed moment that propelled national governments and anti-doping agencies to create WADA, because it offers some important insight into the co-dependency of policy and media coverage on moral panics about doping. The scandalous Tour de France in 1998, which exposed cross-border drug smuggling and 'doped up' cyclists for all to see, clearly illustrated the inability of anti-doping agencies to control illegal drug use in sport. Perhaps sensing this long run of failure, IOC President Samaranch offered a compromise: he called for a sharp reduction

in the banned substance list to focus only on those that had serious health consequences. However, the response from the media was swift and clear-cut: Samaranch was seen as 'throwing in the towel' on the fight against doping in sport. The press coverage leading up to the Lausanne Conference on doping constrained the debate around performance enhancement to one of policing techniques. Thus, rather than question the underlying logic of a failed doping policy, the discussion centered on formulating policies aimed at closing the 'loopholes' in the drug wars. Since the establishment of WADA in 1999 their has been a steady push to expand drug testing, crackdown harder on drug cartels, and loosen the standard of proof necessary to prove guilt. When the BALCO scandal emerged as another key moment, WADA constructed it as evidence for needing stricter control of athletes cheating the system; and the media – along with selling more stories – produced a moral drug panic around steroids that urged a targeting of 'doped athletes' to save sport and impressionable youth.

This section picks up on the discussions presented in the previous two chapters on WADA policy and mediated steroid scandals to interrogate how steroid use in sport is portrayed through a limited set of constructions. The separation of my analysis into policy and media discourses about steroid use suggests that these processes work independently of each other. However, the way in which steroids are discussed in each arena indicates that they depend on and perpetuate similar ways of thinking. This produces a situation where governments, policy makers, national anti-doping agencies and the media become locked into perceiving steroids as simultaneously *dangerous* and *effective.* In popular mythology steroids are connected to an array of harms: gender effects, medical risks, 'roid rage', suicide and body image obsession. Once on the field,

the magic of steroids spring to life: suddenly they become *responsible* for transforming mediocre athletic ability beyond what nature intended. This way of thinking continues because steroids are not seen as emerging from the logic of high performance sport; they are isolated as bad drugs, pushed on weak minded athletes that only wish to use short-cuts to avoid hard work.

Although WADA's policy and educational manuals create a master narrative about steroids as a risky doping substance, when actually deployed in a mediated 'steroid scandal' those ideas are framed through the lens of social power (racial, cultural, etc.). Thus anti-doping logic is understood through different contexts, incidents and histories in the media that ultimately reproduce similar narratives about the immorality of the drug. It is in this sense that anti-doping logic is both widespread and adaptable to an endless set of sporting contexts. By explicitly comparing two themes – the BALCO steroid scandal and the threat of death – I will attempt to show how constructions in the media and policy texts converge to frame steroids through discourses of the clean/doped athlete and 'war on drugs' imperative. Ultimately this thesis argues that it is primarily these two ways of thinking about performance enhancement that preserves the 'necessity' of expanding drug testing.

BALCO: "But with time... serious reform may come"

There is a widespread assumption in anti-doping logic that if we just got tougher on doping in sport – if we finally took a stand as a society to eradicate performance enhancing drugs – *then* the problem would be solved. The BALCO scandal has evolved into yet another crisis that replays and reinforces this script. The co-emergence of the media's focus on BALCO/Bonds as a threat to baseball's nostalgic (white) past, along

side WADA's obsession with re-establishing the 'way sport used to be', suggests that important doping moments are created through policy responses to media driven outrage.

Following *SI*'s explosive article "Totally Juiced" (2002), which reported former baseball player Ken Caminiti's claim that over 50 percent of players were using steroids in baseball, MLB was forced to start drug testing. The initial program was temporary, confidential (no names would be released) and without suspensions; although it was heavily criticized for being 'soft', with the most powerful union in sport, there was no guarantee that it would even continue. However, when the BALCO scandal broke in late 2003, there seemed to be no turning back. An article by *NYT* writer Vecsey, titled "Baseball May Be Closer To A Better Drug Policy," captures this moment vividly:

> Smack in the middle of the World Series, the names Barry Bonds and Jason Giambi have come up in a federal grand jury investigation of a drug company that may be the source of a new steroid... We have two kinds of athletes – hothouse and free-range – with no certified way to tell the difference (2003: D1).

As the presumptive headline to the article indicates, 'closer to a better drug policy' actually means drug testing: the only real way to clean up sport. This is premised on the idea that "two kinds of athletes" – clean and doped – is actually a useful metaphor to orient doping policy around. Similar to the response following the Tour de France scandal, eradicating steroids through better chemical surveillance quickly emerged as the key solution. Like most moral panics that are constructed as criminal, the focus tends to remain on eradicating individual 'problems' through sanction rather than engaging with the socio-historical context from which the phenomenon emerged. In this case, the media ignored the shifting training techniques and logic of sport.

Now all MLB players are randomly selected for steroid testing each season. *NYT* and *SI* reporters considered the adoption of drug testing essential to allowing 'natural'

players to excel in baseball again; and thought it would create a 'new era' of clean baseball. For example, Verducci's Cover Story called "Pure Hitters" states:

> Not all the reminders of the Steroid Era are gone yet, but the good news is that the new generation of hitters has a *natural athleticism* and a tough drug policy to help keep them – and their statistics – free of suspicion... A glowering Barry Bonds, closing in on Babe Ruth while under review of the commissioner's office for alleged steroid use, is our daily reminder – like the ex who works a few cubicles away – of the betrayal. And you know what? It doesn't hurt one bit. We are so over it. In fact, now we're falling hard for a game that is cleaner, more nuanced and more competitive than it has been in a generation. It's a young man's game, belonging to new stars who, certified by the sport's tougher drug policy, have replaced their juiced-up, broken-down elders who aged so ungracefully. It is baseball as it ought to be (2006b: 38).

