Article

Calling Time Out in Doha: The Seiko Block Camera and Image Ethics

David Staton ⬤

Abstract
In an effort to put more eyeballs on television sets, and in an attempt to reinvigorate a sport long beleaguered by doping scandals, recent questions surrounding female sponsorships, and a vanishing audience, the International Association of Athletic Federations unveiled a new camera designed by Seiko during the September 2019 World Championships held in Doha, Quatar. The idea was to add to an immersive experience, offering unparalleled views of sprinters at the moment they exploded from the starting blocks. Like many things during the Doha meet, the effort became an ending to a bad joke. Rather than getting to the heart of the event, the camera's focus was a bit lower; the Seiko angle became known derisively as the crotch shot. After objections by two female German sprinters the positioning of the camera angle (specifically what would be shown when) was reconsidered, reframed, and essentially retired. Control of the body, including how it is observed, and the closely related idea of the control of one's image are bound by certain ethical dimensions, particularly when that control is violated or profited from by outside parties. This paper interrogates how those concerns may be ameliorated by embracing an ethics of care.

Department of Journalism and Media Studies, University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, Colorado, United States

Corresponding Author:
David Staton, Department of Journalism and Media Studies, University of Northern Colorado, Campus Box 28, 501 20th Street, Greeley, CO 80639, United States.
Email: David.staton@unco.edu

A False Start in Doha: the Seiko Block Camera and Image Ethics

In an effort to gain viewership, and in an attempt to reinvigorate a sport long beleaguered by doping scandals, a vanishing audience, and questions of gender equity World Athletics (formerly International Association of Athletic Federations, or IAAF) unveiled a new camera designed in cooperation with Seiko during the September 2019 World Athletics Championships held in Doha, Qatar. The idea was to add to an immersive experience, offering unparalleled views of selected sprint competitions at the moment runners exploded from the starting blocks.

In an attempt to bring the viewer from the couch to the coliseum by placing the action in their laps, television producers invaded both the personal and professional (work) space of the athletes. The ever-closer aesthetic particular to the world of viewing sport creates a rich experience for fandom and riches for the networks who broadcast such competition. What's given rare consideration are the athletes themselves who are often lensed in intimate detail.

Employing an ethics of care, an approach that stresses the equality of communicative relationships, this paper will broadly consider the implications for the application of an ethical intervention in the arena of televised sport. Do such ever-nearer views of athletes at work compromise privacy and, if so, how might an ethical consideration be applied to mitigate ill will and bad press? A framework may prove useful in navigating the seemingly blinding speed with which digital developments impacting perception enter the sport marketplace and avoid potential pushback by athletes and audiences. At minimum, if broadcast networks and other sport content producing concerns, alongside the sports' varying governing bodies, embraced the suggested ethical dimension they might engender a sense of equity. Toward that end, both producers and consumers of sport content might ask this simple question: How close is too close? The dimples on the golf ball atop a tee may pass muster. A camera shot lingering on the dimples of a runner's inner thigh may not.

In this article, I will use the instance of the use of the Seiko Block Camera at the Doha World Athletic Championships as a case study toward examining how an ethical framework might better accord the voices of athlete's in implementing new technology, particularly when such interventions may encumber performance. It, in some ways, acts as a cautionary tale with respect to athletic autonomy and representation. A history of ever-closer innovations and the constituted gaze will be discussed to add context to this contemporary discussion. Finally, remedies will be suggested to complement an embrace of ethics.

Background

Prior to the 2019 meet, the director of broadcasting for the world championship promoted Seiko's Block Cam as offering a never-before-seen approach. "The new cameras within the blocks will capture that intense moment just before a race. Seiko has done a brilliant job of bringing this to life," (para 7) noted director James Lord in a World Athletics press release. What was brought to life, in actuality, was a cause célèbre that jolted the event. Internationally, the press responded. The athletes, the *singular* reason for viewership, balked at the use of the camera, going so far as to call it an invasion of a sacred space. Though television production documents governing camera and crew placements ran to more than 100 pages, the athletes were not consulted about the placement of the camera between their legs.

Like many things during the Doha meet ("overwhelming heat and underwhelming crowds" the *New York Times* noted while *The Guardian* and the *Telegraph* headlined articles about the meet using the word "disaster"), the camera effort fell short. By its own accounting, the World Athletic Championships meet is the third largest global sporting event. Winners of some competitions automatically qualified for the Olympic Games in Tokyo and the meet provided opportunity to garner qualifying standards for the Games. Rather than distilling the essence of the race's start—anticipation, synaptic explosion, other-worldly power in initiating a graceful stride—the camera's focus diminished the race's elegant intricacies. Athletes had to straddle the Seiko camera in order to enter the starting blocks and the new perspective became known derisively—by both international, mainstream news outlets as well as niche sport publications— as the "crotch cam." The Associated Press, the *Daily Mail*, Yahoo! Sport, *The Guardian,* the *Los Angeles Times*, and the BBC all weighed in with the vulgar description, as well as trade and niche platforms such as *Fstoppers,* Eurosport, and LetsRun.com among many others. After objections by the German Athletics Federation, the positioning of the camera angle (specifically *what* would be shown *when*) was reconsidered, and repurposed but not altogether retired.

To be sure, there is a transactional value enjoyed by popular athletes; their documented performance on the field or the pitch or in the arena may be rewarded monetarily and contractual obligations may bind them to prescribed television appearances. The bulk of professional and amateur athletes, however, do not enjoy those salaries and commercial endorsement is rare for fringe sports. (A generational track and field competitor, sprinter Usain Bolt made more than $30 million in 2018, according to *Forbes* magazine, though less than $1 million of that figure came from racing.) Ought a larger salary bring or legitimize outsize scrutiny of athletes' bodies? Should athlete's forgo privacy or autonomy as a

condition of employment? If an athlete does not have control of how their image, their body, or their likeness is presented and re-presented, they indeed forfeit autonomy. Such queries may ultimately be settled by legally binding documents, but does that make it okay ethically? In this case study, I propose an ethical intervention may have better served the competitors by inviting their input.

