



This is a repository copy of *Tension in the union of art and sport: Competition for ownership of the baseball statuary and its influence upon design.*

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/102791/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Stride, C.B. orcid.org/0000-0001-9960-2869 and Thomas, F.E. (2017) Tension in the union of art and sport: Competition for ownership of the baseball statuary and its influence upon design. *NINE: A Journal of Baseball History and Culture*, 24 (1-2). pp. 1-28. ISSN 1188-9330

<https://doi.org/10.1353/nin.2015.0030>

© 2017 University of Nebraska Press. This is an author-produced version of a paper subsequently published in *NINE*. Uploaded in accordance with the publisher's self-archiving policy.

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

Tension in the Union of Art and Sport: Competition for Ownership of the Baseball Statuary and its Influence Upon Design

Christopher Stride & Ffion Thomas

Christopher Stride

Institute of Work Psychology, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, United Kingdom

Dr C B Stride, Institute of Work Psychology, University of Sheffield, Mushroom Lane, Sheffield, S10 2TN
c.b.stride@sheffield.ac.uk
+44 114 2223262

Dr Chris Stride is the statistician at the Institute of Work Psychology, University of Sheffield. He has published across a wide range of social science disciplines, even poking a toe into pure science or humanities upon occasions, and is particularly interested in the use of statistical methods to support and add rigour to research in areas where advanced quantitative analysis would typically be considered an anathema.

Ffion Thomas

School of Sport, Tourism and The Outdoors, University of Central Lancashire,
Preston, United Kingdom

Ffion Thomas, School of Sport, Tourism and the Outdoors, University of Central Lancashire, Preston, PR1 2HE
ega07fet@sheffield.ac.uk

Ffion Thomas is a postgraduate student at the University of Central Lancashire, UK, with research interests in football and baseball, and is currently investigating the impact of nostalgia upon the visual culture of sport.

Correspondence to c.b.stride@sheffield.ac.uk

Tension in the Union of Art and Sport: Competition for Ownership of the Baseball Statuary and its Influence Upon Design

Abstract

Sculptures of athletes are both an ancient art-form and a modern phenomenon. The unveiling of over 150 statues of baseball players within the US since 1990 represents the first cohesive integration of public sculpture and a contemporary professional sport, simultaneously boosting a nascent sport sculpture industry. Yet to what extent is this union an appropriation, or a meeting of equals?

An emerging artistic genre would typically be founded upon stylistic innovation, yet the baseball statuary has remained traditional in design. This inertia is posited as reflecting tension in the ownership of sport statues, with the artist's desire to create subordinated to the commissioning *body's commercial imperatives*, *the subject's family's influence*, and the scrutiny of a devoted fan base perceived as seeking an idealised representation..

However where typical patterns of project ownership or branding strategies are perturbed, convention is being challenged incrementally. Based upon an examination of the form and ownership of the baseball statuary, and detailed case studies of two statues of atypical form, we conclude that an evolution in design is occurring, and that it will increasingly be driven by the growing influence of the professional sportsman on the use of his own image, as much as by artistic creativity.

Keywords

Statue, sculptor, baseball, ownership, art

Tension in the Union of Art and Sport: Competition for Ownership of the Baseball Statuary and its Influence Upon Design

Introduction

‘Public monuments do not arise as if by natural law to celebrate the deserving, they are built by people with sufficient power to marshal (or impose) public consent for their erection.’ Kirk Savage, author.¹

‘The purpose is not to make art; it’s to show real people as they really were.’ Henry Thomas, statue subject’s relative.²

‘This is not just about sports; it’s about art.’ Omri Amrany, sculptor.³

For professional sports organisations in North America, Europe and Australia, player recruitment is no longer limited to sportsmen and women. Since the early-1990s, stadium precincts and downtown plazas have been adorned with figurative sculptures of athletes, cast in heroic action or imperial eminence. The USA’s national pastime of baseball has embraced this fashion enthusiastically. By 1 January 2016, 218 figurative statues of specific baseball players, managers, executives, broadcasters and even fans were in situ across North America. Such ubiquity reflects how sport sculpture now forms one of the most visible interactions between the cultural communities and businesses of art and sport.⁴

In this study we investigate the concept of ownership of sport statues, their role in proclaiming ownership of territory, history and a distinct identity, and the interaction of ownership and design. Focussing upon baseball, we examine the tension between an artist’s desire to express creativity, and the often countervailing push of the commissioning organisation’s commercial imperative. We posit that the balance of power between the businesses and cultures of sport and art with respect to the construction of sport statues will contribute to homogeneity of design. However, through a close inspection of two recently-erected statues of atypical appearance, we argue that where the balance of project ownership departs from the norm, a greater degree of design innovation may occur. Furthermore, we consider the implications of recent commercial trends and legal developments on the future commemoration of

sport stars and explore how changes in funders' profiles and motivations may result in a parallel reappraisal of design aesthetics.

The Business of Sculpture meets the Business of Sport

Sculptures of athletes are both an ancient art-form, pioneered in life-size or greater by the Greek and Roman civilisations - yet also a modern phenomenon.⁵ The unveiling of over 150 statues of baseball players within the US since 1990 represents the first cohesive integration of public figurative sculpture and a contemporary professional sport, simultaneously sustaining a flourishing sport sculpture industry. Yet to what extent has this union been an appropriation of sport by art, of art by sport, or a meeting of equals?

Spotlighting figurative sculpture within baseball reveals the primacy of artistic inspiration over external commissioners in the infrequent early examples, which date from the dawn of the professional game.⁶ The first such monument located away from a grave was conceived and sculpted by Douglas Tilden: 'The Ballplayer' was exhibited in Paris, New York and San Francisco.⁷ Early 20th century sculptures of Christy Mathewson and Babe Ruth also debuted as gallery pieces, with subject and design choice resting with the sculptors.

The genesis of the modern ballpark statue honouring a franchise's baseball hero can be seen in 'Honus Wagner' (Forbes Field, Pittsburgh, 1955) and 'Stan Musial' (Busch Stadium I, St Louis, 1968).⁸ However these unveilings were interspersed with sculptor-led gallery-sited pieces (e.g. Rhoda Sherbell's 'Casey Stengel', 1965); and civic commissions such as Joe Brown's monumental 'The Batter' and 'The Play At Second' (Veteran's Stadium, Philadelphia, 1975-1977).⁹ It was the arrival of retro-styled ballparks, heralded in the Major Leagues by the success of Baltimore Orioles' Camden Yards, and accompanied by a cornucopia of similarly nostalgic decoration adjacent to and inside such facilities, that kick-started statue production on a far greater scale.¹⁰

There has been minimal academic discourse on sports statues until recently, in part due to the contemporary nature of this phenomenon, but also reflecting a broader lacuna of reference to visual artefacts amongst sport historians noted by Huggins and O'Mahony.¹¹ Published research focused specifically upon baseball's statuary is limited to just three articles, though studies on sport statues, which have begun to

appear within the disciplines of history, sociology and tourism, form a growing and stimulating literature on the motivations behind, and narratives of a handful of individual examples.¹² These essays most often focus upon atypical statue subjects with wider cultural significance, such as barrier-breakers or war heroes, or statues that are instruments of reparation or biography.¹³

However few articles comment upon the nature and implications of the relationship and balance of power between the artist and the culture he is working within (nor do any incorporate contextual quantitative evidence from statuary to contextualise or extrapolate conclusions drawn from case studies). As monument historian Kirk Savage opines 'Public monuments do not arise as if by natural law to celebrate the deserving, they are built by people with sufficient power to marshal (or impose) public consent for their erection'.¹⁴ A statue's construction reflects but also creates heritage, by demonstrating how the society that erected it, particularly those with power and influence within that society, developed and ordered ideas about the historical importance, relevance and effect of individuals and occupations, moments and achievements. A sportsman's statue may accentuate or mask the importance of technique and power, highlight race or even religion, celebrate or conceal the host institution or place of birth. Hence identifying a monument's owner(s) is of critical importance in interpreting it, since it is likely to be their motivations that shape individual and collective memories in shared public space.

