

**Red Sox, Yankee, Astro or “Dodger”:
Roger Clemens Response to the
Accusation of Steroid Use**

By:

Richard F. Wisgirda

A Senior Honors Thesis Submitted to the
Department of Communication of Boston College

May 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	3
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	4
CHAPTER 2: CONSTRUCTING THE ROCKET: ROGER CLEMENS	6
CHAPTER 3: THE MITCHELL REPORT	10
CHAPTER 4: PREVIOUS SCHOLARSHIP ON SPORTS COMMUNICATION	15
CHAPTER 5: METHODOLOGY	23
Denial.....	24
Evade Responsibility.....	24
Reduce Offensiveness of Event.....	25
Corrective Action.....	25
Mortification.....	26
CHAPTER 6: 60 MINUTES INTERVIEW: “THE HARDEST WORKING MAN IN THROW BUSINESS”	27
Denial.....	27
Bolstering.....	28
Attacking the Accuser.....	29
Differentiation.....	29
Defeasibility.....	30
Shirting the Blame.....	30
Transcendence.....	31
Visuals.....	32
CHAPTER 7: CLEMENS PRESS CONFERENCE: DIAL 1-800-CLE-MENS	34
Defeasibility.....	34
Denial.....	36
Bolstering.....	36
Attacking the Accuser.....	37
Shifting the Blame/Transcendence.....	39
Minimization.....	40
Provocation.....	40
Visuals.....	41
CHAPTER 8: CONGRESSIONAL HEARING TESTIMONY: MR. OCTOBER AND MISS REMEMBERS	43
Roger Clemens.....	43
Denial.....	43
Bolstering.....	44
Attacking the Accuser.....	46
Defeasibility.....	47
Brian McNamee.....	48
Mortification.....	48
Defeasibility.....	48
Good Intentions.....	49
Bolstering.....	49
Other Factors.....	50
Congressmen/Congresswomen.....	50
Andy Pettitte.....	53
Visuals.....	53
CHAPTER 9: THE ROCKET HAS LANDED	55
CHAPTER 10: CRASH AND BURN	60
WORKS CITED	62

ABSTRACT

This paper primarily analyzes the public statements made by Roger Clemens following the accusation by his former trainer, Brian McNamee, that he used performance enhancing drugs. McNamee named Clemens in the Mitchell Report as a steroid user and claimed to have injected Clemens with steroids himself. Clemens immediately refuted the claim and after some time went to the press with his story of innocence. Despite his claims, his reputation had already been damaged. This paper looks at his interview with Mike Wallace on 60 Minutes, his press conference where he played a seventeen minute taped phone conversation with McNamee, and his testimony before the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

Previous scholarship on sport illustrates the use of narratives in media coverage including baseball. Certain narratives, such as winning, losing, tradition, and the heroic figure repeat themselves in sports media. Fans identify with the players or teams and become part of the narrative themselves. Certain athletes may be picked out using these narratives to be held up as role models for the public.

The statements of Roger Clemens are examined using the techniques of image reconstruction by William Benoit. The framework is used to analyze Clemens attempts to deny using steroids, keep his reputation, and destroy the credibility of Brian McNamee.

Chapter 1 Introduction

Roger Clemens was viewed as one of the greatest pitchers in the game of baseball. Clemens played for the Boston Red Sox, Toronto Blue Jays, New York Yankees, and Houston Astros during his career. He won seven Cy Young awards, given to the best pitcher in baseball, one Most Valuable Player award, and won 354 games.

Clemens success was attributed to his fanatical workout regimen and dedication to the game of baseball. Clemens was held up as a role model for young kids to emulate. He pitched into his forties, and pitched well. He was awarded almost a mythic status as one of the greatest pitchers of all-time, compared to pitchers of every generation. He was not just an ordinary player, or even a good player, but one of the greats.

On December 13, 2007 Clemens was accused of using steroids. After the accusations the view of Clemens changed. Some people no longer believed his longevity and success was due to his hard work, but rather to performance enhancing drugs. His image as one of the hardest working men in baseball and an all-time great was starting to crumble. He needed to respond. He needed to tell the world he was innocent.

Clemens chose to tell the public through three appearances, a *60 Minutes* interview, a press conference, and his testimony in front of Congress. Those three public statements will be analyzed to determine how Clemens used image restoration to attempt to repair his image.

Chapters two will provide background on Roger Clemens' career. Chapter three will explain the Mitchell Report, an investigation by the Mitchell Commission into the use of steroids in baseball. The fourth chapter is about previous research on sports

communication while chapter five is an explanation of image restoration theory by Benoit. Chapters six through eight are analysis using image restoration of Clemens three rhetorical choices. Chapter nine is a summary of the three rhetorical choices and the latest developments in the Clemens' saga. Chapter ten discusses what future players should in the case of being accused of steroid use.

Chapter 2

Constructing The Rocket: Roger Clemens

Roger Clemens is considered by many to be one of the greatest pitchers of all time. Clemens was a menacing pitcher able with a great fastball and was not afraid to throw inside to hitters. Due to his success and pitching style, he was given the nickname “The Rocket.” Making his debut in 1984 at the age of 21, Clemens has played for four Major League Baseball teams over the course of his twenty-four year career (Roger Clemens, 2008).

Clemens grew up in Texas where he played his high school baseball for Spring Woods High School. Clemens was a good athlete, lettering in baseball, football, and basketball while in high school. In 1981 Clemens attended San Jacinto Junior College in Texas for one year. (Roger Clemens career biography and statistics, 2008). He transferred to the University of Texas and over the course of two seasons he won 25 games and lost only seven. He was the winning pitcher in the final game of the 1983 College World Series, helping Texas defeat Alabama. Clemens would also receive All-American honors during his two years at the University of Texas. Clemens became the first University of Texas baseball alumnus to have his jersey retired. Clemens continued his rise to stardom when he came to the major leagues (Roger Clemens career biography and statistics, 2008).

Clemens debuted for the Boston Red Sox on May 15, 1984. In 1986 Clemens posted a career high with 24 wins and led the Red Sox to the World Series. Clemens won the first of his Cy Young awards and the Most Valuable Player award for the 1986 season (Roger Clemens, 2008). The Cy Young Award is given to the top pitcher in each league

each year. In a game against the Seattle Mariners in 1986, he was the first player to strike out 20 batters in a nine inning game. Clemens would later repeat this in 1996 against the Detroit Tigers. He is the only pitcher to strike out 20 batters in a game on two occasions. Clemens would win two more Cy Young awards with the Red Sox in 1987 and 1991. He won 192 games with the Red Sox which is tied with Cy Young for the most career wins by a Red Sox pitcher (Roger Clemens: Professional career, 2008). No Red Sox player has worn the number 21 since Clemens left the Red Sox (Roger Clemens: Professional career, 2008).

Clemens signed with the Toronto Blue Jays after the 1996 season. Red Sox general manager Dan Duquette said Clemens was in the twilight of his career. Clemens wanted to prove his doubters wrong and over the next two seasons Clemens had a combined record of 41-13, winning the Cy Young again in 1997 and 1998. (Roger Clemens: Professional career, 2008).

Clemens would be traded to the New York Yankees before the 1999 season (Roger Clemens: Professional career, 2008). Clemens won two World Series title with the Yankees in 1999 and 2000. Clemens would win his sixth Cy Young award in 2001. He started the season with 20 wins and one loss, but he ended it with a 20-3 record. Clemens recorded his 300th win and 4,000th strike out in the same game for the Yankees in 2003. Clemens decided to retire following the 2003 season (Roger Clemens, 2008).

Clemens came out of retirement however, for the 2004 season and pitched for the Houston Astros. Clemens would win his seventh and final Cy Young award in the 2004 season. The following year Clemens put off retirement again and signed a record setting contract for a pitcher. He led the Astros to their first World Series in franchise history,

but were swept by the Chicago White Sox. In the spring Clemens pitched for Team USA in the World Baseball Classic. After announcing his retirement once again, Clemens decided to pitch for half the season with the Astros. After the season Clemens once again announced his retirement (Roger Clemens: Professional career, 2008).

Clemens decided to come back in 2007, once again only pitching half the season. The Red Sox, Yankees, and Astros all courted Clemens, but Clemens decided to return to the Yankees. He finished 6-6 with a 4.18 earned run average. He won his 350th game becoming only the eighth pitcher in Major League Baseball history to do so (Roger Clemens, 2008).

Over his career Clemens has amassed 354 wins, 4,672 strikeouts, won seven Cy Young Awards and one League Most Valuable Player award. Clemens is seen as an icon for his longevity and success over this great span of time. Clemens is idolized by many young ballplayers and even gives instruction to minor league ballplayers. He is a hero in the state of Texas where he grew up and starred for the University of Texas Longhorns. (Roger Clemens, 2008). He was seen as a lock to be inducted into the Hall of Fame on his first ballot when his time came. Now some of that has been put into doubt by steroid allegations.

On December 13, 2007 Roger Clemens was named as a steroid user in the Mitchell Report. Kat O'Brien (2007) states that Clemens' former personal trainer, Brian McNamee, claims to have injected Roger personally with steroids. McNamee claims to have injected Clemens over the course of several years starting in 1998, when Clemens played for the Toronto Blue Jays. O'Brien (2007) also writes that McNamee says he injected Clemens with different kinds of steroids such as Winstrol and testosterone.

McNamee also named Yankees pitcher Andy Pettitte and former second baseman Chuck Knoblauch as steroid users. McNamee claimed to have injected both with human growth hormone (HGH) as well. Both Pettitte and Knoblauch later admitted to using human growth hormone.

Chapter 3 Mitchell Report

Baseball players have been thought to be using performance enhancing drugs, such as steroids, as far back at the late 1980's. Fans, executives, scouts, and even players themselves would speculate about steroid use in baseball though. Buster Olney (2006) writes no one ever spoke up about the issue.

Ronald Blum (1996) states in 1994 the baseball players union decided to go on strike canceling the final fifty-two games of the regular season, the playoffs, and the World Series. The strike also shortened the 1995 season from 162 games to 144 games. Blum (1996) reports the owners lost more than 700 million dollars because of the strike while players lost about \$350 million. The strike lasted 232 days, the longest ever in United States professional sports. Even worse than the money lost by owners and players, was the interest fans lost in the game. According to the Associated Press twenty eight percent of fans expected their interest to be diminished after the strike was over (Our Press Services, 1995). Average attendance per game dropped twenty percent following the strike (Blum, 1996). Baseball was struggling to rebound from this disaster until the summer of 1998.