In imposing such a literal viewpoint, the exposure of a person's groin, there is an ethical dimension contingent on human subjectivity that seems to have gone unobserved by World Athletics: visual images are saturated with, and sustained by, a particular type of power due to their visual textuality and the track athletes were not accorded any authorship nor agency in this narrative. Control of the body, including how it is displayed, and the closely related idea of the control of one's image in the world of sport, are bound by certain ethical dimensions, particularly when that control is violated or profited from by outside parties. The issue of image control posed by the Seiko Block Camera is not an isolated case. A similar situation has played out in the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), the oversight body for collegiate athletics in the United States. A decades-in-the-making decision by the organization in October, 2019 affirmed collegiate athletes the right to legitimately be compensated for commercial use of their likeness, thereby exerting some control in their representation. The NCAA enjoys non-profit status, though its most recent financial statement for 2019 demonstrates revenue exceeding $1 billion (Crowe LLP, 2019). That figure is largely fueled by lucrative television contracts ensuring broadcast exposure for the amateur athletes it oversees. And, late in 2020, thousands of member players of Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA), the governing body of association football, signaled their intent to sue a video game manufacturer, Electronic Arts, because their images had been appropriated without consent (Humayun, 2020).

At a late January meet in 2021, collegian Christian Noble crossed the finish line of the 5,000 meters race with a record-setting time. The NCAA, however, did not immediately recognize the mark because the meet promoters had implemented a digital display (pacing lights, which surround the oval and visually mark the runner's pace relative to time) that the sanctioning body said acted as an unfair advantage. After some debate, Noble was awarded the record-setting time, but not before careful consideration and consult was given concerning the use of the technology. That idea, of negotiation and mediation, ought to have taken place prior to the distance runner's shining moment.

Camera Innovation in Sports

In the ever-broadening televised sporting arena, an applied broadcast logic and resultant media logic creates (and attends to) a viewer's desire to be near enough to reach out and touch the athletes while observing the action from a host of

angles. In pursuit of sporting simulacrum the logic insinuates and insists "being there" holds tremendous appeal. Over the last 50 years, broadcasters have moved toward a sort of wish fulfillment for sports viewers to directly connect with that vantage due in large part to technological innovation. Zettl (2005) prescribes two fundamental ways of looking at visual media: looking *at* an event and looking *into* an event. In the first, the camera is used primarily to report what is going on. One might consider this sort of looking an objective approach. In looking into an event, Zettl addresses psychological implications and emotional tensions: "'Looking into' not only shows what is happening, but why. Its main purpose is event intensification" (p. 202). Here, clearly, a subjective viewpoint is informed. Innovation has brought looking *at* and looking *into* together.

Consider the sea change affected by the implementation of instant replay. Making its debut in an Army versus Navy football contest in 1963, the now ubiquitous review/rewind/revisit/reconsider viewing function forever changed the way television viewers experience sport. It was implemented during that late autumn game played between the service academies just three weeks after the assassination of President Kennedy. Following a Black Knights touchdown the broadcasters alerted viewers, "Ladies and gentleman, Army has not scored again!" prior to revisiting the captured moment (Raphaelson, 2015, para 11). McLuhan (Cox & Crean, 1976), in an interview, noted of the innovation that it offered a post-convergent moment in television. What a mass viewership had synchronously experienced for the first time offered a new and informed insight into sport; the innovation afforded a reliving of an instant that allowed for the actual, visual verifiability of a redo, a re-experience, a reconsideration, a momentary halting of an impassioned past time. Many more time-and-space altering innovations would occur and, in each case, viewers were coming closer to the action and, via slow-motion technology, altering its pace. This creates a sort of subversion of temporality and distance. As such, the advent of instant replay marked what would become an expansive moment in televised sport, a winnowing and enlarging of viewpoints made possible through technological advances in photo optics and engineering. Lens zoom, remote shutter releases, electronic view finders, auto focus mechanisms, and ever lighter (thus more portable) camera and recording innovations fueled looking at and looking into sport. The placement or location of those technologies, literal points of view, also shaped the ways in which competition is viewed.

Seemingly ubiquitous in outdoor venues today, Skycam, the system of robots, wires, and cameras that allow viewers to fly over the on-field action, debuted in 1984. Cummins (2009) study using subjective images garnered from Skycam of a college football game indicates a clear rise in the sense of viewer presence, spatially and in terms of engagement over views offered by traditional sideline cameras. In a follow-up study, Cummins et al. (2012) tethered the use of subjective camera angle presented to sports fans to arousal and enjoyment. From overhead to underneath: in 1992, Kluetmeier became the first

photographer to place a camera on the bottom of an Olympic pool, offering a worm's eye view of aquatic action, again affording viewers unprecedented viewing angles (Dietsch, 2008). Camera angles don't exclusively add a sense of being there, they also add a sense of power particularly when those angles are vertical (Giessner et al., 2011). Innovation in such angles comes in the form of the Divecam, a vertical-dropping camera system synched with the descent of the diver, debuted at the 1996 Olympic Games. It offers synchronized, parallel viewing of the action, allowing viewers to vertically plummet from the dive platform alongside the athlete as they plummet at 35 mph toward the water. Traveling much faster—126 miles an hour—is Serena Williams' serve speed. It's a blur except when seen by Hawk-Eye, which enables viewers to track the trajectory of the ball.

