

Lopez, Lori Kido and Jason Kido Lopez. (2017) "Deploying Oppositional Fandoms: Activists' Use of Sports Fandom in the Redskins Controversy." In *Fandom: Identities and Communities in a Mediated World*. Jonathan Gray, Cornel Sandvoss, and C. Lee Harrington, eds. New York: New York University Press, pp. 315-330.

Deploying Oppositional Fandoms

Activists' Use of Sports Fandom in the Redskins Controversy

LORI KIDO LOPEZ AND JASON KIDO LOPEZ

Sports teams have long been called upon to stop the offensive and derogatory practice of using Native Americans as mascots, particularly when those mascots rely upon outdated and problematic stereotypes (King & Springwood 2001; Taylor 2013). Amid the hundreds of name-change battles that are being waged across the country, the refusal of the NFL's Washington Redskins to change their name stands out in a number of ways. First, the insistence of the professional football team in using a dictionary-defined slur makes it nearly impossible to defend the name as potentially reverent or respectful.¹ The team offers a clear example of the way that naming and the use of mascots reflect histories of oppression—in this case, the history of Native American genocide and the selling of scalps known as *redskins*. But the Redskins are also an important case to examine due to their tremendous size and visibility. Representing the US capital, the Redskins are a national franchise with an audience of millions, including the nearly eighty thousand ticket holders who occupy FedExField during games, as well as the viewers who tune in to national telecasts of NFL games every season. Indeed, football is the most popular sport in the United States, and broadcasts of NFL games are the most popular programs on television (Bibel 2014).

While the Washington Redskins serve as an exemplary case of an offensively named sports franchise, owner Daniel Snyder offers an equally exemplary case of holding firm and resisting change. In May 2013, he said in an interview with *USA Today*, "We'll never change the name. It's that simple. NEVER—you can use caps" (Brady 2013). Snyder has stood strong amid an outpouring of criticism and anti-Redskins activism. Since 2013, this has included the stripping of their legal trademark

by the US Patent and Trademark Office, the refusals of over forty news organizations to use their name in the media, as well as outspoken condemnation from over ninety Native American tribes and organizations, fifty US senators, and a list of notable celebrities and influencers that includes President Barack Obama (ChangetheMascot.org n.d.). Yet Snyder insists that their fans support the name staying the same, claiming it is a symbol of pride that reflects their history of honoring Native Americans.

Given the extremely offensive nature of the team's name and stubbornness of the team's owner, Native American activist groups have taken up the cause of getting the Redskins name changed. Indeed, the burden seems to fall to them since organized efforts to change the name have not been seen to originate from Redskins fans. This raises the question of what relationship Native American name-change activists have to sports fans more broadly, including fans of the Redskins, the NFL, and sports in general. In this chapter we examine how the controversies surrounding this particular Native American mascot provide an important site for considering the ways that activists can potentially work with, around, or in spite of sports fandoms.

Our research is based on interviews with representatives from the Oneida Nation and the National Coalition Against Racism in Sports and Media and analysis of their actions and strategies. This includes in particular a close reading of the eight radio spots from the 2013–14 Change the Mascot campaign and the media coverage that followed those spots. Although much media studies research finds fans to be the ideal candidates to enlist as allies in the battle for social change, sports fans are a unique kind of audience that demands new theorizing as to their relationship to activism and social justice organizing. By examining what forces push up against the fans, and by breaking from fan studies' dominant framing of fans as progressive political actors to instead examine an instance in which fans are the object upon which progressive activists must act, we aim to broaden the field's picture of fan politics and activism. We argue that sports fans must be understood as participating in "oppositional fandoms," or fandoms that are temporarily defined by their position in opposition to another fandom. This positioning creates a mobile and dynamic set of affective identifications that can be a double-edged sword for social justice activists—serving as a potential opportunity for fans to meaningfully engage with social

justice issues, as the dominant view in fan studies goes, while also risking digging in against change. This investigation also reminds us that activists must pay particular attention to the environments in which fandoms are being engaged in order to solicit political support effectively, as not all fandom environments are created equal. What we ultimately see through this case is that despite the bad reputation of many sports fandoms, sport cultures can in fact provide a potentially transformative context for shifting the national discourse on significant social justice issues.