Before examining the balance of ownership between representatives of the worlds of art and sport, we consider potential owners of a sport statue within each of these overarching categories, the relationship between owner profile and motivations for statue construction, and the likely impact upon design of owner profile and motivations.

Ownership of a sport statue: claimants and their claims

Even without stakeholders' competing claims, the multivalence of the construct of ownership itself facilitates simultaneous multiple 'owners'. Legal ownership is the most tangible form, yet may still be contested. When a sport statue is considered as a purely material object, its legal owner is the commissioning body who has funded, or raised the funds for the monument, or whoever they have gifted it to. However, unlike abstract sculpture or landscape painting, a subject-specific sports statue portrays a

widely recognised public figure, and may have commercial value in the context of their image rights. Sports lawyer John McMillen and art historian Rebecca McMillen examined contested ownership between a commissioning body and subject over the use of the latter's image, noting that, although artistic freedom has so far prevailed in civil disputes, primarily due to First Amendment rights taking precedence over a subject's personal image rights, the legal situation is not fully resolved and may be subject to future challenge.¹⁵

Beyond the strictures of legality, further tensions around sport statue ownership exist between a series of stakeholders who perceive a claim to the object or subject. Consider first those from the sporting sphere, whose primary association with the statue will be through the subject. A sport organisation or civic body may perceive a statue of their past player or manager as their property even if commissioned by a non-official committee of fans or residents. The subject depicted, (and the uniform he may be depicted wearing) are representatives of their club or city. If they have granted permission for the statue to be sited on their land, this claim will be enhanced.

However, the ownership of almost any part of a sport organisation, from tangible objects such as the stadium and its environs, present players, colours, trophies, mascots and even pre-game music, to intangibles such as the histories, memories and ethics, may be contested by fans. The fans' claim is based on multiple factors: some cite longevity, others knowledge and hereditary rights, on the basis that owners and players may come and go but 'true' supporters will always remain, and hence know and care more. Sociologist Holly Swyers, describing the most ardent Chicago Cubs fans, notes that 'while they cast themselves consistently in the fan role, their shifting analysis of the Cubs' corporate interests shows how such assignments are more about claiming the moral high ground.'¹⁶ Fans also push a financial argument for ownership, with their purchase of tickets and merchandise funding the organisation.¹⁷ These two strands may create amongst the most ardent a sense that the club is theirs, accentuated if the legal owners are perceived as lacking commitment.¹⁸ Therefore a stadium-sited bronze image of a club hero will naturally be 'claimed' by fans; it depicts their hero, and is located on their territory. Likewise, where commissioners site a statue in a public plaza, city centre or park, with public access even without public ownership, local residents will come to regard a monument in that space as their own through its familiarity or even imposition.

A further sports-related claim on ownership comes from the subject depicted, not only via the aforementioned legal perspective, but through a sense of a moral entitlement to self-determine public representation. Especially where a subject is deceased, the claim upon the subject's image may extend to immediate family or descendants: a conferred ownership through a sense of responsibility for, or bestowed guardianship over the collective memory of a loved one or blood relative. Residents within the locality of a subject's birth may also see themselves as caretakers of their native son's image, since his achievements reflect on them through his upbringing and childhood experiences.

In conflict with these claims associated directly or indirectly with the business of sport, come those under the umbrella of the 'art business'. First, the sculptor has an indubitable claim, expressed visibly through a signature, upon the fruit of their creativity and interpretative skill. An ownership claim such as this also has commercial implications. Past output creates a portfolio used in obtaining future commissions, hence the importance of claiming, or have a positively received artwork identified as theirs. Second, most frequently where a statue is erected in a civic setting, and especially where that monument is primarily organised and funded by a civic body, the project committee will contain representatives from the local arts or culture department, with varying degrees of interest in and knowledge of sport or indeed the subject being portrayed. Their sense of ownership derives from a professional responsibility for providing critically and publically well-received artwork for their city.

The motivations behind sport statues, and their interaction with ownership in influencing design

We now consider the scenarios in which baseball player statues arise with respect to instigation, funding and location; and explore the association between relative claims of ownership, and the aims and motivations behind statue construction. We then consider the implications of these motivations upon design.

First, where baseball franchises fund statues and site them at their ballparks (or franchise-specific Halls of Fame), the balance of ownership lies with the franchise. Their impulse to commemorate the past grows out of present needs. An overarching motivation will be to reflect the distinctive brand of their organisation upon their own

stadium environment. A variety of strategies are in play: the proclamation of success by basking in reflected glory (thus attracting and retaining supporters by boosting their self-esteem through vicarious achievement);¹⁹ creating a distinct visual identity to tattoo their ownership upon the stadium environment; attracting, strengthening and maintaining allegiance through evoking nostalgia;²⁰ and the associated provision of an ‘authentic’ vista via the mimetic properties of statuary, in an attempt to counteract the ‘McDonaldised’ environment of a modern sports stadium with its lack of ‘real’ built heritage.²¹ Hence a stadium-sited statue is a multi-faceted tool potentially facilitating every stage of the awareness, attraction, attachment and allegiance model for consumer loyalty to sports teams outlined by marketing researchers Daniel Funk and Jeffery James.²² However, a franchise-commissioned statue is also an object, a subject and an interpretation of history imposed upon the fans. In this sense it is a totem of the sport organisation’s ability to control their stadium environment and wider identity.

The impact upon design of such strategies will collectively encourage traditional realist portrayals of the subject selected in part for their playing era. Evoking nostalgia intrinsically relies on recognition, hence the recreation of a definitive playing style or a specific moment through pose and expression, and is most effective when portraying a subject active within the viewer’s adolescence or young adulthood.²³ Successfully reflecting glory from a great player likewise depends on the viewer identifying the hero or victory proclaimed. A statue is an effective marketing tool in part through its ability to deliver an immediate visual impact. To maximise this advantage, the subject has to be instantly recognisable. The aim of proclaiming the franchise’s primacy will likewise ensure that any player portrayed is clearly clothed in the franchise’s playing uniform.

Given the overarching motivation of creating a positive brand image, and the associated short-term public relations benefit upon unveiling, franchises naturally want existing supporters to receive the statue positively. As such, where the franchise is the legal owner of a statue, the fans still have influence regarding the image, if not primary ownership of the image: in terms of both subject selection and statue design, the franchise’s understanding of their fans’ opinions will be accounted for. Similarly the subject’s family and friends will perceive ownership over the image produced and the messages evoked. Each will desire a recognisable depiction that foregrounds positive traits, abilities and achievements. Where a ballpark statue project is developed by fans, a rare occurrence but not unknown, the balance of ownership and

priorities will be weighted differently, yet the direct impact of fan nostalgia upon design will have the same effect as that due to franchise perception of and acknowledgement of fan preference.²⁴ As psychologist Alan Hirsch notes in his treatise on nostalgia, the past is usually a sanitised place.²⁵ Such idealism automatically shrinks the design possibilities.