The summer of 1998 provided lots of drama in baseball. The New York Yankees won 114 games, the most since the 1906 Cubs, Baltimore Orioles shortstop Cal Ripken ended his record consecutive games played streak, the Boston Red Sox and Chicago Cubs both made the playoffs, and Mark McGwire and Sammy Sosa's chase of the home run record (San Francisco Chronicle, 1998). McGwire and Sosa brought fans back to the game with their chase of Roger Maris' single season home run record (Chicago Sun-

Times, 1998). McGwire would hit seventy home runs to set the record while Sosa would finish with sixty-six. The Associated Press (1998) reported McGwire also impacted the economy around St. Louis. St. Louis Cardinals merchandise sales rose while the team set an attendance record of 3,195,021, all while the team finished nineteen games out of first place (Associated Press, 1998). McGwire and Sosa helped reinvigorate the game of baseball in the United States. Even with this home run explosion no one dared mention the idea of steroids even though McGwire admitted using androstenedione, a steroid precursor (Olney, 2006).

Olney (2006) states there was evidence dating back to 1989 when *Washington Post* columnist Thomas Boswell reported he had sources claiming Jose Canseco used steroids. In 1995, Frank Thomas and Tony Gwynn, two All-Star players at the time, said they believed there was a growing steroid problem in baseball. In 2002 former National League Most Valuable Player Ken Caminiti admitted he had used steroids. Caminiti would later die at the age of 41 from drug and alcohol abuse. Olney (2006) writes in 2002, *USA Today* polled more than 500 players and 79 percent wanted steroid testing while 44 percent said they felt the need to take steroids. Steroids in baseball are not a new problem.

In March 2006 Major League Baseball Commissioner Bud Selig ordered an investigation into past steroid use by major league ballplayers. The investigation was headed by former Senate majority leader George Mitchell. Kevin Cullen (2007) writes Mitchell was a former Democratic senator from Maine. Selig reacted to pressure by Congress on the steroid problem in the game of baseball. Earlier in the year, the book *Game of Shadows* written by Mark Fainaru-Wada and Lance Williams, chronicled the

supposed use of steroids by one of the game's greatest home run hitters, Barry Bonds. As more and more attention was turned on the issue, Ben Shpigel (2006) states Selig reacted by placing stricter penalties on players using performance enhancing drugs. Selig worked with the Executive Director of the Players Union, Donald Fehr, on reopening the collective bargaining agreement to amend the drug policy. Selig changed the drug policy twice, once in 2004 and the second time in 2005. Congress did not believe this was a drastic enough step and Selig decided to open the Mitchell investigation (Shpigel, 2006).

On December 13, 2007 George Mitchell released an investigative report on steroid use in baseball. Bill Shaikin (2007) reports the 409 page report was researched for 20 months and includes the names of 86 current and former Major League Baseball players. Some of the higher profile names in the Mitchell Report were former American League MVP Mo Vaughn, relief pitcher Eric Gagne, catcher Paul Lo Duca, pitcher Kevin Brown, former American League MVP Miguel Tejada, pitcher Andy Pettitte, and outfielder Barry Bonds. The biggest name on the report was pitcher Roger Clemens. Clemens was named by his former personal trainer Brian McNamee (Shaikin, 2007). The Mitchell Report however does not name Mark McGwire or Sammy Sosa as steroid users.

The Mitchell Report states explicitly that on several instances Brian McNamee injected Roger Clemens with a different types of performance enhancing drugs. The report states that while with the Blue Jays "Clemens asked McNamee to inject him with Winstrol, which Clemens supplied" (Mitchell Report, 2007, p. 217). "McNamee injected Clemens approximately four times in the buttocks over a several-week period with needles that Clemens provided" (Mitchell Report, 2007, p. 217). McNamee claims that after he injected Clemens with Winstrol "Clemen's performance showed remarkable

improvement” (Mitchell Report, 2007, p. 218) McNamee continues that he injected Clemens with performance enhancing drugs twice more, once in 2000 and for the last time in 2001 (Mitchell Report, 2007).

The Mitchell Report stated that Major League Baseball banned steroids as far back as 1991, but there was no test for the drugs until 2003. Mitchell made a number of recommendations in the report such as allowing a third party to run drug testing, to increase random year round tests, to create a team to investigate drug use, and to record packages sent to team clubhouses.

Stan Grossfield (2007) reports Mitchell found canceled checks by players to steroid dealers and even found a thank you note written by a player to his dealer on the team’s stationary. Mitchell also uncovered documents in which teams discussed possible steroid use by players when scouting them.

Mitchell received testimony from McNamee and former Mets clubhouse attendant Kirk Radomski. Radomski plead guilty to steroid distribution and as part of his plea bargain was working with Mitchell. Mitchell did not have the power of subpoena nor were any of the testimonies under oath. Mitchell requested to talk to certain players, but the players declined. The only player to talk to Mitchell was Toronto Blue Jays designated hitter Frank Thomas (Grossfield, 2007).

Mitchell has received a lot of criticism for his report. Many people have said the report is hearsay and there is no proof to back it up. Others point to the conflict of interest as Mitchell used to be on the Red Sox board of directors. Former federal prosecutor John Dowd said “I don’t think it’s good for the game. He’s involved in baseball; he’s not independent” (as cited in Dodd, 2006). Senator Jim Bunning from Kentucky, who is a

baseball Hall of Famer did not agree with the appointment either. Bunning said “While George Mitchell is certainly a man of great integrity, I believe that baseball would have been wiser to pick someone who is not as close to the game and may be able to make a more objective look into the facts” (as cited in Dodd, 2006). Despite Mitchell’s credentials and experience there was controversy over his appointment.

Mitchell wrote in the report that players named should not receive any punishment because of their actions in the past. Mitchell also acknowledged there were more users than he was unable to uncover. The report was supposed to center around what can be done to solve the problem in the future, instead of punishing people for the past (Shaikin, 2007). The Mitchell Report was supposed to help baseball move forward from its troubled past with performance enhancing drugs. Instead the report has continued speculation and much of it centers on one man, Roger Clemens.

Chapter 4

Previous Scholarship on Sports Communication

Over time a lot of scholarship from a communication perspective has been written about sports, the media and the public. Sports in America are multi-billion dollar businesses and are driven by fans. Since there is such a high demand for sports information through the media, it is important to look at scholarship on how media portrays sports.

The first piece piece of research looks at the use of narratives in sport. Harris and Hills (1993) in their research “Telling the Story: Narrative in Newspaper Accounts of a Men’s Collegiate Basketball Tournament comment “Narrative is used pervasively to structure conceptions of daily events in American society, and storytelling or recounting of narratives is a major means of sharing this information” (109). Harris and Hills (1993) claim “sport seems particularly well suited to news coverage using a narrative framework because of its inherent storylike structure” (108). Harris and Hills (1993) found sport reinforces the status quo of inequities in power, particularly those in international relations, gender relations, economic relations, and race/ethnic relations. These narratives have central features such as interchangeable characters, formulaic plots, and themes stressing competition and conflict. These narratives can be used for a team or single player. The narrative of the heroic athlete is one that is commonly used.

The sport of baseball lends itself to the use of narrative. In Trujillo and Krizek article “Emotionality in the Stands and in the Field: Expressing Self Through Baseball” the stories they tell “reveal the rich narrativity of ballpark culture and inform fans and workers about the unique oral history of the franchise itself” (1994, p. 310). Stories are

told of past accomplishments and records such as Joe DiMaggio's 56 game hit streak or Hank Aaron's former home run record. The stories become part of the narrative folklore of the team (Trujillo, 1994). They are passed down as the ballpark is able to bring together generations of family and friends (Trujillo & Krizek, 1994).

Nick Trujillo researched the different aspects of baseball culture in his article "Interpreting (the Work and the Talk of) Baseball: Perspectives on Ballpark Culture." Trujillo (1992) believes baseball is a social drama with the elements of ritual contest and symbolic representation. The structure of baseball's ritual contest shows "the contest between the virtuous and the villainous, the suspense of the contest, the triumph of justice and the intervention of fortune, anxiety as the game proceeds, heroic deeds and untimely errors, dramatic climaxes, and the euphoria of the victors along with the gloom of the vanquished" (Trujillo, 1992, p. 363). The ballpark is a place where the fans, players, and workers share this common sense of reality (Trujillo, 1992). Trujillo (1992) contends these people are all participants in the drama. Baseball can be broken down to heroes struggling over good and evil. Trujillo (1994) finds hero worship of players by children. Children gather to see and receive autographs from their favorite players. The narrative of athletes as heroes can be seen in the media.

The narrative of heroic athlete in the media is one area of scholarship. Nick Trujillo looks at the portrayal of Nolan Ryan in print and television stories in his article "Hegemonic Masculinity on the Mound: Media Representations of Nolan Ryan and American Sports Culture." Ryan is portrayed as a larger than life figure using hegemonic masculinity. Trujillo (1991) defines the features of masculine hegemony in American culture as physical force and control, occupational achievement, familial patriarchy,

frontiersmanship, and heterosexuality. Ryan was described as having the power of the male body and captured the force of male athletic power (Trujillo, 1991). Ryan's individual awards and team achievements were seen as occupational achievements. Sportswriters describe Ryan, a Texan, as a cowboy and American hero who embodies the values of the old frontier (Trujillo, 1991). Trujillo (1991) states sportswriters portray Ryan as an almost mythic hero and therefore maintain the ideals of masculine hegemony. Ryan is perfect as a "white, middle-aged, upper-class, banker-athlete, with working-class cowboy values, who was raised by a middle-class family in a small rural town, and who is a strong father and devoted heterosexual husband" (Trujillo, 1991). These values have been written about in the media for years.

Athletes were written about as heroes for decades before Nolan Ryan. Benjamin Rader studied the portrayal of sports stars in the 1920's in his article "Compensatory Sports Heroes: Ruth, Grange and Dempsey." Rader (1983) states "the same skill and shrewd promotion which successfully hawked automobiles, breakfast foods and lipstick also sold athletes to the public" (11). People could see the fantasies and images of power and instant success in sports (Rader, 1983). Rader (1983) discusses how the American public were in awe of the skill and power of star athletes such as Babe Ruth, Red Grange, and Jack Dempsey. Rader (1983) describes the popularity of the athletes in the public's "satisfaction in the athletic hero who presented an image of all-conquering power" (12). The media has expounded on the values of power in sports heroes for decades.