The narrative used by the media focused on a sharp distinction between the kind of baseball that was played before and after drug testing: in the past it was "juiced-up, broken-down" baseball as signified by Bonds; but now, post-steroids, the game is "cleaner, more nuanced and more competitive." The doped-up players of the 'Steroid Era' are not only described as cheating, but also ruining the quality of play that relies on skill. In this framework of 'small ball' versus 'big ball', drug testing is simply assumed to be the only way out of boring baseball, unfair play and artificially enhanced records. The resident doping cheat Bonds is differentiated as a remnant of 'big ball' that younger superstars – such as Albert Pujols (picture on the front cover of *SI*) – shun to exhibit "natural athleticism." Although this fits rather awkwardly, since Pujols is an incredibly explosive home run hitter, the image of 'purity' is nonetheless linked to the idea that younger players are starting a re-birth of the game as it was played in the 'good old days'. We are told these athletes are pure because they are "certified by the sport's tougher drug policy," thereby closing the gap that allowed cheats to ruin the sport.

This illustrates the adoption of WADA's doping policy and construction of steroids in the media within the language of nostalgic baseball metaphors that readers would be familiar with. The key points from the 'clean' and 'doped' archetypes are also reproduced in the Barry Bonds and Mark McGwire incidents. Although each player used a type of steroid, which WADA considers the most harmful drug in sport, the reaction from the media indicates that doping scandals do not exist outside of *social power.* Discourses about Barry Bonds converged around links between deviance, black athletes and drug use (which are especially prevalent in American sport) through the deployment of the 'doped athlete' narrative. On the other hand, constructions of Mark McGwire focused on his hero status during the 'crises of whiteness' that read his andro use through the framework of the 'natural athlete'. This illustrates the way mediated doping scandals can also be caught up in reproducing social inequalities and anxieties.

Once Bonds was framed as a cheat other steroid discourses emerged: he became 'freakishly' large from juicing; his sporting performance was tainted; his sexual virility was threatened; and his constitutionally protected rights (such as his illegally leaked grand jury testimony) no longer mattered. In this case, media coverage of MLB's steroid scandal reinforced anti-doping logic by centering the 'problem' on an athlete already considered problematic. As Paula Giddings notes:

> African-Americans are again the medium through which new morality plays are staged for public consumption. Now, in another period of change, it is no coincidence that the issues of sexual harassment, date rape, spousal abuse, preferential treatment, child molestation and hate speech reach the height of nationalized ritual via *black* protagonists (in Golden, 1994: 14).

Unlike McGwire, who was well liked and actively protected by the media, Bonds has long lived on the metaphorical edges of the imagined nation. By ostensibly telling the

BALCO scandal through a 'bad black'[27], this also enabled MLB and the Commissioner to more easily reclaim innocence through his eradication. Although the media often suggests these are key 'turning points' toward better policy, the coverage is safely within taken-for-granted approaches to doping. Because steroid scandals are driven by an emphasis on the moral and bodily purity of individual athletes, the context of technologically enhanced sports science, which challenges the idea of protecting "natural athleticism," is ignored. The obsession with the individual doper produces an identifiable target of 'juiced-up' sport that perpetuates a set of ideas about steroids as 'artificial' enhancers.

Dramatic media scandals have provided the impetus for policy changes and shifts in discourse about steroids since Cold War sport placed the athlete at the center of consumption and inspection. For example, Kurt Jensen's death in 1960 triggered the first prohibition of drugs; female communist athletes raised fears about the threat to 'natural' gender; Ben Johnson's scandal marked (racialized) fear about rampant cheating in the Olympics; and the Tour de France incident led to the formation of WADA. The BALCO scandal appears to be another crucial moment in the perpetuation of moral panic about doping. WADA's response to the on-going scandal has been to reinforce their key rhetorical points by framing the incident as a widespread societal problem. In their *Play True* publication directed at athletes, WADA orients their 'talking points' through examples learned from BALCO. These claims about BALCO illustrate the *dependency* anti-doping authorities have on mediated scandals. WADA Chair Richard Pound states:

[27] Although Bonds is often characterized as using race as an excuse for his distasteful personality and drug cheating, I would argue that his *explicit* discussion of racism in America – and the McGwire coverage in particular – played a significant role in the media's backlash. As Andrews (2001) notes, black athletes are often celebrated precisely because they abdicate their race.

> 2004 was a banner year for revealing the scope of the problem in today's society... The scandal involving Balco and the designer steroid THG, while representing shameful chapter in sports history, has helped draw more attention to our cause. This can only serve us in our long-term battle to rid sport of doping. Overall, doping garnered more attention in 2004 than ever before (*WADA Annual Report*, 2004: 3).

Pound's terming of 2004 as a 'banner year' alludes to the way scandals that spread fear about the "scope of the problem" are actually encouraged by WADA. This becomes a problem when one realizes that the "long-term battle" is not winnable, and the shaming of 'doped athletes' is actually a *normal* routine for anti-doping authorities. The inevitable result of policy based on an imagined 'purity' is that people will continue to get caught unless this mentality is altered. I wonder if athletes and reporters who readily accept tougher sentences, increased surveillance and reduced athlete rights would do so without these public scandals.

The idea that BALCO is a rampant, out of control problem creates a level of panic that seemingly requires swift and punitive responses. Since the overall conceptualization of sport as healthy remains unchallenged, the 'progressive' policy response is easily transformed into law and order discourses. For instance, Pound argues:

> Consider too that rampant abuse and flimsy or non-existent policies among professional leagues have been brought into the public spotlight over the past year thanks to government inquiry. Public awareness and debate may be the only immediate positive outcome of the US Congressional hearings [into steroid use in baseball]. But with time and persistent efforts, serious reform may come. Or it may be imposed through legislation (*Play True*, Issue 3, 2005: 1).

