

Viking Girls, Mermaids, and Little Brown Men: U.S. Journalism and the 1932 Olympics

By David B. Welky
PURDUE UNIVERSITY

The summer of 1932 did not suffer from a lack of interesting news stories. The Great Depression put millions out of work and forced many Americans to tighten their belts. Franklin Delano Roosevelt received the Democratic party's nomination for President. The debate on the repeal of prohibition raged across the country. Herbert Hoover dispatched troops to disperse a motley group of World War I veterans who had formed a "Bonus Army" and marched on Washington to demand payment of their pensions. Adolph Hitler worked to be named chancellor of Germany. The nation mourned the deaths of entertainer Flo Ziegfeld, the "glorifier of the American girl," and Rin Tin Tin, the famous animal actor. One of the biggest events of the summer, however, was the Xth Olympic Games in Los Angeles.¹

Many who have written about the Olympics have addressed events like the black power demonstrations of 1968, the killings in Munich in 1972, the American boycott in 1980, and a host of other similar incidents. Some have drawn attention to the increasing professionalization and politicization of the Olympic movement. Other authors have focused on great figures in Olympic history to write chatty accounts that are designed for consumption by a general audience. While these endeavors are both legitimate and useful, they only begin to tap the Games' potential as a source of scholarly study. By concentrating on the extraordinary, these authors have ignored the seemingly mundane.² This article provides but one example of how the "ordinary" in the Olympics can be used to probe larger issues—in this case, the relationship between the U.S. media and American society. An examination of the media's coverage of the 1932 Los Angeles Olympics reveals that it was far from an objective retelling of the facts of a sporting event. Instead, the Olympics unfolded as a sort of morality play that reflected and reinforced elements of traditional American culture.³

Many historians have detailed the role that newspapers play in creating social norms and have noted the press's generally conservative nature. But they have

shaped their arguments around the content of the front pages of the paper—political news and editorial commentaries. Other sections, like the sports page, have been virtually ignored.⁴ Because they limit their attention to a few pages of the paper, these authors have created a distorted picture of the media's ability to influence society. Indeed, these efforts go far beyond the front page; they can be seen quite clearly in other sections as well, making it apparent that the traditionalist slant to the news is much more comprehensive than has previously been argued.⁵

Traditional American culture and morals faced a stern challenge in the 1920s.⁶ The 1920s, as Lynn Dumenil has brilliantly detailed in *The Modern Temper: American Culture and Society in the 1920s*, do not comprise a distinct era in American history. Instead, the period marked the culmination of a series of wrenching transformations that had been set in motion by industrialization, urbanization, and immigration during the late 19th century. World War I contributed to these changes by promoting population movement and economic growth. The 1920s, rather than being a disjointed and incongruous decade, merely saw the expansion of forces and trends already present within American society.⁷ The Victorian mores of restraint and frugality continued to come under fire, and a new consumer ethic, which stressed leisure and personal satisfaction, rose to take their place. Movies featured new, sultry stars like Rudolph Valentino and Douglas Fairbanks and promoted overt eroticism. Women, who had already received the vote, moved into the workplace in increased numbers. By 1930, 25.3 percent of females over 16 were employed. Divorce rates were rising while male dominance of the family was declining.⁸ A small group of “flappers” spurned tradition, bobbed their hair, and danced the Charleston. James Joyce, T.S. Eliot, e.e. cummings, and others rejected traditional literary norms. African Americans, led by a gifted group of intellectuals, staged a Renaissance in Harlem. Black migrants, drawn by the lure of factory jobs during the war, formed new, sometimes militant communities in cities across the North.

The 1920s were a time of increased diversity in America, as marginalized groups such as Japanese Americans fought to be included in the mainstream, yet preserve a sense of their own ethnic uniqueness. While conservative culture still held sway, these new movements made serious impressions on old-stock Protestants, who struggled to maintain their cultural hegemony. Fearing the loss of their power in society, conservatives supported a number of movements that aimed to sustain their ideal of a harmonious and homogenous society. Throughout the decade, anti-immigrant, anti-Communist, and anti-Catholic groups garnered wide support for their efforts to keep America safe for middle-class WASPs. Many conservatives saw prohibition as a means of imposing cultural unity on a diverse society. Finally, the Ku Klux Klan, which rose again in the 1920s, resisted the secularization of society and the decline of the Protestant moral code.⁹

The Great Depression aided the conservative reaction by stalling much of the liberal movements' momentum. Despite economic hard times, most people maintained their faith in American capitalism and scorned revolution, choosing instead to espouse traditional views with new vigor. Americans had a hard time accepting the idea of women working when men were not, and the employment

of women dropped significantly. Many women who could find jobs were assigned to marginal secretarial positions. Hemlines came down, and the dancing stopped. The Harlem Renaissance ground to a halt, and blacks faced even more difficult economic realities than whites. Tradition, it seemed, had withstood the threat of the 1920s.¹⁰

The media played an important role in this reassertion of traditional values. Its power was a result of the ongoing movements toward standardization and mass culture in the 1920s, which were aided by the development of the automobile and the spread of radio and movies. In 1932, the newspaper was a necessity for the average person and served as the primary source of news. Therefore, it acted as a key mold of public opinion. The newspaper industry, feeling the effects of economic depression and facing the high costs of new printing technologies, had been consolidating since the 1890s. This process continued through the 1920s and 1930s, leaving fewer and fewer cities with competing dailies. At the same time, the Associated Press (AP) and other wire services limited the variety of news published even in rival papers. The AP also drew smaller towns into its orbit, and standardized national news started to supersede local stories. Magazines, too, became more national, and were sources of information that could be viewed in identical form from Los Angeles to New York. Although many ethnic groups and members of the working class maintained distinct identities and supported papers whose opinions diverged from the mainstream press's, American tastes and attitudes became more nationalized as people everywhere read and saw the same things.¹¹

The consolidation and standardization of the American print media meant that a small cluster of writers controlled the news. As Heywood Broun, a columnist for the *New York World-Telegram*, put it, the press was "largely governed by a little writing oligarchy." This applied for sporting events as well. The overwhelming majority of the newspaper articles concerning the 1932 Olympics were written by a select cadre—most notably Alan Gould, general sports editor for the AP. Few articles were credited to local reporters. Similarly, editorials referred to the Games on only a handful of occasions (because of this imbalance, use of "the press," "the media," and "newspapers" generally refers to the Associated Press and the papers which published its articles. Non-AP sources are usually noted as such). Additionally, all photographs of the Games were processed by one of four large press photograph syndicates.¹² These "information elites"—which included editors, reporters, and members of the AP—presented their own interpretation of the Games to the American people. As we will see, they created an Olympic story. Their tale espoused a traditional vision of the world that presented America not as it *was*, but rather, what a few people wanted it to *be*.

It was only natural that the press would support traditionalist views. Conservatives dominated the inner circle of the Associated Press. Because the AP was a nonprofit organization that depended on its member papers for financial support, it was inclined to uphold their perspective. Powerful groups like the Pulitzer family and the Ochs-Sulzberger-Dreyfoos consortium controlled the majority of the member papers and exerted a strong influence on the organization.

The “reactionary” William Randolph Hearst, a leader in the post-World War I campaign against radicals, was another influential media figure. These men and groups belonged to the “moneyed stratum of society,” and were linked to conservative business interests. In this sense, the media’s portrayal of the Games can be seen as a reflection of the ideals of a select and conservative portion of society.¹³

The Olympic story can also be viewed as a tool by which a minority tried to force traditional cultural values on the general public. The Bohemianism of the 1920s led many conservatives to fear that the old order would be wrecked beyond repair, and that new social structures would be created without any solid cultural base or foundation. These concerns caused conservatives and the media to redouble their efforts to impose traditional values on the public in order to preserve what they believed to be the best way to organize society—the old way.¹⁴

The “Olympic storytellers” in the press tried to teach the public several lessons, that upheld traditional values in their coverage of the 1932 Olympic Games. The media’s vision dictated that women be trivialized and subordinated to men. Women were allowed to play certain roles, but should participate in only a few approved activities. Blacks were grudgingly recognized as a part of society, but still vigorously and openly segregated from the white population. Foreigners, especially those from what were regarded as strange and exotic cultures, were treated with a mixture of fascination and suspicion, but viewed as a threat. Finally, America’s dominance and superiority were to be accepted as unquestionable facts. These lessons may not have been consciously taught. Instead, they reflected the subconscious biases of the media and conservative society.

The 1932 Olympics

The 1932 Olympics have been shrouded by the passage of time, and most people only associate “Los Angeles” and “Olympics” with the 1984 Games. Yet, the 1932 Games were hugely successful and established new standards for future Olympic organizers. The Games attracted 1,408 athletes from 37 countries, and well over one million spectators thrilled to their exploits. In 14 days of competition, these athletes shattered 16 world records and established 33 new Olympic marks in a wide array of events ranging from track and field to rowing and cycling. The Games were held in the Olympic Coliseum, which seated 105,000 people, and in many smaller venues scattered around the area, several of which had been built specifically for the Olympics.¹⁵

The Los Angeles Olympics featured many innovations that have since become standard. For the first time, winners received their medals in a ceremony at the now-familiar victory platform. The 1932 Olympics utilized electric photo-timing devices as back-ups to hand-timing so judges could review close finishes on film. Although female athletes stayed in Los Angeles’s Chapman Park Hotel, all of the male competitors stayed in the 321 acre “Olympic Village,” which had more than 500 bungalows, 40 kitchens, a hospital, and a post office. Overlooking the entire spectacle was the first Olympic torch, which burned 107 feet above the top of the Coliseum.¹⁶

The 1932 Olympics were extensively broadcasted, and the power of the press created a truly worldwide festival. More than 900 reporters from around the world attended the Games, and kept their audiences abreast of the action from telegraph departments located around the city. Correspondents wired more than four million words from the office in the Coliseum alone. Los Angeles officials assisted reporters by providing hundreds of ultra-modern teletype machines, which printed results from every venue within seconds.¹⁷ Despite this global exposure, the many Olympic traditions that began in Los Angeles, and the incredible feats of athleticism that took place, the 1932 Olympics have been largely ignored by historians.¹⁸ This neglect being noted, we must now turn our attention to the story that the media created in Los Angeles.