Where a community group or informal alliance of residents and commercial interests organises and funds a statue, many of their motivations will parallel those of a sport organisation. A community that has lost traditional industry, or lacks notable landmarks or artefacts through which to project a distinct history and culture, faces the same issues of lack of identity as the modern stadium. In such an environment, 'history has become heritage, heritage has become a resource.'²⁶ Hence cities use it to inwardly reimagine and outwardly reimage themselves to compete in 'an increasingly symbolic place economy.'²⁷ A statue may be erected to generate identity and a sense of place and home, reflecting a topophilic attachment; or to bask in the glory of a successful native son, and perhaps his hometown values.²⁸ The image produced will again prioritise recognition of the subject and his field of achievement.

Hence, even where a ballpark-sited statue has contested ownership, or a statue is sited away from a ballpark, and even if motivations and aims vary, claimants upon ownership who could be said to be within the business of sport - or even just sport-connected, be it through legal ownership, support, or relationship with the subject - will align their design priorities towards traditional realism. This will specifically result in portrayals of the subject in action or posed with baseball equipment (therefore distinguishable as a baseball player), and which are often strict reproductions of popular or significant photographic images i.e. flashbulb memory designs.²⁹

It might be argued that ownership claimants from the art industry would hold a diametrically opposed design preference, prioritising artistry and invention over conservatism and tradition. Whilst this may well be true for statues commissioned by arts professionals, relatively few baseball monuments have emerged through this route. Such projects would most likely be sited in civic locations where the statue subject choice would not be confined to, or even prioritise a baseball player.

One would suppose that a sculptor would desire personal artistic freedom, to produce authentic art, and receive recognition as an authentic artist from an audience that may not be acknowledged by (or relevant to) sport organisations or their fans –

namely art critics and fellow sculptors, whose opinions will be weighted towards artistic judgements that go beyond realism, in part due to an element of peer pressure arising from the unfashionable status of figurative art and 'mere reproduction'.³⁰ As McMillen and McMillen remark, 'Ironically, a realistic sculpture of an athlete today is considered bad art, whereas, the greatest honour an athlete in Ancient Greece could receive was an exact replica of his image.'³¹

However, we argue that the commissioning process typically compels a sculptor's eventual design aesthetic to deviate from personal preference towards an alignment with those of the sport-related ownership claimants. For sport organisation funded statues, the organisation usually chooses or shortlists a sculptor on the basis of previous work, without the open competition for commissions associated with civic-funding, and provides a photograph or strict remit from which to propose a design.³² This process fuels homogeneity of design in three ways. First, sculptors are denied the opportunity to even pitch for work if their portfolio does not match the realist ideal sought by the commissioning body. Unable to propose innovation via an open competition, sculptors wishing to break into sports sculpture will be forced to tailor their work to suit what is expected. Second, where photographs are pre-selected as statue designs, they are likely to depict either playing action, often a flashbulb memory lodged deep in the consciousness of fans; or posed compositions originally designed for promotional purposes.³³ Finally, where multiple statues are sequentially erected at the same ballpark, pressure exists to maintain a consistent sculptural style, increasing the likelihood of the initial sculptor being awarded subsequent commissions.³⁴

Hence, especially for ballpark-sited statues, the balance of ownership claims of the funder, fans, subject and subject's family upon the statue, and the resulting alignment of design preferences even when their motivations may vary, ensure that the only other ever-present competing owner - the sculptor - is effectively hired to produce a pre-specified heritage object rather than to interpret or design; a process of recreation rather than creation. A sculptor's ability to insert their own artistic signature, or to experiment in ways that might result in wider artistic development of the genre, will be limited to minor personal motifs such as patination techniques, and will not constitute meaningful genre development or heterogeneity within the wider statuary.

Therefore, though claims upon ownership may be multiple, stylistic evolution will be consistently stymied where franchises, fans, community or family have a primary claim. We now consider two strands of evidence for this rationale. First, to assess our claims as to design homogeneity and the relationships between ownership, location and design, we consider these variables across the complete baseball statuary. Second, by selecting two designs that differ from the norm, we examine how atypical ownership and the resulting motivations or strategies can contribute towards variation.

The North American baseball statuary: ownership and design characteristics

Methodology

The selection of baseball as an example sport was based on both the size of its statuary, and its relative maturity, both of which enables a greater degree of contextual background to be assessed. The number of baseball statues around the world (almost all located within the US, with a handful of examples in Canada, Japan, Mexico and the Caribbean islands) is only exceeded by soccer globally, with no single nation/sport combination approaching the US baseball statuary in size; UK soccer, for example, has a smaller, though growing statuary numbering over 70 subject-specific statues as of January 2016.³⁵ Though the hypotheses outlined above could be generalised to it, the point at which its numbers began to grow exponentially can be placed between 5 to 10 years after the equivalent moment in US baseball.³⁶ Numerous causes and facilitators can be hypothesised as driving baseball's precedence and prevalence in statue development. These include the aforementioned fashion in ballpark construction, baseball's unique ability to provoke nostalgic feelings within generations of spectators, a sense of the past as a better place being enhanced by a players' strike and admissions of steroid use; wealth; relative sophistication of marketing strategies, and contagion.³⁷

To assess ownership profile, we identified and collected data on every subject-specific baseball statue in situ across the North American continent, using an archival and web search, and interviews with sculptors and statue project organisers to gather information.³⁸ Variables collected can be classified as relating to either the visual image (i.e. the statue itself, its design type and detail), the site of production (e.g. the sculptor, funder, project instigator), or the site of reception and seeing (e.g. the location).

Results

As of 1 January 2016, 218 statues, and two further public-sited figurative sculptural artworks that could not be strictly classified as statues, depicting specific baseball players, managers, executives, broadcasters and, in one instance, fans, were in situ across North America. At least 30 further statues feature non-subject-specific baseball-related figures.

Within the subject-specific statues (to which our statistical analysis is confined given the potential importance of subject choice in relation to ownership, and other variables considered) 184 distinct subjects are portrayed at least once, of which 71% are players, 9% managers, 14% executives, 5% broadcasters and 1% fans. Though for just over half of the statues, the subject (or at least one subject where multiple figures) was alive at the date of unveiling, all but 7 of the player subjects had retired from an active role in baseball by this time. 51% are sited at MLB ball parks, 13% at Minor League parks, 15% in non-professional-ballpark urban locations such as city parks, plazas or malls, 11% in Sports Museums or Halls of Fame, 8% at colleges or schools, and the remainder in miscellaneous commercial locations or graveyards.

Of the 123 statues sited at MLB ballparks or franchise-specific Halls of Fame, the vast majority (85%) were commissioned and funded directly by the franchise concerned or their commercial sponsors. Alternative (i.e. non-sport organisation) funding streams are more prevalent where a statue is sited away from a ballpark. In an urban location such statues were most likely to be funded by public appeals, donations from fans and local residents.