Ethical dimensions of non-human decision making in competition have been examined in court sports (B. Dyer, 2015) and cricket (Steen, 2011). And, with more specificity, Hawk-Eye has been critically condemned on the court—tennis aces Roger Federer and Novak Djokovic have demonstrably opposed the decisiveness of the technology—and off. Former professional tennis player, Michael Stich (2007), has noted Hawk-Eye an inaccurate measure not accounting for in-play nuance. Some professional golfers, too, have notably fraught relationships with camera crews. The popular bad-boy-of-the-moment on the pro tour, Bryson DeChambeau, was widely criticized for a testy exchange with a camera operator during a tournament in July, 2020. DeChambeau sought to retain privacy as the camera captured him struggling with a shot in a sand trap whilst golf has always championed transparency. "I think we need to start protecting our players out here compared to showing a potential vulnerability and hurting someone's image," the pro told reporters following the Rocket Mortgage Classic third round (Gray, 2020, para 4). Athletes, particularly those in individual sports, might consider the always-on relentlessness of the camera blessing and curse as they are often its singular focus. Being on display may lead to prize money and perhaps commercial endorsement, but it can lay bare one's physical shortcomings in 4 K detail on, and sometimes off, the field of play. The players' acknowledgment of the camera constitutes a sort of heightened awareness of surveillance.

Point of View

The adoption by the ESPN *Summer X Games* in 2011 of the GoPro camera demonstrated the personal could go professional, when the small, affordable device offered broadcast viewers a participant's point of view. This sort of first-person visual narration creates a new style of realism (Ortiz & Moya, 2015) and an embodied identification

> The viewer's mirror neurons copy the real sensations and enable the viewer to experience, virtually and in safety, the same emotions felt by the person actually

taking part in the action. This produces an embodied link between a character who records the action from his or her own body and a viewer who fully identifies with that person thanks to the phenomenon of embodied simulation (p. 62).

Action sports and racing events now routinely allow viewers to visualize the course and competitor spacing using drones. Drone technology was deployed during the Sochi Olympics to offer intimate and invigorating coverage of snow boarding and ski jumping. It's a far cheaper, more mobile version of helicopter tracking, placing viewers at once above, yet near the action, offering a previously unavailable perspective (Ayranci, 2017). Such viewpoints, once impossible to see given the the human eye, have been developed by Intel. The high tech giant's TrueView uses massive computing power and a battery of cameras to immerse viewers in 360 degree experience of live, sporting events, chiefly National Football League (NFL) games. Intel wed drone technology with TrueView in the halftime presentation during 2018's Super Bowl LII. These applied technologies—in the pursuit of getting ever closer to the action—inform a way of viewing that is visually immersive and emotionally engaging when properly implemented. They do not, however, offer insight or input from athletes into ways of *being* viewed. The viewers' privileged proximity is akin to a panopticon, eyes always drawn to those marked bodies in uniform.

A variant of such voyeurism is related to advances in viewing, more specifically sharing the point of view of the athlete. Early efforts included National Association for Stock Car Racing's (NASCAR) debut of RaceCam in driver Cale Yarborough's car in 1983, which allowed viewers to trace his left hand turns over the course of 500 miles. Helmet cameras worn by motorcycle racers at Carlsbad Raceway surfaced three years later and World League of American Football (WFL) players introduced an in-game helmet camera (costing about $20 thousand) in 1991. In the debut of the technology in the WFL, a quarterback wearing the camera was hit so hard by a defender the helmet and camera flew from his head onto the turf. The quarterback, the Orlando Thunder's Kerwin Bell, recounted coming to the sidelines after the debating blow: "I was coming to the sideline, and all of a sudden people rush up to me. I thought they were worried about me being hurt, but they were worried about the helmet cam." (Lemire, 2019, para 9). Also in furtherance of a closer-closer look, network coverage of a variety of sport turned to a more-is-more approach. Whereas early professional football games typically used a two camera setup (NFL Football Operations, 2020), FOX network's coverage of Super Bowl LIV, in February 2020, used 90 cameras. That inside look takes place on the baseball diamond, as well. Major League Baseball routinely features players, triumphant or tearful, in the dugout. The International Tennis Federation zooms in on players barking at chair umpires. And, in October 2019, viewers could virtually join in a confetti storm with other National Women's Soccer League players celebrating a championship in Cary, North Carolina. In general, viewers engage

in these public-private moments at a direct, eye level vantage; it is an engaging viewpoint or camera angle simulating human vision. There are, of course, exceptions that afford viewers innovative and energized camera perspectives: the rim rattling dunk lensed from atop the backboard or the graphically, detailed trajectory of a moonshot home run as it exits the ball park and the 2015 introduction in collegiate and professional football of the pylon camera. The deliberate and intended focus in most, but certainly not all, televised sport competitions are those decisive moments: when club face strikes dimpled ball, the shot leaves a forward's flicked wrist and hits nothing but net, or the javelin momentarily defies gravity to sail downfield. Even though we often look up to sports heroes, from the comforts of the couch we, with rare exception, don't often look up *at* our heroes. In Doha, sprint competitions in track and field—in which there are no offensive strategies, no designed plays and no integral or intervening apparatus—provided an exception.

A September, 2019 press release from Seiko heralded the arrival of its Block Cam. Promoting its debut at the 17th IAAF World Athletic Championships, the release noted: "Thanks to these two cameras in each block, the audience will see the expressions on the athletes' faces as they prepare for the gun and the explosive way that they propel themselves forward from the blocks." A short time later, a *Japan Time*s (2019) article about the innovation included this: "Block Cam technology allows TV viewers to see everything—from the athletes' faces as they settle into the blocks, to the explosiveness of their powerful starts as they take off after the gun." And, with that "everything," when the Doha sprint events began so did athletes' complaints.

