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Abstract

This paper considers the recent International Olympic Committee (IOC) decision to deny women the opportunity to compete in ski jumping at the 2010 Winter Olympics in Vancouver, Canada. Drawing on a feminist Foucauldian framework, we suggest that the Olympics is a discourse that constructs excellence and fairness as “within the true,” with the IOC protesting that this recent decision is not about gender, but about the upholding of Olympic ideals. We interrogate three conspicuous absences in this discourse, each of which trouble the IOC’s claim that this decision is not evidence of gender discrimination. In particular, we contextualize this decision within the risk discourses upon which the IOC has historically drawn on denying women’s participation in particular Olympic events, arguing that the discursive silence around the issue of risk points to “old wine in new bottles” as the IOC dresses up the same paternalistic practices in new garb. We conclude with a consideration of these discursive structures as more than simply oppressive of women. Instead, they may also be understood as indicative of the ‘problem’ posed by women, especially those who threaten the gender binary that pervades many sporting structures. Finally, these structures signal opportunities for resistance and subversion as women act to shed light on the discursive silences upon which structures of domination rest.
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Introduction

At the Ninth International Symposium for Olympic Research in Beijing, China, from August 5th to 7th, 2008, Dick Pound, long-time member and out-spoken critic of the International Olympic Committee (IOC) gave the opening address for the conference entitled “The Future of the Olympic Movement: Promised Land or Train Wreck?” In his talk, Pound argued that there are many “important issues” that must be addressed by the Olympic Movement and the International Olympic Committee (IOC), suggesting that if these issues are “not properly handled…[the Olympic Movement’s] future will be much less certain than most seem to think.” Among the topics discussed by Pound were the IOC’s mission, managing risk, the cost of bidding for the Games, the size of the Olympic Programme, Eurocentricity in the Movement, the Youth Olympic Games, doping, and politics. Of interest to our study is his barely cursory discussion of gender equity in the Movement. Indeed, he went so far as to suggest that “gender equity has all but been achieved,” a statement we find highly problematic in light of recent research suggesting that there is still a long way to go. For example, a recent Women’s Sport Foundation research report suggests that at the Beijing Olympics, women participated in 137 events while men participated in 175 events. While this report speaks to continued numerical inequities in the Olympic Games broadly speaking, we aim here to highlight important elements of the discourse around women’s ski jumping as one current and contentious example of gender inequality.
The Olympic Games have often served to bring athletes, communities, and nations together. Feminist sport scholars, however, have criticized the IOC for their exclusionary practices, suggesting that despite rhetoric of inclusion and emancipation, the IOC continues to entrench notions of gender difference, and plays an important role in constructing men’s sport as the “real” version against which women’s sports should be measured. In the history of the modern Olympic movement, female athletes and their advocates have long had to struggle for inclusion in the Games, even going so far as to institute the “Women’s Olympic Games,” first held in Paris in 1922. The inclusion of women’s athletics was an uphill battle, but as we have just witnessed in Beijing, female Olympians have benefited from the labours of their predecessors. In any social system, policies can be altered and ideologies can be challenged. In response to these challenges, the IOC has instituted changes that resulted in more equitable gender representation in the Games.

The modern Olympic Movement, and the systemic relations of power embedded in its governing body, the IOC, has been an important site for contestations between competing interests attempting to shape the face of modern sport. Jennifer Hargeaves argues that the history of the Olympic Games could be retold as a “history of power and elitism, obsessions and excesses, divisions and exploitation.” Throughout the history of the Movement, formal and ideological constraints have effectively placed women as “outsiders” in particular sports, forcing women to fight for their rights to participate in these events. As Raymond Williams has argued, it is not until a group poses a significant challenge to the authority of the dominant group, that any sort of negotiation begins in earnest.

In a January 2008 agreement, brokered by the Canadian Human Rights Commission, the Canadian government pledged to pressure the IOC to reconsider a November 2006 decision
denying women the right to compete in ski jumping at the 2010 Olympic Games in Vancouver, Canada. Shortly after this announcement, representatives of the IOC affirmed their resolution to exclude women, suggesting that the decision was not “about gender.” Rather, they argued that women’s ski jumping failed to meet the technical criteria for Olympic inclusion. In the spring of 2008, several ski jumpers filed a lawsuit in the British Columbia Supreme Court against the Vancouver Organizing Committee for the Olympic and Paralympic Games. Recently, a decision was handed down in this case, effectively ending any chance of women’s ski jumping being included in the 2010 Games.