The Power of Fan Activism

Scholarship on fan activism often theorizes and celebrates the potential for fans to use their affective relationships and fannish undertakings in service of social justice activism, or intentionally working to rectify a broader injustice or inequality that extends beyond the realm of the fan object. Fan-based activist organizations such as Racebending.com, Nerdfighters, the Harry Potter Alliance, the Browncoats, Lady Gaga's Little Monsters, and the Colbert Nation have all demonstrated the ways in which fandom can provide a useful set of skills for collectively agitating toward political causes (Lopez 2011; Kligler-Vilenchik et al. 2012; Jenkins 2014; Cochran 2012; Bennett 2014; Burwell & Boler 2008). As Henry Jenkins and Sangita Shresthova (2012: n.p.) argue in their introduction to an edited journal issue on fan activism, "insofar as a growing number of fans are exploring how they might translate their capacities for analysis, networking, mobilization, and communication into campaigns for social change, we support expanding the field of fan studies to deal with this new mode of civic engagement." These investigations of activist collectives echo the progressive and celebratory orientation of early fan scholarship, where studies of active readers argued that fans have the ability to rewrite and repurpose even the most sexist or racist components of a beloved text (Radway 1984; Jenkins 1992). While such studies remind us that fandoms have long been seen to offer a productive site for marginalized audiences such as women and queer folks to build community and develop their voices, here we expand our consideration to include the way that activists are also working with and against fandoms.

We must also note the many fandoms that are rooted in racism, or that organize to promote racist ideologies and actions (Wanzo 2015). Prominent examples of these are in the complaints of fans who are upset at the casting of African Americans in roles that were presumed to be for white actors, such as Amandla Stenberg as Rue in *The Hunger Games*, Idris Elba as the Norse god Heimdall in *Thor*, Michael B. Jordan as the Human Torch in *Fantastic Four*, and many others. Hate-based fandoms such as those of White Power music have also been seen to organize around the promotion and spread of racist ideologies (Corte & Edwards 2008). These examples remind us that fandom itself is a politically neutral endeavor; any collective of engaged individuals can organize their cooperative efforts toward a cause that is larger than their own specific fandom. As such, it is important to theorize the ways that activists are negotiating their desire for progressive social change in relation to these fandoms.

Although we rarely see coordinated efforts such as these emerging from sports fans, they are nonetheless commonly considered to fall within the category of “bad fandoms.” A naïve characterization might simply condemn the sports fan as simple-minded, brutish, or prone to emotional outbursts, while more extreme criticism has often posited a connection between sports fandom and violent, misogynistic, racist, or homophobic attitudes and behaviors. Indeed, much scholarship on sports fandom has served to uphold the latter, with scholars exploring the way that sports fans’ enjoyment of the sport can be tied to violence and may even increase as player aggressiveness increases (Bryant, Zillmann, & Raney 1998). Others have found that reveling in violence on the field can lead to violence off the field (Lanter 2011; Roberts & Benjamin, 2000). The conception of sports fans as violent is especially concerning when it is combined with problematic attitudes toward disenfranchised populations such as people of color, women, and queer communities (Love & Hughey 2015; Cleland 2014; Kian et al. 2011). While these findings are indeed worrisome, we caution that they should not be taken to represent all sports fans—as with all fan collectives, sports fans are obviously heterogeneous and need not be roundly condemned. Yet they do offer a powerful and common representation of sports fans.

This conception differs from the other “non-bad” fandoms mentioned above and offers an important site for further exploring the rela-

tionship between fans and activists. While many fandoms might seem particularly useful to activists in the fight for social justice, sports fans are not often viewed this way. This offers an opportunity to explore how it could still be the case that activists can engage with sports fans as they work toward their cause. In examining the way that activists have approached the Redskins controversy, we can more clearly understand the strengths and drawbacks of deploying sports fans toward activist causes.