This positions draconian policies as the *only* option – whether baseball likes it or not. The reminder that "it may be imposed through legislation" forcefully suggests that if "serious reform" is not enacted WADA will intervene. The inevitability of this same logic to other mediated scandals – in other professional leagues – suggests that any incident may be

enough to compel non-conforming leagues to 'get on board'. WADA's construction of BALCO is informative because it offers insight into how a rationalized practice in sport (performance enhancement) has been constructed as a menace to 'fair play'. The connection to rising use of steroids by youth creates yet another compelling imperative to activate a hard approach. This further entrenches a 'war on drugs' logic through the increasingly restrictive policy responses from WADA on the one hand, and the sense of anxiety about steroids created by the media on the other.

From 'Death in the Locker Room' to Suicide: "Steroids Killed My Son"

Rob Goldman's "Death in the Locker Room" (1984) is a sensationalistic account of doping in sport, which argues its use is an epidemic that is literally killing athletes. Aside from some negligible anecdotes, however, the crux of his argument depends on repeating a previous 'study' by Dr. Gabe Mirkin. Famously, Mirkin asked over 100 runners, 'If I could give you a pill that would make you an Olympic champion – and also kill you in a year – would you take it?', and over half said yes. Goldman asked a similar question, with similar results. As Beamish and Ritchie point out, Goldman is influential not so much for his research findings, but his establishment of a dominant *rhetorical* strategy framing the 'steroids problem'.

> The most serious outcome of Goldman's strategy is how it shapes the public's, sport policy makers' and journalists' understanding of why and how athletes use performance-enhancing substances. 'Would you still take the drug?' indicates that performance-enhancing substances are 'magic bullets' that athletes simply take and results – both positive and ominous – follow without fail. Substance use is completely removed from the social and historical context within which it occurs (2005b: 413-414).

The 'magic bullet' thesis interlocking performance and death as two sides of a double-edged sword features prominently in the literature on doping, especially following *SI*'s

dramatic story linking inoperable brain cancer to Lyle Alzado's death through steroids (Denham, 1999). While evidence demonstrating this link has failed to materialize, some researchers have turned to emphasizing a constellation of social, psychological and physical adverse effects surrounding steroids that, together, create a "significant public health threat" (Miller et al., 2005: 2). Though certainly more nuanced, the same framework Goldman uses – which highlights risks, underplays safe use and avoids discussing the social and historical context of steroids – is employed to support a similar policy agenda.

Following the suicide of three steroid using teenagers (Rob Garibaldi, Efrain Marrero, Taylor Hooton), there has been a revival of the discourse of steroids as *deadly*. Although to date the 'threat' remains contained to three deaths loosely connected to steroid use, journalists and policy makers have expanded these incidents to the level of moral panic. This particular construction of steroids utilizes the classic scare tactic of innocent youth at risk to an uncontrollable drug that overrides their psyche. When coupled with the idea that use among teenagers is rising, particularly because they are mimicking 'juiced-up' sluggers like Barry Bonds, the agenda to eradicate doping becomes translated into a public threat. As part of the series called "Beyond Balco: Steroids in School," the *NYT* ran several articles detailing this new threat.

> To many teenage athletes, Bonds' success has surely justified steroids use, to the detriment and perhaps even the death of some... [His parents] told Efrain he needed to stop, because steroids are dangerous. "But Barry Bonds does it," his parents remember Efrain saying... "Efrain stopped, just like we asked him to," his mother said. "And I believe he spiraled into a severe depression. We didn't know this at the time, but we're finding out the thing to do is not go off them cold turkey like that. And I believe that is what happened: steroids killed my son" (Anderson, 2005: D1).

> Hooton and several other parents have touched the nation through their testimony... Even later that day, committee members blasted [MLB] and the players union for their shoddy and passive attitude toward significant testing. Now Selig seems to have been energized by the public forum. "When I first heard Mr. Hooton describe the tragic circumstances that led him to this cause, I knew we in baseball had a social responsibility to step up and join the fight against the abuse of steroids and other performance-enhancing substances among our youth," Selig said... Hooton said he felt testing was "the only way" for high school and college athletes, "even if it's random" (Vecsey, 2005: 1).

The tragic suicides of three young American baseball players who used steroids shifted the anti-doping agenda by providing concrete incidents of the health threat it posed. By subtly connecting their initial motivation to use steroids to Bonds (and the 'Steroid Era' in general) this located the problem of *youth* steroid use with MLB drug policy. As the MLB Commissioner notes, this created a "social responsibility" to expand drug testing and impose harsher penalties. Through the creation of a moral panic that appropriates the established drug discourse about the side-effects of 'withdrawal', steroids take on the chemical properties of a *potentially* widespread risk. Donald Hooton's claim that drug testing is "the only way" is indicative of the 'war on drugs' logic that pervades thinking about performance enhancement in sport. Thus connections between 'doped athletes', increased steroid use and teenage suicide are drawn to support the *necessity* of public consumption of athletes' fluids. This again illustrates the way in which 'steroid problems' – ranging from gender threats, cheating to death – are understood through a restrictive set of discourses that avoids the social context of its use.

The media's focus on steroid induced suicide enables WADA to construct steroids as an illegal drug. This is a key move in that it shifts emphasis from the fuzzy idea of 'spirit of sport' to the evil (and apparently communist and Mexican)[28]

[28] WADA has made reference to 'unregulated production centers' in old communist regimes and cross-border drug smuggling rings in Mexico (*Play True*, Issue 1, 2007).

international drug cartels and drug pushers. The tainted source of steroids is also reinforced in educational campaigns to establish them as dangerous illicit drugs. For instance, the CCES pamphlet called "Using Steroids?" states:

> Steroids are a controlled substance. That's why there's a black market. As regulations on legal labs that make steroids tighten up, counterfeit drugs made in unclean "basement" labs fill the black market. Dealers will tell you just about anything to make more money.