This paper considers the case of women’s ski jumping, contextualizing the events outlined above within the history of gender politics that has characterized the modern Games. We begin by examining the Olympic discourse, considering what appears with regularity across a range of texts, especially media accounts as the controversy unfolded and IOC statements and documents related to gender inclusivity. Our principle analytic strategy, however, is to interrogate the silences in this discourse, considering those exclusions that work to construct and shore up those elements of the discourse that are present with regularity. We conclude with a consideration of this discourse as more than simply oppressive. We draw on recent feminist interpretations of Foucauldian theorizing to suggest that the discourse may also be read as an opportunity for subversion and resistance.
Olympic Discourse

Michel Foucault’s notion of discourse serves as a jumping off point for this discussion. Building on (and departing from) earlier approaches to representation that focuses the meaning conveyed by visual representations, Foucault approaches representation in a way that permits a more nuanced theorization of the operation of power. Moving beyond a consideration of language, Foucault uses the notion of discourse to capture the production of “meaningful statements” about a given topic in a particular historical moment. As Hall points out, Foucault uses this concept in an attempt to overcome the traditional distinction between what one says (language) and what one does (practice). Discourse, Foucault argues, constructs the topic. It defines and produces the objects of our knowledge. It governs the way that a topic can be meaningfully talked about and reasoned about. It also influences how ideas are put into practice and used to regulate the conduct of others.

What makes the notion of discourse compelling for theorizing power is that it never rests in one moment, text, practice, or even set of practices. Instead, a given discourse appears with regularity across a range of texts (broadly defined) and practices to regulate what may be said “within the true” about a given subject in a particular socio-historical moment. It is critical to remember that for Foucault, the focus was always on the implications of these processes for power:

...in a society such as ours, but basically in any society, there are manifold relations of power which permeate, characterize and constitute the social body, and these relations of power cannot themselves be established, consolidated nor
implemented without the production, accumulation, circulation and functioning of a discourse.\textsuperscript{23}

Not only, then, does a discourse constrain what can \textit{meaningfully} be said about a particular topic at a particular time, but it also works to authorize particular voices and silence others.\textsuperscript{24} These processes of authorization and silencing, though, are dynamic and contextual, must be continuously reproduced, and are thus open to challenge and contestation from moment to moment.\textsuperscript{25}

The Modern Olympic Movement operates as a discourse that constructs what can meaningfully be said about amateur athletics, Olympism\textsuperscript{26}, and the Olympic Games. In texts such as the \textit{Olympic Charter} and IOC press statements, excellence, inclusivity and fairness are constructed as “within the true.” The \textit{Olympic Charter}, for instance, outlines that the mission of the IOC is “to promote Olympism throughout the world and to lead the Olympic movement,” promote “ethics” and “the spirit of fairness,” and “act against any form of discrimination affecting the Olympic movement.”\textsuperscript{27} Specifically, it aims to “encourage and support the promotion of women in sport at all levels and in all structures with a view to implementing the principle of equality between men and women.”\textsuperscript{28} This commitment to equality and fairness is evident in IOC statements defending the decision to exclude women’s ski jumping from the Vancouver Games. As IOC president Jacques Rogge stated, “The decision of the International Olympic Committee not to include women's ski jumping was taken on technical grounds not on gender issues.”\textsuperscript{29}

The other important dimension of the Olympic discourse is athletic excellence and elitism. The Olympics, though committed to inclusion and fairness, is (perhaps somewhat
paradoxically) also about recognizing and rewarding only the most elite performances. Rogge’s frequently cited comment about women’s ski jumping illustrates this point well:

If you have three medals, with 80 athletes competing on a regular basis internationally, the percentage of medal winners is extremely high... In any other sport you are speaking about hundreds of thousands, if not tens of millions of athletes, at a very high level, competing for one single medal. We do not want the medals to be diluted and watered down. That is the bottom line.\(^{30}\)

Olympic discourse, then, constructs the IOC and the Olympic Movement as committed to athletic excellence as well as fairness. Furthermore, the discourse authorizes the IOC as the legitimate authoritative voice. Our central interest in this paper, though, is not what is present with regularity in this discursive formation. Instead, we wish to focus on the absences that help construct the discourse. It is to this issue that we now turn.

