BRITAIN AND THE WORLD

SPORT AND THE BRITISH WORLD, 1900–1930

Amateurism and National Identity in Australia and Beyond

ERIK NIELSEN

Britain and the World

Edited by The British Scholar Society

Other titles in the *Britain and the World* series include:

IMPERIAL ENDGAME:
Britain's Dirty Wars and the End of Empire
Benjamin Grob-Fitzgibbon

SCIENCE AND EMPIRE:
Knowledge and Networks of Science in the British Empire, 1850–1970
Brett Bennett and Joseph M. Hodge (*editors*)

BRITISH DIPLOMACY AND THE DESCENT INTO CHAOS:
The Career of Jack Garnett, 1902–1919
John Fisher

ORDERING INDEPENDENCE:
The End of Empire in the Anglophone Caribbean 1947–1967
Spencer Mawby

BRITISH IMAGES OF GERMANY:
Admiration, Antagonism and Ambivalence, 1860–1914
Richard Scully

THE ANGLO-AMERICAN PAPER WAR:
Debates about the New Republic, 1800–1825
Joe Eaton

BRITISH POLICY IN THE PERSIAN GULF, 1961–1968:
Conceptions of Informal Empire
Helene von Bismarck

CINEMA AND SOCIETY IN THE BRITISH EMPIRE, 1895–1940
James Burns

THE BRITISH ABROAD SINCE THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY:
Vol. 1: *Travellers and Tourists*
Vol. 2: *Experiencing Imperialism*
Martin Farr and Xavier Guégan (*editors*)

IMPERIAL CULTURE IN ANTIPODEAN CITIES, 1880–1939
John Griffiths

SPORT AND THE BRITISH WORLD, 1900–1930:
Amateurism and National Identity in Australasia and Beyond
Erik Nielsen

PAX BRITANNICA:
Ruling the Waves and Keeping the Peace before Armageddon
Barry Gough

Forthcoming titles include:

BRITISH IMPERIALISM AND INDIA'S AFGHAN FRONTIER, 1918–1948
Brandon Marsh

NEW DELHI: THE LAST IMPERIAL CITY
David Johnson

Britain and the World
Series Standing Order ISBN 978–0–230–24650–8 hardcover
Series Standing Order ISBN 978–0–230–24651–5 paperback
(*outside North America only***)**

You can receive future titles in this series as they are published by placing a standing order. Please contact your bookseller or, in case of difficulty, write to us at the address below with your name and address, the title of the series and one of the ISBNs quoted above.

Customer Services Department, Macmillan Distribution Ltd, Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire RG21 6XS, England

Sport and the British World, 1900–1930

Amateurism and National Identity in Australasia and Beyond

Erik Nielsen
Sessional Tutor, University of New South Wales, Australia
Honorary Academic, Macquarie University, Australia

palgrave
macmillan

Softcover reprint of the hardcover 1st edition 2014 978-1-137-39850-5

First published 2014 by
PALGRAVE MACMILLAN

Palgrave Macmillan in the UK is an imprint of Macmillan Publishers Limited, registered in England, company number 785998, of Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire RG21 6XS.

Palgrave Macmillan in the US is a division of St Martin's Press LLC, 175 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10010.

Palgrave Macmillan is the global academic imprint of the above companies and has companies and representatives throughout the world.

Palgrave® and Macmillan® are registered trademarks in the United States, the United Kingdom, Europe and other countries.

ISBN 978-1-349-48538-3 ISBN 978-1-137-39851-2 (eBook)
DOI 10.1057/9781137398512

This book is printed on paper suitable for recycling and made from fully managed and sustained forest sources. Logging, pulping and manufacturing processes are expected to conform to the environmental regulations of the country of origin.

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

A catalog record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

Contents

Series Editors' Preface

Sport and the British World 1900–1930: Amateurism and Identity in Australasia and Beyond is published as the thirteenth volume in the British Scholar Society's Britain and the World series from Palgrave Macmillan. From the sixteenth century onward, Britain's influence on the world became progressively more profound and far-reaching, in time touching every continent and subject, from Europe to Australasia and archaeology to zoology. Although the histories of Britain and the world became increasingly intertwined, mainstream British history still neglects the world's influence upon domestic developments and Britain's overseas history remains largely confined to the study of the British Empire. This series takes a broader approach to British history, seeking to investigate the full extent of the world's influence on Britain and Britain's influence on the world.

Erik Nielsen's monograph investigates the history of amateur sport in the British World during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and, in the process, delves into wider debates on the links between Britain and the Old Dominions. While the focus is mainly centred on Britain and Australia, the sporting relationship between these two and the Dominions of New Zealand and Canada also play a crucial role in understanding how amateurism influenced the development of identity in both an imperial and local sense. Sport provided a way for people to negotiate their place within the British World in ways that both challenged and reinforced imperial norms.

Editors, *Britain and the World*:
James Onley, American University of Sharjah
A. G. Hopkins, Pembroke College, Cambridge
Gregory A. Barton, Australian National University
Bryan S. Glass, Texas State University

Acknowledgements

A number of scholars have provided me with vital assistance throughout the development of this book. Without the energetic support of Dr Sean Brawley, it would have been impossible to carry out much of the research, and the quality of the writing would have suffered. His influence on my development as a historian goes far beyond what is present on the subsequent pages. Dr Anthony Hughes provided invaluable advice and other support and I benefited not only from his support, but he made my life easier as a researcher due to the positive impression he left in Lausanne at the Olympic Museum. A number of other scholars within the sports history community also offered me support and advice during email conversations and at conferences, including Beck Press, Tony Collins, Duncan Stone, Robert Barney, Daryl Adair, Richard Cashman, Bruce Coe, Paul Circosta, Meryll Fletcher, Wray Vamplew, Matthew P. Llewellyn and Geoff Kohe, along with countless others. The Postgraduate Community at the School of History and Philosophy at UNSW provided a supportive environment for my development as a historian. Charmaine Robson, Eureka Henrich and Eve Carroll-Dwyer organised seminars and conferences that offered other prospective scholars and me with an environment to develop arguments and presentation skills. I would like to thank these colleagues for the expenditure of their precious time, as well as those who contributed to these sessions – especially Anna Doukakis, Carlin de Montfort and Lindsay Yeates.

Financial support for this study was provided by the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences at the University of New South Wales (UNSW) through their Postgraduate External Research Programs. I was also fortunate enough to be awarded the 2008 Tom Brock Scholarship by the Tom Brock Bequest Committee. These awards allowed me to consult with international sources that offered me the opportunity to give my study an international perspective.

A number of librarians and archivists have provided me with invaluable assistance in the production of this study. While I am a bit reticent to single out any of these often sadly underappreciated professionals for fear of forgetting someone, the following librarians and archivists have been particularly helpful – Andy Carr of the State Library of New

South Wales, Ruth Beck-Perrenaud, formerly of the Olympic Museum in Lausanne, Switzerland, Alice Constance of the British Olympic Foundation, Sandra Bell of Library and Archives Canada, Abbey Lewis of Archives New Zealand, Stephen Donnell of the New Zealand Olympic Committee and David Studham and Trevor Ruddell of the Melbourne Cricket Club Library. Bryan Brown – the Development Director of Hampton School – also provided assistance with sources relating to Hampton School. Jon Devitt and Harry Gordon were also extremely generous in allowing me to view Mr Gordon's collection of material relating to the Olympic Movement in Australia held at the National Library of Australia. The following institutions have graciously permitted me to quote material held in their manuscript collections: the Alexander Turnbull Library (National Library of New Zealand), Cadbury Research Library – Special Collections at the University of Birmingham, the Musée Olympique (International Olympic Committee Archives), the New Zealand Olympic Committee and the State Library of New South Wales.

Early versions of aspects of this work have been published elsewhere. The International Centre for Olympic Studies and the Australian Society for Sports History have allowed portions of the following to be reproduced:

Erik Nielsen (2008) 'Richard Coombes: "Grand Old Man" of Australian Olympism?', in Robert K. Barney et al. (eds), *Pathways: Critiques and Discourse in Olympic Research: Proceedings of the 9th International Symposium for Olympic Research* (London: International Centre for Olympic Studies), 286–95.

Erik Nielsen (2008) '"Oh Error, Ill-conceived." The Amateur Sports Federation of New South Wales, Rugby League and Amateur Athletics', in Andrew Moore and Andy Carr (eds), *Centenary Reflections: 100 Years of Rugby League in Australia* (Melbourne: Australian Society for Sports History), 9–23.

Erik Nielsen (2009) 'Profound Indifference: Amateur Athletics and Indigenous Australasians in the Early 20th Century', *Sporting Traditions,* 26 (2), 15–30.

Erik Nielsen (2010) 'The Fall of Australasia and the Demise of the Empire Olympic Team', in Robert K. Barney et al. (eds) *Rethinking Matters Olympic: Investigations into the Socio-cultural Study of the Modern Olympic Movement: Tenth International Symposium for Olympic Research* (London: International Centre for Olympic Studies, 2010), 106–15.

The process of turning this work from a manuscript to a book has been made easy for me by the expertise of the Britain and the World editorial team of James Onley, A.G. Hopkins, Gregory Barton and Bryan Glass. Special thanks are due to Jenny McCall (Publisher – History, Scholarly Division), Holly Tyler and Richard Bouwman at Palgrave Macmillan.

My final and deepest thanks go to my own little transnational community, my family. The Nielsen, Eatock, Roberts, Krogh and Pedersen clans have indulged my journey through this process and tolerated some strange behaviour on my part under pressure. Special thanks go to my nuclear family, John and Lynne Nielsen as well as Anika and Jason Portelli.

Erik Nielsen,
Sydney, February 2014

Abbreviations

AAA	Amateur Athletic Association
AAC	Amateur Athletic Club or Australasian Cricket Council
AAFC	Amateur Athletic Federation of Canada
AAU	Amateur Athletic Union (United States)
AAUA	Amateur Athletic Union of Australasia (or Australasian Union)
AAUANZ	Amateur Athletic Union of Australia and New Zealand
AAUC	Amateur Athletic Union of Canada (or Canadian Union)
AFA	Amateur Football Association
AOF	Australian Olympic Federation
ASA	Amateur Swimming Association
ASFNSW	Amateur Sporting Federation of New South Wales
BOA	British Olympic Association
CAAU	Canadian Amateur Athletic Union
CAHA	Canadian Amateur Hockey Association
CJU	Canterbury Journalists' Union
DFA	Dominion Football Association
EEC	European Economic Community
FA	Football Association
FIFA	*Fédération Internationale de Football Association*
IAAF	International Amateur Athletic Federation
IOC	International Olympic Committee
ISDN	*Illustrated Sporting and Dramatic News*
MAAA	Montreal Amateur Athletic Association
MCC	Marylebone Cricket Club
MRU	Metropolitan Rugby Union
NARA	National Amateur Rowing Association
NPC	National Provincial Championship
NCC	National Coursing Club
NCU	National Cyclists' Union
NSWAAA	New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association
NSWASA	New South Wales Amateur Swimming Association
NSWCA	New South Wales Cricket Association
NSWOC	New South Wales Olympic Council
NSWRA	New South Wales Rowing Association

NSWRL	New South Wales Rugby League
NSWRU	New South Wales Rugby Union
NYAC	New York Athletic Club
NZAAA	New Zealand Amateur Athletic Association
NZAU	New Zealand Athletic Union
NZIJ	New Zealand Institute of Journalists
NZOA	New Zealand Olympic Association
NZOC	New Zealand Olympic Council
NZRFU	New Zealand Rugby Football Union
NZSF	New Zealand Sports Federation
QAAA	Queensland Amateur Athletic Association
RFU	Rugby Football Union
RLSS	Royal Life Saving Society
SAAAA	South Australian Amateur Athletic Association
TAAA	Tasmanian Amateur Athletic Association
USA	United States of America
USFSA	*Union des Société Françaises Sports Athlétiques*
VAAA	Victorian Amateur Athletic Association
VAL	Victorian Athletic League
VCA	Victorian Cricket Association
WAAAA	West Australian Amateur Athletic Association

1
Introduction

The question of the impact of Britishness on identity has regained a foothold within Australian historiography in the past decade. Neville Meaney's work, particularly articles published in 2001 and 2003, has been central to this renewed interest.[1] Sport played a cursory role in this preliminary discussion, with Meaney and John Rickard arguing over whether the behaviour of crowds at test matches was suggestive of a significant nationalist response.[2] In 2006 Tony Collins chided both these historians for assuming that vociferous Australian barracking represented nationalism, and situated Australian sporting culture within Australia's British inheritence.[3] Despite Collins' intervention, sport still seems firmly outside the fold as far as Australian considerations of Britishness are concerned. A symposium in the December 2013 issue of *History Australia* considered the impact of nationalism and transnationalism on Australian historiography but made only sparing mention of sport. It was referred to as shorthand for diversion from serious debates within Australian political culture as Britain reoriented itself towards Europe in the 1960s; however. James Curran assured readers that the 'talk of crisis and anxiety' that he and fellow Meaney protégé Stuart Ward had identified in this period did not suggest 'that this crisis of meaning diverted forever the Australian gaze from the sports pages in the newspapers'.[4] Curran's flippant aside speaks volumes for the assumption that sport belongs outside serious consideration of Australian understandings of Britishness.

This study takes the opposite view, and argues that sport has much to offer our understanding of Britishness in an Australian context. This is particularly true of amateur sport, which historians identify as the dominant form of Australian sport at the same time that Britishness dominated Australian political culture. Amateurism has been described

by Richard Cashman as 'the core and enduring ideal which dominated Australian sport for over a century'.[5] In a similar vein, Stuart Ward has argued that '[f]or much of the twentieth century, Australian political culture was characterised by a deep attachment to the British embrace'.[6] A study of how these two issues influenced each other is vital to establishing the importance of sport in Australia during the nation's formative years. This monograph explores the interrelated significance of these concepts to the development of Australian sporting culture by providing an examination of how the Amateur Athletic Union of Australasia (AAUA or Australasian Union) helped define amateurism in Australia and New Zealand between 1897 and 1927. It did so through a complex set of relationships across the British world – with metropolitan Britain, with former British territories (the United States) and with fellow British Dominions (Canada). The central pan-British relationship to this organisation was the Australasian relationship, which tied Australia and New Zealand together.[7] Amateurism and Britishness were deeply entwined and influenced the development of each other in Australasian athletics through this period. Amateurism in Australasia subverted classic English conceptions and provided a dynamic that influenced the way that identity was expressed in regional and imperial contexts. In one sense, this study offers a fresh interpretation about the role of amateurism and identity in Australasian sport. At a deeper level, it is about the way a group of men made sense of the world and their place in it. The ideological tenets of amateurism are questioned as the actions and intent of its proponents are put under hitherto unparalleled historical scrutiny. The result is that Australasian amateur officials are shown to be less beholden to abstract notions of pure sport prevalent in England than historians have previously argued. The amateur community in Australasia contained individuals from a more diverse social background than those in England and North America, which meant that it engaged in activities that were considered outside the pale of amateurism in these other locales. The development of amateurism in Australasia influenced the development of identity in both an imperial and local sense. Tensions erupted between Australasian and English amateur officials due to the unwillingness of the latter to engage in tours to Australasia. Australasian relations with Britain were thus focused through channels outside the amateur mainstream. While historians such as Bill Mandle have argued that dissension with English norms resulted in the formation of national identities, this study takes its cues from historians such as James Belich, Neville Meaney and Tony Collins who stress continuity with British norms in Australia and New Zealand.[8] It instead argues

that disputes with the leaders of English amateurism were overcome by forming relationships with like-minded officials. Although these figures were less influential within English sport itself, their links with the Australasian Union placed that body closer to the centre of British sport. This process continued beyond Britain itself, with a relationship with Canadian amateur figures created on the same basis. This relationship was not strong enough to harmonise notions of amateurism between the two communities. In addition to defining amateurism and Britishness, this introduction will outline recent developments in the historiography of both. But first it is necessary to briefly outline the development of amateur athletics in Australasia.

The formation of the Australasian Union was the culmination of a three-decade-long process that began with the formation of independently acting clubs. The first amateur athletic club in Australia was the Adelaide Amateur Athletic Club (AAC), which was formed in 1867 by prominent members of the social elite of Adelaide.[9] The club was charged with establishing amateur athletics in response to professional footraces, which were seen to introduce unwary young men to betting and 'sharp practice'.[10] John Lancelot (later Sir Lancelot) Stirling, an athlete from Adelaide, won an amateur hurdle championship of England in 1870, although the peak body of amateur athletics in England, the Amateur Athletic Association (AAA), was not founded until later in the decade.[11]

Despite this success, the Adelaide AAC was superseded by clubs in New South Wales. This was in no small measure due to the enthusiastic stewardship of Richard Coombes, who had arrived in Melbourne from England in 1886 before quickly moving on to Sydney. The first club formed in Sydney was the Sydney AAC, founded in 1872, with ten other clubs formed before 1883.[12] This growth ultimately saw the formation of the New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association (NSWAAA) in 1887, the same year that the New Zealand Amateur Athletic Association (NZAAA) was established. Coombes was amongst the speakers who persuaded representatives of seven clubs to form the NSWAAA at a meeting on 20 April 1887 and was appointed to a nine-man committee to formulate the rules of the association.[13] He served as vice-president of the association from 1887 until 1893, when he became president until his death in 1935. Coombes was elected to the International Olympic Committee (IOC) in 1905 and served until 1933. In addition to his athletics work, Coombes had parallel careers in sports as diverse as rowing, coursing – the antecedent of modern greyhound racing – and rifle shooting.[14] Coombes' role as an athletics administrator was supplemented by key

roles in the development of the New South Wales National Coursing Association and the Australian Coursing Union.[15] However, Coombes' main sporting interest was athletics, and he bought to Australia a reputation as 'a champion walker and cross-country runner'.[16] As a journalist, Coombes wrote for newspapers such as the Sydney *Referee* on a multitude of topics, including athletics, coursing and rifle shooting.[17]

After the establishment of an effective association in New South Wales, Coombes set about promoting contests with the newly formed association in New Zealand. Coombes invited a team from New Zealand to compete at the New South Wales championship of 1890 and helped arrange the first Australasian championships with the inclusion of Victoria in 1892.[18] The success of these championships saw the foundation of a regional body, the Australasian Union, in 1899 following the Australasian Amateur Conference of 1897.[19] It survived until 1927, long after New Zealand had declined to join the Australian Commonwealth, with Coombes serving as president throughout the body's existence.[20]

The formation of the Australasian Union influenced the manner in which athletes from Australia and New Zealand represented themselves on the world stage. Australian and New Zealand athletes competed at the Olympic Games of 1908 and 1912 as part of a combined Australasian team. Many historians have argued that representation at the Olympic Games creates a sense of national identity.[21] This is not surprising due to the importance that identity has played in the development of sports history as a discipline in Australia. Bill Mandle asserted that a sense of Australian nationalism was engendered through the success of Australian cricket teams playing against England in the nineteenth century.[22] Mandle influenced the 'Imaginary Grandstand' paradigm that argues that sport was significant to Australian culture as it produced an Australian identity. In this view, sport allowed for a sense of national identity to be embraced by Australians and to be expressed to an international audience. John Hoberman has described this process as sportive nationalism.[23] David Montefiore has critiqued the so-called 'Mandle Thesis' for its focus on questions of national identity, arguing that internal reforms established the popularity of cricket. Cricket administrators were able to claim ascendency over players after a glut of international matches saw the popularity of cricket diminish in the 1880s as a result of these reforms.[24] Montefiore moves the focus away from outward expressions of identity to internal aspects in establishing the significance of sport. This study argues that the path to creating an Australian identity in athletics was influenced by this integration with New Zealand, a phenomenon that might be termed the 'Australasian amateur athletic

relationship'. This identity was pan-British, not 'nationalism pure and simple', as Bill Mandle has described the reaction of Australians to cricket success against England in the late nineteenth century.[25] Central to this pan-British identity was a shared commitment to the concept of amateurism.

Amateurism

Barbara Keys defines the moral code of amateurism as prescribing 'not only playing without material reward [such as cash prizes or wages] but also a "gentlemanly" style, effortless and scrupulously fair'.[26] To adherents of amateurism, professionalism destroyed the spirit of sport as it became overshadowed by the self-interest of the participants.[27] For example, Lincoln Allison defines amateurism as being 'about doing things for the love of them, doing them without reward or material gain or doing them unprofessionally'. The last aspect of this definition illustrates that amateurism is in part a negative definition. Allison identifies two aspects of sport that amateurism defines itself against, namely 'the conflicting models of commercialism and professionalism'.[28] Allison advocates a form of sport that reflects the positive aspects of his definition – while eschewing commercialism, professionalism and the punitive measures that were used to enforce amateurism. He finds the efforts of Avery Brundage, the President of the IOC between 1952 and 1972, to enforce the amateur code as 'repulsive in its fanaticism'.[29] Allison's definition is ultimately philosophical. This study is concerned with what happens when the philosophy of amateurism meets the expediencies of creating a vibrant amateur athletic culture. How do amateur administrators act when faced with the realities of establishing themselves within Australasian sporting culture? Do they act the same way as administrators in other parts of the world? What can this tell us about the wider issue of Britishness?

Proponents of amateurism express a desire to purify sport of the pernicious influence of professionalism.[30] The late Australian philosopher of sport, Bob Paddick, defined the distinction between amateurism and professionalism as the distinction between 'an activity done for its own sake and an activity done for some further purposes'. Furthermore,

> amateurism is the having of certain kinds of reasons for action. The reasons are all contained within the activity; there are no further reasons. Another way to express the same idea is to say that it is done for enjoyment, or it might be called 'play'. Another name for amateurism is disinterestedness.[31]

As noted at the outset, amateurism became 'the core and enduring ideal which dominated Australian sport for over a century'.[32]

The development of amateurism as a social force is often seen by historians in concert with the development of athleticism, or the games cult, in British public schools.[33] Due to the deference that colonial society continued to pay Britain throughout the nineteenth century, the burgeoning Australian elite schooling system relied on British-trained masters influenced by the games cult to take charge.[34] The employment of games enthusiasts soon became unavoidable as schoolmasters 'were recruited almost exclusively from Oxford and Cambridge', which acted as 'little more than finishing schools for public school boys' in this period.[35] L. A. Adamson, a graduate of Rugby School who was headmaster of Wesley College, Melbourne, from 1902 until 1932, is emblematic. He was recruited as Wesley's senior resident master in 1887 as a twenty-six-year-old.[36] Crawford describes him as

> an extraordinary man with an extreme passion for schoolboy and amateur sport and firm beliefs in the moralistic values that could be transmitted through the activities of the playing field and the river.[37]

To Adamson, '[s]port was an integral feature of social class, and it was the "purity" of amateur sport that appealed . . . '[38] The influence of men such as Adamson saw sport attain virtually the same importance in Australian schools as it did in Britain. According to Crotty,

> Sport taught schoolboys how to handle failure, to accept reverses without questioning the legitimacy of the system which produced such setbacks. One was to play by the rules and accept the results. Sport at school was alleged to teach boys to stand up for themselves, in both a moral and physical sense.[39]

Sport in elite Australian schools thus reflected the morality of the rising Australian middle class in the same way that it did in British public schools. Despite the 'lilywhite' reputation of amateur sport, violence was a common feature of both British and Australian school sport and was generally applauded by proponents of the virile masculinity promoted through athleticism.[40]

While athleticism in Britain and Australia drew from the same well of inspiration, adaptation was necessary if it were to remain relevant to Australian society. Crotty ascertains a trend away from piety towards militarism between 1870 and 1920 as the hegemonic form of masculinity in Australia.[41] While the introduction of sporting aptitude

as an index of the ideal student certainly aided this shift, the practice of sport was not immune from criticism. The pure, amateur sport with a chivalric bent promoted by Adamson and others was infused with a more militaristic ethic in order to cut off criticism that 'school sport was antithetical to the defence interests of Australia'. The imperial motif of these schools was supplemented by specifically Australian concerns, such as the fitness of the Australian 'race' to meet the challenge of a seemingly inevitable Asian invasion.[42] As a result, sport was '[invested] with the qualities of preparing boys for war, likening the battlefield to the games field, and playing up the connections between loyalty to team and loyalty to King, country and empire'.[43]

To this extent, sport followed the path of other forms of cultural expression, such as juvenile literature, that sought to standardise conceptions of masculinity.[44] The tying of athleticism to matters of national survival saw avowedly imperialist sporting commentators and administrators such as Richard Coombes forced to take note of rising Australian nationalism.[45] To Phillips, this had a major influence on how amateurism was expressed in Australia:

> [a]n overtly class-based version of amateurism was incompatible with an Australian society that perpetuated the myth of egalitarianism . . . the interpretation of amateurism in the Australian context was consistent with the formation of national identity.[46]

The elite concept of amateurism developed at British public schools also influenced Baron Pierre de Coubertin (1863–1937), founder and chief ideologue of the Olympic Movement. He was a French aristocrat driven to introduce British sport models into France and internationally. He was inspired by the British public school system, repeatedly visiting England to undertake research into English education methods.[47]

During one such visit he made a pilgrimage to the tomb of Thomas Arnold, the former headmaster of Rugby School from 1828 until his death in 1842 and Coubertin's idol, at Rugby Chapel. Filled with an appreciation of Arnold's achievements based more on imagination than a solid understanding of the facts, Coubertin was overcome with a vision of Arnold's ghost. The 'appearance' of Arnold confirmed his sense of vocation in seeking to convince his countrymen of the value of athletic education, 'a "proven" method for the production of "Muscular Christians"'.[48] Coubertin felt he had imbibed the true spirit of sport, the spirit of amateurism. While Coubertin may have incorrectly attributed the rise of competitive sport at public schools to Arnold, he nevertheless

gave the British concept of amateur sport an international focus through the Olympic Games.[49] Australasian identity was also given an international stage through the formation of Australasian teams for the Olympic Games of 1908 and 1912.

Recent developments in the historiography of amateur sport

Historians such as Murray Phillips and Stuart Ripley have recently moved away from the study of middle-class schools and questioned the traditional understanding of amateurism in society. Phillips argues that 'very little has been written addressing the ideology of amateurism and its social consequences' in Australia. He suggests that existing studies of amateurism have taken two forms; as parts of histories of 'discrete sports' and as 'parts of larger histories of Australian sport'. Examples of the former tendency '[suffer] from [a lack of] any comprehensive background to provide a comparative basis' due to their specificity. Examples of the latter 'are mostly based on secondary sources, synoptic in nature and, because of their genre, generally quite limited in scope'.[50] New Zealand historian Malcolm MacLean has similarly called for a greater comparative focus within that country's sports historiography in order to break down its nationalist focus. Links with Australia and the wider British world are seen as potentially fruitful avenues for study.[51] The necessity of comparison in both the case of amateurism and Britishness underlines that not only are these concepts linked in this study, but previous studies into each suffer from similar drawbacks that need to be rectified.

This study attempts to overcome the shortcoming in Australian amateur historiography identified by Phillips. Despite being primarily focused on the sport of track and field athletics, it will address the relationship between it and other sports in order to understand the differing conceptions of amateurism in 'discrete sports'. For example, the NSWAAA joined the Amateur Sporting Federation of New South Wales (ASFNSW) in the aftermath of the formation of the professional New South Wales Rugby League (NSWRL) in 1908. This decision reflected a fear, common in all amateur sport, of the rise of professionalism.[52] However, the NSWAAA was reluctant to ratify the general suspension of athletes Horrie R. Miller and Sydney Hubert Sparrow invoked by the New South Wales Rugby Union (NSWRU) as they could not disprove the athletes' claims that they had not received money for their participation in rugby league. The NSWAAA split from the ASFNSW in 1914 after a long-running dispute over its approach to rugby league.[53] The tension between athletics officials and those from other sports indicates that the relationship between those who organised the Olympic Movement

in Australia was tenser than the phrase 'A Network of Friends' would suggest.[54] Phillips rejects the notion of a 'national' amateurism and argues that differences existed in the definition of amateurism between sports, such as rugby union and Australian football, and across colonial/state lines in the same sport, such as rowing.[55] The case of the NSWAAA and the ASFNSW indicates significant divisions within the state of New South Wales. This study will use these divisions to further illuminate aspects of the diffusion of amateurism in Australia.

Phillips' call for studies of amateurism to be less synoptic and more comparative has been met in Ripley's social history of professional sculling, which has fundamentally altered the way that the relationship between amateur and professional sport in Australia is viewed.[56] Ripley's work raises the question of whether the administrative element of amateurism was more important than the ideological. He observes that the Muscular Christian ethic, fundamental to middle-class conceptions of sport, was identifiable in early professional scullers, such as Ned Trickett, considered Australia's first sporting world champion.[57] He has further demonstrated that Coombes played an active role in urging the administrative reform of professional sculling, which runs counter to Coombes' historical representation as a proponent of pure amateurism.[58] In *Paradise of Sport*, his influential general history of Australian sport, Richard Cashman describes Coombes as 'a dominant figure in many amateur sports' and 'a lifelong imperialist and an apostle of amateur sport' with influence deriving from his twin roles as journalist and administrator.[59] John A. Daly argues that '[h]is espoused philosophy of "sport for sport's sake" was the basis of a strong amateur ethos that defined the operation of the [Australasian Union] well beyond his lifetime'.[60] Ian Jobling has paid the most attention to Coombes' career as an amateur official and promoter of the Olympic Games. Jobling recognises Coombes as a product of the public school system as a student at Hampton Grammar School. He addresses the impact of Coombes' educational experience using Perkin's statement that games at public schools were seen as the

> cradle of leadership, team spirit, altruistic self reliance and loyalty to comrades – all the qualities needed for the chief goal of the upper middle-class education, the public service.[61]

Henniker and Jobling assert that as a result of Coombes' education at Hampton Grammar School, he 'had these qualities entrenched by his intense involvement in sport during his youth and young-adult life in England'.[62]

Ripley's research has shown that *laissez faire* administrative procedures preferred by the organisers of professional sculling proved no match for the organisational vigour of the amateur bodies.[63] While professional administrators were content to allow the market to dictate the development of sculling, amateur officials implored their professional counterparts to follow their lead and '[consolidate] their organisational frameworks and [establish] efficient managerial networks'.[64] Ripley finds it 'astonishing' that Coombes' involvement in professional sculling has not entered historiographical debates, and laments that the notion that amateur and professional forces were polarised 'has given way to conformity, even to the point of becoming a truism' in terms of the analysis of amateur ideology.[65] The fusing of the administrative aspect of amateurism to the ideological has obscured the historical understanding of the chief proponents of amateurism. Coombes the organiser has been taken to be Coombes the ideologue.

In addition to this empirically informed rethinking of Coombes' experience, a conceptual critique of amateurism's ethical basis has emerged. Historians are questioning the traditional dichotomy between Victorian middle-class respectability and working-class debauchery, particularly with regards to sport. Huggins and Mangan argue that both left and right have sought to compartmentalise the Victorians, as 'repressed and repressive' counterpoints to the sexual revolution of the 1960s and as mythological beacons in the form of former Conservative British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher's 'Victorian values' of seriousness, earnestness and sobriety. 'The Victorians have thus been the victims of academic *naïveté*, sectional manipulation and political simplification – all in the interest of the peddling of a purified past.'[66] Mike Huggins recognises the 'ideological power' of notions of Victorian middle-class respectability, but calls for historians to 'question critically . . . the extent to which such beliefs were actually held'.[67]

Tony Collins argues that it is important to question Victorian conceptions of sport as '[t]he moral tenor of modern sport is still largely derived from, and shaped by, the tenets of Victorian middle-class sporting ethics'. The notion of 'fair play' and a 'golden age' of pure amateur sport provides a prism for the discussion of perceived modern corruptions of sport, such as drug use, excessive violence and disrespect for match officials.[68] The relationship between Victorian concepts of respectability and sport was complex. John Pinfold's study of horse racing in Victorian Liverpool led him to conclude that the racecourse acted as a venue 'where "conventionality" could be safely left behind'. Wealthy men and women could engage in 'unrespectable behaviour . . . as long as it could

be kept out of the public domain'.[69] Collins has argued that the 'gentlemanly' ethics of rugby union were 'a changing and fluid response . . . to the influx of working-class players into rugby in the 1880s'. The 'ethical system of "fair play"' was invented to supersede '[t]he earlier, more overtly violent traditions of public-school and middle-class rugby'. As a result, the 'continued control of the game by its public-school-educated rulers' was justified.[70]

Both Ripley's research and this conceptual challenge provide a gateway for a history of amateur athletics that is based as much on the practical influence of amateur organisations as on the 'philosophical' components. Steven Pope has completed such a study with respect to the United States. He argues that rather than amateurism being a pure state of sport, bureaucratic officials such as James E. Sullivan of the Amateur Athletic Union and the American Olympic Committee 'used the amateur ethos as a mechanism for turning their social prejudices into resilient athletic structures'.[71] A national identity shaped through Olympic competition was the end result of a process which included the regulation of the 'immigrant-working-class sport of track and field, and . . . the more familiar environs of collegiate athletics.'[72] An investigation in this manner will allow for a similar understanding of the factors that permitted the rise of amateurism in Australasia. The simplistic dichotomy of amateurism as an ideology and professionalism as a practice has obscured the practical achievements of figures such as Coombes and has limited our understanding of their impact on sporting culture by compartmentalising them as ideologues. This study is concerned with the manner in which Coombes and his ilk formed international relationships aimed at developing amateur sport. This will respond to a suggestion to pay greater attention to the role that administrators played in the rise of sport.[73]

Nationalism and Britishness in sporting identity

The theme of identity has been central to the study of sports history in Australia since its academic beginnings in the 1970s. The theme's importance in Australian sports historiography dates from a landmark article by Bill Mandle published in 1973 which asserted that successful Australian cricket teams in the nineteenth century were 'living examples of the power that could come from a federated nation'.[74] Moreover, Australians were able to assert a measure of social superiority over the British due to the more egalitarian and democratic nature of Australian cricket.[75] The so-called

Mandle thesis has no place for a subtle interaction of nationalism and imperialism, as pride in Australian achievements in cricket became 'nationalism pure and simple' and furthered the goal of the Federation of the Australian colonies.[76] In contrast, Richard White argues that the political movement towards Federation in no way reflected 'the culmination of patriotic feeling' or a separatist Australian identity.[77] While there were certainly burgeoning nationalist artistic movements within Australian society, the political solution of Federation has been categorised as 'one of those constitutional devices recommended by apologists for bourgeois democracy for containing political equality'.[78]

Ken Inglis agrees with Mandle that 'Australian cricket teams helped the cause of federation'. He also sees that cricket, rather than forcing Australia apart from Britain, served to forge tighter Imperial bonds.[79] In addition, the Mandle thesis has been criticised by historians who have argued that the 'old bugbear' of intercolonial rivalry was 'alive and kicking' in Australian cricket, rather than being set aside as Mandle claimed.[80] Montefiore has argued:

> The slump [in interest in Anglo-Australian cricket] of the 1880s demonstrated that particular developments of nationalist or imperialist achievement in the sporting arena remained prey to parochialism, intercolonial rivalries and class tension.[81]

The continuing importance of intercolonial rivalry, despite the development of national forms of representations, remains relevant to the Australasian amateur athletic relationship. Athletic associations representing the states of Australia and the Dominion of New Zealand retained a great deal of power within the structure of the Australasian Union, meaning that intercolonial rivalries also played a key role in the developing Australasian amateur athletic relationship.[82]

While amateur athletics itself has not been the focus of much historical attention, the sport has been studied in relation to the Olympic movement in Australia and the study of influential administrators, such as Richard Coombes.[83] Olympic histories, such as Harry Gordon's *Australia and the Olympic Games* and Reet and Max Howell's *Aussie Gold*, have expressly nationalist focuses. They are primarily concerned with chronicling the heroic deeds and recounting the interesting stories that have accompanied Australia's participation at the Olympic Games.[84] The work of Howell and Howell is concerned with '[recounting] the deeds of Australia's most successful Olympians – its gold medallists'. According

to Howell and Howell, Australia's gold medallists are worth studying because

> [t]hrough their personal exploits they have achieved sporting immortality, for at a moment they reached the pinnacle of their sport . . . Our sporting champions have made a remarkable contribution to Australia's social scene, helping the nation's self image.[85]

Athletes such as Edwin Flack, Nick Winter, Herb Elliot and Betty Cuthbert have been eulogised in these publications.

Ian Jobling has written extensively about the manner in which amateur athletics influenced Australian identity, focusing on the role of athletics in the Olympic Games and other international events, such as the 1911 Festival of Empire Sports. Jobling's early work is clearly influenced by the Mandle thesis. In 1988 he traced 'The Making of a Nation through Sport' by examining Australia's involvement in the early Olympic Games. He asserted that Australia's first Olympic champion, Edwin Flack, fostered nationalism as 'it was seen that Australian athletes could be successful in sporting competitions with countries other than Great Britain and those of her empire'.[86] He further argued that the strength of Australian national feeling prevented the development of support for a pan-Imperial Olympic Team in Australia.[87]

Garth Henniker and Jobling's biographical study of Richard Coombes and his role in the Olympic Movement in Australia offered a more nuanced study of the identity embraced by Coombes. They argue that as an avowed imperialist, Coombes reluctantly embraced Australian nationalism. They characterise Coombes' traversal of these forces as 'imperialism and nationalism in action'.[88] The authors argue that Coombes ardently combined the concepts of Olympism and imperialism when possible, and that Australian nationalism 'was possible for him as long as it did not threaten his loyalty to the British Empire'.[89] The tendency amongst sport historians has been to view these varying levels of identity as distinct. For example, Henniker and Jobling argue that Coombes' British identity was

> confronted by the rising nationalism of this colony [when he arrived in Australia]. Coombes was able to adjust his own sense of Australian nationalism over time, and align it within the embrace of Empire. What was good for Australian sport became, by extension, a greater benefit for the British Empire.[90]

Henniker and Jobling imply that Coombes' sense of Australian identity was distinct from his imperial identity, and that they had the potential to clash. This study argues that Australian and wider imperial sporting identities were formed in dialogue with each other and influenced the development of the other.

More recently, the influence of the Australasian amateur athletic relationship on identity was considered in the edited volume, *Sport, Federation, Nation*. The authors examined the persistence of bodies such as the Australasian Union and the formation of Australasian teams. Charles Little argued that growing opposition to Australasian teams after 1910 'serves to reinforce the widely held viewpoint that the first decade of the twentieth century saw the emergence of a distinctive [New Zealand] national identity'.[91] Little and Cashman argue that 'the Australasian team at the 1908 and 1912 Olympic Games, occurred largely for reasons of convenience', a view shared by Greg Ryan.[92] Anthony Hughes argues that the NZAAA's decision to break away from the Union was due to 'New Zealand's desire to operate athletically as an independent nation and to be recognised as such by the world governing body'.[93] This final quotation illustrates the manner in which governing bodies such as the NZAAA were conflated with the nation in this volume. The stated aim of *Sport, Federation, Nation* is to ascertain 'possible links between the coming of [Australian] Federation in 1901 and its relationship to sport'.[94] Federation saw the six Australian colonies coalesce into the Commonwealth of Australia without New Zealand, which developed into a separate nation. As such, the volume privileges nationalism as the determining factor in splitting the Australasian athletic community.

This study moves away from notions of nationalism to understand the breakdown of the Australasian amateur athletic relationship. Local (state and Dominion), national (Australian and New Zealand), regional (Australasian) and global (British) identities were part of a complex which fed off and influenced each other. As in the case of cricket, the influence of the states – as well as the Dominion of New Zealand – remained strong despite the formation of the Australasian Union. Notions of Britishness as expressed through Australian administrators such as Richard Coombes were influenced by debates within British sport and external influences, such as those emanating from America. The American influence was far from alien from British influence, although there was often conflict between athletic camps in the two countries. Americans were viewed by some Britons to be part of the wider 'British World' in the late nineteenth century, although the American Revolution severely disrupted this imagined community.[95]

This study will demonstrate that for a time at least America was very much a part of Australasia's understanding of a British World of athletics. An athletic version of the American Revolution took place following the London Olympic Games of 1908, disrupting a tight relationship between Australasian and American athletic organisations.[96] The importance of the British World was cemented by the fact that a rapidly developing athletic community in Canada took the place of their fellow North Americans. The British World has been the subject of much recent historiographical debate.

The British World

The recent twenty years have seen a renewal of interest in the concept of 'Britishness', particularly through the British World school of historiography. While Canadian Phillip Buckner has been identified as a prime mover in this endeavour, he himself traces this resurgence to the publication of Linda Colley's *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707–1837*.[97] Prior to the impact of Colley's work, New Zealander J. G. A. Pocock made 'A Plea for a New Subject' of British history in 1974 in the aftermath of the United Kingdom's decision to join the European Economic Community (EEC).[98]

Colley argued that the notion of Britishness was consciously developed rather than self-evident, and that 'Great Britain [could plausibly be regarded] as an invented nation superimposed . . . onto much older alignments and loyalties'.[99] Colley demonstrates that a sense of Britishness emerged amongst English, Scottish and Welsh nationals in Britain itself as well as in the Empire. Crucially, however, the differences between the existing nationalities were never levelled and that multiple identities (including regional and local identities) were always apparent within British identity.[100] Buckner asserts that Colley's work launched two historiographical debates: the first being over the 'the nature of British identity – whether it had ever existed and, if it did exist, how it was defined'. The second 'was over the question of whether the term "British" should be reserved for the inhabitants of the British Isles'.[101] As Carl Bridge and Kent Fedorowich argue, '[j]ust as in Britain one could be a Liverpudlian, Lancastrian, Englishman and Briton, so in New Zealand one might be an Aucklander, North Islander, New Zealander and Briton'.[102] This understanding is central to the British World project. Just as Colley has asserted her thesis with reference to Britain itself and the multitudinous identities that existed within it, scholars engaged with the British World project have clearly asserted that British identity within the British World did not subsume other

identities. As Bridge and Fedorowich state, '[m]embership of this world did not preclude, indeed it encouraged, economic competition, political conflict and contested identities, which in turn attempted to forge an overarching consensus'.[103]

Buckner and Francis define the British World as 'a world held together more by a sense of belonging to a shared British culture than by ties of commerce and trade . . . a shared British culture to which all of the various immigrant communities from the British Isles, including the Scots and the Irish [not to mention the Welsh], contributed'.[104] To Bridge and Fedorowich, the British World was a place 'where migrants found they could transfer into societies with familiar cultural values' and was reinforced by networks of 'family, cultural, commercial, and professional' links.[105] Combining these two issues, Pickles suggests that 'the migration of British peoples and economic and cultural institutions around the Dominions, and the subsequent settlements established, arguably make up the main area of work' in British World scholarship.[106] Both aspects of this formulation are present in the case of Australasian athletics. The Australasian Union can be considered an institution that had analogues across the British World – most notably the AAA and the Amateur Athletic Union of Canada (AAUC or Canadian Union). Much of the administrative initiative was of course provided by an English migrant, Richard Coombes.

These recent reevaluations of Britishness mean that a more nuanced investigation into the British influence on athletics is easier now than was the case when these issues were first addressed in sport. In 2003, Neville Meaney argued that that 'Australia needs a new British history which incorporates the Oceanic Greater Britain into its tale'.[107] Meaney's call has been furthered recently by the publication of *Australia's Empire*, a companion to the recent *Oxford History of the British Empire*.[108] While Meaney chastises radical nationalist historians for developing a myth of 'thwarted nationalism', the authors of *Australia's Empire* argue that Australians developed a distinct culture and a distinctive understanding of the imperial relationship.[109] Editors Derek Schreuder and Stuart Ward argue that due to a 'growing sense of local agency and local capacity, it is not unreasonable . . . to speak of the formation of not only "Empire in Australia", but of "Australia's Empire"'.[110] Furthermore, '"*Australia's* Empire" was . . . as much the product of the Australian imagination as of the British Colonial Office'.[111]

This distinction illuminates four key points. First, that the Australian colonies were 'places with their own internal dynamic and agency' rather than 'mere "repetitions of England"'. Second, that Australians

adopted conceptions of Empire 'subtly attuned to their colonial coordinates.' Third, that Australians played a role in the colonisation of the Australian continent and the Pacific region. Finally, that 'the imperial legacy is as much [Australia's] as Britain's'.[112] The authors further argue that the 'Empire loomed larger in the Australian imagination' than in the British, due to family, business and institutional links, as well as information flows, transport networks and cultural connections.[113]

A growing recognition of the importance of Britishness has been felt as acutely in New Zealand. In addition to Pocock's pioneering work, James Belich has suggested that Britain's Dominions (Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and Canada) were constituted as 'neo-Britains'.[114] In a national context, he has applied 'recolonisation' as a concept for understanding a tightening of bonds between New Zealand and the British metropolis in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.[115] Katie Pickles has suggested that Pocock provided a 'catalyst' for the British World approach and that Belich set 'important intellectual trends in current British World scholarship'.[116] The conception of Britishness prevalent in both countries – which stresses the independence of colonial action and the enduring connection between the colonies and Britain – is apparent in the themes to be drawn out in this work.

Meaney favours politics and international relations as the site for the study of Britishness and downplays the significance of cultural manifestations of identity, such as the partisanship of sports spectators.[117] By contrast, John Rickard argues for the importance of cultural expressions of identity – but neither he nor Meaney challenge the assumption that sport expresses a distinctive Australianness.[118] The placement of sport outside the pale of Britishness is to a certain extent reflected in *Australia's Empire*. John Hirst describes reactions to sporting success as 'patriotic bravado' that masks Australia's imperial past.[119] Mark McKenna argues that Australia will remain a nation defined by 'military myth and sporting prowess' if a republican debate based on wider constitutional reform does not develop.[120] However, in the same volume authors such as Angela Woollacott as well as Richard White and Hsu-Ming Teo assert the importance of sport in the creation of Australia's British identity. Woollacott employs Daryl Adair, John Nauright and Murray Phillips' arguments about the construction of Australian masculinity through sport to assert the importance of inter-Empire contests in creating Australian British masculine identity.[121] White and Teo challenge the Mandle thesis concerning the creation of Australian nationalism through sport, primarily through the work of Tony Collins

and Henniker and Jobling.[122] The treatment of sport in *Australia's Empire* indicates that the study of Australian Britishness through the prism of sport is of increasing importance, with older notions about the link between sport and nationalism coming under challenge. The acknowledged link between the track and field athletics communities of Australia and Britain offers an excellent opportunity to extend the analysis of the influence of Britishness on Australian culture. Recent innovations can extend previous sporting studies of Australia's British relationship as expressed through sport.

The British World concept has not met with universal approval amongst historians, with Pickles arguing that the

> key interventions of postcolonialism – in theory at least – go further than British World boundaries . . . with postcolonial approaches there is a clear awkwardness in arguing for the importance of a British past is today offensive to some, and irrelevant to others.[123]

The British World posture has been criticised for reasserting whiteness as a subject and empiricism as a method,[124] a charge that has been vigorously rejected by the concept's proponents. Buckner and Francis suggest that the focus on the Dominions should not be interpreted as nostalgia for the days of white domination, but recognition that 'the legacy of their imperial past cannot easily be wiped away and consigned to the dustbin of history'.[125] While the recognition that the imperial legacy is something that needs to be dealt with is implicit in this argument, to Pickles at least the lack of methodological innovation severely constrains the potential for imperialism to be successfully confronted.[126]

Despite this critique, the nature of this study makes the application of a British World paradigm appropriate. The opportunity to question sport's role as a simple promoter of nationalism by placing it in its wider imperial context is too good to pass up. Nevertheless, there are pitfalls that need to be avoided. One of the most important recent methodological innovations of postcolonialism is the increasing problematisation of racial identities through a focus on 'between-ness, encounters, embodiment and intimacy'.[127] The anxieties over race at 'the edge of empire' in places such as the Northern Territory in Australia and British Columbia mean that the 'British World' and even Britain itself was not as 'white' as it seemed.[128] Bridge and Fedorowich admit that the idea of whiteness was central to the idea of the British World, but assert that there was space for non-whites within it. To these scholars '"[w]hiteness" was a dominant element [in the British World]. Nevertheless, this

world was not exclusively white'.[129] This study examines this issue to a certain extent through an examination of the involvement of indigenous Australians and New Zealanders in the predominately white sport of amateur athletics. Richard Coombes and others attempted to induce Māori (some of whom were keen participants) and Aboriginal Australians (who were generally not) to take a greater role in the sport and bolster Australasian Olympic teams. This approach was rejected and ultimately this study is one of exclusion, be it self-imposed or otherwise. The process by which a largely white British World was constructed needs to be confronted.

Although notions of Britishness are central to this study, 'Britishness' in itself ultimately does not provide a complete conceptual framework suitable for this study. This is due to the important role played by the United States of America (USA) in the events studied. The formation of the USA played an important role in defining the residual British Empire and the way it was viewed. American historian Eliga H. Gould suggests that the American Revolution resulted in reluctance on the part of the British Parliament to impose 'the sort of uniform political institutions that Parliament had so disastrously attempted to establish [in America] during the 1760s and 1770s'. The British Parliament also eschewed the right to levy parliamentary taxes through documents such as the Canada Act (1791).[130] Gould's conception of Empire as a 'virtual nation' is evident in the form of Empire that Schreuder and Ward attribute to 'Australia's Empire'. It is also apparent in Pocock's conception of British history as 'a pluralization of a history that can only in part be told as that of a single imperial state'. However, Duncan Bell has amply shown that many figures within the British political establishment sought to reform or extend the British Constitution to cover the 'white' Dominions such as Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and Canada.[131] This movement found historical expression in the works of J. R. Seeley in the nineteenth century.[132] Both these views, which might be termed Independent Britishness and United Britishness, are expressed in this study. The expression of different types of Britishness exemplifies the complexity of the way that British identity was expressed. Pocock differentiates his concept of 'British History' from the 'Greater British' history propounded by Seeley. This history 'aimed at the extension of that state [Great Britain] into the structure of a global empire'. Seeley's project was doomed by the existence of the secessionist United States.[133]

The United States adopts a position on the cusp of Britishness, as it developed from British origins but took a vastly divergent path to that of other settler colonies. The presence of the United States

in this study occasionally forces it outside the realm of Britishness and into the realm of transnational history. While historical studies of sport have routinely crossed national boundaries, Barbara Keys was the first scholar to apply an explicitly transnational approach to sport history.[134] Charlotte Macdonald has more recently undertaken a study of national fitness movements across Britain and the British World Dominions of New Zealand, Australia and Canada.[135] The rise of transnational history complements the contemporaneous rise of 'British World history', although the two terms are undeniably different.[136] The current wave of transnational history derives from debates within American historiography. 'The Internationalization of History' by Akira Iriye and 'American Exceptionalism in an Age of International History' by Ian Tyrrell are recognised as seminal articles that led to the development of transnational history within American historiography.[137] Iriye argued that historians 'should make an effort to discuss problems whose significance transcends local boundaries'.[138] Tyrrell explicitly argued for transnational history as a way to counter notions of exceptionalism that permeated American historiography.[139] The concept of transnational history underwent a process of definition at a series of conferences held at La Pietra in Florence, Italy, resulting in the publication of *Rethinking American History in a Global Age*. Iriye defined transnational history as imp[lying] 'various types of interactions across national boundaries', as opposed to international history, which 'implies a relationship among nations'.[140] To Tyrrell, transnational history 'concerns the movement of peoples, ideas, technologies and institutions across national boundaries'.[141] Ann Curthoys and Marilyn Lake employ a similar definition in an Australian context. To these two scholars, '[t]ransnational history seeks to understand, ideas, things, people, and practices which have crossed national boundaries'.[142]

Of course, an Empire-wide history by its very nature crosses frontiers that developed into national borders. Some facets of transnational history's relationship to statehood are extremely important to this study, and require attention outside the definition of British history. Firstly, while not denying the importance of 'nationalism and the nation-state in the modern world', Tyrrell argues that 'the primacy of these concepts' was accepted too readily by historians.[143] This study questions the primacy of the nation with regard to a contentious relationship with Britain and in the response of New Zealand to Australia. While this study makes it clear that Australasians questioned their British counterparts and New Zealand saw itself as different to Australia, a growing sense of nationalism did not provide an impetus for separation.

Instead, these communities remained tied to wider networks that eventually did produce separate identities. This follows another aspect of transnational history, that a sense of nationality is 'profoundly affected by transnational contingencies'.[144]

Chapter breakdown

The next chapter will provide an overview of the development of the sport of amateur athletics in Australasia. It will demonstrate that amateur officials employed similar tactics to raise the profile of amateur sport that professionals used. It takes the form of a local study of the way amateur athletics was popularised in Sydney and Australia more generally. This serves to question the extent to which amateur athletics drew its significance by leaving the shores of Australia through participation in events such as the Olympic Games. This chapter is influenced by work undertaken by Camilla Obel in New Zealand, who has moved away from the mythic All Blacks in order to better understand the impact of rugby in New Zealand. Obel argues that domestic strategies played a key role in promoting the game in New Zealand. She identifies a shift from gathering crowds for challenge matches for the Ranfurly Shield to the creation of local and television publics through the National Provincial Championship (NPC).[145] This study uses Obel's insight to address the way in which athletics administrators developed publics within Australia, through the creation of a district network of clubs in Sydney and the promotion of tours to Australasia by overseas athletes.

The promotion of tours to Australia is particularly interesting from a transnational perspective. It inverts the typical approach that sees Australians as wide-eyed innocents going abroad to the Olympic Games. Through negotiations with administrators and athletes from abroad, Australasian officials were plugged into a transnational market of athletic talent. The economic laws of supply and demand came into conflict with the noble ethics of amateur sport. Australians were forced to pay their own way to compete in major events in Europe and America, and also provide the funding to entice overseas athletes to tour Australasia. Australasian administrators became frustrated with the unwillingness of the AAA in particular to sanction tours to Australia, despite the fact that Australian athletes made the effort to compete in England. Australasian amateur officials engaged in activities, such as the organisation of competitions and tours, that contravened classic British conceptions of amateurism. Not only did Australasian amateur officials engage in activities that contravened classic British conceptions of amateurism, the refusal of English officials to reciprocate Australasian efforts caused

friction between the two communities. The efforts to popularise athletics locally thus drew upon transnational influences and problematised Imperial relations.

Chapter 3 demonstrates that the type of activities organised by amateur officials was matched by a liberal definition of amateurism formulated by the Australasian Union. It argues that the Australasian amateur community contained a more diverse class of amateurs than was the case in Britain and North America. Rather than seeking to exclude athletes that did not conform to the white, middle-class ideal as was the case abroad, Australasian amateur administrators sought to include working class and indigenous athletes. However, problems were caused for administrators as figures aligned with professional rugby league sought to ensure that the liberal conception of amateurism was maintained in the face of wider amateur opposition. This chapter will demonstrate that the Australasian amateur community was more inclusive than in England and North America and that the Australasian amateur athletic community was not strongly influenced by standards employed by English governing bodies.

Chapter 4 marks the point in this study when the focus shifts from amateurism towards Britishness. It explores the contentious relationship between Australasian and British officials hinted at in Chapter 2. In Australian sports history a clear line is drawn between nationalists and imperialists. This study rejects such divisions as simplistic. This chapter will argue that the relationship between Britain and Australia can be better understood by paying attention to small groups of amateur administrators and the way they interacted. A small coterie of British officials struck up a relationship with Australian figures. This was in marked contrast to the attitude of leading English administrators, who often chose to ignore their Australasian counterparts. The coterie of officials who struck up a relationship with Australasian administrators also had differences of opinion with the English leadership. They found common ground with administrators such as Coombes – who were thus willingly drawn into domestic debates within British sport. Despite the imperial ethic of the likes of Richard Coombes, the relationship between Australasian officials and the elite of British sport was marked by tension and confrontation. Australasian officials developed relationships with figures in Britain based on shared criticisms of classic English conceptions of amateurism. This tension led to Australasians looking further afield for influences. For example, training methods used by colleges in the North East of the United States were advocated by Australasians as a way to reassert British athletic dominance after the 1900 Olympic

Games. This aspect of the study demonstrates how Britishness in sport constantly evolved rather than remained static.

Chapter 5 expands on the North American influence by addressing the Australasian relationship with fellow former colonials in Canada. As relations deteriorated between American and British athletes later in the first decade of the twentieth century, Australian administrators looked towards the United States and Canada for support lacking from England. It will be argued that Canadian influence offered a safe halfway point between English intransigence and the 'brave new world' that American sport represented. Canada offered the modernity of America within a British framework. However, there were limits to pan-British unity, and Australasia and Canada developed vastly different conceptions of amateurism. Despite collaborating on schemes such as the attempted creation of an Imperial Olympic team, Canadians and Australasians employed vastly differing conceptions of amateurism and Britishness. Canadians employed a literal conception of amateurism as developed in the United States, while Australasians employed a British model in dealing with team sports, where the goal of keeping amateurs apart from professionals was harder to maintain. The relationship formed between administrators from Australasia and Canada was not strong enough to ensure a standard conception of amateurism. The Australasian and Canadian examples offer an opportunity to assess the different ways in which the old world continued to influence the new. Ian Tyrrell argues that

> the limitations of the settler society model must be confronted. Such an approach cannot provide an adequate alternative transnational framework unless it combines comparisons of settler societies with analysis of the systematic relationships between the 'new worlds' and 'old'.[146]

Australasia continued to be tied to the old world through cricket and rugby tours, while Canadian administrators assiduously avoided British influence in sports such as association football. This meant that – despite the community of interest established by Australasian and Canadian administrators – sport in the two communities followed two divergent paths. The influence of Canada on Australian sport is a new frontier in historical study. The common British heritage of these nations did not replicate in the sporting sphere. Both nations developed indigenous games as their major spectator sport – hockey in Canada and Australian Football.