Taking cues from 'reefer madness' and "basement" meth labs, steroids are now being cast through the fear connected with 'black market' drugs. Of course, the fact that their illegality *creates* this situation indicates the looping back to 'purity': they are illegal because they make 'also-runs' out of otherwise undeserving athletes; and they are dangerous because they are illegal. WADA's active disdain for medically supervised doping indicates that their concern with tainted drugs and health effects is not actually genuine. Why else would you center the ethics of 'clean sport' (along with their governance structures, political clout and jobs) ahead of an approach that might actually impact how athletes think about training? As Konig (1995) ironically points out, "instead of criticizing doping, ethics affirm it by not wanting to admit that sport itself is an expression of the doping logic" (256).

The use of steroids by youth raises several different issues that question whether the same type of approach, which I advocate for adult sport, should be taken. While this thesis maintains that steroid use is a part of high performance sport training, youth sport does not seem to qualify under that same sort of logic. The distinction is two fold: first, youth sport itself is less enmeshed with technology and sports science to improve body chemistry; and, in a related second point, young people are experiencing rapid developmental changes – brought on by puberty – that could be harmed by steroid use.

Like every athlete, young people can accelerate their growth through nutrition and exercise; but at this developmental stage steroid use can actually stunt growth, and present more health risks than use later in life (Miller et al., 2005). From this standpoint, an age restriction on steroid use seems appropriate.

I would argue that steroid use – along with other performance technologies and strategies common to elite sport – should be avoided in youth competition. While the cultural logic of 'winning at all cost' is prevalent in youth sport, young people are not usually professional, full-time athletes. This kind of training routine would represent a risk to long term health that youth may not be able to fully appreciate. As with other drug related policies, there is a question whether young people are in a position to consent to the harms of competitive sport (including steroid use).

However, I would still strongly argue against drug testing high school athletes to achieve this end. Drug testing is only concerned with identification of deviancy so that authorities can punish rule breakers; when it comes to creating healthy sport it is an ineffective, expensive and invasive policy option. I think a reasonable approach is asking coaches, teachers and parents to be aware of and talk about steroid use with youth. Within sport in particular coaches should be actively constructing the kind of cultural environment that encourages their athletes to be healthy. For example, if a football coach is constantly telling a teenager to 'beef up' by hitting the gym to succeed, we should not act surprised if that teenager turns to steroids. It is convenient to blame professional superstars for youth steroid use but in many ways the culture created within each sporting environment can set the tone.

The 'Side Effects' of Anti-Doping Campaigns

This thesis argues that current anti-doping approaches in sport are broken. Not only are they ineffective, but unintended consequences stemming from repression appear to actually place the athlete at greater harm. Thinking about performance enhancement is currently restricted through the lens of the clean/doped archetype, which premises ideals of purity on protecting biological bodies. As Mary Jo Kane (1995) points out, constructions of social behaviour (such as the clean athlete) linked to the natural body are "particularly effective because any set of beliefs that can claim a *biological basis* is more readily seen as immutable and therefore impervious to challenge [my emphasis]" (3). This enables WADA authorities to connect 'doping' – regardless of the definition or substance – to an outside, technological influence interfering with the natural order. Drug testing tends to follow as a way to eliminate steroid use because the discourse of 'purity' *separates* it from rationalized sport. However, using Franklin's (1990) notion of technology as cultural practice, one can see that the so-called biological purity of 'clean' athletes is actually being *produced* by sporting authorities to justify constructing dopers as an oppositional category. This dichotomizes complex, interdependent routines of sport preparation to a simplistic conceptualization of good and evil: if an athlete follows the rules they are clean and healthy; if they are caught with banned chemicals in their fluids – *whatever* they may be – athletes are seen as artificial, unhealthy drug cheats.

While the media and policy texts streamline stories, images and half-truths about steroids as dangerous and unfair, the *social consequences* of the war like drive to eradicate doping from sport continue to be ignored through the rhetoric of purity. However, it is athletes competing for glory who are caught in the crosshairs of a policy

that does not 'fit' how sport functions. The findings from my thesis suggest that constricted discourses about steroids actually perpetuate a number of social problems.

WADA education information on the health and gender effects of steroid use indicates that their elimination from sport will create a 'safe haven' for athletes. Although I do not wish to diminish the potential risks of steroid use, since there clearly are some health consequences, the internal logic of sport itself encourages a range of unsafe practices that remain because they are effective. One need only think of a wrestler pumping up their muscle capacity through months of grueling training and supplement use, and then dramatically losing 20 pounds of weight to compete against an opponent of similar size, doing the same rationalized routine.

The focus on zero tolerance campaigns (athletes are suspended for two years on their first doping offence) seriously undermines a more practical approach to performance enhancement technologies. Like the approach to marijuana, WADA educational information on steroids is often 'massaged' to reach the level of anxiety necessary to justify an absolute ban. In particular, the linking of steroids to suicide expands fear about its use, encouraging repressive waves of sanction; unfortunately this has the counter effect of blocking athletes from access to information about potential safe use. WADA's draconian stance on medically supervised doping, which they compare to torture, suggests they are actually more concerned with identifying 'cheaters' than improving health. The fact that doping authorities only wish to improve health through drug testing is particularly revealing.

The elephant in the room is the 'win at all cost' logic of athletics: sporting authorities do not wish to undermine the chase to be "Swifter, Higher, Stronger" – which

obviously requires using sport science and technology – because of the fan and corporate interests depending on it; as well as the engrained imperatives which have evolved in sporting culture to prove character through victory. Although it is too soon to know exactly where WADA is heading, it does appear to be on the path of increased athlete surveillance coupled with a reduction in privacy rights. The suggestion by Verroken (2001), who is a top UK anti-doping policy advisor, to expand testing even more is indicative of this logic.