Women Athletes

At first glance, it would appear that the media gave women a prominent role in their coverage of the 1932 Olympics.¹⁹ Women were represented out of proportion to their actual numbers. Of 1,408 athletes who participated in the Olympics, 127 (9.0%) were women. Women competed in only 14 of 126 total events (11.1%),²⁰ but were featured in 481 of 3,010 articles surveyed that involved Olympic athletes (16.0%).²¹ Additionally, 436 of 1,255 surveyed photographs of Olympic athletes were of women (34.7%). Nor were women consigned to the back pages of the newspaper. Two hundred forty-six articles (51.1%) featuring women appeared on the front page of the sports section, and 354 (73.6%) were on the front two pages. These numbers compare favorably with men's position within the paper. Of 2,395 articles featuring male athletes, 1,047 were on the first page (43.7%), and 1,725 (72.9%) appeared on the first two sports pages. One-third (32.3%) of the photographs featuring women were on the first sports page, and 44.7% were found on the first two pages. Again, this compares favorably to the men (32.4% and 43.1%).²²

While this quantitative information suggests that the press overrepresented women, it cannot show *how* the female Olympians were presented. An analysis of these articles and photographs reveals that one of the dominant themes of the Olympic coverage was a conservative, traditional view of women and their place in society. The "ideal" woman was a competent housewife who knew how to cook, clean, and sew. She was also a mother—women who did not want children were "unnatural." A woman was also supposed to be a charming beauty who knew the importance of good looks and appropriate dress. Men were supposed to value these traits and put women on pedestals in order to worship their "superior" qualities, while minimizing their role in the world outside of the home.²³ The vast majority of the coverage emphasized not what these women were (athletes), but rather what they should have been. This traditional picture of women can be seen in the storytellers' rendition of track and field and swimming and diving events.²⁴

DELICATE PARODIES: WOMEN'S TRACK AND FIELD

Many in the Olympic movement believed that track and field events were so "unfeminine" that women could not participate in them without risking their

virtue and purity. For example, Baron Pierre de Coubertin, father of the modern Olympics, believed that women should be excluded from the Games altogether. He maintained that a woman's only function in the Olympics was to "crown. . . the winner with garlands."²⁵ Despite Coubertin's sentiments, women played Olympic golf and tennis as early as 1900. The International Olympic Committee (IOC) added swimming to the program for the 1912 Stockholm games. In 1926, the IOC voted to include five track and field events for women, finally overcoming its reluctance to allow women to participate in any sport in which they could not wear long skirts or non-revealing bathing suits.²⁶

As it turned out, women's participation in the 1928 Amsterdam Games slowed their drive to participate in Olympic sports. The poorly trained athletes jumped off to numerous false starts. Fears about their stamina seemed to be confirmed when several of the participants collapsed in exhaustion at the finish of the highly competitive 800-meter race. Although many male runners finished their heats in comparable conditions, detractors saw this as proof that women were incapable of such stressful activity. The IOC nearly dropped women's track and field altogether, but instead chose to limit women to running distances of 400 meters or less. The IOC did not reinstate the 800-meter race until 1960.²⁷

The reluctance to encourage women's participation in track and field events went beyond the IOC. The Women's Division of the National Amateur Athletic Federation (NAAF) argued that women's sports should be run on the principle of "play for play's sake," and opposed involvement in competition of any kind. This body, headed by Lou Henry Hoover, the president's wife, even petitioned the IOC to eliminate women's track and field in 1929. Most physical educators also opposed Olympic competition for females, and recommended that they be restricted to "play days" that stressed low impact sports like folk dancing, balancing stunts, and "posture parades." Although educators approved of a few more lively activities, such as tennis, golf, and horseshoes, "play days" were designed to emphasize sociability and cooperation, not athleticism.²⁸

The media generally endorsed activities like badminton, golf, and swimming, but feared that participation in competitive track and field would cause females to "lose their womanliness" due to the unnatural growth of "ugly muscles." Strenuous athletics, the argument went, destroyed a woman's "physical beauty and social attractiveness" and made it more "difficult to attract the most worthy fathers for [her] children." In addition, competitive sports ran counter to women's basic nature. Unlike men, they were "plant-like," and better suited to quiet activities at home. Many believed that involvement in track activities would de-feminize women and create clumsy and unattractive "he-men ladies." These brutes would upset traditional roles by neglecting their duties to home, husband, and children.²⁹ Even the few in the media that argued in favor of participation in athletics insisted upon maintaining strict gender separation, and warned against occasions where the sexes might play together or against each other.³⁰

The media reflected these attitudes in its portrayal of female track and field athletes in the 1932 Olympics. The press de-emphasized women's athletic abilities, their discipline in training, and their willingness to stretch traditional roles in

order to compete in the Olympics, and instead focused its attention on the more acceptable activities and roles that the athletes played. It placed an athlete whose abilities seemed to carry her beyond the limits of what women should be capable of in a category by herself. She was neither woman nor man, but Amazon. While the Olympic storytellers in the press did note athletic achievements and discuss new records, much of their coverage concerned the lessons of traditional society—women should be subordinate, domestic, and beautiful.

The press made it clear that women's track and field athletes were merely "delicate parodies" of their male counterparts, and that women's events were less important than men's. One way it did this was by providing little in-depth coverage of the women's events. Coverage of men's events often went into extreme detail, and papers analyzed, discussed, and debated practically every yard of each race within the course of an article. In contrast, the press provided only the barest details of women's events. Articles on women's track and field often contained little more than a mention of the victor's name and essential information such as times or distances. The *New York Times*, for example, printed nine paragraphs on the men's 100-meter semifinals and eighteen on the finals. The women's 100-meter semifinals received one and a half paragraphs, the finals only four.³¹ The lack of details clearly demonstrated that the women's events were not nearly as meaningful as the men's. In addition, editors usually buried coverage of women's track and field at the end of a column, or on the bottom of a page. Rarely was it the lead story. Not only was there more extensive coverage of the men, but that coverage was located in a position that indicated its importance relative to that of the women.

Papers also used titles to subordinate female athletes. Almost without exception, women were referred to as "Miss" or "Mrs." By doing this, newspapers made a woman's identity dependent on her relation to a man. The first information a newspaper reader learned about a female athlete was not her name, but her marital status. Male athletes, by contrast, were not placed into "married" and "single" categories; it was their athletic prowess that was of primary significance. Additionally, the press almost always referred to a woman athlete as a "girl." The use of the diminutive generated images of hair-ribbons and dolls, not Olympic champions. The widespread use of "girl" suggested that these athletes still had to pass through at least one stage of development before they could be considered "women." Apparently, women were not supposed to be able to run or jump. The press rarely used the diminutive in reference to male athletes (at least white athletes, as we shall see). The use of "Miss" or "Mrs." and "girl" set women apart from men and reduced them to a less than fully developed person whose status was dependent upon a man (or lack of one).³²

At the same time, newspaper reporters pigeonholed women athletes into traditional female roles by trivializing their participation in the track and field competition. The women were a mere sidelight to the men, and were not taken seriously; they were only there to provide "variety" in the competition. Papers published female Olympic athletes' favorite recipes and assured readers that they would go back to "sewing and cooking and the more prosaic duties of everyday

life" after the Games, instead of pursuing athletics. Even the *Los Angeles Times*' Muriel Babcock, one of only a few female writers to cover the Games, linked women athletes to traditional roles. She summed up their participation in the Games under the headline, "Girls Liked Cantaloupe and Parties." Reporters expressed concerns for women's abilities to hold up under the pressure of the Games, emphasizing their supposedly delicate nature. They noted that the intense press coverage of the Olympics imposed a "heavy handicap" on the women. Reporters feared that, "[u]nlike men, who know better what to do and aren't so easily annoyed," women would break down under such media scrutiny.³³

The press appreciated beauty and applauded women who fit the image of the graceful housewife. For example, high jump champion Jean Shiley received praise not for her athletic skill, but for being the "prettiest girl of the American track team." Papers expected that a woman would give up sports for a movie career, particularly if she was "pulchritudinous." Presumably, the silver screen was a better place for these "sprint queens" to show off beauty than the field of competition.³⁴ The fact that these women were participating and breaking records in events, which had only recently been the subject of so much criticism, often seemed lost on the press.

But one female track and field athlete was so extraordinary that she had to be treated differently. Mildred "Babe" Didrikson's athletic prowess and achievements forced the media to construct new means of explanation. Members of the writing fraternity reacted on two fronts—they stressed her "feminine" elements, to fit her into their vision of women, while creating an entirely new category for her, which was neither male nor female, but somewhere in between.