The themes of masculine power and domination have led to research in media portrayals of sports. Lois Bryson in her article "Sport and the Maintenance of Masculine Hegemony" looks at how sport is an institution where male hegemony is created and

reinforced. Sports links maleness with valued and visible skills while it positively enforces the use of aggression, force, and violence (Bryson, 1987). Bryson (1987) points out men are in charge of almost every sport, even in some sports with little male representation. Women's sports are also trivialized or completely ignored (Bryson, 1987). Women are faced with the challenge of either choosing to compete in a world with male rules or not to compete and look weak (Bryson, 1987). The American public is sent these messages through the media during sports coverage. There are a lot of people that see these messages.

These messages are sent through many different media forms such as print, internet, and television. Scholarship has been written about the portrayals of sport in the different media. Nick Trujillo and Leah Ekdom in "Sportswriting and American Cultural Values: The 1984 Chicago Cubs" looked at sports writing in newspapers. They found sportswriters often avoid making critical comments in their sports articles. Trujillo and Ekdom (1985) explain sportswriters do not want to offend readers or effect circulation. Despite not making explicit comments, close analysis can reveal some commentary on the values of sport in American society. There are many themes in sportswriters articles about baseball (Trujillo & Ekdom, 1985). The most dominant theme in sports is winning (Trujillo & Ekdom, 1985). Baseball also lends itself to the themes of tradition, change, teamwork, individualism, work, play, youth, experience, logic, and luck (Trujillo & Ekdom, 1985). Trujillo and Ekdom (1985) write these themes were used in the sportswriting and juxtaposed throughout the season. Trujillo and Ekdom (1985) state sportswriters had to explain the story of a baseball team using these values to explain the success and failure of the ballclub. The sportswriters did not only give the story of the

team, but “gave us an in depth look at the underlying values of American culture as well” (Trujillo & Ekdorn, 1985, 279).

Nathaniel Poor wrote about baseball player Curt Schilling and his use of the internet in his article “Playing Internet Curveball with Traditional Media Gatekeepers.” Poor (2006) found Schilling used internet message boards to communicate with Red Sox fans during his possible trade negotiations. Schilling wanted to interact directly with fans instead of through the traditional media, such as newspapers, radio, and television. Schilling avoided the traditional “gatekeeping”, the process by which media choose to cover or ignore news, of media outlets (Poor, 2006). Some in the media felt threatened by Schilling’s use of the internet (Poor, 2006). Poor (2006) states it is part of the natural order of new media forms and older media will have to adapt.

Kenneth Zagacki and Dan Grano researched how sports radio talk shows give fans an opportunity to share their feelings about their favorite sports teams in “Radio Sports Talk and the Fantasies of Sport.” Zagacki and Grano (2005) use Ernest Bormann’s fantasy theme analysis to see how callers exchange ideas and make sense of their social world. They found sports talk radio can help fans cope when the team loses and strengthen community identity after wins (Zagacki & Grano, 2005).

The way fans of sport teams identify with the teams and players is another area of scholarship that has been researched. Walter Gantz in “An Exploration of Viewing Motives and Behaviors Associated with Television Sports” studies the motives of people watching sports on television. Gantz (1981) writes being a fan can serve as an escape function from reality. Fans can live vicariously through an athlete, enjoying his/her successes (Gantz, 1981). Fans also may feel like she/he contributed to an athlete’s

success. During times of success a fan may have feelings of satisfaction and self-worth. Failure by a team can be turned into a success if the fan disagrees with the game strategies used by his/her team (Gantz, 1981). The fan may also use scapegoating or disassociate themselves from the team to lessen the feelings of defeat (Gantz, 1981).

Gantz continued his research of fan behavior with Zheng Wang, Bryant Paul, and Robert F. Potter in their study “Sports Versus All Comers: Comparing TV Sports Fans With Fans of Other Programming Genres.” Gantz et al. (2006) state serious fans consider their fanship to be part of their personal identity. Sports fans extend the ritual of watching sports games as long as possible (Gantz et al., 2006). Sports fans also like to relive the game again and again (Gantz et al., 2006).

Fans of baseball teams identify with the team in the same way. Trujillo and Krizek (1994) illustrate that to many fans Major League Baseball is not a business, but it is our “national pastime.” A team is more than a money making venture, it is a public trust that gives a sense of identification and identity for those fans (Trujillo & Krizek, 1994). Fans relate to the teams and players personally. Despite the fact the team is owned by a small, wealthy group, fans still believe it is “their” team (Trujillo & Krizek, 1994)

Trujillo and Krizek (1994) demonstrate that the ballpark is a community in the literal sense. Each ballpark provides shelter, places to eat, medical facilities, and retail stores to provide clothing. The ballpark also serves as a “community in a richer sense as a place where friends and families come together to work, to play, and to share in communities celebrations” (Trujillo & Krizek, 1994, p. 307). Baseball does create a deep connection with its fans and society as a whole.

Research has been done on baseball reinforcing the ideologies of American society. Trujillo and Ekdom (1985) say baseball is emblematic of American society as a whole. Trujillo (1992) states critics claim “the business of sports reaffirms the ideology of American capitalism (p. 365). Trujillo (1992) found the ballpark is a place of capitalist labor. Ballparks are commodified and are seen as a way of generating revenues (Trujillo, 1992). It is through the income oriented actions of the ballpark workers that baseball becomes a capitalist enterprise (Trujillo, 1992). Other aspects of baseball are used to reinforce capitalism. Trujillo (1991) explains Nolan Ryan is held up as a successful product of the American capitalist system. Ryan is written about as a commodity because when he pitches attendance goes up.

Trujillo (1992) discusses how the ballpark also teaches other lessons of our culture such as success and failure, individualism and teamwork, and tradition and change to name a few. According to Trujillo (1992) the ballpark does show the same problems as the American capitalist system. Ballparks commodify “people as products and stratifies them along gender, racial, and socioeconomic lines (Trujillo, 1992, p. 366).

Baseball is used to further the American Dream also. Nolan Ryan’s hard work leads him to success in terms of team victories and individual records (Trujillo, 1991) Trujillo (1991) states Ryan’s success is shown as proof the system works, if a person is willing to work hard for it. Rader (1983) writes Babe Ruth saw himself as the classic case of the America success story. Ruth wrote in his autobiography that in America it did not matter where a person came from, everyone still has a chance at success (Rader, 1983). Ruth gave hope to people that had feared American society no longer allowed the ordinary person to succeed (Rader, 1983).

It is important to study baseball from a communication perspective because Trujillo and Ekdom (1985) state the “symbiotic relationship between baseball and the mass media remains a powerful one in contemporary America” (p. 264). The messages sent by media coverage of sports, such as baseball, are sent to millions of homes. Gantz et al. (2006) found fans of any programming genre tend to be heavier viewers than nonfans, causing fans to process information through the program differently. Messages sent through sports media are processed differently by sports fans. It is important to research the narratives being broadcast over such a wide group of people.

Chapter 5 Methodology

Apologia and image reconstruction are two widely studied rhetorical forms. Apologia and image reconstruction are used after something is done that is deemed offensive or wrong by the audience. The accused must do something in order to defend or explain their behavior in the face of the actions or accusations. Apologia and image reconstruction use similar techniques in order to restore the reputation of the accused.

Apologia was studied first by Ware and Linkugel. Ware and Linkugel (1973) write apologia consists of four different strategies, denial, bolstering, differentiation, and transcendence.

The first strategy a rhetor might use is denial. Ware and Linkugel (1973) describe denial as “simple disavowal by the speaker of any participation in, relationship to, or positive sentiment toward whatever it is that repels the audience” (p. 124). Denial does not attempt to change the audience’s meaning or affect for what is in question (Ware & Linkugel, 1973).

A rhetor may use bolstering. Bolstering is used to “reinforce the the existence of a fact, sentiment, object, or relationship” (Ware & Linkugel, 1973, 125). Ware and Linkugel (1973) state the speaker is trying to identify himself/herself with something the audience finds favorable. The speaker reminds the audience that they had favorable feelings about them in the past.

Differentiation is used to separate the speaker from a fact, sentiment, object, or relationship viewed negatively by the audience (Ware & Linkugel, 1973). The speaker shows the audience how their situation is not like other people who are accused of the same thing.

The last technique, transcendence, is joining some fact, sentiment, object, or relationship with a larger context that the audience does not see and views favorably (Ware & Linkugel, 1973). The audience may not see the bigger picture and realize the action was not as offensive in the new context. The speaker argues that other issues are more important than the charge against them.

Benoit and Hanczor expanded on Ware and Linkugel's apologia strategy and created image reconstruction. Image reconstruction gives the rhetor more options. Benoit and Hanczor (1994) base image reconstruction on five main strategies denial, evade responsibility, reduce offensiveness of event, corrective action, and mortification. Each main strategy has different ways of being achieved.

Denial

Benoit and Hanczor (1994) state denial can be done in two ways. Simple denial is the same as Ware and Linkugel define it, the rhetor denies the action occurred or denies committing the action. The rhetor may also shift the blame allowing the audience to redirect its negative feelings towards something else (Benoit & Hanczor, 1994). Benoit and Hanczor state shifting the blame works better than denial because it gives the audience the answer to "if you did not do it, who did?"

Evade Responsibility

The accused may also try to evade responsibility for the incident. Benoit and Hanczor (1994) find scapegoating or provocation allows the rhetor to claim his/her wrongful act was in response to an earlier act. The person who provoked the wrongful act will therefore be held responsible. Defeasibility is another way to evade responsibility. Benoit and Hanczor (1994) define defeasibility as the speaker claiming a lack of

information or control over the situation. The accused can also claim the incident was an accident and they were therefore not completely responsible for the incident (Benoit & Hanczor, 1994). The final technique to evade responsibility is claiming the action was done with good intentions. The rhetor asks he/she be relieved of some of the responsibility since it was done with good intentions. (Benoit & Hanczor, 1994).

Reduce Offensiveness of Event

The accused may attempt to reduce the offensiveness of the event. Bolstering attempts to strengthen the audience's positive feeling towards the rhetor (Benoit & Hanczor, 1994). Benoit and Hanczor (1994) add although the negative feeling for the act may stay the same, the positive feeling towards the speaker may help offset the negative. The rhetor may try to minimize the negative feelings associated with the incident, therefore lessening the damage to the rhetor's reputation (Benoit & Hanczor, 1994). Differentiation is defined as separating the action from similar, but more offensive actions (Benoit & Hanczor, 1994). Benoit and Hanczor (1994) write the action may be perceived as less offensive in comparison. Transcendence "functions by placing the act in a different, and more favorable context" (Benoit & Hanczor, 1994, 420). Attacking one's accuser can be another successful strategy to reduce the offensiveness of the act. Benoit and Hanczor (1994) write that if the accuser's credibility can be damaged, the damage to the speaker may be reduced. Compensation is the last technique to reduce offensiveness of an action. The accused offers to reimburse the victim through services or monetarily. The offer hopes to relieve the ill feelings from the act.