The Change the Mascot Movement

The football team that is now the Washington Redskins originated as an NFL franchise called the Boston Braves in 1932. To avoid confusion with the Braves baseball team they soon changed their name to the Redskins, and in 1937 they moved to their current home in Washington, D.C. Their history has been rife with racial controversy, starting with the fact that the claimed Indian ancestry of their original owner, William Henry Dietz, has long been contested. More significantly, the Washington Redskins were the last NFL team to integrate. Owner George Preston Marshall was a famously outspoken racist, and he refused to draft any African Americans to the team until the government stepped in and threatened to cancel their stadium’s lease in 1962 (Smith 1987). Although they eventually began to diversify their roster, protests against the racist epithet embodied by their name and logo have fallen on deaf ears since as early as 1973. Indeed, notable protests by Native Americans demanding a name change have been documented every decade since, most often when the Redskins rose to national prominence by playing in a Super Bowl. Their battle is just one of many, as there have been hundreds of struggles over Native American sports mascots and team names waged across the country at all levels, including professional, college, and high school teams (Davis-Delano 2007; Hofmann 2005).

This is the context into which Native American activists reinvigorated a battle over the name in 2013. It was a conversation initiated decades ago that had been fought, and continued to be fought, by many different organizations and political entities—including the National Congress of American Indians, the National Coalition Against Racism in Sports and Media, the American Indian Movement, and others. Here we focus primarily on the strategies of the Oneida Indian Nation and

their campaign called Change the Mascot, which was inspired by the actions of high school students in nearby Cooperstown who petitioned to change their mascot to something other than Redskins. Sensing that the success of these young activists reflected a shifting political climate with regard to this persistent issue, members of the Oneida Indian Nation began organizing around the single issue of changing the name of the Washington Redskins. Many activists believed that if they could cut off the head of the snake—the most visible offender, the biggest franchise—others across the country would be forced to follow suit, or at least be weakened in their defenses.

The crux of the activists' strategy was to follow the Redskins along on their road games and buy radio slots in every city. Radio advertisements were relatively cheap in comparison to national television spots, and they could be flexible in shaping their message as the season progressed. These sixty-second spots incorporated responses to relevant issues within the sports world, tying together issues that were already being discussed in news media to the demand for a name change. For instance, in August 2013, Philadelphia Eagles wide receiver Riley Cooper was caught on tape using a slur against African Americans. Change the Mascot immediately incorporated the response of NFL Commissioner Roger Goodell into their radio advertisements, commending Goodell for doing the right thing in saying that "racial language is obviously wrong, insensitive, and unacceptable." The radio ad then transitioned to the voice of Oneida Nation Leader Ray Halbritter, who states that with the Eagles playing the Washington Redskins in the next game, Goodell has the opportunity to now denounce the name Redskins by using the same words he used to describe the Eagles player. As the message concludes, "we do not deserve to be called Redskins, we deserve to be treated as what we are, which is Americans." This strategy proved effective in garnering wider media coverage, as a *Washington Post* article commented that "at least four national programs this week transitioned pretty quickly from comments about Riley Cooper to comments about the Redskins' team name" (Steinberg 2013). A new radio spot was created for each away game, so after Washington's opener in Green Bay, Wisconsin, activists moved on to Oakland, Dallas, Denver, and Minneapolis. Their carefully crafted messages included discussions of the hurtful nature of the epithet, the support for change from the country's

leading voices, the racist history of the team, and the history-making nature of their campaign. These media-centered actions were also supplemented with protests that were often staged in conjunction with other Native American organizations. For instance, during the Vikings game, in a state with thirteen Indian tribes, a number of Native organizations came together in a massive game-day protest with between four and five thousand participants that drew national media coverage (Cox 2014).

Alongside their radio spots, Change the Mascot also created a number of videos to convey their message. One was called "Proud to Be" and shows contemporary and historical images of Native Americans while a narrator lists words such as "proud, forgotten, Indian, Navajo, Blackfoot, Inuit, Sioux, underserved, struggling, resilient, rancher, teacher, doctor, soldier, unyielding, strong, indomitable." It ends with the statement, "Native Americans call themselves many things. The one thing they don't . . ." before fading to an image of the Redskins helmet. The two-minute video was released on YouTube days before the Super Bowl in 2014, and was labeled by the *Huffington Post* "the most important Super Bowl ad you didn't see" (Irwin 2014). The video did end up being shown on television four months later, when a California tribe called the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation paid for the advertisement to run in seven major cities during halftime of the NBA finals, where it was exposed to over fifteen million viewers. Publicity for this video has also flourished online through social media, and the version posted to YouTube by the National Congress of American Indians has over three million views.

