

Imagining the Citizen-Fan:

Sport Metaphor in American Politics and Implications for Democratic Culture

On October 6, 2018, Brett Kavanaugh was confirmed to the Supreme Court of the United States. His confirmation hearings had been embroiled in controversy, primarily as a result of sexual assault accusations made by a former high school classmate, Christine Blasey-Ford. For a group of College Republicans at the University of Washington, Kavanaugh's confirmation was a cause to celebrate, so they made plans to gather that evening at a nearby bar in Seattle. The event, "Beers 4 Brett," was held at Shultzzy's, described on the establishment's Facebook page as "a sports-themed bar & grill" (Sun, 2018, ¶ 7). For the Republican supporters, the venue seemed an ideal place to toast the newest Supreme Court justice, especially since they could do so over the judge's well-publicized favorite beverage.

It may not be commonplace to celebrate political outcomes at a sports bar but, considering the nature of political language, it probably should not be seen as unusual. Indeed, researchers and journalists have long recognized the shared logic and rhetorical practices of politics and sport (Butterworth, 2014; Hruby, 2012; Segrave, 2000). From Tannenbaum and Noah's (1959) "sportugese" to Lipsyte's (1975) "sportspeak," we have seen sport's influence on political speech. More recently, however, these metaphorical associations have begun to transform political attitudes and even behaviors. In her book, *Uncivil Agreement*, political scientist Lilliana Mason worries that Americans increasingly define their political affiliations in sporting terms. In other words, Democrats and Republicans do not merely identify with a political party, they are loyal fans of a team. Mason does not see this as a healthy rivalry, instead lamenting, "Partisan battles have helped organize Americans' distrust for 'the other' in politically powerful ways. In this political environment, a candidate who picks up the banner of

'us versus them' and 'winning versus losing' is almost guaranteed to tap into a current of resentment and anger across racial, religious, and cultural lines, which have recently divided neatly by party" (Mason, 2018, p. 3). She adds, "Group victory is a powerful prize, and American partisans have increasingly seen that goal as more important than the practical matters of governing a nation" (Mason, 2018, p. 3).

Mason's book addresses commonly held assumptions that politics in the United States is more bitterly partisan than it has ever been. There appears to be supporting evidence for this assumption, especially as Americans have increasingly "sorted" themselves into highly polarized social alignments (Ellis & Stimson, 2012; Mason, 2018). As Mason puts it, "We have gone from two parties that are a little bit different in a lot of ways to two parties that are very different in a few powerful ways. These underlying social shifts have put the American population into a partisan team-based mindset, through which the country has split itself into us and them" (Mason, 2018, p. 43).

For rhetorical and political theorists interested in the idea of agonism, it is important to point out that we have always had an "us" and "them." U.S. history is marked by a series of identifiable "thems" against whom we can constitute an "us." Ivie (2005) explains that the enemies of American democracy are found both outside of and within the nation's borders. While the threats to democratic culture may have different points of origin, the nation's responses to those threats are consistent. In short, American politics features a persistent tendency to treat any opposition as a "disease" to be eradicated, even when opposing voices are found among fellow citizens. Ivie contends that the problem can only be met through a more genuine rhetorical attitude that accepts difference and conflict. Consistent with political theorists of agonism, this requires citizens to view conflict as both unavoidable and potentially productive. In Mouffe's terms, "the aim of democratic politics is to construct the 'them' in such

a way that it is no longer an enemy to be destroyed, but as an 'adversary' that is, somebody whose ideas we combat but whose right to defend those ideas we do not put into question" (Mouffe, 2000, p. 101-02).

Rather than reducing democracy to its institutions – that is, national citizenship or voting – Ivie (2005, p. 195) suggests redefining it in rhetorical terms:

[Improving democratic practice] requires revising the very conception of democracy from one grounded in the frightful trope of disease to a healthier notion of democratic persuasion as an exercise in contested and contingent pluralism, an ongoing drama of adversaries who may bridge the divide sufficiently to achieve a relationship of consubstantial rivalry or fall short and into the abyss of sheer enemies.

From this point of view, the language of "rivalry" becomes especially important, for it invites us to consider meaningful parallels between politics and sport.