The final chapter is concerned with the breakup of the Australasian athletic relationship. Long after Australasia was politically repudiated, the athletes of Australia and New Zealand were united under the umbrella of the Australasian Union and also combined in a joint 'Australasia' combination at the 1908 and 1912 Olympic Games at London and Stockholm respectively. Typically, Australasia has been presented as a rubric of convenience that New Zealand rejected once it was able to assert its nationality. The chapter will present a different explanation that stresses that New Zealand distinctiveness was expressed throughout the life of the relationship, and that the expression of 'nationalism' does not explain its ultimate demise. The Australasian Olympic team was rendered obsolete as an Imperial Olympic team became impossible. Three interrelated factors explain the demise of the Australasian Union. First, the Australasian Union expanded beyond the Eastern states and embraced continental Australia through the membership of South Australia and Western Australia. Reflecting a tradition of innovation, New Zealand suggested a biennial test match to modify the Union – but was rebuffed by their Australian counterparts. This rebuff provided a second reason for the split. Third, the impetus for a split was provided by the election of a particularly mercantile NZAAA council in the mid-1920s. These factors, rather than nationalism, forced the Australasian Union apart. The final chapter thus provides an explanation for the breakup of the Australasian athletic relationship that goes beyond abstract notions of nationalism and examines specific features of the relationship.

2
The Commercialisation of Australasian Amateur Athletics

> The unfairness of British sporting bodies is very marked. We in Australia may send home Hellings, Cavill [. . . *et cetera*] but we must pay the piper for the privilege (?), and if we desire a J. B. Tyers to visit us in return we have again to pay the piper.[1] – 'Harrier', athletic commentator for *The Australasian* (Melbourne).

If the name 'Cavill' was not synonymous with Australian swimming at the turn of the twentieth century, even an informed observer may attribute the sentiments expressed in the quotation above to current concerns in Australian sport. 'British sporting bodies' may also have to be modified to read 'French rugby clubs' or 'Indian cricket franchises'. These changes would reflect the contemporary realisation that – while Australia may develop rich sporting talent – its place in the global market places it at a disadvantage when securing the services of top athletes. The quotation actually derives from a leading athletic commentator from the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. It illustrates that, in spite of vastly different methods of transmission and consumption of sport over this period, a surprising continuity exists in some aspects of the conduct of amateur sport between then and now.

Amateur athletics in Australasia was in fact marked by a distinctly capitalist edge, demonstrated by the techniques that were employed to popularise the sport. This realisation sits uneasily with the notion of sport undertaken for its own sake rather than more base motivations as furthered by proponents of amateur sport.[2] Athletics is far from the most popular of sports in Australasia, the role of most popular sport historically falling to cricket in the summer and the various codes of football in the winter months. Nevertheless, athletics is an extremely significant sport in Australasian culture due to the central role that its

competitors and administrators played in defining Australia and New Zealand's engagement with international competitions. These include the Olympic Games and various pan-Britannic sporting festivals, from the Festival of Empire sports in 1911 until the present incarnation – the Commonwealth Games. The careers of administrators and notable athletes make sense to the Australian sporting public and sports historians alike through their achievements at these large competitions.[3] In a New Zealand context, Adrian Smith has suggested that the silver fern on black running vest worn by its athletes at international events 'proved a simple but memorable motif' for New Zealand. The gear of athletes such as Peter Snell 'stood out in a sea of white running vests' in the era of black and white television. Smith likens this effect to that of the haka performed at rugby union internationals in restating 'a powerful and remarkably resilient representation of New Zealand nationality'.[4]

Reet and Max Howell have argued that Australian Olympic champions are worth studying as they 'have made a remarkable contribution to Australia's social scene, helping the nation's self image to evolve'.[5] Among the athletes that the Howells studied is Stanley Rowley, the winner of a teams event at the Paris Olympics of 1900.[6] His victory in this event had little impact on the evolution on Australian sporting culture. In fact, it is doubtful whether the event for which Rowley has been posthumously awarded an Olympic title was even recognised as an Olympic event at the time.[7] This is not to say that Rowley, a key competitor in early Australasian championships, was an insignificant athlete. He competed in front of large crowds during the Australasian tour made by the great American sprinter Arthur Duffey in 1905. It is in this capacity that Rowley will be studied in this chapter. The view that sees the significance of athletics in its Olympic expression diverts focus away from what the sport meant to the vast majority of competitors. By examining the manner in which Australasian athletic administrators were able to attract athletes from overseas to the Antipodes, we can begin to appreciate the international relationships that were formed in the name of Australasian athletics. This is a vital first step in understanding the way that Britishness was understood, as the influence that these negotiations had an important impact on relationships with English administrators.

The New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association (NSWAAA) and the Amateur Athletic Union of Australasia (AAUA – or Australasian Union) took a series of steps to popularise athletics throughout Coombes' tenure as president of these organisations. These bodies used tactics that are generally attributed to professional sport to provide a standard of sports that would attract competitor and spectator alike.

They also attempted to attract prominent international athletes to achieve this end. They were successful in attracting two of the greatest athletes of the early twentieth century – British distance runner Alfred Shrubb and American sprinter Arthur Duffey – to tour Australia in 1905. The strategies employed by amateur sporting bodies as well as this tour provided a more tangible attraction to Australasian athletic fans than the rather esoteric benefits of international success.

This chapter is influenced by a suggestion by Stephen Hardy, who sought to explain the rise of sporting culture through an economic model. By moving beyond 'the broad processes that concern social historians – [such as] developments in social class, urban life, or racism', Hardy called for a focus on

> central issues as sport organizations defined them . . . the acquisition and maintenance of facilities, supplies, and players; the staging of events, the minimization of costs, the garnering of publicity; in short, the concerns of a business.[8]

This chapter will demonstrate that these were not simply the concerns of professional sporting businesses in the traditional sense. These were important for institutions that purported to be antagonistic to the profit motive, namely amateur athletic organisations.

The role of finance in amateur sport

Pecuniary concerns are more often attributed to professional sports than their amateur counterparts. Mercantile professionalism is often presented as supplanting idealistic amateurism, as Dilwyn Porter diagnoses with regard to association football (soccer) in nineteenth-century England. While this author rejects the 'journalistic cliché' of an amateur golden age, he nevertheless accepts the dichotomy between mercantile professionalism and pure amateurism.[9] Despite the claims of the purity of amateurism by its adherents, many historians have asserted the importance of money in the conduct of amateur sport. As noted in the Introduction, Lincoln Allison has defined amateurism in opposition to both professionalism and commercialism. He also argues that growing commercialism rather than professionalism in sport has played the major role in the demise of amateurism as a social force. Writing from a contemporary philosophical perspective, he argues that 'professionalism in sport remains only the minor dimension of the decline of amateurism [in the second half of the twentieth century]: the more comprehensive opposing force remains commercialism'.[10] Allison sees this trend as a

result of historical processes, such as the 'wholesale demolition of constraints and limitations on the operation of commercial principles' in Britain during Margaret Thatcher's reign as Prime Minister. The belief 'that amateur sport could be absorbed into a commercialising society in the same way that other institutions were' contributed to the demise of 'amateur hegemony' in sport.[11] While this analysis offers a prescient analysis of late-twentieth-century developments, there is a danger that too sharp a distinction can be drawn between amateur and commercial sport during the era of amateur hegemony.[12] The philosophical distinction between amateur and commercial sport is not replicated in the historic record. This chapter will demonstrate that commercial intent was observable in amateur sport (in this case amateur athletics in Australasia) prior to the social changes instigated by Thatcher and similar governments in the liberal-democratic world. The breaches of amateur principles that result from its commercialisation are of a different form than those that have traditionally excited sports historians.[13] These breaches do not provide an individual with personal gain through access to profits derived from gate money or other sources. But they do provide amateur sport with a profit motive beyond that of 'sport for sport's sake'. For the nature of amateurism in sport to be fully understood, this aspect of its history needs to be brought before the attention of scholars. Australasian amateur officials engaged in these activities which contravened classic British conceptions of amateurism, causing friction between the two communities. The efforts to popularise athletics locally thus drew upon transnational influences and problematised Imperial relations.

Writing in the 1970s before rugby union embraced open professionalism, sociologists Eric Dunning and Kenneth Sheard saw the development of the sport as paralleling

> the dominant trend in modern sport, namely the growing competitiveness, seriousness of involvement and 'achievement-orientation' of sports-participation.
>
> Expressed differently, the trend we are referring to is the gradual but seemingly inexorable erosion of 'amateur' attitudes, values and structures, and their correlative replacement by attitudes, values and structures which are 'professional' in one sense or another of that term.[14]

Dunning and Sheard point to the development of large arenas (such as Twickenham stadium in London) that generate income, which is then

used to pay for ground staff that maintain the facilities, as an example of the way that professionalism has influenced rugby union. The authors ascertained a movement towards professionalism as the improved conditions gave non-financial benefits to players. These benefits included the opportunity to 'play in representative [rugby union] in front of large crowds'.[15]

In a similar vain, John Bale has used Pierre Bourdieu's concept of social capital to explain how the first man to run a mile in less than four minutes, Roger Bannister, obtained benefits through his fame as an athlete. These benefits could be capitalised upon regardless of whether he was actually paid for his performances.[16] In an Australasian context, Camilla Obel has analysed the success of New Zealand rugby by considering the influence that provincial competition has had on popularising the sport during the amateur era. Obel suggests a move away from national teams competing abroad in favour of domestic events in order to explain the cultural significance of sport. She argues that

> . . . focusing attention on the All Black [New Zealand's successful national rugby] team misses the point that it was the establishment of domestic, amateur rugby union competitions that served to cultivate and secure 'enduring or regular publics'.[17]

The first major competition between New Zealand's provincial unions, the Ranfurly Shield, was established in 1902 and consisted of challenge matches against the holders. This provided a source of revenue and power within the structure of the New Zealand Rugby Football Union (NZRFU) for select unions, such as Auckland, Wellington and Canterbury.[18] The National Provincial Championship (NPC) was set up in 1976 as a divisional league that sought to recover public interest and gain sponsorship and media coverage.[19]

Obel employs the insights offered by Eric Leifer's organisational analysis of the four major league sports in North America to chart the development of rugby union in New Zealand. Leifer identified 'a significant shift in organising professional sports from a focus on "gathering crowds for matches to creating publics"'.[20] Obel uses this insight to chart the development of rugby union from a game that attracted sporadic interest through the Ranfurly Shield to one that created a national public through the successful NPC. The nature of the Ranfurly Shield as a challenge competition was unable to create regular local publics, but it 'did encourage provincial unions to "gather crowds for matches" involving the Shield'.[21] The league structure of the NPC 'represented [the

larger provincial union's] first attempt at cultivating local publics for season-long competitions'.[22] It was able to create a national television public in the early 1990s through measures such as streamlining the fixture list and instituting a finals series that prevented the title being decided long before the season was completed.[23] Obel argues that the success of rugby in establishing a public for itself 'rested on the adoption of aspects central to the organisation of professional competitions'.[24] This is interesting in light of the advice that Richard Coombes offered professional sculling administrators to adopt the administrative style of amateur rowing to ensure their survival.[25] Obel's work has demonstrated that the opposite was also true, that amateur officials employed schemes similar to those used by professional sporting organisations in order to gain prominence. This significantly influenced imperial sporting relationships, as rugby bodies in Britain (particularly the Scottish Rugby Football Union) expressed wariness about whether rugby in New Zealand was sufficiently amateur.[26] Amateur athletics was just as concerned with creating these publics, although of course it was unable to replicate the success of rugby union. This recognition is significant in the case of athletics in Australasia as any interest in the sport is widely and narrowly attributed to interest in the Olympic Games. A reinterpretation of Australasian responses to athletics that compares the response to external events such as the Olympics to domestic events offers the opportunity to question the 'imaginary grandstand' understanding of Australian sport. This reinterpretation will begin at the local club level and move towards intercolonial/interstate and ultimately international events.

Club events

The structure of club athletics in New South Wales provides a useful starting point for addressing the professional-like tactics of Australasian athletic administrators. The NSWAAA adopted a number of programs aimed specifically at attracting the attention of the general public, including the institution of a district scheme in order to promote the sport in 1900. Richard Waterhouse asserts that the adoption of district schemes signifies a point of delineation between amateur and professional football. Waterhouse claims that '[rugby union] administrators not only decried professionalism but also the idea of sport as spectator entertainment'. On the other hand

> [f]or those who adhered to the professional codes . . . both in Sydney and Melbourne, football became a means of identification with

> suburb or local community; in essence the game provided a means of identification against the anonymity of the city.[27]

This view should be challenged, as sporting bodies professing adherence to amateur ideology were at the vanguard of developing district competition in New South Wales. The NSWAAA followed in the footsteps of other amateur sporting bodies, such as the New South Wales Cricket Association (NSWCA) and the Metropolitan Rugby Union (MRU), in adopting this format. Sydney club cricket from the season 1893–94 was played on a district basis, with rugby union following suit in 1900. According to Richard Cashman, proponents of the district scheme in rugby argued that it 'would increase spectator interest [and] . . . enhance the competition'.[28] Charles Little has argued that fervent local support for the professional South Sydney District Rugby League Club was only assured once the club and the code had eclipsed the fortunes of the corresponding district rugby union club.[29] In short, the self-consciously amateur rugby union competition provided a spectacle that sustained the interest of the South Sydney community in the face of the development of professional rugby league. If professional sporting bodies in New South Wales used the concept of local rivalry to improve the position of their competitions, they could only do so because amateur organisations such as the MRU, NSWCA and NSWAAA had laid the groundwork.

The adoption of a district scheme sometimes led to conflict within the amateur communities themselves. Dr Herbert Moran, the university-educated captain of the 1908 Australian rugby union team (the Wallabies), suggested that the decision to employ the district scheme disrupted the 'corporative spirit and a tradition' of establishment clubs.[30] Nineteenth-century rugby in Sydney was defined by clubs 'based on people of like minds and social background'. Dominant clubs included the Wallaroo and Waratah clubs, who were formed by middle-class former pupils of elite public schools, such as the King's School, Newington School and Camden College. These former students developed into influential advocates of 'the twin ideologies of amateurism and athleticism'. For example, influential administrators and 'Muscular Christians', the Arnold brothers, were closely linked to the King's School and the Wallaroo club. The power of these clubs was increasingly challenged by clubs based around localities at the end of the nineteenth century, providing the necessary basis for the formation of the district competition.[31]

The district competition reinforced the growing power of community clubs based in inner-city working-class areas such as South Sydney

and Glebe. The Glebe club was formed prior to the district competition and was amongst the first to advocate district representation. The club dominated the early years of the district competition, winning three premierships outright and sharing a fourth with the establishment Sydney University club. The emergence of these clubs brought a new tenor to Sydney's rugby, with Glebe noted for 'rough and illegal play'.[32] As these clubs were amongst the first to join the breakaway New South Wales Rugby League (NSWRL) competition, the creation of the district scheme in rugby union may be judged to have laid the foundations for the development of rugby league as a professional code. The MRU itself was responsible for unleashing the forces that they would ultimately oppose in their acrimonious feud with the professional code. In developing a similar scheme, the NSWAAA placed itself amongst other amateur sporting bodies that were barely sticking to the margins of the 'sport for sport's sake' ethos. Rugby union players in particular faced criticism for this divergence from accepted amateur practice. When the first Wallabies toured England in 1908 they, like the 1905 All Blacks, were accused of professionalism by organisations such as the Scottish and Irish rugby unions.[33] In a similar manner, the Australasian amateur athletics community distanced themselves from important amateur ideologues in Britain itself.

The district scheme of 1900 adopted by the NSWAAA was one of a series of measures that were designed to improve the standard of athletics, in doing so adopting schemes that transgressed amateur norms. It ensured that athletes would represent the club that corresponded to their residence, as was the case with the MRU scheme of the same year. Exceptions were made for educational clubs, such as the Sydney University Amateur Athletic Club, and clubs outside the metropolitan area.[34] The success of the scheme would be based on creating what Leifer would describe as a local public.[35] Residents of Sydney's burgeoning suburbs, replete with newly established ovals, would be able to support local players and engage in expressions of civic pride.[36] The NSWAAA was perhaps hoping to establish a following similar to rugby and cricket when they divided the Sydney region into North, East, South and West Sydney district clubs. Before the scheme was inaugurated, the NSWAAA expressed the hope that it would 'produce more interest and will, no doubt, bring out many new athletes'.[37] A contest between East and South in 1901 was reputed to have drawn five to six thousand spectators, a crowd that compared favourably with contemporary football attendances.[38]

Of the six clubs represented at the 1900 annual meeting of the NSWAAA, four (Warringah Harriers, Forest Lodge Harriers, Darlinghurst

Harriers and Redfern Harriers) can be easily placed within the four districts as suggested in April 1900.[39] At a meeting held on 1 June 1900 the scheme was altered so that 'Parramatta should be considered to be wholly in the West district'.[40] The area from where the Sydney Harriers club drew its members appears to have been at the apex of the East, South and West districts. It thus seems entirely possible that the desire to break up this club influenced the decision to institute a district. However, no organised resistance seems to have been offered to the NSWAAA's plans, and there seems to have been a general sense of apathy towards the issue. The meeting that the leadership of the NSWAAA intended to use to explain the district scheme to its members did not attract a quorum on the first two occasions, and was finally successfully held only at the third attempt.[41] While Coombes considered the attendance poor at even the third attempt, the *Sydney Morning Herald* correspondent applied a more forgiving standard for judging the attendance and considered the crowd 'good'.[42]

Despite its early success, the district scheme was short-lived. It appears that the NSWAAA was unable to cultivate any local publics through its scheme. The case of the South Sydney club provides an explanation for its failure. Charles Little, a historian of sport in South Sydney, has remarked that it is a particularly nebulous locality:

> the term South Sydney has historically meant a different area in various contexts, with often quite great variance between each of these definitions. Nor is it just a solitary suburb, but rather an amalgam of at least 25 individual suburbs, and an even greater number of sub-localities . . . [43]

The creation of the South Sydney District Amateur Athletic Club added another layer of complexity. The district that encompassed the boundaries of the South Sydney district rugby club bore no relation to that of the South Sydney district athletic club. The western boundary of the rugby club cut a swathe through the current inner-western Sydney suburbs of Newtown, Eveleigh, Erskineville, Alexandria and Mascot.[44] By contrast, the western boundaries of the athletic club consisted of an imaginary line taken from the outer western suburb of Parramatta south to the suburb of Merrylands and along the Southern Railway Line that today services the south-western suburbs of Sydney to Liverpool.[45] That the athletics club was unable to establish a lasting sense of community feeling in the manner of electorate cricket and district rugby can be attributed to the vast territory that the club 'represented'. However,

some measure of success can be attributed to the district scheme. Genuinely local clubs, such as the Newtown Harriers, were formed after the district scheme was rejected. The formation of these clubs indicates a measure of success in popularising the sport, even if it was not popularised to the extent and manner of district rugby and cricket.

The NSWAAA introduced another short-lived district scheme in 1921. This scheme had even more exceptions than the 1900 scheme, with 'the Sydney University, Police, N.S.W. Walkers and Schools Clubs' permitted to operate despite the imposition of the district scheme. Athletes already belonging to a club as of 31 August 1921 were allowed to remain with their club and were not compelled to join clubs within their district.[46] The scheme was rejected two years later, which brought 'more harmony between the clubs'.[47] The repeated failure of the district scheme does not detract from the NSWAAA's stated objective to 'produce more interest' in the sport through it. The NSWAAA clearly failed to create a local public comparable to that created by rugby union. The low level of support that the district scheme engendered is indicative of this failure, rather than the existence of an ethos that spurned the spectacular.

The commitment of the NSWAAA to providing attractive sport remained at the fore even when a district scheme was not in operation. The Dunn Challenge Shield was introduced in 1910 as a meeting to decide the champion club of Sydney and ran annually – with wartime interruptions – between 1910 and 1944.[48] It was named after Jack Dunn, a Vice-President of the Newtown Harriers. This club promoted and hosted the first meeting at the nearby Erskineville Oval. The first carnival for the Dunn Challenge Shield was billed as a 'monster' and boasted the 'record entry for amateur sports'.[49] The methods for advertising the first Dunn Shield meeting were similar to those employed in advertising the inaugural carnival at the Carrington Athletic Grounds at Moore Park. These grounds were for a period the home of professional athletics in Sydney and were opened in December 1886 with 'a monster carnival'. They were advertised as

> Gigantic Grounds that outrival all others in the world for Spaciousness, Elegance, and Convenience: replete with all the most modern improvements that capital can command or skill suggest.

The inaugural event boasted a prize of five hundred and fifty pounds, 'The Largest Prize ever given in the world for a Sheffield Handicap'.[50] The *Sydney Morning Herald* estimated that 'probably not less than 9000

visitors' attended the Carrington First Grand Handicap on 18 December 1886.[51] Both the idea of a 'monster carnival' to inaugurate the operation and the boast of records were common to the promotion of both the first professional Carrington and amateur Dunn Shield meetings. While there was a different focus for each of these record boasts, the similarities in techniques employed suggests that a similar promotional ethic was common to both operations.

The Newtown Harriers also took the opportunity to promote itself through the development of the Dunn Shield. It asked the purchasers of its programme 'do you wish to be a successful athlete?' Those answering in the affirmative were advised to join the Newtown Harriers, 'the Most Up-to-date Amateur Athletic Club in New South Wales'. After assuring prospective members that they would be 'provided with sports the whole year round', the programme advised those not belonging to a club to apply to Dunn or club secretary W. E. Corben 'at once'.[52] Not only did these events offer the prospect of a large paying crowd, the promotion of the carnival offered the opportunity for clubs to entice new members to join. Despite Dunn's munificence in donating the Shield, the NSWAAA took control of organising the event and from 1911 the Sydney Sports Ground in Moore Park hosted Dunn Shield contests.[53]

The NSWAAA instituted another competition shortly after the demise of the second district scheme in 1923, the Thompson Cup. This competition was introduced 'with a view to improving the standard of amateur athletics' and took the format of a league, with the nine clubs competing in one-on-one matches against the others over a nine-week period.[54] Rather than a home and away structure, the NSWAAA staged matches at large venues such as the Sydney Sports Ground that offered the opportunity for midweek night meetings.[55] The top four teams played a further semi-final round after the first round was completed, with the first half of a semi-final tie between Botany Harriers and St George attracting 'a large attendance of athletes'.[56] The top two teams, Western Suburbs and St George, played off in a final in the last week of February, with Wests completing an unbeaten campaign in front of a large crowd.[57] The clubs were split into two divisions after the first season and competed for new trophies, and it appears that the final series was not required by the 1926 season.[58] Nevertheless, with the Dunn Shield and Thompson Cup (and its descendants), the NSWAAA had quite a sophisticated competition structure that put it at odds with some developments in England.

This is particularly so with respect to other amateur bodies that eschewed the idea of crowd-drawing competitions. Most notably, the

Rugby Football Union (RFU) in England employed strictures against cup and league competitions that had some influence on causing northern clubs to break away and form the avowedly commercial Northern Union, later known as rugby league.[59] The RFU finally instituted a full league structure in 1987, but local leagues were developed in England's southwest and Midlands in the early 1900s to face the threat of soccer. The organisers of these competitions faced hostility from the RFU, but not expulsion from the rugby union game as their Northern counterparts had suffered.[60] The differing views of the provincials and the RFU are indicative of a spectrum of views amongst amateurs towards commercialism within England itself. The competitive structure of the NSWAAA was representative of the less exclusive strand. This diversity within English sport is important to note, and will be addressed more fully in following chapters as I elucidate the way that Australasian figures attempted to insinuate themselves within British sport.

The Thompson Cup had the desired effect in terms of improving the standard of athletics in New South Wales, as improved Dunn Shield performances in 1924 were attributed to its institution.[61] The institution of competitions such as this often had dual intentions, with hopes to improve the standard of the sport complementing hopes to improve the bottom lines of the NSWAAA and the clubs. Both better performances and large crowds were seen as barometers of success, as the example of the Thompson Cup competition of 1924–25 suggests. Amateur athletics was infused with a financial imperative that historians have not recognised.

The entrepreneurial bent of amateur athletics in New South Wales during Richard Coombes' presidency of the NSWAAA is more easily understood when the circumstances of Coombes' childhood are considered. His father, Richard Coombes Senior, was the proprietor of the Greyhound Hotel near Hampton Court Palace during Richard Junior's early years.[62] Collins and Vamplew argue that hotels '[have] always been closely connected to sport', with publicans of more rowdy establishments arranging and promoting events, as well as acting as bookmakers.[63] In noting the over-representation of New Zealand Irish Catholics in the hotel-keeping trade, James Belich describes the trade as 'on the fringes of respectability'[64] Huggins and Mangan have suggested that some hotel landlords

> were suspected by some of being disreputable simply because of their calling, no matter how they actually behaved or how they used their wealth. Perhaps there was substance behind the suspicion.[65]

The Coombes family do not appear to have been considered disreputable, as Coombes Senior was asked to provide refreshment to the royal sale of yearlings at Hampton Court in 1859 and 1863.[66] It was also the site of upper-middle-class social functions not connected to sport – such as an anniversary session and dinner of the St Andrew's Graduates' Association, an organisation of doctors, in 1880.[67]

Between 1858 and 1864 in particular, this hotel became the focal point of the coursing community in the Hampton Court area, and the Coombes family were often the subject of rave reviews in the coursing press. Coombes Senior was the honorary secretary to the Hampton Court Champion meeting from 1858, the year of the birth of his son, until it was run at Hampton Court for the final time under the title Metropolitan Clubs Champion Meeting in 1864.[68] Despite the short lifespan of the event in the local community, the Champion Meeting gained a reputation for strong and effective management. The efficient stewardship of Coombes Senior and his colleagues meant that coursers were not denied a good day's sport despite a course lacking in space. The 1859–60 *Coursing Calendar* described the 1859 Hampton Court Champion Club Meeting in particularly glowing terms:

> It is truly astonishing what may be effected by good management in converting inferior materials into a fabric worthy of admiration. The park at Hampton Court is certainly not in itself to be compared, as a coursing ground, with many others which could be mentioned, and yet, still, we every now and then, by the exercise of care and judgement, get a capital day's coursing there. Such a day we have just been favoured with . . . [69]

By 1861, the contributors to the *Coursing Calendar* saw it as 'needless to remark that [the officials] performed their duties to perfection'.[70] Competent sporting administration clearly ran in the family.

Both Mr and Mrs Coombes earned reputations as excellent hosts as a result of services provided to coursers at pre-meeting draws and banquets held after the racing. The favourable impression was doubtless aided by improvements to Coombes' residence undertaken in 1858 – the year of Richard Coombes Junior's birth and just as the Hampton Court Champion Meeting was being inaugurated. The *Coursing Calendar* of 1858 indicates that the Greyhound Hotel underwent a programme of renovations 'in order to accommodate the large parties likely to be present'.[71] The renovations consisted of a portico to provide access to the hotel as well as the development of dining, coffee and billiard

rooms.[72] As a result, the establishment was ideally suited to take advantage of an expanding clientele created by the Hampton Court coursing boom.

The 'large and lofty dining-room' was well-received by the participants at the inaugural Champion Meeting and seemingly assured the place of the Hampton Court Champion Meeting on the coursing calendar:

> . . . on the evening before the draw, a large party of the right sort sat down to an excellent and well-served dinner, which did great credit to Mrs Coombes in her department, and to the host in his selection of the wines, which were of a superior quality. Seldom have we assisted at a more agreeable entertainment, and we cannot but congratulate all parties concerned on this auspicious commencement, in-doors as well as out, of I hope, a long series of Hampton Court Champion Meetings.[73]

The hospitality offered by the Coombes family was favourably commented upon during many reviews of coursing at Hampton Park. A review of the 1861 meeting commented on the 'good cheer' provided by Coombes Senior. A meeting hosted by the Amicable Club in the same season saw it as scarcely necessary to relay that 'Mr and Mrs Coombs [*sic*.]' offered 'every satisfaction' to their guests.[74] By 1864 the Greyhound Hotel was considered the usual headquarters of coursing in Hampton Court.[75] The financial fortunes of the Coombes family in Richard Coombes Junior's formative years were thus intimately tied to their ability to take advantage of the commercial possibilities of sport. As a result, Coombes was not raised in an environment that shared the traditional amateur antipathy towards the commercialisation of sport. As a result, the development of club athletics in Sydney was not unduly restricted by an insistence on excising commercialism from the sport. The next section will demonstrate that intercolonial contests between the colonies (later states) of Australia and New Zealand were similarly unencumbered.

Intercolonial representative contests

As well as club meets, intercolonial – later interstate and interdominion – competitions were also infused with a commercial imperative. The formation of the Australasian Union at the Australasian Amateur Conference held in conjunction with 1897 Australasian Championships in Sydney saw the standardisation of colonial teams to take part in

the Australasian championships. It was agreed that '[n]o colony shall be at liberty to *start* more than three men in any running, walking, or hurdling event'.[76] The programmes of the 1896 championship held at Christchurch, the last held prior to this change, and the 1899 Australasian championships held in Brisbane, the first held under the auspices of the Australasian Union, demonstrate that the effect of this change was immediate. The programme for the 1896 Australasian championship meeting shows that while athletes from New South Wales and Victoria are exclusively listed as representing their colonies; some athletes from New Zealand represented clubs and others represented their colony. By contrast, the 1899 Australasian championships programme lists all competitors in championship events representing colonial teams.[77]

The adoption of a more streamlined approach resulted in the establishment of handicap events at Australasian championship meetings, which allowed the carnival to grow in spite of the limits placed on championship events. While 108 nominations were received from 42 athletes in 1896, the admittedly exceptional 1905 championships held in Sydney attracted 424 nominations from 162 athletes, including 89 local athletes who competed solely in the array of handicap events.[78] While it is unlikely that all these athletes actually competed, they would have paid an entrance fee just to nominate. The opportunities for state associations to recoup some of the expenses incurred through the organisation of Australasian championships were restricted following a decision made in 1904 to forbid organising associations from charging interstate athletes entrance fees.[79] From 1905 an extensive programme of handicap events that attracted local athletes short of championship class became the best way for organising associations to raise funds through the Australasian championships. Given the history of the Coombes family as promoters of coursing, it is not surprising that the NSWAAA made the most of this opportunity.

The organisation of the Australasian championships on strictly state/colonial lines allowed the fomentation of interstate – and international with New Zealand as a member association – rivalries that were central to Australian sport. Rivalry between the colonies, particularly in competition with New South Wales, was a feature of Australasian athletics even before the foundation of the Australasian Union. Following the visit of a New South Wales team to New Zealand in 1889, a team representing the New Zealand Amateur Athletic Association (NZAAA) at the 1890 New South Wales championships proved extremely successful, winning seven of eleven events. In Gordon's words, 'the news [of success] was greeted with huge – at times extravagant – enthusiasm'.[80]

The Victorian Amateur Athletic Association (VAAA) attributed a perceived growth trend in amateur athletics in New South Wales to its own influence. In a bout of parochialism – typical of sporting contacts between the two dominant colonies and, later, states of Australia – the VAAA opined that, although the influence of New Zealand was a welcome spur to New South Wales,

> . . . the establishment of a nearer rival in Victoria, and the frequent contests between the athletes of New South Wales and Victoria have probably been a considerable factor in the sudden advances made by the sport in New South Wales during the past two years, during which the number of clubs and schools associated has more than doubled.[81]

The Australasian championships were infused with an importance that belied the 'sport for sports sake' ethic of amateurism. The rationale behind the event was expressed in a sort of 'mission statement' in the programme for the 1905 championship meeting:

> THE Main Object of the Meeting is to decide the 'Champion State or Colony,' the State or Colony gaining the most FIRST Places in the 15 Athletic Championship Events being entitled to that honour . . . [82]

The first Australasian championship meeting was held in November 1893, the first season following the inaugural season of the Sheffield Shield (1892–93). The Sheffield Shield was donated by Lord Sheffield, the organiser of the successful 1891–92 English cricket team that visited Australia. This competition saw colonial and later state teams (originally Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia) play each other in home and away contests, with the leader of the table declared the winner of the shield. The Sheffield Shield rejuvenated Australian domestic cricket, with the extra competitiveness attracting spectators back to the game.[83] Its institution reflected a progression of intercolonial cricket towards a more formal competition structure. Montefiore argues that the New South Wales, Victorian and South Australian Cricket Associations sought to popularise intercolonial (as well as club) cricket at the expense of contests between the various Australian and English elevens in the 1880s. While intercolonial cricket matches had been played since 1851-52, the desired dominance of intercolonial cricket was thwarted as the inordinate weight of costs borne by the Victorian Cricket Association (VCA) saw them unwilling to subsidise matches against New South Wales in 1889–90. Negotiations between the NSWCA and the powerful

Melbourne Cricket Club drew the ire of the VCA, which suspended the club.[84] The institution of the Sheffield Shield competition ensured that intercolonial and later interstate cricket would form a permanent place in the Australian cricket calendar, with the exception of wartime interruptions. The progression of the Australasian athletics championships from a loose representative structure towards a more defined structure based strictly on colonial representation reflects a similar trajectory. The proximity of the commencement of the Australasian athletics championship to the establishment of the Sheffield Shield suggests that similar motives were behind the foundation of both these championships.

Historians have not recognised the importance of spectacle to the development of amateur sport in Australia, instead focusing on the issue of class distinction. This has resulted in the binary opposition of pure amateurism and mercantile professionalism, which 'has given way to conformity, even to the point of becoming a truism'.[85] The NSWAAA adopted a district scheme in 1900, the same year as rugby in Sydney. The scheme was supposed to increase popular interest in athletics in terms of attendance as well as participation. The Australasian championships held under the auspices of the Australasian Union were streamlined and embraced intercolonial rivalry in the same manner as Sheffield Shield cricket. Amateur athletics was part of the wider trend in Australian amateur sport to move toward a degree of what Dunning and Sheard have called incipient professionalism. These were not breaches that resulted in personal gain for individuals, but they resulted in amateur sport being infused with an ethic beyond that of 'sport for sport's sake'. While it may be argued that spectacle was only part of the motive behind the institution of these policies, the ensuing part of the chapter will address the most overtly mercantile of amateur sporting operations, the organisation of tours to Australasia. These breaches of amateurism *did* result in personal financial gain for participants, and were allowed to exist within amateurism due to the ethic outlined above. Later chapters will show that this also affected relations between England and Australasia in an athletic sense.

The importance of tours in Australian culture

Geoffrey Blainey's seminal work argued that Australian society had been hampered by the 'tyranny of distance'. John Hirst has argued that Australian society was not unduly affected by distance, but that the 'circumstances of Australian settlement have been such that, from the beginning, goods, people and information have been highly mobile'.[86]

This is equally true of culture and the way Australians have spent their leisure time. Despite the distance that separates Australia from centres of 'western' culture in Europe and the United States of America, the leisure needs of Australians have traditionally been satiated by attractions imported from overseas. Waterhouse argues that '[i]n the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries Australians depended almost exclusively on imported companies . . . for opera performance'.[87] Even less exclusive leisure activities, such as pantomime, came to be dominated by imports. Noted theatre entrepreneur J. C. Williamson – himself an American immigrant – 'began to import English productions complete with sets and performers'. The local pantomime culture that developed in the nineteenth century was thus replaced in the twentieth by imports as Australian audiences became accustomed to consuming overseas entertainment forms and entertainers.[88]

The entertainment industry offers a clear example of an industry that maintained the type of networks that the British World approach to history is concerned with uncovering.[89] But, as is the case with the British World project in general, the shadow of the United States of America looms over these networks. Just as some leading political figures included the United States within the definition of 'Greater Britain', American cultural forms also influenced Australian society.[90] Waterhouse argues that minstrel troupes played a role in 'introducing American commercial advertising techniques to Australian show business and bringing modern forms of entertainment to city and the bush'.[91] Sport was no different, with the lines between athlete and entertainer often blurred. The worldwide baseball tour organised by sporting goods magnate Albert Goodwill Spalding that visited Australia in 1888–89 included a parachutist and balloonist named 'Professor' Bartholomew and an African-American 'mascot' named Clarence Duval, who entertained crowds, the teams and local celebrities with dancing and baton twirling displays.[92] Amongst sports that were to attain a place in the Australian sporting canon, tours by English cricket teams were important in establishing the sport's popularity in Australia.[93] However, cricket administrators were to find that the benefits of tours could be compromised by overexposure. A glut of privately organised tours of English cricketers to Australia saw the complete disintegration of popular demand for cricket tours. The 1887–88 southern summer saw two English teams visit Australia, with four incarnations of the 'Australian Eleven' meeting three English combinations – the tenth and eleventh English tourists, as well as a combination of the two touring teams. The combined English team played an Australian Eleven in the season's only

officially recognised test match before a meagre 1,971 spectators – the lowest on record.[94] The apathy shown by Australian cricket supporters had an echo in the disappointment that Australian theatregoers would show towards imported stars of the theatre that met their disapproval. Waterhouse recounts that English music-hall star Little Tich was pelted with pennies in 1926 after his performance was deemed substandard.[95] Australian audiences thus demanded quality from overseas performers. The first tour organised under the auspices of the Australasian Union promised such quality. It included Alfred Shrubb – the unquestioned long-distance world champion – and Arthur Duffey – a strong contender for the world championship of sprinting.

The Shrubb-Duffey tour

Historians have ignored tours of Australasia made by amateur track and field athletes despite recognising the importance of tours made by professional athletes.[96] These athletes included Americans Lou Myers, Stone Davis and Ed Skinner and Britons W. G. George, Albert Bird, Billy Clarke and Harry Hutchens and Irishmen Frank Hewitt and Tom Malone.[97] Alfred Shrubb and Arthur Duffey were amongst the most notable athletes of the first decade of the twentieth century. Shrubb won ten Amateur Athletic Association (AAA) or English track championships in addition to four cross-country championships between 1901 and 1904. He won the four miles and 10 miles championship double from 1901 until 1904 and added the mile championship in 1903 and 1904.[98] In 1904 he broke multiple world records during a single run at Ibrox Stadium (home of the famous professional football club Glasgow Rangers), including the six, eight and 10 miles world records for amateurs. He extended his run to an hour, breaking the world record for the distance covered in that time by running 11 miles and 1137 yards.[99] Performances such as these saw Shrubb considered the finest English distance runner since George. The management of the antipodean tours of both George and Shrubb shared a commercial ethic, despite the latter touring as an amateur.

Duffey, an American, was described by contemporary commentator Arthur Ruhl as

> [m]uscular and compact, with a limitless amount of explosive energy, he combined many of the qualities of a highpower [*sic*] motor and a rubber ball. He was a rubber ball at the 'trick' distances up to fifty yards, and a highpower [*sic*] machine for the last fifty.[100]

Duffey won the Amateur Athletic Union (AAU) of the United States championship in 1899 and multiple AAA championships in the first decade of the twentieth century. The star American sprinter preferred to compete in England rather than America after touring England *en route* to the Paris Olympic Games. He became a noted journalist after the end of his athletic career.[101]

The Shrubb-Duffey Tour had its genesis in a request from the NZAAA to James E. Sullivan, secretary-treasurer of the American Amateur Athletic Union and organiser of the 1904 St Louis Olympic Games. The New Zealanders requested that Sullivan organise a tour of the 'World's Champions' to Australasia following the 1904 Olympics. The American considered the project possible, although quite expensive.[102] The NZAAA explored other avenues after the American was unable to commit enough time to the project. The tour – apparently still-born after Sullivan's inability to contribute – was reinvigorated by New Zealand athlete W. F. Simpson, who had toured England in 1902. Correspondence flowed between Simpson and Shrubb, with the Englishman expressing his willingness to tour in a letter of 15 August 1904.[103]

Shrubb's willingness to tour was not matched by enthusiasm on the part of the English AAA. The NZAAA negotiated directly with the athletes through New Zealand's Agent-General in London, William Pember Reeves, after support was not forthcoming from the English body. The Agent-General, whose title was later changed to 'High Commissioner', played a key role in promoting New Zealand products to British consumers. In the context of the promotion of immigration, Belich describes High Commissioners '[doubling] as managers of an ongoing promotions campaign'. While he uses the later title, it is clear that Belich was referring to a process also undertaken by Agents-General and nominates Reeves as an example of a former New Zealand politician who filled this role.[104] The use of an official tied so intimately to the economic fortunes of New Zealand illustrates the mercantilism of the efforts to bring the athletes to Australasia. The Sydney *Referee* reported that Reeves 'being a business man, got right down to business instanter when appealed to'.[105] The NZAAA negotiated directly with Shrubb and Duffey through Reeves rather than relying on official channels that were intended to ensure the probity of such endeavours. These tactics may be considered a rejection of the amateur organisational ethic that Coombes insisted that professional sports such as sculling adopt.[106]

The haste that the NZAAA employed in securing the services of Shrubb and Duffey resulted in ill-feeling between the English and

New Zealand AAAs. The *New Zealand Referee* considered that the 'New Zealand Association will have nothing to thank Mr. [Charles Herbert, secretary of the AAA] for' if the plans for the tour eventually prove successful.[107] Herbert claimed confusion rather than lack of interest on his part. He stated that he was unable to carry out the wishes of 'Grierson' – who had corresponded with the AAA about the tour – as he did not know who 'Grierson' was.[108] The Grierson in question was in all likelihood J. F. Grierson, the NZAAA president. New Zealand's self-image as the 'Britain of the South' promoted the idea that it was part of the same community as Britain itself. Belich describes New Zealand as experiencing 'recolonisation' between 1880 and 1960, a period when links to Britain were tightened and New Zealand shifted away from a trans-Tasman world towards a conceptual geography that stressed British links.[109] Under these circumstances, the imagined familiarity of the two communities meant that the further identification of Grierson was not necessary. Herbert's confusion suggests that the English did not view the relationship in the same way.

In spite of the confusion and Coombes' suggestion that it was more likely that the tour could be organised for the 1905–06 season, the athletes were secured for early 1905.[110] The NSWAAA was to a large extent responsible for the shift away from a team of champions to a tour involving Shrubb and Duffey. It predicated its involvement in the scheme on the assurance that the team included at least one of the major athletic 'celebrities' of the day, namely Shrubb or Duffey.[111] The desire for lucrative celebrities is reflective of lessons learnt by Richard Coombes through his father's experiences in organising lucrative coursing events. The demand was made with the express knowledge that Duffey at least was a compromised figure in terms of his amateur standing. Bill Naughton, the *Referee's* correspondent in America, reported a disagreement between Charles Herbert of the AAA and Sullivan over the amateur status of Duffey in 1901. Herbert alleged that American athletes, including Duffey, had illicitly accepted expenses from clubs wishing to add 'tone and importance to what would otherwise have been obscure meetings'.[112] In 1904 Duffey's reputation as America's finest sprinter was challenged by friends of the 'Milwaukee Meteor', Archie Hahn, winner of multiple events at the 1904 Olympics.[113] Duffey was accused of dodging Hahn in order to maintain his record as a world champion and was lampooned as 'Duffey the Globe-Trotter' as a result of his exploits in England and his forthcoming trip to Australasia.[114] Significantly, both Shrubb and Duffey were absent from the St Louis Olympic Games of 1904. The NZAAA requested that Sullivan ship the athletes;

but, as the American suggested, they 'were satisfied to be "puddling in the mud" in England, and not looking for world's championships, [he] could not very well ship them'.[115] This appears to be further evidence of Duffey withdrawing from challenging events in favour of maintaining his reputation, while Shrubb's conduct may be indicative of the wider British lack of interest in these games.[116] Coombes was thus aware that Duffey had a reputation that ran counter to certain aspects of the amateur code. He was suspected not only of being influenced by money, but was accused of employing a traditional trick of professional champions on the wane. Despite the American's dubious reputation, Coombes remained eager to invite him to Australia.

Shrubb and Duffey continued to defy the conventions of amateurism while in Australasia. In addition to the travelling expenses he had already received to undertake the tour, Shrubb sought £100 from the NZAAA in order to pay the wage of his assistant at his pharmacy. The NZAAA was of the opinion that only £30 ought to be paid for this purpose. The Englishman countered that if the extra money were not paid, he would immediately return home. Eventually a sum of £60 was agreed upon, allowing the tour to continue.[117] When Shrubb attempted the same manoeuvre in Sydney, NSWAAA officials including Coombes refused to yield and instead told Shrubb that he had half an hour to decide if he was to run or not.[118] While Coombes' response to this altercation seems to paint him in a positive light, his complicity in the arrangements of the tour reflects more negatively. In addition to predicating his support for the tour on 'celebrities' with dubious reputations, Coombes and his association entered into an arrangement contrary to even the most liberal definition of amateurism. The payment of £30 for the wages of Shrubb's assistant, which all associations agreed to, ran counter to the Australasian Union's own definition of amateurism. Rather than remove money from the sphere of sport, as some apologists of amateurism seek to suggest, the Union sought to control the way money was used.[119] Its definition of amateurism allowed the payment of travelling or hotel expenses 'in the case of a championship event, or with the special sanction of the Amateur Athletic Association to which he belongs'.[120] While the payment of Shrubb and Duffey's expenses was not necessarily a breach, the payment of wages to Shrubb's assistant definitely was.

The conduct of Shrubb, Duffey and those who invited them drew criticism from the *Referee's* rival with a more working-class focus, the *Sydney Sportsman*.[121] 'Tattler', the *Sportsman's* athletic writer, questioned whether Shrubb and Duffey deserved the title of 'gentleman

amateurs.'[122] He questioned sections of the media who suggested that they were in Australasia 'for sport and pleasure at their own expense'. He pointed out that the associations had a monetary stake in bringing the athletes out and saw the tour as a cynical money-making exercise. For 'Tattler', the purpose of the tour was 'to try and give amateur running a lift and wipe off a few debts of a few years standing'.[123] This statement was included in an article that raised more general criticisms of the probity of amateur athletics in Australasia. 'Tattler' was critical of the system of 'open orders' for amateur prizes. Under this system, athletes were given a voucher to buy a trophy from a retailer before displaying the prize to officials in order to verify the transaction, a system that 'Tattler' saw as open to abuse.[124]

His criticism should not be taken as that of an indignant idealist, as he also chastised the NSWAAA for reducing the possible crowd through its policy of banning bookmakers from the track.[125] Nevertheless these criticisms are an example of a writer for a working-class newspaper criticising his middle-class contemporaries for not upholding the true tenets of amateurism. This sits uneasily with the traditional dichotomy between middle-class amateurism and working-class professionalism, whereby '[t]he articulation of the amateur sporting ideology led to greater class segregation, and even conflict, in sport'.[126] This conflict is significant in Australian Olympic historiography as working-class athletes have traditionally been disproportionately successful in Olympic competition.[127] 'Tattler's' criticism indicates that those professing to speak for the Australian working class saw the working class as having a stake in amateur sport. This may begin to explain why working-class Australians have engaged with the Olympic movement to such an extent.

Within months of the end of their Australasian tour, both Shrubb and Duffey were permanently suspended as amateurs. In October 1905 the *Referee* announced that Shrubb had been permanently suspended by the AAA 'for malpractice in connection with the receipt of expenses.'[128] The revelation of Duffey's suspension a matter of weeks later was even more spectacular than that concerning Shrubb. The *Referee* provided its readers with a succinct cable from London:

> Monday 2.30 p.m. – A.F. Duffey, the well known American sprinter, who some time since visited New Zealand and Australia, in an article in a New York magazine admits that for the past seven years he has been paid for his services, and affirms that the English A.A.A. and the A.A. Union of the United States were cognisant of the fact.[129]

Coombes' response to the news of Shrubb's disqualification was quite astonishing in its easy acceptance of the situation. He doubted that

> anyone who has closely followed English Athletics during the past few seasons could be in any way surprised at the news. The rumblings of the current storm have long-been heard, but as the English A.A.A., ever slow to move, made no sign, it looked like nothing would happen – during this season at any rate.[130]

The implication is that Coombes suspected that top English athletes, and perhaps Shrubb himself, were subverting amateur statutes while remaining ostensibly committed amateurs. Rather than seeking to insulate Australasian athletes from this influence, the Australasian Union president pragmatically engaged with this athlete in order to provide a spectacle for the sporting public.

Coombes had previously decried the practice of remaining an amateur while covertly accepting expenses. In April 1904 he suggested:

> far from finding fault with the seceders [to professionalism], they must be commended. It is not with the man who straightforwardly states he hopes to make money out of his athletic ability that amateurism has to beware; it is the man who makes money by betting, fixing up heats, and 'working' athletics for all there is in it by various methods, all the time managing to keep in the amateur class. The quasi amateur is a thousand times more harmful to amateurism than the straight out pro.[131]

'Sprinter' of the *Canterbury Times*, a correspondent with whom he had many stoushes over the concept of amateurism, went one step further:

> Professionalism and amateurism can exist side by side with distinct advantage to each branch. It is only a question of time when a further advance will be made, and one governing body for both classes will be the general rule.[132]

'Sprinter' later advocated on behalf of the New Zealand Sports Federation (NZSF), which included professional and amateur bodies. Coombes was equally vociferous in his opposition to such a body, preferring that professional and amateur bodies remain separate. As such, Coombes can be seen to be concerned more with the practical distinction between

amateur and professional than with the typical amateur condemnation of professional sport. His pragmatic acceptance of professional sport compares unfavourably with the response of L. A. Adamson – an acknowledged ideologue of athleticism in Australia – to professional sport. Adamson – the Rugby-educated headmaster of Melbourne's Wesley College – refused permission for S. B. Gravenall of the Wesley teaching staff to play for St Kilda in the increasingly professional Victorian Football League in 1911.[133]

Coombes reacted to the news of Duffey's revelations with disbelief, in contrast to his response to Shrubb's suspension. He admitted the possibility of members of the AAA committee being aware of Duffey receiving too liberal 'expenses' but was confident that 'if the committee, as a whole, had the knowledge affirmed by Duffey, he would assuredly have been '"dealt with"'. He felt assured that the AAU had 'no definite knowledge' of Duffey's actions.[134] Naughton's 'American Budget' of 29 November 1905 printed an extract of the magazine article in which Duffey's actions came to light. According to an editorial, he:

> intends to expose the crookedness of amateur athletics in all its nauseous details. He is not
>
> IN ANY SENSE AN AMATEUR
>
> in accordance with the definition of the [AAU]. He has not been an amateur for several years, and still, he has been competing, not only in this country, but in England and Australia, and in various other parts of the world, as a bona fide amateur athlete. He has supported himself by his ability as an amateur athlete since the year 1898, and when you realize that this condition is not unusual; that the athletes who are working for five dollar medals and glory alone, are rare, you will then understand the importance of a series of articles which Mr. Duffey is to write for this magazine.[135]

Duffey's critique of amateurism rested on three factors. In the first instance, Duffey cites the popularity of athletics as a reason for temptation. He anachronistically blames the development of track and field, from the pure ancient age when 'athletes were content to strive for parsley crowns' through to the contemporary age when unscrupulous individuals could take advantage of expense provisions and the drawing power of star athletes. Second, Duffey blames the 'unscrupulous athletic manager' for arranging as liberal expense allowance as possible, while

the tempted athlete constituted the third factor. He justified the actions of himself and other athletes by suggesting that the athlete gives 'the best years of his life' to the sport and calls for the 'anomalous conditions which compel him to occupy his current paradoxical position' to be blamed rather than the athlete themselves.[136] Duffey beat a hasty retreat from these claims, and no evidence of the projected series was reprinted in *The Referee*. In a letter to Coombes, Duffey suggested that the damaging revelations in the editorial resulted from a 'misapprehension' by the editor of the American paper, Bernarr Macfadden, and that he had meant to say no such thing. He blamed Sullivan for igniting the issue, and intimated that he would pursue legal action against him.[137]

Rather than accepting his personal complicity and that of the organisation he led in the affair, Coombes explained Shrubb's indiscretion by retreating to the traditional image of athletics outside London as outside the amateur pale. He suggested that:

> [p]romoting clubs, particularly big ones in the North, Midlands, and Scotland, feel bound to provide 'star' performers, if they are to maintain their positions, and make overtures to noted runners – and the 'stars' quickly gauge their own market value.[138]

This criticism is hypocritical given the NSWAAA's insistence that the Australasian tour include 'athletic celebrities'. Shrubb himself confounds the traditional view that the south of England was pure, while more northerly regions were especially prone to deviant acts. Shrubb was referred to as the Horsham (Sussex) wonder and was a member of the South London Harriers club.[139] Furthermore, Shrubb made his professional debut in London, where he performed in front of '[q]uite a large number of well-known amateurs'. His reputation was apparently unharmed by his suspension:

> The reception with which he met proved that he still has the good wishes of the British public, to the majority of whom the ins and outs of the Amateur Athletic Association's very necessary laws are comparatively unknown.[140]

This comment suggests a distance between the AAA and the wider athletic public even within its heartland. Another interesting aspect of Shrubb's professional debut was that he competed at a complex known as 'Olympia', suggesting that value placed in the glories of ancient athletes was contested by amateurs and professionals in this period.[141]

The Rowley tour

Coombes' denigration of 'promoting clubs' was disingenuous given the support that Sydney athlete Stanley Rowley received from the athletic communities of Glasgow and Huddersfield during his tour of England and France in 1900. Rowley had been suggested as a possible tourist after the Australasian Union was unable to commit funds to a team for England and the Paris Olympics in 1900.[142] The matter was taken up by Coombes in his role as athletics contributor to *The Referee* and given a measure of support by the *Sydney Morning Herald*, who printed details of the foundation of a fundraising committee.[143] Coombes promoted the movement by publicising the efforts of subscribers. In doing so, he appealed to the stereotypically middle-class instinct to 'keep up with the Joneses'. A typical example of the publicity given to subscribers is as follows:

> **The Treasurer's Report**
>
> The hon. treasurer of the fund being raised to send an Australian representative to the Olympian Games in Paris and the English Championships in London this year acknowledges the receipt of the following additional subscriptions:- Mr. A.H. Phillips, 1 1s., Mr. H. Levian 10s, and Mr. J.R. Henderson (on behalf of Pirates F.C.) 1 15s. The various subscription lists in circulation are reported to be filling up well.[144]

Despite the attempt to garner popular support for the scheme, the fund came in below the figure of £100 that Coombes set for the Rowley Fund. He did not share the satisfaction of other contributors:

> At the final meeting of the citizens' committee, which was formed to secure Australian representation in London and Paris this year, more than one speaker voiced the opinion that what had been done was to be reckoned as satisfactory. Personally I cannot agree with the contention. The sum required was £100, and at the time the committee disbanded under £60 had been raised, including a couple of guineas contributed in a sportsmanlike way by Brisbane sympathisers . . . Some £30 is still required to finance Australia's champion, for it would be a lasting disgrace if, after asking him to represent us, we let him pay any of his legitimate expenses.[145]

Harrier in *The Australasian* characterised the response of 'would-be subscribers not directly connected with our associations' as

> Oh yes . . . that is all very nice. But you ask us to subscribe £1,500 to afford entertainment to English spectators, and if they wanted you, surely they would be willing to help you financially.[146]

Harrier's fictional response is given credence by the lethargic response to this cause compared to the alacrity to which the Shrubb-Duffey Tour was organised.

Before Rowley left, Coombes organised a programme of events that he considered would give Rowley the best chance of finding his form. His first engagement was to be a 100 yards scratch race at Huddersfield on 16 June 1900, but he instead began his tour with a more taxing handicap race at Glasgow three days earlier.[147] Coombes expressed surprise at this development, and speculated that he had competed at a charity meet in aid of the Boer War effort.[148] It soon became clear that Rowley's appearance at Glasgow was a result of less noble motives. Letters from Rowley and Archie Baird (the Australasian Union's representative in Europe) confirmed that the Glasgow meeting's promoters – the West of Scotland Harriers – had donated £5 towards the foundering Rowley fund. The Huddersfield Athletic Club was likely to do the same if he competed at their meeting.[149] In the context of the desperate financial situation that Rowley found himself in, it appears as though the sprinter had altered his itinerary to alleviate his monetary concerns. The change in engagement in all likelihood did not aid him in an athletic sense. There appears to be a fine line between Rowley's conduct in this matter and the professional chasing 'gate money'.

Rowley felt slighted by the athletic leadership in London, whom he claimed had not 'shown [him] one little bit of courtesy', hounding him for entrance fees and offering him a solitary complimentary ticket for the AAA championships. On the other hand, he expressed affection for the 'provinces . . . [where] the people can't do enough for you'.[150] Rowley thus took advantage of the very northern athletic culture that Coombes would blame for Shrubb's professional conduct. He also spent significant time racing in the Midlands. Amongst his most significant performances were those at the Midlands towns of Wolverhampton and Stourbridge, both just outside Birmingham, on 30 June and 9 July. According to the *Athletic News*, the Wolverhampton Charity Sports were 'rapidly assuming the proportions of an A.A.A. championship meeting, merely because of competitors who are now in the habit of attending'. The popularity of this event was reflected in the crowd of 9,000 spectators that attended the 1900 event. Despite the later misgivings that he expressed over the probity of events from the Midlands, Coombes turned a blind eye to the

implications of these developments and concentrated on Rowley's success. His victory in the 100 yards scratch race at Wolverhampton over Reginald Wadsley, the 1899 AAA 100 yards Champion, asserted the superiority of Rowley over the local sprinters. He won the event by two yards with this margin extended over the last twenty-five yards, a clear indication of sprinting superiority.[151] While the setting at Stourbridge may not have been as salubrious as Wolverhampton, Rowley's time of 10 seconds for the 100 yards 'show[ed] our crack is what [Australian commentators] claimed him to be – an even timer. Bravo, Rowley. Congratulations'.[152] Coombes may well have congratulated himself, as Rowley's achievement also conferred respectability on the Australian athletic leadership, as it showed its judgement to be sound. The NZAAA would later feel the sting of English barbs when George Smith toured England in 1902 claiming a world record for the 120 yards hurdles that Coombes himself doubted.[153] Smith, and by extension the NZAAA, was criticised for not reaching the standard expected in England, despite the difficulties in acclimatising and his victory in the 120 yards AAA championship.[154]

While Coombes' attitude towards athletics in the north and Midlands may have varied to suit his own exigencies, his reliance on this old, class-based formulation also reflects his increasing unfamiliarity with the English sporting scene. The professional Football League was inaugurated two years after Coombes' emigration to Australia in 1886. The twelve foundation clubs in this league were from the Midlands and Lancashire, reflecting the development of a professional northern culture divergent from the amateur south. However, this fault line did not last and a Southern League mixing professional and amateur clubs was established for the 1894–95 season, with southern clubs also joining the Football League proper.[155] Private clubs such as Chelsea along with workplace teams such as Woolwich Arsenal (later Arsenal) and West Ham United formed and embraced professionalism during the period between Coombes' emigration and the fallout from the Shrubb-Duffey tour.[156] Mason identifies professional clubs representing skilled and semi-skilled workers in areas such as Chelsea, Tottenham and Fulham as amongst the most popular drawcards in London, showing that a tolerance of professionalism had developed amongst a significant sector of society and was not just representative of the tastes of factory workers.[157] Coombes' unfamiliarity with these trends in English sporting culture allowed him to take refuge in the dated conceptions of his own experience.