Corrective Action

The accused could also choose corrective action. The rhetor promises to correct the problem by restoring the ways before the action or by preventing the action from happening again (Benoit & Hanczor, 1994). Benoit and Hanczor (1994) differentiate corrective action from compensation by stating corrective action promises to fix the problem while compensation only pays for it.

Mortification

The last technique of image reconstruction is mortification. Benoit & Hanczor (1994) assert the accused confesses to his/her wrongful actions and begs for forgiveness. If the apology is deemed appropriate the accused may be pardoned.

The rhetor has many different rhetorical techniques to choose from in the face of accusations of a wrongful act.

Clemens made three public statements in response to the accusations of steroid use. He was interviewed by Mike Wallace on *60 Minutes*, called a press conference, and testified in front of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee. These three statements reflect Clemens' response to the allegations by Brian McNamee.

Chapter 6

***60 Minutes* Interview: “The Hardest Working Man In Throw Business”**

In Roger Clemens’ interview with *60 Minutes* host Mike Wallace, Clemens used many rhetorical strategies to absolve himself from the situation and win over public opinion. The strategies Clemens used were denial, bolstering, attacking the accuser, differentiation, defeasibility, shifting blame, and transcendence. The two strategies Clemens used more consistently throughout the interview were denial and bolstering.

Denial

From the first words spoken by Clemens, the audience could tell he would be denying the allegations. Clemens describes the accusations, “the stuff that’s being said, it’s ridiculous. It’s hogwash” (Anderson & Morgan, 2008). Interviewer Mike Wallace describes the charge by Clemens’ former trainer Brian McNamee that he injected Clemens during the ’98 season and Clemens responds “It never happened. Never happened” (Anderson & Morgan, 2008). Clemens flatly denies the charges and repeats himself for emphasis. When Wallace reads another charge about the 2001 season Clemens gives the same answer. He tells the audience “I wasn’t doing it” (Anderson & Morgan, 2008). Clemens uses denial and repetition again when questioned about his years of supposed steroid use, “Didn’t happen. It didn’t happen. It just didn’t happen” (Anderson & Morgan, 2008). Clemens reiterates throughout the interview he has never taken performance enhancing drugs. When Wallace questions him about whether he used specific drugs McNamee claimed to have injected in him, he responds “never” to each and every one (Anderson & Morgan, 2008). Clemens most common and pervasive theme was denial, but Clemens uses other rhetorical tools to help his cause as well.

Bolstering

Clemens began the interview by using bolstering. Clemens used bolstering in his first words during the interview. Clemens said he is angry that people do not believe him after “what I’ve done for the game of baseball and as a person in my private life, what I’ve done...” (Anderson & Morgan, 2008). Clemens wanted to remind the public of his great accomplishments and make it clear he was angry at all of those who were now in doubt. Clemens reminded the public of the great pitcher he was throughout his entire career, not just the years he allegedly took steroids. McNamee claimed to have injected Clemens in 1998 and 2001, two years in which Clemens won the Cy Young. Clemens responded by adding “I won in 1997 – I won the Cy Young Award, in 2004, when he supposedly – I wasn’t doing it” (Anderson & Morgan, 2008).

Clemens also mentions his famous workout habits many times. Clemens’ success has long been attributed to his tireless training regimen. When Clemens was questioned about his success at the age of forty-five he replied “You do it with hard work. Ask any of my teammates. Ask anybody that’s come here and done the work with me” (Anderson & Morgan, 2008). He tells Wallace “And I’ve worked my tail off to get where I’m at” (Anderson & Morgan, 2008). Clemens wanted the public to accept his argument that hard work brings success, not taking shortcuts like using steroids. Clemens wanted the public to know he had worked hard for everything he accomplished.

Clemens said he took care of McNamee, whom he considered to be a friend. Clemens claimed “I treated him as great as anybody else. I helped him out” (Anderson & Morgan, 2008). Clemens wanted the public to know he was nothing but nice to Brian

McNamee and Clemens was the victim in this situation. Clemens did not stop discussing Brian McNamee during the interview though.

Attacking the Accuser

Attacking one's accuser is another rhetorical strategy Clemens chose. Clemens claimed McNamee did not tell him McNamee had named him in the Mitchell Report. Days before the report came out, Clemens said McNamee asked him if he could borrow fishing equipment in Cabo, but did not say anything about the accusations. Clemens said "Doesn't say a word that, you know, I'm fixing to – I'm fixing to bury you with all these accusations." (Anderson & Morgan, 2008). Clemens attempted to make McNamee look like a backstabber. Clemens had treated McNamee as a friend, while McNamee was asking favors while secretly ruining Clemens' reputation behind his back. Clemens was asked what McNamee would gain by lying about him and Clemens replied "Evidently not going to jail" (Anderson & Morgan, 2008). When asked the reason he would go to jail Clemens added "Well, I think he's been buying and moving steroids" (Anderson & Morgan, 2008). Clemens painted McNamee as a desperate man trying to do anything to save himself, even if it meant turning in a friend.

Differentiation

Clemens also attempted to use differentiation to separate himself from his friend and teammate, Andy Pettitte. Pettitte was also named in the Mitchell Report by McNamee. Clemens attempted to make a distinction between his situation and Pettitte's. When Clemens was questioned about Pettitte's admission to use of human growth hormone, he claimed he had no idea. Wallace questioned him as to why McNamee would tell the truth about Pettitte, but lie about him. Clemens responded "Andy's case is totally

– totally separate. I was shocked to learn about Andy’s situation, had no idea about it” (Anderson & Morgan, 2008). Clemens attempted to use differentiation to separate himself from Pettitte.

Defeasibility

Clemens used defeasibility to try to make himself look innocent of taking drugs. Clemens admitted McNamee did give him shots, but of Lidocaine and B-12 for his joints (Anderson & Morgan, 2008). That was all McNamee ever gave him. Clemens explained his use of other legal drugs he was given. Clemens described taking Vioxx, once a widely used anti-inflammatory and painkiller, like candy. Vioxx would later be taken off the market for causing heart attacks and strokes. Clemens blameed his doctors saying “And now that – now these people who are supposedly regulating it tell me it’s bad for my heart...I trusted that it was not harmful. That I didn’t want to put anything in my body that was harmful” (Anderson & Morgan, 2008). Clemens told the public that despite his claims of always watching what he puts in his body, sometimes the people around him let him down. The trainers and doctors allowed him to do the harm to his body, it was not him personally. He also sent the message that he trusted his trainers and doctors fully. He would have trusted McNamee so possibly McNamee may have given him steroids without his knowledge instead of Lidocaine or B-12.

Shifting the Blame

Clemens tried to shift the blame onto the public. Clemens was frustrated about the public perception he received. Wallace asked him about going in front of Congress under oath, but Clemens replied he did not think that would win people over. Clemens told Wallace “A lot of people have already made their decision” (Anderson & Morgan, 2008).

He added later “And that’s our country, isn’t it? Guilty before innocence. That’s the way our country works now” (Anderson & Morgan, 2008). Clemens shifted the blame to the American public. He was not guilty because he used steroids, but he was guilty because the American public already believed he used steroids. Clemens said people have already made up their minds, making it near impossible for him to change that. Clemens seemed to be also setting up an excuse that even if he had evidence, it would not matter, because people already believed he took performance enhancing drugs.

Transcendence

The final rhetorical technique Clemens used to try and absolve himself of the steroid accusation was transcendence. Clemens spoke about receiving injections for painkillers when he needed to go out to pitch. Clemens told the story of before a World Series game of receiving a shot even though manager Joe Torre told him not to pitch. Clemens said “I’ll be damned if 15 minutes before I’m going to start a World Series game I’m going to go out there and look my teammates in the eye and tell them I can’t go” (Anderson & Morgan, 2008). Clemens said he did it because it was his job. Clemens conveyed to the public the bond he had with his teammates. Nothing was going to stop him from pitching. He has injected pain killers into his body, but not for himself, but for the good of the team. He could not let his teammates down, they were counting on him. Clemens later answered one of Wallace’s questions “I didn’t play my career to get fame or go to the Hall of Fame or worry about all that” (Anderson & Morgan, 2008). Clemens played for the love of the game. He did not want everything that went with being a Major League All Star pitcher, he just wanted to go out on the mound. Clemens painted himself

as a heroic figure. Even in pain he went out and did his job, because that is what real men do.

Visuals

Clemens was interviewed one-on-one by Mike Wallace in his home in Texas. The setting was one Clemens was familiar with and Mike Wallace was considered to be a friend by Clemens. Clemens did appear to be agitated at times and raised his voice, but was under control. The interview clearly was edited which allowed Clemens to seem to be well spoken. Clemens was able to answer questions quickly and say what he wanted the audience to hear.

Clemens used the techniques of denial, bolstering, attacking the accuser, differentiation, defeasibility, shifting blame, and transcendence in order try to win the support of the public. Clemens was able to use some successfully while others did not seem to work as well. Denial, bolstering, attacking the accuser and transcendence seemed like appropriate tactics in the interview.

His use of differentiation, shifting blame and defeasibility were not as successful. Differentiation did not work when he tried to separate himself from Pettitte. Not only do they share McNamee as a trainer, but the two worked out together. Clemens pitched with Pettitte on the Yankees and the Astros and they were considered good friends. It is difficult to believe the two trained together and were friends, but Clemens knew nothing of Pettitte's human growth hormone use. Clemens also never explains how his situation is different than Pettitte's. He does not give a reason why McNamee would tell the truth about other players, but lie about himself.

Shifting the blame did not work well because he blamed the public. Clemens was clearly angry that people believed he had used steroids, but not everyone was going to believe Clemens. Plenty of people still probably believed Clemens. It was not a good decision to blame the people you are trying to win over.

Defeasibility can work, but after all the claims of a strict training regimen and knowing what went into his body, it was difficult to believe he could have taken steroids or any harmful drug without his knowledge.

Clemens interview worked in some parts, but suffered in others. Clemens should have used just a few strategies. Overall Clemens seemed credible.

Chapter 7

Clemens Press Conference: Dial 1-800-Cle-mens

Roger Clemens called a press conference on Monday, January 7th 2008 in order to help proclaim his innocence from steroid use and clear the air over his interview on *60 Minutes*. The press conference lasted about forty five minutes with words from Clemens' attorney Rusty Hardin and Clemens. They also played a seventeen minute taped phone conversation between Clemens and Brian McNamee. Throughout the press conference Clemens continued to use image reconstruction to deny his use of performance enhancing drugs to try to restore his reputation. The biggest techniques used in the press conference were defeasibility, denial, bolstering, and attacking the accuser. Clemens also used shifting the blame, transcendence, minimization, and provocation.