56% of statues depict the subject in playing or coaching action; 28% are posed; 11% capture interaction with fans; and just 5% are of triumph designs (where the subjects are celebrating). The latter type of design, whilst rare, is more likely to occur when funding is from an individual donor or commercial source.

Unsurprisingly, posed designs are more commonly found depicting the more static contributors to the game, such as executives and broadcasters. Tables 1a and 1b illustrate the relationships between project promotion and funding, and location and design.

<Table 1a, 1b here>

The relationship between location and funding profile, and the existence of variation in both, posits statue ownership as heterogeneous. Despite this, almost every sculpture can be said to be sculpted in a realist figurative style; just 11 of the subject-specific statues display any type of abstract features. Furthermore, within these stylistic restrictions, variability in design is further limited by the dominance of design type by posed or action designs as detailed above. The two figurative sculptures that were of such exceptional design that they could not be considered statues or even standard busts were a giant head of Jackie Robinson, sited alongside a similar image of his brother Mack, in downtown Pasadena, CA; and the hands of Ralph Kiner clutching a bat, sited at PNC Park, Pittsburgh, PA.

We now consider two statues in detail, both of which, compared to the orthodoxies identified above, are outliers in their combination of legal or perceived ownership.

Case Studies: atypical ownership and design variation

Walter Johnson, Nationals Park, Washington DC, unveiled 8th April, 2009
Opened in 2008, Nationals Park represents a recent example of the fashion for a retrospectively designed ballpark in a downtown location. Yet the associated motif of statues depicting former players presents a unique tension for the Washington Nationals. Relocating from Montreal in 2005, they became professional baseball's fourth incarnation in the USA's federal capital, following the Senators/Nationals/Statesmen of 1891-1899, the Senators of 1901-1960 (who adopted the Nationals suffix for the seasons 1905-06) and the 'new' Senators of 1961-1971.³⁹ In addition, the Negro League Homestead Grays, notionally based in Pittsburgh, played up to two-thirds of their fixtures at the Senators' former Griffith Stadium from the start of the 1940s to the collapse of the Negro Leagues in 1948, and often outdrew the generally struggling Senators.⁴⁰ Whilst this franchise lineage confer a sense of baseball history upon Washington, the disrupted lineage, demolition of their previous ballparks and the void preceding the new Nationals arrival collectively dilutes the representation of the current franchise's heritage through tangible artefacts, be they genuine or reimagined. The effectiveness of heritage objects in branding the Nationals and proclaiming their ownership over the new stadium would be debateable. With

baseball absent from Washington for 33 years, two generations passed without either childhood memories of supporting a ‘local team’, or the associated learning and socialised nostalgia that game day rituals provide, such as the oral history of support recounted to children by their elders on the way to the ballpark.⁴¹

As such, Nationals Park would have been expected to eschew the fashion for subject-specific statues in the same way that recent expansion franchises have, be it due to lack of suitable subjects, or an associated history.⁴² Yet in 2009, three statues of baseball players of yore were unveiled by the ballpark’s center field gate (they were moved to the home plate gate in 2015) Perhaps unsurprisingly, given the absence of Nationals-specific heritage, these statues were neither commissioned nor funded by the franchise. Instead they were erected as part of a city-wide public art programme, financed from the public purse, with the DC Commission on the Arts and Humanities (DCCA) and the DC Creates Public Art Program (DCCPAP) undertaking commissioning.

On 13 March 2009 the statues were announced in a press release that included the following paragraphs:

The DC Creates Public Art program of the DC Commission on the Arts and Humanities (DCCA) is thrilled to announce the dedication of two new public art works at Nationals Park. These exciting projects showcase public art to the approximately 2.5 million patrons attending baseball games at Nationals Park each year. This places significant artworks in Center Field Plaza and along the main concourse, which adds to the texture of an up and coming and vibrantly diverse retail neighborhood....

...The artworks were selected by a jury of stakeholders, DC residents and arts professionals at the end of a competitive process. Both projects are commissioned and owned by the DC Creates Public Art Program and the DC Commission on the Arts and Humanities. The projects have been commissioned in collaboration with the Washington Nationals (WN), the DC Sports and Entertainment Commission (DCSEC), and Hellmuth Obata and Kassabaum, P.C. (Architect), for the stadium. Local officials are hoping the ballpark will not only be a sports venue serving as a cornerstone for the new Anacostia River waterfront entertainment district, but also be viewed as an impressive sports architecture and arts destination.⁴³

Despite being ballpark-sited, the Nationals’ statues represent a departure from the host sport organisation’s legal ownership status almost always associated with

stadium artworks. . The civic authorities' ownership of the project, in particular the primary role of the creative arts community within the City Administration, is clear from the foregrounding of art ahead of both subjects and baseball in their press release, and the desire for the stadium to be viewed as an 'arts destination'. Moreover, as a publicly-funded arts project, the sculptor was chosen via an open competition. This was won by Timeless Creations Inc., now renamed Studio Amrany, a prolific Chicago-based sculpture business with a focus on sport stars.⁴⁴ To emphasise the arts community's deep involvement in the project, the competition was judged by a committee of arts professionals supplemented by members of the public and project stakeholders (including a representative of the Nationals). In designing an artwork for, and then working alongside an arts-centred body, the sculptor had potentially greater freedom to interpret the sporting image in an unconventional format. Likewise, this process gave an arts-based body the chance to reject a traditional ballpark statue form in favour of innovative design.

Three heroes from Washington's baseball past were selected by the project committee in advance of sculptor selection.⁴⁵ Josh Gibson, widely regarded as the finest hitter of the Negro League era, represents the history of the Homestead Grays; Walter Johnson, whose peerless pitching led the Senators to their only World Series triumph in 1924, is the icon for the longest-established Washington franchise; and Frank Howard, a mighty slugger, is portrayed to acknowledge the Senators final incarnation. Gibson and Howard are depicted hitting, Johnson pitching. However the statues are not standard figurative action formats. Attempting to capture what he terms as 'the fourth dimension, that of movement' by using an effect similar to that of a stop-motion photograph, sculptor Omri Amrany has given Gibson, Johnson (Figure 1) and Howard multiple arms.⁴⁶ 'Motion blur' styling has become the signature motif of Amrany's sporting work, first appearing in a truncated form on his 1994 statue of basketball star Michael Jordan, and subsequently expanded on his studio's sculptures of six Detroit Tigers hitters and pitchers.⁴⁷ The Nationals' statues represent Amrany's most ambitious implementation, which represents genuine innovation within the sphere of sport sculpture, but also reflects a primacy of art over realism (in terms of accurate representation of sport) within the design. The multiple pitching arms of Johnson (and multiple bats of Howard and Gibson) capture movement of a single limb, whereas the mechanical essence of both pitching and hitting involves rotation of the torso and transference of weight. Therefore the sculpture does not reflect these

techniques as they would be seen, experienced or understood by a player or committed fan. This posits the multiple limbs as a primarily artistic adornment.