> One major feature of the out-of-competition testing programs that affects their effectiveness has been the availability of athletes and the relaxed response of governing bodies to the absence of their athletes from regular testing. The *only way* to reverse the trend of 'cat and mouse' pursuit of athletes by sampling officers is to require athletes to present a *weekly* body fluid sample that can be reliably checked for age and ownership (perhaps through DNA testing) by a process of random testing (52).

I bring this quote in as an example of the kind of access doping authorities expect to have to athletes bodies in the name of a never ending boundary war against technology. Athletes generally accept this shift because the 'doped athlete' is seen as categorically different than (partially aided) clean competitors. This draws on divergent constructions of steroids as dangerous; enabling athletes with a wide variety of viewpoints on technological enhancement to submit to WADA's authority. This scenario naturalizes surveillance of athletes by aligning their values with visions of health and fairness that cannot account for their cyborg identities. As long as this sport paradox continues, doping scandals and moral panics will pervade, and doping authorities will have one option: 'get tougher'.

Appendix: Research Questions

Central Research Question:

What are the similarities and differences between discourses on steroid use in competitive sport from the print media, policy documents and competitive athletes?

Sub-questions:

(1) How does steroid use affect the construction of the 'body' among competitive athletes, policy documents and the print media?

(2) How does steroid use affect the construction of 'fair competition' in the print media, competitive athletes and policy documents?

(3) How are steroids talked about in relation to other performance enhancing technologies and drugs by the print media, competitive athletes and policy documents?

(4) Do findings from the print media, competitive athletes and policy documents comport with past literature outlining the deployment of discourses on race, gender, sexuality and nationalism in sport relating to steroid use?

References

Abdel-Shehid, G. (2005). *Who da man? Black masculinities and sporting cultures.* Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press Inc.

Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism.* London: Verso.

Anderson, D. (2005, March 11). Without Bonds, hearing loses much of its power. *New York Times*, D1.

Andrews, D.L. (Ed.) (2001). *Michael Jordan, Inc: Corporate sport, media culture and late modern capitalism.* New York: State University of New York Press.

Anshel, M.H. & Russell, K.G. (1997). Examining athletes' attitudes toward using anabolic steroids and their knowledge of the possible effects. *Journal of Drug Education*, 27(2), 121-145.

Bahrke, M.S., Yesalis C.E., Kopstein, A.N. & Stephens J.A. (2000). Risk factors associated with anabolic-androgenic steroid use among adolescents. *Sports Medicine*, 29(6), 397-405.

Banet-Weiser, S. (1999). Hoop dreams: Professional basketball and the politics of race and gender. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 23(4), 403-420.

Beamish, R. & Ritchie, I. (2004). From chivalrous 'brothers-in-arms' to the eligible athlete: Changed principles and the IOC's banned substance. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 39(4), 355-371.

Beamish, R. & Ritchie, I. (2005a). The spectre of steroids: Nazi propaganda, Cold War anxiety and patriarchal paternalism. *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 22(5), 777-795.

Beamish, R. & Ritchie, I. (2005b). From fixed capacities to performance-enhancement: The paradigm shift in the science of 'training' and the use of performance-enhancing substances. *Sport in History*, 25(3), 412-433.

Berning, J.M., Adams, K.J. & Stamford, B.A. (2004). Anabolic steroid usage in athletes: Facts, fiction, and public relations. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*, 18(4), 908-917.

Berkow, I. (1998, August 27). Over fence came before over counter. *New York Times*, C1.

Boffey, P. (1998, September 30). Post-season thoughts on McGwire's pills. *New York Times*, A16.

Boyce, B.G. (2003). Use and effectiveness of performance-enhancing substances. *Journal of Pharmacy Practice*, 16(1), 22-36.

Brewer, B.D. (2002). Commercialization in professional cycling 1950-2001: Institutional transformations and the rationalization of 'doping'. *Sociology of Sport*, 19(3), 276-301.

Burck, C. (2005). Comparing qualitative research methodologies for systemic research: The use of grounded theory, discourse analysis and narrative. *Journal of Family Therapy*, 27(3), 237-262.

Burke, M.D. & Roberts, T.J. (1997). Drugs in sport: An issue of morality or sentimentality? *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport*, 24, 99-113.

Butryn, T. (2003). Posthuman podiums: Cyborg narratives of elite track and field athletes. *Sociological Journal of Sport*, 20, 17-39.

Butryn, T. & Masucci, M. (2003). It's not about the book: A cyborg counternarrative of Lance Armstrong. *Journal of Sports and Social Issues*, 27(2), 124-144.

Cafri, G., Thompson, J. K., Ricciardelli, L., McCabe, M., Smolak, L. & Yesalis, C. (2005). Pursuit of the muscular ideal: Physical and psychological consequences and putative risk factors. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 25(2), 215-239.

Chass, M. (1998a, August 27). Baseball Tries to Calm Down a Debate on Pills. *New York Times*, C1.

Chass, M. (1998b, October 30). No Decision Yet On Androstenedione. *New York Times*, D7.

Chass, M. (2006a, February 14). Selig's next problem: Bonds's landmark homers. *New York Times*, D8.

Chass, M. (2006b, May 9). No record, no foul: No need for a salute. *New York Times*, D4.

Cole, C.L. (1994). Resisting the canon: Feminist cultural studies, sport, and technologies of the body. In Birrell, S. & Cole, C.L. *Women, sport, and culture*. Champaign, IL.: Human Kinetics.

Cole, C.L. (2000). Testing for sex or drugs. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 24(4), 331-333.

Cole, C.L. & Mobley, A. (2005). American steroids: Using race and gender. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 29(1), 3-8.

Curry, J. (1998, September 9). A Reluctant Home-Run Hitter, A Reluctant Hero. *New York Times*, D3.