Defeasibility

Clemens used defeasibility when he tried to explain why he did not meet with the Mitchell investigators. Clemens was asked if it was a good idea that his legal counsel told him not to appear in front of Senator Mitchell. Clemens replied "From what I've learned now that they [Clemens' representatives] asked them [Mitchell commission] what it was about and they would not respond what it was about" (personal communication, January 7, 2008). Clemens claimed to not know if he had been named in the report and saw no reason to meet with the investigators. Clemens added "Obviously if I had known what Brian McNamee was saying about me, I would have been there" (personal communication, January 7, 2008). Clemens wanted to make it clear he did not know what McNamee had said to investigators. This story matched with he said on *60 Minutes*. Earlier in the press conference though Hardin explained McNamee had met with Clemens' investigators and told them what he said to the Mitchell investigators. Hardin

explained “Two investigators meet with Brian McNamee in New York, they interview him for several hours. He is totally cooperative, totally forthcoming and basically tells them the same story that has been reported he told the Mitchell commission” (personal communication, January 7, 2008). Hardin said he met with Clemens about what the investigators reported. Clearly Clemens knew something. Hardin attempted to use defeasibility to explain how Clemens still did not have total knowledge of the situation. Hardin admitted to not knowing names would be used until the morning of the release of the Mitchell Report. Hardin stated about the McNamee information “We wouldn’t know until the next morning whether that was actually going to be in the Mitchell Report, whether his [Clemens] name was going to be in there, and whether the information Brian McNamee reported to him was going to be in there” (personal communication, January 7, 2008). Although Clemens knew what McNamee said, he did not know until days before the report and did not know whether it would be in the report. Clemens claimed defeasibility in his knowledge of the use of performance enhancing drugs in baseball. He said “It wasn’t something that was talked about in the clubhouse in a big way...It wasn’t something that was just out there that I ever discussed or talked about” (personal communication, January 7, 2008). He said it was not discussed in clubhouses and steroid use was not out there for everyone to know. Clemens would have little reason to meet with the Mitchell investigators since he was lacking knowledge about the situation. He reiterated his point that he lacked knowledge of Pettitte’s use of human growth hormone (HGH). “Andy and I never talked about it. The only time steroids or a subject of that nature came up was when it was newsworthy and we talked to it in passing. When I first learned of Andy I said ‘Never’ (personal communication, January 7, 2008).

He used defeasibility by stating he did not know McNamee did not have a medical degree. “He was a licensed trainer from what I was told.” Clemens added he worked with both the Yankees and the Blue Jays on the training staff. Clemens’ statements of defeasibility are consistent with his *60 Minutes* interview and help to explain some of his actions.

Denial

Clemens denied using steroids throughout the press conference and in the taped phone conversation. Hardin opened the press conference describing when Clemens first heard the allegations “He [Clemens] strongly denied them, acted very shocked” (personal communication, January 7, 2008). Hardin added “His position I will tell you now has never varied.” Clemens has continued using denial throughout the process.

In the phone recording Clemens talked about the “untruths.” Clemens said “so much of it is untrue, its tearing everyone apart” (personal communication, January 7, 2008). He repeated to McNamee “I just need you to come out and tell the truth” (personal communication, January 7, 2008). Clemens was clearly making the point that what was being said about him was false. Clemens told McNamee “I didn’t do it, this, you know all this stuff, and like I said I’m numb to everything” (personal communication, January 7, 2008). Clemens continued denying he ever used performance enhancing drugs.

Bolstering

Bolstering also comes across in the recorded conversation as McNamee repeated that Clemens treated him better than family. Clemens stated he treated McNamee fairly and McNamee would interrupt “You treated me better. You treated me like family” (personal communication, January 7, 2008). Clemens came out looking like a good

friend. McNamee added “You treated me better than anybody, you treated me, I’ve learned from you how to raise my kids. I learned from you how to raise my kids” (personal communication, January 7, 2008). McNamee told Clemens “Everything I have to this day, I have because of you” (personal communication, January 7, 2008). Although later in the conversation McNamee pleaded to Clemens “My wife is gone, my kids are gone, what do you want me to do?” (personal communication, January 7, 2008). Clearly McNamee did not owe all that much to Clemens.

The idea of the heroic figure can also be seen in Clemens’ statements. Clemens told a reporter “This not about records and heroes and numbers. I could give a ---- about that” (personal communication, January 7, 2008). He only cared about his health. Later told the reporters “I got another asinine question the other day about the Hall of Fame. You think that I played my career because I’m worried about the damn Hall of Fame. I could give a ----- about that also” (personal communication, January 7, 2008). Clemens reminded the public of his accomplishments in baseball.

Bolstering was also used when Hardin discussed George Mitchell in the introduction to the press conference. Hardin stated Mitchell was a man of great integrity and Clemens was not trying to belittle the report by Mitchell. Clearly Clemens was belittling another man.

Attacking the Accuser

Clemens main theme of the press conference was attacking the accuser. This press conference was supposed to ruin the credibility of the man who named Roger Clemens in the Mitchell investigation. By saying Mitchell was a man of integrity and would never print misinformation, Hardin was basically stating that McNamee had lied to Mitchell.

He also refused to blame the government, stating Clemens lawyers phrased everything “according to McNamee” (personal communication, January 7, 2008). Clemens and Hardin made it very clear that they thought the misinformation came from McNamee. Hardin also talked about how the charges against Clemens were “so untrue” perhaps McNamee “changed his mind” and show up to clear Clemens (personal communication, January 7, 2008). Hardin wanted the public to believe McNamee just fabricated a story and would now feel guilty about it. The recorded phone conversation was purely used to attack McNamee. Clemens continually told McNamee to tell the truth. McNamee never once told Clemens he used steroids. He constantly asked Roger “what do you want me to do?” even almost to the point of begging him. McNamee came across as willing to do anything for Clemens, even once saying “I’ll go to jail. I’ll do whatever you want me to do” (personal communication, January 7, 2008). McNamee did not come across as a reliable witness if he was able to be swayed. At one point Clemens says “I didn’t do this Mac” and McNamee responded with a quick “fine” (personal communication, January 7, 2008). The conversation made McNamee look like someone who could be pushed around. McNamee never once said his story was false though.

Clemens also attacked the media, whom he believed to be his other accuser, the media. Hardin said “Many of you in all your due respects have already made up your mind” (personal communication, January 7, 2008). Hardin felt it was unfair that people had already made up their mind without hearing Clemens’ story. The media had already condemned Clemens in the public.

The most visible attacks came from Clemens who was already upset that he even had to be at the press conference. He began by apologizing to his college baseball coach

because he could not be at his son's funeral since he had to be at the press conference. He continued saying to the reporters "I'll answer your question even though there are some in the audience that I am very uncomfortable even looking at right now. For things that I have, again, I am just going to try and rise above it" (personal communication, January 7, 2008). He believed they did not give him the benefit of the doubt and did not look into the facts. Clemens visually became more upset as the press conference went on, at one point snapped at reporters "can I drink water, is that like or is that good or bad? And I can swallow" (personal communication, January 7, 2008). Critics had hypothesized why Clemens drank so much water in his *60 Minutes* interview and some believed it was due to nervousness. Later Hardin handed Clemens a card that read "lighten up" after he continued to raise his voice. Clemens read the card aloud and answered "it's hard." He then continued about a *Los Angeles Times* article that had named Clemens in the steroid scandal previously. The *LA Times* corrected the story and issued an apology to Clemens, but Clemens was still upset. Clemens continued to raise his voice, shouting "How do you prove a negative? Do I just keep shelling out millions? Is that what I do?" (personal communication, January 7, 2008). Clemens finished the press conference "I can not wait to go into the private sector and hopefully never have to answer it again" (personal communication, January 7, 2008). An obviously agitated Clemens then left the podium.

Shifting Blame/Transcendence

Hardin began the press conference by trying to explain Clemens' actions after the unveiling of the Mitchell Report and his statements on *60 Minutes*. Hardin attempted to shifted the blame for Clemens' lack of a formal statement following the Mitchell Report on to himself. Hardin explained saying he did not want Clemens to make any statements

in public due to possible future legal proceedings. Hardin was just hired and did not know if the accusations were true or false. He did not know Clemens well yet and could not anticipate what an agitated Clemens might say. Hardin used transcendence in this instance. He stated he did not want Clemens to make any public statements that could lead to possible perjury charges. Clemens' silence looks less offensive when compared to the bigger picture of possible perjury charges. If Clemens said something in reaction to McNamee's statement that Hardin later found out to be false, Clemens would go to jail and Hardin would look like a terrible lawyer.

Minimization

Clemens used minimization to explain his B-12 shots to reporters. Reporters asked why a professional athlete would need B-12 and Clemens responded "I've taken it forever." He added "I don't think the public's aware of how often guys, I'm not the only one that receives the shots from trainers, doctors, nurses. But it's quite often and its very common" (personal communication, January 7, 2008).

Provocation

Clemens decided to record a phone conversation with McNamee and play it for the reporters. A reporter asked if it was legal for Clemens to tape a phone conversation. Hardin responded saying it is legal in New York and Texas to record a phone conversation if one party is aware of it. Clemens used provocation in this instance to explain his decision to tape the conversation. Clemens claimed he was provoked to tape this conversation to prove his innocence.

Visuals

The press conference was a visually awkward and poorly constructed attempt to follow the *60 Minutes* interview. The *60 Minutes* interview allowed for a more controlled atmosphere. Clemens could anticipate some of the questions and was put in a more relaxed environment. The press conference did not allow for that to happen. Clemens and Hardin sat onstage at a table with a podium to their left from which they would talk. During the seventeen minute taped conversation both sat at the table listening with the media present. Clemens sat doing nothing, tapping his pencil and looking down the whole time. Sitting in place for seventeen minutes is never an aesthetically pleasing visual. When Clemens got up for his question and answer session he was visually angry. He was very short with reporters and kept raising his voice, sometimes snapping at the reporters. He did not come across any better in the conversation.

During the taped phone conversation Clemens came across as a bully. Clemens kept demanding someone needed to come forward to tell the truth while McNamee kept asking what he should do. Clemens at one point told McNamee he did not know who could be on their phone lines. McNamee responded no one was on his line, but he did not know Clemens was taping the conversation. Clemens looked like a liar. Although the tape was damaging to McNamee's story, it mostly made him look pathetic. McNamee was pleading with Clemens over what to do and Clemens continued to say to he wanted the truth to come out. Not once did McNamee say his story was untrue, but rather kept begging Clemens over what to do. McNamee did use the line "it is what it is and it's not good. I want it to go away" (personal communication, January 7, 2008). McNamee would later claim this line "it is what it is" was his way of saying the story was true.