<Figure 1 Here>

Whilst gaining approval of the DCCAH, the statues divided opinion amongst fans and relatives of the subjects when unveiled. The most notable negative comments came from Walter Johnson's closest living relatives, who voiced their strong disappointment at the portrayal, specifically the multiple right arms of their legendary forbear. Johnson's grandson reflected the need for a subject's family to see their relative as they perceive them: 'The guy was my grandfather, for heaven's sake, and this absolutely negates the whole thing. I will have a difficult time going to ballgames now and seeing the statue.' As a more general reflection of the tension between competing stakeholders within the businesses of art and sport, the latter proxied by the relative of a sportsman in this instance, he further commented, 'The purpose is not to make art; it's to show real people as they really were.'⁴⁸ Though the Arts Committee, via Executive Director Gloria Nauden, offered a gentle public defence, the sculptor was more forthright: '[The statue] is not some frozen figure. This is not just about sports; it's about art... Everybody can criticize art because there are a lot of elements. But the fans always have the final judgments.'⁴⁹

Hence Amrany initially proclaims ownership of the artwork for the arts community in a statement that constituted a partial rebuttal of Thomas' claim. However, by further declaring that fans have the final judgement, Amrany appears to concede ownership of the subject's image to the supporters, on the basis that the subjects are primarily their heroes. This is disingenuous in several respects. First, there is no evidence that supporters were or are seeking artistic progression in the way their heroes are depicted; in fact their natural minimum expectation would be to see their heroes 'as they really were'. Secondly, in this instance the supporters lack the claim of ownership upon image (or even the desire to claim it) that would be expected with a typical ballpark statue. All three subjects represented different franchises that lack a direct lineage or even locational continuity with the existing Nationals (despite the attempt of the plaque inscriptions to provide that: Johnson is described as having played for the Washington Nationals - during his playing career they were commonly known as The Senators)⁵⁰. In the cases of Gibson and Johnson, only a very small

percentage of existing Nationals fans could have seen either in action. Hence, the sculptor is freed from the expectation of having to recreate an image or playing style with which many people will feel familiarity or ownership of.

Third, even if perceiving ownership, fans do not have a specific ‘right to reply’ channel. Whether or not their views have been taken into account in subject selection or design, fans have very limited influence in having a statue removed or altered. Throughout the inventory of ballpark or civic-instigated statues researched, we did not find a single example of a franchise or public arts committee attempting to systematically gauge the fans reactions post-unveiling. Fans do not get the platform to ‘review’ a statue in the same way that an art critic does.

However, in one respect, the fans, and more widely, the sport does have ownership of this artwork. By locating the artwork inside the ballpark, access is limited to those who pay to attend a ballgame or take a ballpark tour. Though the DCAHH legally owns the artwork, and the design flourishes symbolize the sculptor’s and the wider art industry’s ownership of this sports statue, the object itself has effectively been gifted to a baseball organisation. It might therefore be seen as an evangelistic artefact, sent from an arts industry seeking to innovate within the world of sport.

Albert Pujols, Westport Plaza, St Louis, unveiled 2nd November 2011

It is extremely rare amongst the baseball statuary (and indeed the wider sports statuary) for an athlete to be honoured in bronze during their career.⁵¹ Therefore the statue of Albert Pujols presents a distinctly atypical example: the only case of a single statue of baseball player, erected to commemorate his achievements for a particular club or franchise, being unveiled whilst he was still an active representative of them. Moreover Pujols was not approaching retirement in 2011 – rather, he was at the peak of his powers, having just completed a season of personal and collective triumphs.⁵²

The rarity of statues featuring contemporary players is undoubtedly related to the use of the genre in evoking or reflecting fan nostalgia – but also to a wider tradition in statuary. Subjects require an achievement to be honoured for, or a death to be memorialised. The latter scenario precludes career-coincident portrayals; and for many occupations, the magnitude of their achievement, be it a scientific discovery or political leadership, will often become apparent only after their career has concluded, or even after their death. This tradition has translated to the modern fashion for sport

statues, though subjects may be just as likely to achieve their greatest feats early in their career as later, and outstanding performance may be instantly quantifiable through reference to statistical record.

In 2010 an anonymous donor who wished to honour Pujols both for his sporting achievement and also his charity work within the city of St Louis commissioned a statue St Louis Cardinals' first baseman, funding and gifting the artwork to Pujols' charity foundation.⁵³ Pujols had represented the Cardinals with distinction for the previous decade, receiving numerous accolades including nine All-Star team appearances, and selection as the National League MVP on three occasions. He also contributed to franchise success as an integral part of World Series winning teams in 2006 and 2011. Pujols' popularity within the city was boosted by the work of his charity, the Pujols Family Foundation, created in 2005 with the twin aims of supporting families and children who live with Down's Syndrome, and providing 'education, medical relief and tangible goods' for impoverished children in Pujols' native Dominican Republic.⁵⁴ The charity has distinct religious overtones that reflect the Christian faith of its founder. The website proclaims 'The Pujols Family Foundation is a national not-for-profit agency that exists to honor God and strengthen families through our works, deeds and examples.'⁵⁵ Pujols has frequently spoken about his faith in interviews concerning both baseball and his wider profile.⁵⁶

Harry Weber was chosen to sculpt Pujols, in part due to an expectation that eventually the statue would be sited at Busch Stadium upon the slugger's likely future election to the National Baseball Hall of Fame. The Cardinals have a policy of honouring their Hall Of Famers with a statue. Weber has sculpted 11 of the 12 monuments in situ at Busch Stadium, each action poses, but his sculpture of Pujols is very different. Unusually the statue subject took the lead in creating a design, one which depicts the great slugger celebrating a home run by raising both fingers and head upwards as a mark of his religious convictions (Figure 2).⁵⁷ Triumph designs of any type are rare in the baseball statuary: this portrayal is unique in incorporating, indeed foregrounding an overt referencing of a subject's faith. Pujols commented at the unveiling

'There's going to be a lot of people asking, "Well, why is he not swinging the bat?" That's to remind me it's not about me, but it's about Jesus Christ who gave his life so we can have eternal life. It's really easy to lose focus when you have millions of people telling you how great you are.'⁵⁸

<Figure 2 Here>

Pujols did not wish for his statue to be erected at Busch Stadium until he was elected to the National Baseball Hall of Fame, hence achieving parity with the adjacent statue subjects. For an initial location he chose Westport Plaza, St Louis, a suburban mall featuring a Pujols-monikered restaurant and sports bar operated under license from the Pujols Foundation, whose headquarters are adjacent. Hence the restaurant and charity gained tangible advertising and publicity through coverage of the statue unveiling, and a longer-term visual identity for their premises. The statue stands in front of the restaurant, affixed to a low metal base but lacking a plinth, an omission designed to make relocation straightforward.⁵⁹ A further peculiarity is the absence of plaque or inscription; both sculptor and funder perceived the pose and the character to be so recognizable as to make explanatory material superfluous.⁶⁰ A plaque describing a player still in his prime, with the potential to add further achievements to his honour's list, would also have been likely to have become outdated within a handful of seasons.

As the primary influence in statue design and location - the former a statement of his personal beliefs and the latter of potential commercial benefit - the artefact's ownership could be said to lie with Pujols, providing a metaphor for primacy of the player in modern baseball. Yet due to that very primacy the statue was, at the point of unveiling, taking on a further layer of meaning. At the end of his triumphant 2011 season, Pujols' contract with the Cardinals had expired. There was intense speculation over whether he would stay in St Louis, the fans' overwhelming wish being that he should. When the statue was revealed, a journalist commented that 'You can't pack your statue with you'.⁶¹ The temporal intersection of Pujols' career and the statue's development meant that the latter had effectively become a lever by which St Louis could apply pressure on Pujols to remain in the city: it became a symbol of both their perceived ownership of, and desire to retain ownership of Pujols, even though the statue's existence owed nothing to the civic authorities nor the Cardinals. In other words, though they could make no claim of ownership upon the object, the object reflected a compelling peer pressure that gave them ownership of its subject. Pujols' preceding commitment to city, both in his longevity and success as a Cardinal, and his charity work, had tangibly embedded his image within the fabric of St Louis.