As a rhetorical critic invested in democratic practices, I believe it is imperative to seek healthier modes of political engagement, and sport is among the sites where we might enact such practices. To an extent, then, I share an orientation with the "Beers 4 Brett" boys. Yet, I find the commonplace use of sport as a simple metaphor for political combat to be limited. Thus, this chapter investigates the rhetorical dynamics of the Brett Kavanaugh confirmation as a means to assess both the limitations and possibilities for thinking of political partisanship in terms of sport. More specifically, I follow the tradition of agonistic democracy in order to think more productively about rivalry as a feature of democratic culture. The Kavanaugh hearing provides a compelling context for this analysis, and not simply because some college students had some beers in a sports bar. First, the nomination and confirmation processes were both strongly and visibly partisan in ways that mimic the powerful allegiances of sports fans. Indeed, aligning oneself with Kavanaugh or Blasey-Ford might be akin to aligning with Ohio State or Michigan,

or the Yankees or Red Sox. Second, because the hearings ended in a vote, there was a clear outcome and narrative closure, much like a sporting event that features a definitive winner and loser.<sup>1</sup> Third, and perhaps most importantly, the language of sports was central to the hearings, especially through the testimony of Kavanaugh himself. In this way, the logic of sport was a mechanism for the nominee to bolster his character and build identification with his “fans.” For these reasons, I turn to the Kavanaugh hearings as a “representative anecdote” (Burke, 1945), a narrative that brings together a number of features that characterize contemporary politics. In particular, I am interested in the extent to which political partisanship functions similarly to sports fandom. To explore this idea, I turn first to political communication scholarship on the game frame and polarization. I then examine research on fan identity in sports and the metaphorical equations made between sport and politics. Finally, I evaluate the ways contemporary partisanship mirrors sports fan loyalties before concluding with some ideas about a more productive understanding of sport as a metaphor for political identity.

### **The Game is the Frame**

Political communication researchers have long been concerned with the over-emphasis on the game metaphor, especially in the context of elections and campaigns. Operating within the framework of media framing, these scholars note that news coverage of campaigns is highly dependent on strategic frames. This is most obvious with respect to the “game frame.” In short, “the framing of politics as a strategic game is characterized by a focus on questions related to who is winning and losing, the performances of politicians and parties, and on campaign strategies and tactics. This framing is often contrasted with a focus on political substance and issues” (Aalberg, Strömbäck & de Vreese, 2011, p. 163). Multiple rhetorical choices might constitute the game frame—moving the “political football” in a policy proposal, landing a “knock-out blow” in a debate or, most commonly, monitoring candidates’ progress through the

“drama inherent in the horse race” (Jarvis, 2005, p. 9). Since 1952, the year in which television advertising began to shape presidential campaigns in the United States, the “horse race” has occupied 40 percent of news coverage, far more than any other frame used to cover elections (Benoit, Stein, and Hansen, 2005, p. 359). Although some scholars contend the game frame makes politics more exciting for voters and enhances their participation, the majority fear that characterizing elections as sporting events positions voters as mere spectators, therefore relegating them to passive roles as viewers (Jamieson, 1992).

Most of the work on the game frame is focused on news media and political campaigns. If we move outside of framing, specifically, which is tethered to its interest in media, we can consider how the language of sport influences citizen attitudes beyond elections. This is the underlying question of Mason’s book, which uses social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986) to make sense of the rooting interests of political partisans in the United States. She makes an important distinction between three terms: “In the social-scientific study of politics the term *polarization* traditionally describes an expansion of the distance between the issue positions of Democrats and Republicans. . . . *sorting* is usually defined as an increasing alignment between party and ideology, where *ideology* indicates a set of issue positions or values” (Mason, 2018, p. 7). Sorting is what is at stake in her analysis, and her conclusion is that the collapse of the distinction between party affiliation and ideology is driving Americans further and further apart. In short, “Democrats and especially Republicans are feeling closer to liberals and conservatives, considering them to be groups of people that are most like them ‘in their ideas and interests and feelings about things’” (Mason, 2018, p. 28).

If political partisanship can be equated to sports fan loyalty, it becomes useful to consider what scholars tell us about the nature of fan identity in sports. The scholarship in this area is robust, with much of the work in Europe focused on negative fan behaviors such as

hooliganism and much of the work in the United States focused on fan identifications and motivations. As Wann and Branscombe conclude, much like political partisans, “Highly identified sports fans, in particular, take pride in their loyalty to their team. Such loyalty, developed in early adolescence, seems to be a stabilizing force in the spectators’ lives” (1992, p. 59). Loyalty in sports fan identity cultivates in-group status, which once again calls to mind Tajfel and Turner’s (1986) work on social identity. For Crisp and colleagues, “The sporting world provides many sources for strong and enduring social identification. In spectator sport, the personal psychological lives of individuals can be tied to the fates of their chosen teams” (Crisp, Heuston, Farr, & Turner, 2007, p. 10). As they add, “Cialdini and colleagues’ (1976) classic study of ‘basking in reflected glory’ demonstrated the simple power of winning and losing upon collective self-esteem, a vivid illustration of the grip that meaningful social memberships can exert over self-perception” (Crisp, Heuston, Farr, & Turner, 2007, p. 10). Given the overlap between political partisans and sports fans with respect to identification and self-esteem, one might conclude that Mason’s work on polarization and sorting is really about BIRGing and CORFing.