BABE DIDRIKSON: VIKING GIRL

Mildred Ella "Babe" Didrikson was born in Port Arthur, Texas, on June 26, 1911, the youngest of Ole and Hannah Didriksen's seven children.³⁵ She was a great natural athlete who excelled at every sport she tried, whether it be running, jumping, basketball, golf, or baseball. M.J. McCombs, director of women's athletics at Employer's Casualty, a Dallas insurance company, "discovered" Didrikson playing in a high school basketball game. He offered Didrikson a secretarial position with the firm in exchange for her considerable athletic talents. Didrikson accepted and became the star of the Employer's Casualty basketball team, once scoring more than 100 points in a game. She entered the 1932 Olympic tryouts as Employer's Casualty's lone representative. Despite the fact that she had little training or experience in track and field, she won the team competition all by herself, outscoring teams with as many as 20 members. Her performance won her the sobriquet of "the one-girl track team." She participated in three events in the 1932 Olympics—the javelin throw, the 80-meter hurdles, and the high jump—and broke records in all three events, winning two gold medals and a silver (she would have won three gold medals, but her last try in the high jump was ruled an illegal "dive" and disallowed).³⁶ Didrikson's outstanding performance challenged the notion that women were unfit for rigorous athletic competition. The media responded to this challenge in two ways.

One response was to treat Didrikson like other female track and field athletes. In other words, de-emphasize and trivialize her athletic abilities and stress elements, which conformed to traditional norms. Reporters referred to Didrikson, like the other women, as "Miss" and "girl." Her fashionable slimness attracted as much attention as her talents, and Didrikson was commonly described as a "slender, brown-haired Texas girl." Papers also made it clear that her triumphs were a mere sidelight to the men's events. The *New York Times* noted that Didrikson's victory in the 80-meter hurdles was impressive, but that it did not, "of course. . . , contribute to the United States point score in the men's track and field competition," which was seen as the more important attraction. One of the most popular photographs of Didrikson showed her shopping for shoes in Chicago, while wearing a dress—uncommon apparel for Didrikson. The press also discovered that even Babe Didrikson had a male superior. One story which followed her to Los Angeles, involved an argument she had had with her employers. She had resigned in anger, only to realize the error of her ways and return in tears to "ask for forgiveness."³⁷

The press encouraged Didrikson's involvement in more "appropriate" activities. During the Olympics, Didrikson declared her intention to join the golf tour, and papers suddenly printed pictures of Babe, in a long dress, swinging away on the course. Golf was viewed as a more suitable sport for women than track and field, as it was less strenuous and allowed women to wear clothes that covered them much more completely than track outfits. Papers reported a change in Babe once she stepped onto the golf course. She looked "much more feminine" and appropriate than she had in her "flannel track overalls." Didrikson's involvement in golf, a traditionally safe sport for women, quickly took precedence over her achievements in the Olympic Coliseum.³⁸ By focusing on her involvement in what was perceived to be a proper sport for women and by demonstrating her inferiority and subordination to men, the newspapers did their best to transform Didrikson into their ideal of what a woman should be.

The second means of coping with Babe Didrikson's exceptionalism was to segregate her from women and place her in a class of her own. The press labeled those of her ilk as "Amazons" or "Viking girls," representations that were far from laudatory. In fact, the "Amazon" posed a danger to the traditional world. The "Amazon," exemplified by Didrikson, possessed the "Viking capacity for berserk rage." Not only was Didrikson, as a *Dallas Morning News* editorial claimed, "too good for her own sex," she was also living proof that women's involvement in rigorous athletics could lead to "a new super-physique in womanhood," which could increase participation in both sports and politics and actually "threaten. . . the old male supremacy even in the mere routine of making a living." This group, it seemed, had the power to overturn traditional gender roles and was, therefore, carefully excised from the ranks of women and placed in a new, derogatory category by itself. Babe Didrikson was a woman whose physical presence "scared" male reporters. She could hardly be allowed to become a role model to others.³⁹

Babe Didrikson's position in American sports memory may be significantly lessened had it not been for Grantland Rice, the most famous sportswriter of the

day. Rice, like many others, believed that female Olympians should not be taken “any too seriously,” and maintained that their primary role in Los Angeles was merely to provide “refreshing variety.” Babe Didrikson became an exception to this rule. Didrikson met Rice early in the Olympics and quickly became one of his favorites. Rice admired Didrikson’s natural talent and sharp wit, and his passion for sports helped him (in this case) to ignore some of the stereotypes regarding women athletes. Several of Rice’s columns, which appeared in more than eighty newspapers, featured the track star. These articles thrust her into the limelight. Unlike most of his fellow journalists, Rice applauded Didrikson’s “stamina” and hailed her as “the athletic phenomenon of all time, man or woman.” She was the only woman included in his list of the seven “most interesting” athletes of the Games. Rice, however, felt compelled to stress that Didrikson, although a superb athlete, was not burdened with “bulging muscles.” Rice encouraged Babe to pursue a golfing career, and stood by her side for those first golfing photographs. Rice’s portrayal of Babe Didrikson serves as a reminder that, while the press overwhelmingly imposed traditional viewpoints on the Olympic story, it was not monolithic.⁴⁰

In general, however, the media’s representation of female track and field athletes reflected conservatives’ long-standing reluctance to allow them to compete. It also demonstrated the press’s desire to portray women in traditional roles in house and home, while keeping them subordinate to men. It trivialized women’s sports and placed those who excelled in them, like Babe Didrikson, in categories that distinguished them from other women. Women made tremendous advances on the field in 1932, but in the newspapers, it was the same old story.

PRETTY LITTLE MERMAIDS: WOMEN’S SWIMMING

The media accepted women swimmers and divers more easily than women sprinters and high jumpers. Women had been participating in aquatic sports in the Olympics since 1912. Swimming and diving were not regarded as dangerous pursuits and were, in fact, among the recommended physical activities for women. Therefore, women swimmers and divers did not pose any sort of threat to the traditional order. However, these athletes were treated much like female track and field competitors. As with women’s track and field, the media trivialized women’s aquatic sports and those who competed in them. Once again, the newspapers downplayed women’s athletic abilities, and instead concentrated on their beauty, their grace, and their glamour.

The aquatic events gave writers plenty of opportunities to concentrate on physical attractiveness rather than athletic talent. The Olympic story was full of references to “pretty,” “lovely,” and “petite” girls, and the storytellers commended the “sunburned pretties” for their “rhythm,” their “grace,” and their “charm.” Olympic diving champion Georgia Coleman was known as “Gorgeous Georgia,” while Helene Madison, who won three gold medals in freestyle swimming, was “a beautiful New Yorker.” Even articles intended to praise women’s athletic abilities often turned into critiques of their beauty. The *Atlanta Constitution* noted that the swimmers and divers not only had skill, speed, and stamina, but that “they [we]re something to look at as they march[ed] by.” Syndicated sportswriter

Westbrook Pegler devoted an entire paragraph to a discussion of these athletes' talents before inquiring, "Have I mentioned that they are all very pleasant to peer at?" One particularly blatant headline in the *Chicago Tribune* declared: "You get money's worth at Olympic swim—In Loveliness." The newspapers placed far greater emphasis on physical attributes than athletic skill.⁴¹

Newspaper accounts trivialized aquatic athletes by making them seem smaller than life. Stories consistently referred to women swimmers as "Miss" and "girl," just like their track and field counterparts. At the same time, the press tagged swimmers with other titles that emphasized their diminutive nature. Swimmers were not swimmers, they were "mermaids" or "water sprites." In fact, the whole Olympic contest lost its status as an international sporting event. Instead, papers reduced it to a "water carnival"—a playground for all of the mermaids and water sprites.⁴²

Newspapers used photographs to create images of female swimmers as beautiful, graceful, and only incidentally athletic. Very few pictures of swimmers or divers in action appeared in the Olympic coverage. The action photographs that were printed generally had captions that drew attention to the performer's grace or the rhythm exhibited in her movements. Much more frequent were photographs of the athletes out of the pool—in their swimsuits. These were usually full body shots, which allowed the reader to examine its subject from head to toe.⁴³ Occasionally, these pictures even appeared when there was no corresponding article about the athlete, as if her appearance was all that needed to be known about that person.⁴⁴ After Olympic officials demanded that female American divers change into swimsuits that covered more of their backs, the *Washington Post* and many other papers printed pictures of two of the offenders, Georgia Coleman and Jane Fauntz, modeling the forbidden articles. The photographers made sure to pose their subjects so that their exposed backs, the source of the dispute, were prominently displayed. The *Los Angeles Times* protested the officials' draconian decision, and complained that it had "made no difference" to the judges that the exposed skin "was pleasing to the eye."⁴⁵ These images of relatively scantily clad women served to reinforce the ideas that came through in the contents of the articles—that women were objects.

Overall, the Olympic storytellers' presentation of women swimmers and divers matched the traditional view of American society. Women were supposed to be attractive, charming, and graceful, and had little or no actual importance in the real (or Olympic) world. Instead of competing as trained athletes, the press expected these "mermaids" to "furnish a large share of the beauty angle" in the Olympics. Papers speculated openly about which swimmers would receive opportunities to display their grace and beauty on the silver screen, and expressed shock when Eleanor Holm, who had "lovely legs," turned down the opportunity to be "glorified" in the Ziegfield Follies and instead chose to train for the Olympics. They nodded approval when she stated that her appearance was "more important . . . than any swimming championship."⁴⁶

The fact that women could be athletic had little significance for the Olympic storytellers. For the press, it was much more important to place these women in a context that appealed to the traditional elements of society. The coverage of the

Games molded these competitors into figures that could be used to maintain standards of charm and physical attractiveness. The media demonstrated that these athletes could cook, sew, and type, just like women were supposed to. Newspapers taught that women were dependent upon and subordinate to men, and that their activities were inferior. Especially in aquatic events, the press depicted women as objects to be looked at and judged by traditional standards of beauty, and they used pictures to express this belief. Athletes like Babe Didrikson, who deviated so far from the norm that they could not be domesticated, were simultaneously feminized and segregated from other women.