The wholehearted support that Coombes and his association showed to the tour of Shrubb and Duffey was tempered in Victoria. The

Melbourne press showed a degree of caution towards potential 'pothunters'. As the tour was taking shape in October 1904, *The Australasian* assured its readership that 'if any athletes from abroad expect to visit Australia on anything but a genuine amateur basis the Victorian association is certain to decline participation'.[158] While this may indicate a stricter awareness about the implications of the tour in its aftermath, the Melbourne press sought to abrogate the responsibility of the VAAA with the same alacrity shown by Coombes. The *Australasian* maintained that the VAAA could not be considered 'cognisant' of Duffey's persistent flouting of the amateur statutes.[159] While this may be true in this breach, Duffey's reputation would have been as well known to Melburnians as to Sydneysiders given the regard that *The Referee* was held in sporting circles.[160] While the athletes themselves were condemned, there has been a reticence to question the promoters of such tours. This double standard reflects the manner in which the individual athlete is judged more harshly than the institutional forces that led to the breach. Likewise, the traditional link between professional codes and district schemes negates the argument that amateur bodies were responsible for instituting them.

Conclusion

This chapter has demonstrated that the amateur athletic community in Australasia employed the same tactics as popular sports such as cricket and rugby football to establish the sport's popularity. The establishment of Australasian championships mirrored the creation of a Sheffield Shield competition. In both athletics and cricket relationships between colonies were formalised through the creation of events, although the home and away nature of the Sheffield Shield differed from the biennial Australasian athletics carnivals. In all three sports a scheme of district representation was adopted, which aimed to create local supporter bases for the sports. Amateur athletic figures followed the leads of administrators of other sports. The first Australasian championships were held in November 1893, the next summer after the first Sheffield Shield competition. The New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association (NSWAAA) agreed to the Sydney district athletic scheme in April 1900, just as the first season of district rugby was beginning. This indicates a clear conception of popularising sport that influenced these diverse amateur sports. The divergent circumstances of the various sports have obscured this commonality. These processes have become synonymous with professional sport as a result of scepticism over the claims of the amateur

status of cricketers and the subsequent success of professional rugby league clubs in the creation of what Leifer would term local publics. The failure of the district and other schemes to popularise athletics has resulted in the conflation of the actions of athletics administrators such as Richard Coombes with the views of patrician supporters of athleticism.

The tour of Australasia by Alfred Shrubb and Arthur Duffey displays the commitment of Australasian administrators to popularising the sport through spectacles. In keeping with other sports and cultural forms, the Amateur Athletic Union of Australasia (AAUA or Australasian Union) sought to bring international performers for the benefit of audiences in Australia and New Zealand. While Victorian officials pledged rigorous care in assessing the amateur status of potential tourists, athletes with discernibly bad reputations were accepted because their 'celebrity' status outweighed the potential risks to the probity of amateur sports. The tourists made demands that were contrary to the laws of amateurism and they were both permanently suspended on their return to the northern hemisphere. Coombes in particular did not accept any responsibility for this development and retreated into the traditional distinction between northern professionalism and southern amateurism in England. This was despite Shrubb being a southerner and Coombes' enthusiasm for the treatment of Australian athlete Stanley Rowley by northern and Midlands clubs during his tour of England in 1900. This displays a contingent response to issues related to amateurism and raises questions as to Coombes' understanding of contemporary English sport.

This chapter has looked beyond the ideological sheen that accompanies amateurism towards the day-to-day organisation of amateur sport. It has clearly demonstrated that amateur athletics in Australasia did not follow a pure path of 'sport for sport's sake'. The next chapter continues this analysis by investigating the manner in which the amateur athletic community was constituted in Australasia. The Australasian amateur community was not strongly influenced by standards employed by English governing bodies and was more inclusive than in England and North America. The Australasian Union allowed the reinstatement of former professional athletes and expressed a very limited willingness to accept indigenous athletes from both New Zealand and parts of Australia as amateurs. It also permitted amateur competitors in professional sports to remain as amateurs under specific circumstances, a situation that led to challenges from both amateur bodies in other sports and athletes themselves who expected that these rights would continue to be respected despite pressure from other amateur bodies. These

three aspects of amateur sport in Australasia reflect the desire to popularise the sport of athletics that has been demonstrated in this chapter. Future chapters will demonstrate that the commercial ethic and inclusive approach to defining amateurism that marked Australasian athletics compromised its relationship with the leaders of English amateurism. They will also show that despite this tension Australasian athletic officials accepted the primacy of British leadership and continued to view themselves as part of an athletic British World.

3

The Role of Race and Class in Defining the Australasian Amateur Community

The home of professional athletics in Sydney in the late nineteenth century was named after Englishman Lord Carrington, the Liberal Governor of New South Wales.[1] His Lordship also assumed patronage of the New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association (NSWAAA) in 1888 after the association became firmly established.[2] Carrington had waited to become patron of the association until it had been operating for a year.[3] His patronage of professional athletic arenas and the amateur athletic association reflects the manner in which the two forms of sport were locked in a battle for influence in Australasia. The Vice Regal's reticence to join the NSWAAA until it had satisfied him that it was a stable entity shows that amateurism had to prove itself in the sporting landscape. Amateur athletics was not going to have it all its own way in establishing itself in Australia. The measures employed to popularise the sport of athletics as outlined in the previous chapter were matched by a policy of widening the parameters of acceptable amateurism. The Amateur Athletic Union of Australasia (AAUA or Australasian Union) allowed groups that were considered outside the pale of amateur sport in other parts of the world to compete in amateur athletics under their control. These tactics allowed the Australasian Union to extend their influence to the same degree that spectacle was used in an attempt to popularise the sport.

Jeffrey Hill has identified the Amateur Athletic Association (AAA) of England as one of 'the main sport[ing organisations] to oppose professionalism', alongside the Rugby Football Union (RFU). It 'worked to marginalize the pedestrian tradition of professional running . . . which had acquired a popular following in the nineteenth century'.[4] This chapter will illustrate that Australasian amateur athletics bodies also sought to marginalise professional athletics, but did so in different ways. Australasian athletics bodies did not employ the 'fit but few'

principle identified by Tony Collins with regard to English rugby union.[5] Rather, they defined amateurism loosely in the hope of transcending what might be termed the natural constituency of amateurism – the urban middle class. The dealings of amateur administrators with two groups – the Indigenous inhabitants of Australasia and amateur athletes who competed in football competitions where professionalism was tolerated – will be used as case studies to demonstrate how amateur officials sought to extend their influence. The difficulties that these attempts caused – and the manner in which amateur officials sought to overcome them – offer insights into the ambiguities of amateurism. Despite the southern English roots of amateurism, a path suited to local conditions was sought by Australasian officials. This path was *not* uniquely Australasian, however, and in the main relied on precedent within English sporting culture.

The concept of amateurism, particularly in historical terms, is often understood as being tied inextricably to notions of social class. It is typically seen as a middle-class construct that distinguished itself from and reacted against working-class professional sport.[6] Richard Holt argues that amateurism was more than a matter of not accepting money for play:

> [A]mateurs were gentlemen of the middle and upper classes who played sports that were often also enjoyed by the common people . . . but [amateurs] played these and other games in a special way.[7]

In an Australian context, Daryl Adair and Wray Vamplew suggest that 'the role of social class . . . was central to the emergence of the amateur code in sport, both in Britain and Australia. This was because although amateurism invoked rhetoric about "fair play," its staunchest advocates sought to separate sports participants according to class position'.[8] Douglas Booth and Colin Tatz further argue that the late nineteenth-century linking of Muscular Christianity and Social Darwinism – as social doctrine that applied Charles Darwin's theory of natural selection to class groups – saw amateur sport 'injected [with] class and race prejudice'.[9] Steven Pope has argued similarly in an American context, asserting that amateur officials such as James E. Sullivan 'used the amateur ethos as a mechanism for turning their social prejudices into resilient athletic structures'.[10]

Issues of class have occasionally obscured the racial implications of amateurism. Allen Guttmann, for example, has argued that the disqualification of Native American Olympic champion Jim Thorpe at

the 1912 Olympic Games was due to class issues rather than racial discrimination.[11] Pope disagrees and asserts that Thorpe was sacrificed by American athletic leaders in the name of national prestige. While the Native American was one of many college athletes to play semi-professional baseball, his ethnicity made him an easy target.[12] Apologists for amateurism often view professional sport as inherently corrupt and construct cautionary tales around personal problems suffered by professional athletes. In 1996 the official historian of the amateur New South Wales Sports Club, Maurice Daly, wrote that professionals were seen as 'indolent and idle; even wastrels and parasites'.[13] As such, the sad decline of Aboriginal professional sprinter Charlie Samuels into alcohol abuse and early death suits Daly's gloomy perspective. By contrast Colin Tatz offers a more sympathetic perspective of Samuels' life and athletic career, as well as Indigenous contemporaries such as Paddy Doyle, who was described by contemporaries as an 'honest trier', Bobby Williams who was noted for his 'quiet, decent demeanour' and Harry Murray, known as a 'straight ped', or pedestrian as professional athletes were known.[14] Tatz suggests that Aboriginal athletes rejected amateur sport for similar reasons to why they rejected other aspects of middle-class European culture. Instead they embraced professionalism, where 'they were free of officialdom, Christian or otherwise'.[15] This chapter extends Tatz's influential view by investigating the attempts made to co-opt Indigenous athletes into the amateur mainstream. The absence of Australian Aboriginals from amateur athletics amidst this pressure offers an example of their agency in resisting white dominance.

Indigenous inhabitants of Australia and New Zealand have a history, albeit hidden and disrupted, of involvement in amateur track and field athletics enduring for over a century. This history has been overshadowed by the outstanding achievements of Aboriginal Australians and Māori in sports such as Australian Rules football, boxing and the two codes of rugby.[16] Tatz has sought to remedy this situation by bringing to light the experiences of athletes such as Percy Hobson, Commonwealth Games high jump champion in 1962, who was 'asked by officialdom not to broadcast his [Aboriginal] ancestry'.[17] Tatz's attempts to bring to light the experiences of Aboriginals in amateur athletics are extended through an examination of the policies of colonial/state organisations in Australia as well as New Zealand. He compares the overtly racist views of bodies such as the Queensland Amateur Athletic Association (QAAA) with the superficially liberal views of other organisations. The QAAA bore an extremely intolerant attitude towards Indigenous involvement in its sport and sought to prevent Murri (Queensland Aboriginal) athletes from competing as amateurs. On the other hand,

the president of the Australasian Union, Richard Coombes, sought to include Indigenous athletes. They were seen as potential champions and a resource to be exploited. Tatz has criticised the QAAA for proscribing the participation of all Murri athletes from 1903, after previously banning athlete Tommy Pablo on the grounds that so-called 'full-blooded' Aborigines were incapable of understanding the core values and rules of amateurism.[18] The policies of other organisations, such as the NSWAAA and the New Zealand Amateur Athletic Association (NZAAA) require close scrutiny, as they also served to promote overt racism consistent with prevailing racial hierarchies.

The status of Indigenous athletes in Australasia

While racial discrimination was the norm for Aboriginal Australians, the disqualification of Tommy Pablo constitutes a rare example of this overt discrimination being recorded in the mainstream press. This athlete nominated as a representative of the Toowong Harriers for the 1903 Brisbane St Patrick's Day Meeting. His nomination was refused by the QAAA due to his alleged inability to understand amateurism.[19] Coombes responded negatively to this decision within a week of his nomination being refused. He contrasted the Queensland approach to that of New South Wales where all athletes were ostensibly welcome regardless of 'social position, creed or colour'. He also argued for all cases to be treated on their merits rather than with a blanket ban, commenting that 'there are intelligent Australian Aboriginals in the land without question. I am told Tommy is very intelligent and educated into the bargain'.[20]

His response to the Pablo case raises three issues concerning Indigenous participation in amateur athletics. The first is about the traditional issue of class and amateurism. Remembering Guttmann's insistence that Jim Thorpe was stripped of his Olympic titles as a result of class prejudice rather than Native American ancestry, it remains a fair question to ask whether Tommy Pablo was discriminated against as a result of his social position rather than because of his Murri heritage. Class tensions, while apparent in Australian amateur sport, were more muted than in other countries such as England or the United States. This is supported by discussions of rowing and sculling by both Daryl Adair and Stuart Ripley.[21] Meanwhile, Reet and Max Howell contend that working-class athletes have been over-represented amongst Australian Olympic champions as compared to those from other nations.[22] The relative success of Australian working-class athletes in amateur sport appears to indicate that they were welcomed into the Australian amateur fold more easily

than was the case in other countries. As such, it seems unlikely that Pablo was discriminated on the grounds of class.

Second, the Pablo case shows that important power relationships compromised Aboriginal access to amateur sport. Pablo had an ally in Coombes, who was fed a constant stream of information from Queensland and had a regular section of 'Queensland Athletic Notes' in his influential *Referee* column. This explains why he was able to comment on the Pablo issue with such alacrity. Charles Campbell is a likely source of the information that informed his knowledge of Pablo's disqualification. The anonymous *Referee* correspondent in Brisbane was certainly disappointed at the handicap Campbell was given at the St Patrick's Day Sports in question.[23] He was an experienced athlete and selected as a representative on the prospective 1898 Australasian athletic tour of England.[24] His successful athletic career made him well known to Coombes and he was also a noted writer, who contributed his thoughts on training to an exercise magazine in Brisbane.[25] Whoever was responsible, they clearly had some dealings with Pablo away from the track, as they were able to comment on his intelligence and educational achievements. In short, Pablo had an advocate who had the ear of one of the top administrators in Australasian athletics. It is doubtful whether many other Indigenous athletes had similar advocacy on their behalf. Even so, it was not enough to see that Pablo was accepted as an amateur. This indicates the extent of handicaps faced by Indigenous athletes seeking to engage in the amateur code.

The third issue raised by the Pablo case is the perceived difference between the Murri of Queensland and the Māori of New Zealand/Aotearoa. In the end there was no clash between the superficially liberal attitude of the NSWAAA and the overt racism of the QAAA. The executive of the Australasian Union, which was made up of New South Welshmen Coombes and E. S. Marks, decided to leave the decision to admit so called full-blooded aborigines to what they termed 'domestic legislation'.[26] In essence, they left it up to the member associations of New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland and New Zealand to decide on the amateur 'worthiness' of Indigenous athletes. The policy of deciding the standing of Indigenous athletes through 'domestic legislation' has resonance with the place occupied by Aboriginal Australians within the Australian legal system. Section 51 (xxvi) of the Australian Constitution prevented the federal government 'from making special laws for the Aboriginal people' prior to the 1960s.[27] As a result, state governments were given the responsibility for determining the paternalistic legislation that affected the native population.

Some states, including Queensland, earned reputations for imposing particularly onerous restrictions on Aboriginals within their 'care'.[28] The Federal government was empowered to 'enact "special laws" for Aboriginal people' by a referendum held in 1967, although this power has been sparingly used.[29]

The response of purportedly liberal athletic organisations suggests that the distinction between the New Zealand Māori and Indigenous Australians was adopted across the spectrum. The NSWAAA suggested that 'what might hold good in Queensland would be altogether unwarrantable in New Zealand, where the native race had a very high standard of intelligence'.[30] Māori athletes had already achieved a level of success in amateur athletics, with both Hori Eruera (1897 at the age of seventeen) and James Te Paa (1899) winning Australasian Pole Vaulting championships.[31] Influential Māori activist Peter 'Te Rangihiroa' Buck was the long jump champion of New Zealand in 1903.[32] The NZAAA apparently showed a more liberal attitude than the QAAA, as it voted in favour of allowing Aborigines to compete as amateurs. However, its reasoning exemplified a paradox in New Zealand race relations caused by Pākehā (New Zealanders of European descent) claims to be 'deft interpreters of Polynesia'.[33] The NZAAA considered Māori 'to be on a different footing from Australian Aboriginals'.[34] While it is clear that Pākehā did not mistreat Māori to the same extent that white Australians mistreated Aboriginal Australians, there was a general antipathy towards Indigenous Australians. This is particularly true of responses to Aboriginals from Queensland, and is exemplified by the denigration of Queensland fast bowler Eddie Gilbert as 'Arthur Mailey's Abo' in the New Zealand press. Mailey, a former Australian test cricketer, had advocated the selection of Gilbert against England in his capacity as a journalist during the bodyline Ashes series of 1932–33.[35]

In his study of Aborigines in professional running, Tatz argues that particular attention should be placed on the subjugation suffered by professional runners in Queensland due to 'its particularly long history of race hatred and violence (and) its special legislation that demeaned and discriminated.'[36] The willingness of New South Wales athletic administrators to legitimise the overtly racist policies of the QAAA by allowing 'domestic legislation' to stand rather than demanding that a racially non-discriminatory amateur standard be applied also requires criticism. Charles Martin, in his study of the rise and fall of the 'colour line' in American college sports, reminds readers that colleges in the supposedly more progressive northern states of the United States bear responsibility for not challenging white supremacist notions held by southern schools.

Northern schools allowed their counterparts in the south to dictate the eligibility rules, meaning that African-American athletes were often 'benched' to prevent their opponents from suffering the embarrassment of playing against their so-called 'inferiors'. Martin is particularly critical of Boston College which 'callously placed the benefits and prestige of securing a bowl invitation ahead of the rights of their African American athletes' on multiple occasions in the 1940s.[37] 'Liberal' states legitimising the more reactionary views of overtly racist states by allowing them to frame particularly discriminatory laws is part of a wider Australian socio-legal pattern. As Helen Irving argues, the Australian Constitution 'addressed [Indigenous Australians] only as [the] antithesis of the white Australian'.[38] The executive of the Australasian Union also legitimised the racist policies of the QAAA by refusing to challenge its discriminatory approach to Aboriginal athletes. In doing so, they served to classify Aboriginal athletes as the antithesis of the (white) amateur.

Discrimination was only one aspect of the experience of Indigenous Australasian athletes. Coombes suggested that Indigenous Australasians could be used as field athletes at Olympic Games on a number of occasions. First Nations Canadians and Native Americans left an indelible mark on the 1908 and 1912 Olympic Games. While Thorpe's name has become firmly ensconced in the public imagination, other athletes (such as Hawaiian Duke Kahanamoku and Native Americans Andrew Sockalexis and Louis Tewanima of the American team and Tom Longboat of the Canadian team) also left a positive impression on Coombes.[39] The presence of what Coombes termed 'red Indians' in the Canadian and American Olympic teams of 1908 led him to suggest that New Zealand clubs scout for Māori throwers whom he described as 'often very heavy as well as strong and active'.[40] He also suggested that Aboriginal Australians be shown discus and javelin demonstrations by touring American athletes in January 1914. Coombes hoped that they would be persuaded to take up the event and boost Australian Olympic chances.[41] In an American context, Martin suggests that small southern colleges such as Texas Western (now known as University of Texas at El Paso) broke the colour line within their teams as a result of '[o]pportunism, self-interest, pragmatism, and occasionally even a touch of idealism'. They actively recruited African-Americans in order to boost their competitiveness 'by tapping a new source of talent' that was overlooked by elite schools committed to white supremacy.[42] Coombes was suggesting a similar course of action, although the success of Native American and First-Nation Canadian athletes means that Australasia was not planning on blazing a trail in the same manner as Texas

Western. However, the Australasian and later southern American examples demonstrate the circumstances in which communities notorious for their racist policies could open their horizons to include non-white athletes.

Coombes warmed to his subject and in April 1914 made a similar comment about the suitability of Māori to throwing events:

> I cannot for the life of me understand how it is that our New Zealand friends have not, for example, 'developed' a Maori shot-putter or hammer-thrower. During my last visit to New Zealand I saw, between Wellington and Wanganui, several Maoris each with the apparent strength of a Titan and the poundage of a Ralph Rose [a noted American shot-putter, discus and hammer thrower].[43]

Both supportive and derisive responses to Coombes' suggestions were infused with racist overtones. A *Sydney Morning Herald* correspondent described the suggestion as 'certainly one worth following up.' According to this correspondent:

> [c]enturies of ancestors accustomed to the use of the spear and boomerang have made the aborigine phenomenally expert with these primitive weapons, and with the slightly heavier javelin he would have a great natural advantage over the more civilised competitors.[44]

This representation of Aboriginal culture as primitive relies on a racist assumption based on stereotyped views about the capabilities of Aboriginal people. 'Tattler' of the *Sydney Sportsman* provides a more positive description of Aboriginal capabilities, although the racial politics behind his comments are no less problematic. This writer was a critic of Coombes' suggestion, describing it as 'a lot of silly talk', and pointed out that Aboriginals had previously 'distinguished themselves in the athletic field in the past, and in the roped arena [boxing ring]'.[45] 'Tattler' therefore observes that Aboriginals possessed a limited skill set and that their capabilities were restricted.

Racial stereotyping also influenced the way that New Zealand Māori sportspeople were represented, as Brendan Hokowhitu has demonstrated with regard to Thomas Rangiwahia 'Tom' Ellison – otherwise known as Tamati Erihana – a Māori of Ngai Tahu descent. Ellison was a key figure in the development of rugby union in New Zealand in the late nineteenth century. In addition to an exemplary playing career, he was a key innovator in terms of the way that New Zealanders played rugby

and represented themselves on the world stage. Ellison expounded his theories about the game in a book entitled *The Art of Rugby Football* published in 1902 and is credited with developing the now outlawed 2-3-2 scrum formation and the position of wing forward. He was the first captain of an officially sanctioned New Zealand touring team and also introduced the *haka* to rugby and developed a prototype of the iconic All Black jersey.[46] Hokowhitu argues that, despite Ellison's centrality to the development of New Zealand rugby, Māori rugby footballers have been represented 'typically for their physicality as opposed to the innovativeness, intelligence and the *tino rangatiratanga* [chieftainship or self-determination] that Tom Ellison embodied.'[47]

At first glance, it appears that the experience of Māori athletes defies this view, as they were perceived to possess greater intelligence and were thus considered more acceptable as amateurs than Indigenous Australians. The willingness to allow Māori to compete as amateurs while rejecting Indigenous Australians reflected a widely held view that Māori were 'more advanced than [Australian] Aborigines'. As a result, Māori 'were exempted from much of the extreme antagonism evinced by white colonials'.[48] The Australasian response to overseas developments also reinforced the image of Māori physicality within athletics. The emphasis that Coombes placed on 'developed' when suggesting that Māori would make good throwers in 1914 may indicate an acceptance of the widely held belief that Māori were suited to physical tasks such as throwing.

The idea that Māori throwers could be 'developed' was rejected by 'Amateur' of the *Otago Witness*, who had in years past participated in Māori versus European athletic events. He argued that Māori were 'superior to the European in anything that required agility . . . but when it came to feats of strength or endurance the white man invariably came out on top.'[49] Views such as these continued to be expressed into the second half of the twentieth century. Wallie Ingram, a contributor to *Te Ao Hou* (*The New World*) in 1953, expressed the belief that 'New Zealand's first male field-event champion at an Olympic festival could be a Maori—if he concentrated on the hop-step-and-jump [triple jump]'. He based his recommendation on the belief that the triple jump 'is an event in which rhythm and timing play a most important part, two essentials which Maori sportsmen and dancers seem to inherit'.[50] The views of 'Amateur' and Ingram regarding Māori correlate to early twentieth century stereotypes of African-American athletes and performers that presuppose a 'natural rhythm'. This view has been given fresh impetus in more recent times by the success of Polynesian rugby footballers.[51] Contemporary observers are likely to

combine the stereotypes of Polynesian athletes as agile and as possessing extraordinary strength with regard to rugby footballers, indicating that the disparate views of Coombes, 'Amateur' and Ingram have coalesced.[52]

The response to Indigenous Australasian involvement in amateur athletics was quite ambivalent in nature. Overtly racist views were joined by more superficially liberal views, although the holders of liberal views did not adequately challenge racist policies and were themselves beholden to prevailing racial hierarchies. Aboriginal Australians in particular remained steadfastly outside the amateur community despite leading amateur officials advocating their inclusion in order to boost the competitiveness of Australia and New Zealand on the Olympic stage. This call was emphatically rejected by Indigenous athletes, who preferred to compete in professional sports, as noted by Tatz. The advocacy of amateur officials such as Coombes for Aboriginal involvement means that low levels of Indigenous participation cannot be solely attributed to exclusionary policies before the First World War. The call for Percy Hobson to hide his Aboriginal ancestry indicates the later development of racial antipathy on the part of Australian athletic administrators. But prior to the First World War, the best explanation for low Indigenous involvement in amateur athletics is that they chose not to participate. Nevertheless, the advocacy of Coombes is indicative of a strategy to enlarge the amateur community of Australasia beyond the typical amateur constituency. This desire was also observable in the response to team sports.

The relationship between team sports and amateurism

The Australasian societies did not receive an unproblematic conception of amateurism as part of their British 'cultural baggage'. Major English sports developed vastly different conceptions of amateurism, which in turn influenced Australasian conceptions of amateurism. The existence of professionals and amateurs on the same cricket team was rooted in historical precedent. Cricket teams representing English counties and the Marylebone Cricket Club (MCC) in test matches against Australia included both amateurs and professionals. According to Holt, 'there are numerous references to (early) cricket matches in which famous aristocrats took part alongside commoners'.[53] Cricket in England was dominated from 1846 until the 1860s by professional teams that toured the country playing local combinations for gate money. However, this dominance was broken by the rise of the English County Championship,

which introduced first-class competition based on locality.[54] Teams in the County Championship drew on the earlier tradition of aristocratic leadership bolstered by the skills of professionals to form their elevens. This was also reflected in the selection of English teams that toured Australia. Australian cricketers steadfastly defended their status as amateurs, although many English observers considered their conduct on and off the field as akin to professionalism.[55]

The MCC adopted a loose definition of what constituted an amateur cricketer. Amateurs were defined as gentlemen, while professionals were referred to as 'players'. In 1879, the definition read:

> That no gentleman ought to make a profit by his services in the cricket field, and that for the future, no cricketer who takes more than his expenses in any match shall be qualified to play for the Gentlemen versus Players at Lords; but that if any gentleman feels difficulty in joining in the match without pecuniary assistance he shall not be barred from playing as a gentleman by having his actual expenses defrayed.[56]

This definition was adopted by the rugby-playing Yorkshire County Football Club. The club found that 'such a definition was so broad as to allow virtually any payment as long as it was related to "expenses defrayed"'.[57] While sports such as rugby union tightened up their amateur definitions, cricket retained this loose definition. According to Derek Birley,

> [t]he leading amateurs of the day . . . have always been able to cash in on the game just as much as, and often more than, the professionals. Indeed the distinction between gentlemen and players was never a matter of money, but rather of caste.[58]

Rather than forbidding amateurs to play against professionals, cricket developed a division of labour within teams. Amateur cricketers generally engaged in the most leisurely aspect of the game, batting, while professionals were employed to carry out physically demanding work, such as bowling and maintaining the grounds of county clubs. The captaincy of these teams was the preserve of amateurs.

That cricket applied different standards of amateurism than other games was recognised at the time. Former England cricket captain Lord Harris opined in *The Times* in January 1909 that – while athletics and football (association and rugby) were 'rent in twain' over amateur

definition – cricket had 'passed through the scathing fires, and may we not without arrogance suggest that what may seem indifference is in truth the wisdom of experience'. Harris argued the cricket professional 'recognises [the distinction] as convenient, and bows to those social regulations'.[59] The simplicity with which Harris broaches the subject indicates that cricket had not 'passed through the scathing fires' at all, and had not faced the hard questions that football and athletics were in the process of dealing with.

Other British games had a similar tradition of competition between amateurs and professionals. The Football Association (FA) in England legalised professionalism 'under stringent conditions' in July 1885 as a way to retain amateur control over football, and selected a professional to play for England against Scotland in 1886. Football also adopted the cricket tradition of playing Gentlemen (amateurs) versus Players (professionals) representative fixtures, which were dominated by the professionals.[60] Association footballers were divided into amateur and professional clubs that were free to compete against each other. In practice, however, the gulf in quality between amateur and professional teams meant that little contact occurred between the two classes of players. The amateur sector of the FA formed a breakaway body, the Amateur Football Association (AFA) in July 1907. It was active until February 1914, when it 'return[ed] to the FA's broad church, albeit as an affiliated association with a distinctive identity'.[61] The dominance of professional soccer was so firmly established by 1914 that it was the AFA 'that was now subject to "stringent conditions"'.[62] In contrast, the English Rugby Football Union (RFU) remained an amateur body in principle, and contact with professionals was strictly prohibited. Its refusal to allow broken-time payment, or payments made to an athlete in lieu of wages lost through playing and travelling, contributed to the formation of the breakaway Northern Union (forerunner of the Rugby Football League) in 1895.[63] Golf was another important ball game that allowed professionals to compete against amateurs. Amateurs were first invited to the second British Open golf championship in 1861, after the inaugural tournament had been restricted to professionals.[64] The divergent approach to amateurism current in various English amateur sports suggests that multiple currents of amateurism were developing even within British circles. This is vital to understanding the way in which Australasian conceptions of amateurism related to their British counterparts. While scholars have aimed to create a distinction between exclusionary British amateurism and inclusive Australasian amateurism, there was in fact a continuum of British views about amateurism that included inclusive views as well as exclusionary views. As will be demonstrated in the

following two chapters, this allowed Australasians to appeal to strands within British amateurism that more closely aligned with their own views and needs.

The Australasian Union and team sports

Of all these sports, cricket was the most important to amateur athletes in Australasia. 'Throwing the Cricket Ball' was an official athletic event sanctioned by the Australasian Union.[65] The great Australian cricketer Victor Trumper won this event at the athletics carnival held in conjunction with Australian Federation celebrations in January 1901.[66] His presence at an amateur carnival was problematic as he had competed against professional cricketers during the 1899 Australian tour of England. While playing against professionals did not endanger the status of an amateur cricketer, the Union's amateur definition prohibited an amateur from 'knowingly and without protest compet[ing] with or against a professional for a prize of any description or for public exhibition'.[67]

Trumper was allowed to compete as an amateur athlete as the Australasian Union carried what may be termed 'the games clause' in its amateur definition. The games clause appears to have been agreed upon at the Australasian Amateur Conference held in Sydney in October 1897. The 1896 amateur definition of the NSWAAA included a section 2, clause (b) that dealt with competing against professionals in games. However, the list was restricted to 'football or cricket in ordinary club matches for which no money prizes are given, or in competition under the management of the respective Unions and Associations'.[68] This was similar to By-Law IX of the Amateur Athletic Union of Canada agreed to at its founding in 1909. This read that '[a]n amateur shall not lose his amateur status by competing with or against a professional in cricket, golf or indoor bowling'.[69] In 1896 the English AAA, in consultation with the Scottish and Irish bodies, ruled that playing with or against professional cricketers and footballers in ordinary club matches did not compromise the amateur status of athletes.[70] This decision was ratified at the AAA's Annual General Meeting in March.[71]

The establishment of a universal amateur definition at the Australasian Amateur Conference of 1897 saw the list of games where amateurs could play with or against professionals expanded. A subcommittee consisting of Coombes, Leonard Cuff of New Zealand, Basil Parkinson of Victoria and Nat Mandelson of Queensland was formed to draft a definition at the first sitting of the meeting on 1 October.[72] The

exceptions to the definition, including the games clause, were unanimously agreed to during the third sitting of the meeting on 5 October.[73] In addition to the unanimous support for this change recorded at the meeting, the major sporting and daily newspapers of Sydney carried no reports of dissension on this matter.[74] A supplementary section of the Australasian Union's amateur definition, Section 2 – Exceptions clause (b) read:

> Amateurs shall not lose their status by competing with or against professionals in any game (for list of 'games' see jurisdiction clause) for which no money prize is offered . . .
>
> *Games* :- Baseball, cricket, football, handball and fives, golf, lacrosse, tennis (L. and C.), quoits, racquets, hockey.[75]

Games were differentiated from athletic exercises under this definition. The list of athletic exercises included the 'games' and other events such as the disciplines of track and field, and individual sports such as boxing, boating, cycling, fencing, swimming and wrestling.[76]

The distinction between athletic exercises and games was so ingrained in the Australasian amateur athletic community that Richard Coombes expressed reservations at the inclusion of bodies representing games and bodies representing athletic exercises within the proposed Amateur Sporting Federation of New South Wales (ASFNSW). This body was formed in 1908 in response to the threat to amateur sport posed by professional sport, and in particular rugby league football.[77] He argued that

> it would be impossible to make a clear definition of 'amateur' acceptable to all associations which controlled athletic exercises, and at the same time, to those which controlled games. Whenever games were mixed up with athletic exercises the same difficulty presented itself.

Coombes suggested that the amateur definition of each body should be allowed to stand, and highlighted the difficulties that could arise between the adoption of a separate definition by the ASFNSW and the existing amateur definition of the Australasian Union.[78]

He further highlighted this difficulty to an international audience in January 1909. He was one of a number of sporting officials from across the world to contribute to a debate in a London newspaper, the *Sporting Life*, about the possibility of a uniform definition to govern future Olympic Games. While supportive of the idea, he considered

it 'well-nigh impossible' in practice. The main difficulty that he saw was the distinction between athletic exercises and games as was played out in the ASFNSW debates. He recounted that during negotiation he offered 'a way out' to those gathered in the form of a clause that '[met] the views of the golf players . . . without any real loss to the uniformity of the amateur definition'.[79] The compromise that Coombes alluded to meant that the games clause of the ASFNSW was in fact less stringent than that of the Australasian Union, as it allowed a money prize to be available to professionals.[80] This change was made at the request of the New South Wales Golf Council, reflecting the tradition of allowing amateurs to compete with professionals at lucrative major tournaments.[81]

The games clause was indicative of a conception of amateurism that sought to include as many athletes as possible. The amateur athletic associations of Australasia employed a loose conception of amateurism in order to allow a wide base of athletes to qualify for its events. Coombes' statement to the *Sporting Life* revealed the tension between seeking a universal definition for amateurism and a desire for freedom of action for each country to define amateur status. Despite his support for the movement towards a uniform definition, Coombes claimed to favour a system whereby '[amateur] status is defined and accepted by the governing body of the sport they represent in each country – always provided that each entrant is an amateur in all branches of sport'. He complained that a Victorian rowing Eight had been prevented from competing in the London Olympics as they did not meet the strict Henley criteria for amateurism. The Victorians would have been able to compete under his scheme as they were accepted as amateurs in Victoria, though not necessarily in New South Wales.[82] The tension that such a scheme would have created between different jurisdictions makes it difficult to see how it could have furthered the case of a uniform amateur definition.

In spite of his expressed support for a uniform amateur definition, Coombes seems to have preferred the establishment of amateur definitions suited to specific circumstances. From its foundation in 1899, the Australasian Union allowed athletes who had compromised their amateur status to apply for reinstatement after 'absolutely refrain[ing] from professional practices' after one or two years, depending on the distance they lived from their state or dominion headquarters. Athletes residing within 100 miles of the headquarters were required to wait two years, while those outside this mark were required to wait only one year.[83] High rates of applications for reinstatement were taken by amateur athletic

bodies as evidence that amateurism was usurping professionalism as the dominant sporting form in Australasia. The 1906 Annual Report of the NZAAA commented:

> Evidence of the increasing popularity of amateur athletics throughout the colony is afforded by the large number of applications for reinstatement received last year. These numbered forty-nine, of which forty-four were granted.[84]

The NSWAAA made similar claims in its annual report of 1910.[85] These responses indicate that Australasian amateur officials were competing for, rather than distancing themselves from, athletes outside the amateur mainstream. In previous years the NSWAAA was at pains to stress that it had shown 'careful consideration' with regard to reinstating professionals.[86]

While some working-class athletes may have taken advantage of this opportunity, the reinstatement clauses were targeted first and foremost at rural athletes. These athletes were often required to compete as professionals due to a lack of amateur events in their locality. The case for the importance of the reinstatement clause to rural athletes was made particularly strongly in New Zealand. 'Sprinter' of the Christchurch *Star* explained that:

> where a new club [in a rural area] is being formed and its success depends more or less upon the adhesion of a number of professionals, the practice of the [NZAAA] Council has been to reinstate all but the most glaring cases.[87]

In 1907 the NZAAA suggested a change in the reinstatement laws, whereby an athlete who resided further than 50 miles from an athletic club could apply for reinstatement after one year rather than the previous mark of 100 miles. The geographically smaller member associations of Victoria, Tasmania and New Zealand voted in favour of the motion, while the larger New South Wales and Queensland voted against the measure.[88] Rural athletes from the smaller states and New Zealand were obviously more likely to be closer to the headquarters of the respective associations than their counterparts in the larger states. The impact of geographical size explains why Victoria, Tasmania and New Zealand were keen to reduce the distances and underlines the importance of reinstatement to rural athletes. The position of New South Wales and the

Australasian Union on reinstatement led to conflict with New Zealand, as addressed in the final chapter.

The reinstatement programme of Australasian athletics officials influenced the relationship of the Australasian Union with international amateur athletic bodies. The South African amateur athletic body cited disagreement over 'certain . . . Australasian Rules, which do not altogether agree with those of the A.A.A. of England' as an excuse for not forming an alliance with the Union.[89] While the specific laws in question are not identified, a prospectus for a proposed South African tour of Australasia that matched the performances of athletes from both regions indicated that reinstatement was the disputed issue. A. E. Kerr (*sic*), the Australasian record holder in the two-mile walk, is listed in this document as 'Ex-professional: not eligible under English rules to compete under amateur laws'.[90]

Australasian amateurism rested on a premise foreign to most conceptions of amateurism: that amateur status could be earned after a period of penitence rather than being a fact of birth or social standing as was the case in most parts of Britain. This is particularly true when amateurism sought to establish itself in regions where professionalism was dominant, such as in the foundation of the QAAA in Rockhampton in 1894. The Rockhampton athletic community got the jump on their Brisbane counterparts in forming an amateur association. Coombes had planned to travel to Brisbane in August 1894 and help in the establishment of such an association. His inability to make the journey and the fact that only two clubs were active in Brisbane saw plans to form an association shelved. The QAAA formed without Brisbane having 'in anyway been advised of Rockhampton's intention in the matter and was therefore left out in the cold'. Coombes travelled to Brisbane in August 1895 and proposed a peace scheme between Brisbane and Rockhampton whereby a centre would be formed in each city, with a board of control being formed by representatives of each centre.[91] If the Brisbane athletic community was caught unawares by the Rockhampton action, those in Sydney were better informed. The readership of *The Referee* were alerted as early as 8 August 1894 that '[t]he sportsmen of Central Queensland [are] tired of waiting for the formation of an athletic association' and that an association would soon be formed in Rockhampton[92]

The Rockhampton body offered a sort of amnesty to former professionals in order to allow the body's establishment. According to the *Referee* report, the formation of the association was predicated on the notion that 'recognised amateurism [will be] declared to start in Central

Queensland from a certain date'.[93] The secretary of the nascent QAAA, J. Kenna, put the following notice in multiple Queensland newspapers:

> Athletes who have at any time competed in open events for Cash Prizes, thereby becoming Professionals, and who wish to be recognised as Amateurs in future must make application to the Secretary of the Q.A.A.A. on or before MONDAY, the 15th October, 1894, otherwise their claims will not be considered.[94]

New South Wales officials, including Coombes, were obviously not concerned by this approach to the amateur question. In October it granted a QAAA request to be considered a 'kindred association' and accepted the association as a partner in the Australasian Championship Sports agreement that oversaw Australasian championship meetings before the formation of the Australasian Union.[95] In the same month New South Wales athletes were given permission to compete at the Ambulance Sports Meeting in Brisbane after the NSWAAA were assured that the meeting would be held under QAAA rules.[96] R. C. Reid, a New South Wales athlete who travelled to Brisbane, commented that he 'was glad that kindred associations were springing up' during an unofficial reception to welcome the intercolonial athletes.[97]

The Queensland arrangement provided a useful example for those seeking to promote amateurism in similar contexts, such as Western Australia. Charlie Cutbush, a former cyclist, offered 'practically the same story as every recent visitor from Western Australia' when interviewed by Richard Coombes in 1905. He recommended that a sort of amnesty be offered to athletes who became professionals during a recent boom in professional running in Western Australia: 'If amateurism could be declared to officially start from a certain date, as was done in Central Queensland in 1895, the difficulty could be overcome.' Any professional that sought to compete as an amateur would be 'weeded out' as another boom in professional running came around. Cutbush suggested that a Western Australia Amateur Athletic Association be formed in Perth with a self-governing centre in the goldfields.[98]

Central Queensland and the Western Australian goldfields are historically two of Australia's most significant mining regions.[99] Mining towns, especially those that had experienced a gold rush, had always been central to the development of professional athletics in Australia. Mining towns were full of three things that attracted professional running; cash, entrepreneurs and a gambling spirit. But mining towns also provided the dynamic towards responsible governance of professional athletics, particularly in Victoria – where the sport was strongest. A professional

club was formed in gold-mining Stawell in Victoria's Grampian region in 1878, described by John Perry as 'a brawling and rambunctious mining town'.[100] The Stawell Athletic Club also convened a meeting in April 1895 that saw the foundation of the Victorian Athletic League (VAL), the professional counterpart of the VAAA. The VAL was based in Stawell for the first twelve years of its existence, only moving to Melbourne in 1907. To this day the town hosts the most important and richest professional athletics carnival in Australia.[101]

The existence of flourishing professional communities in mining towns provided concerted opposition to amateurism when it attempted to establish itself in these communities. The level of competition with professional athletics explains why amateur officials in Australasia were required to adopt unusual techniques. However, engagement with professional sport proved problematic, not least in the case of two rugby league footballers, H. R. 'Horrie' Miller and Sydney Hubert Sparrow, who asserted their amateur status through the games clause.

The Miller and Sparrow cases

The refusal of the NSWAAA and the Australasian Union to suspend two athletes involved in rugby league proved controversial with other amateur bodies. Rather than a general debate over the worthiness of the games clause within amateur sport, these controversies can be understood as resulting from a power struggle for control of rugby football. The first case involved H. R. 'Horrie' Miller, who served as secretary of the New South Wales Rugby League (NSWRL) after the original leadership was removed from office amid complaints over the financial handling of the game. Miller was, unlike typical rugby league figures, a university-educated member of the middle class. He played rugby union for the Sydney University club before playing rugby league for the Eastern Suburbs district club. He was appointed full-time secretary of the NSWRL in 1914, a position he held until 1946, after deputising in the role on three occasions.[102] Rather than seeing rugby league as a working-class 'caste' game, he saw the game as having universal appeal. As part of Miller's universalist vision for rugby league, he provided support for women rugby league footballers who attempted to organise a league in 1921. He appears to have acted on his own initiative and without the support of the wider NSWRL. Derisory press reports that belittled the efforts of the women players also lampooned Miller.[103]

Despite his middle-class background, Miller was central to the professionalisation of rugby league. He is credited with applying the phrase 'The Greatest Game of All' to rugby league in Australia, a phrase that

was central to the marketing campaign associated with the Winfield Cup competition organised by the NSWRL from 1982 until 1995.[104] He was also central to the negotiations that saw some members of the 1908 Wallabies rugby union team convert to rugby league for a series of matches. These footballers played against the Australian rugby league team, the Kangaroos, in 1909 in order to boost the popularity of rugby league. This was a key moment in the development of rugby league as a professional code, as prior to this the NSWRL had claimed a façade of amateurism.[105] Miller's middle-class status was underlined by gossip that he would underwrite any loss incurred by James Joynton Smith, the entrepreneur who orchestrated the conversion of the Wallabies, through the fourth Wallabies versus Kangaroos match.[106]

Despite these actions, Miller successfully maintained his status as an amateur athlete. He was reinstated as an amateur in early 1909 by the Australasian Union after W. B. Alexander of the NSWAAA asked the Union executive for an opinion as to his amateur status.[107] The statutes of the ASFNSW – of which the NSWRU and NSWAAA were both members – made provisions for a disqualification imposed by a member of the organisation to be made general by the executive committee.[108] As a result, Miller's suspension by the NSWRU as part of a blanket ban of rugby league participants affected his status as an amateur athlete. This brought the divisions of amateur definition between the various sports of New South Wales into the open. The matter of Miller's reinstatement was brought before the executive of the Union, which comprised President Coombes and the treasurer and acting secretary, Stanley Rowley. Rowley was deputising as secretary for E. S. Marks, who was touring Europe with the Wallabies. The executive met with Miller and president of the NSWRL Harry Hoyle on 21 January 1909, but made it clear that the case referred specifically to Miller and was not to be misconstrued as a test case for rugby league in general. The executive was of the opinion that as Miller had not received any direct or indirect remuneration whilst playing rugby league or in his capacity as secretary to the league, 'he has not contravened the rules and regulations of the A.A. Union as to amateur definition, and as a consequence his amateur status remains good'.[109]

Marks' absence was significant due to his strict adherence to amateur ideology. He viewed the decision to allow Miller to retain his amateur status as 'very probably good in law, [although] it was bad in the light of the purity of amateurism, its advancement, and maintenance'.[110] The differing perception of Coombes and Marks to this issue points to a significant cleavage in the understanding of amateurism within

Australasian athletics and sport in general. As explored in the Introduction, Coombes has traditionally been represented as receiving his indoctrination into amateur ideology through an elite education.

However, statistical and anecdotal evidence presents a clear picture that Coombes did not receive the sort of education that historians such as J. A. Mangan have argued produced 'bloods' and Corinthians.[111] He was not in fact educated at a public school, but at Hampton Grammar School, located close to his place of residence. The schools of England and Wales were subject to several reviews in the mid-nineteenth century, beginning in 1861 with the Newcastle Commission into popular education. The reviews were defined by the type of school studied, with the Clarendon Commission of 1864 reporting on the nine Great Public Schools and the Schools Inquiry Commission, otherwise known as the Taunton Commission, reporting on Grammar and Secondary schools.[112] The Taunton Commission was specifically charged with reporting on middle-class education and investigated Hampton Grammar School amongst others in 1866 and reported in 1867. The very presence of Hampton School in the Taunton Commission is indicative that the school was aimed at a middle-class rather than elite clientele, and that Coombes was not influenced directly by the elite Public School ethic.[113]

The statistical and anecdotal evidence provided by the Taunton Commission report confirms the less than elite nature of Coombes' education. It provides information as to the conditions of Coombes' education as an eight-year-old boy, as the school was visited by Commissioner D. R. Fearon on 11 October 1866.[114] The Taunton Commission into English and Welsh secondary schools reports that rather than the elite connotations that 'Grammar' has to Australian readers, the actual experiences of Coombes were more akin to that of a local secondary school.[115] As of 1866, the Hampton Grammar School was attended by 223 students, all of whom were non-boarding day scholars who were offered a free education. None of the school's £341 income was received from the parents. The occupation of the student's parents were listed as B and C categories, denoting farmers and shopkeepers (presumably where Coombes senior fitted) in the former case and artisans and labourers in the latter. Hampton Grammar School was considered of 'Non-classical' character and was ranked in the third class, essentially meaning that more than ten per cent of its students were under the age of 14.[116] The character of the school 'was determined by the subjects of instruction *actually* taught', with 'Non-classical' implying that Latin and Greek were not taught, although a school teaching 'merely the rudiments of Latin' would also be included in this

category. The commissioners considered the distinction between 'Non-classical' schools and 'Elementary' schools for the primary instructions of the 'Labouring Classes' 'often very slight, especially in the North of England'.

The anecdotal part of the report into Hampton Grammar School offers further evidence of the actual state of the education offered. The school was divided into two departments, the lower or English department and the barely functioning Grammar or Latin department.[117] The relative strengths of the students of the English department were observed to be writing and British History, although there were clear deficiencies in the aptitude of the students in English grammar and arithmetic.[118] No pupils attended the Grammar school at this point, although one or two had attended the Grammar school in the period before the recent summer vacation. The Grammar school was unsurprisingly labelled 'an entire failure' by the commissioners. The failure of this department was attributed to the 'defective character of the buildings' as well as the 'age and infirmities of the head master'. The failure of this department was also attributed to its openness as it was previously 'filled with ill-taught boys of the lowest orders so that the middle classes all withdrew'.[119]

The trustees of the school planned to implement a new scheme that would serve to improve the quality of the school in 1867. Amongst these was to boost the school's finances by levying fees on students and by placing the 'burden of providing school books and materials' on parents rather than on the school's endowment.[120] They also intended to overhaul the curriculum, with new subjects Greek, mathematics, land surveying and mensuration to be made available to students at the Grammar school, with elementary mathematics offered to students at the English school.[121] There is evidence to suggest that these improvements did in fact enhance the quality of education provided by the school throughout Coombes' period as a student.[122] However, ambitions for the school to join the elite of English education remained just that until the twentieth century.

Some measure of sporting culture seems to have developed at the school in the years close to Coombes' leaving. The school acquired 'a very keen rugger man' as a master in the form of the Reverend Walter Smith, although he seems to have been added to the staff around 1884. Thomas Hughes' *Tom Brown's Schooldays*, a key foundational text of the games cult, was given as a prize in 1874 – perhaps to Coombes as he left the school.[123] There is evidence of rowing at the school from 1870, although the first formal athletic sports were not held until 1875, just after Coombes had left the school. Coombes did compete at a Hampton

Grammar School athletic event as a twenty-six-year-old former student in 1884. The years 1870–75 provide the formative years of sport at Hampton, with cricket and rugby also developing at the school during this period.[124] This corresponds to the final years of Coombes' school career. This is vital, as the nature of sport in English school depended on whether staff or students played the leading role in organising the events. In both England and the United States sport developed at schools and universities prior to the games cult generally as a result of student initiative. Mangan argues that G. E. L. Cotton of Marlborough School sought to control the 'imperfectly organised' schoolboy sport to attract students away from 'questionable amusement' as a first stage in the development of the games cult.[125] These euphemisms barely conceal the fact that, while staff-organised sport usually represented the epitome of 'rational recreation', student-organised sport was rough, ready and often violent. If Hampton followed the pattern of its more illustrious counterparts and students held the initiative, it is likely that Coombes played a role as an organiser. If so, sport would not have been 'entrenched' in Coombes' character by the school; rather, Coombes would have entrenched sport into the school.

Of course, if Coombes had done so, he would not have been directly influenced by the 'games cult' of elite English schools. The interest of the elite school system in amateur sport was based around a belief that character-building sport presented British society with ready and willing subjects to serve Britain's defence and imperial aspirations. This is best exemplified by the aphorism attributed to the Duke of Wellington that the battle of Waterloo was won on the playing fields of Eton. The discipline of elite schools was based on the often brutal 'house' system instituted by Thomas Arnold at Rugby School and quickly adopted by other schools.[126] This system was also the cornerstone of sport at elite public schools. As Mangan explains, '[t]he ferocity of keenly-contested house matches helped create a hardened imperial officer class naively eager for colonial wars'.[127] It was quite obviously beyond the capabilities of the masters of Hampton Grammar School to organise such contests even if they wished to, as all students were locals who had no need to board at the time of Fearon's report. These factors illustrate that Coombes was not the typical product of the public school that historians have argued. The school was neither representative of the elite school system in terms of the students that were attracted to it nor in terms of the subjects that were taught.

Interestingly, some press reports from the early twentieth century seem to implicitly recognise the distinction between Coombes and his

counterpart on the executive of the Australasian Union, the impeccably educated honorary secretary-treasurer E. S. Marks.[128] When introducing the two New South Welshmen to Queenslanders in 1899, the Brisbane newspaper the *Courier* gave an extensive rundown of Marks' career at Royston College, which was described as 'one of the largest private schools of its kind then (late 1880s) in the colonies', as both an administrator and an athlete followed by a less-detailed description of his post-school career as an athlete. The inverse is true in the case of the paper's description of Marks' English-born counterpart. Coombes' school career is tersely dismissed with the statement, '[h]e left school at the early age of 15, and almost immediately began his athletic career'. The report then lists his post-school administrative and athletic achievements. He is identified as the founder of 'one of the oldest of the cross-country clubs in England', and a list of notable athletes against whom Coombes competed is provided. His competitive career is described as 'a sort of frenzy of enthusiasm' and Coombes the athlete was described as 'Jack of all trades and master of none'.[129]

While this description may be considered somewhat derisive of Coombes' athletic prowess, it marked him as a possessor of a true amateur spirit, the 'Corinthian'. Eminent British historian of sport Richard Holt recognised sportsman and educator G. O. Smith as the archetypal Corinthian:

> a slightly built figure for a great [association football] centre-forward, [Smith] would casually saunter on to the pitch for a cup final just as he strolled to the wicket to score the odd century for Oxford. Hard training was bad form. 'The Corinthian of my day never trained', remarked Smith, 'and I can safely say the need of it was never felt.'[130]

While Coombes clearly lacked Smith's ability as an athlete, he was represented as a Corinthian through his reluctance to specialise in one form of sport – the *Courier* also noted his keenness for rowing and coursing despite the piece residing in 'Mercury's' 'Amateur Athletic Harrier Notes'.[131] While later historians conflated this representation based on his post-school career on an imagined elite education, this piece separates Coombes the schoolboy from Coombes the amateur.

The unmistakably elite education of Marks is also distinguished from the less exclusive educational experiences of Coombes. The effect that educational experiences had on the development of approaches to amateurism has been noted in another context by influential sociologists Eric Dunning and Kenneth Sheard. In the late 1970s, these scholars

noted that nineteenth-century rugby union officials from the north of England were more likely to accept 'broken-time' payments as an acceptable part of amateurism than their southern counterparts, who were more likely to be educated at elite public schools. As a result of these educational experiences, northern officials had 'not received a thorough grounding in amateur principles'. This had the dual effect of promoting a 'less than steadfast' commitment to elite conceptions of amateurism amongst northerners and the development of a less antagonistic approach to class distinction than their southern counterparts.[132] That the differing educational experiences of Coombes and Marks provided differing bases for their amateur ideologies is reflected in the dispute over Miller's amateur status. Marks' response to the disqualification of Miller indicates that he was influenced by a less forgiving view than Coombes, which equates to the situation of English rugby officials in the late nineteenth century outlined above. This distinction provided an important tension in the development of amateurism in Australia.

While Marks' minority opinion reflected the amateur ideals of the English elite, the actions of the Australasian Union were replicated in England, the other centre where rugby league developed. The AAA based in London decided at a meeting on 23 November 1895 that

> a playing or ordinary member of any football club or organisation does not lose his amateur status by being such member, but he does [lose his amateur status] if he receives payment for broken time.[133]

The AAA noted that this decision 'practically recognises the Northern Rugby Union'. There appears to have been some rivalry between the AAA and the RFU, which in turn influenced the decision to allow Northern Union players to compete as amateur athletes. The minutes of the meeting related that 'in former years the Rugby Union refused to recognise the suspensions of the A.A.A.'[134] This motion ratified a decision reached at a conference between the AAA, the National Cyclists' Union and the Amateur Swimming Association on 16 November 1895.[135] The rivalry between the two bodies appears to have dissipated by the time that rugby league formed in Australia in 1908. The amateur definition of the AAA current in that year allowed for athletes to retain their amateur status despite competing with or against professionals in soccer or rugby union, with no mention of rugby league.[136] The confusing status of rugby league within English amateur athletics reaffirms the difficulty in establishing the extent to which the standard of Australasian amateurism aligned with that current in England. Amateurism was a

constantly debated concept contingent on not only disputes within and without specific sports, but also on particular time periods. As a result, Australasian practices that might appear divergent from the English model actually fit within a continuum of English responses to amateurism. Australasians were able to situate themselves within this English continuum, and following chapters will demonstrate that they continued to participate in debates, both English and across the wider British World, about the nature of amateurism as a result.