Environments of Sports Fandom

The strategies deployed by name-change activists reflect a complicated understanding of sports fans and the role that they might play in organizing around this cause. First, we can consider the fact that Redskins fans themselves have not been seen taking up a leadership role in challenging the racism of their team's name or branding. Although there are dozens of groups and pages on Facebook devoted to fans who want to keep the Redskins name the same, it is difficult to find much solidarity around a slogan such as "love the team, hate the name," which would reflect a fan's participation in name-change activism.² When asked if they had any football fans as part of their name-change movement, one

name-change activist simply stated that they did not. This does not mean that such fans do not exist—and with such a large regional fan base, it is safe to assume there are indeed fans with widely varying positions on the name—but the lack of fan participation is striking for two reasons. First, we can see that it does not align with much of the previous research on fan activism that shows how the passion of fans can meaningfully be redirected toward social justice causes when it comes to the treatment of a favored franchise. Moreover, in this particular case, converting fans into name-change activists could be a potentially powerful move. Snyder's desire to keep the name is strong, but it seems clear that preserving the name would be unwise in the face of his team's own fans calling for change. All football franchises are simply businesses, and businesses must respond to consumer demands. This would seem to be an opportune moment to utilize fans as consumer-activists and leverage their buying power into a political demand that must be addressed. Yet this has not happened.

On the contrary, the narratives that are consistently propagated position activists as being in opposition to fans, with frequent media coverage of the hostile interactions between activists and fans. For instance, an episode of the *Daily Show* in 2014 was framed as “controversial” because it invited Redskins fans to actually speak to Native Americans, and was rumored to descend into yelling and name calling. The segment that aired was edited so that it remained lighthearted (albeit uncomfortable), cutting away from what news reports later said became so intense and threatening that one person called the police (Williams 2014). This narrative is upheld in conversations with activists, who admit nervousness around staging any events near FedExField. One activist stated:

A reporter friend of mine once said to me, the way you're going to end this is show up at the stadium on a game day. We've always been like, the fans are great. He's like, the fans aren't great—they're gonna be drunk and throw a bottle at you. [. . .] At the height of this, [the stadium] was a powder keg. If we would have shown up there it would have been a riot.

Both the suggestion of the reporter and the activist's response are telling with regard to the assumptions being made—the sports fans are expected to respond with violence that would endanger the safety of the activists.

Although this assumption about how such an interaction would play out may be unfounded, it is important to consider the environment in which sports fandom takes place and how it facilitates or limits the potential to turn sports fans into activists. In many ways, sports fandom is similar to other types of fandom that take place within rowdy social arenas such as comic conventions or live musical concerts. These carnivalesque environments offer spaces for play and experimentation with one's identity, such as face painting or donning a costume that frees the fan to behave in ways that might otherwise be deemed unacceptable (Lamerichs 2014). These are also spaces of heightened emotion, where random screaming can lead to a collective cheer among the crowd, or where one could be moved to tears of joy or frustration. Yet sports fandom often incorporates additional elements that lead to a particularly combustible set of factors. First, as noted in the reporter's suggestion, there is a lively culture of alcohol consumption that surrounds sports fandom.³ When coupled with the heightened emotional climate of a space where passionate fans are celebrating or bemoaning their team's performance, the culture of drinking alcohol can lead to serious consequences—in fact, the prevalence of alcohol-fueled disorderly conduct, assaults, arrests, and ejections is one reason for the banning of alcohol sales at most collegiate football games throughout the country (Glassman et al. 2007; Rees & Schnepel 2009). In the environment of the sports arena, it is not uncommon to witness what Foster, Hyatt, and Julien (2012) call the “dysfunctional fan” who engages in confrontational behaviors such as getting in fights with other fans or drinking to excess, as well as fans who engage in the negative rhetorical practices of complaining, obsessing about performances, verbally confronting other fans, and otherwise being obnoxious. They argue that such behaviors must be attributed not only to individual personalities, but to the institutional and social setting of sports fandom itself.