**Discursive Silence**

It is not only what is said that is important in understanding a discourse. Equally important is what is unsaid:

Silence itself – the things one declines to say, or is forbidden to name, the discretion that is required between different speakers – is less the absolute limit of discourse, the other side from which it is separated by a strict boundary, than an element that functions alongside the things said, with them and in relation to them within overall strategies... There is not one but many silences, and they are an integral part of the strategies that underlie and permeate discourses.\(^{31}\)

In the same way that discourse marks certain statements, actions and institutional arrangements as “within the true,” it (un)marks others as “without”: “it ‘rules out,’ limits and restricts other
ways of talking, of conducting ourselves in relation to the topic or constructing knowledge about it.” It is important, then, that we interrogate the silences in a particular discursive formation as we seek to illuminate the operation of power. As Mills (1997) notes, it is particularly important for feminist researchers employing a Foucauldian perspective to interrogate these absences in the texts they consider, to ask who (or what) is not represented, and why that might be.

These silences are important not simply because they mark what is beyond the true, but because, in so doing, they shore up the true in a particular discursive formation. They naturalize and legitimize the privileged position of those who have benefited from particular relations of power. In the silences about exclusionary practices in the history of the modern Olympic Movement, for instance, athletes and nations are cast as the beneficiaries of the Olympic ideal of inclusiveness, allowing for a continued ignorance about a history of symbolic violence perpetrated against women, visible minorities, and others.

**History and successes in women’s ski jumping**

In terms of the discourse around women’s exclusion from ski jumping, the first silence is the history and success of women in the sport of ski jumping. In Canada, for example, women have been donning their skis and joining their male counterparts on the ski jumps since the early 1900s. One central figure in this history is Isabel Coursier, named “Women’s Amateur Champion Ski Jumper of the World” in 1922. Born in Revelstoke, British Columbia on 21 March 1906, Coursier took an interest in skiing as a child, receiving her first pair of skis when she was eight years old. When interviewed in 1977 about her experiences as a ski jumper, she recalled, “…I was always in the out-of-doors sliding on something either on my seat or a pan or a shovel or a piece of linoleum. And then Bob Blackmore … made my first pair of skis. He was a trapper, a boatman living down near us.” She recalls her equipment: “they started off with
single groove skis, the ones that the, Bob Blackmore made me. And then later on ... bought my first pair of jumpers from ... Frank Wells, who had his shop down in Lower Town as we called it…the first pair of jumpers…were two groove.” For clothing she wore “anything you could improvise…that kept you dry. Mostly... army riding britches…so we just bought men’s pants and you could wear those or bloomers or anything you happened to have…..They didn’t sell ski outfits as such, just any kind of pants you had.”³⁸ As a child, Coursier joined a burgeoning group of female ski jumpers in Revelstoke, known by the local community as the “glider girls.”³⁹ By the time she was 16 years old, she was a recognized household name in Revelstoke, winning ski jumping and ski joring⁴⁰ contests, and touring to tournaments throughout North America. From 1922 until her retirement in 1929, Coursier held the record for the longest women’s ski jump: 84 feet at Revelstoke’s Ski Club in 1922-23.⁴¹

![Figure 1: Coursier jumping in Quebec, Canada, 1925. Courtesy of the Revelstoke Museum and Archives, Revelstoke, British Columbia, Canada.](image)