Davis, L. & Delano, L. (1992). Fixing the boundaries of physical gender: Side effects of anti-drug campaigns in athletes. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 9(1), 1-19.

Denham, B.E. (1997). *Sports Illustrated*, the 'war on drugs', and the Anabolic Steroid Control Act of 1990. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 21(3), 260-273.

Denham, B.E. (1999). Building the agenda and adjusting the frame: How the dramatic revelations of Lyle Alzado impacted mainstream press coverage of anabolic steroid use. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 16(1), 1-15.

Dodge, T.L. & Jaccard, J.J. (2006). The effect of high school sports participation on the use of performance-enhancing substances in young adulthood. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 39(3), 367-373.

Dohrmann, G. (2004, December 13). BALCO Blows Up. *Sports Illustrated*, 101(23), 50-54.

Donovan, R.J., Egger, G., Kapernick, V. & Mendoza, J. (2002). A conceptual framework for achieving performance enhancing drug compliance in sport. *Sports Medicine*, 32(4), 269-284.

Dyer, R. (1997). *White*. London: Routledge.

Editorial Desk (1998, August 9). The Olympics' Drug Problem. *New York Times*, 18.

Erickson, P.G., Riley, D.M., Cheung, Y.W. & O'Hare, P.A. (Eds.). (1997). *Harm reduction: A new direction for drug policies and programs*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Faigenbaum, A.D., Zaichkowsky, L.D., Gardner, D.E. & Micheli, L.J. (1998). Anabolic steroid use by male and female middle school students. *Pediatrics*, 101(5), e6.

Fainaru-Wada, M. & Williams, L. (2006). *Game of shadows: Barry Bonds, BALCO, and the steroids scandal that rocked professional sports*. New York: Gotham Books.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fausto-Sterling, A. (2000). *Sexing the body: Gender politics and the construction of sexuality*. New York: Basic Books.

Ferber, A. (2007). The construction of black masculinity: White supremacy now and then. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 31(1), 11-24.

Franklin, U. (1990). *The real world of technology*. Toronto: CBC Enterprises.

Gabriel, J. (1998). *Whitewash: Racialized politics and the media*. London: Routledge.

Gardiner, G. (2003). Running for the country: Australian print media representation of indigenous athletes in the 27th Olympiad. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 27 27(3), 233-260.

Garman, B.K. (1994). Myth building and cultural politics in W. P. Kinsella's *Shoeless Joe. Canadian Review of American Studies*, 24(1), 41-62.

Gilroy, P. (1987). *'There ain't no black in the Union Jack': The cultural politics of race and nation.* London: Hutchinson.

Goldberg, L., MacKinnon, D.P., Elliot, D.L., Moe, E.L., Clarke, G. & Cheong, J.W. (2000). The adolescents training and learning to avoid steroids program: Preventing drug use and promoting health behaviours. *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine*, 154(4), 332-338.

Goldberg, L., Elliot, D.L., MacKinnon, D.P., Moe, E.L., Kuehl, K.S., Nohre, L. & Lockwood, C.M. (2003). Drug testing athletes to prevent substance abuse: Background and pilot study results of the SATURN (Student Athlete Testing Using Random Notification) study. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 32, 16-25.

Goldberg, L. & Elliot, D.L. (2005). Preventing substance use among high school athletes: The ATLAS and ATHENA programs. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, 21(2), 63-87.

Golden, T. (1994). Black male: Representations of masculinity in contemporary American art. New York: Harry N. Abrams.

Goldman, R. (1984). *Death in the locker room: Steroids and sport*. South Bend, Ind.: Icarus Press.

Gorman, D.M. (2002). Defining and operationalizing 'research-based' prevention: A critique (with case studies) of the US Department of Education's Safe, Disciplined and Drug-Free Schools Exemplary Programs. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 25(3), 295-302.

Grosz, E. (1994). *Volatile bodies: Toward a corporeal feminism*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Gruneau, R. (2006). 'Amateurism' as a sociological problem: Some reflections inspired by Eric Dunning. *Sport in Society*, 9(4), 559-582.

Haraway, D. (1991). A cyborg manifesto. In *Simians, cyborgs and women: The reinvention of nature*. New York: Routledge.

Hartgens, F. & Kuipers, H. (2004). Effects of androgenic-anabolic steroids in athletes. *Sports Medicine*, 34(8), 513-554.

Henry, N. (2006). The Barry Bonds probe and the shadow of race. *Black Scholar*, Winter, 45-48.

Hoberman, J. (1997). *Darwin's athletes: How sport has damaged black America and preserved the myth of race*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Hoffman, J.R. & Ratamess, N.A. (2006). Medical issues associated with anabolic steroid use: Are they exaggerated? *Journal of Sports Science and Medicine*, 5, 182-193.

Hogan, J. (2003). Staging the nation: Gendered and ethnicized discourses of national identity in Olympic opening ceremonies. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 27(2), 100-123.

Houlihan, B. (1999). Anti-doping political measures: The new approaches after the Lausanne meeting on doping. *The Limits of Sport: Doping* (Conference paper).

Irving, L.M., Wall, M., Neumark-Sztainer, D. & Story, M. (2002). Steroid use among adolescents: Findings from Project EAT. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 30(4), 243-252.

Jackson, S. (2004). Exorcizing the ghost: Donovan Bailey, Ben Johnson and the politics of Canadian identity. *Media, Culture and Society*, 26(1), 121-141.

James, C. (2005). *Understanding the socio-cultural world of student athletes*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars Press.

Kane, M.J. (1995). Resistance/transformation of the oppositional binary: Exposing sport as a continuum. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues,* 19(1), 191-218.

Kakutani, M. (2006, March 23). America's Game, American Scandal. *New York Times*, E1.