But the aspect of sports fandom that seems most relevant within the strategies of Change the Mascot activism is the structure of pitting one contingent of fans against the other. As Vivi Theodoropoulou (2007) argues, sports fans can often be considered anti-fans in the sense that their love for their own team is often positioned against their hatred of a rival team. While Theodoropoulou focuses on the existence of long-standing rivalries between two teams, here we consider that many sports matches—including football, baseball, basketball, soccer, and

others—are premised on opposition. Even in the absence of a specific long-standing rivalry, at every single matchup fans enter the stadium positioned in opposition to fans of the competing team. This kind of oppositional fandom marks a particularly dynamic form of anti-fandom that is structured by the competitive structure of sports like football, which pit the object of one's fandom temporarily against a distinct enemy and its contingent of fans. We define oppositional fandom as a temporary positioning of one's fandom in direct competition to an opponent, as we commonly see within sports fandoms. This opposition serves to deepen one's identification and allegiance (to one's own team), but is also characterized by a larger fandom of the competition that unites the two opponents (to the sport, or to sports itself). Lloyd Sloan (1989) notes not only that fans' affective responses to the emotion of the game parallel those of the athletes, but that the fans themselves become winners and losers depending on the outcome of the game. In this sense, an attack on a fan's sports team feels like a personal attack because fandoms are divided into binary oppositions of "us" versus "them," and each fandom must defend themselves against the other (Boyle & Haynes 2000). When we take this oppositional fandom into consideration, we can even more clearly see the volatility of the specific environment of the football stadium on game day—fans who are passionate about their own team's success, who have perhaps overindulged in judgment-impairing beverages, and who are in an environment that is commonly populated by disruption and emotional outburst are also congregating in a space where they are primed to see opposition as a direct threat. It is not a coincidence that we often see news stories about violence between fans breaking out in the stadium. Furthermore, as Cornel Sandvoss (2003) notes, many sports fans mistakenly view their fandom as apolitical. An incursion of politics could certainly be seen as a threat not only to themselves and the team, but to their entire conception of sports. Amid this environment of fandom, any critique of the Redskins franchise that is directed toward Redskins fans could simply be lumped together as another form of opposition that must be resisted and repulsed at all costs—perhaps even through violence. Thus, despite the fact that turning Redskins fans against their own name or their owner's decisions would clearly strengthen the name-change movement, the particular environment of the stadium on game day may not be conducive to changing minds.

Utilizing Oppositional Fandoms

Yet this does not mean that sports fans are a lost cause when it comes to political engagement. On the contrary, all of the reasons why it might be ineffective to solicit support for the name-change at FedExField during Redskins home games might strengthen the potential to activate fans of the other thirty-one NFL teams during away games. Indeed, we can see that the lessons learned from considering the environments of fandom as well as the strengths of oppositional fandom have both been strategically utilized by name-change activists in order to bolster their movement. Despite the fact that one fan base is positioned against the other fan base, both are united under the banner of the sport they are watching. Thus, even sports fans who boo one other on game day can be seen to identify with one another in some sense; at its root, their opposition to one another is inspired and sanctioned by a larger shared fandom.

We can see an understanding of this aspect of oppositional fandom in the use of radio advertisements in cities to which the Redskins traveled. The strategy of following the Redskins around the country can be seen as a deliberate appeal to the oppositional fandoms of local football fans. Fans of the Green Bay Packers throughout Wisconsin, for instance, would have been particularly susceptible to taking up an anti-Redskins position on the week that the Washington Redskins were coming to town. Opposition to the Redskins, which would make annoyance with the team's racist name an even easier sell, would be a natural position to take up in that moment. The same would be true for Raiders fans in Oakland two weeks later, or Cowboys fans in Dallas the week after that. Amid a climate where it was estimated that 71 percent of the country overall did not support a name change (ESPN 2014), activists recognized they were fighting an uphill battle and that gaining any political ground was important. This means that convincing any NFL fans that the Redskins name was racist could be considered a gain, even if the ultimate goal of changing the name was not necessarily a desire of these oppositional fans (as such a correction might actually make their opponents seem less racist). Playing upon the natural proclivities of sports fans to take up positions against their opponents was one way of bolstering the number of sports fans across the country who would readily agree to the fact that the word "redskins" could even be considered a problem.