Metaphors may clarify ideas and enhance interest. More importantly, they function as a “device for seeing something *in terms of* something else” (Burke, 1945, p. 503) that can shape attitudes and influence behaviors. A substantial body of scholarship in rhetorical studies makes clear that metaphor is far more than a colorful figure of speech, as it can have significant constitutive effects on culture and politics (Cisneros, 2008; Ivie, 1987; Osborn, 1967). Given the conflictual nature of politics, it may be that using sport as a metaphor may assist in characterizing the particulars of any political debate (Aikin, 2011). However, there also are inherent risks when we reduce politics to sport, or citizenship to fan identification. In an early study on this topic, Lipsky (1979, p. 28) expresses concern that, “Politicians and political

commentators increasingly were using sports metaphors and, by analogical extension, seeing politics in athletic images." The consequence, he contends, is that such language "promotes an interest in 'winning' or 'losing' while obfuscating the reasons that should underlie an interest in winning political power" (Lipsky, 1979, p. 36).

### **Framing Kavanaugh in Sporting Terms**

It is not entirely clear if political partisans lost sight of the reasons the Brett Kavanaugh hearings were important. Nevertheless, in an era defined by polarization and "owning" your opponent on social media, it is clear that much of the reaction to the confirmation process demonstrated the tendencies of sports fans. First, it was obvious that public opinion was divided sharply along partisan lines. Based on substantial polling data, observers concluded that Republicans overwhelmingly supported Kavanaugh while Democrats overwhelmingly opposed him (Dann, 2018; Velencia & Mehta, 2018). The many reports of these polls in the news media reinforced the language of partisanship and polarization. *The Washington Post* called it a "party-line fight" (Barnes & Guskin, 2018), *Politico* referred to it as "sharply partisan" (Shepard, 2018), *Fox News* framed it as "historic rancor" (Re, 2018), and *Vanity Fair* concluded Kavanaugh's appointment "seems to have deepened partisan entrenchment" (Nguyen, 2018, ¶ 5).

These characterizations in news media are representative of the coverage of other political events, including elections, investigations, and congressional hearings. We can easily observe similar language choices in both the marketing and broadcast of presidential debates, for example (Blakenship & Kang, 1991). Or, consider the tendency to cover the 2019 testimony of Special Prosecutor Robert Mueller as anything other than a mediated drama inviting loyalists on each side to embrace the spectacle of it all at the expense of evaluating the substance. More than simply enhancing partisan allegiances, coverage of the Mueller hearings also served to

reinforce already established public opinion on the matter of Russian interference in the 2016 presidential election and the prospect of impeachment proceedings against President Donald Trump (Karson, 2019).

In the case of Kavanaugh, the pervasive focus on partisanship certainly gave the impression of two bitter rivals fighting for an on-field victory. The connection to sports was made all the more profound, however, by the degree to which Kavanaugh's actual testimony was grounded in athletic activity and its purported virtues. Writing in *The New Yorker*, Lauren Collins observes, "By my count, Brett Kavanaugh, speaking before the Senate Judiciary Committee on Thursday, mentioned sports nearly fifty times. . . . Borrowing glory from the playing field, Kavanaugh was exhibiting and exploiting the American patriarchal fallacy that competitiveness is tantamount to character" (Collins, 2018, ¶ 1). More than simply talking about coaching his daughter's basketball team or being willing to spend a lot of money to go to baseball games, Kavanaugh invoked his high school memories of bonding with friends over sports and working out. The latter reference inspired much of Matt Damon's parodic performance as Kavanaugh on *Saturday Night Live*, premised on the nominee's old calendar reminders about "lifting weights."