Despite the ruling of the executive of the Australasian Union, the ASFNSW steadfastly continued to pressure the NSWAAA to disqualify Miller. In October 1909, forces within the NSWAAA sought to suspend Miller again, this time as a result of his role as secretary to the professional New South Wales League of Swimmers.[137] The position of the ASFNSW antagonised E. R. Larkin, the secretary of the NSWRL. Larkin expressed the opinion of many when he suggested that 'the federation was not formed to purify sport but for the object of killing the league'.[138] A motion to secede from the ASFNSW was debated by the NSWAAA on 27 April 1910.[139] Coombes related:

> Without question the speaking was plain. It was contended that the real issue was between the N.S.W. Rugby Union and the N.S.W. Rugby League; That the Rugby Union was using the leverage of the Federation to smash the Rugby League; that the Federation was antagonistic to and jealous of the A.A.A. owing to its affiliation to the A.A. Union of Australasia, and that the correct policy of the A.A.A. was to cut adrift altogether from the Federation. On the other hand, it was said that if the N.S.W.A.A.A. left the Federation it would probably lose the Sydney University A.C., the A.A.A. of the Great Public Schools and the Public (State) Schools A.A.A., to say nothing of being possibly banned by all bodies remaining in the Federation.[140]

A major confrontation was postponed by the resolution to hold a mail vote to verify the decision of the executive made in January in response to the Miller issue. The executive received unanimous support from the bodies that voted, with Tasmania abstaining.[141] The decision of Coombes and Rowley was also employed in New Zealand. The NZAAA allowed the reinstatement of Hamilton footballer Alfred Montgomery St George in July 1912 after it was satisfied that he had received no payment for playing rugby league.[142] It affirmed this decision in advice to the Canterbury Rugby League after it inquired into the status of rugby league players in 1913.[143]

The view that the ASFNSW was an implement to 'smash the rugby league' was not confined to a 'paranoid fringe' of the amateur community. The impetus for the ASFNSW developed from a meeting of the New South Wales Amateur Swimming Association (NSWASA) on 19 March 1908. After reading a letter from the NSWRL, the council of that body passed a resolution that:

> this Council is of the opinion that a conference of all amateur bodies in N. S. W. should be convened for the purposes of discussing matters in reference to the furtherance of amateur sport in N. S. W., and the Hon. Sec. takes the necessary initiatory steps.[144]

Ernie Howes, the secretary of the NSWASA, invited amateur sporting bodies to send three delegates to a meeting at the New South Wales Sports Club on April 7, which laid the foundations for the ASFNSW.[145] The *Sydney Morning Herald*, the preeminent voice of middle-class opinion in early twentieth-century Sydney, was in no doubt about the aims of the NSWASA. Its report of the meeting was emblazoned with the headline 'Campaign against Rugby League: Swimming Association Takes Action'. The newspaper also included a further two resolutions passed by the council of the NSWASA:

> That any amateur swimmer who plays, manages, or becomes a member of any football club attached to the N.S.W. Rugby League forthwith ceases to be a member of this association.
>
> That this council is of the opinion that the rules as submitted by the N.S.W. Rugby Football League are contrary to the definition of an amateur as defined by this association.[146]

Despite the views of the NSWASA, the ASFNSW definition of what constituted an amateur included a similar games clause to that of the NSWAAA.[147]

The situation was complicated by the poor reputation of the rugby union. Sean Fagan argues that the NSWRU had attempted to match the payments and allowances allowed by the rugby league, and that many saw its actions as 'duplicitous'.[148] An example of the double standards employed by the NSWRU can be seen in the reinstatement of Reginald 'Snowy' Baker. In addition to his rugby career, Baker won a silver medal at the London Olympics of 1908 as a middleweight boxer. After returning to Australia, he 'began to capitalize on his athletic and boxing fame'. He opened 'a physical culture establishment' and later became involved

in professional boxing as a referee, promoter and stadium owner. He also became involved in the motion picture industry – trading on his athletic prowess.[149] While Jack Pollard described Baker as 'the greatest all-round sportsman' produced by Australia, Mandle argues that 'it was as an entrepreneur-showman, publicist and businessman that he seems in retrospect to have been most important'.[150]

This ambiguousness was reflected in general attitudes to Baker. He was professionalised as a boxer by the ASFNSW in 1909, mere months after his Olympic performances, but continued to play rugby union.[151] Professional boxers were considered particularly offensive to strict amateurs, due to the latter's disdain for prize fighting. According to Bob Petersen, boxing 'has hardly ever been considered, along with wrestling, as more than a low sport, though higher than cock-fighting and ratting'.[152] The *Referee's* journalists did not know what to make of Baker, and debate surrounded his status. An article in April 1925 claimed that he was the 'World's Best All-round Amateur Athlete'. According to the writer, he 'freely indulged in every manly pastime with signal success'.[153] However, in 1932, boxing writer Jack Gell criticised Baker for his role in the professionalisation of swimmer and boxer Harold Hardwick in 1915.[154] According to Gell, Hardwick was 'offered up as a sacrifice on the altar of dividends'. Gell laid the blame for the failure of Hardwick's boxing career squarely at the feet of Baker, who

> possibly with the best intentions, but with his eye always on the Stadium banking account, set out to capitalise him by matching him with American Jeff Smith, unquestionably one of the finest fighting-boxing combinations who ever came to Australia.[155]

Gell considered that Hardwick had been matched with a tough opponent too early in his career. Not only did this adversely affect his boxing career, but it left him unable to compete as an amateur swimmer.

Other amateur officials were critical of the decision to allow Baker to continue as an amateur rugby player. New South Wales Rowing Association (NSWRA) official Vicary Horniman considered the interpretation of the games clause that allowed Baker to play rugby union 'erroneous'. The NSWRA had a reputation for a particularly strict interpretation of amateurism, and prevented manual labourers from rowing as amateurs. It boycotted intercolonial contests with Victorian crews due to that colony's more flexible amateur standards. The Victorian Amateur Rowing Association allowed manual labourers and those that had accepted money in other sports to compete as amateurs.[156] Stuart Ripley argues

that the NSWRA's exclusivist attitude differentiated it from other amateur sporting bodies, such as the NSWRU and the New South Wales Cricket Association, which sought to popularise their games, although some rowing officials such as Coombes took an interest in maintaining the probity of the rival professional circuit.[157] Horniman argued that governing bodies based in Sydney should 'exercise a great deal of care as to whom they allow to take part in their games'.[158] Coombes disagreed with Horniman, and maintained that 'Baker cannot, by the Federation's own rules, be debarred from competing against amateurs in a game for which no prizes are offered'.[159] The ASFNSW concurred with Coombes and permitted Baker to continue playing rugby union, despite his status as a professional boxer. Chairman of the ASFNSW and later International Olympic Committee (IOC) member, James Taylor of the New South Wales Amateur Swimming Association, offered the opinion that a professional 'is entitled to play in that section of the athletic exercises clause which includes the games'.[160]

The NSWRU appears to have moved to tighten its rules regarding amateurism in 1910. The Metropolitan Rugby Union (MRU), the body that organised the local Sydney competition, suggested a new amateur definition to the NSWRU in September 1910. The new definition was similar to the previous definition, but attempted to draw a line through past indiscretions. The new rules would allow the NSWRU to punish an offender who committed a breach after 1 January 1911.[161] This new definition also included a games clause, although it was restricted to 'football as played by and under the New South Wales British Football Association [soccer] or by the New South Wales Football League [Australian Rules]'.[162] This was a move clearly designed to marginalise the NSWRL.

Amongst those caught up in this renewed wave of amateurism was another rugby league-playing athlete, Sydney Hubert Sparrow of the Newtown Harriers. Sparrow was handed a general disqualification by the NSWRU in December 1910.[163] Like Miller, Sparrow was middle-class, and was born in the small town of Tichborne near the central western New South Wales city of Parkes. He enlisted during the Great War, serving as a second lieutenant in the 20th Battalion of the Australian Imperial Force. He was wounded twice, the second proving fatal. His enlistment records show his occupation as a qualified chemist who completed a four-year apprenticeship in the town of Wyalong.[164] He played for the Newtown rugby league club during its premiership season of 1910, but thereafter played for Marrickville at the sub-district level.[165]

Despite the support of the executive of the NSWAAA for the suspension of Sparrow, it was challenged vociferously by significant figures

amongst the athletics community. The amateur athletic community of New South Wales had previously resisted attempts by the executive of the NSWAAA to simplify its position. The complex position occupied by the NSWAAA was seemingly resolved in August by the decision to adopt the amateur definition of the ASFNSW from 1 January 1911. This decision effectively meant that the registration of rugby league-playing athletes by athletic clubs would not continue after the 1910 season.[166] Coombes had earlier hoped to convince the affiliated clubs to agree not to register league players, as demonstrated in an interview with the *Sydney Morning Herald*:

> 'the difficulty could be overcome by the A.A.A. informing its affiliated clubs that it is desirable that League footballers should not be admitted to membership. This may, on the face of it, appear to be sidestepping the problem. It would, however, solve this particular aspect of the question, and is, after all, a matter of expediency. It is better for, say, one or two League footballers to be retired from the A.A.A. than for the A.A.A. to cut the painter from the federation.'
>
> How can they be retired?
>
> 'When the end of the season comes round their subscriptions could be declined; though, of course, according to the A.A.U. definition of an amateur, they have not forfeited their status.'[167]

Legislative action on the part of the executive was necessary as the clubs refused to acquiesce to this suggestion. The association's machinations were not popular with a section of the athletic community. September 1910 saw a motion seeking to rescind the August resolution in favour of adopting the ASFNSW amateur definition placed before the council. This counteraction sought to withdraw from the Federation and hold a general meeting to allow all members to discuss and vote on the matter. Coombes was evidently frustrated by the matter, and considered that enough time had been spent on it: 'It is to be hoped we will all be spared such a state of affairs – delegate meetings of late are bad enough, without even thinking what a general meeting would be like.'[168] This exchange suggests that Coombes did not have a free hand with which to operate. While it is apparent that he did not want rugby league players within amateur circles, he was required to pay attention to divergent points of view. Coombes could not arbitrarily act as an athletics Czar in the same way that James E. Sullivan of the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States may have done.[169] There was quite obviously an influential

lobby within the amateur community that supported rugby league and prevented Coombes from moulding the amateur community of New South Wales in his own image.

Throughout the year of 1911 four motions to secede from the ASFNSW were placed before the NSWAAA and were narrowly defeated. Among the most vigorous and eloquent secessionists was Jack Dunn, the donor of the Dunn Shield. Dunn moved the first motion calling for the NSWAAA to refuse to endorse the ASF suspension of Sparrow in February 1911.[170] He was a passionate supporter of Sparrow, as described by the Sydney *Sportsman*:

> [A]s [Dunn] vigorously denounced those who were instrumental in bringing about Sparrow's disqualification, he paused occasionally for breath to get off his chest an overflow of words castigating in most severe terms the damnably outrageous act of the Rugby Union.[171]

Other important figures, such as G. F. Wooldridge of the King's School and the Amateur Athletic Association of the Great Public Schools, adopted a more ambiguous attitude. In June, Wooldridge expressed concerns that players allowed to remain amateurs would later join the professional ranks.[172]

However, in October Wooldridge, in representing the NSWAAA to the ASFNSW, claimed that it would be grossly unfair for those who played under rugby league rules to be debarred from other forms of amateur sport.[173] The inconsistency in his position reflects the confused administrative structure of amateur athletics that was also apparent in the games clause of the amateur statutes. This ambiguity manifested itself tactically in June. Some secessionists opposed the defeated June motion, but 'plainly stating their reason that the matter, if agreed to, could only go to the federation as the opinion of the A.A.A., and no beneficial results could be obtained'.[174] This indicates that support for secession may have been stronger than its repeated failure indicated.

Some officials retained a strict intolerance to rugby league players seeking to retain their amateur status. 'Argus', a persona that Coombes would later inhabit,[175] commented:

> Of the League, its game, and its constitution we have no concern. They are well able to look after themselves. They can pay, and the players may accept as much as they can get. But they should not, for one moment, expect to retain their amateur status at running, cycling, swimming, etc. The League must be judged by its acts :- 1.

> The buying over certain "Wallabies," Olympic Game winners. 2. The promotion of professional swimming and running. 3. The introduction of loss of time rule, which, in effect, is professionalism.[176]

This statement raises two main issues. Firstly, it is factually inaccurate that 'they should not, for one moment, expect to retain their amateur status at running, cycling, [and] swimming'. The games clause and the Miller case offered athletes a clear directive that they could retain their amateur status if they could prove that no money was taken. Secondly, as far as the games clause was concerned, an individual such as Sparrow was not responsible for the actions of the League. Through the apparent hypocrisy of the games clause and its application in cases such as that of 'Snowy' Baker, rugby league players seeking to remain amateurs in athletics could justifiably feel entitled to maintain this position, regardless of the moralistic points of view of other amateurs. They were supported by a substantial sector of the amateur community that was unwilling to see the status of qualified amateurs compromised illegitimately. The principle of the games clause remained an important part of defining the amateur community in New South Wales and was affirmed in other parts of Australasia through the mail vote that confirmed the NSWAAA's action. However, its application was influenced by external factors, such as the battle for control of rugby football.

The games clause was also important in defining Coombes' place in New South Wales amateur sport, particularly with regard to the Olympic Movement. Supporters of the secession movement finally succeeded in separating the NSWAAA from the ASFNSW in October 1914.[177] The Federation had claimed control of Olympic administration in New South Wales during July 1911, changing its name to the 'New South Wales Amateur Sporting Federation and Olympic Council'.[178] This effectively drove a wedge between Coombes and the rest of New South Wales's Olympic administrators. The secession meant that the NSWAAA was absent from the first meeting of the Olympic Council held in preparation for the 1920 Antwerp Games. Coombes compared this situation to 'the production of Hamlet with the Prince of Denmark missing'.[179] The estrangement of the NSWAAA from the Olympic Council had the affect of compromising Coombes' access to the Australian Olympic Federation (AOF). This situation was overcome in 1923 with the decision that 'the representative of Australia on the I.O.C. be an ex-officio member of the Council of the Federation'.[180]

Coombes' strained relationship with other New South Wales Olympic administrators coincided with a more hands-off role with the NSWAAA.

Between 1920 and his death in 1935, he attended only 31 of 290 NSWAAA meetings held.[181] The 1932 meeting noted that Coombes was 'absent [from meetings] through illness', although there is evidence that he was not held in the highest regard by his fellow administrators.[182] His death was not even mentioned in the minutes of the first meeting of the New South Wales Olympic Council (NSWOC) held following his passing.[183] This is despite the florid and often overwrought recognition of the deaths of other less important figures within the NSWOC minutes.[184] When Coombes was offered a testimonial in April 1931, a rifle shooting official named Mr Cromack explained his significance by recounting a story of an elderly Coombes trying gallantly but unsuccessfully to help his rifle club overcome the difficulty of being 'a man short'. The 'Grand Old Man's' mind was willing, but his body was unable to get into the prone position. The moral that Cromack drew was that 'although [Coombes] might not be of practical assistance his very name uplifts the sport'.[185] This evidence suggests that, just as historians have too readily accepted Coombes' persona as a pure amateur, his significance to the NSWAAA in the years before his death has been overstated. An aspect of his administrative career that cannot be underestimated, however, is his contribution to the international relations of the Australasian Union. It is to this facet of his life and the Union's existence that this study now turns.

Conclusions

This chapter has demonstrated that Australasian athletic amateurism did not define itself as narrowly in terms of 'race' and in opposition to professionalism as was the case in North America or in England. Richard Coombes' attitude to sport outlined in the previous chapter found resonances in Australasian amateurism as both these conceptions of sport eschewed dogmatic English amateurism. Australasian amateur officials offered limited access to dominated Indigenous communities to compete as amateurs. This access was mediated by racial stereotypes and hierarchies, which explains why Indigenous athletes did not compete as amateurs despite the openings offered. The absence of Aboriginal Australians in amateur athletics, despite a strong presence in professional athletics, bears testament not to their domination, but to their agency as they adopted the form of the sport free of controlling influences so prevalent in other aspects of their life.

The independence shown by Indigenous athletes was also evident in the case of amateur athletes who competed in the otherwise professional

New South Wales Rugby League (NSWRL) football competition. The Amateur Athletic Union of Australasia (AAUA or Australasian Union) adopted a games clause in order to facilitate the participation of a number of athletes who competed with professionals in other sports. The NSWAAA came under pressure from other amateur sporting bodies, notably those representing rugby union and swimming, to disqualify amateur athletes who played rugby league. The position of rugby union in particular was fraught with difficulty as they had previously allowed Reginald 'Snowy' Baker to play rugby union as an amateur despite his boxing as a professional. The NSWAAA's acquiescence to the demands of the New South Wales Rugby Union (NSWRU) led to claims of hypocrisy, and athletes who were threatened with suspensions ensured that their rights to compete as amateurs were not compromised. Rather than a case of working-class resistance to middle-class domination, the dispute between factions of the New South Wales amateur athletic community reflected divisions within the middle class.

The case of rugby league footballers attempting to retain their amateur status displays a spectrum of amateur values within the middle class. Miller, Sparrow and their advocates espoused a liberal conception of amateurism, while Vicary Horniman espoused the most exclusionary form. Athletics and rugby union officials attempted to occupy the middle ground, employing a liberal form when it suited them but also insisting on an exclusionary form when their interests were threatened. Amateur officials were not narrowly concerned with pure sport as historians have argued. This and previous chapters have demonstrated that Richard Coombes was influenced by more diverse personal factors than the British public school cult of athleticism, and that amateur athletics administrators employed measures more akin to professional sport to popularise the sport. This chapter demonstrated that the Australasian Union drew a shifting line between amateurism and professionalism. Its own needs to popularise the sport rather than the purity of sport was the key factor in how this line shifted.

The end of this chapter marks a transition from the part of the study where Britishness is subordinate to the concept of amateurism. The previous chapters would perhaps indicate that this study follows a familiar pattern in Australian historiography, that of finding differences between Australia and Britain and asserting an independent Australian nationality. The next chapter follows Tony Collins and Neville Meaney's lead in recognising differences between Australia and Britain as akin to provincial differences within Britain itself.[186] In doing so, it employs three concepts of Britishness that have been employed recently by

historians in the Australasian region. The first concept employed is Neville Meaney's notion that 'thwarted Britishness' can explain developments in Australian history better than the idea of 'thwarted nationalism' as has been espoused by radical nationalists.[187] The second is James Belich's definition of 'Better Britain', which he argues was formed during what he terms recolonisation, a period whereby New Zealand strengthened its bonds with Britain from the 1880s and imagined itself as an integral part of the British nation.[188] The final concept is Schreuder and Ward's idea of 'Australia's Empire', whereby Australians created their own meaning of Empire through their interactions with Britain.[189]

The next chapter will address the strained relationship between the Australasian Union and their English counterpart, the Amateur Athletic Association (AAA). The previous chapter hinted at these difficulties with regard to the AAA's inaction with respect to the Shrubb-Duffey tour. The next chapter will address themes such as the funding of international teams, the preparation of athletes and the rules of sport to demonstrate the tensions within the relationship between the Australasian Union and the AAA. It will not argue that these differences are symptomatic of an assertion of Australian independent nationality. Rather, links between other figures in British amateur sport will be explored to show how the Australasian Union engaged in English domestic debates, placing it in its international context.

4

‘Imperialism and Nationalism in Action’? Reconfiguring the Athletic Relationship with Britain

In 1908, *The Referee* ran a five-part series of articles entitled ‘How English Rugby Strikes an Australian’. The first in the series commenced with the caveat that the author was ‘under the natural disadvantage (?) of not finding in England the things to which I have become accustomed in my own land, and of decrying, or rather being tempted to decry, all things English’.[1] Given this clear expression of Australian distinctiveness, it is surprising that this comment was made by an English rugby international. Garnet Vere Portus, an Australian studying at Oxford who later became a well-known historian, wrote this series and played his only two test matches for England before it was printed. Portus’s position represents a paradox in the way in which identity is expressed through international sport. Developments in international sport, particularly in the Cold War era, saw ‘victorious athletes [become] indispensible symbols of national vitality’ in the late twentieth century.[2] However, during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries the distinction between nations was not as stark and a number of individuals represented adopted and even multiple countries.[3] Portus’s dual nationality reflects this earlier period of sporting representation when nationalism was not expressed with the forcefulness of later periods.

The previous chapters have addressed aspects of Britishness through the concept of amateurism. Chapter 2 examined the New Zealand Amateur Athletic Association’s (NZAAA) growing dissatisfaction with Charles Herbert of the English Amateur Athletic Association (AAA) after he was perceived to have been unsupportive of its attempts to entice Alfred Shrubb and Arthur Duffey to tour Australasia in 1905. Chapter 3 has demonstrated that a version of amateurism that differed from elite British conceptions developed in Australasia in order to extend the coverage of the amateur definition. Despite these differences, the Australasian amateur community did not envisage itself as outside

the pale of Britishness. This chapter will suggest a schema that can explain how the forces outlined in the previous chapters can be contained within the concept of Britishness. The Amateur Athletic Union of Australasia (AAUA or Australasian Union) dealt with perceived slights at the hands of the AAA by forging relationships with British sporting figures that were more closely aligned with their own views. As a result, it was able to participate in domestic British debates about the nature of amateur sport. Elements of Australian sport that have historically been considered unique can thus be seen to be part of a wider British discussion about the nature of sport.

Historians who have previously dealt with Richard Coombes have stressed his Britishness. In addition to his work promoting the Olympic Games in Australia, Coombes remained a firm advocate of the sporting aspect of John Astley Cooper's Pan-Britannic Festival and an Imperial Olympic team.[4] His advocacy of wider British identity within the sporting sphere offers a challenge to the orthodoxy that Australians sought to develop a national identity through sport. Garth Henniker and Ian Jobling's formulation that 'Coombes was, in his promulgation of the Olympic movement, both imperialism and nationalism in action'[5] provides insufficient explanatory power. A reliance on a dichotomous relationship between nationalism and imperialism needs to be eschewed in order to explore the complexities of identities expressed through sport. This chapter will employ a British World framework in order to demonstrate the manner in which a pan-British identity was established and maintained in Australasian athletics.

'British History'

John Pocock's work organises the complex of local, national and pan-Imperial identities embraced by Britain's former 'White' Dominions. It offers a way to address the notion of Britishness without relying on a binary opposition between nationalism and imperialism. He defines 'British History' in its simplest form as 'the plural history of a group of cultures situated along an Anglo-Celtic frontier and marked by an increasing English political and cultural domination'.[6] In terms of identity, Pocock suggests that it is 'the history of the attempt, with its successes and failures, to create [a British] identity.'[7] Pocock describes it as

> a history of a number of cultural and historical identities, forming themselves and each other, and possibly, at some points, in some

> cases, and in some particulars, merging in a common identity which may have a history, a past, and a future.[8]

British History was developed as the United Kingdom embraced European integration. English historians became 'increasingly willing to declare that neither empire nor commonwealth ever meant much in their consciousness, and that they were at heart Europeans all the time'.[9] Pocock criticised this view from a New Zealand perspective, later describing the integration of the United Kingdom into Europe and away from the political, economic and cultural links of Empire as

> the great divorce which occurred when you told us that you were now Europeans, which we, as New Zealanders, were not; so after all those generations in which you had allowed the notion of empire to shape your identity (or so you now tell us, by way of justifying what you do now, since you no longer have the Empire), we were to learn that you cared as little for our past as for our future. What you did, of course, was irrevocably and unilaterally to disrupt a concept of Britishness which we had supposed we shared with you . . . [10]

Pocock further argued that, as 'the British' redefined themselves as Europeans, colonials or 'neo-Britons' required an 'historically valid [way] of redefining British history as [their] own'.[11] Pocock's work has been identified as key to the development of what has been variously termed 'British World' history or 'New Imperial History'.[12]

In an Australian context, Stuart Ward has argued that the issue of the United Kingdom's integration into the European Economic Community (EEC) 'challenged core ideological assumptions about the organic unity of the British world' and served to submit 'many dated assumptions about the Anglo-Australian connection . . . to detailed public scrutiny'.[13] Ward and James Curran argue that this scrutiny led to a 'refashioning [of] the national image from the early 1960s to the 1980s [that] represented not so much the stirring of a more "authentically" Australian nationalism as a response to the relatively sudden collapse of Britishness as a credible totem of civic and sentimental allegiance in Australia'.[14] As may be inferred, British History implies more than the 'history of England with excrescences' or 'merely the history of England as and when it took place elsewhere'.[15] Pocock argues that British History 'takes on a global dimension' through the establishment of colonial societies.[16] British World History offers a way to avoid histories of former colonies falling into a 'highly insular mode of its own derivation'.[17] Neville

Meaney has argued that 'Australia needs a new British history which incorporates the Oceanic Greater Britain into its tale'.[18] He criticises the Radical Nationalist school of Australian historiography, arguing that they have adopted heroes of the labour movement and the Labor party as 'chief agents in defining and prosecuting Australian nationalism'.[19] Meaney argues that 'the heroes of 'nationalist history [such as John Curtin and Ben Chifley] appear to have identified with this myth of Britishness'.[20]

Tony Collins has argued similarly with regard to Australian rugby league culture, with nationalist heroes such as Dr H. V. Evatt performing 'notable . . . expressions of loyalty'.[21] Collins argues that 'rugby league saw itself as no less British than any other sport' despite traditional links between rugby league, the labour movement and Irish Catholicism.[22] This was no less true in the middle-class-aligned rugby union code, as Collins has described the 'indivisibility of rugby union and the British Empire [as] an article of faith among [rugby union's] supporters'.[23] Meaney and Collins also stress the importance of recognising multiple expressions of Britishness. Meaney argues that the constituent elements of the Bush Legend espoused by Russel Ward are 'more accurately to be viewed as provincial distinctions, comparable to those of Cornwall or Yorkshire'.[24] Collins suggests that aspects of Australian sporting culture considered expressions of Australian nationalism, such as forthrightness, egalitarianism and opposition to snobbery, were identical to aspects of northern English sport that stressed difference from southern English sporting culture.[25]

While not explicitly adopting a British History or British World posture, Richard Cashman's biography of Australian cricketer Frederick 'The Demon' Spofforth examines the manner in which wider British identity was expressed by middle-class cricketers in the nineteenth century. Spofforth expressed a willingness to play for England against Australia at a send-off just before migrating, arguing that his presence in an English victory would confer honour on Australia. Australian captain Billy Murdoch unsurprisingly hoped this would not be the case, although Murdoch himself later settled in England and played test matches against South Africa.[26] These examples demonstrate that the study of the history of sport can add 'a cultural dimension' to Meaney's analysis, an aspect that John Rickard argues is lacking.[27] While Meaney dismisses the partisanship of Australian spectators at Test matches amongst other things as tests of Australian nationalism, Rickard argues that 'surely *all* these [cultural] elements are relevant'.[28] Collins in turn criticises Rickard for assuming that sport was 'self-evidently an

expression of [Australian] nationalism', and points to a developing critique of the link between sport and Australian nationalism.[29] As such, an investigation of sporting aspects is necessary for the innovations of British World History to be fully realised. Historians employing such a posture cannot cede the cultural practice of sport as an irredeemable site of nationalism. The insights of British World History are as applicable to the study of sport as they are to other fields of academic study.

Three elements of British World History as applied to the Australasian region inform this study. The first is Neville Meaney's argument that certain tense aspects of Australia's relationship with Britain, such as Britain's decision to join the EEC, can be attributed to Australian Britishness not being recognised in Great Britain itself, a concept he terms 'thwarted Britishness'.[30] A second aspect of British History relevant to this study is James Belich's definition of 'Better Britain'. Belich argues that the shift from progressive colonisation to recolonisation, the tightening of New Zealand's bonds with Britain during the period between 1880 and 1960, reflected a shift in conceptualising New Zealand's place within the Empire. He argues that the concept of New Zealand as a 'Greater Britain' – the model of New Zealand's British future dominant during the era of progressive colonisation – was replaced during the recolonial era by the concept of New Zealand as a 'Better Britain'. 'Greater Britain' saw New Zealand's British future as mirroring the rise of the United States of America into fully independent statehood, while 'Better Britain' saw New Zealand as an integral, but subordinate, part of Britain. To Belich, the former idea offered New Zealand 'an American model of New Zealand's future, in contrast to Better Britain's Scottish one'.[31] The final aspect is Derek Schreuder and Stuart Ward's concept of 'Australia's Empire'. Schreuder and Ward argue that Australians played a key role in defining what the Empire entailed. The dynamics and agency of the Australian colonies meant that Australia did not become a 'mere "[repetition] of England"'.[32] This aspect of British World History asserts that Australia adopted and rejected aspects of Britishness in keeping with their own circumstances. The two latter concepts provide an important counterpoint to each other. By employing both, the complexities of imperial relations can be better expressed. While Belich's definition of 'Better Britain' captures the deferential aspect of the relationship and the desire of antipodeans to assert themselves within the Empire, Schreuder and Ward demonstrate that this assertion was not passive. Australians and New Zealanders helped define the Empire through their interactions at a regional and global level. Applying both these concepts also links

this study to the emerging imperial historiography of both Australia and New Zealand.

Thwarted Britishness: the Australasian relationship with English amateur organisations

Tony Collins has recently employed the concept of thwarted Britishness to overturn the notion that sporting nationalism and imperialism existed in a self-supporting system, with nationalism 'somehow incubated' within a framework of imperial loyalty. To Collins,

> disputes with the British rugby authorities were based largely on [Australia's] sense of thwarted Britishness, rather than incipient nationalism, and . . . when faced with a choice between challenging the British link or reaffirming their loyalty towards the empire, the Australians invariably chose the latter.[33]

This section will demonstrate the applicability of the thwarted Britishness concept to the relationship between Australasian and English athletics administrators. Later sections will explain how these Australasian administrators sought to retain and reaffirm the links with Britain despite the diffidence displayed by the AAA towards their antipodean counterparts.

In spite of the acknowledged assertion of Englishness by Richard Coombes, tensions between him and the AAA leadership marked the relationship between Australasian and English amateur athletic administrators. These tensions may have in fact developed before he left England, as his conduct was discussed at an AAA meeting held on 14 April 1883. He was accused of participating at a meeting which was not advertised as being held under AAA laws, but was not subject to any action, as 'there was no proof' that AAA laws were not in fact observed.[34] While Coombes was exonerated, it is possible that he developed some ill-feeling towards the AAA leadership. It is more likely that tensions developed due to a perceived lack of interest from the AAA in Australasian affairs.

Charles Herbert, the secretary of the AAA, has been seen as central to Australasia's involvement in international sport due to his supposed advocacy on the part of Australasian interests at the Sorbonne Congress of 1894. This congress aimed at reviving the Olympic Games, and his close relationship with Pierre de Coubertin gave rise to his suggestion that New Zealander Leonard Cuff be appointed to the inaugural International Olympic Committee (IOC).[35] Harry Gordon argues that

Herbert 'acted officially as a delegate of both the NZAAA and the [Victorian Amateur Athletic Association (VAAA)], and is credited with having, less formally, watched the interests of all amateur sport in Australasia'.[36] Herbert was asked to represent the VAAA in a letter from that organisation's honorary secretary, Basil Parkinson. This letter also made eight suggestions about the VAAA's views on amateurism, covering such issues as the bar on manual labourers, mutual suspensions, the applicability of an amateur definition to all sports, the value of prizes, gate money, betting and the nature of future Olympic Games.[37]

A close examination of contemporary sources demonstrates that English delegates at this meeting in fact displayed a lack of advocacy on behalf of Australasian interests akin to the lack of action over the Shrubb-Duffey tour that saw tensions rise between the AAA and the Australasian Union. An English translation of minutes taken during the deliberations of the 'Commission on Amateurism' held during this conference indicate that Herbert played little role in these discussions. The minutes indicate that 'R. Todd' (probably Robert Todd) of the National Cyclists' Union (NCU) spoke on behalf of the AAA for much of the meeting, with Herbert making a cameo appearance. Neither Todd nor Herbert is recorded as having advocated on the VAAA's behalf, despite the letter sent from Parkinson.[38] This is not to say that these ideas had no impact on the Congress, with two issues raised by the VAAA placed before the meeting. Coubertin placed 'the view of the Australians' on the subject of reinstatement before the second meeting of the Commission on 20 June. Coubertin explained that in Australia

> anyone who had been disqualified [as an amateur] could only be reinstated after having demonstrated the wish to be reinstated and given the necessary proof. It was possible to be reinstated only once in a lifetime.[39]

As both Parkinson's letter and Coubertin's statement refer to reinstatement being available to an athlete 'once in a lifetime', it appears certain that Coubertin is referring to the VAAA when he referred to 'the Australians'.

Coubertin concluded his presentation of the VAAA's views by quoting 'one delegate' at the conference who stated that in a reinstatement case 'one should rely on the word of honour of the individual'. Rather than supporting the views of the VAAA, Todd was reported to remark that 'all too often one came across people who set no great store by their word of honour'.[40] On 21 June the financial difficulties of Australian

competitors, who would be required to spend six months away according to Parkinson, were placed before the meeting during a debate about travel expenses. Again, it was one of the French delegates, Chairman Monsieur de Saint-Clair, rather than Herbert or Todd, who raised the matter.[41] These examples indicate that the English delegates did not advocate on the Victorian's behalf, despite Gordon's assertion. Rather, French delegates who had seen the Victorian proposals presented them to the meeting.

Despite these tensions, a clear Imperial ethic was observable in early Australian efforts to send athletes to the Olympic Games. Ian Jobling argues that Richard Coombes' advocacy for Australian representation at the Olympic Games placed athletics as a marker of Australian nationalism. According to Jobling,

> Australia's affinity to sport was such that its involvement and attitudes towards the early Olympic Games of the twentieth century had a nation-making effect in that it led to expressions of independent nationalism which were in conflict to loyalty to Great Britain and devotion to Empire.[42]

Such assertions are problematised when Coombes' publicity efforts to secure passage for Sydney sprinter Stanley Rowley to the Paris Olympic Games of 1900 are examined. His efforts made clear appeals to Imperial exigency in order to attract help from Australian and British sources. Rowley's 1900 tour can be understood as a continuation of an Australasian athletic tour suggested for 1898, but later postponed. Upon the cancellation of the tour, Coombes suggested that it be held back until 1900 in order to allow competition at the major English competitions of that year and the Paris Olympic Games.[43] While 'Harrier' in the Melbourne periodical *The Australasian* was initially keen for the tour to be organised for 1899, he eventually admitted that the 'arguments in favour of [Coombes'] suggestion seem sound'.[44]

The delay in sending the team did not stop the Australasian Union from taking decisive action aimed at securing the support of the AAA for the tour of Australasian athletes. Correspondence between Archie Baird, the Union's representative in Europe, and Coombes (as reprinted in *The Referee*) demonstrate that negotiations to this end were underway in February 1899. A letter dated 17 February from Herbert to Baird announced the AAA General Committee's decision to offer a hearty welcome to any Australasian athletes who would tour in 1900. The letter also intimated that Herbert would 'place [himself] entirely at the

team's disposal'. However, Baird's commentary attached to this letter confirmed that the AAA could offer 'no direct financial assistance', although the organisation offered to sanction a meeting in London that could potentially help defray some expenses.[45] The London *Sportsman* praised the AAA's response to the negotiations, suggesting that it found difficulty in 'formulat[ing] a scheme whereby our kinsmen from "down under" may be helped in their visit, and at the same time commit no offence against the laws of amateurism'.[46] This statement indicates that concerns over the purity of amateurism prevented the AAA from financially aiding the Australasian team.

The notion of going 'home' to compete played an important role in defining the utility of this tour. The imperial imperative embedded in Rowley's tour manifested itself in two ways. Britain, and England in particular, was seen as the centre of international sport. Anglophones saw the AAA championships, rather than the Olympic Games, as the world's premier athletic competition in this era. An editorial from the London *Referee* making this point was reprinted in its Sydney namesake in August 1899:

> 'England is the World' is an axiom that may be aptly applied to sport in general and athletics in particular. The value of an English championship transcends that of every other country. Home, Colonial, American, and foreign [athletes] regard . . . an English championship as the highest possible honour that can be attained.[47]

In addition to travelling 'home' to England, Rowley's tour allowed him to compete at the highest level. His tour of 1900 was also framed as an Imperial endeavour due to the presence of a posse of American athletes intent on annexing a series of English titles *en route* to Paris.[48] *The Referee* contained reports about the potential strength of the American team as early as March 1899, more than a year prior to the Games themselves. The actions of a committee charged with organising American representation was compared to that of the Australians, who were doing 'little, if anything'.[49]

The strength of the American team was again made apparent to Australian readers as Rowley left Australian shores. Coombes related that in the 100 yards, the 'greatest of events', the Americans had a 'string of flyers', including three who had recorded times faster than ten seconds for the distance. They were supported by a series of 'even-timers', who had posted a time of ten seconds for the 100 yards. It was these sprinters that Coombes saw as the biggest threat to British dominance.

Coombes saw colonial runners as a way to overcome the dearth of British sprinters. After relating to his readers the immense strength of the American sprinters, he suggested that 'Australia will help the Empire' by augmenting English sprinting talent. After describing English sprinters in a derogatory manner, Coombes elaborated on his claim that colonial sprinters would aid England's attempts to hold off the challenge presented by American sprinters:

> Calcutta comes to the rescue with Norman Pritchard, reported to be an even-timer, whilst Australia here takes a hand with Rowley, who has repeatedly done evens, and whose best figures are 9.9-10 seconds. On figures and performances in International contests the Americans appear to hold the advantage, but it must be remembered that the Yankees have the advantage of superfine cinder tracks, and the best of handling by athletic directors. Rowley . . . has always run on grass, and has never been trained in the proper acceptance of the term in his life.[50]

Rowley's tour was thus viewed in Imperial terms as a bulwark against the rising American threat to British dominance. Despite Coombes' faith in these athletes, the American team swept all before it at the English Championships and the Paris Olympics. American athletes won eight of fourteen events at the English Championships held in London.[51] The 'Olympic Medal Winners' database on the official International Olympic Committee (IOC) website lists America as winning sixteen events to Britain's four.[52] Stanley Rowley contributed to one of these four British victories by making up the numbers in the 5,000 metres team race, underlining the pan-imperial nature of Rowley's representation.[53]

Despite Herbert's undertaking to offer assistance to Australasian athletes referred to earlier, Rowley felt slighted by the lack of attention that he was shown by the Englishman. He complained bitterly about the treatment he received from Herbert in a letter written to a family member on the eve of the English championships. The letter related that Herbert had not 'shown [him] one little bit [of] courtesy' during his tour, and complained that the only time he had heard from Herbert was in a letter requesting the payment of the 10 shillings entry fee for the AAA championships:

> This is, I hope, not an example of the courtesy, let alone hospitality, of the English A.A.A. It is quite different when you get into the provinces. There the people can't do enough for you.[54]

Herbert's treatment of Rowley was also the subject of heavy criticism in the Australian press. 'Harrier' of *The Australasian* in Melbourne was particularly vociferous in his criticism of Herbert. The refusal of the AAA to answer correspondence from their Australasian counterpart indicated to 'Harrier' that 'courtesy is a quality apparently lacking in the English Association'. He linked this unwillingness to its earlier treatment of Rowley and contrasted it to the treatment he received in 'the North':

> Stanley Rowley, on returning from his recent trip, spoke highly of his treatment by individual supporters of athletics in the North and elsewhere, but was entirely ignored officially by the English A.A.A. No, not entirely, for the secretary, Mr. Herbert, did communicate with him once, and that was to request Rowley to pay his entrance fee for the English Championships. How nice and fraternal to a gentleman who travelled 13,000 miles to compete.[55]

While Coombes was generally more sympathetic and understanding of the constraints on Herbert's time, on this matter he was forced to admit that '[t]here is no getting away from the fact that this indictment is true in substance'.[56] Nevertheless, he adopted a 'thwarted Britishness' posture himself when in 1901 he suggested that the Australasian Union appoint someone immediately to press for Australasia to host the games in the future. He suggested that the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States (AAU) be asked to 'hold a watching brief for our Union'. Coombes stated that it seemed to him 'a waste of time to look to the English A. A. A. in this or any other matter'.[57] The circumstances surrounding Rowley's tour of England and France in 1900 provide the context for this outburst.

Rowley and 'Harrier's' critiques of Herbert anticipated many of the arguments that were later expressed by the NZAAA with regard to his lack of assistance during negotiations with Shrubb and Duffey. Two aspects of the critiques are particularly noteworthy – 'Harrier's' invocation of the perceived fraternal relationship between Britain and Australia and the distinction between Herbert the metropolitan and the more courteous 'provincial' figures. The imperial imperative that was infused in the tour by Coombes and other Australian commentators was not seen to be reciprocated in the conduct of Herbert towards Rowley. The Englishman did not show due regard for the 'fraternal' relationship that the Australians had identified as crucial to the meaning attached to this tour. This was seen as a rejection of pan-imperial ties, and

represented an instance whereby Australian claims to Britishness were thwarted. 'Harrier' clearly valued the tight bonds of Empire, a trait that Rowley also demonstrated. Rowley placed himself at the centre of the Empire despite residing in Australia by seeing Queen Victoria after returning to London from Paris. Rowley admitted to being 'rather proud of this, as there are thousands of Londoners who have not had that pleasure'.[58] David Cannadine has argued that the latter period of Victoria's reign and that of Edward VII saw the ritual surrounding the British Monarchy develop from being 'inept, private and of limited appeal' to become 'splendid, public and popular'.[59] During this period, ritual surrounding the monarchy became pan-imperial. Three years prior to Rowley's visit, colonial premiers and troops marched in the parade honouring the sixtieth anniversary of Victoria's coronation.[60] Herbert's rejection of Rowley is particularly poignant in this context as it shattered notions of pan-imperial unity and thwarted Rowley's sense of Britishness.

The distinction between Herbert's aloofness and the warmth shown to Rowley by northern athletics figures reflects Australian affinity for aspects of northern English sporting cultures discerned by Collins.[61] A notable example is the 1910–11 dispute between the AAA and the NCU. These groups came into conflict after the NCU allowed professional athletic events at their meetings. The NCU instituted its own athletic organisation after the AAA terminated an 1885 reciprocal agreement between the bodies.[62] A prominent defector was Olympic champion Emil Voigt of Manchester, who acted in an administrative capacity for the rebel group. A *Manchester Daily News* report attributed to Voigt from 30 July 1910 listed Voigt as the honorary organising secretary of a body named the Amateur Athlete's Union.[63] Speculation reigned that Voigt would defy his resultant AAA suspension and run for Victoria at the 1911 Australasian championships after he migrated to Melbourne.[64] When asked by the VAAA if it had any objection to Voigt competing for Victoria, the NZAAA resolved that if Voigt could sign the amateur declaration he could run. This was despite the fact that the NZAAA had realised that Voigt had 'incurred the displeasure of the English A.A.A.' through his actions.[65] In any event, Voigt did not run at this or any other Australasian championships. Nevertheless, the resolution of the NZAAA reiterates the gulf between leading Australasian amateur athletics administrators and their English counterparts.

The next section will demonstrate that values such as a more open definition of amateurism also found a receptive audience in southern

England. There were multiple variations within English sporting culture that make it difficult to define a single Australasian response to English sporting cultures. Australasians dealt with their sense of British imperial loyalty being thwarted by figures such as Herbert by forming relationships with British figures who were more closely aligned with their own views. This enabled the Australasian Union to remain within the British fold despite rejecting aspects of the AAA approach to amateurism.

Better Britain: the Australasian Union and the sympathetic English

The inaugural meeting of the Australasian Union Board of Control held in Brisbane in December 1899 originally decided that there were insufficient funds to send a team abroad, although funds were eventually found to send Rowley.[66] In complete contrast to the aloofness that Herbert showed when Rowley was in Europe, a series of English writers agitated for the AAA to provide funds to ensure his passage when it seemed in doubt. An editorial from the *Illustrated Sporting and Dramatic News* (*ISDN*) called for the AAA in London to subsidise the 'poor' Australasian Union in its efforts to send Rowley as part of a bulwark against American domination.[67] 'Old Blue' (probably in the *Sporting Life*, but reprinted in the *Referee*) suggested that in addition to a welcome, the AAA should provide a grant of £250 towards the Australasian team's expenses. He justified the spending of such a sum as it would help in the AAA's stated objective of 'foster[ing] and popularis[ing]' the sport, and argued that the AAA's responsibility extended beyond England's shores.[68]

These authors were writing at a point in time when the idea of imperial unity was under sustained attack. The *ISDN* saw Rowley as 'a great addition to our defending forces' in the face of the American invasion. The military allusion was noteworthy due to the contemporaneous Boer War between British and Afrikaner settlers in South Africa. The *ISDN* made an explicit link between the efforts of the Australasian Union to send Rowley to England and the efforts of the Australasian contingent at the Boer War:

> The Australasian people are helping with men and money to maintain our supremacy in South Africa, and the A.A.A. might therefore find some of the money, while Australasia finds the man to help maintain our supremacy on the athletic field.[69]

'Old Blue' also made links between the South African conflict and the utility of Rowley as a member of a pan-British athletic force against the Americans, commenting:

> Dear to the heart of British folk is International fray in any shape or form. Dearer still, however, is the mimic strife of those whose cradles were rocked to the sound of the same mother tongue.[70]

The Australian athlete-as-loyalist representation was particularly powerful at this time because South African sportsmen were the subject of much controversy in English sporting discourse throughout the war. A South African cricket team, including Afrikaner Johannes Jacobus Kotze, toured England in 1901. While the team was accepted once it arrived, correspondents including Arthur Conan Doyle waged a campaign against preparations for the tour. Doyle and other correspondents such as G. Lacy of Sandgate saw the tour as hampering the war effort, and argued that the cricketers should remain in South Africa and fight as English volunteers had done.[71] The breach between British and South African sportsmen was only healed following the successful tour of a South African rugby team comprising players of both British and Afrikaner heritage in 1906.[72]

These divisions are likely to have influenced athletics, as teams of Afrikaner athletes and cyclists had toured England in 1895 and 1898. These tourists included Piet Blignaut, who was reported to have died in particularly brutal circumstances at Elandslaagte during the war. The *Sydney Morning Herald* reported that he had been summarily executed after firing at an officer supervising the 'Gordons [driving] home with the bayonet' at prone Afrikaners after the battle. The *Sydney Morning Herald* correspondent described the private 'put[ting] the nozzle of his Lee-Metford [rifle] against Piet Blignaut's temple and [blowing] out his brains'.[73] The possibility of sending an athlete 'home' to defend Britain's athletic honour at this moment was seen as an opportunity to affirm imperial identity. This opportunity was only strengthened by the subsequent behaviour of previous athletic visitors. By linking their advocacy of aid to Australasian athletes to the war effort, the *ISDN* and 'Old Blue' were influenced by a pan-imperial worldview in comparison to Herbert's insular approach as perceived by Rowley and 'Harrier'.

Coombes and 'Old Blue' did not just share a pan-imperial worldview; they also shared similar ideas about the concept of amateurism. They used the articulation of the other's arguments informed by these common beliefs to bolster their arguments in their own local contexts.

By engaging in this process, Coombes was able to continue to contribute to domestic English debates about the nature of amateurism despite being situated in Sydney. Buckner and Francis have critiqued the teleological 'colony-to-nation' thesis by pointing out that there was 'a continual process of renegotiating the status of Canada within the Empire'.[74] There was a similar process of renegotiation about the nature of English society as well. The early twentieth century saw a host of issues – most notably the idea of universal suffrage – debated within English society. Historians must recognise the dynamism within England itself or run the risk of reproducing an image of a static country. A recognition of diversity of opinion also provides an opportunity to investigate the way in which provincials used these distinctions to include themselves in English domestic debates. Coombes was most keen to act in this way.

Historians have traditionally used press debates about amateurism to differentiate the nature of amateurism in different countries. For example, Ronald Smith has criticised Steven Pope's statement that 'Americans were no less amateuristic in their orientation than the British' despite numerous British press criticisms of American amateurism. Pope answers Smith's question as to 'why did the British criticise Americans for not being true amateurs?' by arguing that statements made in the press 'are always filtered through a prism of cultural rivalries, anxieties, and antagonisms and thus cannot simply be taken at face value'.[75] Australian cricketers touring England in the nineteenth century had their amateur status questioned by the British press in the same manner as American college athletes identified by Smith. These criticisms of the cricketers were not made without reason, as the Australian teams had formed joint-stock companies and shared in the profits accrued. But James Bradley argues that these criticisms were informed by concerns over the threat that these teams posed to the established order of cricket, as a throwback to an earlier era marked by touring professional teams. The professional teams had been disenfranchised by the development of the county championship structure that reputedly 'cleaned up' cricket.[76] American athletes posed a similar threat to the established order, with the American Olympic team of 1908 representing the sporting element of the American challenge 'for the political, economic, and athletic leadership of the world'.[77] In short, some British journalists criticised Australian and American amateur standards as part of a defence of Britain's position as the leader of international sport.

Coombes and 'Old Blue' shared views critical of English amateur administrators, and thus had a different agenda to journalists seeking to maintain traditional British supremacy. They sought to ensure that

their criticism of English amateurism as it stood remained at the centre of debates. As such, the debate offered Coombes an opportunity to assert himself as a significant British athletic leader despite his location in Sydney. By extension, he was promoting Australasia as an integral part of the British nation in the same manner that Belich has identified with regard to New Zealanders in the recolonial period.[78]

'Old Blue' used Australian examples to argue for a more liberal definition of amateurism, while Coombes used the connection with the English writer to press for English aid to Rowley. Their relationship was forged through a dispute over the amateur standing of Australian rowers. 'Old Blue' had seized upon correspondence from future Australian Prime Minister Alfred Deakin that the stringent Henley definition of an amateur rower, rather than a lack of funds, would prevent Australian rowers from competing in England.[79] Frantic writing on the part of Coombes forced 'Old Blue' to accept that the lack of funds was the only impediment to an Australasian team touring England in July 1899.[80] This exchange culminated in 'Old Blue's' suggestion that £250 be made available to Australasian athletes as a way to forestall American athletic dominance.[81] Coombes was thus able to turn this debate into an opportunity to cement the position of Australasian athletes within the imperial fold.

'Old Blue' also used Australasian ideas about amateurism to strengthen his own arguments about the conduct of English amateurism. He contributed a series of articles to the *Sporting Life's* 1908 submission to the IOC on a general definition of amateurism in his capacity as a senior writer for that paper. Chapter 3 of this study referred to Coombes' contribution to this endeavour, which Murray Phillips has recognised as part of 'a wide-ranging [international] debate about what constituted an amateur'.[82] 'Old Blue's' first contribution was indicative of the international scope of this effort, suggesting that the amateur definition of the Amateur Sporting Federation of New South Wales (ASFNSW) could serve '[a]s a basis' for a general definition of an amateur athlete.[83] This suggestion enhanced the position of Australasian governing bodies within the British amateur fold, as it conferred a degree of prestige on them absent in their earlier dealings with Herbert. A persistent theme in 'Old Blue's' contributions to this controversy was the idea that the opinions of international organisations were valid and needed to be taken into account. This was partly a matter of expediency, as the contemporary Olympic system provided that the host country would define the eligibility of athletes. As 'future Olympic Games will be held alternatively in other countries . . . for many a long year', Britain's continuing involvement in the Olympic Games depended on accepting

international conceptions of amateurism regardless of whether a general definition was developed or not.[84]

Nevertheless, 'Old Blue' maintained that 'foreigners' (including Australasians) had legitimate concerns about the way amateurism was defined. He vehemently disagreed with two aspects of amateurism as defined by certain English organisations that Australasians found particular fault with – the 'status clause', also known as the manual bar,[85] and the ban on payment of expenses. Daryl Adair has argued that the final rejection of the manual bar of the New South Wales Rowing Association in 1903 cemented a more liberal conception of amateurism in Australia than in England.[86] This is certainly true when the Amateur Rowing Association is considered, but does not take into account the wide-ranging controversy surrounding the manual bar in English rowing circles.[87] The controversy was so strong that a rival body, the National Amateur Rowing Association (NARA) was established in 1890 to 'allow rowers who were amateur in the ethical rather than the social sense' to compete.[88] 'Old Blue' firmly asserted the righteousness of the NARA position, calling the manual bar 'intolerable', 'snobbish' and 'illogical'. He maintained that foreigners were right to consider 'that such class distinctions in sport lower its dignity'.[89] The case of the manual bar controversy in English sport indicates that qualities of Australian sport that have been attributed to a uniquely Australian concept of amateurism are part of a wider British debate about defining amateurism. Figures with a wider worldview like 'Old Blue' recognised this contribution more than insular figures such as Herbert.

Contrary to the position taken by the AAA in 1900, 'Old Blue' was a firm advocate of the payment of expenses. As was the case with the social status issue, he began by arguing that practicality dictated that expenses should be paid in order to allow the cream of amateur athletic talent to compete at international competitions. This argument was followed by an assertion that the payment of expenses was 'distinctly advisable', and that England had been 'markedly backward' in supporting its own athletes.[90] A later article reiterated the point about expenses being required to allow worthy athletes to represent their countries in all but 'exceptional cases', and that England would be 'represented by second and third-raters' if they did not legalise the payment of expenses. 'Old Blue' also made the revealing point that 'nowadays the first-class athlete is naturally in great request', a comment that indicates that at least one British commentator recognised the market potential of athletes in the same way that Shrubb, Duffey and Coombes did. 'Old Blue' was nevertheless concerned that a system of paying expenses could be

corrupted and advocated the American system of voting a sum of money to a manager, who would '[see] to the comfort of everybody and [pay] all moneys due'.[91]

'Old Blue' was aware that this was a controversial position, and recognised that a 'prominent Cambridge University don is dead against any expenses being allowed [as he] thinks it implies an excess enthusiasm . . . nearly akin to business competition'.[92] As the 'prominent Cambridge University don's' response implies, 'Old Blue's' advocacy of American measures was heavily opposed by many senior British amateurs, who viewed the American approach less positively. The traditional school of British amateurism was inclined to see this aspect of American preparation methods as a blight on amateur sport rather than something to be emulated. Britain finished in third place behind the United States and Sweden at the Stockholm Games of 1912, a result that saw the inaugural chairman of the British Olympic Association (BOA), Lord Desborough, host a meeting aimed at examining 'The Lessons of the Olympic Games'. This gathering 'produced specific resolutions aimed at reforming British Olympic campaigns' and set off a movement that ultimately saw the formation of 'The Special Committee for the Olympic Games of Berlin'.[93] The efforts to embrace modern methods in Britain following the 1912 Olympic Games were challenged by traditionalists, who feared that the quest for Olympic success was being launched at the expense of Britain's amateur sporting ethic. Liberal MP and former secretary of the ARA, Rudolph C. Lehmann, 'fulminated that the Olympic scheme proposed to the public "means specialisation"'.[94] Specialisation was a key aspect of American sport criticised by British writers, particularly after the 1908 Olympic Games, which saw relations strained between the two countries.[95]

The centrepiece of the Special Committee was a target of £100,000 in public subscriptions, which was criticised as 'stink[ing] of gate-money and professional pot-hunting' in *The Times*. The *Liverpool Daily Post* characterised the work of the Special Committee (which included a number of aristocrats) as 'plebian fussiness'.[96] The apathy of the general public was underlined as the Special Committee failed to meet its objective; less than £11,000 was raised by the end of 1913, a result that saw the Committee retired.[97] This public apathy suggests that the fear of specialisation was widespread amongst the British sporting public.[98]

Nevertheless, the adoption of American methods was also central to Coombes' conception of sport. Henniker and Jobling have suggested that Coombes developed an admiration for the American sporting system around the time of the Great War, 'probably because of their

Olympic successes'.[99] However, Coombes' admiration of American athletic talent had already developed in the lead-up to the 1900 Paris Games. In addition to his efforts to enlist the Australian sporting community on behalf of Britain's campaign to repel the imminent threat of the 1900 invasion of American athletes, Coombes argued for long-term changes to the Australian sporting ethic. Following Rowley's defeat to three Americans at the 1900 AAA Championship meeting, Coombes suggested that

> Rowley has been beaten, but not disgraced. He would probably win the [100 yards] at an English championship meeting nine times out of ten; but this year the race attracted the world's champions, and until we follow the methods adopted by the American clubs and universities we cannot expect our men to beat [them] nineteen times out of twenty. They have too many men to pick from, too much money behind them, and too much system for us as yet.[100]

Coombes expanded on this in the next issue of *The Referee*, responding to a plea for clarification from a reader. Coombes began by comparing the unsystematic approach 'in vogue' in Australia and England, where '[e]ach individual athlete indulges in the sport in his own particular way', to the systematic approach of the American college system. Coombes argued that English athletes entered for championship meetings

> as individuals [and] train more or less according to their own ideas, and act on their own responsibility. It is the same here. In the States it is different. The individual does not enter for the champion events. The athletic director of his university or club enters the various members of the track team under his control as he, the athletic director, thinks best. There is control, management, and system from first to last. The athletic director is a mighty power in the land. His word is law.

Coombes further argued in Darwinist terms that lacklustre American athletes fell victim to a 'gradual weeding-out process' as they were confronted with increasingly challenging events. The result of a process that began with trial games and culminating in the national championships meant that each team member was 'a veritable champion of champions'. Coombes characterised the American team as

> Champions trained to the hour, and handled by highly salaried experts in the art of training men, would be placed on the mark in

> each event to be won. This is system . . . Had he beaten the American king-pins in the circumstances, [Rowley] would indeed have been a phenomenon. When we become as thorough and systematic as the Americans, I should say we have few fears, whilst there are men in Australia of the calibre of Stanley Rowley.[101]

Again, Coombes supported his views with the testimony of like-minded Englishmen. His friend and fellow former walker, J. E. Fowler-Dixon, saw the American system as 'wonderfully complete', with the Americans 'pay[ing] the strictest possible attention to detail'.[102]

Coombes' call for the emulation of American methods was based on the assumption that it was the easiest route to the restoration of British athletic supremacy. His suggestion fits into a wider trend of the role of America in debates about the nature of the Empire. Despite many advocates of Greater Britain envisioning America an integral element of Greater Britain due to a perceived shared racial community of interests, America was also seen as 'the epitome of modernity' and as a potential threat to British claims to international pre-eminence.[103] Charles Bright and Michael Geyer have recognised the same duality of America as 'the supreme inspiration and ultimate enemy' of nations such as Germany and Japan seeking to modernise and achieve their own period of international pre-eminence.[104]

In an Australian context, the United States played a key role during times of tension between Australia and Britain. This is best exemplified by Australian responses to the 'Great White Fleet' in 1908. This display of American naval power visited Australia in 1908 after an invitation was secured by Australian Prime Minister Alfred Deakin from the Colonial Office despite British misgivings. Franklin Matthews, an American journalist who accompanied the fleet, interpreted Australian enthusiasm to the visit as a response to 'the failure of the British to recognise Australian vulnerabilities'. The British Government was considered to be derelict in its duty to Australia's defence due to its decision to place Australian naval defence increasingly in the hands of Japan and its resultant refusal to allow Australia to create a navy of its own.[105] Coombes' advocacy of American preparation methods can be seen to embody both the wider international context and Australian responses to America. American athletic methods represented modernity and a threat to British dominance to Coombes and some British observers alike, but Britain's reluctance to recognise Australian interests gave extra urgency to the adoption of American ideas. This section has demonstrated that one aspect of Belich's conception of 'Better Britain' – the assertion that a community was an integral part of the

British nation – was clearly evident in Coombes' dealing with English athletic figures. However, the following sections will provide evidence that another aspect of recolonial 'Better Britains' – subordination – was fiercely (but ultimately unsuccessfully) resisted by Coombes.