African American Athletes

The Harlem Renaissance of the 1920s challenged existing stereotypes of African Americans. The Renaissance produced an outpouring of art, scholarship, and literature, and marked a cultural rebellion against the complacency and conservatism of the day. Many blacks, along with white intellectuals, eagerly read works by E. Franklin Frazier, Langston Hughes, and James Weldon Johnson. At the same time, jazz and blues music made deep inroads in American popular culture. The 1920s witnessed the rise of the "New Negro." African Americans who had migrated to the North during World War I to work in factories formed race-based communities and gained an idea of their potential power. After the war, employers laid off many of these new arrivals. Blacks, who had expected to share in America's postwar prosperity, instead faced segregation, an urban housing crisis, and race riots in Chicago, Washington, D.C., and other cities. African Americans, fueled by expectations of a greater role in American society, responded to this situation by adopting a new, militant stance. Radical leaders like A. Philip Randolph and Marcus Garvey drew crowds of followers with their appeals for black pride and nationalism. Many blacks worked to create a "race economy," in which black consumers would patronize black-owned businesses. The 1920s saw African Americans making a concerted effort to expand the boundaries of American society and culture to include both blacks and whites, a prospect that terrified most conservatives.⁴⁷

The Great Depression struck the black community hard. It devastated the already sluggish agricultural sector and swelled the ranks of Southern black migrants to Northern cities, which were also inhospitable. One of the most disadvantaged groups in America during the Depression, they were the last hired and the first fired. A 1931 Urban League investigation of 106 American cities revealed that blacks were as much as 60% more likely to be unemployed as whites. Furthermore, the economic downturn of the 1930s undermined any social progress that blacks had made during the 1920s. Racism, prevalent in the 1920s, grew in the 1930s. Most whites believed that blacks were inferior to them, and that the races should be kept apart. The mainstream media based its images of blacks on these long-standing traditions.⁴⁸ Although they gave blacks a place in society and allowed them to bring glory to America, the Olympic storytellers made sure that their readers were aware that they were different, and should be separate

from whites. The press tried to make sure that the challenge of the 1920s was answered with a reassertion of traditional racial values.

TWO STREAKS OF BLACK LIGHTNING

Unlike professional sports, amateur track and field never openly barred blacks from competing with whites (at least in the North). Even before Jesse Owens, blacks had a long history of participation in track and in the Olympics, although they were always few in number. George Poage won the bronze in the 400-meter hurdles in 1904, becoming the first African American to earn a medal in the Games. Howard P. Drew, who never participated in the Olympics due to injury in 1912 and World War I in 1916, was considered the best sprinter of his time. In 1932, however, there were no blacks in the American Olympic Association or the American Olympic Committee, nor were there any black Olympic coaches or managers. So, while their presence was allowed on the field, they were still refused admittance to the larger Olympic world.⁴⁹

The press featured two African American athletes during the Los Angeles Games: Eddie Tolan and Ralph Metcalfe. Tolan and Metcalfe won the gold and silver medals in the 100-meter dash, and took the gold and bronze in the 200. These events were two of the major attractions of the Games, which were heavily tilted towards track and field.⁵⁰ A third black American, Eddie Gordon, claimed the gold medal in the broad jump. He did not get as much attention as Tolan or Metcalfe, as his victory came in a much less popular event.⁵¹ Despite these achievements, much of the press coverage of the two served to reinforce traditional racial distinctions.

The media recognized that Tolan and Metcalfe's victories contributed to the greater glory of America. By doing this, papers conceded that blacks played at least some role in society. The press generally acknowledged that the two athletes had more than made up for American sprinters' poor showing in the 1928 Games, in which they had won only one individual event. The *Indianapolis Star* applauded the black athletes' performances for having "restored sprint supremacy to the United States"—a feat that no white runners could accomplish. Tolan, who had the privilege of running for his "Uncle Samuel," performed the "greatest feat of the day" by winning the 200-meter race. Some even speculated that the Los Angeles Games would become known as "the Eddie Tolan or Ralph Metcalfe Olympiad." Tolan and Metcalfe's on-field accomplishments garnered large headlines in newspapers across the land.⁵²

At the same time, the press made it impossible to forget that these men were not just athletes, they were *black* athletes. While white athletes needed no racial identifiers, it was rare for Tolan or Metcalfe to be referred to without some reminder that they were "two American Negroes."⁵³ White athletes could be called "Jarring Jim" or the "New Orleans Flyer," nicknames that were not race-dependent. However, the issue of race was obvious in the nicknames given to the African Americans. "Negro flash," "dusky little thunderbolt," "two streaks of black lightning," "ace of spades," "a study in ebony," "little black chunk," "sable dynamite," and "black comet" are but a sampling of the many monikers that papers gave to

Tolan and Metcalfe.⁵⁴ By consistently making reference to their racial status, the press separated black athletes from the white majority. In effect, they were segregated. While Eddie Tolan and Ralph Metcalfe were allowed to triumph in Uncle Sam's name, they could not be treated the same as his white nephews.

Newspapers also presented images that hearkened back to the days of slavery. Will Rogers noted in his national column that the slave traders must have sailed with the Olympics in mind, "for these 'senegambians' have just about run the white man ragged." Reporters occasionally used the derogatory term "boy" to refer to black athletes. One photograph in the *Saint Louis Post-Dispatch* featured a picture of Eddie Tolan's "mammy." The *Chicago Tribune* noted that Tolan won his races by such a wide margin that none of the white competitors were close enough "to flick him with a buggy whip." These images reinforced ideas of white superiority by using terms and scenes that reminded readers of times when blacks were held in bondage by whites.⁵⁵

The press needed some sort of logic to explain how these supposedly inferior people could be so talented. For them, the answer lay within the black man's character, and stretched back to his African roots. Blacks had an "ease and grace and natural ability" that whites did not possess. Blacks were "emotional to a high degree," but their ability to relax under pressure gave them an edge in stressful competitions. These traits were related to old African wars, in which blacks supposedly leaped "light heartedly" into battle, even if "death was sure to strike them." Their mirthful and relaxed (almost childlike) nature allowed blacks to excel in sports which supposedly required more natural ability than disciplined training or team cooperation. Perhaps one day, the papers speculated, "negro athletes" would gain the skills necessary to pass beyond "mere running and jumping."⁵⁶ Even when blacks did succeed, therefore, the press attributed their victories to their allegedly primitive nature and inborn talent, carried over from their days in Africa. If white Americans could not be athletically superior to Eddie Tolan and Ralph Metcalfe, they could at least be culturally superior.

Southern papers dealt with black athletes in a different way. Instead of taking the time and the trouble to segregate and demean African Americans, Southern newspapers simply ignored them. Of course, these Olympic champions did receive some notice, as they participated in and won two of the glamour events of the Games. Regardless, the Southern press minimized their space in print as much as possible. Furthermore, pictures of blacks almost never appeared in Southern papers. Out of a sample of 135 photographs from four Southern newspapers, only one was of a black athlete, Eddie Gordon. Racism was so strong in the South it could reduce the black track stars to near invisibility, in order to create the illusion of a pure-white Olympics.⁵⁷

The black press provides an interesting contrast to the mainstream papers and suggests that different groups could interpret the Olympics in varying ways that appealed to their own agendas. Like the mainstream press, Bud Billiken's *Chicago Defender* used the Olympics to create an idealized vision of society. The *Defender*, like mainstream papers, differentiated between the races. It did so, however, by using racial modifiers to denote the *white* athletes. While Tolan and

Metcalfe were members of “the Race,” and therefore acceptable to the *Defender's* readers, the paper made it clear that other track competitors were “white.” Indeed, whites were rarely mentioned at all in the pages of the *Defender* unless they had been defeated by a black athlete. The *Defender's* coverage of the Olympics concentrated almost exclusively on Tolan and Metcalfe. The paper decried the “lily-whiteism” of the Games, and noted that the only black employee at the vaunted Olympic Village was a shoeshiner. The *Defender* noted a few white athletes, such as Babe Didrikson, but only briefly. The “lads of Miss Didrikson's race didn't do so well” the *Defender* concluded, and they were largely ignored, just as blacks were in the South's papers.⁵⁸

The South, which so blatantly ignored the black athletes, bore the brunt of the *Defender's* ire. The South's policy of segregation was the major focus of the *Defender's* attacks. The *Defender* noted that Tolan and Metcalfe would not have qualified for the Olympics “had the tryouts been held in the South,” due to its unwillingness to allow blacks and whites to compete against each other. Had segregation been universal, “America would not have entered her speediest runners.” One *Defender* photograph depicted the tryouts for the women's 100-meter dash, held in Chicago, in which Tydie Pickett and Louise Stokes, two black runners, competed. The caption observed that the African American “stars” would not have been permitted to “race with their white sisters” if they had been in “the prejudiced South.” This instance is especially notable, as none of the women running were from the South—there was no reason to refer to the South in the first place.⁵⁹

The *Chicago Defender* told the Olympic story in a way that taught its readers very different lessons from those of the mainstream press. Sounding very much like the proponents of a “race economy,” the *Defender* taught that “the Race” should stick together, and it demonstrated that blacks could triumph over whites, even during the hard times of the Depression. The *Defender* even used the Olympics to taunt the South with African Americans' athletic feats. “Certainly,” it remarked after black athletes trounced their white Southern competitors in the Olympic tryouts, “the South won something, but recalling what that something was is about as difficult as its own attempt to forget what Metcalfe, Tolan, and Gordon did to its favorite sons.”⁶⁰ Just as Grantland Rice did in reference to Babe Didrikson, the *Chicago Defender* expressed an opposing viewpoint—another reminder that even in this era of mass culture and mass standardization, the press was not a monolithic institution.