One of the sprinters, Gina Lückenkemper, in a statement released by her spokesperson, and reported by the BBC (2019) among other news outlets, noted it was "very unpleasant stepping over these cameras as I get into the blocks wearing these scanty clothes." Yahoo! Sport, the world's most visited sport content website (eBiz, 2020) published an article, "Indecent and invasive: Athletics rocked by 'creepy' camera controversy." A poll accompanied the story surveying its millions of readers with the question, "Are athletes right to complain about the new 'crotch cams'?" In the article, Lückenkemper, again, noted, "I as a woman find that quite stupid. And, I have said I would doubt that a woman was part of the development of the camera" (Guy & Halasz, 2019). The sprinter appears to be correct. Westbury Gillett, World Athletics Productions Creative and Live Director, is the man who conceived the idea (World Athletics, Press release, September 2019). Another man, Harumitsu Akashi, is the CEO of Seiko, the developer of the technology, who noted of the athletes' reception of the technology, "I can't even understand it, that was not our intention, but the development is so new that everyone has to get used to it." (archysport.com, October 1, 2019). This dismissive note—"everyone has to get used to it"—suggests a structured, gender bias specifically toward athletes and, in a larger sense, toward athletes' bodies in not considering their input into their representation.

An ethical dialogue ought to consider the various powers and perspectives of camera and subject.

The camera controversy, though largely framed by the media internationally as objections from women competitors, (*The Sun*, *New York Daily News*, *Peta Pixel*, the BBC, CNN, *Running* and *Fstoppers* magazines among other media outlets headlined women's complaints) was enjoined by men, as well. South African 100-meter specialist Akani Simbine noted the cameras were an intrusion into a "sacred space" while British sprinter Zarnel Hughes expressed his concern over the audible qualities of the camera, the implication being that the sound might trigger a runner's false start. He also noted, "'It's a cool feature but it's a bit scary at the same time because it's looking up your nose. You aren't looking at it. You know it's there because when you are set on your blocks you hear it" (C. Dyer, 2019, para 31). Amélie Ebert, of the Athlete Commission of the German Olympic Sport Confederation, echoed athlete's concerns, publicly stating the governing body and presenters should have consulted all athletes before deploying the technology (BBC, 2019). This idea that all stakeholders ought to have a say in decision making is an embodiment of care ethics, which argues "we should work to make all human beings part of our community of dialogue and concern (Nussbaum, 1994, para 13).

Power and the Panopticon

Both ethics of care and the panopticon concern themselves with asymmetrical power. In the ethics of care dynamic, such imbalance is recognized and directly addressed; attention and benevolence is given those in need. With the panopticon, strength is granted those doing the looking; the observed are at a disadvantage, powerless over being viewed. Jeremy Bentham, the English philosopher and social theorist, is widely credited with creating the concept in 1785, though younger brother Samuel developed the germ of the concept. In brief, the idea is that people (in the initial instance prisoners) are being observed at all times, but they never know at exactly when they are being looked upon. The implications for power and social control reside in this sense of omniscience, being "always on" or being always looked upon, and were central to Foucault's (1975) advancement of the panopticon and ideas of bodies and power in *Discipline and Punish*. The book's original title in French is "*Surveiller et punir*"; *surveiller* translates as to monitor, watch, supervise. One of the tenets of Foucault's book is that an unequal gaze creates docile bodies. As such, behaviors can be regulated or inhibited. It may, theoretically, portend the end of violence. Or it may impose a sort of violence by creating a particular kind of looking created by a camera perspective. More so than capturing team sports, in the televising of individual sport, such potential for a controlling, less diffuse, gaze exists particularly with the advent of technologies that isolate athletes' bodies.

The literature concerning camera perspectives, including the idea that proximity and angle can inform or create a particular type of looking, is convincing and rich. Zettl's (2005) is a seminal text. "Although such processes are designed to help the audience see the world from a new perspective and experience it in heightened ways, they also imply a direct and calculated manipulation of the audience's perceptions" (p. 15). A by-product of this manipulation is the creation of particular ways of seeing or ways of looking including the male gaze (Mulvey, 1975), the colonial gaze (Ram, 2018), the post-colonial gaze (Said, 1978), the female gaze (Pollock, 1992), and the erotic gaze (Oates, 2007) among others. Ways of seeing, more particular to the athletic field of endeavor, investigate the ways in which content and framing may facilitate such ways of looking and have been interrogated through a variety of methods and perspectives. A National Institute of Health examination (Puertas-Molero et al., 2019), for instance, offers a sort of clinical approach that points to the powerful, imitative influence of televised sport; what we see, the study suggests, is what we do. And too, these examinations, such as a longitudinal study by the Center for Feminist Research at the University of Southern California, "Gender in Televised Sports," (Cooky & Messner, 2009), have frequently focused on representation and gender or gender hierarchy. They have found the television industry and sports journalism as a whole lacking with regard to equal representation.

The Block Cam points up from the starting block on the track's surface toward the athletes' body; the face, torso, and, when taking their position in the starting blocks, the area between the legs is shown. The camera angle is tight, steady and persistent; such a position, Mutz (2007) contends, is intimate: "The close-up creates a sense of spatial intimacy that often violates individuals' boundaries for personal space" (p. 623) which in turn creates an in-your-face experience. In a broader sense, Waltorp (2018) interrogates the camera's role as a mediator, a prosthetic device, which, following Benjamin (1968), can reveal unconscious optics. Benjamin speaks to the power of the camera's eye: "Evidently a different nature opens itself to the camera than opens to the naked eye—if only because an unconsciously penetrated space is substituted for a space consciously explored" (p. 236).

In televised pursuit of proximity, a *penetrated* space, such as that accorded to the Block Cam, may be a violation or a perceived violation. How close is too close? A macro view of bodies in motion, a team, say, constitutes a surveying or surveillance of the field of competition and its components. Athletes agree to this panoptic view as a concession to playing the game and being visible; for many competing as professionals, this explicit contract, an implied proximity, is attendant with compensation. And so, within accepted norms on the playing field, when macro moves to micro examination via the closeup, the batter's box for example, athletes assent. But, this isn't always the case. Even when the camera operator is conspicuously visible, athletes, particularly those in

individual pursuits, sometimes balk at such exposure, demanding control of the (visual) narrative; the rationale is that their comfort, and hence ability to perform at peak level, should supersede viewer experience. If the camera recording is more invasive, *less* visible, the objections to an implicitly agreed upon surveillance may be considered a legitimate violation of the contract to be seen.