Austral(as)ia's Empire: the Australasian Union and like-minded English officials

The trend towards embracing like-minded figures in the press was replicated in sporting administration. While the embrace of journalists such as 'Old Blue' served to affirm the place of the Australasian Union within the British world, the embrace of administrators who disagreed with the likes of Herbert offered an opportunity to challenge notions of Britishness. Amongst the figures embraced was William Henry, one of the founders of the Royal Life Saving Society (RLSS). Henry became a vital link between Australian and English sport in the lead-up to the Great War. In 1907 *The Referee* reported that 'the English Amateur Swimming Association has taken umbrage at the constant Henry! Henry! Henry! cry from Australia (*sic*) Swimdom'. Henry had advocated a tour by an English swimming champion to Australia in his role as 'consul for Australia'.[106] In order to pave the way for this tour, Henry moved an amendment to the amateur laws at a meeting of the Southern Counties Amateur Swimming Association on 8 December 1906. This motion was 'easily defeated' after '[t]he matter was sharply debated', meaning that the matter was not brought before a full meeting of the Amateur Swimming Association (ASA). The refusal to relax the 'stringent [amateur] rules at present laid down' provided echoes of the AAA's decision not to provide assistance to the Union in 1900 and proved the death knell for the tour.[107] George Hearn, the honorary secretary of the ASA, earned the opprobrium of noted *Referee* journalist Bill Corbett ('Natator') after the following private communication was made public:

> It is my earnest and daily prayer that Henry's proposition, both re expenses and also the trip to Australia will come to an untimely end; it is undoubtedly most important that neither of them reach the A.S.A. In this matter we expect the South to uphold their reputation, and do their duty to amateurism.

Corbett, pen dripping with sarcasm, diagnosed the problem as resulting from Australians 'ignorantly' thinking that 'the Life-saving society and the English A.S.A. were working hand in hand and arranging all

preliminaries with Mr. Henry'. The ASA was unimpressed with the arrangement between Australian 'Swimdom' and Henry, and affirmed that it was 'prepared to consider any invitation [to tour] provided it was forwarded direct to them'.[108]

This dispute cannot be understood without reference to Henry and the RLSS's relationship with the ASA. The ASA repeatedly refused to aid Henry and his collaborator Archibald Sinclair in their efforts to institute a lifesaving focus in swimming. After seeking to place lifesaving within the ambit of the ASA, the continuing intransigence of that body required Henry and Sinclair to set up a new organisation that would become the RLSS.[109] At the heart of this dispute lay fundamental differences about the perceived utility of sport. Christopher Love has argued that the founding of the ASA saw exclusion from the amateur ranks becoming 'more and more openly based upon ideas of class and respectability', rather than on breaches of the amateur statutes.[110] These ideas rested on the promotion of sport as a recreational avocation, while Sinclair and Henry saw sport in more utilitarian terms. Sinclair and Henry were extremely critical of the view of sport as avocation in their treatise *Swimming*, which sought to establish a framework for protecting swimmers from aquatic danger:

> It is a lamentable fact that those possessing the necessary technical knowledge and practical proficiency have hitherto made so few attempts to place the teaching of swimming on a proper scientific basis. When everything is done by 'rule of thumb,' it is not surprising to find that paid instructors have their own notions or theories as to the best method of imparting the art of natation . . . Above all, they [instructors] must have the ability to impart this knowledge to others in an easily intelligible and attractive manner. In a word, they must be able not merely to *do* but to *teach*.[111]

This gulf in expectations about the role of sport in society was also reflected in the differing responses of Henry and Hearn to the idea of a tour to Australia.

Aspects of both the concepts of 'recolonisation' and 'Australia's Empire' are evident in the Australasian Union's embrace of other amateur figures after the lack of interest shown in Australasian affairs by the AAA. The AAA's reticence to interact with the Union did not diminish the commitment of the Australasians to notions of Britishness. They continued to imagine themselves as part of the wider British polity in keeping with the notion of recolonisation. They cultivated tight

and mutually beneficial relationships with English figures who shared similar understandings about the nature of amateur sport. Not only were they able to reaffirm their British status through these bonds, but they attempted to shape the imperial relationship to better suit their needs. The ability to shape the imperial relationship in this manner reflects the notion of 'Australia's Empire'. Henry, along with other important figures such as Lord Desborough, also played a key role in organising the 1911 Festival of Empire sporting events. The remaining part of this chapter will concentrate on Australasian responses to these events. A focus on this event will demonstrate how these three concepts related to each other in a more compact context.

The 1911 Festival of Empire and notions of Britishness

The coronation of George V was commemorated through the Festival of Empire held in London in 1911. The celebrations included a display where '[t]he British Empire was represented in miniature within the [Crystal Palace] Park Grounds'. The event was the 'biggest and last show' held by the Crystal Palace Company, which was declared bankrupt in that year.[112] A series of amateur sporting contests between teams representing the United Kingdom, Canada and Australasia were held in conjunction with this display. Richard Coombes returned to his homeland to manage the Australasian combination. Katharine Moore has argued that Coombes' role in these events and his advocacy of a Pan-Britannic Festival from the 1890s represented 'the opportunity to show a degree of independence while at the same time pledging itself to the ideals of the Empire'.[113] The remainder of this chapter will address the impact of this issue on developing notions of Britishness in Australian sport. It will specifically question whether Coombes was able (or willing) to assert 'independence' from Britain in athletics.

The build-up to the Festival of Empire in Australasia reflected prior developments in the relationship with Britain. The movement was greatly influenced by William Henry during a visit to Australasia in 1910 to 'examine the work of the [RLSS's] local branches' which had helped spawn the fledgling surf lifesaving movement.[114] Henry acted in a dual capacity as an envoy from the RLSS and as a member of the committee responsible for the organisation of the Festival of Empire. He met with New South Wales sporting figures in December 1910 on two separate occasions. In addition to Coombes and E. S. Marks of the Australasian Union, representatives of swimming, cycling, rugby

union and lawn tennis bodies attended the meetings. At the first meeting on 2 December Henry offered an outline of the scheme and offered an opportunity for the views of the Australians to be relayed to organisers in London, including Lord Desborough. There is some evidence that the views of the Australians materially influenced the scheme. Henry listed the countries invited as South Africa, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and India at the first meeting.[115] By the second meeting held on 8 December, Australia and New Zealand had been combined into Australasia and no mention was made of inviting an Indian team.[116]

The removal of India from the list of invitees is notable due to the wider Australian response to Indians. While Rowley was friendly with the European Pritchard in 1900, sport within the wider Indian community was developing to the extent that an Indian cricket team including six Parsis, three Muslims and five Hindus toured England in 1911.[117] While the intent most likely would be to invite only Europeans to the Festival of Empire, the presence of this team would have put the organisers in an invidious position if they were to ignore the non-European cricketers. While it is possible that Henry was poorly briefed before the first meeting and that Indians were never supposed to be invited, India's role within the Empire historically offended Australian notions of white race patriotism. Meaney has argued that the post-Second World War Australian Labor government had great difficulty in accepting the 'ethnically [and] culturally' distinct Indian Republic within the newly formed Commonwealth, despite the economic and strategic benefits that would accrue.[118] Within sport, the presence of Indian batsman K. S. Ranjitsinhji ('Ranji') in the English team of 1897–98 offended the Australian nationalist periodical *The Bulletin* to the extent that it composed racially charged doggerel to undermine his achievements. *The Bulletin* opined that the English team will 'never take another trick/Till Darkie quits the team'.[119] The low regard for Indians in general was a hallmark of the Australian response to the wider British World, and it is unlikely that Australia would have mourned the fact that India would not be invited to the Festival of Empire. The removal of India from the list of invitees possibly accords with a central tenet of 'Australia's Empire', that of Australia altering notions of Empire in order to suit their own interests.

The consultative approach to the organisation of the Festival of Empire was a far cry from that of Herbert, and was unsurprisingly better received by Coombes. Both Henry and Desborough were singled out for

fulsome praise in his manager's report tabled following the tour. Henry was thanked 'for many acts of kind consideration and attention', while Coombes was more effusive in his praise of Desborough:

> I find it difficult to adequately state how many and varied were the acts of courtesy and kindly attention bestowed upon me by Lord Desborough who I wish to thank most sincerely.[120]

The special mentions offered to these two figures reflects the manner in which Australian officials embraced English figures who had a more utilitarian approach to sport. Desborough also played a key role in starting the Olympic reform movement that culminated in the 1913 Special Committee. Desborough obviously shared some of the sporting ethics that led to a fruitful working relationship between Australian officials and figures such as Henry, although it should be noted that Desborough remained aloof from the appeal for subscriptions to the £100,000 fund. Desborough's name is not amongst the names listed on the appeal circulated to newspapers throughout Britain, and Llewellyn argues that the lack of aristocratic support severely hampered the movement.[121]

The diary of New South Wales boxing and swimming champion Harold Hardwick indicates that Henry offered Australasian athletes every conceivable form of assistance while in London for the Festival of Empire. After welcoming the tourists on arrival, Henry seems to have aided Hardwick in acquiring training facilities at the Royal Automobile Club's Baths. On the other hand, Hardwick complained about the 'awful' treatment he had received from boxing authorities, and claimed to have secured only six sparring sessions in his first 35 days in England.[122] Henry also offered extensive help to New Zealand swimmer Malcolm Champion during the next year's Stockholm Olympics, advancing the swimmer a sum of £66. 19. 2 to allow him to compete.[123] In addition to the continued embrace of administrators with a pan-imperial worldview, Hardwick's diary reveals attitudes towards aspects of English society in keeping with criticism levelled at Herbert by Rowley and 'Harrier'. He criticises 'two typical English snobs [that join the ship in Port Said and] who think Australians are awful', yet recognises the team as 'usual English travellers' while in Marseilles *en route* to London.[124]

Moore has pointed out that Coombes took the opportunity when in England to criticise the lack of interest taken by English sporting figures in the Dominions.[125] The explanatory paradigm outlined throughout this chapter offers the opportunity to place these criticisms

in a wider context. While Moore attributes Coombes' willingness to criticise English sport to the lack of interest shown by the English sporting public, this and previous chapters have outlined the development of an Australasian response to English sport that is central to Coombes' criticisms. Coombes reiterated Australasian complaints about the unwillingness of English administrators to sanction tours to the southern hemisphere. He expressed his opinions rather strongly at the AAA annual dinner held on 1 July and called upon English administrators to 'find a means of returning the visits of Australasian, Canadian and South African athletes, and also controlling inter-Empire sport'.[126]

Coombes' solutions to these clearly placed Australasia as an integral part of the Empire. While he explicitly rejected the notion that Australasia was a subordinate member of the Empire, it cannot be stated that the president of the Australasian Union declared athletic independence. Coombes' response therefore occupies a middle ground between the deference of recolonisation and the quasi-independence of 'Australia's Empire'. He rejected the idea that the Australasian Union should take the subordinate position of an affiliate of the AAA, calling for 'an alliance on equal terms'. He vaguely pointed to 'a [political] conference, upon terms of equality, between the Overseas Dominions and the Mother Country; [and asked] could not the same kind be brought about in athletics?'[127] Coombes clearly asserted that the Dominions in general and the Union in particular could offer expertise to the AAA, suggesting that the AAA could adopt the walking rules of the Union for the sake of uniformity. A more incendiary suggestion was to 'allow the three Empire presidents [Coombes himself, along with Lord Alverstone of the AAA and James Merrick of the Amateur Athletic Union of Canada (AAUC)] to act as arbiters' in the ongoing dispute between the AAA and the NCU.[128]

Coombes' solution to the tension between the bodies representing athletes in England and Australasia rested on the belief that England, like the other white nations of the Empire, was 'an equal member of the British family of nations'. But, as Collins has argued with respect to rugby, English sporting administrators took the position of leadership 'and expected everyone else to follow'.[129] The 'England is the World' view that saw the English championships ranked as world championships was alive and well in administrative circles. Yet Coombes' challenge to this hierarchy was ultimately superficial, and it is the superficiality of this challenge that sees the Australasian example fit more easily within the 'Thwarted Britishness' paradigm. While Coombes did

not accept the subordinate place of his territory as suggested by recolonisation, it equally cannot be asserted that Australasia was effectively remodelling athletics in the Empire to its own ends. At the very moment that he was critiquing the English athletic leadership for their insularity, the IOC member in Australasia put forward his most ambitious scheme for athletic imperial unity – the Empire Olympic team.

Coombes and the Australasian Union were seeking to assert its place as an *equal* and integral part of the Empire of athletics, an assertion that was for the most part rejected by their English counterparts. It was at the AAA dinner that Coombes first elucidated his scheme for an official British Empire team for the Stockholm Olympics. This suggestion can be seen as the result of a process towards a formal Empire Olympic team starting with Rowley reinforcing English sprinting talent in 1900. During the opening ceremonies for the 1908 Olympic Games in London and 1912 Games in Stockholm, the Australasian team along with other Dominion teams marched as an adjunct to the British team rather than in alphabetical order.[130] As such, while these teams were nominally individual entities, they also formed a loose confederation of Imperial teams. The appearance of what might be termed an informal Imperial team was furthered by unofficial medal tallies that included colonial successes amongst British victories.[131] To Coombes, imperial integration in an Olympic sense would be finally cemented by an Empire team formed on more official lines following these steps. He was supported by English officials such as Lord Desborough and Canadian officials such as James Merrick, with whom Coombes established a close relationship during the Festival of Empire.[132] While a lack of time would prevent a team being formed in time for the Stockholm Games, athletes from Britain and the Dominions would converge in London and train under the best British coaches before launching a 'raid on Stockholm'.[133] This scheme was later approved by the Olympic reform movement in England and by the AAUC.[134]

Coombes outlined a more ambitious scheme for the scheduled Berlin Games of 1916 after the Stockholm Games had finished. According to this scheme, a British Empire Olympic Council would be formed after the teams from the Overseas Dominions arrived in London. Once formed, the Empire Council would administer the team, with its most important task being the administration of the selection trials. Coombes was equivocal on the format of this event, suggesting that a pragmatic solution to administrative difficulties could be to make use of existing championships. However he favoured the institution of separate events, as it would remove 'foreigners' from the mix as well as provide a

potential source of funds for the team. Coombes was also unsure about how 'the affairs of the expedition' would be controlled, suggesting that 'a commander-in-chief, sectional leaders, etc., or the Council' could be appointed to fill this role.[135] The next chapter will demonstrate that this more ambitious scheme led to tensions between Coombes and previously supportive advocates such as Merrick. But for now it is sufficient to recognise how Coombes' advocacy of this scheme illuminates our understanding of notions of Britishness expressed through sport. The scheme was promoted in the context of a series of criticisms about the conduct of English sport. These criticisms were not those of an administrator yearning for independence from an indifferent mother country. They were aimed at attracting her attention and affirming the place of her offspring as an important and integral part of the Imperial family. They were an affirmation of the Britishness of Australasian athletics at an event hosted by the AAA, a body that was seen to be thwarting Australasian claims to be an important part of the Greater British nation.

Conclusion

The three concepts outlined in this chapter provide an explanatory framework that enables the way Britishness was expressed through amateur athletics in Australasia to be understood. Australasian athletes and administrators perceived an indifferent attitude on the part of English athletics officials, particularly Charles Herbert. Herbert was accused of paying disregard to Stanley Rowley when he toured England, a criticism that was also made with regard to the Shrubb-Duffey tour of 1905. Australasians viewed this disregard for their interests as threatening to their status as Britons and sought to establish links with more amenable British athletics figures. Coombes was not deferential in his dealings with Britain, meaning that his response was not 'recolonial'. However, he was not seeking to establish Australasia's athletic independence, and when the chance to do so was offered he decisively chose to remain in the Imperial fold at whatever cost required. This was demonstrated in his conduct at the 1911 Festival of Empire.

The next chapter continues the analysis of the way in which Britishness was expressed through athletics by examining the way that the Amateur Athletic Union of Australasia (AAUA or Australasian Union) related to its Canadian counterpart. Coombes cultivated a relationship with Canadian official James Merrick after a previous relationship with American officials was complicated following the contentious

1908 Olympic Games. Canada came to represent values that were previously ascribed to America in the first years of the twentieth century, namely modernity through the preparation of athletes as outlined in this chapter. The status of Canada as a British Dominion allowed for these ideas to remain respectable, despite the confrontation with American athletes and administrators. However, Canada employed a very different conception of amateurism than Australasia. Canadian amateur athletic figures were confronted with the same issues as their Australasian counterparts, such as reinstatement and the applicability of the amateur definition to those that engaged in athletic exercises and players of games. For most of the period in question, Canada steadfastly employed their strict amateur definition rather than engaging in the gymnastics that allowed the Australasian Union to extend the franchise of amateurism. The influence of Australasian-style inclusionary amateurism made its presence felt in Canada following the First World War, ironically as Australasia was modifying its stance – particularly with regard to reinstatement. Canada's approach was no less problematic than the Australasian approach, and served to create divisions of their own with their English counterpart. The next chapter will continue the investigation of Britishness as a unifying force, but also one that laid bare divisions between its constituent communities.

5
North American Cousins: Relations with the United States and Canada

The former President of the Amateur Athletic Union of Canada (AAUC or Canadian Union), James Merrick, wrote to International Olympic Committee (IOC) president Henri Baillet-Latour in 1934 bemoaning the state of amateurism in his country. A recent decision by the AAUC had made some 'very retrograde moves' on the question of amateurism. In addition to allowing amateurs to compete with professionals in competition and tryouts without compromising their amateur status, the AAUC allowed the reinstatement of professionals who had not competed professionally for three years. This new understanding indicated to Merrick that the AAUC had 'fallen into very poor hands' in the figure of newly re-elected president P. J. Mulqueen.[1] The 'retrograde moves' as identified by Merrick were in fact interchangeable with those that had been in operation in Australia and New Zealand throughout the early twentieth century. Despite differences in understanding over amateur definitions, Merrick was happy to cultivate a relationship with Richard Coombes and did not see him as possessing unclean hands.

This chapter will expand its predecessor's discussion of how notions of Britishness informed the Amateur Athletic Union of Australasia's (AAUA or Australasian Union) international relationships. It will consider relationships forged with amateur athletic figures and bodies in the United States and Canada. A promising association that complemented Coombes' admiration of American training methods was developed between Coombes and American administrators and journalists William Curtis and James Sullivan during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. These links were problematised by the breakdown in the relationship between American and British athletes following the acrimonious London Olympic Games of 1908. Coombes responded to these changing circumstances by embracing Canada's James Merrick during

the 1911 Festival of Empire Sports. Merrick represented many of the positives that Coombes equated with American sports, but Canada's Dominion status offered the opportunity for these views to be expressed within a British framework. However, the Britishness expressed in this relationship did not lead to uniformity, particularly with regards to amateur definition. Canada was faced with many of the same issues as Australasia in defining an amateur, such as reinstatement and the relationship between amateurism and team sports. Despite the British roots of the concept of amateurism, Canada developed a different response to defining amateurism and reacted differently to British influence than their Australasian counterparts. These differing approaches to Britishness offer an insight into the way that the concept operated in different contexts with differing results.

North America and Australasia

The United States of America occupies an ambiguous place within the political/cultural life of Australia and New Zealand as well as the British World in general. Some figures such as Sir Charles Dilke and Winston Churchill considered Americans as partners in a 'Greater Britain' or the English speaking world.[2] While this idea lost most political import in the mid-twentieth century, the idea of a common bond between the United States and Australia in particular remains politically significant. In April 2010, Australia's then opposition leader Tony Abbott outlined his commitment to the 'Anglosphere' as a guiding principle of his approach to foreign affairs.[3] In addition to a shared linguistic and cultural bond, many early twentieth-century Australian and American observers identified a bond between the two peoples based by a common racial heritage. David Walker has addressed this issue with regards to the visit to Australia of the Great White Fleet in 1908. The early twentieth century saw portions of the Japanese Navy make two well-received visits to Australian shores in 1903 and 1906. Australian enthusiasm for these visits was tempered by the realisation that the terms of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance meant that Japan took greater responsibility for Australia's naval defence.[4] The prevalence of 'yellow peril' anxieties in Australia in this period meant many observers saw a Japan fresh from its victory in the Russo-Japanese War of 1905 as the greatest threat to Australia's national security.[5] The American fleet received a rapturous welcome marked by an explosion of racially infused statements. Walker demonstrates that American journalist Franklin Matthews was frequently confronted with Australians 'express[ing] both a profound

sense of vulnerability and a determination to ensure that Australia should become a "white" continent'. The presence of the Americans was seen to ensure the safety 'of our race of the future' in a poem by Roderic Quinn. On the American side, Admiral Charles S. Sperry 'insisted in official speeches upon blood ties and the cause of Anglo-Saxon unity', although he detected wariness on this front from 'the imperial English'. The *New York Times* recognised the positive welcome as 'a "demonstration of "white supremacy in the Pacific"'.[6] Philippa Mein Smith has suggested that this impulse was as strong in New Zealand and that, through participation in the tour, New Zealand Prime Minister Joseph Ward joined with his Australian counterpart Alfred Deakin and American President Theodore Roosevelt 'to show that "these colonies are white men's country"'.[7] If the British World was a racial community, then the United States occupied a significant place in this world for many Australians and New Zealanders in the early twentieth century.

Elaine Thompson has described Australia's political culture as a 'Washminster mutation', or a unique political culture that draws upon both British and American traditions.[8] As illustrated in the previous chapter, America provided a model for a modernising Australia in the early twentieth century and political events such as the visit of the Great White Fleet influenced imperial relations. Despite these strong political links, the notion that Australian culture is threatened by a rising tide of 'Americanisation' is commonly expressed.[9] In a sporting sense, Richard Cashman and Anthony Hughes argue that it is a misconception that Australia's 'British' sporting heritage has only recently been influenced by America. While the 1990s saw sports such as baseball and basketball grow exponentially in popularity, Cashman and Hughes point out that 'US sport and culture have had a significant influence on Australian sport from the mid-nineteenth century'. Professional runners have been touring Australia since 1883, and Chapter 2 demonstrated that the amateur Arthur Duffey also undertook a tour of Australasia.[10] Furthermore, these authors suggest that the sporting relationship between the two countries 'is long-standing, powerful and often welcomed'.[11] This is a conclusion that will be upheld to a certain extent by an examination of the relationship between Australasian and American governing bodies in this chapter. But this chapter will demonstrate that there were limits to this welcome, particularly when a clash between the English and American approaches to sport developed.

Australia, New Zealand and Canada have historically been linked closely across the political spectrum. The early twentieth century saw all three jurisdictions attain dominion status, as well as Canadian social

democrats visiting Australia and New Zealand in order to assess the compatibility of Antipodean social legislation with Canadian society.[12] Topics such as health care and federalism have been the object of book-length comparative studies, while studies of the Australian constitution have included comparative aspects due to the influence of the Canadian example.[13] A number of comparative studies with a historical focus have also been contributed to the journal *Australasian Canadian Studies* and its predecessor, *Australian–Canadian Studies*.[14] The most sustained effort to create a comparative discourse between Australian and Canadian history has arguably been in labour history.

A collaborative issue of the Australian periodical *Labour History* and its Canadian counterpart *Labour/Le Travail* was published in late 1996. While Australia and Canada share many common characteristics, a number of issues serve to complicate comparisons between the two nations. Kealey and Patmore list three problematic issues; the greater presence of regionalism within Canadian society, the presence of a large Francophone minority centred around the province of Québec, and the greater influence of the United States of America on Canadian society.[15] However, the significance of these issues is dampened in the comparison between the Australasian and Canadian Unions. This chapter will demonstrate that America played an influential role in the development of amateur athletics in Australasia, meaning that the third difference identified is not as stark in sporting contexts. Chapter 6 will show that regionalism and provincialism were a key part of the Australian and New Zealand sporting landscape as well. On the surface, the French influence on Canada appears to be a bigger hurdle to overcome in comparing the two communities. But the impact of the Francophone community on the workings of the Canadian Union appears to be slight. The influence of the major Francophone city of Montreal over sport was waning in the early twentieth century.[16]

Even at the zenith of Montreal's influence over Canadian sport, the Francophone influence appears to have been dwarfed by the Anglophone. 'A Short History of the Montreal Amateur Athletic Association [MAAA]' was appended to a tellingly titled pamphlet, *Sports of Greater Britain*, by Montreal sportsman W. R. Gilbert in 1898. Essentially written from memory, Gilbert admitted to using the notorious Anglophone newspaper the Montreal *Witness* 'for some of the facts'.[17] Gilbert concluded that the success of the MAAA was due to

> the natural inclination of the Montrealer for athletics, and the predominance of amateur athletic sports over professional – predominance

> which existed in Greece, was perpetuated in Great Britain, and to-day is so much in evidence in the M.A.A.A.[18]

The essentially British viewpoint of Gilbert was underlined in his tributes offered to the obviously Anglophone names of the President Mr Sheppard and the Secretary Mr Herbert Brown.[19] In a sporting context it remains apt to describe Canadian amateur sport as part of a pan-British community. While comparison is a rich field of study, relying on this method has drawn criticism from transnational historians for not going far enough to challenge the pre-eminence of nationalism as a historical explanation. For example, Ian Tyrrell suggests that the 'settler societies' model countries such as Australia, New Zealand and Canada 'have tended to be treated as self-contained, to be compared with one another'.[20] This chapter seeks to move beyond comparison by demonstrating that Australia, New Zealand and Canada were very much in dialogue in the sporting sphere. Before this can be achieved, though, it is necessary to uncover the relationship between Australasia and the United States of America.

The Australasian Union and the United States of America

Lord Desborough and William Henry were not the only international administrators with whom Coombes forged a relationship. He was also closely connected to leading New York amateur William 'Father Bill' Curtis, whom Steven Pope describes as developing 'a sports mentality [modelled] on the English elite'. Curtis played a similar role in American sport to that which Coombes played in Australasian athletics. He edited the leading American sports journal the *Spirit of the Times* and was a co-founder of the New York Athletic Club (NYAC). The leaders of this club were instrumental in forming the Amateur Athletic Union (AAU or American Union), which became a powerful force in American amateur sport despite its influence being restricted to a select number of cities.[21] There were important differences between Coombes and Curtis, despite their parallel positions in their respective amateur communities. Most notably, Curtis, as editor of the *Spirit of the Times*, 'summarily ended' the previous policy of reporting professional track and field athletics events.[22] In distinction, Coombes continued *The Referee's* policy of reporting professional sports as part of their mandate to 'Elevat[e] and [Record] the People's Pastimes'.[23]

Despite these differences, Curtis became an important international reference point for Coombes. The closeness between the two

journalist-administrators was revealed in two late August columns following Curtis's death after he was caught in a blizzard on the weekend of 30 June and 1 July 1900. Coombes had previously refrained from announcing the calamity in *The Referee*, hoping in vain that 'the rumors [of his death] might prove foundationless'. Coombes asked his readers to pardon him from making an in-depth declaration about Curtis's passing due to the grief he felt, but described the American as

> a sincere and ever courteous friend, one to whom no demand on his time or good nature was ever made in vain; one who has for many years never failed to write and keep me (and through me my readers) posted in the every doing and happening in the athletic arena of the states.[24]

Coombes was still struggling with his grief a week later, stating that '[a]t every turn I come across some token [such as ephemera sent by Curtis to Coombes or newspaper tributes] by which I am reminded of the deceased'.[25] While much of this tribute is consistent with the hyperbole that inevitably follows the death of a friend, its nature would have resonated with readers given the context of perceived English diffidence towards Australasian athletic matters. The second statement was made on the very page that Rowley criticised his reception from Herbert, as outlined in the previous chapter.

In contrast to the response of English administrators to prospective tourists, the American responded enthusiastically to reports that an Australasian athletic team would leave Australasian shores in 1898. He implored Coombes to arrange for the team to visit America on the outward journey from London following their English commitments. This expression of interest was supplemented by a plan to cover the expenses incurred through this detour with 'money . . . legitimately obtained' through gate-takings from meetings held in Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, St Louis, and San Francisco.[26] This offer was one amongst several offered by American athletics figures, including an offer from AAU Registration Committee chairman James E. Sullivan to pay 40 per cent of the tour's expenses ($2000, 'or £400 out of the £1000 it was estimated [the tour] would cost') that was later repudiated by Curtis.[27] However, the fact that these offers were made at all says much about the enthusiasm that the Americans were showing towards Australasian athletics.

This enthusiasm was underlined by Sullivan's contemporaneous offer to form an alliance with the Australasian Union, a step that the

English Amateur Athletic Association (AAA) steadfastly refused to take.[28] Coombes described the English refusal to ally with the Americans as

> scarcely an argument against our acceptance of the offer. The English body is very conservative, especially in the *personnel* of many of its southern delegates, its chief executive officers, and its University connection, and one wants to have lived in England to be able to thoroughly gauge national sentiment as between English and American sportsmen. We greatly value and esteem the English connection in all matters, and in sport as a matter of course, but in this case prejudice may have had something to do with the rejection of the proffered alliance by the English A.A.A. This correspondence from Messrs. Sullivan and Curtis shows how much greater is the interest in Australasian athletics outside of the colonies than within their confines.[29]

The AAA is represented as a conservative, prejudiced and distant body in contrast to the progressive and engaged American body. The prejudice displayed by leading English administrators is seen to be an unsuitable example for integration with the international athletic community. The lack of interest in creating an alliance with American athletic organisations on the part of the AAA can be equated to the lack of interest shown in Australasian affairs outlined in the previous chapter. American influence was sought in order to stress Australasia's international relevance just as Coombes and his cohorts sought links with English administrators who shared a pan-Britannic worldview in response to AAA indifference.

American figures offered administrative support to the fledgling Australasian body, despite the fact that plans for an alliance were not consummated. For example, Curtis provided Coombes with a raft of information regarding the organisation of the Paris Olympic Games. He alerted Coombes to the difficulties surrounding their organisation in December 1898 and passed on information gleaned from American IOC member William Sloane in April 1899. These contributions further reflected the enthusiasm shown by the Americans towards the prospective 1898 tour. Curtis again beseeched Coombes to arrange for athletes leaving the antipodes for the Paris Games to visit America. His use of phrase – 'do not fail to have [the athletes] visit America' – underscored the urgency with which Curtis approached the issue.[30] Coombes' explanation of the information sent by Sloane indicates that Curtis had specifically written to the IOC member on the AAUA president's behalf.

Coombes described Australia's position in the Olympic Movement as 'out in the cold' in his concluding commentary despite the presence of Englishmen and New Zealanders on the IOC.[31] Curtis in fact was used as a link to the outside world that Gordon has previously argued that Herbert played.[32] American figures played a similar role to that of English figures outside the leadership of the AAA outlined in the previous chapter. They demonstrated enthusiasm towards Australasian affairs and provided vital administrative assistance to the Australasian Union.

Following Curtis' death, Coombes cultivated a relationship with James E. Sullivan, secretary of the American Union and organiser of the St Louis Olympic Games of 1904. This relationship was aimed at securing American help for Australian competitors seeking to compete in St Louis. The intervention of Sullivan in this manner is slightly surprising, given the traditional historical understanding of the St Louis Olympic Games. These Games were marked by a paltry overseas attendance, with 432 of the 554 athletes present at the Games being American.[33] This number has generally been ascribed to American diffidence towards the internationalist and pluralistic goals of the Olympic Movement. Neglecting the clear racist tendencies within his organisation, Pierre de Coubertin argued that the Anthropological Days held in conjunction with the St Louis Games could have been held '[i]n no place but America'.[34] Coubertin also criticised Sullivan's nationalist tendency, arguing that it was his vigorous support for the American team that caused the 'Battle of Shepherd's Bush' between American and British athletes at the London Olympics of 1908.[35] Taking their cues from Coubertin, historians have generally presented Sullivan as a disruptive influence within the Olympic Movement.[36] Wassong's work, which seeks to place American influences at the centre of Coubertin's philosophy of Olympism, is at pains to separate Sullivan from more congenial influences, such as university professor William Sloane.[37] Even Sullivan's attempts to patch up his differences with Coubertin after the 1908 Olympic Games have been viewed as cynical.[38]

There is further evidence, however, that Sullivan attempted to help international competitors reach St Louis. A letter to Coubertin indicates that Sullivan planned to offer inducements to overseas athletes similar to those offered to Australians through Coombes. Sullivan relayed to Coubertin that while the organisers were unwilling to pay the expenses of every athlete, he could

> perhaps bring from abroad a few of the select ones . . . Perhaps I can induce the Exposition people to pay the expenses of a few, like some

> great gymnast or a great fencer. I don't say this officially, but I feel that at the proper time I have influence enough with the Exposition people to get them to make such a concession . . . [39]

This letter indicates that the existence of at least a preliminary scheme to induce international athletes to compete in St Louis. That so few did compete raises questions as to whether American exceptionalism is the correct reason for the failure of the St Louis Olympic Games as an international event.

A letter from Sullivan to Coombes dated 27 October 1903 expressed the hope that Australasia would be represented at the Games.[40] This letter opened a tortuous negotiation process between these two administrators aimed at the realisation of this hope. By May 1904 the *Referee* was reporting that the

> executive officers of the A.A. Union of Australasia expected to have heard something definite from Mr. Sullivan with regard to Australasian representation in the athletic and swimming departments, but no letter came to hand. It is probable Mr. E. S. Marks will cable Mr. Sullivan within the next few days for a specific reply to a letter sent during the last couple of months.[41]

Two weeks after Coombes' admission that negotiations had stalled, *The Referee* reported that negotiations with Sullivan had proved fruitless. As a result, the Australasian Union executive sought donations from the state athletics associations and the New Zealand Amateur Athletic Association (NZAAA).[42] Coombes eventually received a cablegram on 30 June that invited 'two Australasian champions to visit the United States for the purpose of competing in the Olympian Games'. The invitation came with an offer whereby three-quarters of the funds would be supplied by Sullivan.[43] The funds sent by Sullivan were returned to him despite the departure of Victorians Corrie Gardner and Leslie McPherson to St Louis. The funds were returned on the basis that there were no 'representative champions in accordance with the special cabled invitation', indicating the lack of regard with which these athletes were held.[44]

The relationship between Coombes and Sullivan inevitably lost its intensity following the unsatisfactory completion of these negotiations. Chapter 2 showed the disconnection between Sullivan and the NZAAA over negotiations to bring Shrubb and Duffey to Australasia in 1905. Changing conditions within the international athletic environment also placed pressure on this relationship, particularly after

the acrimonious London Olympic Games of 1908. American athletes complained vigorously that the officiating by British referees lacked impartiality and felt slighted by the absence of the American flag at the stadium during the opening ceremony. On the other hand, British officialdom and the sporting public accused the American team of boorishness as a result of the way they expressed support for their fellow athletes. This was compounded by a number of contentious incidents, such as the alleged fouling of British idol Lieutenant Wyndham Halswelle in the 400 metres race and the American appeal that saw the marathon awarded to John Hayes of the United States ahead of Dorando Pietri of Italy. J. C. Carpenter of America was disqualified after a heat of the 400 metres for allegedly blocking and elbowing his British opponent (separate lanes were not used for this event). The removal of Carpenter from the field saw his compatriots decline to compete in the final, meaning that Halswelle won the event unopposed. Pietri led the marathon event into the stadium, but collapsed shortly before the finish line. As this was occurring, the American Hayes was finishing quickly and a collision seemed imminent. Against the rules of the sport, a British official carried the prone runner over the line and the Italian was declared the winner. This decision was overturned by the IOC after an appeal made by the Americans, 'whereupon the British press denounced the Americans for their lack of good sportsmanship'.[45]

The American response to the dispute was placed before readers of *The Referee* through that newspaper's American correspondent, New Zealand-born William Naughton. General American complaints were amplified by a more detailed treatment of complaints made by athlete Ray Ewry, swimmer Charlie Daniels and Sullivan. Naughton explained his purpose as giving the *Referee* readership

> an idea of the way the facts, or alleged facts, were presented in [America]. Then my readers, who no doubt have been regaled with the British side of the case, will be able to strike an average.[46]

Naughton's claim to impartiality does not ring true, due to his pejorative statement regarding 'alleged facts'. His detached tone is also out of keeping with the vehemence of pro-British arguments placed before the readership. A series of responses that stressed notions of 'British fair play' deriving from Americans including Arthur Duffey,[47] the Australasian manager, spectators and athletes,[48] Belgians,[49] Swedes,[50] Canadians,[51] and Hungarians[52] were reprinted. These responses served to stress the righteousness of the British position. The notion of thwarted Britishness

was inverted as the Australasian team manager William Hill reported 'very kind treatment' on the part of British officials.[53] Victorian long-distance runner George Blake criticised his treatment by English administrators in the 'thwarted Britishness' tradition, but was repudiated by Coombes.[54]

Coombes' feelings about the affair may be gleaned from his response to a complaint from a xenophobic American newspaper about that country's inability to win in sporting events. The New York *Evening World* asked '[w]hat can we win?' following American defeats in tennis, athletics and boxing, to which Coombes jokingly responded that Americans 'could easily be told what and how they could win – say a "Marathon" or a 400-metre race' in clear allusion to the allegedly unfair tactics employed by American athletes in London.[55] However, just a week earlier Coombes had refused to reprint 'scathing' comments about the conduct of the American team made by former English athlete George Robertson, a friend and erstwhile doubles partner of Australia's first Olympic champion Edwin Flack.[56] He also refused to reprint Hill's criticism of the American contingent as he felt 'certain that his reported remarks only refer to a few of its members'.[57] Coombes' previous advocacy of American approaches to training left him in the invidious position of seeking to limit the damage caused by revelations of American misconduct. This is best exemplified in the reported remarks of Sydney Marathon runner J. Lynch concerning American preparation methods. He asserted that, while fault lay with both sides, ultimately the Americans had no cause for complaint. Lynch reported, much as Coombes had with regard to the 1900 team, that the team trainer Mike Murphy had exercised perfect control over the team. However, rather than an example for Australasians to follow, Lynch implied that the differences in approach were in part responsible for the disputes.[58] American athletic modernity was thus infused with a new, less positive set of meanings. The American approach to sport could not be advocated in the same manner in the future.

The Australasian Union and Canada

James Merrick stepped into the breach created by the rift with American athletics figures. A mutually beneficial administrative relationship between him and Coombes developed after they met during the 1911 Festival of Empire meeting. Merrick lent his support to Australasian criticisms of English administration, albeit in a more diplomatic manner. In contrast to Coombes' impassioned plea for the AAA to allow English

athletes to tour Australasia, the Canadian asserted the supremacy of the English championships and suggested that

> if proper inducements were held out [by the AAA] to the [Dominion] representative bodies in the shape of an occasional return visit, there was no reason why the [AAA] championships should not only secure a magnificent entry, but an enlarged importance in the life of the nation.[59]

It is clear that Merrick was referring to a pan-Britannic nation, as he concluded:

> British subjects, whether in the home land or the colonies, should reach a higher standard of citizenship by the inspiration of athletics and healthy sport, which would nullify the vitiating tendency of great cities.[60]

The two figures thus expressed a similar pan-imperial worldview, but there were still significant differences. While Coombes' strong criticisms amounted to bluster, Merrick's gentler rebuke contained a more threatening edge than is at first apparent. His summation of the relationship between the supremacy of the championships and the notion of 'return visits' also implied the opposite. Continued neglect on the part of English administrators could result in Canada in turn refusing to compete in England. The previous chapter showed that this was a step that Coombes could not countenance. Although the methods were different, in their own way both asserted the existence of a pan-Britannic community to an organisation that paid little attention to imperial matters. The Festival of Empire provided a pan-Britannic context for the establishment of this relationship, although Canadians and Australasians invested in this relationship to differing extents.

Coombes used Canadian examples in order to further aspects of his own agenda concerning Australasian sport. For example, he reprinted an extensive letter from Merrick in *The Referee* in April 1912 that informed readers of Canadian preparations for that year's Olympic Games.[61] Details of international preparations, usually culled from press reports, were often used by Coombes in order to cajole his readership into supporting efforts to send athletes abroad. His use of a personal letter rather than a press report from Merrick for this purpose emphasises the closeness of the relationship between the two administrators. The strength of this administrative relationship is particularly evident

in the Australasian Union's dealings with the International Amateur Athletics Federation (IAAF). Despite four Australian delegates (Edwin Flack, R. C. Reid, H. N. Southwell and *The Referee's* tennis correspondent R. M. Kidston) being sent to the Lyons IAAF conference in 1914, Merrick claimed partial credit for having Coombes appointed 'sole judge of walking' for the ultimately cancelled Berlin Olympic Games of 1916.[62] In a show of North American unity indicative of thawing relations after the contentious Olympic Games of 1908, the Canadian seconded a proposal made by Sullivan to this effect after the Australasian walking rules had been adopted *en bloc* by the IAAF.[63]

In this context it is not surprising that Merrick was 'asked to hold a watching brief on [the Australasian Union's] behalf' at the IAAF meeting held in 1921.[64] In this capacity, Canadian delegates presented two Australasian suggestions concerning athletic rules to this meeting. The first submission suggested that judges in track events be required to stand 'two or three yards from the [finishing] pole, so as to get the correct alignment with regard to all finishers'. The second submission suggested that athletes be offered the opportunity to 'pass and engage at the height or distance that appeared to him most advantageous' in jumping events.[65] While the second suggestion was rejected, the revised IAAF rules decided upon contained a clause similar to that outlined in the first suggestion. Rule IV [Judges at Finish] of the 'Athletic Rules' published in the minutes of this conference suggested that '[j]udges should be placed at least two meters from and in line with the finishing point'.[66] In spite of a lack of direct evidence of Canadian advocacy on behalf of Australasian interests, the similarity between the Australasian suggestion and the rule accepted at this conference is suggestive of thorough advocacy by the Canadians. It is significant that Merrick and not an English surrogate was entrusted with the task of placing Australasian suggestions before the international community. The engaged attitude of the Canadian, evidenced by his role in Coombes' appointment as an Olympic walking judge, contrasts with the distant attitude of English administrators.

In addition to the development of an administrative relationship, the success of the Canadian Festival of Empire team influenced the discourse that surrounded international competition. Canada dominated the Lonsdale Cup competition at the Festival of Empire, beating the United Kingdom and Australasian combinations into second and third place respectively.[67] Coombes drew similar conclusions from the Canadian success in 1911 to those he drew from the American success of 1900. Coombes unfavourably contrasted the haphazard Australasian

approach, where athletes departed for England at different times and drew from separate funds, to the Canadian approach. He reported that the Canadians drew from a common fund that was 'either wholly or very largely subscribed by the Canadian Government'. As a result, '[t]he Canadians went to England as Canada and it was Canada all the time and there was never mention of State or State associations on any occasion'.[68] The Australasian failure drew Coombes to conclude that

> it would be far better not to be represented at such gatherings than to be represented by a team the component parts of which are more or less 'on their own' owing to force of circumstances. It is of course impossible to command success but we must try to earn it by thoroughness of system and minuteness of detail as so clearly demonstrated in the case of the Canadian Empire Team.[69]

The recommendations present in Coombes' manager's report following the Festival of Empire Games are almost identical to those expressed in press articles after Rowley's defeats in London and Paris. Coombes also repeated his call for an athletic director 'or track superintendent' to supervise 'the training and diet of the team'. He recounted that

> the track Captain of the Canadian team was a Doctor who also holds the position of director of Physical Culture at Toronto University. This officer stayed with his team and practically directed and supervised their every movement and [his] word was a law unto them subject to no appeal whatsoever.[70]

It is clear that Coombes saw the positive aspects he discerned in American sport as common to Canadian sport. The administration of the Canadian team in 1911 was regarded as a 'model' for future Australasian success in the same manner that the American preparation system was identified as a model for emulation in 1900.[71]

While Coombes imagined Merrick as a contemporary of the American modernist approach, the Canadian in fact owed his position of seniority within Canadian sport in part to the repudiation of American influence. His position was gained following the Canadian Athletic War between 1906 and 1908. The 'war' was fought between two factions, the Canadian Amateur Athletic Union (CAAU) based in Toronto, Ontario, and the Amateur Athletic Federation of Canada (AAFC) based in Montreal, Québec. It was fought ostensibly over whether amateurs could compete with professionals in team sports. Morrow suggests that

the conflict boiled down to 'an ideological power struggle between the emerging centre of sport in twentieth century Canada, Toronto, and the revered hub of organized sport in nineteenth century Canada, Montreal'.[72] The war was sparked off by the decision of the Montreal Amateur Athletic Association (MAAA) 'to allow amateurs to play with or against professionals without jeopardizing their amateur status' in an effort to maintain the competitiveness of its lacrosse team.[73] The MAAA stood firm during a period whereby it was offered the opportunity to rescind the decision, and resigned from the CAAU in November 1906.[74] The MAAA then set up the AAFC in February 1907 in an attempt to usurp the authority of the CAAU.[75]

This war of attrition was effectively decided by the injudiciousness of the MAAA president Leslie Boyd in the case of Tom Longboat, a First Nations Canadian favoured to win the 1908 Olympic Marathon. Boyd supported a protest made by Sullivan about the amateur status of Longboat, and was painted in the Ontario press as a treacherous puppet of Sullivan. He was extremely close to Sullivan and spent most of his time in London with the American. The taint that surrounded its president saw the AAFC lose its legitimacy. Morrow describes his actions as 'the major tactical error of the [AAFC]'.[76] After one last attempt to discredit Longboat with American help, the AAFC was forced to the negotiating table in September 1909. A new governing body based on the CAAU, the Amateur Athletic Union of Canada, was inaugurated in November. The AAFC officially disbanded in December.[77]

Merrick 'negotiated an agreement between the two warring factions' and served as the first president of the AAUC.[78] He was clearly in the Toronto faction of the Canadian amateur community, and was keenly involved in the development of sport at the University of Toronto.[79] He also served as vice-president and president of the CAAU during the war with the AAFC.[80] As president of the CAAU, he established a dialogue with the MAAA, which resulted in a series of meetings held between the warring factions. The final meeting, held in Ottawa on 6 September 1909, saw the foundation of the AAUC.[81] Merrick can thus be clearly identified as an opponent to the AAFC and American influence within Canadian sport due to his position as a Toronto delegate and in his role as a conciliator in a dispute that ultimately saw American influence diminished.

To Coombes, Merrick represented a rejection of the excesses of American sport in favour of a reestablishment of British links. The relationship with Merrick developed at an opportune time for Coombes. His contemporaneous repudiation of American influence and role with the

successful Canadian team allowed for advocacy of sophisticated training methods despite wariness of the excesses of American sport. As a result, the modernity previously represented by the United States of America could be adopted as native to the wider British community. In Coombes' estimation, Merrick constituted a safe halfway point between a belligerent yet modern America and a disengaged mother country. In effect, modernity was naturalised through the embrace of Canada. This formulation was quite complex and contradictory given the tense relationship between Merrick and Sullivan. This tension also manifested itself in the relationship between Australasian and Canadian athletic administrators on issues such as imperial integration at the Olympic Games and the definition of amateurism.

Tensions with Canada

An investigation into disputes between the Australasian and Canadian Unions offers important insights into the way that pan-British identities operated. Merrick's approach to the Imperial Olympic team has been cited as evidence of a nationalist backlash against the scheme in the dominions.[82] Despite being a prime mover in the original Empire Team movement, Merrick's presidential address to the Canadian Union's 1912 Annual Meeting reported that Coombes' expanded scheme had 'present[ed] very many difficulties'. Merrick suggested that it was 'improbable' that international teams would agree to the 'concentration of strength' in an Empire team; that Coombes' scheme would compromise the national identity of the colonial teams; and that the team would actually be weakened as the selection trials would 'reduce to one-quarter the strength of the British Empire'.[83] Merrick's critique of Coombes' scheme following initial support for a less radical proposal illustrates that criticism was not necessarily aimed at the concept of imperial integration. Factors specific to Coombes' expanded scheme presented the difficulties identified by Merrick.

Merrick's criticism of Coombes' expanded version of the Empire Olympic team was echoed in Australia. Ian Jobling and Graeme Davison have both quoted a *Sydney Morning Herald* article, 'Empire Olympic Team: A Criticism', of 30 October 1912 to assert that growing nationalism stymied Australian support for the Empire team.[84] The article in part reads:

> At present any competitor sent from Australia competes in the Games as an Australasian, and any victory credited to him is recognized by

> the hoisting of the Australian flag. Apart from all questions of loyalty to the Empire, there is a narrower local patriotism for Australia, which is certainly gratified by the present system . . . [85]

As such, a nationalist critique of the scheme similar to that made by Merrick is contained in this article, although it is quite equivocal. It is contained in the last paragraph and is preceded by the qualification, 'the matter of the loss of identity is a more important one than might appear at first sight'. The placement of the comment and the preceding qualification indicate that nationalism was far from the only, or even the major, concern for critics of the scheme.

In fact, much like Merrick's criticism, the article's author presented a multi-faceted critique of Coombes' scheme that was far from dependent on nationalism. In addition to sharing Merrick's concerns about the effect that Coombes' scheme would have on the national identity of the constituent teams, the correspondent also had doubts that overseas nations would accept a pan-British super team. This author also furthered other criticisms, including an assertion that Britain itself preferred a looser arrangement more in keeping with the original scheme, concerns about the preparation and selection of the team and concerns about the way funds would be gathered and dispersed as well as wider concerns about the overall administration of the team.[86] The criticisms of both Merrick and those contained in the *Sydney Morning Herald* illustrate that nationalism did not dominate the discourse surrounding the reasons to reject Coombes' scheme for an Empire Olympic team and that a host of other reasons were important to its rejection.

Just as Tony Collins has argued with respect to Anglo-Australian disputes in both codes of rugby, the debates over the Empire Olympic team were not 'straightforward' questions of nationalism.[87] The rejection of Coombes' Empire Olympic Team shares a number of similarities with the fate of other pan-imperial endeavours, such as the Imperial Federation scheme in the political sphere. Coombes had a history of engagement with pan-imperial cultural movements, as evidenced by his advocacy of John Astley Cooper's Pan-Britannic Festival throughout the last decade of the nineteenth century.[88] The debate surrounding Imperial Federation shared many characteristics with the debate surrounding the Empire Olympic Team. National identity again played a role in the debates, with critics of the Imperial Federation movement, such as Sir Charles Dilke, warning against imposing an oppressive scheme that could force the Dominions away from Britain.[89]

Like the Empire Olympic team, the national identity question formed part of a complex of issues that saw the demise of Imperial Federation. Much like Merrick in the sporting field, Dilke was actually a proponent of closer imperial ties, but found fault with the scheme suggested. There was confusion over the details of how the Imperial Federation scheme would operate, with a loose meeting of Empire leaders competing with parliamentary (in Westminster) and extra-parliamentary forms for legitimacy.[90] The lack of a coherent scheme prevented a core of support from coalescing behind the idea of Imperial Federation, just as support for an Empire Olympic team could not be gathered around a single scheme.[91] As was the case with English amateur officials, leading British politicians generally remained aloof from the Imperial Federation debate. When they did engage they expressed open hostility to the scheme. Liberal Prime Minister William Gladstone described the proposal of the Imperial Federation League as 'chimerical if not a little short of nonsensical' when it was presented to him in 1893.[92] The similarities between the debates surrounding the demise of the Empire Olympic Team and the demise of the Imperial Federation movement point to the fact that there was a wider debate over the fate of the Empire, of which questions of nationalism formed only a part.

While differences between Coombes and Merrick over the Empire Olympic team were not determined by national contexts, differences over the definition of amateurism reflected divisions between the amateur communities of the two regions. As outlined in Chapter 3, the Australasian bodies allowed amateur athletes who had played rugby league against professionals to continue to compete as amateur athletes. This exemption was made providing that they had not received any payment and could sign a statutory declaration to that effect. This provision was made in the amateur statutes of the Australasian Union, and may be termed the games clause. The Canadian Union employed a more consistent, but no less problematic, standard regarding the amateur status of game players. It made no distinction between athletic exercises and games, and applied the toughest possible standard to both.

The distinguished historian of Canadian sport Alan Metcalfe has described the disaffiliation of the Canadian Amateur Hockey Association (CAHA) in 1936 as 'an event . . . that, in retrospect, can be seen as the beginning of the end of the AAUC'.[93] The CAHA disaffiliated from the Canadian Union following a decision to assert that professionals in one sport could not be amateurs in other sports.[94] This decision needs to be seen in light of a nearly quarter-of-century-long process aimed at finding common ground with the Dominion Football Association (DFA), which

controlled association football (soccer). These debates not only show the fundamental differences between the Australasian and Canadian Unions, they also point to the influence of differing conceptions of Britishness.

The Canadian Union's application of the toughest possible amateur standard to both athletic exercises and games is displayed in the debates that saw the DFA leave the Canadian Union. It withdrew in 1913 after the Canadian Union confirmed a resolution from the 1912 annual meeting that 'teams in the [DFA] should not be permitted to play with or against professional teams from Canada or elsewhere'.[95] The root of the conflict with the DFA was that it controlled both amateur and professional football. It claimed to be an amateur organisation that simply attempted to 'govern [professionalism] and keep it within bounds' as part of its obligations as a member of the *Fédération Internationale de Football Association* (FIFA).[96] It claimed to have 'killed [professional football] for good' in Québec during the previous year and reiterated that it sought to 'control professionalism, by keeping it down'.[97] However, it sought to bring English professional teams to Canada for 'educational purposes' and to reinstate former professionals from Britain and those that had played in failed professional leagues in Canada. Fred Barter of the DFA argued that the organisation had decided to consider reinstating those that had played in these competitions due to the fact that they had not received any money for their efforts.[98]

James Merrick was openly contemptuous of this view, arguing that professional football in Québec was only 'killed' by a lack of public interest, and that those who attempted to play professionally sought to reclaim their amateur status as a result.[99] This view prevailed amongst the members of the Canadian Union, and the critical resolution of the previous year was allowed to stand. They rejected Barter's advice that the Canadian Union 'leave games alone [and] that you allow us to govern football'.[100] Instead, the Canadian Union applied the toughest possible amateur standard to games.

The refusal to differentiate between athletic exercises and games was one example where the response of the Canadian Union to this issue differed from the Australasian one. It was unmoved by arguments that to cast aside the DFA would dramatically reduce its authority. Tom Watson, the president of the DFA, described his organisation as 'a flourishing body, and [we] control more athletes than the whole lot of you together'.[101] Barter also reminded the AAUC that the Canadian soccer community was 'not a mere handful of "British enthusiasts;" . . . You would not call 16,300 a mere handful'. He pleaded the case for the

continuing alliance on behalf of 30 per cent of his members who were also engaged in other sport under the control of the Canadian Union.[102] The Canadian Union adopted the type of exclusivist position of the New South Wales Rowing Association (NSWRA) rather than the more inclusive approach favoured by the Australasian Union.

Relations with Britain played an important role in the development of differing approaches to this question. The Australasian Union valued contacts with Britain to a greater extent than their Canadian counterparts. The notion of the Britishness of the Canadian football community was ambiguous to say the least. In 1910 Merrick claimed that the Canadian Union 'was successful in rescuing the game [of association football] from the attempted domination of a certain Old Country element in Canada'.[103] Rather than desperately seeking to remain linked to Britain as was the case in Australasia, Canada saw British influence as something to be extirpated in this case. Unsurprisingly, the DFA understated its similarities to the Football Association in England. Barter addressed the 1913 meeting with the comment '[w]e are proud to think we have modeled [the DFA] on the British line. We are not preaching English football to you. We are preaching the gospel of soccer in Canada'.[104] The ambiguousness in this statement reflects the distance of Canadian sport from sectors of British sport compared to Australia and New Zealand, despite the traditional British influence on Canadian society.[105] This was different to the Australasian experience, where continuing exposure to British norms was facilitated by contacts such as cricket tours and international events such as the Olympic Games. Canada was a slow adopter of the Olympic Movement and did not send any athletes to the inaugural games in 1896. A sole Canadian-born athlete, George Orton, competed at the 1900 Games wearing the uniform of the New York Athletic Club.[106] It was in the lead-up to these games that Stanley Rowley was sought as an Imperial athlete, as outlined in the previous chapter.

These differing experiences influenced the Australasian and Canadian responses to issues surrounding amateurism in team games. In addition to the British influence, the Canadian athletic community was to a great extent influenced by American norms. This reflects wider societal developments, with American influence more evident in Canada than Australia.[107] American 'legalistic' definitions joined with British class-based formulations to inform Canadian conceptions of amateurism. Morrow describes the 1873 amateur definition of the Montreal Pedestrian Club as 'a perfect *ménage à trois* of American legalistic or negative stricture, of the British social criterion for amateurism

and of the Canadian ethnic twist pertaining to [the prohibition of] Indians (*sic*)'.[108]

A conceptual distance thus developed between Canada and Britain in addition to the spatial distance of Canadian and British athletes. In this context, it is worthwhile considering Allen Guttmann's exposition of how distinctive American and Canadian forms of football developed from the root of rugby. According to Guttmann, English players

> understood the rules. They knew what was 'rugby' and what wasn't. They knew, for instance, that it was proper to pick up the ball and run with it when it was 'accidentally' heeled out of the 'scrum.' But Americans did *not* know and they required written rules for numerous details which Britons took for granted.[109]

American unfamiliarity with the strictures of British class relations in sport required legalistic amateur definitions in the same way as unfamiliarity with the precepts of rugby required a complex set of laws to make sense of football.

Despite the decision of 1913, the AAUC maintained continuous efforts to restore association football to its fold. It reported negotiations aimed at allying with the DFA at its annual meetings of 1919, 1924, and the years between 1931 and 1935. The situation in 1919 was identical to that of 1913, as the DFA sought to govern amateur and professional football, allow the mixing of amateurs and professionals on the same team and insisted on the right to reinstate professionals. Thomas Boyd, president of the Canadian Union, could not 'see how any alliance can take place between the two bodies' while the DFA insisted on these points. However, Boyd sought to diffuse tension between his organisation and the DFA by 'deprecat[ing] the attitude of a number of prominent soccer men to declare a war is on between two such bodies who are honestly, I feel, trying to carry on sport in a clean way'.[110] The Canadian Union also contained elements seeking to wage war, with the Ontario Branch suggesting a motion that would outlaw all contact with the DFA. This motion was ultimately defeated, and dialogue with the DFA mandated.[111] The Ontario Branch's dispute with the DFA in part rested on its decision to reinstate a professional boxer. Playing with or against this athlete made 'players on all teams in the D.F.A.' automatically professional in the view of the Ontario Branch.[112] This view has obvious resonances with Vicary Horniman's response to the reinstatement of 'Snowy' Baker outlined in Chapter 3, and underlines the

fact that Canadian Union adopted a more exclusivist conception of amateurism than its Australasian counterpart.