We can also see that the tactic of using radio advertisements as the primary vehicle for the name-change activists' political message takes the environment of fandom into consideration. Rather than attempting to convince sports fans of their cause in the space of their home stadium, activists conveyed their message to those who were listening to the radio while they were in their cars, at work, or in their homes. Moreover, through the earned coverage that their campaign was able to garner in a wide range of outlets—including local and national newspaper stories; sports magazines such as *Sports Illustrated*; sports websites such as Grantland.com, ESPN.com, and FoxSports.com; the radio programs *Mike and Mike* and the *Jim Rome Show*; and the television shows *First Take, His and Hers*, and the *Dan Patrick Show*—the distribution of their messaging continued well beyond these radio spots to reach a diverse and multifaceted audience of sports fans. Each of these forms of mediated messaging can then be consumed in an environment that potentially allows for more deliberative or thoughtful engagement than the rowdy, competitive arena of the stadium.

Furthermore, as we have seen above, sports fandom involves more than simply having an opponent or being set against outsiders—it also includes a positive identification as fans of the NFL, or of sports in general. This broader fannish identification offers important opportunities for activists, as NFL fans who do not root for the Redskins and sports fans who do not follow the NFL nevertheless both offer potential allies in the fight to change the Redskins name. They are removed enough not to take the activists as outsiders who are attacking their team, but connected enough to the league or to sports to identify with the embarrassment of the Redskins name. This larger utilization of an affective connection to sports fandom can be seen at work in the airing of the “Proud to Be” spot during the NBA Finals. This commercial was clearly meant to address sports fans, as it was aired during a major sports telecast whose audience ostensibly included fans of professional basketball and of the San Antonio and Miami teams who were competing. Although these specific sets of fans might not fall into a strongly oppositional position against football or the Redskins, we can still see this strategic positioning relying on some of the same principles—the targeting of those who are fans of sports, but who are not necessarily fans of football or the Redskins. It is their fandom and interest in sports that make the NBA Finals a more appropriate time

to solicit support for the Redskins name change than other non-sports media events with high viewership, such as the Emmys or a presidential debate. Given the strategies of the name-change activists and the insights of oppositional fandom, even though FedExField might not be the most useful site for the activists to engage with Redskins fans, there exists a resource of NFL fans in thirty-one other stadiums, and of sports fans more generally around the country. Of course there may be other impediments within those environments, but the enthusiasm of oppositional fandom is nevertheless a valuable resource for fan activism.

Conclusion: The Results of Oppositional Fandom

Although Snyder has not yet budged on the name of the team, name-change activists have made important gains through their deployment of oppositional fandom. First, they have clearly renewed national interest in this issue of Native American mascots, with countless discussions taking place across news outlets, sports television programs, and social media, as well as within legislative sessions, boardrooms, schools, and homes. Second, they have managed to catch the attention of Snyder. In a rather misguided attempt to assuage activists, Snyder founded an organization called the Washington Redskins Original Americans Foundation. A letter to fans describing the work of this organization includes descriptions from his travels to reservations:

The stories I heard and the experiences I witnessed were of children without winter coats or athletic shoes; students in makeshift classrooms without adequate school supplies; text books more than decades old; rampant and unnecessary suffering from preventable diseases like diabetes; economic hardship almost everywhere; and in too many places too few of the tools and technology that we all take for granted every day—computers, internet access, even cellphone coverage. (Snyder 2014)

He proposed to donate millions of dollars to reservations in order to combat these problems. As might be expected, this organization was roundly lambasted for simply attempting to pay off Native Americans to stop complaining about the name and almost immediately ceased functioning when tribes started refusing to take his money (Cox 2015).