Given that Kavanaugh's confirmation was imperiled by an allegation of sexual assault, his testimony required that he (re)establish his character and credibility. As many observers noted, this recovery effort was rooted in the privilege of being an affluent, white, male. This identity was cultivated and legitimized through sporting fraternity. Collins (2018, ¶ 3) remarked, "The privilege, more specifically, pertains to white men, whose accomplishments we are to take as earned, the result of grit rather than natural gifts. The white-boy amateur, the vaunted 'scholar-athlete,' incarnates a set of genteel virtues from a homosocial and homogeneous world that many American conservatives would like to rediscover." Noreen

Malone (2018, ¶ 5) wrote in *The Cut*, “They (and here I am thinking also of our president, though he’s older and certainly less of a self-professed choirboy) have all the superficial trappings of masculinity – the swaggering aggression, the bombast, the interest in sports and the right women – without paying much more than lip service to what their grandfathers might have called manly virtues.” For *New York Magazine*, Will Leitch (2018, ¶ 4) observed, “Kavanaugh’s teenage world was divided into a few simple activities, the way every athlete desires: Working out. Hanging with friends (teammates, really). Drinking beers. All with the idea of close bonding with other men, and mainly other men, all nicknamed in the peevishly belittling but-hey-we’re-just-joshing-here way athletes are always nicknaming each other, as the only universe with any judgment or value . . . the only one that matters.” And Diana Moskowitz (2018, ¶ 3) concluded in *Jezebel*, “It’s no surprise at all that Kavanaugh ignored all this well-documented history and reached for the comfortable cliché of the moral and masculine athlete. It’s an image and ideal that’s grown up right along with the idea of America as a world power.”

Most direct in a critique of the sporting metaphor was Dahlia Lithwick, writing for *Slate*. Noting the masculine privilege expressed by so much emphasis on sports, she laments (2018, ¶ 1):

Ah, sports. No confirmation hearing can be complete without a little small talk about which teams the senator supports, and which sports the nominee plays, and which sporting events the nominee likens his job to, and also which sports the senator likens the confirmation process to. It’s a kind of shorthand way of everyone having a beer in the Senate chamber. We’re all just sports fans here, talking about, you know, sports.

Lithwick’s critique brings to mind Lipsky’s concern about the “athleticization of politics.” In other words, with so much focus on athletic virtue and male camaraderie, the merits of

Kavanaugh's nomination and the truth about his behavior were subsumed by the metaphor. As Lithwick (2018, ¶ 8) put it succinctly, "It's not a game when the spectators are also the victims."

Beyond the metaphorical associations between politics and sports, the many references linking Kavanaugh's character to his socialization through white masculinity and sport reflect a similar logic within sport itself. Although athletes of color, especially African Americans, have achieved tremendous success through sports in the United States, they nevertheless face any number of barriers based on assumptions about race and character. This has manifested in various ways, perhaps most obviously through historical practices of "stacking," which refers to slotting particular athletes into particular positions based on racial identity. Most visibly, "quarterbacks in football and catchers in baseball have traditionally been White, whereas Black players are more often found playing in the outfield in baseball and as running backs or wide receivers in football" (Woodward, 2004, p. 357). These characterizations have a long legacy of cementing stereotypical attitudes about African American athletes, which has translated to limits on opportunities for players at specific positions and strict regulations against behaviors — such as wearing flamboyant attire (Griffin & Calafell, 2011) or "excessive celebrations" (Cunningham, 2009, p. 45) — that are deemed "unprofessional."

What is at stake here is found in traditional political attitudes that identify particular bodies as more credible than others. Sport scholars are surely familiar with the notion of "hegemonic masculinity," what Connell (1990, p. 83) describes as "the culturally idealized form of masculine character." Although this masculine character can occasionally accommodate racial diversity, it is commonly associated with White masculinity (Butterworth, 2013; Trujillo, 1991). Grano (2010, p. 256) explains the consequences of this characterization:

For whites, character and the body are unified so that the white athletic body signifies proof of character (a triumph of inborn, interior will over bodily limits) while for African

American athletes, a body wired with primal drives is essentially conditioned against characterological controls and becomes redeemed for civic life not by force of an independent interior will, but through a contingent relationship to external disciplinary structures.

In other words, race provides a cultural shorthand for determining the virtues of individual bodies, thus reinforcing default positions about White men as inherently virtuous and Black men as inherently criminal (Cunningham, 2009).

The emphasis on characterological assumptions in sport is not a theoretical detour, for this history provides a persuasive warrant for arguments validating the character of other men. Consider news coverage of young athletes accused of sexual harassment and assault, for example, many of whom are described as “good” kids from “good families,” with “bright” futures. A useful example can be found in the case of Stanford University swimmer Brock Turner, a white male from an affluent family who received a shockingly lenient sentence after being convicted of sexually assaulting a woman who was unconscious. Turner’s connection to sport worked alongside his race and socio-economic status to remind the public that the potential future of a young, White male is inherently more valuable than the past, present, or future of women or people of color (O’Neil, 2016; Stack, 2016). Indeed, if one wanted to forecast a possible future for Brock Turner, Brett Kavanaugh makes for a suitable example.