Significant concessions were made by the Canadian Union in 1924 in an attempt to allow an alliance with the DFA. Its committee, empowered to reach agreement with the DFA, agreed to permit the registration of reinstated amateurs who had played professional football in Britain and Ireland. A period of five years' grace was allowed for the DFA to bring out professional British or Irish teams 'for the purpose of giving exhibition games throughout Canada'.[113] The DFA declined to accept these advances, however, and no agreement was reached.[114]

The willingness of the Canadian Union to accept such measures was indicative of a more tolerant attitude within the body towards reinstatement evident in the mid-1920s. President W. E. Findlay, in his address to the 1925 annual meeting, argued that its 'rules [were] far too drastic in [prohibiting] the re-instatement of men who commit infractions of our definition of an amateur'.[115] The new tolerance was reflected in the decision to allow the reinstatement of Class B professionals for a year's trial period.[116] The next president, J. A. McVicar – who had negotiated the 1924 agreement with the DFA – called for 'mercy where mercy should be given' in the case of reinstating professionals.[117]

This view was challenged by the Australian-born secretary of the Canadian Union, A. S. 'Pop' Lamb, whom Metcalfe describes as 'a leading defender of the most conservative definition of an amateur'.[118] Lamb suggested that the Union had gone too far and that

> if we lose sight of the fact that this Union is an Amateur Athletic Union, which has only been built up and made possible by self-sacrificing sportsmen over a period of years, it is doomed to failure.[119]

Lamb's conservative view won out over the more tolerant view. At the 1927 annual meeting McVicar spoke out against further loosening of the amateur statutes. He repudiated the movement towards reinstatement, warning that the Canadian Union was

> in danger of losing our perspective of the amateur situation by attaching too much importance to the cases of some fifty or seventy-five men in Canada who have wandered from the amateur ranks and now wish to return.[120]

For his part, Lamb described the reinstatement issue as divisive and caused 'even greater dissatisfaction, petty jealousies, a gross violation of

the Constitution and finally the disruption of one of our most important branches'.[121]

The 1931 annual meeting of the Canadian Union approved negotiations with the DFA, which saw the matter reopened. 'The Committee appointed to consider the situation in regard to the relations of this Union with the Dominion Football Association' developed a scheme whereby the Canadian Union would adopt the amateur definition of the IOC, while the DFA would ensure that its amateur definition would conform to that of the IAAF.[122] Despite confidence expressed that an agreement could be reached in 1932, the movement towards an alliance was thwarted by the DFA's insistence that amateurs and professionals could play with and against each other (as was the case in cricket and rugby league in Australasia) and that a professional in other sports could play as an amateur footballer. The Committee's recommendation read:

> This is such a radical change that your committee finds itself unable to recommend an alliance with the D.F.A. until the [Canadian Union] has committed itself definitely on these two points. It simply points out that the International Olympic Committee and the International Amateur Athletic Federation have not objected to intermingling [amateurs and professionals in teams] in certain cases, but have taken a decided stand against the latter. Its motto has been 'once a professional, always a professional'.[123]

The Canadian Union 'committed itself' later in the meeting as it rejected a proposal to allow 'an athlete competing in professional sport [to] be permitted to become registered as an amateur in other sports'. It instead voted to create a committee to study the domestic and international situation and present findings about the advantages and disadvantages of allowing 'intermingling'.[124]

J. C. McCuaig argued in favour of intermingling, suggesting that Canada was 'legislating against itself' through its strict stance, while 'men like [English athlete] Lord Burghley and others . . . play with and against professional football and cricket players and then come and compete with our own Canadian athletes as simon-pure sportsmen' in international competitions.[125] McCuaig unwittingly identified the crux of differing approaches to amateurism in Britain, Australasia and Canada. The idea that a Lord could be anything other than an amateur was preposterous to many Britons, regardless of his conduct. Societies that did not 'boast' the same stratified class structure were more reliant on legalistic structures to define the amateur community. The

Australasian Union chose to adapt its legalistic structures to allow an antipodean (and therefore non-aristocratic) Burghley to continue to compete as an amateur. This decision was informed by the development of tighter bonds with English sport in its entirety. These bonds required Australasian sport to accept all British sport's hypocrisies. Canada's looser bonds meant that it could apply the strictest possible standard. Local exigencies produced a differing interpretation of the British concept of amateurism in both Canada and Australasia.

The report of the committee, chaired by the conservative Lamb, was tabled before the 1933 annual meeting of the Canadian Union. It admitted that track and field and swimming authorities in Britain allowed greater freedom than it did in terms of competing with or against professionals.[126] However, the committee also sought the opinion of IAAF president Sigfrid Edström, who has been described as an 'amateur fundamentalist'.[127] He reiterated that 'in our sports no competitions against professionals, under any circumstances whatsoever, can be permitted.'[128] The committee suggested that no change be made and that instead the Canadian Union

> reaffirm its faith in the aims and objectives outlined in the foreword of the handbook, which declares in part, that 'Through the medium of competitive athletics, it seeks to promote health, character and citizenship'.[129]

Those who supported amateurs and professionals being allowed to play with and against each other considered the report limited. E. D. Battrum described it as 'excellent in what it covers [but] it did not cover what it set out to do' and, like other efforts to deal with this issue, provided nothing more than a 'magnificent coat of whitewash'.[130]

Both advocates of 'intermingling' and their conservative opponents adopted new tactics when the report was tabled at the 1933 annual meeting. Battrum suggested that governing bodies affiliated to the Canadian Union be given 'the right for the year 1934 to apply British principles and method of control to their particular branch of athletics'.[131] The phrase 'British principles' did not just refer to the manner in which British sporting bodies defined amateurs; it also had resonances with the way in which middle-class Anglophone Canadians viewed their place in the world. However, American-funded research conducted by social scientists in Canada between 1932 and 1934 'concluded that worries about "Americanization" [of Canadian society] were groundless'. Even citizens in the supposedly 'most American' province of Alberta believed that 'Canada should "work out her own destiny"

guided by the British tradition of values in government, law, and public morality'.[132] Battrum's use of the phrase 'British principles' employed a wider meaning that would have found resonances among his fellow members.

Battrum's suggestion was later considered as a separate motion, and was in turn modified to read:

> That any governing body of amateur sport affiliated with the Amateur Athletic Union of Canada may, if so desired permit the playing of professionals with or against amateurs under their jurisdiction without endangering the amateur status of the registered amateurs concerned.[133]

While this motion was ultimately defeated, proponents of intermingling seem to have had some success in breaching the walls of conservative resistance. Chief Inspector George S. Guthrie argued that he 'want[ed] to see [his] children and grandchildren grow up according to British principles of playing the game and not be knocked out of it by professionals'. However, Guthrie also said:

> I am absolutely opposed to a life sentence on any man. You do not do it with criminals. I am more in favor of suggesting a maximum penalty that when a man breaks away he knows exactly how long he has got to stay out of amateur sport before he can apply to be reinstated again.[134]

This view seems to have predominated at this meeting, and the decision to allow reinstatement was made.[135] The Canadian Union also took the decision to place 'soccer football' on the list of pastimes whereby an amateur could compete with or against professionals without losing their amateur status.[136] The Union seemed to have reached a compromise that would allow it to successfully manage amateur sport. At the same time, the meeting passed a resolution that admitted that dishonesty and hypocrisy existed within amateur sport and made a commitment to tackling these issues.[137] After a torrid and lengthy debate it had decided to employ these measures, and had not fallen into bad hands, as Merrick had suggested.[138] It remained committed to amateurism, but had taken a step that governing bodies in other parts of the Empire had earlier taken to potentially expand their influence.

By contrast, the reinstatement of former professionals in Australasia was the subject of very little controversy prior to the Great War. However, the Australasian Union became influenced by the strict policy

of the IAAF regarding the reinstatement of those who had forfeited their amateur status. The amateur statutes originally agreed to by the member associations of the Australasian Union allowed the reinstatement of a professional who had 'absolutely refrained from professional practices for at least two years'. Those who lived outside a radius of 100 miles from the headquarters of affiliated associations were eligible for reinstatement after standing down for one year, although those who had previously been a member of an amateur club before turning professional were required to stand down for three years.[139] E. S. Marks attempted to extend the period that former amateurs had to stand down from three years to five years in 1909, but received no support from other delegates.[140] Coombes was asked by fellow members of the executive to suggest to the 1911 conference that no amateur who had forfeited their status could be reinstated under any circumstances. The conference paid no heed to this suggestion, and declined to take any action.[141] The suggestion was probably instigated by Marks, given his motion at the previous meeting and Coombes' half-hearted advocacy.

Marks' view came to prominence within the Australasian Union after 1920. It extended the period whereby a professional could apply for reinstatement from two to three years and prohibited any former member of an amateur club who had forfeited their status from being reinstated at its 1920 meeting. The decision offered protection to youths who might carelessly lose their amateur status and athletes in rural areas who lived more than fifty miles from an amateur club, however.[142] This decision was softened at the next meeting in 1921 to allow those who had transgressed the amateur statutes before this decision to have the right to apply for reinstatement until February 1923.[143] It struck out the portion of the reinstatement clauses that allowed someone that had knowingly forfeited their amateur status after consultation with Edström in 1924.[144] However, it and its successor body continued to draw the distinction between athletic exercises and games. In the Amateur Athletic Union of Australia's answer to the questionnaire organised by Lamb in 1933, it informed the Canadian Union that it allowed amateurs and professionals to compete with and against each other in 'Cricket, Football, Golf, Shooting and Sailing.'[145]

This movement away from reinstatement also affected Australasian representatives in international competitions. New Zealand walker Harry Kerr competed at the 1908 London Olympic Games after being reinstated in direct contradiction to the eligibility requirements. Kerr was asked to meet with British Olympic Association (BOA) and IOC member Reverend R. S. de Courcy Laffan after arriving in London so

that 'we may take all possible precaution in getting his entry in order'.[146] Given that the entry form asked whether an athlete had previously competed as a professional, it can be surmised as to what these 'precautions' entailed. Coombes had previously suggested that 'it would be well for New Zealand writers not to enlarge on Kerr's career as a professional athlete'.[147] There appeared to be a deliberate campaign of misinformation aimed at ensuring that Kerr's entry for the 1908 Olympics would be accepted despite his professional past.

International norms on reinstatement were more accepted in Australasia during the 1920s and 1930s. The NZAAA affirmed in February 1926 that '[n]o reinstated runner can represent [New Zealand] at the Olympic Games'.[148] In 1931 the New Zealand Olympic Association sought the opinion of the IOC as to the eligibility of reinstated athletes.[149] The advice that a reinstated athlete who had not knowingly turned professional could compete was unofficially relayed to the NZAAA.[150] From showing open contempt for international standards on reinstatement, the athletics community of Australasia came to accept the international norms just at the point when Canada was beginning to rebel. It therefore appears that Canadian Union approaches to amateurism developed in inverse relation to their Australasian counterparts. Superficially, this calls into question whether a British World of athletics had been created. It is clear that a pan-imperial approach to amateurism did not develop – the local exigencies of creating the athletic community determined how it was defined. But this realisation should not obscure the fact that a British World was *imagined* in athletics, just as Coombes imagined Merrick as an heir to the American modernist approach to athletics. In a perverse way, the strength of this imagination is demonstrated by its resilience in the face of separate development.

The reassertion of conservatism in Canada

The decisions of the 1933 Canadian Union annual meeting appeared to have borne fruit by the time it met again in 1934. The reinstatement process was described as 'a most satisfactory one as it removes the stigma of "once a professional, always a professional"'.[151] W. A. Fry, who was responsible for administering the reinstatement process, described it as

> a forward step, following out the principle that no one should get a life sentence except for a major crime. After all, there were so many of the infractions of our rules that drew suspensions that were not

> serious that I think I will always be proud of the fact that I had something to do in giving these boys a second chance through that legislation.[152]

However, signs were apparent that its decision to allow football to be considered a 'pastime' would not result in an alliance and would in fact cause friction with sports similar to football. Secretary-Treasurer Sam Davidson of the DFA informed the Canadian Union in September 1934 that his body would be willing to 'investigate the possibility of an alliance'. This alliance 'would be along the lines of a small annual fee and not based on individual [registration] cards for each player'.[153] The Canadian Union for its part affirmed that any agreement between the bodies 'will provide that all players under the jurisdiction of the Dominion Football Association must take out amateur cards'.[154] Thus the differences between it and the DFA remained intractable despite the compromise reached over the intermingling of amateurs and professionals. The decision to include association football as a 'pastime' led to confusion amongst the Union's members as to what actually constituted a pastime.[155]

This confusion led to a fresh debate over the application of 'British principles' at the 1935 annual meeting. The Central Ontario, Maritime Provinces and Thunder Bay Branches, along with the Canadian Amateur Basketball Association (CABA), all presented resolutions to the meeting seeking to allow intermingling. CABA also sought to have basketball recognised as a pastime.[156] The Canadian Union was growing tired of these interminable debates, and its attitude hardened. Formerly pro-intermingling, P. J. Mulqueen argued that what was needed was to 'get rid . . . of all these cursed resolutions asking to wreck this Union'. He described the conduct of the CAHA (the [ice] hockey body) as 'deplorable. Lacrosse and Baseball are just as bad'. He further argued that these bodies had 'no right' to tear down the Union. The motion to allow intermingling was comprehensively defeated by 98 votes to 49.[157] This provided the context for the CAHA to disaffiliate in 1936 and begin the process of the erosion of the Union's authority.[158]

The concept of 'British principles' was also dealt a severe blow at this meeting. Lamb deprecated the possibility that the 'hateful class distinctions' of British sport, such as amateur and professional cricketers entering the field through separate gates, could be introduced to Canadian sport.[159] Similar criticisms of British standards were expressed by Australian cricket commentators seeking to define the differences between Australian and English cricket culture in the

nineteenth century.[160] While the Australian criticisms of this tradition celebrated the expression of a more progressive cricket culture, Canadian criticisms were aimed at the preservation of the conservative order. These differing responses demonstrate how Britishness was invoked differently in these separate communities. The overarching concept of Britishness was not strong enough to ensure uniformity. Furthermore, Lamb's status as an Australian by birth emphasises the fact that there were divergences of opinion *within* these communities as well.

Faced with the opportunity to establish a more inclusive form of amateurism, the Canadian Union retreated into its exclusivist tendencies. Not only did it turn its back on the process to include these sports, it beefed up the 1933 motion that admitted dishonesty and hypocrisy in some forms of amateur sport. It called on administrators to display 'the courage of their convictions' in response to the professional threat and demanded audited statements from branches and affiliated bodies in order to uncover illegal payments.[161] This position differed greatly from the Australasian Union's policy of viewing team games as separate from athletic exercises and allowing amateurs to compete with professionals in team games. The distance is amply demonstrated in the refusal of the meeting to consider a motion that '[i]n team games amateurs may be allowed to play with and against professionals'.[162]

Conclusion

Richard Coombes, in his capacity as President of the Amateur Athletic Union of Australasia, cultivated relationships with leading American athletics figures to overcome the lack of interest of their English counterparts. The Americans William 'Father Bill' Curtis and James Sullivan displayed an enthusiasm for Australasian affairs that was lacking among Amateur Athletic Association (AAA) figures such as Charles Herbert. The American relationship offered an important international link to the Australasian Union, keeping them abreast of Olympic developments and even offering financial inducements in order to secure Australasian representation in the United States. This relationship was eventually strained as a result of the breakdown in the relationship between British and American athletes following the contentious London Olympic Games of 1908.

Coombes' admiration for the modernising aspects of American athletics left him in an invidious position as a result of this episode. American ideas about the preparation of athletes were overshadowed by the alleged misconduct of American team members at the London Games.

Coombes was able to resolve this paradox by forming an administrative relationship with James Merrick of the Amateur Athletic Union of Canada (AAUC). Merrick offered the same assistance that the Americans had provided, and the relationship was forged during the expression of imperial unity that was the 1911 Festival of Empire. This provided crucial context to the development of this relationship and allowed Coombes to continue his critique of English approaches to sport from inside the prism of Britishness rather than from outside. Canada's successful preparations for the Festival of Empire Sports saw that country being seen as an example for Australasia to follow. The modernity that Coombes ascribed to American athletics could thus be contained within a British context.

The workings of the Australasian–Canadian athletic relationship offer important insights about the wider British relationship. Despite the development of a close working relationship, Coombes and Merrick disagreed over the constitution of an Empire Olympic team. While both originally expressed support for the concept, the Australasian president's suggestion of an expanded scheme was rejected by the Canadian. This difference of opinion reflected debates about the nature of imperial integration that had resonances far beyond sport. Athletics administrators in Australasia and Canada developed vastly differing conceptions of amateurism. This is best exemplified through the way that the Australasian and Canadian Unions dealt with athletes who also competed in team sports. The Australasian Union employed a distinction between athletic exercises and games. This reflected historical understandings of amateurism employed in British sports – particularly cricket – which continued to influence sport in Australasia.

The Canadian Union recognised no such distinction between athletic exercises and games. It applied the same exacting standards to sports as different as track and field athletics and association football. It excluded a large number of athletes who played football because its amateur statutes prohibited competition with or against professionals and outlawed the reinstatement of former professionals. It engaged in a number of failed attempts to reintroduce the Dominion Football Association (DFA) into the fold. For a period it loosened its amateur definition in an effort to create an alliance with the DFA. However, this compromise failed and the Canadian Union retreated into an exclusivist position on amateurism. This had a catastrophic effect on the amount of influence that it was able to command in the sporting community. It not only prevented the possibility of forming an alliance with the

DFA, its belligerence also forced a breach with popular sports such as hockey.

The difference between amateurism as expressed in Australasia and Canada can be attributed to differing relationships with British sports. Australasian sport continued to be closely entwined with British sport through tours by cricket and football teams. As such, British conceptions of amateurism remained influential in Australasia. Canada did not value these links to the same extent. Indeed, British influence was actively scorned on occasions, as evidenced by the campaign to remove the 'Old Country element' from association football. British norms were thus not employed to the same extent in Canada as they were in Australasia. This realisation is important in understanding how notions of Britishness operated in colonial societies. While Australasia and Canada developed an alliance based on a shared British identity, this did not prevent the two communities from employing vastly different solutions to similar issues.

The previous two chapters have been concerned with notions of Britishness. The previous chapter provided a challenge to the notion of nationalism by situating Australasian complaints about the conduct of English sport within the concept of Britishness. Australasian disagreements with English amateur bodies were placed within a wider British debate that included English voices of dissent. This chapter has extended this critique to encompass the relationship with Canada. The final chapter continues this challenge to nationalism through an investigation of the breakup of 'Australasia' in an athletic sense through an examination of the demise of joint Australasian teams and the Australasian Union itself.

6

A Question of Nationalism? The Dissolution of the Australasian Amateur Athletic Relationship

At the 1924 Annual General Meeting of the New Zealand Amateur Athletic Association (NZAAA), Auckland delegate Harold Amos criticised the influence of the Amateur Athletic Union of Australia and New Zealand (formerly the Amateur Athletic Union of Australasia or Australasian Union) on New Zealand athletics. According to the *New Zealand Times*, Amos

> deprecated the stringency of the [Australasian Union's] amateur reinstatement rule. It is not right, he said, that a body situated in another country should legislate for New Zealand concerning the conditions of which they are quite ignorant.[1]

Judging by these statements, it would appear fair to surmise that Amos was expressing a nascent New Zealand independence from Australia that would culminate in the decision to secede from the Australasian Union in 1927. Yet in 1935, eight years after New Zealand's secession, Amos emerged as the last remaining advocate of a proposed international athletics test match between Australia and New Zealand. The NZAAA had first proposed this idea as a way to modernise and prolong the Australasian athletic relationship in the early 1920s.[2]

The Australasian athletic relationship confounds the nationalist teleology which asserts that 'history is a struggle by "peoples" towards achieving self-realisation'.[3] Throughout the Australasian athletic relationship, New Zealanders were aware of their distinctiveness and on occasion expressed it vigorously. New Zealanders funded athletes from New Zealand who competed for 'Australasia' at the Olympic Games. The second half of the first decade of the twentieth century was marked by a particularly bitter dispute between the respective leaderships of the NZAAA and the Australasian Union. But the awareness of this

distinctiveness did not provide the dynamic that ultimately curtailed the relationship. Imperialism is vital to understanding the demise of the relationship, as the notion of joint imperial representation at the Olympic Games provided a justification for joint Australasian representation. New Zealanders acted decisively to reject Australasia once this possibility was removed. The Union's demise will be explained by a shift from a Pacific community at its outset to a continental community following the establishment of Amateur Athletic Associations outside of the Eastern Seaboard of Australia. New Zealand's tradition of innovative thinking and administrative acumen informed its response to the changing dynamics of the Union. Less innovative Australian bodies rejected proposals made by New Zealand to reform the relationship to better reflect these changing conditions. This provided the spur for New Zealand's secession, as a particularly commercially minded council was elected in the late 1920s.

'Australasia' and the 'Tasman World'

New Zealand historian James Belich describes the nineteenth-century relationship between Australia and New Zealand as both horizontal and vertical. The communities of Australia and New Zealand were linked together horizontally, with this relationship 'stretch[ing] vertically from a shared Australasia to Britain'. Belich further suggests that the horizontal links were broken following New Zealand's decision not to join the Federation of the Australian colonies.[4] The persistence of the Australasian Union and Australasian Olympic teams indicates that the relationship persisted well into the twentieth century. To Belich, the legacy of a 'Tasman world' incorporating the east coast of Australia and New Zealand represents 'part of a joint past [that] historians in both countries seem reluctant to recognise'.[5] Belich has described early nineteenth-century sealers, whalers and sailors who worked on either side of the Tasman Sea that lies between Australia and New Zealand as 'Tasmen'. They lived in a Tasman World, 'a strange social and cultural entity that did not see Australia and New Zealand as markedly separate places'.[6] The industries that Tasmen were employed in relied on Sydney, where '[m]ost whaling, timber and trading stations were funded and staffed from'. He furthermore describes the Tasman Sea as 'more bridge than barrier'.[7]

Australian historians have been accused of being especially neglectful of the joint 'Australasian' past, while New Zealanders such as Keith Sinclair expressed some interest in trans-Tasman connection. Indeed,

Sinclair looked further afield and argued that 'New Zealanders [and East Coast Australians] belong to a branch of New World civilization the main centres of which are Sydney, San Francisco and Auckland – the Pacific Triangle'.[8] Belich argues that cultural and economic interactions marked the relationship between the eastern Australian colonies and New Zealand from an early stage. To Belich, 'Sydney has long been one of New Zealand's most important cities, and for a century New Zealand was one of Sydney's most important hinterlands'.[9] Rollo Arnold uses the term 'perennial interchange' to describe how 'both the similarities and diversities of the two communities had worked to create deep-seated continuous two-way trans-Tasman population movements'.[10] He affirms that by 1888 the commonalities between the seven Australasian colonies rendered it 'absurd to contemplate two peoples'.[11] Much study of the Australasian sociopolitical relationship is concerned not with a joint past, however, but with its dissolution following New Zealand's decision to remain aloof from the Australian Federation movement.[12]

Recent developments have moved the debate towards comparative and transnational study of the region. Donald Denoon and Phillipa Mein Smith have sought to affirm the trans-Tasman relationship as a central aspect of the historiography of Australia and New Zealand.[13] Mein Smith has suggested the concept of 'the Tasman World' as an alternative to Australasia. Rather than being 'based on sovereignty like Australasia' as an amalgam of the two countries, the Tasman World is 'constituted by diverse, multiple *communities of interest*'. This world 'also possesses a British history developed from a learning empire whose *modus operandi* was to exchange ideas, things and people habitually and with ease'.[14] Mein Smith also rejects the notion that Federation dissolved the Tasman World and affirms that trans-Tasman links were strong throughout the twentieth century and continued to develop to the point where '[i]n the twenty-first century the Tasman world is more integrated than at any time in the brief 200 years of its history'.[15]

Mein Smith's formulation underlines a significant difference between the Tasman World and Australasia. However, Belich conflates this community based on the shores of the Tasman Sea with Australasia, which he defines as 'Australia plus New Zealand'. These are two distinct geographic formulations, as the inclusion of Australia implies the inclusion of the entire Australian continent. Belich describes Australasia as 'a very loose, vague and semi-tangible imagined community'. 'Real' links between the communities include the pre-1840s relationship between Sydney and New Zealand and the later 1860s relationship between the New Zealand province of Westland and the Australian colony of

Victoria. Belich also points out that 'thousands' of Australians were involved in the Māori Wars of the 1860s.[16] These links are concentrated on the fringes of the Tasman Sea and, like Mein Smith, Belich suggests that residues of this relationship remained significant into the twentieth century. Whereas Mein Smith argues that the Tasman World survived the Federation process, Belich argues that Australasia was a casualty of New Zealand's decision not to Federate.[17]

While these scholars draw different conclusions, the 'residues' of Australasia as identified by Belich in fact better reflect a continuity of the Tasman World as identified by Mein Smith. These residues include New Zealanders playing in Australian lotteries and links in popular culture, literature, sport, migration and banking.[18] These residues are almost exclusively restricted to the East Coast of Australia. The lotteries played by New Zealanders emanated exclusively from states situated on Australia's eastern shore – Victoria, New South Wales, Tasmania and Queensland.[19] The trans-Tasman theatre entrepreneurs that Belich mentions as based in Australia, Harry Rickard and J. C. Williamson, were to a lesser extent restricted to the East Coast. English-born Rickard opened vaudeville theatres in Sydney and Melbourne in 1892 and 1894 respectively, but later also opened theatres in Adelaide and Perth.[20] Williamson toured Melbourne and Adelaide as a performer, but became sole tenant of Melbourne's Theatre Royal in 1881 and later lived in semi-retirement in the exclusive Sydney suburb of Elizabeth Bay.[21] Belich suggests that the Sydney *Bulletin* could be called 'a Tasman, or Australasian, journal' due to the influence of New Zealand authors in its literature pages until the 1960s.[22] Given its place of publication, the former appellation is more appropriate. The influence of 'Aussie league' – the Sydney-based New South Wales Rugby League[23] – over New Zealand from the 1980s is to Belich 'a part of the recent revival of the Tasman World'.[24]

The vestiges of the relationship between Australia and New Zealand as identified by Belich were thus based around the Tasman World, not Australasia. This indicates that his obituary for this community was premature and that those links based around the Tasman fringe of both countries were maintained. This is not understood due to the conflation of Australasia with the Tasman World. These conflated formulations ignore the vast differences between a Tasman World – based around New Zealand and the four Eastern colonies – and Australasia. The latter formulation – involving New Zealand and the entirety of Australia – involves massive territory to which New Zealand was less proximate. This difference is particularly significant in terms of the secession of New Zealand from the Australasian Union.

Sport and Australasia

Trans-Tasman athletic contacts were established soon after the independent foundation of the New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association (NSWAAA) and the NZAAA in 1887. Reciprocal tours quickly followed, with athletes from New South Wales competing in the inaugural New Zealand championships held in Dunedin in 1889 and a New Zealand team competing in the following year's New South Wales championship meeting. The Victorian Amateur Athletic Association (VAAA), established in 1891, was not founded until after these early encounters, meaning that trans-Tasman interaction was a prerequisite for early contact between colonial Amateur Athletic Associations in Australasia. These associations entered into an Australasian Championship Agreement in 1893 that allowed for regular competition between New South Wales, New Zealand and Victoria.[25] With the arrangement due to expire, the bodies took the opportunity to enter a more wide-ranging agreement in October 1897. Representatives of these bodies and the newly formed Queensland Amateur Athletic Association (QAAA) convened the Australasian Amateur Conference in Sydney at that time to agree on a constitution covering issues such as amateur definition, racing rules and representative teams.[26] They agreed to found the Australasian Union, a decision ratified by the various member associations between December 1898 and March 1899.[27]

The sport of track and field athletics offers an excellent opportunity to chart the Tasman World in the post-Federation era due to the tradition of joint Australasian Olympic representation in 1908 in London and in 1912 in Stockholm as well as the persistence of the Australasian Union. The persistence of the concept in sport after the Federation of the Australian colonies has been the focus of historical attention, most notably in the edited volume *Sport, Federation, Nation*.[28] Richard Cashman argues that the term persisted in Australasian teams as costs incurred by competing overseas necessitated pragmatic unions of convenience. He also notes that sports such as rugby league cynically exploited the term for commercial gain. In all, Cashman lists five reasons for the persistence of Australasia within sport. In addition to the reasons outlined above, he suggests that the term was 'cynically exploited' for propagandistic reasons – as in the case of the Australasian Jubilee Football Carnival of 1908. The fourth reason listed is that there was no imperative to necessitate dispensing with the concept of Australasia in certain sports, resulting in a time lag between Australian Federation and the dissolution of bodies such as the Australasian Union. A final reason is that the imperial bond that influenced administrators

such as Richard Coombes facilitated a continuing sense of Australasian identity.[29] Of these explanations, the imperial imperative will be most fully addressed in this chapter.

Australasia's persistence in the sporting context is significant due to the alacrity with which the concept was politically repudiated – especially within New Zealand circles – after the Australian colonies federated.[30] Historians such as W. F. Mandle have previously argued that sport as a cultural form was ahead of political developments and that expressions of pre-Federation sportive nationalism were the harbinger of political union.[31] Daryl Adair and Wray Vamplew disagree, pointing out that the enthusiasm felt towards sporting victories was not replicated in the political sphere – as evidenced by fact that Federation was only adopted after a second referendum with only marginally more than half of the eligible voters engaging in the process.[32] The persistence of Australasia within sport offers an opportunity for the mythology that surrounds sport and nation-forming to be challenged. With reference to combined Australasian teams, Greg Ryan argues that New Zealand accepted Australasian representation as a pragmatic compromise to their difficulties in funding a team. To Ryan, the organisation of Australasian teams 'allowed New Zealand athletes to surmount extremely limited financial and administrative resources'.[33] This argument has an in-built explanation for the eventual demise of the Australasian team, as rising strength saw New Zealand branch out on its own once those difficulties had been overcome.

Despite the transnational links implicit in the Australasian athletic relationship, much of the research into it has been concerned with national identity. *Sport, Federation, Nation* presents the historiographical context of Australasian sporting organisations as completely determined by the relationship between Australia and New Zealand as nation-states. This reflects the stated aim of the book to ascertain 'possible links between the coming of Federation in 1901 and its relationship to sport'.[34] The historiography that informs this work is thus dominated by the question of why New Zealand remained aloof from Australian Federation. Little uses the views of E. J. Tapp, F. L. Wood (the sole Australian on the list), Miles Fairburn and Keith Sinclair to explain New Zealand's reticence to federate with the Australian colonies. Tapp argued that Federation provided little apparent benefit to New Zealand, and that there was a concern that joining the Commonwealth of Australia 'might jeopardise their own close relationship with Britain'. Wood's controversial and generally repudiated explanation for New Zealand aloofness centred on reasons that also discouraged some Australian colonies from federating and the intransigence of

New Zealand premier Richard Seddon. Fairburn cited internal problems, a greater reliance on Britain as a trading partner, a feared loss of independence and fear of marginalisation in the Australian parliament for New Zealand's reticence. Precedence is given to the views of Keith Sinclair, who contends that New Zealand briefly engaged with the Federation process as a result of 'a brief attack of nerves' over the consequences of standing apart from Australia. This was combined with a nascent sense of New Zealand's destiny as a separate nation to keep it out of the Commonwealth.[35] The view that New Zealand's ultimate destiny was to form a separate identity is implicit in the argument that financial costs saw Australasia pragmatically embraced, and that national forms of representation were embraced once they became affordable.[36]

The reliance on nationalism to explain New Zealand's reticence to federate with the Australian colonies is not sport-specific. The pervasiveness of the concept is underlined by its application by James Belich. He refutes the claims of other historians – most notably Sinclair – that nationalism marked the relationship between New Zealand and Britain. The New Zealand collective identity in the recolonial era (1880–1960) is described by Belich as 'intense, but not nationalist. It was subnationalist, or "dominionist" – a New Zealand identity fitting neatly within a British one'.[37] Nevertheless, he argues that in regard to Federation,

> [i]ncipient nationalism is a more convincing explanation for New Zealand's cold feet. Myths of 'select' settler stock, the absence of convicts, and a climate allegedly conducive to racial improvement meant that 'many New Zealanders felt superior to Australians'.[38]

The resonance of these myths was, according to Belich's own work, observable in New Zealand's response to Australia in an era before national identity could plausibly be identified. He demonstrates that New Zealand attempts to attract British migrants from the mid-nineteenth century relied on '[d]irect denigration of competitors'. The Australian colonies provided stiff competition to New Zealand for prospective settlers not put off by the lengthy ship journey to the farthest reaches of the Empire. Literature emanating from New Zealand focused on Australia's convict heritage, while Australian literature warned prospective migrants about the likelihood of earthquakes striking in New Zealand.[39]

While much of this differentiation can be attributed to commercial imperative, this does not lessen the importance that the 'convict

stain' in particular has on the determination of Australian national identity. Marian Quartly argues that, despite some historians seeking to 'write the convicts out of history and memory . . . the convicts have served as icons carrying particular understandings of the [Australian] national past'.[40] Arnold also illustrates that New Zealand perceptions of Australians as convicts had cultural resonance into the twentieth century. He recounts how Australians were viewed as 'shady neighbours of doubtful origins' during his boyhood in the 1930s.[41] New Zealand's tradition of distinguishing itself from Australia in the pre-nationalist era and Belich's rejection of a nationalist response to Britain makes his assertion of a nationalist response to Australia problematic. Belich illogically attributes an 'incipient nationalism' to late-nineteenth century New Zealand in its response to its colonial 'siblings', but not in its response to its imperial 'parent'. Nationalism provides a similarly unsatisfactory explanation for the demise of the Australasian Olympic team and the Australasian Union.

The Australasian Olympic Team

According to Little and Cashman, athletes from the Australian states and New Zealand who formed Australasian Olympic teams in 1908 and 1912 were not 'selected by a national or Australasian body'. Rather, they were selected by state or Dominion bodies and had their expenses paid by public subscription.[42] Teams from Australasia that were organised and competed internationally prior to this date followed a similar pattern. As the Australasian Union was being formed in Sydney in 1897, plans were hatched for an Australasian team to tour England in 1898.[43] This prospective six-man team was to consist of two athletes each from New South Wales and New Zealand, with a single athlete from both Queensland and Victoria. The tour was projected to cost £900 and each association was tasked with contributing a sum roughly proportional to the number of athletes provided to the team. The NZAAA was thus tasked with finding about £300, a task which contradicts Ryan's argument that New Zealand embraced Australasia as a cost-saving mechanism.[44] The New Zealand athletic community's apathetic response to this tour ultimately saw it scrapped. The original New Zealanders selected for the team declined the offer to tour,[45] while the make-up of the team was criticised at an NZAAA meeting as a 'sop' team.[46] The concept was pilloried by the honorary secretary of the NZAAA, L. W. Harley, who claimed that any success the team gained would accrue to Australia and advised that '[f]ar better would it

be to wait a few years, and send a representative team of their own'.[47] New Zealand in fact took this action in 1902, when George Smith and W. F. Simpson toured England. Smith's win in the 120 yards hurdles at the prestigious English AAA championship was hailed as 'The New Zealand Victory' by the Christchurch *Star* newspaper.[48] The events of 1898 and 1902 were formative in two ways; despite the presence of an Australasian 'team', New Zealand was required to fund its own representation, and New Zealand vigorously expressed its own identity in 1902.

The devolved approach to funding and the importance of subnational identity was replicated in Australian Olympic representation between 1900 and 1906, with the possible exception of the tour of Stanley Rowley to England and Paris in 1900. This tour grew out of the ashes of the 1898 tour, and represented a rare display of cooperation amongst Australian athletes as the Australian colonies prepared to federate. After the efforts of the Sydney athletic community to raise funds for his tour came up short, Rowley appeared at an impromptu meeting at the Melbourne Cricket Ground on his way to Europe. The VAAA alleviated his financial shortfall by collecting funds from amongst the crowd present.[49] Rowley's funds were also supplemented by 'a couple of guineas contributed in a sportsmanlike way by Brisbane sympathisers'.[50] The pan-Australian nature of Rowley's tour was underscored by the fact that he was pictorially represented in the English press as wearing an Australian coat of arms at the English championships of 1900.[51]

The cooperative nature of Rowley's tour represented the brief flourishing of a 'Federation Factor' in Australian sport that quickly dissipated before the 1904 St Louis Olympic Games.[52] Tensions between Victoria and New South Wales developed as Victoria grew impatient with the intricate, but apparently fruitless, negotiations between Coombes and James Sullivan outlined in the previous chapter. Coombes was charged with inaction by Melburnian Hare and Hounds Club member W. Kent Hughes, and the club responded by forming a publicity committee.[53] It was this Victorian effort that ultimately led to hurdler Corrie Gardner representing Australia at the St Louis Games, with club funding supplemented by association recognition.[54] Coombes and Hughes engaged in a public slanging match that pointed to the severe differences between the two sporting communities in Australia's largest cities.[55] Coombes unfairly accused Hughes of ignorance, and pointed to the hitherto secret negotiations between himself and Sullivan as evidence of the Australasian Union's vigour. He also asserted the primacy of the NSWAAA by suggesting that the successful prosecution of negotiations with Sullivan represented 'the chance of the Melburnian H. and H.'

to contribute to a call for subscriptions.[56] Hughes returned fire with a criticism of 'provincial jealousies' emanating from New South Wales, claiming that while Victoria was 'ready and willing to subscribe to send a Sydney athlete to America . . . Sydney people [were] unwilling . . . to subscribe anything'.[57] Gardner's Victorian identity was asserted at the Games themselves as he was provided with a dark blue (a colour synonymous with Victorian sport) guernsey with a gold mitre on the breast.[58]

These trends were also clearly evident in the efforts to send Australian athletes to the 1906 Intercalary Games held in Athens.[59] Just as Gardner's tour was facilitated by his club, the passage of Sydney University's Nigel Barker was aided by a strong local committee of sporting administrators, members of the sporting press and university identities.[60] Tensions between New South Wales and Victoria erupted again after the VAAA went over Coombes' head and enquired about the possibility of Australians receiving a portion of the £200 offered by the Greek government to British athletes to facilitate their presence in Athens.[61] The Greeks responded with an offer of £100 for the exclusive use of Australian athletes, meaning that Victorian long-distance runner George Blake and New South Wales swimmer Cecil Healy were able to travel to Greece.[62] Rather than congratulate his colleagues for their initiative, Coombes patronisingly asserted that New South Wales '[did] not require the money', even if Victoria did. Coombes also raised the possibility of suspending the funds to avoid '[getting] into trouble with English and foreign bodies over the matter of "expenses"'.[63] No such decision was made, of course, but the opportunity to sanctimoniously put Victoria in its place was eagerly taken.

As was the case before 1908, the Australian states and New Zealand funded their own representatives in London and Stockholm. New Zealanders themselves were central to securing the passage of hurdler H. St A. Murray of Christchurch and walker Harry Kerr of Tariki, in the Taranaki region, to London in 1908. Thus the capability of the New Zealand athletic community to fund its competitors was demonstrated from the outset of Australasian representation. While the NZAAA chose not to task itself with raising half of the £200 required to send Murray and Kerr abroad, newspapers such as the Christchurch *Star* and the Wellington *Evening Post* quickly raised £90 between them.[64] The spectrum of New Zealand society appears to have joined in the efforts to send these athletes abroad. The bid to send Kerr to London was supplemented by £16 15s (about 15 per cent of the £110 required to allow him to travel) raised in Kerr's sparsely populated home town of Tariki.[65] This local effort was supported by political elites, as New Zealand Prime

Minister Joseph Ward provided Murray with a letter of introduction and a £5 5s donation that allowed him to travel on 24 April.[66] Kerr followed on 15 May.[67] Despite this success New Zealand was ironically racked by similar tensions to those found in Australia, as a dispute broke out between the Christchurch and Wellington communities over who had contributed more.[68] New Zealand did not send a raft of athletes likely to win scores of events at the London Olympics of 1908, nor indeed to the Stockholm Games of 1912. But neither did Australia, and its relative lack of strength has not given rise to arguments that it needed to be combined with New Zealand in order to overcome its financial and administrative shortcomings.

Despite internecine tensions, New Zealanders expressed pride in their athletes' efforts, with the *Otago Witness* paying tribute to the 'wholehearted manner in which the admirers of the athletes have taken the matter up'.[69] This pride was further expressed in the performances of these athletes as New Zealanders, rather than Australasians. As Kerr was farewelled by his community, local dignitary J. Knowles paid tribute to 'a Tariki boy who had been chosen to represent the Dominion in a championship meeting where all the greatest athletes in the world would be assembled'. Other speakers at the send-off also expressed the hope that Kerr would 'uphold the credit of the Dominion' in London.[70] The athletic press in New Zealand was also keen to express the 'New Zealandness' of these athletes, although 'Amateur' of the *Otago Witness* thought that the Dominion's reputation could be enhanced by a victory in the marathon rather than walking or hurdles events.[71] Interestingly, Coombes had suggested in 1904 that George Smith represented a good hope for Australasian victory given the lack of international competitiveness of his pet hurdles event.[72] In addition to a different approach to the significance of events, New Zealand athletes were clearly identified as New Zealanders despite knowledge that an Australasian team would be formed. While the *Otago Witness* carried an agency report on 24 June 1908 informing New Zealanders that an Australasian team would join other national teams, 'Amateur' throughout July persisted in describing Arthur Rowland (a New Zealander resident in London who joined the team) as a representative of New Zealand.[73] Little and Cashman argue that a movement aimed at ensuring separate representation for New Zealand that developed prior to the Stockholm games reflected 'a very evident strain of an emerging New Zealand national consciousness'.[74] Whether this represented an 'emerging' development is doubtful given the tradition of New Zealand distinctiveness throughout the era of Australasian Olympic representation.

The imperial context provides a more convincing explanation than convenience or an *emerging* New Zealand consciousness for the adoption and ultimate rejection of Australasia at the Olympic Games. While an Imperial Olympic team was ultimately not formed, Coombes remained committed to it until it was rendered impossible by dwindling interest throughout the Empire and by edict of the IOC in 1913.[75] The possibility that such a team could be formed later provided justification for Australasian Olympic representation in 1908 and 1912. The movement towards an official imperial team was bolstered by an unofficial tradition of combining imperial teams into a single collective. Coombes felt that the Australian athletes that travelled to Athens in 1906 were 'correctly' bracketed with Britain and other imperial teams at these games.[76] Their lack of success in Athens makes it impossible to know whether Australian athletes would have happily received a Union Jack at their moment of victory, or whether they would have vigorously protested this display, as Irish athletes did.[77] The imperial units were also unofficially joined in the Parades of Nations held for the first time in the London and Stockholm Opening Ceremonies. In a now traditional spectacle, the visiting teams follow Greece in alphabetical order with the host nation appearing last. At London, however, the Great Britain team was preceded by the Australasian, Canadian and South African teams. The Dominions were also bracketed at Stockholm, although this time the Dominions followed the Great Britain team.[78] Thus, while these teams were nominally individual entities, they also formed a loose confederation. The appearance of what might be termed an informal imperial team was furthered by unofficial medal tallies that included colonial successes amongst British victories.[79]

An imperial ethic further influenced the way that the Australasian team represented itself at these games. The Australasian team marched behind an Australian flag at both these events, although Murray bore the flag in 1908 and New Zealand swimmer Malcolm Champion had this honour in 1912.[80] When the organisers of the Stockholm Games asked for an Australasian flag for decorative and ceremonial purposes, Coombes assured his hosts that an Australian and New Zealand flag would be sent with the team. If a mishap ensued, Coombes added 'that Australasia would be quite satisfied if the Union Jack was hoisted should an Australian or a New Zealander prove successful'.[81] This imperial context reduced the necessity for a distinct New Zealand identity to be ferociously expressed, at least internationally. When a New Zealander bore an Australian flag – replete with Union Jack like the other colonial flags – in this context, it provided a demonstration of British power.

This imperialist representation paid due deference to more local forms of representation. Australasian athletes at Stockholm wore the emblem of their own state or Dominion, meaning that New Zealand athletes were furnished with a silver fern emblem to place on their uniform.[82] As a result, New Zealand felt able to join with Australia, despite being able to send its own athletes and express a sense of pride in its own competitors.

Australia, New Zealand and the other Dominions had an ambiguous basis for unitary representation. Coubertin was famously vexed by the question of how to define 'British' representative teams.[83] The founder of the modern Olympic movement was aided by the British Olympic Association (BOA), who formulated a set of rules about who was entitled to a separate team. They defined a country as

> any 'territory having separate representation on the International Olympic Committee,' or, where no such representation exists, 'any territory under one and the same sovereign jurisdiction'.[84]

Both aspects of this formulation were problematic. The idea of representation on the IOC was anathema to Coubertin, who repeatedly insisted that IOC members were representatives of the Olympic Movement in a particular country rather than a nation's delegate to the IOC. The Dominions also had very little sovereignty of their own, with much of it held by the British Crown. As the noted Australian cultural historian Richard White comments with regard to the Australian Commonwealth:

> [I]t had no power to declare war or peace, it could not make formal treaties with foreign powers and it had no diplomatic status abroad. The Head of State was the British monarch; the Governor-General, her representative, retained wide discretionary powers; Commonwealth law could be invalidated by legislation of the British parliament; the highest court of appeal was the Privy Council in London; the national anthem was England's.[85]

The grounds on which separate Canadian and South African teams could compete are unclear, as neither territory boasted IOC members at the London Games, although Coombes' inheritance of New Zealander Leonard Cuff's place on the IOC entitled Australasia to representation.[86]

Coombes' response to 'the identity question' during debates over the Imperial Olympic Team confirms the centrality of IOC membership to the provision of separate Olympic representation in his estimation. He pointed to the example of South African athletes at Stockholm during

his rejoinder to critics of the scheme. According to Coombes, 'points' won by South Africans were awarded to the United Kingdom by their Swedish hosts due to the fact that no South African to that point sat on the IOC. He argued that their identity had not been submerged as the victorious South African athletes wore 'the springbok on their breasts' and were recognised in the press as South Africans, regardless of the destination of points accrued.[87] Two aspects of Coombes' formulation are interesting. The situation that he ascribed to the South African position within the Empire is remarkably similar to New Zealand's position within Australasia. As demonstrated earlier, New Zealanders wore 'national' insignia and had their achievements recognised as New Zealand achievements in 1908 just as Coombes argued the South Africans had in 1912. The second aspect of interest is the manner in which he defines South Africa as unworthy of separate national representation due to their lack of representation on the IOC. This raises the intriguing counterfactual of how Australia would have been represented had Cuff retained his IOC membership. Would Australian athletes have been subsumed as Britons, New Zealanders or Australasians?

The most illuminating piece of evidence linking Australasian representation to Imperialism and IOC membership derives from Coombes' outline of the expanded Empire Team proposal. After suggesting that the Dominion teams would converge in London to form the Empire team, he stated that 'Australia and New Zealand, unless they desire it otherwise, will send their own teams, there being no occasion to unite as Australasia'.[88] In Coombes' mind, it would not be New Zealand's development into a fully fledged nation that would see it 'liberated' from the Australasian 'yoke'. Australasian Olympic representation would be eradicated by the ultimate realisation of Imperial integration that would render differences between the Dominions obsolete. Membership on the IOC, or lack thereof, on the part of constituent members of this 'family' would be irrelevant in terms of Olympic representation.

The notion that representation on the IOC entitled separate representation in the Games also influenced relations between Australia and New Zealand. The New Zealand press carried reports in 1909 that, in the course of a conversation, Coombes

> had suggested that New Zealand should apply to the Olympic authorities to be made a separate province so that New Zealand could have its own representatives at the Olympic games. It would cost them nothing and would save a lot of time and needless trouble.[89]

Little and Cashman argue that the NZAAA had 'misinterpreted' Coombes, who merely suggested in a letter that a local council should be formed to establish 'a more formal avenue for the selection and funding of New Zealand and state representatives on the Australasian team' and corrected the NZAAA when in New Zealand.[90] However, the newspaper report quoted above indicated that this idea was raised in a conversation rather than a letter, indicating that this issue was brought up in a different forum than the call for state bodies. Furthermore, the actual motion passed at the NZAAA meeting did not refer to athletes at all, but decided '[t]hat steps be taken to have the Dominion [New Zealand] separately represented on the International Council of the Olympic Games (*sic* – the IOC)'.[91] It is significant that the NZAAA resolved to seek separate representation on the IOC first rather than a separate team.

Coombes' imperial ethic was in all likelihood responsible for the suggestion for New Zealand to work towards separate representation. In his history of the BOA, Matthew P. Llewellyn has suggested that this organisation sought to further its influence by seeking to promote acquiescent Dominion representatives to the IOC. Llewellyn argues that English-born imperialists – including Coombes (joined the IOC in 1905), Canada's John Hanbury-Williams (1911) and South Africa's Sidney Farrar (1913) – 'would assist Britain's Olympic officials to carry out their imperial agenda within the broader international Olympic movement'.[92] New Zealand representation as suggested by Coombes would have undoubtedly provided a further representative to this end. The press designation of New Zealand as a potential 'separate province' rather than a 'separate nation' further underlines the imperial context of this suggestion. The demise of the imperial team firmly placed the nation at the centre of sporting representation. Without the cocoon provided by identification with the Empire, the distinctions between New Zealanders and Australians were of greater consequence. The idea of Australasian representation at the Olympic Games was doubly redundant for New Zealand, replete with an IOC member after 1919, by the time of the Antwerp Games of 1920.[93] New Zealand was thus recognised as a separate nation by the international athletic community from this point. New Zealanders had been aware of their separateness from Australia from the outset.

Nationalism and the Australasian Union

As one of the senior associations, the NZAAA was in a position of strength at the time of the Australasian Union's founding. This situation was replicated more generally, as New Zealand ranked a close third

to Victoria and New South Wales in terms of population and economic production before 1901.[94] Despite this position, New Zealand soon adopted a subordinate position politically and economically compared to Australia.[95] The athletic world was different, and New Zealand maintained its position of pre-eminence within the Union. The NZAAA hosted more Australasian championship carnivals and won more overall championships than any other member association.[96] Chapter 2 demonstrated the key role that it played in the organisation of Arthur Duffey and Alfred Shrubb's 1905 tour to Australasia. Charles Little has suggested that pragmatism can explain the adoption of the Union by New Zealand, and notes that the Union's longevity could be attributed to its refusal 'to usurp the rights normally associated with national bodies'.[97] This section will build on this understanding by suggesting that factors such as the shift from a Tasman community to an Australasian community can explain the demise of the Union.

The NZAAA's position of strength within the Australasian Union found expression in a keen sense of nationalism early in the twentieth century. But nationalism did not provide the dynamic that tore the Union apart. The impact of nationalism within the Union was strongest during the NZAAA presidency of the appropriately named Walter G. Atack, which was established in November 1905.[98] The leading advocate for New Zealand athletic independence was 'Sprinter' of the *Canterbury Times* newspaper, of which Atack was the editor. While 'Sprinter' commented that the Union was an 'anchor' preventing the growth of the sport in 1903, his nationalist antagonism was most specifically directed towards Australia's influence on the way amateurism was defined in New Zealand.[99]

'Sprinter's' campaign against Australia was invigorated following the controversial issue of reinstatement outlined in Chapter 3. In 1906, he asserted that 'the wedge of separation' was being driven into the Union and prophesied that the next Board of Control meeting would see the NZAAA secede. 'Sprinter' aligned New Zealand's athletic aspirations with its political ones, which 'show[ed] a tendency to run in a groove of their own untrammelled by hoary-headed usage and custom . . . '[100] Coombes was able to head off this movement during a visit to Christchurch, where he 'clear[ed] up points which had previously been somewhat obscure'.[101] He was less adroit in his handling of a 1907 New Zealand proposal to change the reinstatement laws to allow a more liberal interpretation (see Chapter 2). The vote was effectively split on geographic lines, with the smaller associations of Victoria, Tasmania and New Zealand voting for the affirmative and outnumbering the larger associations of New South Wales and Queensland. Technically, the matter was undecided

as the effectively moribund associations of South Australia and Western Australia had not responded. Coombes cynically took advantage of this situation to claim that 'there is not a majority of the affiliated associations in favour of the proposal'.[102] This response was grudgingly accepted by some New Zealanders, such as 'Vaulter' of the *New Zealand Referee*, but 'Sprinter' was less impressed.[103] He described the situation as 'scandalous' and suggested that 'the welfare of the sport in its own country' would be bolstered if 'New Zealand asserts its independence and cuts the painter that is dragging it at the heels of half-dead and alive Associations in Australia'.[104]

The reinstatement issue was part of a wider debate about the nature of amateurism current in New Zealand athletics. Atack raised the ire of key amateur figures in New Zealand by suggesting a reciprocal agreement with the recently formed professional organisation, the New Zealand Athletic Union (NZAU).[105] This overt collusion with the professional code was too much for the Otago, the Wellington and the newly formed Southland Centres of the NZAAA who opposed the agreement, while support was found in Canterbury and Auckland. The scheme was eventually defeated after a rancorous debate lasting for over a year. 'Sprinter', a supporter of the agreement, commented that 'the Wellington, Otago and Southland Centres must accept all responsibility for having provoked the [hostilities]'.[106]

While it is tempting to suggest that the split represented a conservative counterrevolution in response to an increasingly liberal conception of amateurism, both sides of the debate contained progressive elements as well as conservative ones. Atack was a committed trade unionist, and was a key member of organisations such as the New Zealand Institute of Journalists (NZIJ) and the Canterbury Journalists' Union (CJU). As president of the NZIJ in 1894, Atack put forward a motion in support of J. S. Guthrie, editor of the Christchurch *Press*, who had refused to disclose the identity of a source in the Supreme Court.[107] As a member of the CJU, founded in 1901, Atack railed against the low salaries paid to journalists and the lack of support afforded to journalists by the institute on this matter.[108] The CJU eventually folded due to pressure from newspaper proprietors who made it clear that members would face dismissal and it was replaced by a more moderate body, the New Zealand Journalists' Association.[109] The other side was represented by Arthur Paape of the Southland Centre, who unsuccessfully stood for election as a candidate of the Independent Political Labour League of New Zealand for the seat of Invercargill at the 1908 New Zealand General Election.[110] The demands of the League were as

radical as those of their counterparts in the Australian Labor Party, and included the foundation of a state bank, the 'Nationalisation of the Land and Means of Production' as well as a White New Zealand.[111] Paape played an integral role in causing the athletic split through his work in forming the Southland Centre, and was eulogised before the split as 'a man whose heart is in his work'.[112] Paape showed his social democratic conscience in suggesting that 'Mr. Atack would make a very good Tsar' in response to that figure's conduct.[113] While these figures found themselves on differing sides of the debate, they shared a commitment to the administration of amateur athletics as well as common progressive political principles. Their influence on amateur athletics disrupts the notion that its administrators were all middle-class conservatives.

Atack's inability to see his pet project come to fruition saw him agitate for constitutional reform aimed at developing a more centralised structure for the NZAAA.[114] This movement was opposed by the Wellington Centre, and seven of its number nominated for election in October 1908. The NZAAA was based in Christchurch at this time, and Atack astutely saw these nominations as 'merely a preliminary to the removal of the headquarters to the Empire City [Wellington]'.[115] The returning officer of the NZAAA ruled these nominations invalid. He ruled that while no laws prevented the nominations from being received, the custom that council members were required to reside in the same city as the association's headquarters (Christchurch) should be observed. This decision drew strong criticism in Wellington and provoked the Otago Centre to pass a motion in favour of moving the headquarters of the association to Wellington at its 1908 annual meeting.[116]

To the dissident forces within the NZAAA, Australia represented an opportunity to mitigate what they saw as the excesses of the regime rather than a threat to its independence. The refusal of the NZAAA to forward the Wellington Centre's complaints to the Union executive for arbitration was particularly controversial. This refusal culminated in a fiery meeting of the Wellington Centre that ended with the decision to push for the establishment of a rival council in that city.[117] The leadership of the NZAAA clearly framed the issue as a nationalist crusade, with Atack justifying the decision not to forward the complaint as

> for years the Council had been fighting against the endeavour of Australia to control New Zealand and the precedent would be immediately availed of if the Council sent on the appeal.[118]

The dissidents responded to the situation by ingratiating themselves with Australia not through weakness, but through political self-interest. The Wellington Council and its supporters harnessed its indignation towards creating a new NZAAA council, which was consummated at a meeting of the Wellington, Otago and Southland Centres held in Christchurch on 5 December 1908.[119]

A compromise between the warring councils was reached at a meeting held in Dunedin on 20 March 1909, with both councils resigning and the Otago Centre empowered to hold fresh elections.[120] The Wellington faction won these elections, but the Christchurch council only slowly handed over power, with Atack asking for a letter of indemnity.[121] The replacement of the Christchurch council thus laid a path towards less antagonistic relations between Australia and New Zealand. Colin Howell and Daryl Leeworthy have recently applied the insights of borderlands scholars to sport in South Wales and Cape Breton in Canada. They view borders and frontiers 'as conduits for remarkable cultural and social exchange' and note the similarity between borderlands and the Atlantic Ocean. These scholars take their cues from historians who view this body of water 'as a highway of cultural transmission rather than a barrier to understanding' in the same way that Belich views the Tasman Sea as 'more bridge than barrier'.[122] Their research into these communities suggests that South Wales' relationship with the English city of Bristol and Cape Breton's relationship with the American metropolis of Boston was 'more culturally enriching than it was dominating'. Cape Bretoners actually felt more dominated by the Canadian cities of Toronto and Montreal than by Boston.[123] This situation perfectly mirrors the Wellington response to the competing influences of Canterbury and Australia.