The IOC “has repeatedly said [that] women's ski jumping is ... not yet ready for Olympic competition.”⁴² They suggest it is still in its early stages and needs time to mature.⁴³ Contrary to
this assumption that women’s ski jumping is a relatively new sport that needs time to develop
and grow (an assumption often made about women’s sport in general), case studies of athletes
like Coursier suggest that women have a long tradition in the sport. While Coursier learned to
jump at a time when ski jumping was increasing in popularity among men in Canada but only
had a small number of female participants, she recognized that women’s ski jumping in other
countries began long before the sport was taken up by Canadian girls and women. She recalled,
“…there were more Scandinavian skiers ‘cuz [sic] they had learned skiing before the rest of us
born here would take it up.” Evidence suggests that Ingrid Olavsdottir Vestby competed at
what is generally acknowledged to be the first ski jumping competition in 1862 that took place in
Trysil, Norway. Other Scandinavian women like Olga Balstad-Eggen, Hilda Braskerud,
Johanne Kolstad, Ella Gulbrandsen also set women’s ski jumping records in the 1920s and
1930s. In the 1930s, Norwegian ski jumper Johanne Kolstad, known as the “Queen of the Skis,”
and French athlete Denise Martineau toured the United States offering exhibitions of jumping to
promote the sport among American women. In 1937, Kolstad was credited with a 186 foot
jump. Historically, ski jumping competitions in North America and Europe were open to both
men and women.

Despite this long history of women’s involvement in the sport, only recently has the
Fédération Internationale de Ski (FIS) sanctioned women’s ski jumping as a regular and ongoing
competition. In addition, almost without exception, newspaper stories and websites lack any
contextualization of the history of women’s ski jumping, or present only its ‘official’ (i.e.,
sanctioned by the FIS) history. This is an important discursive silence. In order for Rogge’s
claim that women have not achieved the standards necessary for Olympic inclusion to be “within
the true,” the silence around women’s long history of competition is important, even necessary.
Also important is the silence around recent achievements by women in the sport. As just one indicator of women’s competitiveness in the sport, the current record on the 95m jump at the Whistler Olympic Park, site of the 2010 events, is held by Lindsey Van, an American ski jumper and plaintiff in the lawsuit outlined above. It should be noted that only the men’s records – a half a meter shorter than Van’s jump - are the ‘official’ hill record jumps, perhaps because Van’s jump was completed at the Canadian Championships, not an FIS sanctioned event, held in January 2007. Importantly, the FIS, like the IOC, has operated within an institutional framework that has historically excluded women. This also raises the question of whether, by intention or neglect, women are being excluded from particular competitions and official records precisely because they are threatening men’s athletic dominance in this event. This threat challenges the binary logic that pervades many (most) sporting institutions and legitimates gender discrimination.

Even this (too) brief overview of women’s experience and successes in this sport is enough to highlight the conspicuousness of their absences from the discourse around the current controversy. The IOC’s claim that the sport is “immature,” or that Olympic competition would be “watered down” by the inclusion of women’s ski jumping, rests on this history, and these successes remain hidden from view.

**Historical exceptions to technical criteria**

The second important silence is that the IOC has made numerous exceptions over the years to the very guidelines to which they are holding so firmly in this case. Thus, while the exclusion is framed as one based on a technical set of considerations, exceptions to these criteria are not without precedent. Indeed, the 2007 Olympic Charter clearly indicates that “The decision to include a discipline or event in the programme falls within the competence of the IOC
Executive Board” and “deadlines set forth…may be waived, in order to allow changes in the programme with the approval of the relevant IF [International Federation], of the OCOG [Organizing Committee of the Olympic Games] and of the competent organ of the IOC.”

The IOC has seemed particularly willing to overlook certain criteria when there is some commercial or political mileage to be gained by the inclusion of particular events. For example, Pound suggests “there has been some pressure on the IOC to expand the program of the Games to include sports that have any appeal to today’s ‘youth.'” Even at the same time as they announced the exclusion of women from ski jumping (in 2007 there were 83 women from 14 countries competing on the FIS circuit), the IOC affirmed the inclusion of ski-cross (30 skiers from 11 countries).

Brent Morrice, Chair of Ski Canada suggests that ski-cross has half the number of athletes as women’s ski jumping with competitions taking place on only one continent. Asked by a Canadian reporter to explain this seeming contradiction, “Mr. Rogge said that ski cross is ‘immensely popular, maybe not in your country, but in Europe. And the technical and participation level is okay for the Olympic Games.’” Other examples of exceptions made for inclusions of women’s events include: Women’s bobsleigh in 2002 (26 women from 13 nations) and women’s snowboard cross in 2006 (34 women from 10 countries). What is generally absent in the discourse around the ski jumping controversy is the idea – illustrated by the exceptions outlined above – that the IOC can and does exercise considerable discretion in determining which events to include. This, again, is an important silence in that it becomes part of the construction of the IOC as a body committed to fairness (and, implicitly, objectivity).