Overall the press conference was a failure. Clemens used the same techniques he had used in the *60 Minutes* interview and we learned nothing new. Clemens still denied using steroids and claimed he had no knowledge of steroid use around him. His rhetorical techniques were overshadowed by his obvious anger over the situation. All we saw was an agitated Roger Clemens and heard him bully a desperate, pathetic Brian McNamee over the phone. The press conference was a poor choice at that time. Perhaps a brief press conference earlier to deny the accusations may have worked, but Hardin dismissed the idea. A later press conference with an obviously agitated client repeating prior statements was not a wise choice either.

Chapter 8

Congressional Hearing Testimony: Mr. October and Miss-Remembers

On February 13, 2008 Roger Clemens, Brian McNamee, and Mitchell Report attorney Charles Scheeler answered questions from the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. The three men answered questions about the validity of Brian McNamee's claim Roger Clemens used steroids written in the Mitchell Report. In the hearing both Clemens and McNamee attempted to use techniques of image reconstruction to prove they were the more trustworthy source. Clemens used denial, bolstering, attacking the accuser, and defeasibility. McNamee chose mortification, defeasibility, and good intentions. Congressmen and Congresswomen also influenced what was said and how it was viewed. Most Congressmen and Congresswomen chose a side and it could be seen in their questioning. The most intriguing portion of the testimony came from someone who was not even present, Andy Pettitte. The sworn testimony of Pettitte influenced the credibility of both Clemens and McNamee.

Roger Clemens

Denial. Clemens continued to stick to his main defense of denial. He refused he had ever taken performance enhancing drugs of any kind from Brian McNamee and had never used them in his life. In closing his opening statement Clemens told the committee "Let me be clear: I have never taken steroids or HGH" (personal communication, February 13, 2008) Clemens later talked about a *Los Angeles Times* report where Clemens and Andy Pettitte were named as using steroids. Andy asked him how he was going to respond and Clemens told the committee he replied "I'm going out here and I'm going to tell them the truth. I did none of this" (personal communication, February 13, 2008). Clemens repeated himself later in the testimony "Brian McNamee has never given

me growth hormone or steroids” (personal communication, February 13, 2008). Clemens made his denials clear throughout the testimony.

In his deposition Clemens repeatedly denied ever talking about human growth hormone (HGH) with Brian McNamee. Later in the deposition Clemens admitted to discussing HGH with McNamee after McNamee injected Debbie Clemens, Roger’s wife. Clemens credibility came under fire for the inconsistency in the deposition. Clemens continued to deny talking about HGH with McNamee though. Clemens said “Congressman, again, I never had any detailed discussions with Brian McNamee about HGH” (personal communication, February 13, 2008). Clemens lost credibility in this exchange.

Bolstering. Another staple of Clemens rhetorical techniques was bolstering. Throughout Clemens’ public statements he reminded the public of his success in baseball and his famous work ethic. In the Congressional testimony it was no different. Clemens used his opening statement to help bolster himself. Clemens spoke about his work ethic and family, “I’ve always believed that hard work and determination were the only ways to be successful and to reach goals. Shortcuts were not an option. This was instilled in me since I was a young boy by my mother and grandmother” (personal communication, February 13, 2008). Clemens talked not only about his hard work, but about his family values. Clemens later repeated his strong relationship with his mother, “I was raised by great, strong women, my mother and my grandmother. They gave me my will and my determination” (personal communication, February 13, 2008). Clemens talked about being able to tell his sons he played the game the right way. Clemens wanted to make sure everyone knew family was important to him. Clemens spoke about his attitude, “I

am a positive person and I enjoy doing things for others. I'm not just a ballplayer. I'm a human being" (personal communication, February 13, 2008). Clemens continued saying "If I'm guilty of anything, it is of being too trusting of everyone, wanting to see the best in everyone, and being too nice to everyone" (personal communication, February 13, 2008). Clemens bolstered himself by continually telling the committee he cared about cleaning up baseball especially for younger kids. He wanted the committee to know he believed these hearings were necessary for informing youth about the dangers of steroids. Clemens painted the picture of a caring, hard working, positive, family man who was now being taken advantage of.

Clemens bolstering was not effective in some cases because Clemens would not actually answer the question he was asked. It seemed sometimes if Clemens could not answer the question immediately, he would ramble on about his own greatness. The biggest evidence of this occurred when Representative John J. Duncan, a Republican from Tennessee, asked "Mr. Clemens, did you refuse to meet with the Mitchell Commission?" (personal communication, February 13, 2008). Clemens continued his claim that he did not receive an invitation and began a rant "But I'm a public person. I am easy to find. When the commissioner asked me to get myself together to go out there and the league asked me to put USA on my chest and represent my team, my country, I did everything I could do to get ready" (personal communication, February 13, 2008). Clemens talked about this story of pitching for the USA, but it had nothing to do with the question. Clemens did not help himself because it just looks like he was evading a simple question.

Attacking the Accuser. Clemens had many accusers including Brian McNamee, the Mitchell Report, and Andy Pettitte. Clemens attacked McNamee in his opening statement saying “People who make false accusations should not be allowed to define another person’s life” (personal communication, February 13, 2008). Clemens told the committee McNamee was lying and it was ruining Clemens reputation. Clemens was also attacking the media because Clemens’ alleged steroid use had become the biggest topic in sports. Clemens was no longer discussed as the possible best pitcher of all time, but now was the possible best player to use steroids. Clemens attacked McNamee again, “if I knew what – the lies this man was telling about” (personal communication, February 13, 2008). Clemens called McNamee a liar. Clemens referred to him only as “this man” and would not even use his name. Clemens read a note from his wife about how McNamee injected her with HGH and described her feelings, “She has been broken up over this for a long time, and she said to me now she feels like a pawn amongst his game” (personal communication, February 13, 2008). Clemens made McNamee look manipulative, trying to take advantage of Mrs. Clemens and using her to ruin him.

Clemens attacked the Mitchell Report on several occasions for not contacting him so he could defend himself against McNamee’s accusations. Clemens claimed the player’s union and his representatives received the invitation, but he never got the information. When Clemens was asked if someone from the player’s union would know how to get in touch with him Clemens replied, “I believe being one of the more visible players in the game over the last years – that that courtesy would’ve been extended to me” (personal communication, February 13, 2008). Clemens attacked the Mitchell Report and the Player’s Union for not doing enough to alert him of the allegations.

The most damaging allegations came from Clemens' teammate, training partner, and friend, Andy Pettitte. In his affidavit Pettitte told the investigators Clemens admitted to him he was taking HGH. When Clemens was questioned about Pettitte's character he said "Andy's a fine gentleman" (personal communication, February 13, 2008). Clemens was asked by Representative Elijah Cummings "What possible motive would Mr. Pettitte have to fabricate a story about you, his friend? To which Clemens replied "Andy would have no reason to" (personal communication, February 13, 2008). Clemens only response to Pettitte's accusation was "I think he misremembers" (personal communication, February 13, 2008). Clemens could not attack the character of Pettitte, unlike McNamee, and was left with the excuse of a misunderstanding.

Defeasibility. Clemens used defeasibility to explain his decision not to speak with the Mitchell Commission. In his deposition Clemens claimed "I had no idea that Senator Mitchell wanted to talk to me. If it was about baseball and steroids in general, I would have wanted to see him" (personal communication, February 13, 2008). Clemens continued by saying "Congresswoman, the fact of the matter was I was never told by my baseball agent/attorney that we are asked to come down and see Senator Mitchell (personal communication, February 13, 2008). Clemens said he did not know of any invitation from the Mitchell Commission yet Representative Carolyn Maloney quoted Roger from his *60 Minutes* interview, "I listened to my counsel, I was advised not to. A lot of the players did not go down and talk to him as well" (personal communication, February 13, 2008). Clemens' story broke down as he admitted to Mike Wallace of *60 Minutes* he knew about the invitation, but was told not to visit with the Mitchell Commission. Clemens tried to reconcile it by saying "And with all respect, Senator

Mitchell, from what I understand, again, was asked by members of the player's association, 'What do you have to talk about with these players and would you please tell us what it is?' And they said, 'We're not going to respond to that. You'll have to come down and see us' (personal communication, February 13, 2008). Clemens changed his story about his knowledge of the invitation to meet with the commission, but claimed he did not know what the meeting was about.

Brian McNamee

Mortification. McNamee in his opening statement immediately admitted to distributing performance enhancing drugs and apologized for it. McNamee said "I want to be clear that what I did was wrong. I want to apologize to the committee and to the American people for my conduct. I have helped taint our national pastime. I hope that my testimony here today allows me, in some small way, to be part of this solution" (personal communication, February 13, 2008). McNamee continued "My father, who served for 24 years with the New York City Police Department, instilled in me that people are human and make mistakes and that I should always step up and acknowledge my mistakes despite the consequences" (personal communication, February 13, 2008). McNamee used mortification, bolstering, and took a shot at Clemens all in the same statement.

Defeasibility. McNamee used defeasibility to explain the inconsistencies in his testimony about the amount of performance enhancing drugs he gave to athletes. McNamee stated "When I first provided information to federal investigators, I had not spent much time going back over these facts and trying to piece together the details....In the following weeks and months, I've had the opportunity to think about these events and consider the specific drug regimens used. As a result, I now believe that the numbers of

times I injected Roger Clemens and Chuck Knoblauch was actually greater than I initially stated” (personal communication, February 13, 2008). McNamee’s lack of knowledge earlier in the process caused the change in his testimony. Representative Tom Davis questioned McNamee about his testimony that he injected Clemens with Winstrol, a performance enhancing drug, in the Tampa Bay clubhouse during the 1998 season and asked “And I’m just saying, could your memory be faulty on this?” (personal communication, February 13, 2008). McNamee replied “very much so” (personal communication, February 13, 2008). McNamee’s defeasibility explained his inconsistencies and problems with his story, but they also damaged his credibility.

Good intentions. McNamee used good intentions to further explain the changes in his testimony as time has passed. McNamee admitted “I lied to police officers to protect friends, ball players, coaches and myself, with whom I worked” (personal communication, February 13, 2008). McNamee replied to a question about misleading investigators and replied “The part about the injections were part recollection and part withholding, trying not to hurt these players” (personal communication, February 13, 2008). McNamee admitted to withholding information to help protect players he knew. He also cited defeasibility in his explanation of why he did not tell investigators everything. McNamee was just trying help his friends.