Nationalism was not extinguished by this development, but it was much more muted from this point and did not provide the dynamic towards secession. In addition to the complaints made by Amos referred to at the beginning of the chapter, the NZAAA sought special dispensation on reinstatement from the International Amateur Athletic Federation (IAAF). The council passed a motion to this effect in June 1925, which also commented on the 'unsatisfactory nature of present representation [by Australians] on [the] International Federation' and a 'lack of understanding of conditions prevailing in [New Zealand]'.[124] Rather than threaten secession, it 'decided to forward case stated to A A Union requesting that [claim for special dispensation] be put before the [IAAF]'.[125] The New Zealand response in this instance has much in common with Richard Coombes' strong criticism of English administrators outlined in Chapter 4. In spite of offering heavy criticism, both the

peripheral Coombes in 1911 and the peripheral NZAAA in 1925 ultimately sought to maintain close links with the centre – Britain in Coombes' case and the Union in New Zealand's case.

These disputes were minor compared to the tensions within the Union between New South Wales and Victoria. The 1920s was a time of outright conflict between the NSWAAA and the VAAA. Mandle remarks that Coombes 'was never forgiven by the Victorians' for the disqualification of walkers Radich and Wilson at the 1922 Australasian Championships, and points out that the VAAA challenged Coombes' presidency in 1924 and 1926.[126] The VAAA also passed a motion criticising his capability as a walking judge in 1922 and threatened a boycott of the 1924 Australasian championship meeting if the Tasmanian Amateur Athletic Association (TAAA) appointed Coombes referee.[127] The TAAA refused to be intimidated and duly appointed Coombes to the position, and were accused by 'Harrier' in Melbourne of doing Coombes 'the greatest disservice' and 'set[ting] the athletic world in turmoil'.[128] The VAAA eventually sent a team to the championships, although it prevented its members from officiating while Coombes was present.

The other member associations joined to condemn the VAAA's actions. The 1924 Board of Control passed a motion that expressed regret at the VAAA's actions and called the action 'derogatory and against the interests of amateur athletics'. The only sign of dissension was the abstention of Victorian delegates Abbott and Langford.[129] The show of confidence implied in the NZAAA's support of the motion was made explicit when it appointed Coombes as a walking judge for the New Zealand championships in 1926.[130] It continued to express respect for Coombes before and after its secession from the Australasian Union. Harry Gordon has noted that a letter from New Zealand athletic official Joseph Heenan attributed the continuing existence of the Union to Coombes' influence and stated that 'New Zealand's withdrawal will be automatic' if his tenure as president ended.[131] The respect and affection shown to Coombes and the manner with which the NZAAA sided with the executive eloquently assert that factors other than a nationalist uprising caused New Zealand's secession from the Union. The letter also offered a warning that the relationship needed to continue to evolve if it were to survive – a warning that was not heeded.[132]

The dissolution of the Australasian Union

Much like the case of the Australasian Olympic team, reasons other than nationalism can explain the demise of the Australasian Union. Foremost amongst these is its shift from a Pacific (or Tasman) Community to

one that embraced Australia and New Zealand in their entirety (that is, Australasia). At its foundation, the Union represented a strictly Pacific community. It was founded amidst the Federation process that saw the colonies of Australia unite as a Commonwealth. As Hughes notes, during the official Federation celebrations the *Sydney Morning Herald* recognised that through the formation of the Union 'the federation of athleticism was accomplished'.[133] However, the Union at this point bore little resemblance to the Commonwealth, with only the colonies on the Eastern Seaboard of the Australian mainland represented. An Amateur Athletic Association from Tasmania was formed in 1902, with those from South Australia and Western Australia forming in 1905.[134] These associations held a precarious position within the Union in their early days. The TAAA was unable to provide delegates to the 1904 Board of Control meeting and its delegates were late to the 1905 meeting.[135] This organisation only became established within the Union after it hosted the 1908 Australasian championship meeting. Tasmania's place within the Union did not cause New Zealand significant problems due to its geographical proximity and the maintenance of a Tasman community. Nineteenth-century descriptions of the region often referred to '"Australia, New Zealand and Tasmania", implying a great archipelago in which New Zealand was no more separate than Tasmania'.[136]

Despite the first Australian amateur athletic club being founded in Adelaide, the South Australian Amateur Athletic Association (SAAAA) was less successful in establishing itself within the Australasian Union before the First World War.[137] Despite its foundation in 1905, the organisation was unable to attend the 1908 Championship meeting and Board of Control meeting held at Hobart.[138] This situation was repeated in 1909, whereupon the VAAA was tasked with providing assistance to its counterpart in Adelaide.[139] Any assistance provided proved to no avail, as the association was also absent in 1911.[140] The Union provided some respite however, as fines levied for non-attendance in both years were waived. The West Australian Amateur Athletic Association (WAAAA) was even less stable. When Coombes' correspondence with the association was marked 'dead' in 1907, he quipped that 'whether this means that the secretary is dead or the association, I cannot say'.[141] The moribundity of the association was confirmed at the 1908 Board of Control meeting. A letter from P. Byrne of Kalgoorlie informed the gathering that the WAAAA was defunct and requested that he be allowed to compete at the concurrent Australasian championships. The WAAAA was officially declared defunct later during the same meeting.[142] A second WAAAA was recognised in 1914, but did not survive the war.[143] Western

Australia did not become a permanent fixture of the Union until after New Zealand had left the organisation in 1927.[144]

The inability of associations from outside Australia's Tasman shore to establish themselves within the Union before the First World War meant that the Tasman community held firm. However, the establishment of the SAAAA within the Union after 1920 severely weakened New Zealand's links to the community. These developments reflected Australian cultural trends in the pre-Federation era that facilitated Australian nationalism. Denoon argues that the idea of Australasia and the wider Pacific community lost influence in Australia as 'Australian popular culture had turned away from the ocean'. Radical nationalist poetry and art in the 1890s took their inspiration from 'the real Australia and real Australians west of the dividing range' that separated cities such as Sydney from the bush.[145] This art also separated Australia from New Zealand. Denoon et al. argue that while this Pacific community lost favour in Australia, it remained an important and controversial aspect in New Zealand after Federation. New Zealand's politicians were inspired by 'a vision of an island empire [including Fiji, Samoa and Tonga] to balance the continental federation of Australia'.[146]

The SAAAA's integration within the Australasian Union after the war had an almost immediate impact on the NZAAA's place within the organisation. Ever since the first Australasian championship was held in Melbourne, these meetings were held in the capital cities of newly integrated territories in order to boost the popularity of the sport. The NZAAA made the other member associations aware of their difficulties during the 1921 Board of Control meeting held in the South Australian capital, Adelaide, claiming that it was finding difficulties sending the team 'under present conditions'.[147] However, rather than seceding from the Union at this point, the NZAAA suggested reforming the relationship by instituting a biennial athletic test match between Australia and New Zealand in place of the Australasian championships. Such a step would recognise the fact that the relationship had shifted towards a truly Australasian one in that almost all Australian states were now covered by the Union. New Zealand hosted an international match against a touring South African combination that summer, a match that was considered by some to be a continuation of the recent drawn rugby series between the two countries.[148] The introduction of such a match between Australia and New Zealand would have offered an elegant solution to the changing nature of the relationship. The nationalist impulse would have been recognised by the test match format, but the mutually beneficial Australasian relationship would have been maintained. A new

phase in the relationship would have been created, just as it had when the Union was formed after the Australasian Championship Agreement proved unsuitable in the face of an increasingly complex Australasian athletic relationship.

The response of the Australian associations ranged from antagonism to lukewarm support. A subcommittee appointed at the Adelaide meeting reported that the scheme would merely pass the cost borne by New Zealand onto the Australian states, and was unconvinced that New Zealand would save much given the cost of sending a larger team to Australia every four years.[149] Coombes expressed some sympathy for the movement, although the VAAA was antagonistic towards the proposal due to the cost it would impose on them.[150] This was ironic, as Victorians had earlier criticised the conservative attitude of the English AAA, who had refused to support tours to Australasia prior to the Great War (as outlined in Chapter 2).

New Zealand's response to the changing environment reflected the innovative approach it employed in attracting potentially lucrative tours to Australasia throughout the life of the Union. The NZAAA constructed a truly Pacific community by reaching out to figures in the United States and organising tours of American athletes in 1914, 1923 and 1926. These tours of course supplemented the NZAAA's successful prosecution of negotiations that brought Shrubb and Duffey to Australasia in 1905. Other Australian sports, such as the rugby codes, had identified San Francisco as a viable and important site of potential expansion in the early twentieth century.[151] Where these organisations failed, the NZAAA succeeded. They were undoubtedly bolstered by the presence of Australians and New Zealanders in California. New Zealand-born Bill Naughton provided *The Referee* with an 'American Letter' for 25 years until his death in March 1914. According to Naughton's *Referee* obituary, his formative years spent in New Zealand gave him an 'apt knowledge of the sporting world in Australasia'.[152] He was joined in San Francisco by Queenslander William Unmack, who would later gain notoriety for organising the ill-fated tour of America undertaken by Australian female swimmers Sarah 'Fanny' Durack and Wilhemina 'Mina' Wylie in 1919.[153] Unmack had competed in Queensland as a walker, and his transactions with the NZAAA prompted Coombes to remember his achievements.[154]

Unmack had suggested a tour of Australasia by an American team to Coombes in 1912, but these plans stalled.[155] Planning tours to Australasia was a difficult proposition, and a proposed tour by South

African athletes organised by the Union for 1909 had also failed.[156] However, the NZAAA took charge and was able to facilitate a tour in early 1914 that was undertaken by four athletes, R. W. Templeton, G. L. Parker, E. R. Caughey and J. A. Power, who were supported by Manager Eustace Peixotto. As an indication of this team's strength, six Australasian records were set by the Americans during their stay.[157] The NZAAA reacted to news of the tour's original failure by reopening negotiations with the Union's American counterpart. While the NZAAA explained its actions to Coombes, any deference to the president was misplaced, as he asked the NZAAA to take the matter in hand themselves.[158] Coombes' response to New Zealand's efforts was replicated in America, as the leadership of the American Union delegated responsibility for the tour to Unmack.[159]

The dynamism of the NZAAA compared favourably with the lethargy of their counterparts in Australia. Its June 1913 meeting resolved 'that unless more enthusiasm was shown [by the Australian bodies] the tour should be called off', a threat that sparked New South Wales and Victoria into action.[160] New Zealand's role in cajoling the diffident Australian bodies into action provides evidence of their status as the administrative powerhouse in the region. American team member Ruric Templeton described the council as the 'most energetic body of men he had yet seen get together in the interests of amateur Athletics or amateur sport of any kind'.[161] The NZAAA's administrative ability saw it raise half of the £480 that the tour was projected to cost and thus earned the right to host half of the team's engagements.[162] A dispute developed between the VAAA, who had chosen 24 and 26 January 1914 to host the Australasian championships, and the NZAAA, who chose 17 January as the Americans' last commitment in New Zealand.[163] Such an arrangement would have meant that the Americans would miss the championships. New Zealand's suggestion to move the event drew a blistering and perhaps unfair response from Victoria. Disregarding the effort the NZAAA had expended in reinvigorating and organising the tour, Basil Parkinson accused New Zealand of 'neglect' and threatened to pull out of the tour.[164] A compromise was found whereby the New Zealand commitments were split and the Americans were able to compete in Australia before completing their tour in New Zealand.[165] The NZAAA's willingness to compromise is indicative of a less combative approach than that evident during the reign of the Christchurch council.

The efforts of Ira Emery, the General Secretary of the Olympic Games South African Executive Council, saw Australasia graced by a tour of

South African athletes and cyclists in 1921–22.[166] The innovative capabilities of the NZAAA were again on show in 1923 as they were able to organise a profitable tour of American athletes even after the executive of the Union found the proposal 'not entirely favourable'.[167] This tour was in fact restricted to parts of the North Island of New Zealand, as Auckland, the Centres on the South Island and the Australian associations did not participate.[168] The tour was able to turn a profit in excess of £200, although individuals within the NZAAA were beginning to question the organisation's reliance on spectacular events. A Wellington delegate to the 1923 NZAAA Annual General Meeting, A. B. Sievwright, 'deprecated too much optimism financially' and noted that apart from the proceeds from this tour the NZAAA had run at a loss for the previous year.[169] Rather than a weak body seeking administrative support from Australia, the NZAAA was clearly a dynamic organisation. Australia was able to take advantage of their dynamism, as Sydney sprinter Edwin 'Slip' Carr was invited to New Zealand to test himself against touring American sprinter Morris Kirksey.[170] An ankle injury did not prevent Carr from enhancing his reputation, although a clearer guide of his future prospects may have been gained if Olympic champion Charles Paddock had toured as originally envisioned.[171]

This tradition of organising spectacular and potentially lucrative events clearly influenced the NZAAA's response to the changing environment. New Zealand continued to advocate the test match option for most of the 1920s despite the early rebuff. Continuing Australian reticence towards the proposal was identified as a threat to the relationship by Coombes in 1924, with the 'writing . . . on the wall' in terms of New Zealand's membership of the Union.[172] This diagnosis was premature and New Zealand continued to press for a biennial test match against Australia rather than secede. It put a more complete motion to the Hobart conference of 1924, suggesting a limited meeting of 'nine or ten events as may be mutually agreed upon, and that the cost of transport be borne by the visiting teams'. The matter was only decided in the negative following some bizarre voting patterns. The two New Zealand and Tasmanian delegates voted in favour, while the two New South Wales and Queensland delegates voted against despite Coombes' sympathy for the movement. The Victorian vote was split and the South Australians declined to vote, meaning that the matter was tied. Coombes had a second opportunity to see the matter resolved in the affirmative, but he refused to use his deciding vote as Chairman and simply declared 'the motion "not carried" on account of the tied vote'.[173]

Despite the continuing antipathy of the Australian bodies, Coombes' fears of secession did not immediately come to fruition. While the NZAAA's advocacy of the proposal at Board of Control meetings ceased, they continued a more subtle game of persuasion behind the scenes. Heenan's letter to Coombes in 1926 referred to by Gordon constitutes an example of this type of contact. Heenan suggested that once New Zealand left the Union following the next year's Australasian championship, an 'Australian A.A.A.' could be set up to host annual Australian championships. The Union would be changed to 'an [Amateur Athletic] Federation of Australia and [New Zealand] charged particularly with the care of the Amateur Statutes, Australasian Records, and the biennial contests'. Heenan interestingly diagnosed the Union as 'a survival of past pre-Commonwealth days' and expressed surprise that no specifically Australian organisation or championships had been set up in the intervening period.[174] Even if Heenan was unsure of the particulars, he clearly identified that things had changed since the founding of the Union as a Tasman community.

Heenan would later become a key figure in the efforts of New Zealand's first Labour government to '[encourage] greater participation in sport and physical recreation'.[175] The politically savvy tone of this letter is completely different from the way that the Canterbury council approached conflict with Coombes. Heenan appealed to Coombes' sense of importance rather than forcing him on to the defensive. He suggested that if Coombes were to leave the organisation 'New Zealand's withdrawal will be automatic and I doubt if then we could be drawn ever into a Federation'.[176] While Gordon uses this as an indication of the esteem with which Coombes was regarded in New Zealand, it is possible that Heenan was engaging in some gentle flattery. The sentiments that Heenan expressed to Coombes were not evident in the actions of the NZAAA following the secession. It chose E. S. Marks rather than Coombes as its agent in Australia, perhaps due to the latter's failing health.[177]

The NZAAA followed the plan of action outlined by Heenan and seceded from the Australasian Union at the next meeting, fittingly held in Wellington in December 1927. A motion was passed at this meeting to the effect that the NZAAA would withdraw and join the IAAF as a separate member.[178] It was represented by its recently elected president and secretary, R. W. McVilly and L. A. Tracy respectively. These men were appointed to the council of the NZAAA at its Annual General Meeting of 1925 after something of a coup against the incumbent council. Tracy took the role of secretary from the improbably named

Victor Hugo after a rare failure in organising an overseas tour in September 1925.[179] However, a committee formed by the Wellington Centre of the NZAAA drew up plans to reinvigorate the faltering scheme.[180] This committee was successful, and members of it, including McVilly and Tracy, were elected to key posts at the Annual Meeting of the NZAAA in November 1925.[181] Tracy had no prior experience with the NZAAA council, although McVilly had been part of the movement to wrest control from Canterbury in 1908.[182] The actions of the old council were heavily criticised in the Wellington press, with their 'bungling' compared to the energy of the Wellington committee, who were able to not only organise the tour but realise a profit of £1255 14s. 2d.[183] This success was not always well-received within the association itself, though, with Otago delegate F. W. Wilton accusing the council of 'acting like a body of showmen' after yet more tour plans were hatched.[184] Wilton's critique reflected the tension between amateur athletics as 'sport for sports sake' and amateur athletics as an institution that needed to compete for public attention for legitimacy. The body elected in November 1925 clearly emphasised the latter, which can explain why Australia's refusal to countenance the test match idea came to a head at this point.

McVilly and Tracy argued for the right of the NZAAA to 'control her own destinies' in very different terms at the fateful Wellington Conference. While McVilly expressed opinions similar to those Heenan expressed to Coombes, Tracy incorrectly identified Australia as New Zealand's athletic 'father' and claimed that New Zealand had now achieved 'majority'.[185] Anthony Hughes has justifiably described Tracy's designation of Australia as New Zealand's father as 'intriguing' and suggested that a fraternal comparison would more fittingly describe the relationship.[186] While Hughes diagnoses confusion on the part of New Zealand in its response to Australia, Tracy's inexperience may better explain the differences of opinion among the New Zealand delegates. Tracy was of a later generation than McVilly, and had competed in the 220 yards event and the relay event during the 1922 test match against South Africa.[187] Thus Tracy's ignorance about New Zealand's impressive athletic history could be attributed to his relative inexperience in athletic administration.

Despite leaving the Australasian Union, the NZAAA continued to suggest the biennial test match scheme to their Australian counterparts. A sub-committee 'to bring down proposals in connection with biennial meetings with Australia' was appointed at the 1928 NZAAA Annual General Meeting, a year after secession.[188] The sub-committee's positive

report led the NZAAA to communicate with the Amateur Athletic Union of Australia, but also to refuse a request from that body to return the Australasian Championship Shield. The NZAAA believed that the shield, won by New Zealand in Wellington in 1927, could be used as a trophy for the biennial test match.[189] The Australian body again declined to take up the New Zealand proposal.[190] The scheme was revived in 1931 within a month of the first Bledisloe Cup rugby match played between New Zealand and Australia in Auckland. Harold Austad of the NZAAA council was of the opinion that the improved financial position of the Amateur Athletic Union of Australia meant that the scheme 'would receive favourable consideration'.[191] After years of poverty, the newly named Australian body recorded a credit balance of £81 14s 3d in 1932 as a result of the success of the 1930 Australian championships in Melbourne.[192] The success of this meeting was due in significant part to the presence of German athlete Dr Otto Peltzer and American athlete Leo Lermond, which aroused great enthusiasm on the part of Melburnians.[193]

The familiar pattern of New Zealand enthusiasm and Australian reticence was played out yet again in 1931. The matter was considered at the Amateur Athletic Union of Australia Board of Control meeting, but the NZAAA's request for the matter to be addressed through a speedier mail vote was rejected.[194] The Board of Control reaffirmed its view that the scheme was not 'practicable' and suggested that it and the NZAAA 'decide upon themselves' as to whether tours were to be organised.[195] This decision essentially asks the Australian and New Zealand bodies to treat the other as it would any other international body. This clearly indicates that the Australian body had effectively internationalised its New Zealand counterpart. The NZAAA's continuing commitment to this scheme in the face of Australia's lack of interest is far removed from an expression of separatist nationalism. While the NZAAA saw limited utility in the Australasian Union after the demise of the Tasman community, it nevertheless sought to continue the mutually beneficial relationship between the two countries. However, it is clear that the patience of New Zealand was well and truly exhausted after this refusal. When the New Zealand Olympic Association (NZOA) considered the proposal to constitute regular meetings with Australia in 1935, former proponent of the scheme Austad suggested that the NZOA would be 'doing little more than beat[ing] the air if this [resolution] is passed'.[196] Thus the flame of the Australasian athletic relationship was extinguished.

Conclusion

The demise of the Australasian athletic relationship had both vertical and horizontal causes. In neither the case of Australasian Olympic representation nor the Amateur Athletic Union of Australasia (AAUA or Australasian Union) does rising New Zealand nationalism provide a sufficient explanation for the demise. The adoption of Australasian representation at the Olympic Games has traditionally been seen as a pragmatic solution to administrative difficulties and its rejection is seen as resulting from an emergent New Zealand nationalism. However, the Australasian form of representation provided New Zealand with no administrative advantages. New Zealand clearly expressed a sense of distinctiveness *throughout* the period of joint Australasian representation, and New Zealand nationalism was in no sense rising as separate representation was adopted. The demise of the joint Australasian Olympic team can be attributed to a changing environment whereby identification with Empire by Dominion athletes was marginalised by national identification. The Australasian team gained the appearance of an unofficial Imperial Olympic team through the way it represented itself and via external factors such as the way that Dominion teams were linked to Great Britain teams at the 1908 and 1912 Opening Ceremony Parades of Nations and in unofficial medal tallies. New Zealand was also invited to participate in a conspiracy that would see the British Empire represented on the International Olympic Committee (IOC) to the fullest extent possible. The communities of the Empire eventually declined to come together in an official team, and national representation became predominant. In this context New Zealand rejected Australasian representation with little fanfare or sorrow.

Nationalism was an ever-present aspect of the discourse that surrounded the Australasian Union. Nationalist feelings between New Zealand and Australia were at their highest twenty years prior to the New Zealand Amateur Athletic Association's (NZAAA) ultimate decision to secede. The ultimate dissolution of the Australasian Union was due to the organisation's inability to reform itself to better reflect New Zealand's strength. This strength had led to the development of a Pacific community stretching to California. This community was undermined as the Union came to more closely resemble the Australian continent. The NZAAA responded to this threat by seeing an opportunity to reform the Union through the establishment of a biennial test match between Australia and New Zealand. The refusal of the Australian bodies to consider this proposal put a stop to the evolutionary process

of the Australasian amateur relationship, of which the founding of the Union itself was a part. The election of a particularly entrepreneurial NZAAA council saw New Zealand run out of patience. The decision to secede marked the end of a transnational community that spanned thirty years and embraced the British World and beyond. This study will finish with concluding remarks about what this relationship has to tell us about sport and culture in general.

Conclusion

This study has demonstrated that the concept of amateurism interacted with a pan-British worldview throughout the existence of the Amateur Athletic Union of Australasia (AAUA or Australasian Union). Amateurism was an example of early twentieth-century Australasian sport's British inheritance. This inheritance was not a simple matter of Australasian athletes and administrators aping dominant British conceptions. Australasians developed a localised understanding of amateurism that varied from the British example in important ways. The origins of this conception of amateurism can be traced to the early life of Richard Coombes, an English immigrant who became the president of the Australasian Union upon its foundation in 1899, retaining this title until his death in 1935. While he has previously been presented as the embodiment of elite English amateurism, this study has showed him to have had more humble origins.[1] His local school – Hampton Grammar in south west London – provided a very basic level of instruction at the time that Coombes commenced his education. While the standard of the school improved throughout his attendance, it did not reach the standard of an elite Public School. Sport was developing at Hampton Grammar rather than an established part of the curriculum during his school career.

Coombes helped to organise a series of events aimed at attracting the attention of the sporting public as president of the New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association (NSWAAA). Taking a lead from other avowedly amateur sporting organisations – such as the New South Wales Cricket Association (NSWCA) and the Metropolitan Rugby Union (MRU) – he twice instituted a system of district competition, in 1900 and 1921.[2] The (albeit short) existence of these competitions and the pioneering role played by amateur sporting bodies demonstrates a greater

acceptance of spectacle amongst amateurs than has been previously recognised. This realisation is underscored by the institution of competitions such as the Dunn Shield in 1910 and a league structure for clubs in the mid-1920s. These competitions provided a streamlined competition structure for club contests. Their success was judged partly by an improved standard of competition and partly by increased crowds. Intercolonial competition underwent a similar streamlining process after the foundation of the Australasian Union.

Coombes' interest in the spectacular was also manifest across the Tasman Sea. The New Zealand Amateur Athletic Association (NZAAA) was instrumental in securing the services of American sprinter Arthur Duffey and British distance runner Alfred Shrubb to tour Australasia in 1905. This tour revealed massive inconsistencies between the image of purity that surrounded amateur sport and the reality of its administration. These athletes negotiated 'expenses' for themselves that went beyond what was acceptable under amateur statutes. Duffey's presence in the touring party was insisted upon by the NSWAAA despite a dubious reputation. Both these issues point to pragmatism rather than idealism in organising this potentially lucrative tour. Both athletes were permanently suspended as amateurs for other offences upon their return to the northern hemisphere. While tours made by athletes have been seen as vital to the development of professional athletics, this study has extended this analysis to amateur sport.[3] An investigation of these tours shifts the focus from international events – such as the Olympic Games – to domestic events in order to explain the significance of sport to Australasian sporting culture. Following the insights provided by Camilla Obel, this research shows that amateur bodies employed similar techniques to their professional counterparts in order to popularise their sport.[4] This was true not just of major sports such as rugby, but also sports like athletics that did not ultimately succeed in their aims.

Another aspect of Coombes' policy of popularising athletics was the adoption of a more liberal conception of amateur than was evident in Britain or North America. The attempted inclusion of Indigenous Australasians and footballers who played alongside professionals demonstrates this point. Coombes attempted to differentiate the NSWAAA from its Queensland counterparts by insisting that aboriginal Australians were welcome to compete under his association's rules. This was in response to a Queensland Amateur Athletic Association (QAAA) decision to prevent a Murri – Tommy Pablo – from competing in Queensland.[5] Coombes' superficially liberal approach did not extend

to an insistence that the QAAA adopt this standard, however, and the matter of Indigenous participation was left to 'domestic legislation'. This decision had the effect of allowing the overtly racist decision of the QAAA to stand. Coombes made a number of public pronouncements encouraging athletics bodies to seek out talented Indigenous athletes in order to boost the standing of Australasia at the Olympic Games. These appeals were made after the success of Native Americans and First Nations Canadians at the Olympic Games of 1908 and 1912. The infusion of stereotypes based on racial hierarchies into these appeals led to their rejection by Indigenous Australasians and doomed them to failure.

The Australasian Union adopted a 'games clause' as part of its amateur statutes and also reinstated former professionals. The games clause allowed athletes who had played with or against professionals in games to continue to compete as amateur athletes. This was a measure aimed at extending the amateur community, rather than limiting it as was the case in Britain and North America. The institution of professional rugby league in 1908 saw athletics bodies come under pressure to strengthen their pro-amateur stance from bodies such as the New South Wales Rugby Union (NSWRU) and the New South Wales Amateur Swimming Association (NSWASA). The NSWAAA faced strong criticism from within its own community when it attempted to fall into line with such bodies. The cases of two athletes linked to rugby league – H. R. 'Horrie' Miller and Sydney Hubert Sparrow – divided the amateur athletic community of New South Wales. This community was essentially split down the middle between supporters of the two athletes and amateur purists. Coombes and the leadership of the NSWAAA saw it as expedient to fall in line with the rugby union and swimming bodies. Other members of the amateur athletic community – including Jack Dunn, the donor of the Dunn Shield – opposed the influence of these bodies. The NSWRU in particular was accused of hypocrisy as they had previously allowed sportsmen such as Reg 'Snowy' Baker to compete as amateurs despite their dalliances with professional sport. This body was seen as carrying out a vendetta against a competitor rather than being a protector of amateurism. The development of a strong opposition movement paid testament to the success of a policy aimed at extending the amateur franchise but caused Coombes some difficulties within the amateur community. The controversies meant that he lost control over Olympic affairs in New South Wales and played a hands-off role within the NSWAAA in the 1920s. This research further blurs the distinction between amateur and professional sport in the same manner that Stuart Ripley has done in regards to rowing. His lament that the

polarisation of amateur and professional rowing 'has given way to conformity, even to the point of becoming a truism' is just as applicable to athletics.[6]

The acceptance of spectacle and a particularly liberal approach to amateurism materially affected the relationship between Australasian bodies and the English Amateur Athletic Association (AAA). The NZAAA perceived a lack of interest on the part of their English counterparts during the negotiations to bring Shrubb and Duffey to Australasia. This reflected a wider fear within Australasian athletics that English administrators did not accept Australasians as full members of a worldwide British community. Rather than charting an independent course, Coombes and other Australasian administrators established links with amateur figures who shared a pan-imperial worldview. Coombes and journalist 'Old Blue' developed a symbiotic relationship that furthered common agendas – namely English assistance for Australasian athletes competing in Europe and a liberal conception of amateurism. As part of this process, Australasians were able to portray themselves during the Boer War as better and more loyal Britons than South Africans. Coombes was able to participate in domestic English debates about the nature of sport, thereby capturing for himself and his organisation a place within the British world.

By contrast to the diffident AAA and Amateur Swimming Association (ASA), William Henry of the Royal Life Saving Society (RLSS) offered invaluable assistance to Australian swimming organisations. This reflected his approach to sport, which emphasised its utility to society, as evident in his advocacy of life-saving. The behaviour of Coombes at the 1911 Festival of Empire Sports meeting provides an excellent case study for how these notions of Britishness played out in the context of Australasian sport. He insisted on Australasia's and Canada's right to be considered the equal of England and pressed the AAA to allow English athletes to tour Australasia. However, his rhetoric clearly demonstrated that he remained wedded to the British community regardless of the conduct of English administrators. This is all the more evident when his approach is compared to that of James Merrick, president of the Amateur Athletic Union of Canada (AAUC or Canadian Union). While Merrick indicated that Canada's place in the British world was contingent on reciprocal action, Coombes did not make similar threats in his rhetoric. For all his defiance, he was unwilling to fundamentally threaten the established order. While the 'Britishness' of Coombes has been readily recognised, this research has applied recent thinking about Australia and New Zealand's place in the Empire.[7] These scholarly developments

have provided a more sophisticated context within which to investigate the way that administrators such as Coombes embraced the British World.

The Australasian Union's policy of cultivating relationships with like-minded officials extended beyond England to North America. William 'Father Bill' Curtis and James E. Sullivan of the Amateur Athletic Union (AAU) of the United States were embraced in the same manner as William Henry. Curtis was an enthusiastic supporter of Australasian athletics, providing vital information about international matters and exhorting Australasians to visit the United States. Sullivan stepped into this role following Curtis's death and attempted to facilitate Australasian participation at the 1904 St Louis Olympic Games. The relationship between Coombes and Sullivan was problematised by the international reaction to hostile allegations about the conduct of Americans – including Sullivan – at the 1908 London Olympic Games. American sporting modernity – previously viewed positively in Australasia – gained negative connotations after Americans were accused of employing a win-at-all-costs approach and mentality. A relationship was cultivated with the Canadian Union in response to this shift in attitude, which had the effect of harmonising modernity and Britishness. This is not to say that unanimity was reached between Canada and Australasia. Important differences existed on issues such as Imperial Olympic representation and amateur definitions. These differences provide evidence of the limits of the international pan-British community. The historical implications of the Australasian relationship with Canada have been hitherto unexplored within sport. The investigation of this relationship is of vital importance not just to the history of sport, but to the wider history of the way in which these two cultures related to each other within the context of the British Empire.

The relationship between Australia and New Zealand was based firmly on ideas of pan-British unity. This study has eschewed a focus on rising New Zealand consciousness in order to explain the demise of joint Australasian representation and the Australasian Union. Joint Australasian teams followed a tradition of funding and representation from local sources established during Australia's early engagement with the Olympic Games. This allowed New Zealanders to express a sense of national identity through joint Australasian teams despite the risk of Australian dominance. New Zealand national sentiment was thus strong from the outset of joint representation, and did not grow to the extent that it could not be contained within the structure of Australasian representation. The pan-imperial context of early Australasian Olympic

engagement meant that New Zealand did not chafe under the yoke of Australian dominance.

Dominion teams were unofficially linked to the British team at the 1906 Athens Intercalary Games and the 1908 and 1912 Olympic Games. Movements to formalise this link ultimately failed and national representation thus became the only legitimate form of representation at the Olympic Games. The shift towards national representation, along with New Zealand gaining a place on the International Olympic Committee in 1919, had the effect of marginalising Australasian representation.

The demise of the Australasian Union cannot be explained by rising New Zealand nationalism either. As was the case with joint teams, nationalism was an ever-present aspect of the Australasian athletic relationship. Severe tensions developed between the Union executive and the leadership of the NZAAA early in the twentieth century. Walter Atack – the NZAAA president based in Christchurch – led a reforming agenda which aimed at further liberalising the conception of amateurism. This agenda involved allowing greater scope for reinstating amateurs and developing reciprocal agreements with professional organisations. The former aspect of Atack's agenda led to newspaper disputes between Coombes and sectors of the Christchurch press which had close links to the NZAAA leadership. 'Sprinter' – a leading voice of dissent against the Union executive in the Christchurch press – consistently framed his arguments in nationalist terms, criticising Australian influence over New Zealand affairs. These arguments found little favour within wider New Zealand athletic circles, however. This was due to bitter resistance to the second aspect of Atack's agenda in Wellington, Otago and Southland. To administrators from these regions, links to Australia were envisioned as a way to prevent the Christchurch leadership from taking athletics in the wrong direction. Wellington-based administrators usurped the Christchurch leadership, providing the context for tight bonds to be forged with Australia.

These tight bonds allowed the formation of a strong trans-Pacific athletic community. The NZAAA played an instrumental part in the creation of this community and forged links with the West Coast of the United States. It developed a position of strength within the Australasian Union, overseeing arrangements that saw a number of high-profile athletes tour Australasia. However, this did not prevent the Union from shifting from a Pacific community to one that embraced the entire Australian continent throughout the twentieth century. The addition of the South Australian Amateur Athletic Association (SAAAA), in particular, posed difficulties for the NZAAA in remaining part of the Union.

Reflecting a tradition of innovative thinking within the organisation, the NZAAA suggested that the Australasian championships be replaced by a biennial test match between Australia and New Zealand. Australian bodies rejected this scheme, in doing so missing the opportunity to reform the Australasian athletic relationship. The election of a particularly mercantile NZAAA council in the mid-1920s saw that body eventually lose patience with their erstwhile collaborators.

The Australasian Union fell as a result of these factors rather than because of rising New Zealand nationalism. This research offers vital new insights into the relationship between these nations that goes far beyond the sporting world. It speaks to themes – such as the influence that the imperial context had on the formation of national identities in former colonies – central to the historical development of Australia and New Zealand. It also provides a framework of the circumstances through which a trans-Tasman community could survive the decision of New Zealand to reject Federation. The importance of Pacific links to communities that survived this rejection outside the world of sport demonstrates the applicability of this research to wider society.[8]

This study has both confirmed and challenged aspects of the history of Australasian sport. As identified in other sports such as rowing, a less class-bound conception of amateurism operated in Australasian athletics.[9] As was the case with rugby union in New Zealand, amateur athletic bodies across Australasia exploited the spectacular in order to boost the popularity of athletics.[10] However, this study contributes important new insights into the development of Australasian sport. Nationalism did not provide the dynamic for key developments in Australasian athletics, including the somewhat fraught dealings with the AAA and the dissolution of the Australasian Union. Key insights from scholars such as Neville Meaney and Tony Collins are applicable to athletics and Australasian sport as a whole.[11] Rising New Zealand nationalism cannot explain the demise of the Australasian athletic relationship as historians have previously argued.[12] The experiences of the Australasian Union confirm that it is not necessary to look to nationalism in order to understand the way that sporting bodies from Australia and New Zealand viewed their place in the world. Rather, Pan-British identities and transnational flows are vital to understanding the way that Australasians engaged with the rest of the world.

This study has opened up a new agenda for historians of Australasian sport. It has employed a methodology that can offer fresh insights if applied to other amateur sports. The ultimate failure of athletics to become a major spectator sport indicates that a vast array of 'minor'

sports dealt with similar debates within their communities. More is also to be learnt from the engagement of other Australasian sporting bodies with the rest of the world. A wider focus on Australasian sport and its engagement with pan-Britannic and transnational movements can reveal much about how Australian and New Zealand society as a whole engaged with the rest of the world. The demise of the Australasian Union marked the end of one example of a pan-Britannic transnational community. An understanding of other communities of this type – both historical and contemporary – remains vital to understanding how sport has contributed to and continues to contribute to how Australia and New Zealand define themselves.

Notes

1 Introduction

1. Neville Meaney (2001) 'Britishness and Australian Identity: The Problem of Nationalism in Australian History and Historiography', *Australian Historical Studies*, 32 (116), 76–90; Neville Meaney (2003) 'Britishness and Australia: Some Reflections', *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 31 (2), 122–35.
2. Meaney, 'Britishness and Australian Identity', 78; John Rickard (2001) 'Response: Imagining the Unimaginable?', *Australian Historical Studies*, 32 (116), 129–30.
3. Tony Collins (2009) 'The Tyranny of Deference: Anglo–Australian Relations and Rugby Union before World War II', *Sport in History*, 29 (3), 437–38.
4. James Curran (2013) 'Australia at Empire's End: Approaches and Arguments', *History Australia*, 10 (3), 32.
5. Richard Cashman (1995) *Paradise of Sport: The Rise of Organised Sport in Australia* (South Melbourne: Oxford University Press), 54.
6. Stuart Ward (2001) *Australia and the British Embrace: The Demise of the Imperial Ideal* (Carlton South: Melbourne University Press), 2.
7. For a description of the changing definition of 'Australasia', see Donald Denoon (2003) 'Re-Membering Australasia: A Repressed Memory', *Australian Historical Studies*, 34 (122), 292–93. For a description of Australasia as a British community, see James Belich (2001) *Paradise Reforged: A History of the New Zealanders from the 1880s to the Year 2000* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press), 440–41.
8. W. F. Mandle (1973) 'Cricket and Australian Nationalism in the Nineteenth Century', *Journal of the Royal Australian Historical Society*, 59 (4), 238; Belich, *Paradise Reforged*, 30; Meaney, 'Britishness and Australian Identity', 76–90; Tony Collins (2005) 'Australian Nationalism and Working-Class Britishness: The Case of Rugby League Football', *History Compass*, 3 (AU 142), 1–19; Collins 'The Tyranny of Deference', 437–56.
9. William Thomas Kelly (1973) *South Australian Amateur Athletic Association: A History, 1867–1973* (Adelaide: South Australian Amateur Athletic Association), 7. Richard Cashman and John A. Daly suggest 1864 as the foundation date of this club; Cashman, *Paradise of Sport*, 57; John A. Daly (1982) *Elysian Fields: Sport, Class and Community in Colonial South Australia 1836–1890* (Adelaide: the Author), 86.
10. Daly, *Elysian Fields*, 86.
11. Daly, *Elysian Fields*, 88.
12. R. P. B. White and Malcolm Harrison (1987) *100 Years of the NSW AAA* (Sydney: The Fairfax Library/NSWAAA), 16, 19.
13. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 21 April 1887, 9.
14. *The Referee*, 18 April 1935, 3.
15. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 16 April 1935, 16.

16. Ian Jobling (2000) 'In Pursuit of Status, Respectability and Idealism: Pioneers of the Olympic Movement in Australasia', in J. A. Mangan and John Nauright (eds), *Sport in Australasian Society: Past and Present* (London and Portland: Frank Cass), 151.
17. W. F. Mandle (1981) 'Coombes, Richard (1858–1935), *Australian Dictionary of Biography*: *Volume 8* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press), 104–5, at: http://adbonline.anu.edu.au/biogs/A080115b.htm (accessed 17 February 2011). A weekly, *The Referee* was founded in 1886 by Edward Ellis and devoted itself to 'elevating and "Recording the People's Pastimes"' by employing noted writers, such as novelist Nat Gould, to its staff; see Chris Cunneen (1981) 'Elevating and Recording the People's Pastimes: Sydney Sporting Journalism 1886–1939', in Richard Cashman and Michael McKernan (eds), *Sport: Money, Morality and Media* (Kensington: New South Wales University Press), 163, 165.
18. Harry Gordon (1994) *Australia and the Olympic Games* (St Lucia: University of Queensland Press), 16.
19. Cashman, *Paradise of Sport*, 58.
20. Anthony Hughes (2001) 'Sporting Federations: The Impact of Federation on Sports Governance', in Richard Cashman et al. (eds), *Sport, Federation, Nation* (Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW), 124–25.
21. Reet Howell and Max Howell (1988) *Aussie Gold: The Story of Australia at the Olympics* (Melbourne: Brooks Waterloo), viii; John Hoberman (1993) 'Sport and Ideology in the Post-Communist Age', in Lincoln Allison (ed.), *The Changing Politics of Sport* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press), 16; John Hoberman (2004) 'Sportive Nationalism and Globalization', in John Bale and Mette Krogh Christensen (eds), *Post-Olympism: Questioning Sport in the Twenty-first Century* (Oxford and New York: Berg), 185. Barbara J. Keys (2006) *Globalizing Sport: National Rivalry and International Community in the 1940s* (Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press), 17.
22. Mandle, 'Cricket and Australian Nationalism', 224–46.
23. Graeme Davison (2002) 'The Imaginary Grandstand', *Meanjin*, 61 (3), 4–18; Hoberman, 'Sport and Ideology,' 15–36; Hoberman, 'Sportive Nationalism', 177–88.
24. David Montefiore (1992) *Cricket in the Doldrums: The Struggle between Private and Public Control of Australian Cricket in the 1880s*, ASSH Studies in Sports History, no. 8 (Campbelltown: Australian Society for Sports History [ASSH]).
25. Mandle, 'Cricket and Australian Nationalism,' 238.
26. Keys, *Globalizing Sport*, 22. See also Richard Holt (1990) *Sport and the British: A Modern History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 99–100.
27. See Maurice T. Daly (1996) *One Hundred Years of Australian Sport: A History of the New South Wales Sports Club* (Sydney: New South Wales Sports Club), 40–42.
28. Lincoln Allison (2001) *Amateurism in Sport: An Analysis and a Defence* (London and Portland: Frank Cass), 3.
29. Allison, *Amateurism*, 13.
30. Robert J. Paddick (1994) 'Amateurism', in Wray Vamplew et al. (eds), *The Oxford Companion to Australian Sport* (South Melbourne: Oxford University Press), 11–12.

31. Robert J. Paddick (1994) 'Amateurism: An Idea of the Past or a Necessity for the Future?,' *Olympika*, 3, 3.
32. Cashman, *Paradise of Sport*, 54.
33. Cashman, *Paradise of Sport*, 54; Richard Holt (2006) 'The Amateur Body and the Middle-class Man: Work, Health and Style in Victorian Britain', *Sport in History*, 26 (3), 353. For discussions of the development of athleticism, see J. A. Mangan (1981) *Athleticism in the Victorian and Edwardian Public School: The Emergence and Consolidation of an Educational Ideology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press); David W. Brown (1986) 'The Legacy of British Victorian Social Thought: Some Prominent Views on Sport, Physical Exercise and Society in Colonial Australia', in Wray Vamplew (ed.), *Sport and Colonialism in 19th Century Australasia*, ASSH Studies in Sports History: No. 1 (Campbelltown: Australian Society of Sports History [ASSH]), 24; Ray Crawford (1986) 'Athleticism, Gentlemen and Empire in Australian Public Schools: L. A. Adamson and Wesley College, Melbourne', in Vamplew (ed.), *Sport and Colonialism in 19th Century Australasia*, 47; Martin Crotty (2001) *Making the Australian Male: Middle-class Masculinity 1870–1920* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press), 33–34, 41.
34. Cashman, *Paradise of Sport*, 55.
35. Mangan, *Athleticism*, 122.
36. Crotty, *Making the Australian Male*, 51.
37. Crawford, 'Athleticism, Gentlemen and Empire', 44.
38. Crawford, 'Athleticism, Gentlemen and Empire,' 49. Adamson prevented a member of staff from competing in the professional Victorian Football League in 1911.
39. Crotty, *Making the Australian Male*, 60.
40. Crotty, *Making the Australian Male*, 61; Tony Collins (1998) *Rugby's Great Split: Class, Culture and the Origins of Rugby League Football* (London and Portland: Frank Cass), 124. Charlotte Macdonald has argued similarly with regard to New Zealand; Charlotte Macdonald (2009) 'Ways of Belonging: Sporting Spaces in New Zealand History', in Giselle Byrnes (ed.), *The New Oxford History of New Zealand* (South Melbourne: Oxford University Press), 277.]
41. Crotty, *Making the Australian Male*, 11.
42. Crotty, *Making the Australian Male*, 74.
43. Crotty, *Making the Australian Male*, 86.
44. Crotty, *Making the Australian Male*, 112.
45. Jobling, 'In Pursuit of Status', 151.
46. Murray G. Phillips (2001) 'Diminishing Contrasts and Increasing Varieties: Globalisation Theory and "Reading" Amateurism in Australian Sport', *Sporting Traditions*, 18 (1), 25.
47. Georges Rioux (2000) 'Pierre de Coubertin's Revelation', in Norbert Müller (ed.), *Pierre de Coubertin 1863–1937: Olympism Selected Writings* (Lausanne: International Olympic Committee), 27.
48. John MacAloon (1981) *This Great Symbol: Pierre de Coubertin and the Origins of the Modern Olympic Games* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press), 51.
49. MacAloon, *This Great Symbol*, 60–63, 77.
50. Phillips, 'Diminishing Contrasts', 19.

51. Malcolm MacLean (2010) 'New Zealand', in S. W. Pope and John Nauright (eds), *Routledge Companion to Sports History* (London and New York: Routledge), 513.
52. Phillips, 'Diminishing Contrasts,' 22.
53. See Erik Nielsen (2008) '"Oh Error, Ill-conceived": The Amateur Sports Federation of New South Wales, Rugby League and Amateur Athletics', in Andrew Moore and Andy Carr (eds), *Centenary Reflections: 100 Years of Rugby League in Australia* (Melbourne: Australian Society for Sports History, 2008), 9–23.
54. Gordon titled his chapter on key early figures in the Australian Olympic Movement, such as Cuff, Coombes and Basil Parkinson of the Victorian Amateur Athletic Association, 'A Network of Friends'; Gordon, *Australia and the Olympic Games*, 15–27.
55. Phillips, 'Diminishing Contrasts,' 26–27.
56. Stuart Ripley (2003) 'A Social History of New South Wales Professional Sculling 1876–1927', unpublished PhD thesis, University of Western Sydney. Sculling involves one individual rowing against another, as opposed to the team rowing preferred by amateurs.
57. Ripley, 'New South Wales Professional Sculling', 102.
58. Ripley, 'New South Wales Professional Sculling', 348, 366.
59. Cashman, *Paradise of Sport*, 63.
60. John A. Daly (1994) 'Track and Field', in Wray Vamplew and Brian Stoddart (eds), *Sport in Australia: A Social History* (Cambridge, New York and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press), 260.
61. Harold Perkin (1986) 'Sport and Society: Empire into Commonwealth', in J. A. Mangan and Roy B. Small (eds), *Sport, Culture, Society: Proceedings of the VIII Commonwealth and International Conference on Sport, Physical Education, Dance, Recreation and Health* (London: E. & E. N. Spon), 4. Jobling has used this statement on multiple occasions; Garth Henniker and Ian Jobling (1989) 'Richard Coombes and the Olympic Movement in Australia: Imperialism and Nationalism in Action', *Sporting Traditions*, 6 (1), 2; and Jobling, 'In Pursuit of Status', 151.
62. Henniker and Jobling, 'Imperialism and Nationalism in Action', 2
63. Ripley, 'New South Wales Professional Sculling', 102.
64. Ripley, 'New South Wales Professional Sculling', 169.
65. Ripley, 'New South Wales Professional Sculling', 7–8.
66. Mike Huggins and J. A. Mangan (2004) 'Prologue: All Mere Complexities', in Mike Huggins and J. A. Mangan (eds), *Disreputable Pleasures: Less Virtuous Victorians at Play* (London and New York: Frank Cass), ix.
67. Mike Huggins (2000) 'More Sinful Pleasures? Leisure, Respectability and the Male Middle Classes in Victorian England', *Journal of Social History*, 33 (3), 585.
68. Tony Collins (2004) 'Violence, Gamesmanship and the Amateur Ideal in Victorian Middle-class Rugby', in Huggins and Mangan (eds), *Disreputable Pleasures*, 172.
69. John Pinfold (2004) 'Dandy Rats at Play: The Liverpudlian Middle Classes and Horse-racing in the Nineteenth Century', in Huggins and Mangan (eds), *Disreputable Pleasures*, 78.
70. Collins, 'Violence, Gamesmanship,' 184.

71. S. W. Pope (2007) *Patriotic Games: Sporting Traditions in the American imagination, 1876–1926* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press), 19.
72. Pope, *Patriotic Games*, 19–20.
73. Christiane Eisenberg (2005) 'Sport and Politics. Some Considerations for Future Research Perspectives. Discussion of the Papers Presented to the Panel on "Sport, Politics and Business"'. Unpublished Conference Paper, 20th International Congress of Historical Sciences, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, 3–9 July.
74. Mandle, 'Cricket and Australian Nationalism', 242.
75. Mandle, 'Cricket and Australian Nationalism', 242.
76. Mandle, 'Cricket and Australian Nationalism', 238.
77. Richard White (1981) *Inventing Australia: Images and Identity 1688–1980* (Sydney: George Allen and Unwin), 111.
78. Manning Clark (1981) *A History of Australia: Vol. 5: The People Make Laws, 1888–1915* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press), 139. Cashman provides an introduction to the issue of Federation and sport; Richard Cashman (2001) 'Introduction', in Cashman et al. (eds), *Sport, Federation, Nation*, 1–13.
79. Ken S. Inglis (1979) 'Imperial Cricket: Test Matches between Australia and England, 1871–1900', in Richard Cashman and Michael McKernan (eds), *Sport in History: The Making of Modern Sporting History* (St Lucia: University of Queensland Press), 171.
80. Cashman, 'Introduction', 7.
81. Montefiore, *Cricket in the Doldrums*, 80.
82. Charles Little (2001) 'Trans-Tasman Federations in Sport: The Changing Relationships between Australia and New Zealand', in Cashman et al. (eds), *Sport, Federation, Nation*, 69.
83. Henniker and Jobling, 'Imperialism and Nationalism in Action', 2–15; Jobling, 'In Pursuit of Status', 142–63; Michael Letters and Ian Jobling (1996) 'Forgotten Links: Leonard Cuff and The Olympic Movement in Australasia, 1894–1905', *Olympika*, 5, 91–110; Katharine Moore (1989) 'One Voice in the Wilderness: Richard Coombes and the Promotion of the Pan-Britannic Festival Concept in Australia 1891–1911', *Sporting Traditions*, 5 (2), 188–203; Ian Jobling (1988) 'The Making of a Nation Through Sport: Australia and the Olympic Games from Athens to Berlin, 1898–1916', *Australian Journal of Politics and History*, 34 (2), 160–72.
84. Gordon, *Australia and the Olympic Games*; Howell and Howell, *Aussie Gold*.
85. Howell and Howell, *Aussie Gold*, viii.
86. Jobling, 'The Making of a Nation', 163.
87. Jobling, 'The Making of a Nation', 169–70.
88. Henniker and Jobling, 'Imperialism and Nationalism in Action', 2–15.
89. Henniker and Jobling, 'Imperialism and Nationalism in Action', 5–6.
90. Henniker and Jobling, 'Imperialism and Nationalism in Action', 12.
91. Little, 'Trans-Tasman Federations in Sport', 79.
92. Charles Little and Richard Cashman (2001) 'Ambiguous and Overlapping Identities: Australasia at the Olympic Games, 1896–1914', in Cashman et al. (eds), *Sport, Federation, Nation*, 96; Greg Ryan (2001) 'Commentary' in Cashman et al. (eds), *Sport, Federation, Nation,* 133.
93. Hughes, 'Sporting Federations', 126.

94. Unattributed (2001) 'Preface' in Cashman et al. (eds), *Sport, Federation, Nation*, v.
95. Eliga H. Gould (1999) 'A Virtual Nation: Greater Britain and the Imperial Legacy of the American Revolution', *The American Historical Review*, 104 (2), 486.
96. Matthew P. Llewellyn (2011) *Rule Britannia: Nationalism, Identity and the Modern Olympic Games* (London: Routledge).
97. Linda Colley (2003) *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707–1837* (London: Pimlico). Buckner's influence is recognised in Katie Pickles (2011) 'The Obvious and the Awkward: Postcolonialism and the British World', *New Zealand Journal of History*, 45 (1), 86.
98. J. G. A. Pocock (1974) 'British History: A Plea for a New Subject', *New Zealand Journal of History*, 8 (1), 3–21.
99. Colley, *Britons*, 5.
100. Colley, *Britons*, 17, 373.
101. Phillip Buckner and R. Douglas Francis (2005) 'Introduction', in Phillip Buckner and R. Douglas Francis (eds), *Rediscovering the British World* (Calgary: University of Calgary Press), 12.
102. Carl Bridge and Kent Fedorowich (2003) 'Mapping the British World', in Bridge and Fedorowich (eds), *The British World: Diaspora, Culture and Identity* (London and Portland: Frank Cass), 6.
103. Bridge and Fedorowich, 'Mapping the British World', 3.
104. Phillip Buckner and R. Douglas Francis (2006) 'Introduction', in Buckner and Francis (eds), *Canada and the British World: Culture, Migration, and Identity* (Vancouver, BC: UBC Press), 6.
105. See Bridge and Fedorowich, 'Mapping the British World', 3, 6. See also Buckner and Francis, 'Introduction' [2005], 16, 7.
106. Pickles, 'Obvious and Awkward', 87.
107. Meaney, 'Britishness and Australia', 133.
108. Derek M. Schreuder and Stuart Ward (eds) (2008) *Australia's Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
109. Meaney, 'Britishness and Australian Identity', 77.
110. Derek M. Schreuder and Stuart Ward (2008) 'Introduction: What Became of Australia's Empire?', in Schreuder and Ward (eds), *Australia's Empire*, 9.
111. Schreuder and Ward, 'Introduction', 11.
112. Schreuder and Ward, 'Introduction', 11–12.
113. Schreuder and Ward, 'Introduction', 18.
114. Belich, *Paradise Reforged*, 23.
115. Belich, *Paradise Reforged*, 11.
116. Pickles, 'Obvious and Awkward', 94.
117. Meaney, 'Britishness and Australian Identity,' 78.
118. Rickard, 'Response', 129–30; Collins, 'The Tyranny of Deference', 437–38.
119. John Hirst (2008) 'Empire, State, Nation', in Schreuder and Ward (eds), *Australia's Empire*, 162.
120. Mark McKenna (2008) 'Monarchy: From Reverence to Indifference', in Schreuder and Ward (eds), *Australia's Empire*, 284–85.
121. Angela Woollacott (2008) 'Gender and Sexuality', in Schreuder and Ward (eds), *Australia's Empire*, 317; Daryl Adair, John Nauright and Murray Phillips (1998) 'Playing Fields Through to Battle Fields: The Development of

Australian Sporting Manhood in its Imperial Context', *Journal of Australian Studies*, 22 (56), 51–67.

122. Richard White and Hsu-Ming Teo (2008) 'Popular Culture', in Schreuder and Ward (eds), *Australia's Empire*, 350–55; Henniker and Jobling, 'Imperialism and Nationalism in Action', 2–15; Collins, 'Australian Nationalism', 1–19.
123. Pickles, 'Obvious and Awkward', 91.
124. Tony Ballantyne (2005) 'Religion, Difference, and the Limits of British Imperial History', *Victorian Studies*, 47 (3), 448–50; Pickles, 'Obvious and Awkward', 90, 96.
125. Buckner and Francis, 'Introduction' [2006], 7. See also Buckner and Francis, 'Introduction' [2005], 18–19.
126. Pickles, 'Obvious and Awkward', 97.
127. Pickles, 'Obvious and Awkward', 96.
128. Tony Ballantyne and Antoinette Burton (2005) 'Postscript: Bodies, Genders, Empire: Reimagining World Histories', in Ballantyne and Burton (eds), *Bodies in Contact: Rethinking Colonial Encounters in World History* (Durham and London: Duke University Press), 418.
129. Bridge and Fedorowich, 'Mapping the British World', 3.
130. Gould, 'A Virtual Nation', 486.
131. See Duncan Bell (2007) *The Idea of Greater Britain: Empire and the Future of World Order, 1860–1900* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press).
132. Bell, *The Idea of Greater Britain*, 150–78.
133. J. G. A. Pocock (1999) 'The New British History in Atlantic Perspective: An Antipodean Commentary', *The American Historical Review*, 104, 491.
134. Keys, *Globalizing Sport*, 9–10.
135. Charlotte Macdonald (2011) *Strong Beautiful and Modern: National Fitness in Britain, New Zealand, Australia and Canada, 1935–1960* (Wellington: Bridget Williams Books).
136. Gould, 'A Virtual Nation', 476. See footnote 2.
137. Akira Iriye (1989) 'The Internationalization of History', *The American Historical Review*, 94 (1), 1–10; Ian Tyrrell (1991) 'American Exceptionalism in an Age of International History', *The American Historical Review*, 96 (4), 1031–55.
138. Iriye, 'The Internationalization of History', 3.
139. Tyrrell, 'American Exceptionalism', 1038.
140. Akira Iriye (2002) 'Internationalizing International History', in Thomas Bender (ed.), *Rethinking American History in a Global Age* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press), 51.
141. Ian Tyrrell, 'What Is Transnational History?', Excerpt from a paper given at the Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociale, Paris, in January 2007. Retrieved from http://iantyrrell.wordpress.com/what-is-transnational-history (accessed 24 March 2009).
142. Ann Curthoys and Marilyn Lake (2005) 'Introduction', in Ann Curthoys and Marilyn Lake (eds), *Connected Worlds: History in Transnational Perspective* (Canberra: ANU E Press), 5.
143. Tyrrell, 'American Exceptionalism', 1033.
144. Ian Tyrrell (1999) 'Making Nations/Making States: American Historians in the Context of Empire', *The Journal of American History*, 86 (3), 1020.