"Doha Declaration"

Short of when they are injured, athletes' bodies (or their bodies *and* an intermediary object such as a high performance car) are essential source material in televised sport. In the specific case noted herein, the bodies of track and field sprinters are conspicuous; they rely on skin-hugging fabrics, lightweight shoes, a flat, smooth surface and not much else. An equitable way of looking and being looked at for these athletes may use ethics as a scaffold. This particular sort of ethics, one that avoids harm, psychological or physical, is provoked by the Seiko invention and other ever-closer viewing technologies.

In pursuit of a panacea, remarkably one need look no further than a proclamation by the city of Doha. Adopted in 2001 by the World Trade Organization, the Doha Declaration is a trade agreement concerning intellectual properties and public health. Part of that agreement consists of an educational component aimed at university-level students, which contains a learning module for ethics and integrity as well as a module entitled, "Media Integrity and Ethics." Instruction in the "Key Issue" overview of the module notes:

> In today's interconnected world, there is another way of seeking to find universal values. This method involves engaging in debate and dialogue with others who come from different perspectives in order to come to some consensus about what we all agree upon. (para 18).

As the lesson plan unfolds, particular attention is devoted to the ethics of care. Gilligan (2011) describes this as an ethics bound by voice and relationship in which the importance of *everyone* being heard is paramount. As such, she contends, empathy and cooperation are hard wired into the human condition.

However, during the World Championships, the Doha Declaration wasn't employed when considering the implications of the panopticon on athletic bodies. Instead, the technology was celebrated as an innovation that brought spectators closer to the sport. It was only after complaints by participants and critiques in the press that some remedies were made. The Block Cam technology was reassessed, the lens angle was more closely directed towards competitor's faces, and video footage of runners entering the blocks was deleted at day's end. The IAAF stated in a press release, "We have appropriate measures in place to protect athlete privacy during the process of selecting images for broadcast" at Doha (CBSSports). However, this doesn't address the larger issue — the people

directly impacted by the technology were given no say in its adoption. Additionally, there's no guarantee that the Block Cam won't resurface. It was not put to bed; technology, and the attendant ethical implications, do not sleep, they inexorably advance. For example, international tech giants Intel and Alibaba are developing a real-time bio-mechanical device which would share athlete's performance data, e.g. the heart rate of a 100 meter sprinter at varying intervals of the race, at this time of writing expected to debut during televised coverage of the 2021 Tokyo Olympics. Who owns that data? How close is too close? Most assuredly there will be continued developments of other new technologies to bring fans, and bettors, closer to the field of play.

A considered ethical practice, one that recognizes disparities of power and seeks direct input from those bodies being assessed, addresses the inequity of blind surveillance. In other words, following the Doha Declaration may work. The ethics of care is not simply a high-minded framework of rigid suggestions of the deontological, hard-rules approaches. Rather, the ethics of care's necessary and prerequisite position since its inception affirms the primacy of the body in moral reasoning; it is to be cared for, attended to. It is then, an appropriate fit for corporeal considerations abundant in representation in televised sport.

Ethics of Care as Remediation

Initially grounded in feminism, the ethics of care in part focused on sex difference and moral reasoning; men tend to focus on justice, women lean toward care. Derided in some circles as being essentialist, the ethics of care has undergone transformation and may in ways resemble other normative ethical expressions, particularly virtue ethics (Thomas, 2011). Integrating these perspectives of virtues or values, ethics of care leads to reasoned, moral development and full human potential (Muuss, 1988). Slote (2009) calls empathy the cement of the moral universe, it is distinctly relevant to the moral life and care ethics. He points to mitigating and/or qualifying features of empathy including spatial and temporal dimensions; the closer things are (a zoom into the action from atop a football stadium to the center's snap of the ball), or the more immediate the situation (the speed and controlled fury of a sprint) may shape empathetic response. If, as the athletes have indicated on occasion, they feel compromised in any sense by the insistence of the camera, that voice ought to be considered.

Care ethics holds that empathy should bind morality to such voices without regard for intervening factors. If someone genuinely cares about the well-being of others, they try to learn relevant facts that will allow them to help, writes Slote (2009). Held (2006) suggest a longing for goodness in which the individual values of justice, equality, and personal rights meld with collective ones such as mutual consideration, and solidarity. In this union, dialogue or conversation is a crucial, central tenet (Noddings, 2003): "The purpose of dialogue is to come into contact with ideas and to understand, to meet the other and to care" (p 186). An

ethics of care, then, is rooted in relationships of a reciprocal communication. It is also a respectful approach, with an awareness that dialogues can contain a power imbalance. "Moral agents are envisioned as related, interconnected, mutually dependent, and often unequal in power and resources—as opposed to the conventional portrayal of the agent as independent, equal and self-sufficient" (Pettersen, 2011, p. 55). It invites empathy, not exploitation.

The notion of an ethics of seeing, or spectating, is well trod territory and has taken forms descriptive: Sontag (2003) on pain of others, Peters (2001) on witnessing, and Mitchell, who in an interview, notes "The critique of the image becomes a moral and political task" (Grønstad & Vågnes, 2006, para 29.). Ethics for the *making* of images are largely prescriptive, such as the National Press Photographer's Association Code of Ethics, the Associated Press Code of Ethics for Photojournalists, the Code of Ethics of the American Society of Media Photographers, or, more broadly, the Society of Professional Journalists Code of Ethics, which only addresses visual content in one passing reference. These codes tend to emphasize the responsibility to colleagues and the profession. When subject-photographer relationships are mentioned, it is often in the context of considering sensitivities toward vulnerable populations. Not mentioned in these considerations are people, such as elite athletes, of a particular privileged perception who may actually lack power; people who are bystanders to the use of their own body's image within sporting events.