Bolstering. Although bolstering was difficult for McNamee due to his admitted withholding of information, steroid distribution, and past run ins with the law, he tried his best. In his opening statement McNamee ended “Yet, the spotlight generated by Senator Mitchell’s report and this hearing can help clean up the drug culture in baseball so that young people no longer see performance-enhancing drugs as a necessary shortcut to

success” (personal communication, February 13, 2008). McNamee wanted to show he cared about young kids by showing steroid use was bad.

McNamee also attempted to bolster by mentioning his father was A New York City police officer and McNamee used to be a New York City police officer himself.

Lastly McNamee was bolstered by the fact Andy Pettitte and Chuck Knoblauch, the two other players McNamee named in the Mitchell Report, admitted to use of performance enhancing drugs. Representative and Chairman Henry Waxman cited the two players’ support of McNamee’s statements in his opening statement. Although difficult McNamee tried to highlight his character when he could.

Other Factors

The player’s statements were not only influenced by their desire to support their claims and bolster their character, but also by the Congressmen and Congresswomen. Many times Congressmen or Congresswomen questions, reactions, and statements would show who they believed. The worn affidavit of Andy Pettitte also made a difference in the proceedings. Both of these were crucial in the hearing.

Congressmen/Congresswomen. Representative Dan Burton, a Republican, attacked McNamee, questioning him about his changes in his testimony. He continually asked McNamee questions about inconsistencies which McNamee already admitted to. He stopped to ask Clemens one question, which Clemens struggled to answer, before returning to questioning McNamee. Burton ended “Okay. You know, I’m not going to read any more of this. This is really disgusting....I know one thing I don’t believe, and that’s you” (personal communication, February 13, 2008). Burton had already made it very clear he did not believe McNamee. He listed one inconsistency after another that

McNamee had already confessed to lying about. Burton described Clemens as “a titan in baseball” giving Clemens the status of a heroic figure (personal communication, February 13, 2008). Meanwhile belittling McNamee as a liar.

Representative John Duncan, another Republican, after asking why he did not meet with the Mitchell Commission, replied to Clemens’ answer that he pitched for Team USA “And I appreciate everything you just said” (personal communication, February 13, 2008). Duncan said the report was rushed out and was “based on the statements by a man who, unfortunately, has admitted here several times today that he has lied to law enforcement people and many others and based on information from a man who I understand pled guilty in court and received a five-year sentence this past Friday” (personal communication, February 13, 2008). Clemens’ answer to Duncan’s question mostly had nothing to do with the question. It was Clemens attempt to bolster himself and Duncan’s response was to thank him. Duncan already clearly had his mind made up that he believed Clemens. Duncan ended by saying “I spent five and a half years as a bat boy for the Knoxville Smokies baseball team, clubhouse boy, ball chaser, scoreboard operator. I grew up in minor league baseball and there was a bond between bat boys and the trainers. I hate to hear what I’ve heard from Mr. McNamee today. I think it’s a sad thing” (personal communication, February 13, 2008). Duncan was obviously a baseball fan.

Representative Darrell Issa, a Republican, and Representative Christopher Shays, a Republican, teamed up to attack McNamee. Shays said “Mr. McNamee, you are a drug dealer” (personal communication, February 13, 2008). McNamee attempted to defend himself by saying he did what the players asked. Later Issa attacked McNamee “I just

did what they asked,' You know, that's what every drug pusher says is, ' We wouldn't be selling them if they weren't asking for them'" (personal communication, February 13, 2008). Both Shays and Issa compare McNamee to an everyday drug dealer.

Representative Elijah Cummings, a Democrat, attacked Clemens. Cummings continually asked Clemens about Pettitte's testimony. Clemens had a hard time answering his questions about Pettitte. Cummings ended "All I'm saying is it's hard to believe you, sir. I hate to say that; you're one of my heroes. But it's hard to believe you" (personal communication, February 13, 2008). Cummings admitted he did not believe Clemens.

Representatives attacked both witnesses for the inconsistencies in their testimony and questioned both rather equally. For the most part it was divided down party lines though, with Republicans believing more in Clemens' story and Democrats believing more in McNamee's. McNamee was attacked more vehemently by his questioners though. Many seemed to be in awe of Clemens stature as a great pitcher as opposed to the self admitted lying McNamee who was a failed cop and trainer. It was so bad that Representative Waxman in his closing statements addressed McNamee, "I want you to know, though, that as chair of this committee I appreciate all your cooperation with our investigation, and I want to apologize to you for some of these comments that were made" (personal communication, February 13, 2008). Waxman did not make such a statement to Clemens. Clearly some Congressmen and Congresswomen had already made up their minds on whom they believed and made it clear in their questioning of the witnesses.

Andy Pettitte. One of the key witnesses and influential men in the case was not even present. Andy Pettitte told the committee in a sworn affidavit that Clemens told him he used HGH. Pettitte throughout the hearings was praised as a credible source. Rep. Waxman lauded Pettitte in his opening statement “He found himself in an extremely uncomfortable position but he did the right thing and told the truth....Mr. Pettitte’s consistent honesty makes him a role model on and off the field” (personal communication, February 13, 2008). Pettitte’s mortification made him into a credible person according to many on the committee. Even Clemens bolstered Pettitte “I believe Andy to be a very honest fellow, yes” (personal communication, February 13, 2008). Pettitte was seen as a credible source by everyone in the hearing.

Representative Cummings compared the character of Pettitte to the character of Clemens. Rep. Cummings said “In his deposition, Mr. Pettitte was honest and forthcoming with the committee” (personal communication, February 13, 2008). Rep. Cummings clearly was sending a message to Clemens to be truthful in front of the committee. He repeated over and over Pettitte’s honesty when discussing his allegations against Clemens. In the end Rep. Cummings said “If I walked in here and it was even-stein between you and Mr. McNamee, I must tell you the person that I believe most is Mr. Pettitte. Clearly the person that looked the most credible during these hearings was Andy Pettitte.

Visuals

The setup was a bit odd with Clemens only ten feet from McNamee with Mr. Scheeler placed in the middle. In a dispute as heated and involving as much as this one, it was surprising to see no real dispute between the two. The setting inside of a

Congressional hearing also may have caused the two to act civilly. After the emotion shown on the recorded phone call, one may have expected more emotion in the room.

Clemens did not look comfortable answering some difficult questions, looking down and struggling for words. Many times if Clemens could not think of an answer, he would ramble. Clemens could be seen getting irritated at times and pointed at McNamee on some occasions when referring to him.

McNamee came across a little better. McNamee answered in brief sentences. He did not elaborate many times or ramble. Although McNamee could be seen becoming irritated, especially when Representative Shays called him a drug dealer, McNamee never really raised his voice and seemed calm. Overall McNamee came across as more credible because of his mortification and brief, to the point answers. Both had inconsistencies in their testimony, but McNamee's mortification over lying and withholding evidence made him look better. It questioned his credibility, but apologizing helped cover that. Clemens seemed like he had something to hide. He would try to cover up inconsistencies with more stories or excuses of misunderstandings. Also the vehement attacks by Congressmen and Congresswomen on McNamee helped him look like a more sympathetic figure. Clemens gradually over the course of his public statements had lost more credibility.

Chapter 9

The Rocket Has Landed

Clemens reputation as one of the greatest pitchers in baseball history definitely took a hit on December 13, 2007. After years of being held up as one of the hardest working men in baseball and a role model for kids, one allegation put everything in question.

Clemens choice of denial was a risky one because there are no other alternatives once a denial is stated. If any evidence of steroid use by Clemens was uncovered Clemens' credibility, reputation, and career would be done. It was also a difficult situation because it pitted one man's words against another's'. There was no physical proof or evidence of Clemens using or not using steroids. The fate of Clemens would rest solely on his words and the words of others. Clemens may have believed his reputation would far surpass that of McNamee in public opinion.

Clemens did well in his *60 Minutes* interview. He denied steroid use and bolstered himself. He attacked McNamee's credibility and made McNamee look like he was out to get Clemens. Clemens did not do the interview live and it was edited by *60 Minutes'* producers. Clemens may have been given some questions ahead of time, but at the very least he could anticipate what he would be asked. It allowed Clemens to package what he could say to make himself look good. Clemens was also interviewed by Mike Wallace, a friend of Clemens. Gene Wojcieszowski (2008) writes "Clemens got a familiar face (Wallace first interviewed him in 2001), a self-admitted admirer and gobs of prep time for the make-or-break interview." Clemens did not have any time constraints and probably received multiple takes to gather himself. Overall it was a controlled

environment for Clemens. By far Clemens came away looking the most credible in the *60 Minutes* interview.

Clemens reputation began to fall apart after his press conference. Clemens played the 17 minute taped phone conversation that McNamee did not know was being recorded. Clemens allowed the whole world to know about the condition of McNamee's ill son and seemed to be bullying McNamee during the conversation. Clemens sat awkwardly there while the press and everyone watching at home listened to this "private" conversation. Clemens then answered questions from the media. Clemens could not anticipate these questions and on some occasions become visibly agitated. Clemens snapped at reporters and was not composed. His attorney, Rusty Hardin, had to tell him to lighten up and finally Clemens walked away from the podium, refusing to take any more questions. Clemens began to look less like a victim and more like a bully trying to scare McNamee into changing his story. On the taped recording McNamee never said Clemens took steroids, but he never said he was lying. The tape provided no benefit to Clemens so it only made his tactics look worse.

The testimony in front of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee was the worst choice by Clemens. Chairman Henry Waxman admitted to possibly canceling the hearings, but Clemens' attorneys wanted him to speak in front of Congress. Clemens looked uncomfortable in front of the committee, often stumbling for words and rambling. He did not know what the questions would be and therefore could not prepare answers ahead of time. Clemens was undone by testimony of his friend Andy Pettitte that claimed Clemens discussed his use of human growth hormone with Pettitte. Clemens had no answer for the testimony other than Pettitte "misremembered" the

conversation. On February 27, 2008 Chairman Waxman released a memorandum about the credibility of Clemens' testimony in front of the committee. Waxman summarized "seven sets of assertions made by Mr. Clemens in his testimony that appear to be contradicted by other evidence before the Committee or implausible" (Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 2008, p. 1). The seven assertions in question were Clemens' testimony he never took steroids or HGH, McNamee injected him with lidocaine, trainers gave him pain injections, he received vitamin B-12 injections, he never discussed HGH with McNamee, he was not at Jose Canseco's home from June 8-10, 1998, and he was never told of Senator Mitchell's request to interview him. Some representatives on the committee did not believe him and it is public knowledge (Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 2008).