Kayser, B., Mauron, A. & Miah, A. (2007). Current anti-doping policy: A critical appraisal. *BMC Medical Ethics*, 8(2), 1-10.

Keane, H. (2005). Diagnosing the male steroid user: Drug use, body image and disordered masculinity. *Health: An Interdisciplinary Journal for the Social Study of Health, Illness and Medicine*, 9(2), 189-208.

Kettmann, S. (2000, August 20). Baseball must come clean on its darkest secret. *New York Times*, 13.

Kindlundh, A.M., Isacson, D.L., Berglund, L. & Nyberg, F. (1999). Factors associated with adolescent use of doping agents: Anabolic-androgenic steroids. *Addiction*, 94(4), 543-553.

King, C.R., Leonard, D.J. & Kusz, D.W. (2007). White power and sport: An introduction. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 31(1), 3-10.

Konig, E. (1995). Criticism of doping: The nihilistic side of technological sport and the antiquated view of sport ethics. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 30(3-4), 247-260.

Krane, V., Choi, P.Y.L., Baird, S.M., Aimar, C.M. & Kauer, K.J. (2004). Living the paradox: Female athletes negotiate femininity and muscularity. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 50(5-6), 315-329.

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 & Social Issues*, 25(4), 390-416.

Lenskyj, H. (2000). *Inside the Olympic industry: Power, politics and activism*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Lock, R. (2003). The doping ban: Compulsory heterosexuality and lesbophobia. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 38(4), 397-411.

Longman, J. (2003, October 24). Steroid Is Reportedly Found In Top Runner's Urine Test. *New York Times*, D2.

Luetkemeier, M.J. (1995). Anabolic-androgenic steroids: Prevalence, knowledge and attitudes in junior and senior high school students. *Journal of Health Education*, 26(1), 4-9.

Madison, K. (1999). Legitimation crises and containment: The "anti-racist-white-hero" film. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 16(4), 399-416.

Magdalinski, T. (2000). Performance technologies: Drugs and fastskin at the Sydney 2000 Olympics. *Media International Australia*, 97, 59-70.

Malcolm, N.L. (2006). "Shaking it off" and "toughing it out." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 35(5), 495-525.

Mason, J. (2002). *Qualitative researching* (2nd Ed). London: SAGE.

McCallum, J. & O'Brien, R. (1998, August 31). Swallow This Pill. *Sports Illustrated*, 89(9), 17.

McDonald, M. (2005). Mapping whiteness and sport: An introduction. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 22(1), 245-255.

McDonald, M. & Birrell, S. (1999). Reading sport critically: A methodology for interrogating power. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 16(4), 283-300.

Menser, M. & Aronowitz, S. (1996). On cultural studies, science, and technology. In Aronowitz, A., Martinsons, B. & Menser, M. (Eds.). *Technoscience and cyberculture*. New York: Routledge.

Messner, M. (1992). *Power at play: Sports and the problem of masculinity*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Messner, M. (2002). *Taking the field: Women, men and sports*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Miah, A. (2006). Rethinking enhancement in sport. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1093, 301–320.

Miller, K., Sabo, D., Melnick, M., Farrell, M. & Barnes, G. (2001). *The Women's Sport Foundation Report: Health Risks and the Teen Athlete*. New York: The Women's Sports Foundation.

Miller, K., Barnes, G., Sabo, D., Melnick, M. & Farrell, M. (2002). A comparison of health risk behaviour in adolescent users of anabolic-androgenic steroids, by gender and athlete status. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 19(4), 385-402.

Miller, K., Hoffman, J., Barnes, G., Sabo, D., Melnick, M. & Farrell, M. (2005). Adolescent anabolic steroid use, gender, physical activity and other problem behaviours. *Substance Use and Misuse*, 40(11), 1637-1657.

Miller, P. (1998). The anatomy of scientific racism: Racialist responses to black athletic achievement. *Journal of Sport History*, 25(1), 119-151.

Naylor, A.H., Gardner, D. & Zaichkowsky, L. (2001). Drug use patterns among high school athletes and nonathletes. *Adolescence*, 36(144), 627-639.

Nixon, H.L. (1996). Explaining pain and injury attitudes and experiences in sport in terms of gender, race and sports status factors. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 20(1), 33-44.

Olrich, T.W. (1999). Perceptions of benefits and losses associated with the use and

discontinuance of anabolic-androgenic steroids among male bodybuilders. *Journal of Personal and Interpersonal Loss*, 4(3), 231.

Omi, M. & Winant, H. (1986). *Racial formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1980s*. New York: Routledge.

Patton, C. (2001). "Rock Hard": Judging the female physique. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 25(2), 118-140.

Park, J. (2005). Governing doped bodies: The World Anti-Doping Agency and the global culture of surveillance. *Cultural Studies <=> Critical Methodologies*, 5(2), 174-188.

Palys, T. & Lowman, J. (2000). Ethical and legal strategies for protecting confidential research information. *Canadian Journal of Law and Society*, 15(1), 39-80.

Pellis, E. (2007, May 11). Landis: USADA went after him to get Armstrong. *AP*.

Penley, C., Ross, A. & Haraway, D. (1990). Cyborgs at large: Interview with Donna Haraway. *Social Text*, 25/26, 8-23.

Peretti-Watel, P., Guagliardo, V., Verger, P., Mignon, P., Pruvost, J. & Obadia, Y. (2004). Attitudes toward doping and recreational drug use among French elite student-athletes. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 21(1), 1-17.

Phillips, N. & Hardy, C. (2002). *Discourse analysis: Investigating processes of social construction*. New York: SAGE.

Plymire, D.C. (1999). Too much, too fast, too soon: Chinese women runners, accusations of steroid use, and the politics of American track and field. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 16(2), 155-163.

Price, S. & Cornelius, G. (1997). What ever happened to the white athlete? *Sports Illustrated*, 87(23), 30-42.