The “at risk” female body
The third silence, and the one that serves as the focal point for this paper, is the history of risk discourses surrounding the ‘protection’ of women’s bodies. What constitutes a risk or hazard at any particular socio-historical moment is itself a social construction.\(^{59}\) The focus of this paper is not on the objective risks associated with any particular activity, but upon how risk discourses operate to authorize and legitimate particular exclusionary practices. Discourses surrounding particular risks set the stage for the policing of individuals who occupy subject positions or engage in behaviours that mark them as “at risk.” This policing may be the work of state agents (e.g., racial profiling\(^ {60}\)), average citizens (e.g., community surveillance programs\(^ {61}\)), or subjects themselves (e.g., when individuals take up diet and/or exercise regimes to maintain good health\(^ {62}\)). Often, these discourses have particularly targeted individuals or groups who pose a threat to the status quo. During the “witch craze,” for example, women, the mentally ill, and opponents of dominant religious organizations were particularly targeted as those who posed a risk, and were often ‘tried’ and put to death.\(^ {63}\)

Historically, there have been a number of discourses that have marked women as subjects of risk discourses. These discourses serve to constrain women’s actions, and construct them as subjects in need of policing (by themselves and others). Lupton for example, discusses the ways in which lay and medical discourses construct “the pregnancy experience” as fraught with risk. Pregnant women, she points out, become subject to this discourse, and many voluntarily assume it as they take measures (e.g., folic acid supplements) to mitigate these risks: “Producing a ‘perfect’ infant is seen to be at least partly a result of the women’s ability to exert control over her body, to seek out and subscribe to, expert advice and engage in self-sacrifice for the sake of her foetus.”\(^ {64}\) These discourses, Lupton points out, are rooted in expert knowledges (associated with the medical profession, for example) and testing procedures (e.g., ultrasound tests) “to
which the woman has no access except through expert intervention and interpretation. These discourses construct what is “within the true” with respect to pregnancy, and not only constrain pregnant women’s actions, but also give others some degree of licence to police women’s actions. Pregnant women become embedded in a web of surveillance in which there is no such thing as a no-risk pregnancy. As Lupton argues elsewhere, the discourse outlined above also operates as a mechanism of social control in the case of women who are not pregnant, but are simply potentially pregnant, or even potentially pregnant at some unspecified future time.

There is a lengthy history of women’s exclusion from participation in various forms of physical activity, an exclusion often intimately connected to the circulation and operation of the pregnancy discourse outlined above. In the early 20th century, medical discourses rooted in Victorian ideas of women’s moral virtue, and their physical and intellectual inferiority, positioned women as both too weak for vigorous physical activity and morally obligated to “preserve their vital physical energy for childbearing and to cultivate personality traits suited to the wife-and-mother role.” Discourse around menstruation was a particularly poignant example of this phenomenon, with “malestream gynecology” constructing “any menstrual variation as a condition demanding heroic medical intervention.” Exercise during menstruation was discursively constructed as self-centred and frivolous, and women who ‘failed’ to closely monitor themselves and their reproductive capacities were seen to be breaching a sacred duty. Medical discourse focused on the frailty of women’s internal organs – especially their reproductive organs. The uterus, in particular, was a subject of considerable medical scrutiny. Even in an era where some light physical activity during menstruation was thought to have numerous benefits for women, there were strong objections to women’s involvement in vigorous exercise for fear of uterine displacement. Out of this discourse arose different rules and
guidelines for certain activities, especially those involving jumping, thought to be a particular threat to the uterus. Basketball, for example, was embraced by proponents who believed it to produce qualities important to ‘womanhood,’ but was seen as in need of modification to reduce the strain on women’s bodies. Ski jumping during the 1920s and 1930 was viewed as a strenuous sport for both men and women. Isobel Coursier recalls the demanding physical feat of merely reaching the top of the ski jump:

And you certainly couldn’t get up to practice there without going up on your skis, with or without poles. So, you’d have, you know, to zig-zag up, to get there. There was no getting in on a horse or sleigh to get up there. So it kept you, you, you were fully warmed up, thoroughly warmed up. And I think that’s why we didn’t have any accidents. I never had any accidents to my wrist or knees, or my ankles or my hips. Because you know by the time you got there and got your breath and then up to where you were going to come down the jump uh, it was a constant stream of, you didn’t wait and get cold. You didn’t have much of a wait at the top unless somebody fell and made a great big hole in the hill and then they had to fill that in. But, and yet you were warm as you came down, ankles and knees and your body. So, I’ve, I’ve never used chair lifts to any extent. They didn’t exist here and then any place.