However, less than one month after the unveiling, Pujols chose to join the LA Angels of Anaheim on a 10 year contract worth \$250 million, rejecting a slightly lower offer from the Cardinals, much to the consternation of Cardinals' fans and the wider city.⁶² Though the Pujols Foundation has continued to operate within St Louis, this has not appeased angry Cardinals supporters, perhaps illustrating that affection for Pujols' charity work was dwarfed by admiration for his deeds at the plate. Widespread anger at the time of his defection even led to security guards being deployed by the statue, which had become a site of both remembrance and betrayal.⁶³ Sportsmen have ephemeral careers, yet a statue has relative permanence. Pujols' statue remains in situ unlike the adjacent restaurant's branding, with the 'Pujols 5' moniker dropped upon his departure.

Discussion

The baseball statuary exhibits homogeneity of design amid a mix of legal and perceived owners. However the case studies above indicate that, where certain combinations of project funding, instigation and motivation exist, a degree of innovation is both possible and predictable. The statues of Pujols and Johnson are united by the removal of a commercial imperative from their development process. In both instances the artwork was effectively gifted to the recipient, and the design was unconstrained by an initial project motivation of overtly branding an environment or organisation. This is not to say that these statues are not a showcase for stakeholder identities. The former primarily projects the ethics of its subject, and the latter showcases the motif of the artist.⁶⁴ In both cases it is the atypical effective ownership of the project - in the case of Walter Johnson by the arts sector, and in the case of Albert Pujols, by a combination of an individual donor and subject - that has resulted in atypical motivations, producing a non-standard design.

Funding for baseball statue projects is being increasingly derived from club or commercial sources, both of which are likely to steer design within what is a populist genre towards what is considered to be favoured by popular opinion e.g. traditional realist design. The cost of producing such artworks, and perhaps also the relative lack of, or perceived lack of artistic credibility derived from producing sporting sculpture, are major barrier to sculptors or public arts funding bodies choosing to spend their own resources within this area. However, variations on the scenario described through

the case study of Albert Pujols' statue, in which commercial interests are separated from design if not removed from the process, could both be argued to be likely to reoccur with increasing frequency in the medium-term future, prompting a wider development of form. The control or even legal ownership of a sport statue project by the subject of the piece may transpire not only from individual donors but also if baseball, or possibly even commercial organisations looking to brand through a celebrity sportsman, begin to follow a recent trend in subject selection manifest in college American Football, of honouring contemporary star players and coaches with statues.⁶⁵ An active baseball player would more likely to have image rights to protect than one who had retired and, within a culture in which players will typically employ personal agents and lawyers, the means and inclination to protect them. At the very least this might involve players being given influence over design in return for the use of their image. This in turn could result in further statues reflecting personal character traits that the player wishes to foreground in order to enhance both his public persona and self-esteem. It is even possible that a current player may not want to showcase his greatest achievements so far when he has ambitions of even greater performances in the future, or may see no need advantage in projecting what is already an accepted sporting talent.

The lack of triumph designs amongst baseball statues may appear surprising given the high proportion of statues owned by baseball organisations, and the oft-cited motivation of basking in reflected glory which would appeal to such owners. This is another area in which heterogeneity of design has scope to develop. The current dearth may be explained by four factors. First, recreating an ephemeral scene of triumph is arguably a less flexible branding strategy than that of portraying a great player in action. The length of a player's career, and hence the temporal reference of their image predicates a greater number of fans associating both nostalgic thoughts and an acknowledgement of their club's greatness with a hitter or pitcher than a single moment in time. Second, a triumph design is vulnerable to a reduction in its significance by subsequent successes. Alternatively, its presence may be seen as overshadowing or even denigrating past and future successes. Finally, and more pragmatically, a celebrating group of players will cost more to sculpt and cast than a single performer. However, by largely focussing upon subjects as opposed to moment designs, it could be that project instigators are failing to exploit the full potential of figurative sculpture in generating nostalgia: psychologist Tim Wildschut and

colleagues found ‘momentous events’ to be amongst the most important triggers of nostalgic feelings.⁶⁶

What has yet to be explored are either the owner’s or intended recipients’ (be they from within either the business or sport or the business of art) perceptions of the resulting statues in terms of artistic merit, effectiveness as a branding tool or benefit to the surrounding environment. Whilst fans have instigated relatively few baseball statue projects, and genuine public subscription funding (as opposed to large donations from individuals and a handful of wealthy fans) is rare, the artistic product itself is targeted at supporters, and as previously outlined, they have ownership claims upon the image. However, at this moment there does not exist any detailed qualitative or quantitative research examining how sporting sculpture is received, other than one-line interviews with fans at unveiling ceremonies; nor how it operates in (or its effectiveness at) affecting attitudes, knowledge of player and team histories, and topophilic attachment. To what extent do fans accept or reject the imposition of a specific interpretation of a subject, who may form an integral part in their personal and collective history? Does the absence of a countervailing push for more tangible influence in the statue process reflect a lack of opportunity or interest? Similarly, from within the art industry, there is an absence of critical compendiums focussed upon sporting art, or related judgement on the relative merit of competing works, perhaps acknowledging the degree to which the interests of sport are seen to subjugate artistic freedom.

Conclusion

In its production of durable landmarks that are likely to speak to and influence the thoughts of future generations of onlookers, the process of designing and erecting a statue is in part a tussle for supremacy between multiple stakeholders who wish to influence its form and message to align with the beliefs or artistic skills they wish to project. This makes the study of the resulting form and presentation of sport statues a potential measure of the real ownership of the object and its surrounding environment as opposed to that which various stakeholders might claim.

The baseball statuary may emerge from a limited design template by its very definition – but it is further straight-jacketed by this imbalance of ownership between the sporting and artistic stakeholders. The multiple motivations identified behind the

use of a sporting subject's image beyond simple commemoration of achievement have together contributed to the baseball statuary's rapid growth; but simultaneously restricted its form to one which matches and does not attempt to go beyond the basic template of subject recognition. The result is that tradition has comfortably held sway over sculptor innovation, perhaps an apposite outcome in baseball, the most traditional of American sports. However, we conclude that there is potential for an evolution in design to occur, and that rather than being driven purely by artistic innovation, it is a multi-lineal process in which the growing celebrity and influence of the professional sportsmen and women, and even the increasingly sophisticated marketing strategies of commercial entities may all play a part.