With the exception of papers like the *Chicago Defender*, the press worked to locate black athletes in a place that was acceptable to traditional white society. The media granted blacks some standing in American society, but kept them segregated from and subordinated to whites. The press reminded its readers of African Americans' former days as slaves and found explanations for their successes that stretched all the way back to Africa. The Southern press did its best to ignore blacks altogether. In spite of this, the *Los Angeles Times* proudly announced that this was “the first Olympiad unsullied by racial differences.”⁶¹ It would have been hard to make a more inaccurate assessment.

Japanese Athletes

World War I and its aftermath created many anxieties about the effects of immigration on American society. The wartime drive for “100 percent Americanism” aroused nativist feelings and created deep suspicions of foreigners. America’s tendency towards isolation from world affairs heightened these concerns. Japanese and other Asians came under especially intense scrutiny, as the vast differences between Asian and American cultures led to frequent misunderstandings and made it very difficult for Japanese immigrants to assimilate into American culture, despite their willingness to Americanize. Most Anglo Americans wanted the Japanese to be separated from whites. California passed laws in 1912 and 1920 that restricted Japanese aliens’ freedom of movement and property ownership. In 1921, Congress established a quota system that severely limited immigration. In 1924, it passed the National Origins Act, which barred Asian immigration altogether. The Japanese invasion of Manchuria in 1931 sparked largely negative reactions in the United States and caused Americans to harbor even deeper misgivings about the Japanese.⁶²

The Olympic story in relation to Japan involved conflicting themes. Newspapers were fascinated with the Japanese Olympians, but they combined this fascination with a sense of profound suspicion. Japanese athletes were different, and the press emphasized these differences. Once again, the idea of race appeared, and the press gave Japanese athletes labels that made them seem decidedly smaller than life. But at the same time, these athletes posed a definite threat to the United States. Traditional America was not yet prepared to accept these people as equals.

LITTLE BROWN MEN

The Japanese took the Olympics very seriously. Japan sent nearly 250 athletes to the Games (compared to 400 for the United States and only 120 from neighboring Canada), and 77 Japanese reporters traveled to America to keep their country well-informed of their athletes’ performances. As part of its “meticulous” preparations for the Olympics, Japan sent for samples of Los Angeles’ city water in order to compare them to local samples. Japan’s attempts to prepare for the future intrigued Americans. The Japanese studied other athletes’ performances and talked with foreign coaches. Japanese photographers captured American boats on film for future examination. Observers watched American swimming practices to scrutinize their technique in the water.⁶³ These elaborate preparations for Olympics yet to come made these foreigners seem even more mysterious.

Japan had only recently become interested in Western sports, and its quick rise to athletic prominence fascinated Americans. Japan’s sudden move to the top of the men’s swimming world in 1932 created a sense of wonder in the press. Japan, never known for strong teams, won six of seven events and dominated the American entrants. The media scrambled and searched for the elusive “secret of the Japs,” and attributed their successes in the pool to their careful observations during the 1928 Olympics and the intensive training program that Japan implemented soon after. Newspapers noted that the Japanese were following this

pattern in other sports, such as rowing and track and field, and warily predicted that their successes would multiply in the years to come.⁶⁴

This nervous attraction often spilled over into outright concern. Americans were already wary of foreigners, and the Japanese invasion of Manchuria heightened existing fears of Japanese militarism. The press responded by implying that Japan somehow posed a threat to the United States. It was not just America's athletic competitor, it was a "menace," and the country's "most dangerous rival," one that threatened to disrupt our very "peace of mind." Much of this concern arose from the perceived solidarity and single-mindedness of the athletes. Japan had no "big shots" on its team. Instead, it was united as one in its quest to "do the rest of the world one better." It was this determination and unity that made them seem so frightening.⁶⁵

Papers tempered these fears of a Japanese threat by using race and diminutive terms to create an image of tiny and harmless, yet wonderfully exotic people. Newspapers drew attention to the fact that the Japanese were from a strange place that only a few Americans had seen. The mysticism of the Orient was a popular theme in the press, and it was understood that the "sons of the Samurai" from "the land of the Mikado" were not like us. At the same time, newspapers consistently attached labels to Japanese athletes that exaggerated their relatively short stature in comparison to Americans. The Japanese were commonly known as "little brown men." They were also referred to as the "baby entrant" of the Olympics, because they were a newcomer to the Games. The use of the word "baby" also created images of a tiny, non-adult race of people. By stressing their small stature, newspapers made the Japanese seem less dangerous. After all, why should the United States be afraid of a group of "little brown men"?⁶⁶

These "brown-skinned wonders," as it turned out, were not so fearsome. Their prowess in swimming was balanced by their ineptitude in track and field. Despite failure, the Japanese athletes kept their smiles and cheerful dispositions. These "diminutive but doughty Japs" deserved the "sympathy and applause" of the American crowd. Japanese women swimmers were also harmless, and could easily be put into America's traditional gender roles. The women, reporters discovered, could play piano, cook, and sew, like "proper" women should. Just as important, the women were "more interested in their homes than sports," and "cheerfully" gave up swimming to become housewives whenever they got the chance. The Japanese, much like American women or blacks, could be trivialized and placed into categories, which lessened their threat to traditional America. Even if they were a menace, there seemed to be no chance that these people could actually threaten American superiority. After trying so hard in the Olympic competition, the Japanese had "little to show for their valiant efforts." The Japanese sometimes seemed more like delightful misfits who deserved our compassion than threatening foes that had to be carefully monitored.⁶⁷

Much like the *Chicago Defender*, the Japanese American press presented an alternate perspective on the Olympics. The *Seattle Japanese-American Courier* followed the Japanese contingent rather closely, and all but ignored other athletes. Its coverage may have been different had there been any Japanese Americans

competing. While the mainstream press focused on the need for American competitors to win, the *Courier* stressed the modesty and politeness of the Japanese athletes. In contrast to other papers, the *Courier* applauded Japan's team unity and single-mindedness. Interestingly, these traits conformed to traditional Japanese values. This period was one of rising tensions between the first (Issei) and second (Nisei) generations of Japanese Americans. Many Nisei, who held the American citizenship that their parents could never have because of discriminatory laws, wanted to cast off their immigrant roots and become Anglicized. By promoting traditional mores, the *Courier* may have been trying to pull these dissenters back into the fold.⁶⁸

At the same time, the *Courier* viewed the Olympics as an opportunity to raise the status of Japanese Americans, much as the *Defender* had for African Americans. The *Courier* believed that Japan's sportsmanship and goodwill would earn "the respect and admiration of the world." In particular, it hoped that the Olympics would give Americans a chance to learn "the true character of the Japanese people," thus leading to peace and friendship between the two nations. Implicit in this is the feeling that a greater understanding of the Japanese people would remove many of the negative stereotypes that Americans held of them—perhaps leading to equal treatment under the law.⁶⁹

While the Japanese American press pushed for greater equality, the mainstream media put traditional American values at the forefront of their coverage. The media's treatment of Japanese athletes involved varying and conflicting themes. Papers presented the Japanese as fascinating and exotic people, yet warned their readers that they presented a threat to America. Reporters then minimized that threat by trivializing them. Again, race played a prominent role in the story, and the papers made it clear that these people were beneath white America. These lessons all conformed to the traditional view of foreigners as inferior people who needed to be closely watched. Interestingly, most other countries received little attention from the Olympic storytellers. This may be due to either the relatively small size of the teams that most other countries sent, or the lack of success by other squads—they were not perceived as a threat to American sports dominance. But other teams, like the Germans and the Italians, had stronger performances than the Japanese without receiving similar treatment. This suggests that the press found the Asian athletes to be more irksome than others even before the Games began.

Sports and Nationalism

The post-World War I era saw an outpouring of American nationalism. The Depression of the 1930s damaged Americans' morale and confidence, but did not diminish their vigorous sense of national pride. Americans were confident that their ways were best and that they would always lead the world. The press demonstrated its belief in American dominance by using the Olympics as a gauge for judging national superiority. Papers also created the image of sport as war, a curious phenomenon for the largely pacifist 1930s. The Olympics became a 14-

day-long battle, which was, of course, won by the home team. These images linked the Olympics to the nationalism of the day.⁷⁰

THE OLYMPIC WARS

Martial language frequently appears in sports coverage, and it was one of the predominant themes of the 1932 Olympics. It was often difficult to tell whether the press was describing a sporting event or a war, which pitted the United States' "army of athletes" against a host of foreign "invaders." Each event was but another front in "the Olympic wars." The enemy was crafty, and had the ability to bring "reinforcements" into the "battle." Those who "conquered" their opponents earned the right to "annex" a title. The distinctions made between friendly forces (the Americans) and the "invaders" established clear boundaries between the United States and the rest of the world—perhaps reflecting America's isolationist beliefs. The storytellers were intensely interested in who won this global battle for "athletic supremacy." Besides creating similarities between the Olympics and war, the use of this language further distanced women athletes from the center of attention. After all, only men fought in wars. Women were supposed to stay on the sidelines and provide comfort for the wounded (male) heroes of battle.⁷¹

THE UNOFFICIAL MARGIN OF VICTORY

"The important thing in the games is not to win but to take part; the important thing in life is not the triumph but the struggle; the essential thing is not to have conquered, but to have fought well."