Very little of the discourse about Kavanaugh’s confirmation, of course, overtly spoke about masculinity or race. This is why, then, the rhetorical work being done by references to sport are so important. Rather than needing to express outright preferences for whiteness or masculinity, Kavanaugh supporters could point instead to his affiliations with institutions believed to build and reflect character. In the years since the election of President Barack Obama in 2008, political discourses on the far right have increasingly relied on carefully coded rhetoric

to exploit racial stereotypes and divisions. By casting Obama and other people of color as “Other” or “un-American,” right-wing partisans have capitalized on racist legacies to negate the symbolism of the Obama presidency (Enck-Wanzer, 2011). During the 2016 presidential campaign and the Trump administration, these discourses have intensified, often by relying on demonizing those who would threaten the nation’s greatness – namely, women and people of color. Indeed, the muscular, misogynistic, and racist rhetoric of the “alt-right,” “incels,” and White nationalists (Bergengruen & Hennigan, 2019; Osnos, 2015; Williams, 2018) provides the foundation on which much contemporary polarization has been built.<sup>2</sup>

The extreme polarization exemplified by the Kavanaugh appointment may reveal strong partisan identifications, but it also represents a weak democratic culture. In the words of Levitsky and Ziblatt (2018, p. 9), “if one thing is clear from studying breakdowns throughout history, it’s that extreme polarization can kill democracies.” Part of the problem is that polarization leads citizens to direct their participatory energy to spectatorship, thereby abdicating their responsibilities to play an active role in democratic practices. Instead of thinking of “citizenship as a mode of public engagement” (Asen, 2004, p. 191), too often Americans are content to reduce their democratic activity to voting and to defer to elected officials for leadership (Barber, 1984).

Given these conditions, it may appear that American democracy is indeed at risk, with polarization a leading cause. Based on a particular view of sports fans, intense political identification promotes increasingly poor behavior. Following the metaphor, intense partisanship is equated with intense fan identity. When we consider that, at least in some cases, “the expression of hostility in sports rivalries is culturally acceptable” (Lehr, Ferreira, & Banaji, 2019, p. 29), we should be concerned that sporting language may have effects on political attitudes. But there is another aspect to sport that we should seek to cultivate, one in which

rhetoric and sport are brought back into conversation with one another. Earlier in this essay, I drew on agonistic political theory and its emphasis on the unavoidability of conflict. From an agonistic point of view, conflict must be addressed under conditions of sustained contest. It is the emphasis on contestation to which I now turn.

### **Sport as Agonistic Contest**

Rhetoric and sport, and democracy for that matter, share a common point of origin: ancient Greece. In both, the *agōn* is a central construct. As Hawhee (2005) explains, agonistic conflict is not an end in and of itself. Rather, agonism privileges the sense of community cultivated by the contest. As she notes, “The Olympic Games . . . depended on the gathering of athletes, judges, and spectators alike. *Agora*, the marketplace, shares the same derivative and a strikingly similar force of meaning as *agōn*, and, as is commonly known, functioned as the ancient gathering place par excellence” (Hawhee, 2005, p. 15). In other words, there is something to be *shared* among and between competitors. Shields and Bredemeier (2011) take up a similar theme in their argument seeking to shift the emphasis in competition from war to partnership. As they point out, the “etymology of the word ‘competition’ means ‘to strive’ or ‘to seek’ with” (Shields & Bredemeier, 2011, p. 33).

This cooperative spirit is something missing from many of the sports metaphors applied to contemporary politics. Although it is common for fans to be hostile toward their rivals and occasionally get carried away (especially when coupled with alcohol consumption), many of the dynamics of sports rivalries are benign or even healthy. In fact, the very best rivalries in sports—Duke vs. North Carolina in college basketball, Roger Federer vs. Rafael Nadal in tennis, FC Barcelona vs. Real Madrid in association football—depend on being able to play again another day. Complete destruction is not desirable because it ends the rivalry. This notion finds its parallel in agonism through Mouffe’s focus on “adversaries.” Although conflict cannot be

eliminated from politics, she argues that it can be minimized and managed through recurring contestation. Adversaries are central to this, for they are “persons who are friends because they share a common symbolic space but also enemies because they want to organize this common symbolic space in a different way” (Mouffe, 2000, p. 13).

An important part of re-thinking politics as sport is to question the dependence on hegemonic notions of masculinity and enemyship (Engels, 2010). In both politics and sport, strength and assertiveness are valued, often at the expense of nuance and compromise. Thus, political leadership is articulated as inherently masculine (Sheeler & Anderson, 2013) and sport valorizes figures such as quarterbacks and head coaches (Butterworth & Schuck, 2016). Instead of celebrating athletic conquest and masculine authority as emblematic of political value, Americans would do well to consider politics as a shared enterprise rooted in consubstantial rivalry.