A complicating factor in the Doha scenario is that of technological intervention. Codes of ethics have traditionally neglected visual reporting and generally were written before the explosion of digital technologies (Wahl-Jorgensen & Pantii, 2013). Innovation doesn't just wield technological, economic and social dimensions. Rather, its role as an interloper in ways of making and consuming images is undeniable and invites scrutiny.

> Images are, and must be, conceptualized as relational. They are meaningless if unseen, unexperienced . . . though we may think of the image as the object of analysis, and the technology as the medium of communication, the ethic is the relationship between these two and those who view them. All are constantly in flux (Pearl, 2016, p. 1).

Ethics are not monolithic, instead varying by context, culture, and country. As such, establishing an ethical framework to consider the use of the Block Cam and other technologies is fraught with entanglement: perceptions of technology, roles of spectatorship, and issues of autonomy/privacy are at wide variance. However, well-reasoned attempts to ascribe a universal ethic for sports journalists have been linked to an ethics of care (Christians, 2008; Couldry, 2013; Hossain & Aucoin, 2018). In (very) abbreviated form, Aucoin and Hossain summarize the care of ethics approach: we ought to care for and care about.

And, so, we ought to care for and about athletes' mental and physical well being, including those representations that appear on our screens.

To be sure, addressing the ethics of visually documenting sport is a related but decidedly different interrogation than examining the ethical practice of journalism. Nonetheless, the circumstances surrounding the spectacle of the global event at Doha allow for the suggestion of an ordering structure that might meld ethical looking with responsible technological innovation. Within the multi-billion dollar global industry of televised sport (in the United States the sports media market was valued at $22.4 billion in television contracts during 2019 according to SportBusiness Consulting (2019) any competitive advantage to garner more viewership is an end goal. This intersection—gargantuan economies of big business, the public display of performing bodies, and a seemingly insatiable television viewership—is tenuous.

Consent, Cameras, Care

When power imbalance goes unmentioned, unrecognized, or uncontested, inequities arise. And, though adjustments were made in the deployment of the Block Cam, the never-ending race for viewers will be enjoined by, perhaps created by, intervening camera technologies. If a lack of willful consent from participants can be seen as abusive or a violation, even absent malevolent intent, therein lies the benefit of adopting an ethical framework. In so doing, televisual tools in development may be met with good will and good press. It is worth noting that IAFF Productions, a joint effort of the IAAF and Independent Television News (ITN), expressed an awareness of varying cultural sensitivities present in athletes at the event. Alastair Waddington, who heads the televised efforts told, Sports Video Group, a tech publication covering televised sport

> It doesn't matter where we are in the world, there are always cultural differences and challenges which need to be handled sensitively and appropriately. We have a high percentage of women in our core team and have faced no specific issues relating to operating in Qatar (McLean, 2019, para 9).

A "sensitive" and "appropriate" televisual representation of athletic performance would fully accord the notions of equity, autonomy, and privacy to those bodies and minds, the raison d'être for viewership. If such qualities are deemed valuable, those same purveyors of sport might best invite input from those athletes so as to avoid pushback from them as well as fans and, in turn, other media sources.

This sort of consideration was not extended to the televised representation of the athletes in Doha who had no choice in whether to use the starting blocks equipped with the cameras. And, though their voices would heard and did affect

change, a solution was provided only retroactively. But that resistance, that inclusion and respect for autonomy, seems little recognized by broadcasters as they pursue the ever-closer viewer mandate. For instance, the head of the Olympic Broadcasting Services, Yiannis Exarchos, seemingly affirmed this viewing experience suggesting artificial intelligence programs will be incorporated in Olympic televised coverage including making publicly available the biometric information and metadata of competitors. In an interview, he noted a two-pronged approach to deploying innovation. "The first is the emergence of new technology, which is the key player in life and how we engage with reality. Secondly, we are living in times that present a huge shift in the paradigm, and it is inevitable that is going to have an effect on sport, too," (Impey, 2019, para 6). This reality doesn't accord athletes agency; rather it more nearly suggests a viewing opportunity for the powerful—again, the panopticon construct.

This isn't simply a matter of avoiding unflattering camera angles, it's an ethically-informed decision making steeped in respect and care performing bodies. An ethics of care may be said to boil down to four elements or virtuous practices: attentiveness, responsibility, competence and responsiveness. "The more serious aspect of inattentiveness is the unwillingness of people to direct their attention to others' particular concerns" (Tronto, 1993, p. 130). If the ideals of an ethics of care detailed in the Doha Declaration had been fully embraced, IAAF Productions would have offered a pre-meet consultation with the athletes explaining and exploring the Block Cam i.e. "*Here is where it is placed. Here is what it does. Here is how it looks.*" It should be noted the IAAF (2015) has a formal code of conduct running to near 100 pages, but its "particular concerns" solely address the behavior by athletes and the actions of governing bodies. Concerning its televised code of conduct for technical delegates, the organization developed a tediously detailed 121-page publication (2013) containing nary a mention of ethics.

In a spirit of reciprocity, of demonstrating care, the organization ought to have a document of agreement containing concerns about the ethical representation of its participating athletes. This would be particularly useful upon the introduction of new, potentially invasive, camera technologies. Unlike professional counterparts in many organized sports leagues (in the United States, soccer, football, baseball and basketball among others have player representative unions), track and field athletes are not unionized. Hence, I would argue, they are operating from a disadvantaged position concerning screened depictions. Add to that status a provocative notion that track and field competitions invites exploratory perspectives—as do other sports without balls—more so than others. This is because, whereas running embodies tactic, there isn't a prescribed offense-defense schema with dedicated skill positions and spacing on a playing surface. This invites innovative and experiential camera angles from broadcasters, to anticipate and encourage an active viewing that defies

the traditional strictures of recording team coverage. It is a concentrated focus. And when that exploration of angles is deemed objectionable, the voice of one is not nearly as loud as the chorus from a team. The creation of guidelines that speak to those who are visually documented and those doing the documenting should look to care ethics for substantive insight as it insists on a communicative equality or reciprocity. In short, to be forewarned of such intervening technologies is to be informed and information is power, power that should be accorded athletes, particularly those whose bodies are scrutinized and visually measured in exacting detail. Runners are not accorded the disguise nor protective gear of bulky uniforms, helmets, or caps; they are fully on display. How fully ought to involve their considered input.