Yet it seems that Snyder has finally been convinced to consider, to some degree, the lives and experiences of his team's supposed namesake.

Finally, through the rich and multifaceted coverage that this controversy has aroused, we can begin to see that Snyder's recognition is part of a broader trend. There is certainly a lot of work to be done in effectively mobilizing such discourse into meaningful action, but name-change activists have played an important role in pushing this dialogue forward and garnering national support in doing so. The groundswell created through name-change activism has provided the ideal context for actually discussing the needs of Native Americans across the country.

Using the appeal, accessibility, and widespread popularity of sport, these debates around the Washington Redskins provide a strong example of how activists can leverage a fannish engagement with sports franchises into discussions of political importance. As the scope of conversation about sports widens to include off-the-field issues such as domestic violence, drug and alcohol use, poverty, sexual orientation and gender identity, labor issues, and incarceration, activists working in these areas can use the particularities of sports fandom to aid their causes. In this way, sports remain an increasingly important arena in which to ask what it means to be a fan, what kinds of activities fans are participating in, and what the political implications are for these different forms of engagement.

NOTES

- 1 While some believe that the use of any Native American imagery or peoples as mascots is an offensive practice, others believe the use of words like "Chiefs" or "Warriors" is potentially respectful.
- 2 One website briefly promised free "love the team, hate the name" bumper stickers (www.lovetheteam.com), but these were supplied by a Native American organization, and it is unclear if the site originated from actual fans.
- 3 For evidence of the meaningful relationship between alcohol and sport, we can turn to the entire edited issue of *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* in 2014 that focused on research on alcohol within the field of sociology of sport.

WORKS CITED

- Bennett, L 2014, "If we stick together we can do anything': Lady Gaga fandom, philanthropy and activism through social media," *Celebrity Studies* 5(1-2): 138-52.
- Bibel, S 2014, "NFL 2013 TV recap: 205 million fans tuned in; 34 of 35 most watched shows this fall," *TV By the Numbers*, January 8, tvbythenumbers.zap2it.com.

- Boyle, R & Haynes, R 2000, *Power play: sport, the media, and popular culture*, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh.
- Brady, E 2013, "Daniel Snyder says Redskins will never change name," *USA Today*, May 10, www.usatoday.com.
- Bryant, J, Zillmann, D, & Raney, AA 1998, "Violence and enjoyment of media sport," in LA Wenner (ed.), *Media sport*, Routledge, New York.
- Burwell, C & Boler, M 2008, "Calling on the Colbert Nation: fandom, politics and parody in an age of media convergence," *Electronic Journal of Communication* 18, www.cios.org.
- ChangetheMascot.org n.d., "Supporters of change," www.changethemascot.org.
- Cleland, J 2014, "Racism, football fans, and online message boards: how social media has added a new dimension to racist discourse in English football," *Journal of Sport and Social Issues* 38: 415-31.
- Cochran, TR 2012, "'Past the brink of tacit support': fan activism and the Whedon-verses," *Transformative Works and Cultures* 10, journal.transformativeworks.org.
- Corte, U & Edwards, B 2008, "White power music and the mobilization of racist social movements," *Music and Arts in Action* 1(1): 4-20.
- Cox, JW 2014, "In Minnesota, thousands of Native Americans protest Redskins' name," *Washington Post*, November 2, www.washingtonpost.com.
- Cox, JW 2015, "Native American tribe votes to reject \$25,000 offered by Washington Redskins foundation," *Washington Post*, August 5, www.washingtonpost.com.
- Davis-Delano, L 2007, "Eliminating Native American mascots: ingredients for success," *Journal of Sport and Social Issues* 31(4): 340-73.
- ESPN 2014, "Poll: 71 percent say keep Redskins," September 2, espn.go.com.
- Foster, W, Hyatt, C, & Julien, M 2012, "Pronger you ignorant ape . . . I hope you fall off space mountain!': a study of the institutional work of sports fans," in AC Earnhardt, P Haridakis, & B Hugenberg (eds.), *Sports fans, identity, and socialization: exploring the fandemonium*, Lexington, Lanham, MD.
- Glassman, T, Werch, C, Jobli, E, & Bian, H 2007, "Alcohol-related fan behavior on college football game day," *Journal of American College Health* 56(3): 255-60.
- Hofmann, S 2005, "The elimination of indigenous mascots, logos, and nicknames: organizing on college campuses," *American Indian Quarterly* 29(1/2): 156-77.
- Irwin, B 2014, "The most important Super Bowl ad you didn't see," *Huffington Post*, February 3, www.huffingtonpost.com.
- Jenkins, H 1992, *Textual poachers: television fans and participatory culture*, Routledge, New York.
- Jenkins, H 2014, "Fan activism as participatory politics: the case of the Harry Potter Alliance," in M Ratto & M Boler (eds.), *DIY citizenship: critical making and social media*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Jenkins, H & Shresthova, S 2012, "Up, up, and away! The power and potential of fan activism," *Transformative Works and Cultures* 10, journal.transformativeworks.org.
- Kian, EM, Clavio, G, Vincent, J, & Shaw, SD 2011, "Homophobic and sexist yet uncontested: examining football fan postings on Internet message boards," *Journal of Homosexuality* 58(5): 680-99.