In light of the physical demands of the activity, and the perceived dangers of the sport, early women’s ski jumping also faced adaptations to lessen the risk to women bodies. For example, in Revelstoke, British Columbia, most of the “glider girls” jumped with the assistance of a man who went down the jump with them offering support. Coursier stood out from the rest of her group; she was the only female skier in her group to jump alone without the support of a male skier.
During this same period, the IOC justified the exclusion of women from particular Olympic events on the grounds that women’s bodies – and in particular their reproductive functions – would be irreparably harmed by such vigorous activity. These exclusions came despite evidence that women’s bodies were strong enough for “vigorous” physical activity. Even when women were ‘permitted’ to participate in particularly strenuous events, this was often closely monitored by officials ostensibly concerned about women’s well being, despite the fact that men routinely showed signs of the same kinds of fatigue following similar events. At the 1928 Games in Amsterdam, for instance, the IOC granted women access to only five track and field events, and “became, at first, embarrassed, and then, infuriated at what they perceived to be a horrific catastrophe in the women’s 800 metres event.” While a number of women set records in the event, others allegedly collapsed on the track in exhaustion. As a result, the IOC removed the event from the Olympic programme, and some members, ignoring the fact that some of the men experienced similar symptoms at this distance, “argued for complete expulsion of women from the Olympic games.” This did not come to pass, though women’s athletics remained on the Olympic programme “in a limited capacity and under close scrutiny.”

Canadian women’s ice hockey participation, and the associated discourse, offers another example of women being marked as subjects of risk discourses, constraining women’s actions, and constructing them as subjects in need of policing. By the early 1920s, women’s hockey in Canada had a reputation of being a working-class women’s pastime, where brawls, aggressive play, and injuries were common. Women, while emulating the men’s brand of hockey revered by Canadians, faced censure for copying the aggressive actions of their male counterparts. Press reports made clear the appropriate social expectations of female hockey players. However, as early as the 1920s, female
hockey players were challenging the residual Victorian notions of women as weak and passive and, by extension, their imposed inferiority status. Newspaper reports from women’s hockey during the interwar years suggested that, like the men’s game, women’s hockey was also fast, aggressive and, at times, violent. Headlines such as “Sticks and Fists Fly Freely as Girl Hockeyists Battle;” “Girls Wanted Another Fight But Referees Stopped Them;” “Hockey Amazons in Fistic Display;” “Girls Draw Majors For Fistic Display” suggested that women played a tough, aggressive form of hockey. Sports leaders of the era, highlighting the risks of this type of behaviour, encouraged women to “clean up” the sport. For example, Alexandrine Gibb in her *Toronto Star* column, “No Man’s Land of Sport”, repeatedly chastised aggressive players for their “non-lady-like” behaviour. Commenting on the Dominion Championship game in 1935 between the Preston Rivulettes and the Winnipeg Eatons where “tempers flared, sticks and fists flew in reckless abandon as the rival players dropped the foils,” Gibb reprimanded the behaviour of the athletes stating,

Athletic girls do not often lose their tempers in any game. They have been taught that it is very bad indeed for the boys to do that, but it is practically fatal for girls….Girls can’t afford to stage shows of that kind if they want to keep in sport. It’s quite exciting to see it at the time and you get a kick out of the exhibition, but when it is all over and the tempers cool out, they are usually much ashamed. They should be. Press reports such as this make clear the social expectations of female hockey players in this era. Moreover, the silences around athletic, independent women playing hockey, ski-jumping, or engaging in other similar activities, entrench the biological essentialism implicit in many popular
discussions of sport and gender. The logic seems to be that while men’s bodies (and minds) are up to the challenge of ‘dangerous’ activities, women’s simply are not. Hargreaves argues that gender stereotyping has been an integral part of the development of organized sport.\(^87\) It has always been easier for women to gain access to those events considered socially acceptable for women, suitable for the female body, and less threatening to the current definitions of femininity. Yet, despite the censure and criticism female hockey players faced when engaging in behaviours that put them “at risk,” Wamsley and Adams suggest that many women embraced strategies of aggression in hockey, sometimes engaged in violent acts, and that, as a result of the aggressive styles of play between female athletes, there were significant injuries to players on a regular basis.\(^88\)