—*Baron Pierre de Coubertin, The Olympic Creed*

"Excellently put, but from the American point of view the idea is to take part and win; to struggle and triumph; to fight well and conquer. . . . [T]hat is the American program."

—*The Indianapolis Star, July 31, 1932*

For the press, the unofficial slogan of the 1932 Olympics was "America against the World." Newspapers carefully followed the sporting war, and used point systems to numerically interpret the results in order to better demonstrate American superiority. Point systems were used primarily to judge the track and field competition, which was the Games' featured attraction, but were also applied to swimming. These systems let Americans "scientifically" measure their success against other countries' and actually see the overall margin of victory, in the form of numerical data. Papers stressed that while point systems were "unofficial," they were "universally recognized," and therefore legitimate. To no one's surprise, the United States came out ahead in all of the rankings, as they dominated track and field events.⁷² The use of the point system reinforced the idea of American supremacy in a world full of hostile foreigners.

The press was not at all reluctant to gloat over America's victory in the Olympics, and it boasted that no country had posed a serious threat to the United

States' dominance of Olympic sports. Americans had withstood the invaders' challenge, and once again sat on top of the world. But some wanted even more. One writer noted that if one added "the unofficial points scored in the winter games [held in Lake Placid that same year] to those of the meet just completed, America's unofficial margin of victory would have been greatly increased." This was a comforting thought, for while the United States had always "triumphed..., the margin of victory ha[d] grown smaller and smaller" in recent Olympics. The storytellers wanted as much distance as possible between America and its nearest rival, and they wanted their readers to be certain that they had the privilege of living in the greatest country in the world.⁷³

THE GREATEST OLYMPIC MEET EVER HELD

The size and the spectacle of the Olympics gave Americans another chance to celebrate their perceived superiority. The newspapers filled their pages with praise for Los Angeles's ability to stage the Games in the midst of a massive worldwide depression. No other country, the story went, had the strength or the means to present the world with such an event under such conditions. The Olympics were well worth the "journey half-way around the world" that many athletes had made to be there. The 1932 Olympics emerged from a swarm of superlatives as the "greatest Olympic meet ever held," in ancient times or in modern. Once again, papers reminded readers that only a country as marvelous as the United States could have pulled off this remarkable achievement.⁷⁴

The Olympic story encouraged the widespread nationalism that was sweeping the country in the 1930s. The storytellers reminded Americans, through descriptions of events, point systems, and commentary on the magnificence of the Games, that theirs was the greatest country on earth. The very fact that a successful Olympics had been held indicated America's superiority, and Americans could find even more evidence of this in their defeat of a host of foreign invaders on the field of sporting battle. Americans could now leave the Games behind, confident that pride in their country and contempt for foreigners had been justified.

Conclusion

On July 14, 1932, 105,000 people gathered at the Olympic Coliseum to witness the closing ceremonies of the Xth Olympiad. The Olympic choir sang, and the flags of the United States, Greece, and Germany flew far above the field upon which so many of the world's best athletes had competed, and so many records had been broken. Count Henri de Baillet-Latour, president of the International Olympic Committee, received the Olympic emblem from Captain von Rossen of Amsterdam, host of the 1928 Games, and passed it on to Los Angeles Mayor John C. Porter for safekeeping until the XIth Olympiad in Berlin in 1936. Then the Olympic torch, after burning for 14 days, was extinguished. The athletes boarded ships for home. The Olympic Village, which had housed the youth of the world, was abandoned, then demolished. Los Angeles' time in the global spotlight had come to an end.⁷⁵

The storytellers soon forgot the 1932 Olympics and quickly fixed their attention on the presidential race, the Depression, and Hitler's rise to power. But by the time the press left Los Angeles, it had already done its best to teach many lessons, which, when taken together, defined a conservative vision of society. Women were subordinate to men, and served only to beautify the world of sports. Women belonged in the home, and real work should be left to the men. African Americans were allowed some standing in America, but were still inferior to whites, and should be segregated. The Japanese and other foreigners were dangerous, but posed little threat to the powerful Americans. Finally, it taught that American supremacy was an unquestionable fact and, in spite of the current economic hard times, American dominance of the world was unchallengeable. The media did much more than present the people and events of the Olympic Games. It created a world of Viking girls, mermaids, and little brown men—each of which carried a special significance for traditional America. The coverage of the 1932 Olympics followed a series of anti-reform efforts that arose in response to the cultural challenges of the 1920s. The mainstream press's treatment of Babe Didrikson, Eddie Tolan, and Japanese athletes were as much a part of this conservative movement as the KKK, nativist and anti-Communist groups, and prohibitionists.

*I would like to thank Nancy Gabin, Randy Roberts, and the members of Dr. Gabin's 1995 social history seminar for their helpful comments on this paper.

1. *Des Moines Register*, July 23; *New York Times*, July 29, August 11; *Los Angeles Times*, August 11. All newspaper dates refer to 1932.
2. For a survey of the general literature on the Olympics, see Allen Guttman, *The Games Must Go On: Avery Brundage and the Olympic Movement* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1984) and *The Olympics: A History of the Modern Games* (Urbana and Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1992); Bill Henry, *An Approved History of the Olympic Games* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1948); Lord Killanin and John Rodda, eds., *The Olympic Games* (London: Book Club Associates, 1976); John Lucas, *The Modern Olympic Games* (New York: A.S. Barnes and Co., 1980); Dick Schaap, *An Illustrated History of the Olympics*, 3rd ed. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1975); Jeffrey O. Seagrave and Donald Chu, eds., *The Olympic Games in Transition* (Champaign, IL: Human Kinetic Books, 1988). For women in the Olympics, see Adrienne Blue, *Faster, Higher, Further: Women's Triumphs and Disasters at the Olympics* (London: Virago Press, 1988); Mary Leigh, "The Evolution of Women's Participation in the Olympic Games, 1900-1948," (Ph.D. diss., Ohio State University, 1974); Uriel Simri, *Women at the Olympic Games* (Netanya, Israel: The Wingate Institute for Physical Education and Sport, 1979). These works provide good factual information concerning women in the Olympics, but offer little in the way of analysis or interpretation. For examples of more specialized treatments of the Games, see Robert Edward Lehr, "The American Olympic Committee, 1896-1940: From Chaos to Order," (Ph.D. diss., Pennsylvania State University, 1986); Udodiri Paul Okafor, "The Interaction of Sports and Politics as a Dilemma of the Modern Olympic Games," (Ph.D. diss., Ohio State University, 1979); Robin Tait, "The Politicization of the Modern Olympic Games," (Ph.D. diss., University of Oregon, 1984).
3. "Media" and "the press" refer mainly to newspapers. Popular magazines did not feature extensive coverage of the Games, so while they were consulted to get a feel for the times, they do not figure prominently in this discussion.

4. This imbalance is beginning to be addressed, but much remains to be done. Two notable volumes in this field are Lawrence A. Wenner, ed., *Media, Sports, and Society* (Newbury Park and London: Sage Publications, 1989); and Pamela J. Creedon, ed., *Women, Media, and Sport: Challenging Gender Values* (Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, 1994). Other studies examine more recent representations in the sporting press. See Dan C. Hilliard, "Media Images of Male and Female Professional Athletes: An Interpretive Analysis of Magazine Articles," *Sociology of Sport Journal* 1 (1984): 251-262; Greta L. Cohen, "Media Portrayal of the Female Athlete," in Greta L. Cohen, ed., *Women in Sport: Issues and Controversies* (Newbury Park, CA: SAGE, 1993): 171-184; Margaret Carlisle Duncan, "Sports Photographs and Sexual Difference: Images of Women and Men in the 1984 and 1988 Olympic Games," *Sociology of Sport Journal* 7 (1990): 22-43.
5. Edwin Emery and Michael Emery, *The Press and America: An Interpretive History of the Mass Media*, 6th ed. (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1988); George N. Gordon, *The Communications Revolution: A History of the Mass Media in the United States* (New York: Hastings House, 1977); Oscar Grambling, *AP: The Story of News* (New York and Toronto: Farrar and Rinehart, Inc., 1940); Michael Parenti, *Inventing Reality: The Politics of the Mass Media* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1986); Robert A. Rutland, *The Newsmongers: Journalism in the Life of the Nation, 1690-1972* (New York: The Dial Press, 1973); Michael Schudson, *Discovering the News: A Social History of Newspapers* (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1978); Robert W. McChesney, "Media Made Sport: A History of Sports Coverage in the United States," in Wenner, ed., *Media, Sports, and Society*, 49-69. McChesney argues that sportswriters of the time glorified sports figures. This may have been true for white male athletes, but certainly not for other groups, as we shall see.
6. For the culture of the 1920s and a discussion of its impact upon traditional society, see Frederick Lewis Allen, *Only Yesterday: An Informal History of the Nineteen-Twenties* (New York: Blue Ribbon Books, Inc., 1931); John Braeman, Robert H. Bremmer, David Brody, eds., *Change and Continuity in Twentieth-Century America: The 1920s* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1968); Paul A. Carter, *Another Part of the Twenties* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1977); Lynn Dumenil, "The Progressive Era Through the 1920s," in Mary Kupiec Cayton, Elliott J. Gorn, and Peter W. Williams, eds., *Encyclopedia of American Social History* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1993), 1:173-188; Gilman M. Ostrander, *American Civilization in the First Machine Age: 1890-1940* (New York: Harper and Row, 1970); and Robert Sklar, ed., *The Plastic Age (1917-1930)* (New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1970).
7. Lynn Dumenil, *The Modern Temper: American Culture and Society in the 1920s* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1995), 3-13.
8. *Ibid.*, 112, 130, 129.
9. *Ibid.*, 201-249.
10. For the culture of the 1930s, see William Henry Chafe, *The American Woman: Her Changing Social, Economic, and Political Roles, 1920-1970* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972); Lizabeth Cohen, "The Great Depression and World War II," in Cayton, Gorn and Williams, eds., *Encyclopedia of American Social History*, 1: 189-203; Sheila M. Rothman, *Woman's Proper Place: A History of Changing Ideals and Practices, 1870 to the Present* (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1978); Susan Ware, *Holding Their Own: American Women in the 1930s* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1982); Robert S. Lynd and Helen Merrell Lynd, *Middletown: A Study in American Culture* (New York and London: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1929); Robert S. Lynd and Helen Merrell Lynd, *Middletown in Transition: A Study in Cultural Conflicts* (New York and London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1937).
11. Sklar, ed., *The Plastic Age*, 2; Dumenil, "The Progressive Era Through the 1920s," 176, 183; Allen, *Only Yesterday*, 189; Alan Wells, ed., *Mass Media and Society* (Palo Alto, CA: National Press Books, 1972), 11; Charles C. Alexander, *Nationalism in American Thought, 1930-1945* (Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1969), 86; Sally F. Griffith, "Mass Media Comes to the Small Town: The *Emporia Gazette* in the 1920s," in Catherine Covert and John D. Stevens, eds., *Mass Media Between the Wars: Perceptions of Cultural Tension, 1918-1941* (Syracuse University Press, 1984), 141-155. See Lizabeth Cohen,