Notes

1. Kirk Savage, 'The Politics of Memory: Black Emancipation and the Civil War Monument', in *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*, ed. J.R. Gikllis (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 135.
2. Dick Heller, 'Johnson's Kin Argue This Call', *The Washington Times*, <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2009/apr/18/johnsons-kin-argue-this-call/?page=all> (accessed 12 December, 2012).
3. Ibid.
4. Figurative statues portray a lifelike representation of a human subject. They are at least close to life-size and depict the body; as opposed to statuettes or figurines, which are small enough to be easily lifted, or busts, which depict just head and shoulders.
5. Stephen G. Miller, *Ancient Greek Athletics*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004); Luciana Jacobelli, *Gladiators at Pompeii*, (Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 2003).
6. J. Thomas Hetrick, *Chris Von Der Ahe and the St. Louis Browns* (New York: Scarecrow Press, 1999).
7. Mildred Albronda, *Douglas Tilden: Portrait of a Deaf Sculptor* (Dallas: T J Pub Incorporated, 1980).
8. Each of these statues has since been relocated: Wagner from Forbes Field to Three Rivers Stadium in 1970, and then to its current site at PNC Park in 2001; and Musial from Busch Memorial Stadium to its current site at Busch Stadium III in 2006.
9. Temple University Libraries. 'Dedication of Baseball Players Sculpture Outside Veterans Stadium, 1977', <http://digital.library.temple.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/p15037coll3/id/6862/rec/2> (accessed 17 January, 2013).
10. Daniel Rosensweig, *Retro Ballparks: Instant History, Baseball, and the New American City* (Tennessee: University of Tennessee Press, 2005); Michael Friedman, David Andrews, and Michael Silk, 'Sport and the Façade of Redevelopment in the Postindustrial City', *Sociology of Sport Journal* 21, 2 (2004): 119-39.
11. Mike Huggins and Mike O'Mahony, *The Visual in Sport, in Sport in the Global Society - Historical Perspectives* (London: Routledge, 2011).
12. The three articles identified specifically focused upon baseball statues are: Joseph Stanton, 'A Monument to Musial: The History of a Statue', *NINE: A Journal of Baseball History and Culture*, 20, 2 (2012): 27-42; Christopher Stride, Ffion Thomas and Maureen M. Smith, 'Ballplayer or Barrier Breaker? Branding Through the Seven Statues of Jackie Robinson', *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 31, 17 (2014): 2164-96; and Christopher Stride, Ffion Thomas and Gregory Ramshaw, 'Standing Out from the Crowd: Imaging Baseball Fans through Sculpture', *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 32, 14 (2015): 1611-38.
13. Jaime Schultz, 'Contesting the Master Narrative: The Arthur Ashe Statue and Monument Avenue in Richmond, Virginia', *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 28, 8-9 (2011): 1235-51; Maureen M. Smith, 'Mapping America's Sporting Landscape: A Case Study of Three Statues', *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 28, 8-9 (2011): 1252-68; Maureen M. Smith, 'Frozen Fists in Speed City: The Statue as Twenty-First-Century Reparations', *Journal of Sport History* 36, 3 (2009): 393-414; Gary Osmond, 'Shaping Lives: Statues as Biography', *Sporting Traditions* 27, 2 (2010): 101-11.
14. Savage, 'The Politics of Memory'.
15. John D. McMillen and Rebecca S. McMillen, 'The Legal Aspects of Sports Sculpture', *Willamette Sports Law Journal* 1(2005): 1-23, <http://willamette.edu/wucl/pdf/sportslaw/spring05/mcmillens.pdf>.
16. Holly Swyers, 'The opposite of losses: Where lies the soul of American Sports?' *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 24, 2 (2007). 200.
17. P. Kennedy and D. Kennedy, "'It's the Little Details That Make up Our Identity": Everton Supporters and Their Stadium Ballot Debate', *Soccer and Society* 11, 5 (2010): 553-72.
18. John Williams, 'Walking Alone Together the Liverpool Way: Fan Culture and 'Clueless' Yanks', *Soccer and Society* 13, 3 (2013): 426-42.
19. Robert B. Cialdini, Richard J. Borden, Avril Thorne, Marcus R. Walker, Steven Freeman and Lloyd R. Sloan, 'Basking in Reflected Glory: Three (Football) Field Studies', *Journal of*

-
- Personality and Social Psychology 34 (1976): 366-75; Daniel C. Funk and Jeffrey D. James, 'Consumer Loyalty: The Meaning of Attachment in the Development of Sport Team Allegiance', *Journal of Sport Management* 20, 2 (2006): 189-217; A. Bizman and Y. Yinon, 'Engaging in Distancing Tactics among Sport Fans: Effects on Self-Esteem and Emotional Responses', *The Journal of Social Psychology* 142, 3 (2002): 381-93.
20. Chris.B. Stride, John. Wilson, and Ffion E. Thomas, 'Honouring Heroes by Branding in Bronze', *Sport in Society* 16, 6 (2013): 749-71, Eldon E. Snyder, 'Sociology of Nostalgia - Sport Halls of Fame and Museums in America', *Sociology of Sport Journal* 8, 3 (1991): 228-38; Chad Seifried and Katherine Meyer, 'Nostalgia-Related Aspects of Professional Sports Facilities: A Facility Audit of Major League Baseball and National Football League Strategies to Evoke the Past', *International Journal of Sport Management Recreation and Tourism* 5 (2010): 51-76; Funk and James, 'Consumer Loyalty'.
 21. George Ritzer and Todd Stillman, 'The Postmodern Ballpark as Leisure Setting: Enchantment and Simulated De-McDonaldization', *Leisure Sciences* 23 (2001): 99-113; Daniel S. Mason, Gregory H. Duquette, and Jay Scherer, 'Heritage, Sport Tourism and Canadian Junior Hockey: Nostalgia for Social Experience or Sport Place?', *Journal of Sport Tourism* 10, 4 (2005): 253-71.
 22. Funk and James, 'Consumer Loyalty'.
 23. Snyder, 'Sociology of Nostalgia'; Chris B. Stride, Ffion E. Thomas, John Wilson and Josh Pahigian, 'Modeling Stadium Statue Subject Choice in US Baseball and English Soccer', *Journal of Quantitative Analysis in Sports* 8, 1 (2012): 1-36; Howard Schuman and Jacqueline Scott, 'Generations and Collective Memories', *American Sociological Review* 54 (1989): 359-81.
 24. Examples include the statue of Hall of Fame pitcher Warren Spahn at Turner Field, Atlanta, and the statue of baseball broadcaster Harry Kalas, at Citizens Bank Park, Philadelphia: both were raised due to the organisational and fundraising efforts of groups of fans of the Braves and Phillies respectively, as opposed to the Braves or Phillies organisations.
 25. Alan R. Hirsch, 'Nostalgia: A Neuropsychiatric Understanding', *Advances in Consumer Research* 19 (1992): 390-5.
 26. Gregory J. Ashworth and John Tunbridge, *The Tourist-Historic City*, (London: Bellhaven Press, 1990).
 27. Andrew Smith, 'Reimagining the City: the Value of Tourist Initiatives', *Annals of Tourism Research* 32(2005): 217-36.
 28. Y. F. Tuan, *Topophilia*, (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1974).
 29. Roger Brown and James Kulik, 'Flashbulb Memories', *Cognition* 5, 1 (1977): 73-99.
 30. Bruce Baugh, 'Authenticity Revisited', *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 46, 4 (1998): 477-87.
 31. McMillen and McMillen, 'The legal aspects of sports sculpture', 22.
 32. In an interview with sculptor Susan Wagner, who is responsible for statues of Jackie Robinson and Roberto Clemente amongst others, she notes how she is typically given a choice of images to work from: for example, for her statue of Robinson the commissioning body (the Jackie Robinson Foundations) asked her to pick from 5 options. Telephone interview, first author, 18 November 2012.
 33. Brown and Kulik, 'Flashbulb Memories', 90; Gerald Griggs, Kathryn Leflay, and Mark Groves, "'Just Watching It Again Now Still Gives Me Goose Bumps!": Examining the Mental Postcards of Sport Spectators', *Sociology of Sport Journal* 29 (2012): 89-101.
 34. At AT&T Park, San Francisco, each statue of a former Giant was produced by William Behrends; Bill Mack has sculpted each of seven statues presently surrounding Target Field, Minnesota.
 35. Christopher Stride, Ffion Thomas and John Wilson. 'The Sporting Statues Project'. <http://www.sportingstatues.com>.
 36. Stride, Wilson, and Thomas, 'Honouring Heroes'.
 37. Allen Guttman, *From Ritual to Record* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1978).
 38. Between January 2011 and March 2013, the authors constructed a database of existing North American-sited statues of baseball players, managers, broadcasters and executives as part of a wider project into commemoration in sport. Data and images were obtained through a literature, archival and online search, and via interviews with sculptors and project organisers. Variables collected included the precise location, date of unveiling, design type (broadly classified as 'action', 'posed' or 'triumph'), the full plaque or plinth inscription, and the