In the contemporary sporting world, we continue to see discourses of risk and gender in operation, albeit in different ways. There seems to be deep ambivalence surrounding women who engage in activities that put them “at risk.” This ambivalence is often directly connected to discourses of motherhood. Palmer illustrates this as she describes the experiences of two women who were elite mountaineers. Both became the subject of tremendous public scrutiny for their decisions to “shirk” their family roles to pursue this leisure activity. Indeed, when one of them was killed in 1995,

we saw the morality of risk taking go into overdrive. As a mother of two, [Alison] Hargreaves had effectively abandoned her children by taking such extraordinary risks. The particular cultural definitions and limitations imposed upon Hargreaves ensured she would never dramatically, if fatally distinguish herself from the crowd as a \textit{climber}, but rather as an errant, unthinking mother.\(^89\)
The media constructions that followed the tragedy explicitly questioned Hargreaves’ motivations, and indeed the commensurability of ambition and motherhood, asking, for example, “Should mothers climb mountains?”\textsuperscript{90} The vilification of Hargreaves stood in stark contrast to the ways in which she had been constructed as a national heroine prior to her death.\textsuperscript{91} The following year, however, when Rob Hall died on Mount Everest, leaving behind a pregnant wife, at no point did the media criticize him for “abandoning” his family responsibilities.\textsuperscript{92}

In this contemporary discourse around women, risk and sport, the focus is less often on risk to women’s physical childbearing possibilities, but instead their “duty of care” as mothers.\textsuperscript{93} Though the discourse has shifted somewhat in terms of its emphasis on medical, social, and moral dimensions (and the interconnections between them), it continues to operate as a mechanism of social control over women interested in participating in sporting activities that disrupt dominant notions of femininity and motherhood. In addition, there is some evidence to suggest that traces of the (now discredited) medical discourse remain. Prior to the 2004 Games in Turin, Italy, then president of the FIS, Gian-Franco Kasper, was quoted as saying of women’s ski jumping: “…don’t forget, it’s like jumping down from, let’s say about two metres, on the ground about a thousand times a year, which seems not to be appropriate for ladies from a medical point of view.”\textsuperscript{94} This paternalistic ‘protection’ of women is also evident in different rules for women and men in terms of which hills they can jump in competition.\textsuperscript{95}

Risk discourses (particularly those constructed around femininity and motherhood) have played and continue to play a central role in the way that society generally responds to women participating in activities thought to put them “at risk.” This is particularly important in light of a move by the IOC towards gender inclusiveness in 1991. At that time, the IOC made a commitment that new sports added to the Olympic roster would be available for both men and
Because ski jumping had been on the Olympic roster since 1924, however, it was “grandfathered" from this commitment. This is a crucial silence. The original decision to exclude women from the ski jumping competition (as well as numerous other events, it should be noted) was made in a period dominated by the risk discourses outlined above, in which women (and their reproductive organs) were constructed as frail and in need of medical protection. The grandfathering of women’s exclusion from ski jumping competition, then, serves to re-entrench the sexist attitudes on which the earlier decision rested. These paternalistic practices of the IOC are deeply embedded in historical notions of women in need of protection. Yet, as Robinson reminds us, it is the responsibility of the IOC and international sport organizations to recognize and challenge historical discriminatory practices, not perpetuate them. Perhaps more importantly, the silence around these earlier discourses in the current formation is a conspicuous one, and is integral to the framing of the IOC and the Olympic movement as committed to fairness and equality.