- "Encountering Mass Culture at the Grassroots: The Experience of Chicago Workers in the 1920s," *American Quarterly* 41 (March 1989): 6-33 for a discussion of how marginalized groups preserved their own identity. Gordon, *The Communications Revolution*, 181; Robert Sobel, *The Manipulators: America in the Media Age* (Garden City, NY: Anchor Press, 1976), xvii; Emery and Emery, *The Press and America*, 334.
12. Heywood Broun, "Shoot the Works," *New Republic*, 84 April 27, 1938, 357-358; Kent Cooper, *Kent Cooper and the Associated Press: An Autobiography* (New York: Random House, 1959), 118; *The Games of the Xth Olympiad, Los Angeles 1932: Official Report* (Los Angeles: Xth Olympiad Committee, 1932), 171-172.
 13. Rutland, *The Newsmongers*, 317, 322, 327; Parenti, *Inventing Reality*, 29-30; Emery and Emery, *The Press and America*, 365; Rodney P. Carlisle, *Hearst and the New Deal: The Progressive as Reactionary* (New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1979), 206; Frank Luther Mott, *American Journalism: A History, 1690-1960*, 3rd ed. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1962), 646; Gordon, *The Communications Revolution*, 134.
 14. Schudson, *Discovering the News*, 126-129.
 15. *The Games of the Xth Olympiad: Official Report*, 375; Schaap, *An Illustrated History of the Olympics*, 197; Tait, "The Politicization of the Modern Olympic Games," 58; Killanin and Rodda, eds., *The Olympic Games*, 53.
 16. Killanin and Rodda, eds., *The Olympic Games*, 54; Guttmann, *The Olympics*, 50; Tait, "The Politicization of the Modern Olympic Games," 59; Schaap, *An Illustrated History of the Olympics*, 197; *The Games of the Xth Olympiad: Official Report*, 64.
 17. A. J. Stump, "The Games That Almost Weren't," *American Heritage* 33 (1982): 64-71, reprinted in Seagrave and Chu, eds., *The Olympic Games in Transition*, 193, 199; *The Games of the Xth Olympiad: Official Report*, 67, 166; Killanin and Rodda, eds., *The Olympic Games*, 54.
 18. For scholarly works on the 1932 Games, see Mark Dyreson, "Marketing National Identity: The Olympic Games of 1932 and American Culture," *Olympika: The International Journal of Olympic Studies* 4 (1995): 23-48; Steven A. Reiss, "Power Without Authority: Los Angeles Elites and the Construction of the Coliseum," *Journal of Sport History* 8 (Spring 1981): 50-65.
 19. Although the literature on women in sport is growing, it is still regrettably thin. See Susan K. Cahn, *Coming on Strong: Gender & Sexuality in Twentieth Century Women's Sport* (New York: The Free Press, 1994); Pamela J. Creedon, ed., *Women, Media and Sport: Challenging Gender Values*; Allen Guttmann, *Women's Sports: A History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991); Greta L. Cohen, *Women in Sport: Issues and Controversies*; Ellen W. Gerber, Jan Felshin, Pearl Berlin, Waneen Wyrick, *The American Woman in Sport* (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1974); Stephanie Twin, ed., *Out of the Bleachers: Writings on Women and Sport* (New York: The Feminist Press, 1979) for some works in this field.
 20. Uriel Simri, *Women at the Olympic Games*, 80; Adrienne Blue, *Faster, Higher, Further*, ix.
 21. The term "article" is not directly comparable to our contemporary version. Often, Olympic coverage appeared in long columns of text with small "headlines" appearing within the print and dividing it into different topics. Therefore, what appears to be one "article" may contain a discussion of several events or people. In order to better gauge the amount of coverage given to men and women, "articles" were often examined and split into several smaller "articles." Counting each group of text as one "article" would have rendered the entire operation useless, as men and women often appeared together within these groups. This study surveyed 15 newspapers of varying circulations from across the country for the period July 15 to August 30. This allowed impressions of the Olympic tryouts and "final thoughts" of the Games to be considered. The papers consulted were *Atlanta Constitution*, *Chicago Defender*, *Chicago Tribune*, *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, *Dallas Morning Star*, *Des Moines Register*, *Indianapolis Star*, *Los Angeles Times*, *Miami Herald*, *New Orleans Times-Picayune*, *New York Times*, *Saint Louis Post-Dispatch*, *San Francisco Chronicle*, *Seattle Japanese-American Courier*, and *Washington Post*.

22. As another form of comparison, men appeared on the front page of the newspaper 117 times (4.9% of total articles concerning men), while women appeared 37 times (7.7%).
23. Ware, *Holding Their Own*, 199; Lynd and Lynd, *Middletown*, 116-118; Lynd and Lynd, *Middletown in Transition*, 410; Carter, *Another Part of the Twenties*, 115.
24. Women participated in three Olympic sports in 1932: track and field, swimming and diving, and fencing. Because such a minuscule amount of attention was given to fencing, it is left out of this discussion.
25. Coubertin made this statement in 1902. Quoted in Blue, *Faster, Higher, Further*, 1.
26. Gerber, Felshin, Berlin and Wyrick, eds., *The American Woman in Sport*, 138-139; John A. Lucas and Ronald A. Smith, *Saga of American Sport* (Philadelphia: Lea & Febiger, 1978), 349; Guttmann, *The Olympics*, 47.
27. Guttmann, *Women's Sports*, 169-170; Guttmann, *The Olympics*, 49-50; Anita L. DeFrantz, "The Olympic Games: Our Birthright to Sports," in Greta L. Cohen, ed., *Women in Sport: Issues and Controversies*, 186; William H. Beezley and Joseph P. Hobbs, "Nice Girls Don't Sweat: Women in American Sport," *Journal of Popular Culture* 16 (Spring 1983): 46.
28. Gerber, Felshin, Berlin and Wyrick, eds., *The American Woman in Sport*, 152; Lehr, "The American Olympic Committee, 1896-1940," 211; Allen Guttmann, *From Ritual to Record: The Nature of Modern Sports* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1978), 35. Physical educators wrote many books that detailed how a good "play day" should work. Among these are Margaret M. Duncan and Velda P. Cundiff, *Play Days for Girls and Women* (New York: A.S. Barnes and Company, 1929); Ethel Bowers, *Recreation for Girls and Women* (New York: A.S. Barnes and Company, 1934); and Julia H. Post and Mabel J. Shirley, *Selected Recreational Sports for Girls and Women* (New York: A.S. Barnes and Company, 1933).
29. "Ladies of Sport," *The Review of Reviews*, August 5, 1929, 140-143; Sol Metzger, "Training for Your Own Olympics," *Ladies' Home Journal*, July 1932, 82; John Macy, "Equality of Woman with Man: A Myth," *Harper's Monthly Magazine*, November 1926, 705-713; Fred Wittner, "Shall the Ladies Join Us?" *The Literary Digest*, May 19, 1934, 42; Frederick Rand Rogers, "Olympics For Girls?" *School and Society*, August 10, 1929, 191-194.
30. Edwin F. Patton, "Which Sports for the Adolescent?" *The Parent's Magazine*, August 1931, 17.
31. *New York Times*, August 2, 3. For more examples see the *Washington Post*, August 4 for coverage of the 200-meter dash; *Atlanta Constitution*, August 2 for the 100 meters; *Des Moines Register*, August 2, also for the 100 meters. Stella Walsh's record-breaking 100-meter dash received only one-half paragraph in the *Washington Post*, August 2. Walsh's 100 meter run and Babe Didrikson's record javelin throw received one-half paragraph each in the *Saint Louis Post-Dispatch*, August 2.
32. This form of reference is used on practically every page of Olympic coverage. Those who demand a specific instance can see Will Rogers' article in the *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, July 29, or the *San Francisco Chronicle*, August 1, 1932.
33. *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, July 30; *Los Angeles Times*, July 31, August 13, 14; *Dallas Morning News*, August 2.
34. *Los Angeles Times*, August 8, July 28; *Chicago Tribune*, August 8.
35. Babe changed the "e" in her last name to an "o" as a youth. Susan E. Cayleff, *Babe: The Life and Legend of Babe Didrikson Zaharias* (Urbana and Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 1995) is the best biography of Didrikson. While Cayleff disagrees with me as to how the press portrayed Didrikson in 1932, her perceptive work untangles much of the myth from the reality of her life. For other full-length biographies of Didrikson, see Babe Didrikson Zaharias and Harry Paxton, *This Life I've Led: My Autobiography* (New York: A.S. Barnes and Company, 1955); William Oscar Johnson and Nancy P. Williams, "Whatta-Gal": *The Babe Didrikson Story* (Boston and Toronto: Little, Brown and Company, 1977).
36. Bill Cunningham, "Texas Flash," *Colliers*, August 6, 1932, 26; John A. Lucas and Ronald A. Smith, *Saga of American Sport*, 359; Joan Paul, "Heroines: Paving the Way," in Cohen,