Given the state of contemporary politics, is it possible to translate the abstractions of political theory and reshape our democratic practices? Mason speaks to this through her appeal to “superordinate goals,” mutual aims that transcend political partisanship. As an example of this, she turns to the immediate aftermath of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks. She notes, “For a short time afterward, Democrats and Republicans came together, at least in their approval of the president, George W. Bush. However, the activation of a superordinate American identity did not heal the rift between the parties” (Mason, 2018, p. 134). Here, Mason equates approval of the president with American identity – which may or may not be reasonable – but there is value in her sentiment. What is problematic for Mason’s point of view, however, is that uncritical obedience to a presidential administration may present an image of “unity,” but it is accompanied by the citizenry’s collective failure to hold its government accountable for decisions and policies enacted on behalf of the nation.

If symbolic unity ultimately enables material divisions, what is instead required is a willingness for citizens to see their colleagues, neighbors, and community members as others who share a common symbolic space, even if they want to organize that space in a different way. Levitsky and Ziblatt call this “mutual toleration,” which suggests “that as long as our rivals play by constitutional rules, we accept that they have an equal right to exist, compete for power, and govern. We may disagree with, and even strongly dislike, our rivals, but we nevertheless accept them as legitimate. This means recognizing that our political rivals are decent, patriotic, law-abiding citizens – that they love our country and respect the Constitution just as we do” (Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018, p. 102). It does not mean giving up our loyalties or affiliations, but it does mean that politics cannot be reduced only to “wins” and “losses.” Brett Kavanaugh’s confirmation may well have felt like a “win” for Republicans and a “loss” for Democrats. Over time, the particular details of his confirmation hearing will become artifacts of the past. It seems clear, though, that we will continue to struggle with partisanship and political hostility. We need not agree with each other on major issues or strive for some transcendental form of “unity.” Viewing one another as adversaries instead of enemies, however, would go a long way toward helping us translate the attitudes of sport into the behaviors of a true citizen-fan.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> U.S. citizens tend to react with discomfort when a clear winner and loser cannot be determined in sports. Indeed, a sport such as soccer is often denigrated because draws are commonplace, which may explain why some, such as former U.S. Senator Jack Kemp, think of it as “a European socialist [sport].” Quoted in Foer (2004, p. 241).

<sup>2</sup> One might be tempted to note here that “both sides” are guilty of partisanship and polarization. This is true, to an extent, but I think it is important to reject the false equivalency that sees these as two, equally matched sides. Although those on the radical left can be guilty of damaging rhetoric, there is an important documented history that demonstrates conservative and Republican Party efforts to exploit race and masculine authority. Space prevents an extended discussion of this, but helpful sources include Lakoff (2002) and Lee (2014).

## References

- Aalberg, T., Strömbäck, J., & de Vreese, C. H. (2011). The framing of politics as strategy and game: A review of concepts, operationalizations and key findings. *Journalism, 13*, 162-178.
- Aikin, S. (2011). A defense of war and sport metaphors in argument. *Philosophy and Rhetoric, 44*, 250-272.
- Asen, R. (2004). A discourse theory of citizenship. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 90*, 189-211.
- Barber, B. (1984). *Strong democracy: Participatory politics for a new age*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Barnes, R., & Guskin, E. (2018, October 12). More Americans disapprove of Kavanaugh's confirmation than support it, new poll shows. *Washington Post*. Retrieved from [https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/more-americans-disapprove-of-kavanaughs-confirmation-than-support-it-new-poll-shows/2018/10/12/18dbf872-cd93-11e8-a3e6-44daa3d35ede\\_story.html?utm\\_term=.cc90eaa13b7d](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/more-americans-disapprove-of-kavanaughs-confirmation-than-support-it-new-poll-shows/2018/10/12/18dbf872-cd93-11e8-a3e6-44daa3d35ede_story.html?utm_term=.cc90eaa13b7d).
- Benoit, W. L., Stein, K. A., & Hansen, G. J. (2005). *New York Times* coverage of presidential campaigns. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly, 82*, 356-376.
- Bergengruen, V., & Hennigan, W. J. (2019, August 8). "We are being eaten from within": Why America is losing the battle against White nationalist terrorism. *Time*. Retrieved from <https://time.com/5647304/white-nationalist-terrorism-united-states/>.
- Blakenship, J., & Kang, J. G. (1991). The 1984 presidential and vice presidential debates: The printed press and "construction" by metaphor. *Presidential Studies Quarterly, 21*, 307-318.
- Burke, K. (1945). *A grammar of motives*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Butterworth, M. L. (2013). The passion of the Tebow: Sports media and heroic language in the