Televised sport production technologies are actively being developed to court a younger, video-gaming generation. Toward that end, wearable cameras according viewers a competitor's point of view (POV) have been operationalized. "The whole idea is to attract younger viewers and networks are looking to companies like *ActionStreamer*, which has been developing small point of view cameras to mirror what video games provide," (Fang, 2018, para 6). And, as Exarchos, "an enabler of technology" (Impey, 2019, para 7) noted, the Olympic Games have added Generation Z and Millennial-friendly sport including skate board, climbing, and surfing. Toward enacting an ethical practice steeped in an ethics of care, the following components might be considered across the world of sport:

- An acknowledgment that people have the right to autonomy over depictions of their body.
- An acknowledgment of asymmetrical power between the photographer/videographer and the subject and, at the same time, a recognition of the relational interdependency between those parties.
- Does the camera angle explore or exploit the action of the athlete?
- If it explores, does it contribute to a further understanding of the athletic competition?
- If it exploits, who is at risk and what are the potential damages?

At each turn, an acknowledgment that care must be accorded in the creation and consumption of images is central to an ethical and responsive approach in televised sport coverage. This is particularly applicable when new technologies of image making are implemented.

In design technologies, a movement has been afoot now for some time, to protect and extend the lives of athletes in a physical sense—improved turf and track surfaces, better helmets, even high-tech mouth guards and, in contact sports, the introduction and enforcement of rules protecting vulnerable players. However, what's not been added amid the swirl of technology, and what's not addressed in any meaningful way, is an ethical consideration of competitors'

privacy, consent, and autonomy. In a move toward the well being of sport writ large, those responsible for its broadcasts, organization and viewership ought to accord participants equal care and attentions for their mental states. An ethics of care considers ways of seeing and being seen by inviting empathy, and by extension, exploration, and education. An image maker, whether videographer or photographer, in so doing in no way loses their ability, their purpose, to engage. In ways large and small, an adoption of such considered practice may serve to avoid uncomfortable situations and ensure fair play.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

Funding

ORCID iD

David Staton ⓘD https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9493-9526

References

Ayranci, Z. (2017). Use of drones in sports broadcasting. *The Entertainment and Sports Lawyer*, *33*(3), 79–93.

BBC. (2019). *Doha: German women sprinters win limits on intimate close-ups*. https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-49879958

Christians, C. (2008). Universals and the human. In K. G. Roberts & R. C. Arnett (Eds.), *Communication ethics: Between cosmopolitanism and provinciality* (pp. 5–21). Peter Lang.

Cooky, C., & Messner, M. (2010), Gender in televised sports news and highlight shows, 1989–2009. USC Dornsife; Center for Feminist Research. https://dornsife.usc.edu/assets/sites/80/docs/tvsports.pdf.

Cox, K., & Crean, M. (1976). *It will probably end the motor car*. An Interview with Marshall McLuhan. Cinema Canada, Pay-TV, August 26–29.

Couldry, N. (2013). Why media ethics still matter. In S. J. Ward (Ed.), *Global media ethics: Problems and perspectives* (pp. 13–29). Wiley-Blackwell.

Crowe LLP. (2019). Independent Auditor's Report; National Collegiate Athletic Association Consolidated Financial Statements, August 31, 2019 and 2018.

Cummins, G. (2009). The effects of subjective camera and fanship on viewers' experience of presence ad perception of play in sports telecasts. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, *37*(4), 374–396.

Cummins, G., Keene, J., & Nutting, B. (2012). The impact of subjective camera in sports on arousal and enjoyment. *Mass Communication and Society*, *15*(1), 74–97.

Dietsch, R. (2008). Q&a with SI's heinz kluetmeier" *sports illustrated* rtvd. from https://www.si.com/more-sports/2008/08/19/heinz-qanda

Dyer, B. (2015). The controversy of sports technology: A systematic review. *SpringerPlus*, *4*, 524.

Dyer, C. (2019). Athletics bosses restrict 'crotch cameras' and find new angles after backlash from outraged runners. *Daily Mail,* October 2. https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-7530369/Track-reduces-use-new-crotch-cameras-backlash.html#:~:text=Athletics%20bosses%20restrict%20'crotch%20cameras,after%20backlash%20from%20outraged%20runners&text=The%20International%20Association%20of%20Athletics,is%20was%20broadcasting%20intimate%20areas

eBiz. (2020). *Top 15 most popular sports websites*. http://www.ebizmba.com/articles/sports-websites

Fang, K. (2018). Networks and leagues are expressing interest in bringing wearable cameras into live games. Awful Announcing. https://awfulannouncing.com/tech/networks-and-leagues-are-expressing-interest-in-bringing-wearable-cameras-into-live-games.html

Foucault, M. (1975). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. Penguin.

Giessner, S. R., Ryan, M. K., Schubert, T. W., & van Quaquebeke, N. (2011). The power of pictures: Vertical picture angles in power pictures. *Media Psychology*, *14*(4), 442–464.

Gillian, C. (2011). Ethics of care interview. https://ethicsofcare.org/carol-gilligan/

Gray, W. (2020). *Bryson DeChambeau confronts cameraman for potentially damaging his brand*. https://www.golfchannel.com/news/bryson-dechambeau-confronts-cameraman-potentially-damaging-his-brand

Grønstad, A., & Vågnes, O. (2006). An interview with W.J.T. Mitchell. *Image and narrative*. http://www.imageandnarrative.be/inarchive/iconoclasm/gronstad_vagnes.htm

Guy, J., & Halasz, S. (2019). *New starting-block cameras censored at Doha championships after female athletes protest*. https://www.cnn.com/2019/09/30/sport/athletics-starting-block-camera-scli-intl-spt/index.html

Held, V. (2006). *The ethics of care*. Oxford University Press.