- King, RC, & Springwood, CF 2001, *Team spirits: the Native American mascots controversy*, University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln.
- Kligler-Vilenchik, N, McVeigh-Schultz, J, Weitbrecht, C, & Tokuhama, C 2012, "Experiencing fan activism: understanding the power of fan activist organizations through members' narratives," *Transformative Works and Cultures* 10, journal. transformativeworks.org.
- Lamerichs, N 2014, "Costuming as subculture: the multiple bodies of cosplay," *Scene 2*: 113-25.
- Lanter, JR 2011, "Spectator identification with the team and participation in celebratory violence," *Journal of Sports Behavior* 34(3): 268-80.
- Lopez, LK 2011, "Fan activists and the politics of race in *The Last Airbender*," *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 15(5): 431-45.
- Love, A & Hughey, MW 2015, "Out of bounds? Racial discourse on college basketball message boards," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 38(6): 877-93.
- Palmer, C 2014, "Introduction to special issue on sport and alcohol: on the contemporary agenda of research on alcohol within the sociology of sport," *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 49: 3-4.
- Radway, J 1984, *Reading the romance: women, patriarchy, and popular literature*, University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill.
- Rees, D & Schnepel, K 2009, "College football games and crime," *Journal of Sports Economics* 10(1): 68-87.
- Roberts, J & Benjamin, C 2000, "Spectator violence in sports: a North American perspective," *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research* 8(2): 163-81.
- Sandvoss, C 2003, *A game of two halves: football, television, and globalization*, Routledge, New York.
- Sloan L 1989, "The motives of sports fans," in JH Goldstein (ed.), *Sports, games, and play: social and psychological viewpoints*, Psychology Press, New York.
- Smith, T 1987, "Civil rights on the gridiron: the Kennedy administration and the desegregation of the Washington Redskins," *Journal of Sport History* 14(2): 189-208.
- Snyder, D 2014, "Letter from Dan Snyder," Washington Redskins Original Americans Foundation, March 24, www.washingtonredskinsoriginalamericansfoundation.org.
- Steinberg, D 2013, "From Riley Cooper to 'Redskins,'" *Washington Post*, August 2, www.washingtonpost.com.
- Taylor, M 2013, *Contesting constructed Indian-ness: the intersection of the frontier, masculinity and whiteness in Native American mascot representations*, Lexington, Lanham, MD.
- Theodoropoulou, V 2007, "The anti-fan within the fan: awe and envy in sport fandom," In J Gray, C Sandvoss, & CL Harrington (eds.), *Fandom: identities and communities in a mediated world*, New York University Press, New York.
- Wanzo, R 2015, "African American acafandom and other strangers: new genealogies of fan studies," *Transformative Works and Cultures* 20, journal.transformativeworks.org.
- Williams, ME 2014, "What 'The Daily Show's' Redskins segment didn't show," *Salon*, September 29, www.salon.com.

PART V

Fan Labor and Fan-Producer Interactions