- tragic frame. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 30, 17-33.
- Butterworth, M. L. (2014). Nate Silver and campaign 2012: Sport, the statistical frame, and the rhetoric of electoral forecasting. *Journal of Communication*, 64, 895-914.
- Butterworth, M. L., & Schuck, R. I. (2016). American mythology and ambivalent rhetoric in *Friday Night Lights*. *Southern Communication Journal*, 81, 92-106.
- Cialdini, R. B., Borden, R. J., Thorne, A., Walker, M. R., Freeman, S., & Sloan, L. R. (1976). Basking in reflected glory: Three (football) field studies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 34, 366-375.
- Cisneros, J. D. (2008). Contaminated communities: The metaphor of "immigrant as pollutant" in media representations of immigration. *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, 11, 569-602.
- Collins, L. (2018, September 28). Brett Kavanaugh and the innocence of White jocks. *New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.newyorker.com/news/our-columnists/brett-kavanaugh-and-the-innocence-of-white-jocks-christine-blasey-ford>.
- Connell, R. W. (1990). An iron man: The body and some contradictions of hegemonic masculinity. In M. A. Messner & D. F. Sabo (Eds.), *Sport, men, and the gender order: Critical feminist perspectives* (pp. 83-95). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Crisp, R. J., Heuston, S., Farr, M. J., & Turner, R. N. (2007). Seeing red or feeling blue: Differentiated intergroup emotions and ingroup identification in soccer fans. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 10, 9-26.
- Cunningham, P. L. (2009). "Please don't fine me again!!!!" Black athletic defiance in the NBA and NFL. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 33, 39-58.
- Dann, C. (2018, October 22). Poll: Kavanaugh fallout continues to polarize voters ahead of midterms. *NBC News*. Retrieved from <https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/first-read/poll-kavanaugh-fallout-continues-polarize-voters-ahead-midterms-n922241>.

- Ellis, C., & Stimson, J. A. (2012). *Ideology in America*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Enck-Wanzer, D. (2011). Barack Obama, the Tea Party, and the threat of race: On racial neoliberalism and born again racism. *Communication, Culture & Critique*, 4, 23-30.
- Engels, J. *Enemyship: Democracy and counter-revolution in the early republic*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.
- Foer, F. (2004). *How soccer explains the world: An unlikely theory of globalization*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Grano, D. A. (2010). Risky dispositions: Thick moral description and character-talk in sports culture. *Southern Communication Journal*, 75, 255-276.
- Griffin, R. A., & Calafell, B. M. (2011). Control, discipline, and punish: Black masculinity and (in)visible Whiteness in the NBA. In M. G. Lacy & K. A. Ono (Eds.), *Critical rhetorics of race* (pp. 117-136). New York: New York University Press.
- Hawhee, D. (2005). *Bodily arts: Rhetoric and athletics in ancient Greece*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Hruby, P. (2012, January 4). The SportsCenter-ization of political journalism. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2012/01/the-sportscenter-ization-of-political-journalism/250882/>.
- Ivie, R. L. (1987). Metaphor and the rhetorical invention of Cold War "idealists." *Communication Monographs*, 54, 165-182.
- Ivie, R. L. (2005). *Democracy and America's war on terror*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.
- Jamieson, K. H. (1992). *Dirty politics: Deception, distraction, and democracy*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jarvis, S. E. (2005). *The talk of the party: Political labels, symbolic capital & American life*.

- Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Karson, K. (2019, July 28). Partisan differences on impeachment remain after Mueller testimony, as nearly half of Americans show little movement: Poll. *ABC News*. Retrieved from <https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/partisan-differences-impeachment-remain-mueller-testimony-half-americans/story?id=64587293>.
- Lakoff, G. (2002). *Moral politics: How liberals and conservatives think*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lee, Michael J. (2014). *Creating conservatism: Postwar words that made an American movement*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.
- Lehr, S. A., Ferreira, M. L., & Banaji, M. R. (2019). When outgroup negativity trumps ingroup positivity: Fans of the Boston Red Sox and New York Yankees place greater value on rival losses than own-team gains. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 22, 26-42.
- Leitch, W. (2018, October 2). Along with everything else, Brett Kavanaugh is an obnoxious jock. *New York Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://nymag.com/intelligencer/2018/10/brett-kavanaugh-is-an-obnoxious-jock.html>.
- Levitsky, S., & Ziblatt, D. (2018). *How democracies die*. New York: Broadway Books.
- Lipsky, R. (1979). The athleticization of politics: The political implications of sports symbolism. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 3, 28-37.
- Lipsyte, R. (1975). *SportsWorld: An American dreamland*. New York: Quadrangle.
- Lithwick, D. (2018, September 6). Brett Kavanaugh's confirmation isn't a sporting event. *Slate.com*. Retrieved from <https://slate.com/news-and-politics/2018/09/kavanaugh-confirmation-hearing-protesters-roe-v-wade.html>.
- Malone, N. (2018, September 28). Kavanaugh: Such a Brett. *The Cut*. Retrieved from