Hossain, M., & Aucoin, J. (2018). The ethics of care as a universal framework for global journalism. *Journal of Media Ethics*, *33*(4), 198–211.

Humayun, A. (2015). Top players planning to object to use of their likenesses in FIFA. *The Athletic*. https://theathletic.com/news/zlatan-bale-fifa-latest-updates/HT3gxxGLrsFi

Impey, S. (2019). OBS CEO Yiannis Exarchos on how Tokyo 2020's digital plan is shaping the Olympic movement's future. *Sports Pro*. https://www.sportspromedia.com/interviews/tokyo-2020-olympics-japan-technology-yiannis-exarchos-interview

Japan Times. (2019). New tech enhances TV viewer experience. *Japan Times*, October 3. https://www.japantimes.co.jp/life/2019/10/03/general/new-tech-enhances-tv-viewer-experience/#.Xgp05i2ZODU

Lemire, J. (2019). Helmet cameras would put fans in the Middle of everything. So what's taking the NFL so long? *Sporttechie*. https://www.sporttechie.com/nfl-helmet-cameras-sports-technology-russell-wilson-vicis-actionstreamer

McLean, H. (2019). *Doha 2019: Inside the IAAF World Athletics Championships with IAAF productions*. Sports Video Group Europe.

Mulvey, L. (1975). Visual pleasure and narrative cinema. *Screen*, *16*(3), 6–18.

Mutz, D. (2007). Effects of "in-your-face" television discourse on perceptions of a legitimate opposition. *American Political Science Review*, *101*(4), 621–635.

Muuss, R. E. (1988). Carol Gilligan's theory of sex differences in the development of moral reasoning during adolescence. *Adolescence*, *23*(89), 229–243.

NFL Football Operations. (2020). https://operations.nfl.com/media/4693/2020-nfl-rule book.pdf.

Noddings, N. (2003). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education.* University of California Press.

Nussbaum, M. (1994). Patriotism and cosmopolitanism. *Boston Review*. http://bostonre view.net/martha-nussbaum-patriotism-and-cosmopolitanism

Oates, T. (2007). The erotic gaze in the NFL draft. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies*, *4*(1), 74–90. https://doi.org/10.1080/14791420601138351

Ortiz, M., & Moya, J. (2015). The action cam phenomenon: A new trend in audiovisual production. *Communication & Society*, *28*(3), 51–64.

Pearl, S. (2016). *Image, ethics, technology*. Routledge.

Peters, J. (2001). Witnessing. *Media, Culture & Society*, *23*(6), 707–723.

Pettersen, T. (2011, March 19). The ethics of care: Normative structures and empirical implications. *Health Care Analysis: Journal of Health Philosophy and Policy*, *19*(1), 51–64.

Pollock, G. (1992). The gaze and the look: Women with binoculars—A question of difference. In R. Kendall & G. Pollock (Eds.), *Dealing with degas: Representations of women and the politics of vision* (pp. 106–130). Universe.

Puertas-Molero, P., Marfil-Carmona, R., Zurita-Ortega, F., & González-Valero, G. (2019) Impact of sports mass media on the behavior and health of society. A systematic Review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *16*(3), 486.

Ram, K. (2018). Gender, colonialism, and the colonial gaze. In H. Callan (Ed.), *The international encyclopedia of anthropology* (pp. 2464–2470). John Wiley and Sons.

Raphaelson, S. (2015). He invented instant replay, the TV trick we now take for granted. *NPR*. https://www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2015/01/20/378570541/he-invented-instant-replay-the-tv-trick-we-now-take-for-granted

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. Vintage Books.

Slote, M. (2009). *Moral sentimentalism*. Oxford University Press.

Sontag, S. (2003). *Regarding the pain of others*. Garrar, Strauss and Giroux.

SportBusiness Consulting. (2019). *Global media report 2019*. SportBusiness Media.

Steen, R. (2011). Going upstairs; the decision review system—Velvet revolution or thin edge of an ethical wedge. *Sport in Society*, *14*(10), 1428–1440. *Commerce, Media,*

Stich, M. (2007). Was Roger Federer right to criticise Hawk-Eye? *The Guardian*. https://www.theguardian.com/sport/2007/jul/11/tennis.wimbledon

Thomas, A. (2011). Ética de la virtud y ética del cuidado: ¿complementarias o conflictivas? [Virtue ethics and an ethics of care: Complementary or in conflict?] *Eidos*, *14*(2010), 132–151.

Tronto, J. (1993). *Moral boundaries: A political argument for an ethic of care*. Routledge.

Wahl-Jorgensen, K., & Pantti, M. (2013). The ethics of global disaster reporting: Journalistic witnessing and the challenge to objectivity. In S. J. Ward (Ed.), *Global media ethics: Problems and perspectives* (pp. 191–213). Wiley Blackwell.

Waltorp, K. (2018). Intimacy, concealment and unconscious optics: Filmmaking with young Muslim women in Copenhagen. *Visual Anthropology*, *31*(4–5), 394–407.

World Athletics. (2019). *Trailblazing technology to give sports fans a fresh view of the IAAF World Athletics Championships Doha 2019* [Press release]. https://www.worldath letics.org/news/press-releases/new-broadcast-technology-iaaf-world-champions

Zettl, H. (2005). *Sight, sound, motion: Applied media aesthetics*. Wadsworth.

Author Biography

David Staton is an associate professor of Journalism and Media Studies at the University of Northern Colorado. His research interests include the intersections of sport, ethics, and representation.