- ed., *Women in Sport*, 31, Betty Hicks, "The Legendary Babe Didrikson Zaharias," in Cohen, ed., *Women in Sport*, 38-48; Benjamin C. Rader, *American Sports: From the Age of Folk Games to the Age of Spectators* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1983), 237-238; *Washington Post*, August 1.
37. *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, August 5; *Washington Post*, July 17; *New York Times*, August 5; *Indianapolis Star*, July 17; *Chicago Tribune*, July 30; *Saint Louis Post-Dispatch*, July 19; *Atlanta Constitution*, July 20.
38. *Des Moines Register*, August 12; *Washington Post*, August 17; *Saint Louis Post-Dispatch*, August 12; *Atlanta Constitution*, July 20; *Chicago Tribune*, August 9.
39. "Athlete," *American Magazine*, April 1933, 52; *Dallas Morning News*, August 11; "The World-Beating Girl Viking of Texas," *The Literary Digest*, August 27, 1932, 26; *Atlanta Constitution*, August 5.
40. Charles Fountain, *Sportswriter: The Life and Times of Grantland Rice* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 193, 241-247; *Atlanta Constitution*, July 24; *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, July 30, August 9; *New Orleans Times-Picayune*, July 28.
41. *Miami Herald*, July 17; *Los Angeles Times*, July 17, August 12; *Des Moines Register*, August 12; *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, August 9, 10; *San Francisco Chronicle*, August 13; *Atlanta Constitution*, August 13; *Chicago Tribune*, August 3, 14.
42. The use of these titles was fairly standard throughout the press, as was the representation of aquatic sports as part of a carnival. For specific examples of these, see *Indianapolis Star*, August 10; *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, August 7; *Des Moines Register*, August 7.
43. Pictures of this type appeared in the *New York Times*, July 25, August 10, 12, 13; *Washington Post*, August 7; and in many other instances.
44. *Los Angeles Times*, August 8.
45. *Washington Post*, August 11; *Los Angeles Times*, August 11. The picture also appeared in the *Chicago Tribune*, August 11, *Miami Herald*, August 11, and *Indianapolis Star*, August 11, among others.
46. *Des Moines Register*, July 17; *Los Angeles Times*, August 10, 12. Eleanor Holm did actually sign a movie deal, but she had a short and unsuccessful film career.
47. Gilbert Osofsky, *Harlem: The Making of a Ghetto* (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), 180-186; Dumenil, *The Modern Temper*, 161-165; Ostrander, *American Civilization in the First Machine Age*, 344-347; Herbert Aptheker, *Afro-American History: The Modern Era* (New York: The Citadel Press, 1971), 173; Cohen, "Encountering Mass Culture at the Grassroots," 21-25.
48. Cohen, "The Great Depression and World War II," 192; Waldo Martin, "The Making of Black America," in Luther S. Luedke, ed., *Making America: The Society and Culture of the United States* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1992), 355; Raymond Wolters, *Negroes and the Great Depression: The Problem of Economic Recovery* (Westport, CN: Greenwood Publishing Corporation, 1970), ix, 91; Lynd and Lynd, *Middletown*, 479; Lynd and Lynd, *Middletown in Transition*, 407; Jannette L. Dates and William Barlow, "Conclusion: Split Images and Double Binds," in Dates and Barlow, eds., *Split Image: African Americans in the Mass Media* (Washington, DC: Howard University Press, 1990), 455.
49. Edwin B. Henderson, *The Black Athlete: Emergence and Arrival* (New York: Publishers Company, Inc., 1968), 36-37, 241; Lucas and Smith, *Saga of American Sport*, 378; Lehr, "The American Olympic Committee," 213-215. For general surveys of African American athletics, see A.S. "Doc" Young, *Negro Firsts in Sports* (Chicago: Johnson Publishing Company, Inc., 1963); Arthur Ashe, Jr., *A Hard Road to Glory: A History of the African-American Athlete*, 3 vols. (New York: Amistad, 1993).
50. *The Games of the Xth Olympiad: Official Report*, 779; *New York Times*, July 24.
51. *The Games of the Xth Olympiad: Official Report*, 780.
52. *Indianapolis Star*, August 2; *New York Times*, July 24, August 5; *Los Angeles Times*, August

- 21; *Saint Louis Post-Dispatch*, July 24.
53. *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, August 2. References like this can, however, be found in almost any article that discusses Tolan and/or Metcalfe.
54. *Washington Post*, August 8; *Des Moines Register*, July 16; *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, July 16, August 2, 4; *Los Angeles Times*, July 16, 22, 30; *San Francisco Chronicle*, July 19.
55. *San Francisco Chronicle*, August 4; *Miami Herald*, August 1; *Saint Louis Post-Dispatch*, August 12; *Chicago Tribune*, August 5.
56. *Los Angeles Times*, July 31; *San Francisco Chronicle*, August 5; *Saint Louis Post-Dispatch*, August 15.
57. The papers surveyed (for the period July 15 to August 30) were the *New Orleans Times-Picayune*, *Atlanta Constitution*, *Miami Herald*, and *Dallas Morning News*. Fifty-eight of these photographs were of men. Mark Dyreson has also noted that these athletes were largely “invisible men” in “Marketing National Identity: The Olympic Games of 1932 and American Culture.”
58. *Chicago Defender*, July 23, 30, August 20.
59. *Ibid.*, July 23.
60. *Ibid.*, July 23.
61. *Los Angeles Times*, August 3.
62. Dumenil, “The Progressive Era Through the 1920s,” 182; Robert A. Divine, *The Reluctant Belligerent: American Entry Into World War II* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1965), 2-3; Lynd and Lynd, *Middletown in Transition*, 407; E. Manchester Boddy, *Japanese in America* (San Francisco: R and E Research Associates, 1931; reprint, San Francisco, 1970), 150-165; Oscar Handlin, *Race and Nationality in American Life* (Boston and Toronto: Little, Brown and Company, 1948), 47-48.
63. *New York Times*, July 17, 18, 24; Cayleff, *Babe*, 67; “Sports Winning in Japan,” *The Literary Digest*, December 8, 1928, 17-18; *New York Times*, July 24, August 14; *New Orleans Times-Picayune*, August 22; *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, August 17.
64. *The Games of the Xth Olympiad: Official Report*, 785-786; *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, July 17.
65. *Miami Herald*, July 19, 30; *Los Angeles Times*, July 9, 19, 24; *Washington Post*, August 9.
66. *New York Times*, July 30; *Saint Louis Post-Dispatch*, July 23; *Indianapolis Star*, August 12; *Atlanta Constitution*, July 20.
67. *Los Angeles Times*, July 9, August 8, 14; *Atlanta Constitution*, July 20; *New York Times*, August 14, 21. Note the use of “brown” in reference to the Japanese, instead of the more familiar “yellow.” It seems to imply similarities between African Americans and the Japanese, further evidence of Americans’ belief in the inferiority of both groups.
68. *Seattle Japanese-American Courier*, July 30; Dumenil, *The Modern Temper*, 265-267.
69. *Seattle Japanese-American Courier*, July 23, August 20.
70. Alexander, *Nationalism in American Thought*, 2, 60; Lynd and Lynd, *Middletown in Transition*, 407.
71. *New York Times*, July 30; *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, July 24; *Des Moines Register*, July 31; *Indianapolis Star*, August 4. This is, of course, an exaggeration of the type of coverage that the Olympics actually received, but the use of martial language in reference to sports was at least as common and widespread as it is today, and probably more so.
72. *Washington Post*, July 31; *Los Angeles Times*, August 15. This point system appeared in all of the mainstream newspapers surveyed. Although a few variations existed, the system generally gave out points to the first six places in track events based on a 10-5-4-3-2-1 method.
73. *Los Angeles Times*, July 24; *Saint Louis Post-Dispatch*, August 17.
74. *New York Times*, July 24.
75. See the *New York Times*, August 15, for an excellent description of the ceremonies.