[https://www.thecut.com/2018/09/brett-kavanaugh-prep-school.html#\\_ga=2.10965171.625430380.1553701735-440691931.1553701735](https://www.thecut.com/2018/09/brett-kavanaugh-prep-school.html#_ga=2.10965171.625430380.1553701735-440691931.1553701735).

Mason, L. (2018). *Uncivil agreement: How politics became our identity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Moskovitz, D. (2018, September 28). Brett Kavanaugh and the myth that sports build better men. *Jezebel.com*. Retrieved from <https://theslot.jezebel.com/brett-kavanaugh-and-the-myth-that-sports-build-better-m-1829381019>.

Mouffe, C. (2000). *The democratic paradox*. London: Verso.

Nguyen, T. (2018, October 10). Will Kavanaugh fever kill the blue wave? *Vanity Fair*. Retrieved from <https://www.vanityfair.com/news/2018/10/brett-kavanaugh-midterms-republican-democrat-turnout>

O'Neil, L. (2016, June 11). Status and race in the Stanford rape case: Why Brock Turner's mugshot matters. *CBC News*. Retrieved from <https://www.cbc.ca/news/trending/brock-turner-mugshot-stanford-rape-case-images-sex-assault-1.3629147>.

Osborn, M. (1967). Archetypal metaphor in rhetoric: The light-dark family. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 53, 115-126.

Osnos, E. (2015, August 14). The fearful and the frustrated: Donald Trump's nationalist coalition takes shape – for now. *The New Yorker*. Retrieved from <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2015/08/31/the-fearful-and-the-frustrated>.

Re, G. (2018, October 14). Kavanaugh slugfest could boost GOP in midterms, as polls show voter interest rising. *Fox News*. Retrieved from <https://www.foxnews.com/politics/kavanaugh-slugfest-could-boost-gop-in-midterms-as-polls-show-voter-interest-rising>.

Segrave, J. O. (2000). The sports metaphor in American cultural discourse. *Culture, Sport*,

*Society*, 3, 48-60.

Sheeler, K. H., & Anderson, K. V. (2013). *Woman president: Confronting postfeminist political culture*. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press.

Shepard, S. (2018, October 1). Poll: Kavanaugh opinion hardens along partisan lines.

*Politico.com*. Retrieved from <https://www.politico.com/story/2018/10/01/poll-kavanaugh-ford-opinion-854860>.

Shields, D., & Bredemeier, B. (2011). Contest, competition, and metaphor. *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport*, 38, 27-38.

Stack, L. (2016, June 6). Light sentence for Brock Turner in Stanford rape case draws outrage.

*New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/07/us/outrage-in-stanford-rape-case-over-dueling-statements-of-victim-and-attackers-father.html>.

Sun, D. (2018, October 7). Lawsuit threatened over UW College Republicans' Kavanaugh celebration at local bar. *KIRO-7*. Retrieved from

<https://www.kiro7.com/news/local/lawsuit-threatened-over-uw-college-republicans-kavanaugh-celebration-at-local-bar/848428093>.

Tafel, & Turner (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp. 7-24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall Publishers.

Tannenbaum, P. H., & Noah, J. E. (1959). Sportugese: A study of sports page communication.

*Journalism Quarterly*, 36, 163-170.

Trujillo, N. (1991). Hegemonic masculinity on the mound: Media representations of Nolan Ryan and American sports culture. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 8, 290-308.

Velencia, J., & Mehta, D. (2018, October 5). A final look at where voters stand on Kavanaugh

before the Senate votes. *FiveThirtyEight.com*. Retrieved from <https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/a-final-look-at-where-voters-stand-on-kavanaugh-before-the-senate-votes/>.

Wann, D. L., & Branscombe, N. R. (1992). Emotional responses to the sports page. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 6, 49-64.

Williams, Z. (2018, April 25). "Raw hatred": Why the "incel" movement targets and terrorises women. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2018/apr/25/raw-hatred-why-incel-movement-targets-terrorises-women>.

Woodward, J. R. (2004). Professional football scouts: An investigation of racial stacking. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 21, 356-375.