Clemens' reputation continued to be hurt following a story in the *New York Daily News* on April 27 with allegations of an extra-marital affair with country singer Mindy McCready. The two knew each other starting when McCready was 15 years old. Clemens' attorney, Hardin, confirmed a relationship between the two, but said it was not sexual (Thompson, Vinton, & Red, 2008). In an interview with the *New York Daily News* McCready admitted to the affair (Thompson, O'Keeffe, Vinton & Red, 2008a). The *New York Daily News* also reported an affair with a former Manhattan bartender named Angela Moyer. Moyer refused to comment on her relationship other than admitting that she knew him (Thompson, O'Keeffe, & Red, 2008). The *New York Daily News* reported Clemens had an affair with Paulette Dean Daly, the former wife of golfer John Daly. Paulette Dean Daly did not comment on her relationship with Clemens, but did not deny

the allegations of an affair (Thompson, O’Keeffe, Vinton & Red, 2008b). Clemens bolstered himself as an upstanding, family man. These allegations bring it into question.

Clemens answered these allegations on May 4, 2008. Clemens admitted to “mistakes” in his personal life, but would not elaborate (Ortiz, 2008). Clemens continued to say the articles contained many false accusations, but that he had made some mistakes. Clemens apologized to his family (Ortiz, 2008). He did repeat he never used steroids and his “mistakes” did not have anything to do with performance enhancing drugs (Ortiz, 2008). Clemens appeared to use mortification in apologizing, but still claimed the articles were not completely truthful. If Clemens was choosing mortification, he should have been committed to it. His credibility was eroding by the day.

It is difficult to determine Clemens’ best rhetorical choice he should have made to restore his image. The choice depended on whether or not Clemens did use steroids. If Clemens did not take steroids, denial is the only choice. Clemens should have not been so aggressive in his attacks of McNamee and should not have played the recording of their conversation. Clemens brought personal issues to the public and McNamee admitted to being angry about them. McNamee went from trying not to hurt Clemens to being the catalyst for his public relations catastrophe.

If Clemens did use steroids he should have used mortification. People tend to forgive if the guilty party admits and apologizes for their offensive act. Clemens’ reputation and popularity may have helped him restore his image after admitting steroid use. His image would have been perceived negatively, but not as bad as it is now. The person who did a better job of choosing the appropriate image restoration strategies was his friend and former teammate, Andy Pettitte. Pettitte admitted to using human growth

hormone and was held up as an honest man doing the right thing. The committee even went so far as to say he was a role model for his actions. Clemens' steroid use is still not definitively known so his best rhetorical choice can not be determined. Clemens' choices of public statements can be questioned though. Clemens should have used fewer restoration techniques and made less public statements.

Chapter 10 Crash and Burn

As of today, Clemens is not able to restore his image to prior December 13, 2007. In his public statements, Clemens has looked irritated, confused, and evasive. Under a controlled environment Clemens was able to seem credible. Once Clemens was placed in front of a live audience and forced to answer questions, his credibility began to fall apart.

Clemens used many of Benoit's image restoration techniques with less and less success each time. The more Clemens was forced to answer questions and tell his story, the more Clemens began to look less credible.

Future sports stars should look to the case of Roger Clemens as an example of what not to do. If a person is not well spoken and does not have a cohesive story, it is not a good idea to put them in the public too often. The case to emulate is that of Andy Pettitte.

It is difficult for famous sports players to fight off accusations of wrongdoing. Many times the accuser has far less to lose than the player. The media also spreads the accusations quickly leading the public to make assumptions of guilt. All of these factors were working against Clemens.

Clemens should have used denial if he did not use steroids. He should have been less aggressive in his attacks of Brian McNamee a Clemens never should have played the taped phone recording. Clemens definitely should not have testified in front of Congress. What made the decision more puzzling was Clemens' attorneys' insistence that Clemens speak in front of Congress. Clemens was a baseball player, not a public speaker. Overall Clemens did more damage to himself publicly over time. Brian McNamee became more

credible as Roger Clemens' personal family problems became public. Roger Clemens struckout in his three attempts at restoring his image.

Works Cited

- (1998, September 30). A season for the ages. *The San Francisco Chronicle*, pp. A20.
- (1998, December 31). Home run kings top historic year. *Chicago Sun-Times*, pp. 102.
- Anderson, R. & Morgan, C. (2008, January 6). *60 Minutes* [Television broadcast]. New York: CBS Interactive Inc.
- Associated Press (1998, September 30). McGwire's impact is awesome. *Tulsa World*, pp. 3.
- Benoit, W.L., & Hanczor, R.S. (1994). The Tonya Harding controversy: An analysis of image restoration strategies. *Communication Quarterly*, 42 (4), 416-433.
- Blum, R. (1996, April 11). High price of the baseball strike; The 232-day strike cost team owners \$700 million; \$350 million for players. *Rocky Mountain News*, pp. 2B.
- Bryson, L. (1987). Sport and the maintenance of masculine hegemony. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 10 (4), 349-360.
- Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. (2008). *Testimony of Roger Clemens*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Cullen, K. (2007, December 17). A true fan of the game. *Boston Globe*, pp. B1.
- Dodd, M. (March 31, 2006). *Is George Mitchell independent enough?*. Retrieved April 3, 2008, from http://www.usatoday.com/sports/baseball/2006-03-30-mitchell-role_x.htm
- Gantz, W. (1981). An exploration of viewing motives and behaviors associated with television sports. *Journal of Broadcasting*, 25 (3), 263-275.
- Gantz, W., Wang, Z., Paul, B., & Potter, R. (2006). Sports versus all comers: Comparing TV sports fans with fans of other programming genres. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 50 (1), 95-118.
- Grossfield, S. (2007, December 15). Mitchell: 'There are very, very many others.' *The Boston Globe*, pp. D1.
- Harris, J.C., & Hills, J.A. (1993). Telling the story: Narrative in newspaper accounts of a men's collegiate basketball tournament. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 64 (1), 108-120.

- Mitchell, G.J. (2007). *Report to the commissioner of baseball of an independent investigation into the illegal use of steroids and other performance enhancing substances by players in Major League Baseball*. New York, NY: Office of the Commissioner of Baseball.
- O'Brien, K. (2007, December 19). Rocket: I never used 'roids: Clemens denies Mitchell Report. *New York Newsday*.
- Olney, B. (2006, April 1). An outside-the park investigation. *The New York Times*, pp. 15.
- Ortiz, J. (May 4, 2008). *Clemens apologizes for 'mistakes,' still denies drug use*. retrieved May 4, 2008 from <http://www.chron.com/disp/story.mpl/hotstories/5753146.html>.
- Our Press Services. (1995, March 27). AP poll shows baseball strike eroding interest. *The Commercial Appeal*, pp. D3.
- Poor, N. (2006). Playing internet curveball with traditional media gatekeepers: Pitcher Curt Schilling and Boston Red Sox fans. *Convergence: The international Journal of Research into New Media Technologies*, 12, (1), 41-53.
- Rader, B.G. (1983). Compensatory sport heroes: Ruth, Grange and Dempsey. *Journal of Popular Culture*, 16 (4), 11-22.
- Roger Clemens*. retrieved February 10, 2008 from http://mlb.mlb.com/team/player.jsp?player_id=112388
- Roger Clemens career biography and statistics*. retrieved March 27, 2008 from <http://www.allsports.com/players/roger-clemens/>
- Roger Clemens: Professional career*. retrieved February 10, 2008 from <http://redsox21.com>
- Shaikin, B. (2007, December 14). Baseball's drug report; A dark day for the game; Mitchell names 86 players as users and spreads blame for 'Steroid era.' *Los Angeles Times*.
- Shpigel, B. (2006, March 30). Mitchell is expected to oversee inquiry into steroid use. *The New York Times*, pp. 5.
- The Mitchell Report: The illegal use of steroids in Major League Baseball, day 2. Hearing before the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, House of Representatives, 110th Cong., (2008)*. Retrieved April 28, 2008, from <http://www.lexis-nexis.com/congcomp>

- Thompson, T., O’Keeffe, M. & Red, C. (April 29, 2008). *Source: Roger Clemens had several women, flew them on private jet*. Retrieved May 2, 2008 from http://www.nydailynews.com/sports/baseball/yankees/2008/04/29/2008-04-29_source_roger_clemens_had_several_women_f.html
- Thompson, T., Vinton, N., & Red, C. (April 27, 2008). *Sources: Roger Clemens had a 10-year fling with country star Mindy McCready*. Retrieved May 2, 2008 from http://www.nydailynews.com/sports/baseball/yankees/2008/04/27/2008-04-27_sources_roger_clemens_had_10year_fling_w.html
- Thompson, T., O’Keeffe, M., Vinton, N. & Red, C. (April 28, 2008). *Mindy McCready weeps as she confirms affair with Roger Clemens*. Retrieved May 2, 2008 from http://www.nydailynews.com/sports/baseball/yankees/2008/04/28/2008-04-28_mindy_mccready_weeps_as_she_confirms_aff.html
- Thompson, T., O’Keeffe, M., Vinton, N., & Red, C. (April 30, 2008). *Roger Clemens linked to John Daly’s ex*. Retrieved May 2, 2008 from http://www.nydailynews.com/sports/baseball/yankees/2008/04/30/2008-04-30_roger_clemens_linked_to_john_dalys_ex.html
- Trujillo, N. (1991). Hegemonic masculinity on the mound: Media representations of Nolan Ryan and American sports culture. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 8, 290-308.
- Trujillo, N. (1992). Interpreting (the work and the talk of) baseball: Perspectives on ballpark culture. *Western Journal of Communication*, 56, 350-371.
- Trujillo, N. & Ekdorn, L. (1985). Sportswriting and American cultural values: The 1984 Chicago Cubs. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 2, 262-281.
- Trujillo, N., & Krizek, B. (1994). Emotionality in the stands and in the field: Expressing self through baseball. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 18 (4), 303-325.
- Ware, B.L., & Linkugel, W.A. (1973). They spoke in defense of themselves: On the generic criticism of apologia. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 59, 273-283.
- Wojciechowski, G. (January 2, 2008). *Wallace should throw high and tight with Clemens interview*. retrieved April 30, 2008 from http://sports.espn.go.com/espn/columns/story?columnist=wojciechowski_gene&id=3174965&sportCat=mlb.
- Zagacki, K.S., & Grano, D. (2005). Radio sports talk and the fantasies of sport. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 22 (1), 45-63.