- identity of the statue project promoters and funders, as well as further demographic and performance information on the subjects depicted. The database is complete and accurate to the best of our knowledge. In March 2013 the primary elements of the database (the statue location, sculptor, unveiling date, inscription and photos of the statue showing the design) were made publically available through the project website at www.sportingstatues.com. Prior to its launch, baseball historians from a national spread of chapters of the Society for American Baseball Research (SABR) and the National Baseball Hall of Fame Museum (NBHOF) were invited to view the draft version and suggest any omissions or errors. In the month following its launch, the website received over 10000 unique visitors and substantial regional and national press coverage across North America, yet only one further subject-specific statue erected prior to March 2013 was discovered and added as a result of information received after the launch. As of January 2016 the authors have continued to maintain and update the database with information drawn from through frequent online searches and contacts within the sports sculpture industry.
39. Frederic Frommer and Anthony Williams, *The Washington Nationals 1859 to Today: The Story of Baseball in the Nation's Capital* (New York: Taylor Trade Publishing, 2006).
 40. Brad Snyder, *Beyond the Shadow of the Senators: The Untold Story of the Homestead Grays and the Integration of Baseball* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2004).
 41. Snyder, 'Sociology of Nostalgia'.
 42. Of the 6 post-1972 expansion franchises, only 3 have statues at their ballparks, only two of which (broadcaster Dave Niehaus at the Seattle Mariners, and executive Ted Rogers at the Toronto Blue Jays) are subject-specific.
 43. DC Commission on the Arts and Humanities, 'New Public Artworks on Display at Nationals Ballpark', City, 2009, <http://newsroom.dc.gov/show.aspx/agency/dcarts/section/2/release/16423>, March 2009 (accessed 11 December, 2012).
 44. J. Saffelle, 'The Statues--the Final Chapter with Omri Amrany', Nats320 - A Washington Nationals Blog, <http://nats320.blogspot.co.uk/2008/12/statues-final-chapter-with-omri-amrany.html>, December 2008 (accessed 14 January, 2013).
 45. Gloria Nauden, Director, DC Commission on the Arts and Humanities, personal correspondence with first author, 27 March, 2013.
 46. Omri Amrany (sculptor), interview with both authors, 30 May 2012.
 47. A. Fluck, 'The Story Behind Michael Jordan's Spirit', Chicago Bulls, <http://www.nba.com/bulls/story-behind-michael-jordans-spirit.html> (accessed 17 January, 2013).
 48. Heller, 'Johnson's Kin Argue This Call'.
 49. Ibid.
 50. Frommer and Williams, *The Washington Nationals*.
 51. Across almost 600 statues portraying UK sportsmen and women, North American baseball players and a global statuary of soccer players and cricketers that the authors have catalogued, only a handful of in situ examples depict subjects who were still active players at the time of unveiling; of these almost all were erected when the player concerned had either left the concerned club and/or was nearing career retirement (e.g. soccer player Thierry Henry at Arsenal FC), or were part of a group statue celebrating a team triumph (e.g. Paul Konerko and Juan Uribe as components of the White Sox Championship statue).
 52. In 2011 the St Louis Cardinals won the World Series, Pujols hit over .300 for a 10th consecutive season, and also hit a record 3 home runs in a single World Series game.
 53. Harry Weber (sculptor), telephone interview, first author, 24 February 2013.
 54. Pujols Family Foundation, 'About Us', <http://www.pujolsfamilyfoundation.org/about/> (accessed 13 January, 2013).
 55. Pujols Family Foundation, 'Pujols Family Foundation: Welcome', <http://www.pujolsfamilyfoundation.org/> (accessed 13 January, 2013).
 56. A. Knox, 'Albert Pujols: A Hero's Worship', www.cbn.com/entertainment/sports/700club_albertpujols080206.aspx (accessed 20 December, 2012).
 57. Harry Weber (sculptor), telephone interview, first author, 24 February 2013.
 58. Associated Press, 'Albert Pujols Statue Unveiled', ESPN, http://espn.go.com/mlb/story/_/id/7182254/albert-pujols-statue-unveiled-star-restaurant (accessed 15 October, 2013).

-
59. Harry Weber (sculptor), telephone interview, first author, 24 February 2013.
 60. Harry Weber (sculptor), telephone interview, first author, 24 February 2013.
 61. Associated Press, 'Albert Pujols Statue Unveiled'.
 62. J. Strauss, 'Pujols Signs with Angels: 10 Years, \$254 Million', St Louis Post Dispatch, http://www.stltoday.com/sports/baseball/professional/pujols-signs-with-angels-years-million/article_9181b070-21ae-11e1-93ef-0019bb30f31a.html (accessed 18 October, 2012).
 65. K. Bell, 'A Guard for the Statue: St. Louis Fans React to Pujols Departure', St Louis Post Dispatch, http://www.stltoday.com/news/local/metro/a-guard-for-the-statue-st-louis-fans-react-to/article_4c0ea7e2-21bc-11e1-b03b-0019bb30f31a.html (accessed 13 December, 2012).
 64. A parallel with Pujols' depiction is the statue of Ted Williams at Fenway Park, Boston: it portrays Williams not in playing action but placing a cap upon the head of a sick child, thus foregrounding personal qualities ahead of the on-field skills of a player considered by many as the greatest pure hitter of all-time. As with Pujols' statue, the bronze of Williams was funded by a single individual donor, Hank Evanish, whose links to the subject were primarily non-baseball-related: he was a flight-school pupil of Williams' whilst both served in the US Marines during the Korean War.
 65. Matt Murschel, 'Shiny new statues dull college football legacies' http://articles.orlandosentinel.com/2011-04-17/sports/os-college-insider-04182011-20110417_1_statues-coaching-legends-cam-newton (accessed 18 October, 2012).
 66. Tim Wildschut, Constantine Sedikides, Jamie Arndt and Clay Routledge, 'Nostalgia: Content, Triggers, Functions', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 91, 5 (2006): 975-93.