Price, S. (2005, December 26). The Liar's Club. *Sports Illustrated*, 103(25), 110-115.

Pronger, B. (1990). *The arena of masculinity: Sports, homosexuality and the meaning of sex*. Toronto: Summerhill Press.

Reilly, R. (1998, September 7). The Good Father. *Sports Illustrated*, 89(10), 32-40.

Reilly, R. (2004, October 20). The Goods on Barry. *Sports Illustrated*, 101(11), 96.

Reilly, R. (2005, March 28). Choking Up At the Plate. *Sports Illustrated*, 102(13), 76.

Reilly, R. (2006, October, 30). It's Clear Who's Getting Creamed. *Sports Illustrated*, 105(17), 78.

Riordan, J. & Jinxia, D. (1996). Chinese women and sport: Success, sexuality and suspicion. *The China Quarterly*, 145, 130-152.

Ritchie, I. (2003). Sex tested, gender verified: Controlling female sexuality in the age of containment. *Sport History Review*, 34(1), 80-98.

Roberts, S. (2001, September 26). The Magic is Missing as Bonds approaches 70. *New York Times*, D9.

Roberts, S. (2005, April 3). Past glory versus today's suspicions. *New York Times*, BB1.

Rosenau, P.M. (1992). *Post-modernism and the social sciences: Insights, inroads and intrusions.* New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Rushin, S., Hersch, H. & Kennedy, K. (1998, August 10). Throwing in the Towel. *Sports Illustrated*, 89(6), 17.

Sandomir, R. (2004, April 20). Broadcasters don't know how to deal with steroids. *New York Times*, D4.

Scheft, B. (2004, December 20). The Show. *Sports Illustrated*, 101(24), 24.

Shields, E. W. (1995). Sociodemographic analysis of drug use among adolescent athletes: Observations-perceptions of athletic directors-coaches. *Adolescence*, 30, 849-861.

Sokolove, M. (2006, May 7). 73*. *New York Times*, 12.

Smith, G. (2005, March 28). What do we do now? *Sports Illustrated*, 102(13), 40-50.

Spencer, N. (2004). Sister Act VI: Venus and Serena Williams at Indian Wells: "Sincere fictions" and white racism. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 28(2), 115-135.

Stiller, G.F. (1998). *Analyzing everyday texts: Discourse, rhetoric, and social perspectives*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

St Louis, B. (2003). Sport, genetics and the 'natural athlete': The resurgence of racial science. *Body and Society*, 9(2), 75-95.

Tanner, S., Miller D. & Alongi, C. (1995). Anabolic steroid use by adolescents: Prevalence, motives, and knowledge of risks. *Clinical Journal of Sports Medicine*, 5, 108–115.

Travers, A. (2000). *Writing the public in cyberspace: redefining inclusion on the net.* New York: Garland.

Tucker, L. (2003). Blackballed: Basketball and representations of the black male athlete. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 47(3), 306-328.

van Dijk, T. (1991). *Racism and the press*. London: Routledge.

Vecsey, G. (2003, October 22). Baseball May Be Closer To A Better Drug Policy. *New York Times*, D1.

Vecsey, G. (2005, August 21). A Tragedy That Echoes After a Life Burns Out. *New York Times*, 1.

Vecsey, G. (2006, May 2). Bonds will pass 714, but not the legend. *New York Times*, D1.

Verducci, T. (1998, September, 31). 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53... *Sports Illustrated*, 89(9), 28-33.

Verducci, T. (2004, March 15). Is Baseball In The Asterisk Era? *Sports Illustrated*, 100(11), 36-39.

Verducci, T. (2006a, March 13). The Consequences. *Sports Illustrated*, 104(11), 52-53.

Verducci, T. (2006b, April 3). Pure Hitters. *Sports Illustrated*, 104(14), 38-41.

Verducci, T. (2006c, May 15). Hard Number. *Sports Illustrated*, 104(20), 39-43.

Verducci, T., Yaeger, D., Dohrmann, G., Llosa, L.F. & Munson, L. (2002, June 3). Totally Juiced. *Sports Illustrated*, 96(23), 34-44.

Verroken, M. (2001). Hormones and sport: Ethical aspects and the prevalence of hormone abuse in sport. *Journal of Endocrinology*, 170(1), 49-54.

Wackwitz, L.A. (2003). Verifying the myth: Olympic sex testing and the category "woman." *Women's Studies International Forum*, 26(6), 553-560.

Wade, N. (1976). Anabolic steroids: Doctors denounce them, but athletes aren't listening. *Science*, 176(4042), 1399-1403.

Waddington, I. (2001). Doping in sport: Some issues for medical practitioners. *Leiden International Medical Students Congress* (lecture paper).

Walton, T. & Butryn, T. (2006). Policing the race: US men's distance running and the crisis of whiteness. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 23(1), 1-28.

Wenner, L. (1995). The good, the bad, and the ugly: Race, sport and the public eye. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 19(3), 227-231.

Wichstrom, L & Pedersen, W. (2001). Use of anabolic-androgenic steroids in adolescence: Winning, looking good or being bad?" *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 62(1), 5-13.

Williamson, D. (1994). The psychological effects of anabolic steroids. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 5(1), 18-22.

Wilson, B. (1999). "Cool pose" incorporated: The marketing of black masculinity in Canadian NBA coverage. In White, P. & Young, K. (Eds.) (1999). *Sport and gender in Canada*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.

World Anti-Doping Code, 2003 (www.wada-ama.org).

Yesalis, C.E. & Bahrke, M.S. (2005). Anabolic steroid and stimulant use in North American sport between 1850 and 1980. *Sport in History*, 25(3), 434-451.

Zinser, L. (2006, February 10). Lund 'Not a Cheat,' But Panel Bars Him. *New York Times*, D3.