Concluding Remarks

While the IOC has been criticized for their recent decision by women ski jumpers and their proponents, the discourse surrounding the decision to exclude the women has remained relatively focused on issues of fairness, elitism, the Olympic ideal, and technical requirements. Within this framework, IOC officials, and particularly President Jacques Rogge, are authorized as the experts on Olympism and Olympic ideals. Moreover, their claims that women’s ski jumping has not met the technical requirements for inclusion in the Olympic Games are correct. However, there are a number of important and conspicuous discursive silences and political implications around this controversy. The IOC has made numerous exceptions over the years to the very guidelines to which they are holding so firmly in the case of women’s ski jumping.
Similarly, there seems to be an almost complete dismissal of the history and legacy of women’s participation in the sport, dating back to the mid to late 1800s. Perhaps most important (and most silent) among these is the ways particular risk discourses have operated to exclude women from participation in these events at all levels. Not only were these discourses important in the original decision to exclude women from ski jumping, but they are also implicated in the decisions by other bodies (e.g., the FIS, national organizations) to “allow” women to compete officially.¹⁰⁰ This only serves as a further blockade to women’s Olympic inclusion, as these other competitions become part of the foundation on which women ski jumpers and their supporters can build a case for Olympic inclusion.¹⁰¹ Though we have considered each of these silences on their own, they are, of course, intimately interconnected. Isabel Coursier and the “glider girls,” for example were public figures at a time when there was deep ambivalence about this kind of athletic femininity. It is perhaps unsurprising, then, to find that this history is virtually invisible in current debates about the exclusion of women’s ski jumping. Similarly, the fact that the IOC places an embargo on meeting minutes further marks their decisions as beyond (timely) scrutiny. The relationships between these silences reinforce what is present in the discourse as “within the true,” acting to ignore particular voices and authorize others.

While our analysis has centered on these silences as central to, and implicated in, a discourse that constrains women’s actions, feminist scholars have suggested that we must go beyond a straightforward interrogation of who or what is absent in the texts we consider. In addition, they suggest, we must consider these texts that construct particular kinds of women subjects as responses to an unspoken (and often subversive) alternative.¹⁰² That is to say that discursive constructions may be read as efforts to make invisible those women, historical data, or athletic performances, for example, that trouble or subvert dominant power relations. The
emphasis here is on discourses as dynamic, contingent, and always already subject to challenges at the hands of those subjects who do not conform to dominant constructions. In our view, the case of women’s ski jumping illustrates this point rather well.

As illustrated by the silences outlined above, the controversy over women’s ski jumping illustrates the intersection of Olympic discourse with a discourse of feminine athleticism, one that constructs women athletes as inherently different from (indeed, physically inferior to) men athletes. Throughout the modern Olympic Movement, we have increasingly seen a celebration of athletic femininity. But, it is often a femininity constructed within the confines of perpetuated discourses that reinforce women’s bodies as “at risk” and in need of protection. The ‘unspoken alternatives’ here are the women ski-jumpers, past and present, who disrupt these ideas. Women who compete alongside men, who jump further than men, who resist their infantalization, and who push for the inclusion of ski-jumping in the Olympic Games, all constitute threats to dominant constructions of both the Olympics and female athleticism. That these threats are generally silenced in the discourse can be read as a response to these threats, a way of shoring up constructions of the gender binary in sport, efforts to maintain sport (especially the most risky, high-performance versions thereof) as a male preserve (Messner, 1998).

In our view, this way of theorizing discourse both complicates relations of power (as it should do) and relocates women’s lived experience as relevant to struggles over discursive constructions and the decisions shaped by them. It would, perhaps, be naively optimistic to suggest that the IOC, a body committed to acting “against any form of discrimination affecting the Olympic movement,” is likely to self-critically institute sweeping changes. Past practice does not provide us with much confidence in this. This is not to suggest that the IOC has not made any strides forward, but that those strides have often been partial and/or fraught with contradiction.
What we are suggesting here, then, is that the IOC, the FIS, and other bodies will have their hands forced as women continue to resist the ways they are constructed. The lawsuit described above, for example, was one of the few texts we discovered that shed light on some of the silences we have considered in this paper. This, we believe, is where the real promise of this lawsuit lies. While it may have failed from a legal perspective, it certainly brought the issue to the media’s attention, and has the potential to serve as one of the mechanisms that helps end silences that perpetuate old sexist practices and hide new ones from view. Otherwise, we simply have a case of “old wine in new bottles” as the IOC dresses up the same exclusionary practices in new garb.
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