145. Camilla Obel (2005) 'Amateur Rugby's Spectator Success: Cultivating Inter-Provincial Rugby Publics in New Zealand, 1902–1995', *Sporting Traditions*, 21 (2), 98.
146. Ian Tyrrell (2002) 'Beyond the View from Euro-America: Environment, Settler Societies, and the Internationalization of American History', in Bender (ed.), *Rethinking American History in a Global Age*, 170.

2 The Commercialisation of Australasian Amateur Athletics

1. *The Australasian*, 7 April 1900.
2. Maurice T. Daly (1996) *One Hundred Years of Australian Sport: A History of the New South Wales Sports Club* (Sydney: New South Wales Sports Club), 40–42; Robert J. Paddick (1994) 'Amateurism: An Idea of the Past or a Necessity for the Future?', *Olympika*, 3, 3.
3. For the Olympic Games see Harry Gordon (1994) *Australia and the Olympic Games* (St Lucia: University of Queensland Press); Reet and Max Howell (1988) *Aussie Gold: The Story of Australia at the Olympics* (Melbourne: Brooks Waterloo); Garth Henniker and Ian Jobling (1989) 'Richard Coombes and the Olympic Movement in Australia: Imperialism and Nationalism in Action', *Sporting Traditions*, 6 (1), 2–15; Ian Jobling (2000) 'In Pursuit of Status, Respectability and Idealism: Pioneers of the Olympic Movement in Australasia', in J. A. Mangan and John Nauright (eds), *Sport in Australasian Society: Past and Present* (London and Portland: Frank Cass), 142–63; and Michael Letters and Ian Jobling (1996) 'Forgotten Links: Leonard Cuff and the Olympic Movement in Australasia, 1894–1905', *Olympika*, 5, 91–110. For the importance of pan-Britannic sports see Katharine Moore (1989) 'One Voice in the Wilderness: Richard Coombes and the Promotion of the Pan-Britannic Festival Concept in Australia 1891–1911', *Sporting Traditions*, 5 (2), 188–203.
4. Adrian Smith, 'Black against Gold: New Zealand-Australia Sporting Rivalry', in Adrian Smith and Dilwyn Porter (eds), *Sport and National Identity in the Post-war World* (London and New York: Routledge), 175.
5. Howell and Howell, *Aussie Gold*, viii.
6. Howell and Howell, *Aussie Gold*, 14.
7. *The Referee*, 21 February 1900, 6.
8. Stephen Hardy (1986) 'Entrepreneurs, Organizations, and the Sport Marketplace: Subjects in Search of Historians', *Journal of Sport History*, 13 (1), 16.
9. Dilwyn Porter (2010) 'Entrepreneurship', in S. W. Pope and John Nauright (eds), *Routledge Companion to Sports History* (London and New York: Routledge), 197–98.
10. Lincoln Allison (2001) *Amateurism in Sport: An Analysis and a Defence* (London and Portland: Frank Cass), 147.
11. Allison, *Amateurism*, 141.
12. Allison suggests that the years between 1895 and 1961 mark the period of 'the maintenance of amateur hegemony' [Allison, *Amateurism*, 38.].
13. For example, see Allen Guttmann's treatment of cases involving athletes such as Jim Thorpe, Paavo Nurmi and Karl Schranz [Allen Guttmann

(2002) *The Olympics: A History of the Modern Games* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press), 34, 51, 134–35.]

14. Eric Dunning and Kenneth Sheard (1979) *Barbarians, Gentlemen and Players: A Sociological Study of the Development of Rugby Football* (Canberra: Australian National University Press), 9–10.
15. Dunning and Sheard, *Barbarians, Gentlemen and Players*, 241–42.
16. John Bale (2006) 'Amateurism, Capital and Roger Bannister', *Sport in History*, 26 (3), 493.
17. Camilla Obel (2005) 'Amateur Rugby's Spectator Success: Cultivating Inter-Provincial Rugby Publics in New Zealand, 1902–1995', *Sporting Traditions*, 21 (2), 97.
18. Obel, 'Amateur Rugby's Spectator Success', 100–01.
19. Obel, 'Amateur Rugby's Spectator Success', 105.
20. Obel, 'Amateur Rugby's Spectator Success', 98.
21. Obel, 'Amateur Rugby's Spectator Success', 101.
22. Obel, 'Amateur Rugby's Spectator Success', 105.
23. Obel, 'Amateur Rugby's Spectator Success', 110.
24. Obel, 'Amateur Rugby's Spectator Success', 98.
25. Stuart Ripley (2003) 'A Social History of New South Wales Professional Sculling 1876–1927', unpublished PhD thesis, University of Western Sydney, 337.
26. Greg Ryan (1997) '"A Lack of Esprit De Corps": The 1908–09 Wallabies and the Legacy of the 1905 All Blacks', *Sporting Traditions*, 17 (1), 40–43; Geoffrey T. Vincent (1998) 'Practical Imperialism: The Anglo-Welsh Rugby Tour of New Zealand, 1908', *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 15 (1), 123–40; Tony Collins (2009) *A Social History of English Rugby Union* (London and New York: Routledge), 167–68.
27. Richard Waterhouse (1995) *Private Pleasures, Public Leisure: A History of Australian Popular Culture Since 1788* (South Melbourne: Longman), 78.
28. Richard Cashman (1995) *Paradise of Sport. The Rise of Organised Sport in Australia* (South Melbourne: Oxford University Press), 97.
29. Charles Little (2000) 'Sport, Communities and Identities: A Case Study of Race, Ethnicity and Gender in South Sydney Sport', unpublished PhD thesis, School of History, University of New South Wales, 71.
30. Herbert Moran (1939) *Viewless Winds: Being the Recollections and Digressions of an Australian Surgeon* (London: Peter Davies), 35.
31. Richard Cashman (2002) *Sport in the National Imagination: Australian Sport in the Federation Decades* (Sydney: Walla Walla Press), 52–53.
32. Cashman, *Sport in the National Imagination*, 53–55.
33. Ryan, '"A Lack of Esprit De Corps", 40–43; Collins, *English Rugby Union*, 168.
34. *The Referee*, 2 May 1900, 6.
35. See Obel, 'Amateur Rugby's Spectator Success', 98.
36. Cashman, *Paradise of Sport*, 96–97.
37. New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association, *Annual Report*, 11 April 1900, New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association Records, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, ML MSS 5573: Box 3 – Annual Reports, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia (hereafter Box 3, NSWAAA Records).

38. New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association, *Annual Report*, 30 April 1902, Box 3, NSWAAA Records.
39. *The Referee*, 2 May 1900, 6.
40. *The Referee*, 6 June 1900, 6.
41. It should be noted that wet weather prevented attendance of some delegates to the second meeting. *The Referee*, 6 June 1900, 6.
42. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 2 June 1900, 14.
43. Little, 'Sport, Communities and Identities', 12.
44. Little, 'Sport, Communities and Identities', 14.
45. *The Referee*, 2 May 1900, 6.
46. New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association, *Annual Report*, 27 April 1922, Box 3, NSWAAA Records.
47. New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association, *Annual Report*, 30 April 1924, Box 3, NSWAAA Records.
48. R. P. B. White and Malcolm Harrison (1987) *100 Years of the NSW AAA* (Sydney: The Fairfax Library/NSWAAA), 125.
49. Newtown Harriers Athletic Club, *Programme – The Dunn Challenge Shield*, Newtown, 3 and 10 December 1910, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Davis Sporting Collection 1, Box 10 – Harriers athletic club carnivals, 1890–1930 and Highlanders' picnics and athletics carnivals, 1898–1932, Sydney, Australia [Hereafter DSC 1, Box 10].
50. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 18 December 1886, 2.
51. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 20 December 1886, 9.
52. Newtown Harriers Athletic Club, *Programme – The Dunn Challenge Shield*, Newtown, 3 and 10 December 1910, DSC 1, Box 10.
53. New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association, *Programme – 2nd Annual Championship: Inter-Club Contest for the 'Dunn' Challenge Shield at the Sydney Sports Ground*, Sydney, 11 and 18 November 1911, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Davis Sporting Collection 1, Box 12 – NSWAAA Carnivals, Sydney, Australia [Hereafter DSC 1, Box 12]; New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association, *Programme – Third annual contests for the Dunn Challenge Shield: Sydney Sports Ground*, Sydney, 2 and 9 November 1912, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Davis Sporting Collection 1, Box 11 – Highlanders' Carnivals and NSWAAA carnivals, Sydney, Australia [Hereafter DSC 1, Box 11].
54. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 6 October 1924, 9.
55. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 17 December 1924, 19; 10 February 1925, 12.
56. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 11 February 1925, 20.
57. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 27 February 1925, 12.
58. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 29 November 1926, 15.
59. Tony Collins (1998) *Rugby's Great Split: Class, Culture and the Origins of Rugby League Football* (London and Portland: Frank Cass), 134.
60. Collins, *English Rugby Union*, 111–12, 196.
61. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 8 December 1924, 6.
62. Ancestry.com and the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (2005), *The 1861 England Census Database (online)* (Provo: The Generations Network Inc), at: http://content.ancestrylibrary.com/iexec/default.aspx?htx=view&r=5542&adbid=8767&iid=KENRG9_456 _458-0760&fn=Richard&ln=Coombes&st=r&ssrc=&pid=6949541; Ancestry.com and The Church of

Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (2004) *The 1871 England Census Database (online)*, (Provo: The Generations Network Inc.) http://content.ancestrylibrary.com/iexec/?htx=view&r=5542&dbid=7619&iid=MDXRG10_865_866- 0306&fn=Richard&ln=Coombes&st=r&ssrc=&pid=2694089; Ancestry.com and The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (2004) *The 1881 English Census Database (online)*, (Provo: The Generations Network Inc.); http://content.ancestrylibrary.com/iexec/?htx=view&r=5542&dbid=7572&iid=MDXRG11_840_843- 0442&fn=Richard&ln=Coombes&st=r&ssrc=&pid=15588974.

63. Tony Collins and Wray Vamplew (2002) *Mud, Sweat, and Beers: A Cultural History of Sport and Alcohol* (Oxford and New York: Berg), 5.
64. James Belich (2001) *Paradise Reforged: A History of the New Zealanders from the 1880s to the Year 2000* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press), 222.
65. Mike Huggins and J. A. Mangan (2004) 'Epilogue: The Dogs Bark but the Caravan Moves On', in Mike Huggins and J. A. Mangan (eds), *Disreputable Pleasures: Less Virtuous Victorians at Play* (London and New York: Frank Cass), 208.
66. *The Times*, 11 June 1859, 12; *The Times*, 1 June 1863, 5.
67. Unattributed, 'St. Andrew's Graduates' Association', *The British Medical Journal*, 1 (1016), 19 June 1880, 935.
68. 'Stonehenge' (ed.) (1859) *The Coursing Calendar and Report of the Autumn Season 1858: With Hints on Breeding and Tables of the Performances of the Stock of the Chief Public Stallions* (London: John Crockford [The Field]), 99.
69. 'Stonehenge' (ed.) (1859) *The Coursing Calendar and Report of the Spring Season 1859–60: With Hints on Breeding, &.* (London: John Crockford [The Field]), 142.
70. 'Stonehenge' (ed.) (1861) *The Coursing Calendar and Report of the Autumn Season 1861* (London: John Crockford [The Field]), 149.
71. 'Stonehenge', *The Coursing Calendar 1858*, 99.
72. Unknown, 'Bushey (*sic*.) Park (departmental minute), 15 February 1858, Royal Parks, Park – Bushy, Hampton Court Gdns & Longford River: Greyhound Hotel & Stables (now Tea Gardens), Work 16/71, The National Archives, Kew, United Kingdom.
73. 'Stonehenge', *The Coursing Calendar 1858*, 99.
74. 'Stonehenge', *The Coursing Calendar Autumn Season 1861*, 149, 80.
75. 'Stonehenge' (ed.) (1864) *The Coursing Calendar and Report of the Spring Season 1864: With Entries for the Produce Stakes of the Ensuing Season* (London: John Crockford [The Field]), 29.
76. The Australasian Amateur Conference [AAC] (1897) *Minutes of Meeting of Delegates from the Amateur Athletic Associations of New South Wales, New Zealand, Victoria and Queensland, Held at N.S.W. Amateur Sports Club, 43 Rowe Street, Sydney, 1st to 8th October, 1897* (Sydney: Printed by F. W. White), 11.
77. New Zealand Amateur Athletic Association, *Programme – Australasian Championship Carnival*, Christchurch, 4 January 1896, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia; Queensland Amateur Athletic Association, *Programme – Australasian Championship Carnival*, Brisbane, 9 November 1899, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales,

E. S. Marks Sporting Collection, Q46 Box 2 – Athletics, Sydney, Australia [Hereafter Marks Q46].

78. New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association [NSWAAA], *Programme – Australasian Championship Carnival*, Sydney, 11 and 13 November 1905, Marks Q46.
79. Amateur Athletic Union of Australasia, Minutes of Meeting, 28 January 1904, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, 11.
80. Gordon, *Australia and the Olympic Games*, 16.
81. Victorian Amateur Athletic Association [VAAA] (1894) *Victorian Amateur Athletic Handbook, Rules of the Victorian Amateur Athletic Association, Australasian Records, The Harriers, &c.* (Melbourne: The VAAA), 14.
82. NSWAAA, *Programme – Australasian Championship Carnival*, 1905. Other programmes carried a 'mission statement' to this effect.
83. David Montefiore (1992) *Cricket in the Doldrums: The Struggle between Private and Public Control of Australian Cricket in the 1880s*, ASSH Studies in Sports History, no. 8 (Campbelltown: Australian Society for Sports History [ASSH]), 74.
84. Montefiore, *Cricket in the Doldrums*, 72.
85. Stuart Ripley (2009) *Sculling and Skulduggery: A History of Professional Sculling* (Sydney: Walla Walla Press), vi.
86. John Hirst (1975) 'Distance in Australia – Was It a Tyrant?', *Historical Studies*, 16 (64), 447.
87. Waterhouse, *Private Pleasures, Public Leisure*, 135
88. Waterhouse, *Private Pleasures, Public Leisure*, 69.
89. Carl Bridge and Kent Fedorowich (2003) 'Mapping the British World', in Bridge and Fedorowich (eds), *The British World: Diaspora, Culture and Identity* (London and Portland: Frank Cass), 6.
90. Bridge and Fedorowich, 'Mapping the British World', 8.
91. Waterhouse, *Private Pleasures, Public Leisure*, 72.
92. Bruce Mitchell (1990) 'Baseball in Australia. Two Tours and the Beginnings of Baseball in Australia', *Sporting Traditions*, 7 (1), 4.
93. W. F. Mandle (1973) 'Cricket and Australian Nationalism in the Nineteenth Century', *Journal of the Royal Australian Historical Society*, 59 (4), 224–46.
94. Montefiore, *Cricket in the Doldrums*, 70–1. Montefiore suggests that six incarnations of the Australian Eleven met four English combinations in 1887–88, but the disparity between these figures and those quoted above is a result of Montefiore's inclusion of the matches played by the ninth English tourists in the 1886–87 season.
95. Waterhouse, *Private Pleasures, Public Leisure*, 74.
96. The issue of amateur athletes in other sports touring Australia has received growing historical attention recently; see Sean Brawley (2009) '"They Came, They Saw, They Conquered": The Takaishi/Saito Tour of 1926–27 and Australian Perceptions of Japan', *Sporting Traditions*, 26 (2), 49–66; Gary Osmond (2010) '"Honolulu Maori": Racial Dimensions of Duke Kahanamoku's Tour of Australia and New Zealand, 1914–1915', *New Zealand Journal of History*, 44 (1), 22–34.

97. John A. Daly (1994) 'Athletics', in Wray Vamplew et al. (eds), *Oxford Companion to Australian Sport* (South Melbourne: Oxford University Press), 23–24; Percy Mason (1985) *Professional Athletics in Australia* (Adelaide: Rigby), 5, 12.
98. *Athletics Weekly*, 'British Athletics Championships 1876–1914', at: www.gbrathletics.com/bc/bc1.htm (accessed 16 February 2009).
99. Report of the *Athletic News*. Reprinted in the *Wanganui Herald*, 6 January 1905, 2.
100. Arthur Ruhl, 'The Men Who Set The Marks', *Outing Magazine*, 52 (4), July 1908, 391.
101. Sports Reference LLC, 'Arthur Duffey', at: www.sports-reference.com/olympics/athletes/du/arthur-duffey-1.html (accessed 13 February 2009).
102. *The Referee*, 27 April 1904, 6.
103. *Otago Witness*, 12 October 1904, 57.
104. Belich, *Paradise Reforged*, 82–83.
105. *The Referee*, 30 November 1904, 6.
106. Ripley, 'New South Wales Professional Sculling', 337.
107. *Weekly Press*, 28 December 1904, 50. The *New Zealand Referee* was included in the *Weekly Press* at this time.
108. *Weekly Press*, 25 January 1905, 55. J. F. Grierson was the chairman of the council of the NZAAA.
109. Belich, *Paradise Reforged*, 29–30.
110. *The Referee*, 19 October 1904, 6.
111. *The Referee*, 14 September 1904, 6.
112. *The Referee*, 22 January 1902, 7.
113. Gordon, *Australia and the Olympic Games*, 41.
114. *The Referee*, 18 January 1905, 1.
115. *Weekly Press*, 25 January 1905, 55.
116. Matthew P. Llewellyn (2010) 'Chariots of Discord: Great Britain, Nationalism and the "Doomed" 1924 Paris Olympic Games', *Contemporary British History*, 24 (1), 72.
117. *Otago Witness*, 9 May 1906, 53.
118. *Otago Witness*, 3 February 1909, 62.
119. For an example of an amateur apologist, see Daly, *One Hundred Years of Australian Sport*, 40–2.
120. Amateur Athletic Union of Australasia [AAUA] (1899), *Articles of Agreement, Laws for Athletic Meetings, Rules for Competitions, Record conditions, etc.* (Sydney: AAUA) 12.
121. Ripley, 'New South Wales Professional Sculling', 13.
122. *Sydney Sportsman*, 5 April 1905, 6.
123. *Sydney Sportsman*, 29 March 1905, 2.
124. *Sydney Sportsman*, 29 March 1905, 2.
125. *Sydney Sportsman*, 19 April 1905, 4.
126. Cashman, *Paradise of Sport*, 54.
127. Howell and Howell, *Aussie Gold*, 358.
128. *The Referee*, 11 October 1905, 6.
129. *The Referee*, 1 November 1905, 6.
130. *The Referee*, 11 October 1905, 6.

131. *The Referee*, 13 April 1904, 6.
132. *The Star*, 11 March 1904, 1.
133. Ray Crawford (1986) 'Athleticism, Gentlemen and Empire in Australian Public Schools: L. A. Adamson and Wesley College, Melbourne', in Wray Vamplew (ed.), *Sport and Colonialism in 19th Century Australasia*. ASSH Studies in Sports History: No. 1 (Campbelltown: Australian Society of Sports History [ASSH]), 49.
134. *The Referee*, 1 November 1905, 6.
135. *The Referee*, 29 November 1905, 8.
136. *The Referee*, 29 November 1905, 8.
137. *The Referee*, 17 January 1906, 6.
138. *The Referee*, 11 October 1905, 6.
139. *The Referee*, 11 October 1905, 6.
140. *The Referee*, 7 March 1906, 8.
141. *The Referee*, 7 March 1906, 8.
142. Amateur Athletic Union of Australasia, Minutes of Meeting, 10 November 1899, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, 8. Ironically, Rowley, along with P. Frankel of Queensland, moved the motion to defer consideration of the question.
143. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 2 March 1900, 3.
144. *The Referee*, 11 April 1900, 6.
145. *The Referee*, Wednesday, May 9, 1900, 6.
146. *The Australasian*, 13 January 1900.
147. This refers to a race between competitors starting at the same mark, as compared to a handicap race, where athletes are given an advantage inverse to their athletic ability.
148. *The Referee*, 20 June 1900, 6.
149. *The Referee*, 11 July 1900, 6.
150. *The Referee*, 22 August 1900, 6.
151. *The Referee*, 15 August 1900, 6.
152. *The Referee*, 18 July 1900, 6.
153. *The Referee*, 26 March 1902, 6.
154. *The Referee*, 9 July 1902, 6; 29 August 1902, 6.
155. For an idea of the distribution of clubs in these leagues, see Tony Mason (1980) *Association Football and English Society 1863–1915* (Brighton and Atlantic Highlands: Harvester Press and Humanities Press), 64–68.
156. Mason, *Association Football and English Society*, 45–46. Charles P. Korr (1978) 'West Ham United Football Club and the Beginnings of Professional Football in East London, 1895–1914', *Journal of Contemporary History*, 13 (2), 213.
157. Mason, *Association Football and English Society*, 157.
158. *The Australasian*, 29 October 1904.
159. *The Australasian*, 4 November 1905.
160. For a discussion of the regard in which *The Referee* was held, see Chris Cunneen (1981) 'Elevating and Recording the People's Pastimes: Sydney Sporting Journalism 1886–1939', in Richard Cashman and Michael McKernan (eds), *Sport: Money, Morality and the Media* (Kensington: New South Wales University Press), 162–76.

3 The Role of Race and Class in Defining the Australasian Amateur Community

1. John A. Daly (1994) 'Track and Field', in Wray Vamplew and Brian Stoddart (eds), *Sport in Australia: A Social History* (Cambridge, New York and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press), 257.
2. New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association, *Annual Report*, 17 July 1889, New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association Records, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, ML MSS 5573: Box 3 – Annual Reports, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia (Hereafter Box 3, NSWAAA Records). 'His Excellency Lord Carrington' is listed as patron in this, the second annual report of the NSWAAA.
3. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 21 July 1887, 5.
4. Jeffrey Hill (2006) '"I'll Run Him": Alf Tupper, Social Class and British Amateurism', *Sport in History*, 26 (3), 511.
5. Tony Collins (2006) 'The Ambiguities of Amateurism: English Rugby Union in the Edwardian Era', *Sport in History*, 26 (3), 388.
6. Two major general histories of Australian sport published in the 1990s use the oppositional trope of 'Amateurs versus Professionals' either as a chapter title [Richard Cashman (1995) *Paradise of Sport: The Rise of Organised Sport in Australia* (South Melbourne: Oxford University Press), 54–71.], or as sections within a chapter [Daryl Adair and Wray Vamplew (1997) *Sport in Australian History* (Melbourne: Oxford University Press), 37–40].
7. Richard Holt (1990) *Sport and the British: A Modern History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 98.
8. Adair and Vamplew, *Sport in Australian History*, 38.
9. Douglas Booth and Colin Tatz (2000) *One-Eyed: A View of Australian Sport* (St Leonards: Allen and Unwin), 50.
10. S. W. Pope (2007) *Patriotic Games: Sporting Traditions in the American Imagination, 1876–1926* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press), 19.
11. Allen Guttmann (2002) *The Olympics: A History of the Modern Games* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press), 34.
12. Pope, *Patriotic Games*, 52–53.
13. Maurice T. Daly (1996) *One Hundred Years of Australian Sport: A History of the New South Wales Sports Club* (Sydney: New South Wales Sports Club), 41.
14. Colin Tatz (1996) *Obstacle Race: Aborigines in Sport* (Sydney: University of New South Wales Press), 91.
15. Tatz, *Obstacle Race*, 88.
16. See Tatz, *Obstacle Race* and Brendan Hokowhitu (2005) 'Rugby and *Tino Rangatiratanga*: Early Māori Rugby and the Formation of "Traditional" Māori Masculinity', *Sporting Traditions*, 21 (2), 75–95.
17. Tatz, *Obstacle Race*, 103.
18. Tatz, *Obstacle Race*, 88.
19. Tatz, *Obstacle Race*, 88.
20. *The Referee*, 25 March 1903, 6.
21. Daryl Adair (1994) 'Rowing and Sculling', in Vamplew and Stoddart (eds), *Sport in Australia*, 179–80; Stuart Ripley (2009) *Sculling and Skulduggery: A History of Professional Sculling* (Sydney: Walla Walla Press).

22. Reet Howell and Max Howell (1988) *Aussie Gold: The Story of Australia at the Olympics* (Melbourne: Brooks Waterloo), 358.
23. *The Referee*, 25 March 1903, 6.
24. The Australasian Amateur Conference [AAC] (1897) *Minutes of Meeting of Delegates from the Amateur Athletic Associations of New South Wales, New Zealand, Victoria and Queensland, Held at N.S.W. Amateur Sports Club, 43 Rowe Street, Sydney, 1st to 8th October, 1897* (Sydney: Printed by F. W. White), 14.
25. Murray G. Phillips (ed.) (2000) *From Sidelines to Centre Field: A History of Sports Coaching in Australia* (Sydney: UNSW Press), 19.
26. *The Referee*, 29 July 1903, 6.
27. Helen Irving (1997) *To Constitute a Nation: A Cultural History of Australia's Constitution* (Cambridge and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press), 112.
28. Tatz, *Obstacle Race*, 88.
29. Bain Attwood and Andrew Markus (2007) *The 1967 Referendum: Race, Power and the Australian Constitution* (Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press), vi.
30. *The Referee*, 29 July 1903, 6.
31. Victorian Amateur Athletic Association, *Programme – Australasian Athletics Championships*, Melbourne, 26 January 1914, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Davis Sporting Collection 1, Box 6 – Amateur athletics association carnivals, 1899–1931, Sydney, Australia [Hereafter DSC 1 Box 6], 13.
32. James Belich (2001) *Paradise Reforged: A History of the New Zealanders from the 1880s to the Year 2000* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press), 213. Buck's Māori appellation was derived from Brendan Hokowhitu (2003) '"Physical Beings": Stereotypes, Sport and the "Physical Education" of New Zealand Mâori', *Sport in Society*, 6 (2), 208.
33. Donald Denoon and Philippa Mein Smith, with Marivic Wyndham (2000) *A History of Australia, New Zealand, and the Pacific* (Oxford and Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers), 197.
34. *Otago Witness*, 5 August 1903, 50.
35. Quoted in Greg Ryan (1997) '"Extravagance of Thought and Feeling": New Zealand Reactions to the 1932/33 Bodyline Controversy', *Sporting Traditions*, 13 (2), 43.
36. Tatz, *Obstacle Race*, 88.
37. Charles H. Martin (2010) *Benching Jim Crow: The Rise and Fall of the Color Line in Southern College Sports, 1890–1980* (Urbana, Chicago and Springfield: University of Illinois Press), 43–45, 295.
38. Irving, *To Constitute a Nation*, 113.
39. *The Referee*, 15 April 1914, 9.
40. *The Referee*, 13 January 1909, 10.
41. *The Argus*, 17 February 1914, 12; *Brisbane Courier*, 17 February 1914, 3; *Hobart Mercury*, 17 February 1914, 5; *Sydney Morning Herald*, 17 February 1914, 10. My thanks to Bruce Coe for informing me about this suggestion.
42. Martin, *Benching Jim Crow*, 92.
43. *The Referee*, 15 April 1914, 9.
44. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 17 February 1914, 10.
45. *Sydney Sportsman*, 18 February 1914, 5.
46. Hokowhitu, 'Rugby and *Tino Rangatiratanga*', 78, 85.

47. Hokowhitu, 'Rugby and *Tino Rangatiratanga*,' 89. Hokowhitu defines *Tino Rangatiratanga* as 'chieftainship – also commonly referred to as self-determination'. [Hokowhitu, 'Rugby and *Tino Rangatiratanga*', 76.]
48. Mark Williams (2009) '"The Finest Race of Savages the World Has Seen": How Empire Turned Out Differently in Australia and New Zealand', in Vanessa Agnew and Jonathon Lamb with Daniel Spoth (eds), *Settler and Creole Reenactment* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan), 223.
49. *Otago Witness*, 27 January 1909, 62.
50. Wallie Ingram (1953) 'Maori Personalities in Sport', *Te Ao Hou* [*The New World*], 4 (Autumn), 64. According to *The Oxford Companion to New Zealand Literature*, *Te Ao Hou* 'was a bilingual quarterly published by the Maori Affairs Department, and printed by Pegasus Press, "to provide," as its first issue said, "interesting and informative reading for Maori homes . . . like a marae on paper, where all questions of interest to the Maori can be discussed".' [Roger Robinson and Nelson Wattie (eds) (1998) *The Oxford Companion to New Zealand Literature* (Auckland: Oxford University Press). Accessed 13 June 2009 from http://teaohou.natlib.govt.nz/journals/teaohou/about.html#oxford_en.]
51. John M. Hoberman (1997) *Darwin's Athletes: How Sport has Damaged Black America and Preserved the Myth of Race* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin), 126.
52. For a criticism of this view, see Chris Valiotis (2008) 'Suburban Footballers of Pacific Islander Ancestry: The Changing Face of Rugby League in Greater Western Sydney', in Andrew Moore and Andy Carr (eds), *Centenary Reflections: 100 Years of Rugby League in Australia* (Melbourne: Australian Society for Sports History), 145–46.
53. Holt, *Sport and the British*, 25.
54. James Bradley (1995) 'Inventing Australians and Constructing Englishness: Cricket and the Creation of a National Consciousness, 1860–1914', *Sporting Traditions*, 11 (2), 43–44.
55. Bradley, 'Inventing Australians', 35, 42.
56. Tony Collins (1998) *Rugby's Great Split: Class, Culture and the Origins of Rugby League Football* (London and Portland: Frank Cass), 51.
57. Collins, *Rugby's Great Split*, 51.
58. Derek Birley (1989) *The Willow Wand: Some Cricket Myths Explored* (London: Simon and Schuster [Sportspages]), 13.
59. *The Times*, 22 January 1909, 19.
60. Tony Mason (1980) *Association Football and English Society 1863–1915* (Brighton and Atlantic Highlands: Harvester Press and Humanities Press), 74–76.
61. Dilwyn Porter (2006) 'Revenge of the Crouch End Vampires: The AFA, the FA and English Football's "Great Split", 1907–1914', *Sport in History*, 26 (3), 407.
62. The compromise agreement with the FA mandated 'a series of provisions that were designed to discourage expansion' of the AFA. [Porter, 'Revenge of the Crouch End Vampires', 425.]
63. See Collins, *Rugby's Great Split*, 138–48. Amateur rugby footballers aligned to the RFU remained hostile to their professional rugby league counterparts until professionalism was legalised in 1995.

64. Francis Murray (2000) *The British Open: A History of Golf's Greatest Championship* (Lincolnwood: Contemporary Books), 11.
65. See Amateur Athletic Union of Australasia [AAUA] (1899) *Articles of Agreement, Laws for Athletic Meetings, Rules for Competitions, Record conditions, etc.* [Hereafter *Handbook*] (Sydney: AAUA), 27, for rules regarding the 'Throwing Cricket Ball' competition.
66. Richard Cashman (2002) *Sport in the National Imagination: Australian Sport in the Federation Decades* (Sydney: Walla Walla Press), 221.
67. AAUA, *Handbook*, 12.
68. New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association (1896) *Handbook* (Sydney: New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association), 15.
69. Amateur Athletic Union of Canada [AAUC] (1909) *Constitution and By-Laws of the Amateur Athletic Union of Canada* (Toronto: AAUC), 15, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Davis Sporting Collection 2, Box 18 Athletics: Australia, Sydney, Australia.
70. Amateur Athletic Association, Report of Conference between Representatives of the A.A.A., Irish A.A.A., and Scottish A.A.A., 1 February 1896, Amateur Athletic Association Collection, AAA/4/1: Compilation of conference reports – 1891–1906, Cadbury Research Library, Special Collections, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, United Kingdom [Hereafter AAA/4/1].
71. Amateur Athletic Association, Minutes of Annual General Meeting, 28 March 1896, Amateur Athletic Association Collection, AAA/1/2/2/4: General Committee Minutes vol. 4 – 1889–1911, Cadbury Research Library, Special Collections, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, United Kingdom [Hereafter AAA/1/2/2/4].
72. Australasian Amateur Conference, *Minutes of Meeting*, 3.
73. Australasian Amateur Conference, *Minutes of Meeting*, 5–6.
74. *The Referee*, 6 October 1897, 6; 13 October 1897, 7; *Sydney Morning Herald*, 8 October 1897, 6.
75. AAUA, *Handbook*, 12–13.
76. AAUA, *Handbook*, 13.
77. Murray G. Phillips (2001) 'Diminishing Contrasts and Increasing Varieties: Globalisation Theory and "Reading" Amateurism in Australian Sport', *Sporting Traditions*, 18 (1), 22.
78. *The Referee*, 17 June 1908, 10.
79. *Sporting Life*, 13 January 1909. Contained in a scrapbook held by the Olympic Studies Centre, Lausanne, Switzerland. [Sporting Life, Scrapbook, *The Definition of an Amateur For Olympic Games: An Inquiry Into the Question of a Standard Definition, or Definitions, of an Amateur for Olympic Purposes, Conducted bt* (sic.) *the Editor of the "Sporting Life", and Presented to the Members of the International Olympic Committee With A Respectful Request to the Committee to Consider the Matter*, Commission d'amateurisme: Rapports et definitions de l'amateurisme 1908 á 1971, CIO COMMI-ADMIS-RAPPO, 2047668, International Olympic Committee Archives, Lausanne, Switzerland, 29–30. (Hereafter 'Scrapbook', Commission d'amateurisme 1908 à 1971)].
80. The Amateur Sporting Federation of New South Wales [ASFNSW] (1908) *Articles of Agreement* (Sydney: ASFNSW), 7. Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia.

81. *The Referee*, 17 June 1908, 10.
82. *Sporting Life*, 13 January 1909, 'Scrapbook', Commission d'amateurisme 1908 à 1971, 30.
83. AAUA, *Handbook*, 13–14.
84. New Zealand Amateur Athletic Association, *Annual Report*, 30 November 1906, Athletics New Zealand Records, MS Papers 1238–132: Jubilee Material 1906–1907, Alexander Turnbull Library, National Library of New Zealand, Wellington, New Zealand.
85. New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association, *Annual Report*, 27 April 1910, Box 3, NSWAAA Records.
86. New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association, *Annual Report*, 10 April 1895, Box 3, NSWAAA Records; New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association, *Annual Report*, 28 April 1909, Box 3, NSWAAA Records.
87. *The Star*, 14 December 1905, 1.
88. *The Referee*, 12 June 1907, 8.
89. Amateur Athletic Union of Australasia, Minutes of Meeting, 17 August 1909, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, 7.
90. 'Qrius' (1907) *South African Champions . . . Springbok Athletes (Illustrated)* (Durban: P. Davis and Sons), 15.
91. Queensland Amateur Athletic Association, Minutes of Meeting for the purpose of forming an Amateur Athletic Association for Southern Queensland, 28 August 1895, *Queensland A. A. Assn Minute Book*, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, E. S. Marks Sporting Collection, Box Q82 – Miscellaneous sports – Letters and Minute Books, Sydney, Australia [Hereafter Marks Q 82], 1–7.
92. *The Referee*, 8 August 1894, 3.
93. *The Referee*, 8 August 1894, 3.
94. *Brisbane Courier*, 21 September 1894, 8; *The Queenslander*, 29 September 1894, 578.
95. *Brisbane Courier*, 6 October 1894, 5.
96. *Brisbane Courier*, 8 October 1894, 4.
97. *Brisbane Courier*, 16 October 1894, 4.
98. *The Referee*, 15 February 1905, 6.
99. Geoffrey Blainey (2003) *The Rush That Never Ended: A History of Australian Mining* (Carlton: Melbourne University Press), 87, 178, 190–93.
100. John Perry (2002) *The Quick & the Dead: Stawell & Its Race through Time* (Sydney: UNSW Press), 1.
101. Percy Mason (1985) *Professional Athletics in Australia* (Adelaide: Rigby), 35.
102. Ian Heads (1992) *True Blue: The Story of the NSW Rugby League* (Randwick: Ironbark Press), 76, 81, 121, 127.
103. For details of Miller's biographical details, see the Hindsight radio programme, 'The Greatest Game', ABC Radio National, Broadcast on 19 March 2009 at 1pm. Accessed 19 March 2009 at: www.abc.net.au/rn/hindsight/stories/2009/2515606.htm
104. 'The Greatest Game,' 19 March 2009. Rugby league was extremely popular during the Winfield Cup period and came closest to realising Miller's dream of universal popularity. For details of the marketing techniques used during the Winfield Cup period and the resulting popularity of the game,

see Murray G. Phillips (1998) 'From Suburban Football to International Spectacle: The Commodification of Rugby League in Australia, 1907–1995', *Australian Historical Studies*, 29 (110), 33–36.

105. Sean Fagan (2005) *Rugby Rebellion: The Divide of League and Union* (Kellyville: RL2008), 277–81. See *The Referee*, 21 August 1907, 10 for an example of Giltinan's claims to the amateur nature of the rugby league movement.
106. Smith had organised a fourth match after the takings from the first matches had proved insufficient [Fagan, *Rugby Rebellion*, 299].
107. *The Referee*, 20 January 1909, 10.
108. The ASFNSW, *Articles of Agreement*, 14.
109. *The Referee*, 27 January 1909, 10.
110. *The Referee*, 4 May 1909, 9.
111. J. A. Mangan (1981) *Athleticism in the Victorian and Edwardian Public School: The Emergence and Consolidation of an Educational Ideology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
112. David Ian Allsobrook (1986) *Schools for the Shires: The Reform of Middle-class Education in Mid-Victorian England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press), 4.
113. Allsobrook, *Schools for the Shires*, 2.
114. Henry Labouchere (Baron Taunton), *Royal Commission to Inquire into Education in England and Wales: Volume XII. Special Reports (S. Midland Counties) [Hereafter Taunton Commission Volume XII]*, London: House of Commons (United Kingdom) Parliamentary Papers, Command Papers; Reports of Commissioners, 1867–68, 28.
115. The elite secondary schools of Australia, such as Melbourne Grammar and Sydney Church of England Grammar School, are often denoted by the term 'Grammar'. This is not the case in England, where the term 'Grammar School' denotes a less prestigious school.
116. Henry Labouchere (Baron Taunton), *Royal Commission to Inquire into Education in England and Wales: Volume XXI. Tables of Income, Fees, Pupils, Buildings, Exhibitions of Grammar and Secondary Schools [Hereafter Taunton Commission Volume XXI]*, London: House of Commons (United Kingdom) Parliamentary Papers, Command Papers; Reports of Commissioners, 1867–68, 60–61. For a definition of the 'third class', see 5–6.
117. Labouchere, *Taunton Commission Volume XII*, 29.
118. Labouchere, *Taunton Commission Volume XII*, 30.
119. Labouchere, *Taunton Commission Volume XII*, 29–30.
120. Labouchere, *Taunton Commission Volume XII*, 30–31.
121. Labouchere, *Taunton Commission Volume XII*, 31.
122. Bernard Garside (1957) *A Brief History of Hampton School: 1557–1957* (Richmond: printed by Dimbleby's), 32–37.
123. Garside, *Hampton School*, 42–43.
124. Garside, *Hampton School*, 46–48.
125. Mangan, *Athleticism*, 23. For the United States, see Stephan Wassong (2004) *Pierre de Coubertin's American Studies and Their Importance for the Analysis of His Early Educational Campaign* (Würzburg: ERGON Verlag), 97–99.
126. J. A. Mangan (2004) 'Bullies, Beatings, Battles and Bruises: "Great Days and Jolly Days" at One Mid-Victorian Public School', in Mike Huggins and

J. A. Mangan (eds), *Disreputable Pleasures: Less Virtuous Victorians at Play* (London and New York: Frank Cass), 3.

127. Mangan, *Athleticism*, 138.
128. As opposed to Coombes, Marks had an undeniably elite schooling career at the short-lived Royston College in Sydney. The fact that Royston College hosted several athletics meetings at the Association Grounds in Sydney offers an indication of Royston College's status [*Sydney Morning Herald*, 21 May 1887, 2; 13 June 1889, 9]. This ground is now known as the Sydney Cricket Ground, Sydney's most important sporting venue during the late nineteenth and for most of the twentieth century. Marks had a successful athletics career at Royston, winning events over 150 and 220 yards during the school's sports meet in 1889 and was appointed an honorary secretary of the school's amateur athletic club in 1888 [*Sydney Morning Herald*, 13 June 1889, 9; 16 April 1888, 5]. His athletic and administrative accomplishments at school were used to establish his credentials both as secretary to the Union and as a political candidate when seeking re-election as Lord Mayor of Sydney in 1930 [*Queenslander*, 6 August 1898, 266; *Brisbane Courier*, 23 January 1899, 7; *Sydney Morning Herald*, 24 June 1930, 9].
129. *Courier*, 23 January 1899, 7.
130. Holt, *Sport and the British*, 99–100.
131. *Courier*, 23 January 1899, 7.
132. Eric Dunning and Kenneth Sheard (1979) *Barbarians, Gentlemen and Players: A Sociological Study of the Development of Rugby Football* (Canberra: Australian National University Press), 167.
133. Amateur Athletic Association, Minutes of Meeting, 23 November 1895, AAA/1/2/2/4.
134. Amateur Athletic Association, Minutes of Meeting, 23 November 1895, AAA/1/2/2/4.
135. Amateur Athletic Association, Report of A.A.A., N.C.U. and A.S.A. Conference Adjourned Meeting, 16 November 1895, AAA/4/1.
136. Theodore Andrea Cook (c. 1909) *The Fourth Olympiad, Being the Official Report: The Olympic Games of 1908* (London: British Olympic Association), 763.
137. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 15 October 1909, 7
138. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 29 April 1910, 7.
139. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 28 April 1910, 7.
140. *The Referee*, 4 May 1910, 9.
141. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 23 July 1910, 13.
142. New Zealand Amateur Athletic Association [NZAAA], Minutes of Meetings, 10 June 1912 and 1 July 1912, Athletics New Zealand Records, MSY – 0658: Minute Book – New Zealand Amateur Athletic Association 1908–1913, Alexander Turnbull Library, National Library of New Zealand, Wellington, New Zealand [Hereafter NZAAA Records: MSY – 0658], 216–18.
143. NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 3 February 1913, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0658, 244.
144. Ernie Howes, Circular to New South Wales amateur sporting bodies, 21 March 1908, Marks Q 82.
145. Howes, Circular, Marks Q 82.
146. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 20 March 1908, 10.

147. ASFNSW, *Articles of Agreement*, 7.
148. Sean Fagan (2008) *'Nothing but a Nine-Day Wonder': The Founding of Rugby League – Australia's First Professional Code – 9th Annual Tom Brock Lecture* (Sydney: Australian Society for Sports History and the Tom Brock Bequest Committee), 21.
149. W. F. Mandle (1979) 'Baker, Reginald Leslie (Snowy) (1884–1953)', in *Australian Dictionary of Biography: Volume 7* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press), 150–52. Accessed 30 September 2009 at: http://adbonline.anu.edu.au/biogs/A070152b.htm.
150. Cashman, *Sport in the National Imagination*, 229; Mandle, 'Baker'.
151. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 22 April 1909, 10.
152. Bob Petersen (2009) 'Boxer Shorts', *Sporting Traditions*, 26 (1), 88.
153. *The Referee*, 22 April 1925, 10.
154. Hardwick's battle to return to the amateur swimming fold is covered in Katharine Moore and Murray Phillips (1990) 'The Sporting Career of Harold Hardwick: One Example of the Irony of the Amateur–Professional Dichotomy', *Sporting Traditions*, 7 (1), 61–76.
155. *The Referee*, 2 March 1932, 11.
156. Ripley, *Sculling and Skulduggery*, 8.
157. Ripley, *Sculling and Skulduggery*, 9–11, vi.
158. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 22 April 1909, 10.
159. *The Referee*, 28 April 1909, 10.
160. *The Referee*, 9 June 1909, 10.
161. The definition read 'An "Amateur" shall mean one who shall not commit or have committed an offence under the Rules as to Professionalism, or, shall not on or after the 1st January 1911, compete for money, whether in the form of a prize, staked bet, or declared wager, or knowingly compete with or against a professional, or teach, pursue, or assist in the practice of any athletic exercise as a means of livelihood or for pecuniary gain.' [New South Wales Rugby Union [NSWRU], Circular to members: Copy of a letter from the Metropolitan Rugby Union regarding the definition of amateur footballers, 7 September 1910, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, E. S. Marks Sporting Collection, Q51 Box 7b – Football, Sydney, Australia, B1.]
162. NSWRU, Circular to members, B2.
163. *The Referee*, 7 December 1910, 9.
164. Details of Sparrow's war service can be found in his Personnel Dossier. Australian Imperial Force, Base Records Office, Personnel Dossier of Sparrow, Sidney Hubert, 1914–1920, First Australian Imperial Force Personnel Dossiers, Series B2455, Item No. 11506714, National Archives of Australia, Canberra, Australian Capital Territory, Australia. Accessed 30 September 2009 at: http://naa12.naa.gov.au/scripts/imagine.asp?B=11506714&I=1&SE=1
165. Terry Williams (2008) *Through Blue Eyes: A Pictorial History of Newtown RLFC* (Newtown: Newtown RLFC), 23.
166. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 19 August 1910, 8.
167. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 23 July 1910, 13. Coombes obviously supported this interview, as he reprinted it in his *Referee* column on 27 July with only minor changes.
168. *The Referee*, 28 September 1910, 9.

169. For details of the manner in which Sullivan obtained and abused power, see Pope, *Patriotic Games*, 31–32, 42–54.
170. *The Referee*, 7 June 1911, 9.
171. *Sydney Sportsman*, 26 July 1911, 5.
172. *The Referee*, 14 June 1911, 9.
173. *The Referee*, 25 October 1911, 9.
174. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 14 June 1911.
175. As Coombes was in England managing the Australasian Festival of Empire team at the time, it is unlikely that he made the comment.
176. *The Referee*, 7 June 1911, 9.
177. *The Referee*, 28 October 1914, 10.
178. *The Referee*, 12 July 1911, 9; 19 July 1911, 9.
179. *The Referee*, 7 April 1920, 10.
180. *The Referee*, 28 March 1923, 9.
181. These figures were obtained by examining the Annual Reports of the New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association delivered to Annual General Meetings of that body held between 1921 and 1935 [New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association, Annual Reports, Box 3, NSWAAA Records].
182. New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association, *Annual Report*, 28 April 1932, Box 3, NSWAAA Records.
183. New South Wales Olympic Council [NSWOC], Minutes of Council Meeting, 30 May 1935, Harry Gordon Papers, MS ACC 02/143: Box 2C – NSW Olympic Council, National Library of Australia, Canberra, Australian Capital Territory, Australia [Hereafter Harry Gordon Papers, NSWOC Records].
184. New South Wales Olympic Council, Minutes of Council Meetings, 18 September 1929 and 22 December 1930, Harry Gordon Papers, NSWOC Records.
185. The Richard Coombes Testimonial, 27 April 1931, Marks Q 82.
186. Neville Meaney (2001) 'Britishness and Australian Identity: The Problem of Nationalism in Australian History and Historiography', *Australian Historical Studies*, 32 (116), 84; Tony Collins (2005) 'Australian Nationalism and Working-class Britishness: The Case of Rugby League Football', *History Compass*, 3 (AU 142), 7.
187. Meaney, 'Britishness and Australian Identity', 89.
188. Belich, *Paradise Reforged*, 29–30.
189. Derek M. Schreuder and Stuart Ward (2008) 'Introduction: What Became of Australia's Empire?', in Schreuder and Ward (eds), *Australia's Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 11–12.

4 'Imperialism and Nationalism in Action'? Reconfiguring the Athletic Relationship with Britain

1. *The Referee*, 22 April 1908, 8.
2. John Hoberman, quoted in Richard Cashman (2002) *Sport in the National Imagination: Australian Sport in the Federation Decades* (Sydney: Walla Walla Press), 233.
3. For example, a number of cricketers represented Australia after emigrating from Britain and Ireland during the nineteenth century. In addition,

cricketers such as William Murdoch, William Midwinter, Jack Ferris, Albert Trott and Sammy Woods represented both Australia and England [Rick Smith (2001) *Australian Test Cricketers* (Sydney: ABC Books)].

4. See Garth Henniker and Ian Jobling (1989) 'Richard Coombes and the Olympic Movement in Australia: Imperialism and Nationalism in Action', *Sporting Traditions*, 6 (1), 2–15; Ian Jobling (2000) 'In Pursuit of Status, Respectability and Idealism: Pioneers of the Olympic Movement in Australasia', in J. A. Mangan and John Nauright (eds), *Sport in Australasian Society: Past and Present* (London and Portland: Frank Cass), 142–63; Katharine Moore (1989) 'One Voice in the Wilderness: Richard Coombes and the Promotion of the Pan-Britannic Festival Concept in Australia 1891–1911', *Sporting Traditions*, 5 (2), 188–203; Ian Jobling (1988) 'The Making of a Nation through Sport: Australia and the Olympic Games from Athens to Berlin, 1898–1916', *Australian Journal of Politics and History*, 34 (2), 160–72.
5. Henniker and Jobling, 'Imperialism and Nationalism in Action', 13.
6. J. G. A. Pocock (1974) 'British History: A Plea for a New Subject', *New Zealand Journal of History*, 8 (1), 7.
7. J. G. A. Pocock (1995) 'Conclusion: Contingency, Identity, Sovereignty', in Alexander Grant and Keith J. Stringer (eds), *Uniting the Kingdom? The Making of British History* (London: Routledge), 295.
8. Pocock, 'Conclusion', 300.
9. Pocock, 'British History', 4.
10. Pocock, 'Conclusion', 297.
11. J. G. A. Pocock (1999) 'The New British History in Atlantic Perspective: An Antipodean Commentary', *The American Historical Review*, 104 (2), 493.
12. Katie Pickles (2011) 'The Obvious and the Awkward: Postcolonialism and the British World', *New Zealand Journal of History*, 45 (1), 86.
13. Stuart Ward (2001) 'Sentiment and Self-interest: The Imperial Ideal in Anglo-Australian Commercial Culture', *Australian Historical Studies*, 32 (116), 102, 104.
14. James Curran and Stuart Ward (2010) *The Unknown Nation: Australia after Empire* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press), 6–7.
15. Pocock, 'Conclusion', 297; David Cannadine (1995) 'British History as a "New Subject": Politics, Perspectives and Prospects', in Alexander Grant and Keith J. Stringer (eds), *Uniting the Kingdom? The Making of British History* (London: Routledge), 16.
16. Pocock, 'British History', 19.
17. Pocock, 'British History', 20.
18. Neville Meaney (2003) 'Britishness and Australia: Some Reflections', *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 31 (2), 133.
19. Neville Meaney (2001) 'Britishness and Australian Identity: The Problem of Nationalism in Australian History and Historiography', *Australian Historical Studies*, 32 (116), 77.
20. Meaney, 'Britishness and Australian Identity', 80.
21. Tony Collins (2005) 'Australian Nationalism and Working-class Britishness: The Case of Rugby League Football', *History Compass*, 3 (AU 142), 6.
22. Collins, 'Australian Nationalism', 2–4.
23. Tony Collins (2009) 'The Tyranny of Deference: Anglo-Australian Relations and Rugby Union before World War II', *Sport in History*, 29 (3), 443.

24. Meaney, 'Britishness and Australian Identity', 84.
25. Collins, 'Australian Nationalism', 7.
26. Richard Cashman (1990) *The 'Demon' Spofforth* (Kensington: New South Wales University Press), 194.
27. John Rickard (2001) 'Response: Imagining the Unimaginable?' *Australian Historical Studies*, 32 (116), 129.
28. Meaney, 'Britishness and Australian Identity', 78; Rickard, 'Response', 130.
29. Collins, 'The Tyranny of Deference', 438.
30. Meaney, 'Britishness and Australian Identity', 89.
31. James Belich (2007) *Making Peoples: A History of the New Zealanders from Polynesian Settlement to the End of the Nineteenth Century* (Auckland: Penguin Books), 304.
32. Derek M. Schreuder and Stuart Ward (2008) 'Introduction: What Became of Australia's Empire?', in Schreuder and Ward (eds), *Australia's Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 11–12.
33. Collins, 'The Tyranny of Deference', 438.
34. Amateur Athletic Association, Minutes of Meeting of the General Committee, 14 April 1883, Amateur Athletic Association Collection, AAA/1/2/2/2: General Committee Minutes Vol. 2 – 1883–1886, Cadbury Research Library, Special Collections, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, United Kingdom.
35. Michael Letters and Ian Jobling (1996) 'Forgotten Links: Leonard Cuff and the Olympic Movement in Australasia, 1894–1905', *Olympika*, 5, 92–94.
36. Harry Gordon (1994) *Australia and the Olympic Games* (St Lucia: University of Queensland Press), 36–37.
37. For a reproduction of the letter, see Harry Gordon, *Australia and the Olympic Games* (St Lucia: University of Queensland Press), 441–43.
38. International Athletics Congress of Paris Commission on Amateurism, Minutes of Meetings and Report, 19 June 1894–22 June 1894, Commission d'amateurisme: Rapports et definitions de l'amateurisme 1908 á 1971, CIO COMMI-ADMIS-RAPPO, 2047668, International Olympic Committee Archives, Lausanne, Switzerland [Hereafter Commission d'amateurisme 1908 à 1971].
39. International Athletics Congress of Paris Commission on Amateurism, Minutes of Meeting, 20 June 1894, Commission d'amateurisme 1908 à 1971.
40. International Athletics Congress of Paris Commission on Amateurism, Minutes of Meeting, 20 June 1894, Commission d'amateurisme 1908 à 1971.
41. International Athletics Congress of Paris Commission on Amateurism, Minutes of Meeting, 20 June 1894, Commission d'amateurisme 1908 à 1971.
42. Jobling, 'The Making of a Nation', 161.
43. *The Referee*, 26 January 1898, 7.
44. *The Australasian*, 5 February 1898.
45. *The Referee*, 12 April 1899, 6.
46. *The Referee*, 25 January 1899, 6.
47. *The Referee*, 16 August 1899, 6.
48. Peter Lovesey (1979) *The Official Centenary History of the Amateur Athletic Association* (Enfield: Guinness Superlatives), 50.

49. *The Referee*, 5 March 1899, 5.
50. *The Referee*, 25 April 1900, 6.
51. Lovesey, *The Amateur Athletic Association*, 50.
52. This figure of sixteen does not include George Orton, a Canadian by birth who won the 3000 metres steeplechase while representing the University of Pennsylvania [International Olympic Committee, 'Olympic Medal Winners'. Accessed 18 August 2009 at: www.olympic.org/uk/athletes/results/search_r_uk.asp].
53. Gordon, *Australia and the Olympic Games*, 36–37.
54. *The Referee,* 29 August 1900, 6.
55. *The Australasian*, 29 December 1900.
56. *The Referee*, 16 January 1901, 6.
57. *The Referee*, 23 October 1901, 6.
58. *The Referee*, 5 September 1900, 6.
59. David Cannadine (1988) 'The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual: The British Monarchy and the "Invention of Tradition", c. 1820–1977', in Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (eds), *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge, New York and Oakleigh: Cambridge University Press), 120.
60. Cannadine, 'The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual', 124.
61. Collins, 'Australian Nationalism', 7.
62. Lovesey, *The Amateur Athletic Association*, 62.
63. Emil Voigt, 'Inauguration of the A.A.U.', *Manchester Daily News*, 30 July 1910, Amateur Athletic Association Collection, AAA/3/7/3: News cuttings relating to the National Cyclists' Union and the AAA 1910–11, Cadbury Research Library, Special Collections, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, United Kingdom.
64. *The Referee*, 20 September 1911, 9.
65. New Zealand Amateur Athletic Association, Minutes of Annual Meeting, 6 November 1911, Athletics New Zealand Records, MSY – 0658: Minute Book – New Zealand Amateur Athletic Association 1908–1913, Alexander Turnbull Library, National Library of New Zealand, Wellington, New Zealand, 178.
66. Amateur Athletic Union of Australasia, Minutes of Meeting, 10 November 1899, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, 8.
67. Reprinted in *The Referee*, 28 March 1900, 6.
68. *The Referee*, 17 January 1900, 5.
69. *The Referee*, 28 March 1900, 6.
70. *The Referee*, 17 January 1900, 5.
71. Dean Allen (2009) '"Cricket's Laird": James Logan and the Development of the "Imperial Game" in South Africa, 1888–1902', *Sporting Traditions*, 26 (1), 63–65.
72. Tony Collins (2009) *A Social History of English Rugby Union* (London and New York: Routledge), 168–69.
73. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 16 April 1900, 5.
74. Phillip Buckner and R. Douglas Francis (2006) 'Introduction', in Buckner and Francis (eds), *Canada and the British World: Culture, Migration, and Identity* (Vancouver: UBC Press), 8.
75. S. W. Pope (2007) *Patriotic Games: Sporting Traditions in the American Imagination, 1876–1926* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press), xxiv–xxv.

76. James Bradley (1995) 'Inventing Australians and Constructing Englishness: Cricket and the Creation of a National Consciousness, 1860–1914', *Sporting Traditions*, 11 (2), 42–43.
77. Pope, *Patriotic Games*, 46.
78. Belich, *Making Peoples*, 304.
79. *The Referee*, 11 January 1899, 6.
80. *The Referee*, 26 July 1899, 5.
81. *The Referee*, 17 January 1900, 5.
82. Murray G. Phillips (2001) 'Diminishing Contrasts and Increasing Varieties: Globalisation Theory and "Reading" Amateurism in Australian Sport', *Sporting Traditions*, 18 (1), 23.
83. *Sporting Life*, 16 October 1908. Sporting Life, Scrapbook, *The Definition of an Amateur For Olympic Games: An Inquiry Into the Question of a Standard Definition, or Definitions, of an Amateur for Olympic Purposes, Conducted bt* (sic) *the Editor of the "Sporting Life", and Presented to the Members of the International Olympic Committee With A Respectful Request to the Committee to Consider the Matter*, Commission d'amateurisme: Rapports et definitions de l'amateurisme 1908 á 1971, CIO COMMI-ADMIS-RAPPO, 2047668, International Olympic Committee Archives, Lausanne, Switzerland, 29–30 [Hereafter 'Scrapbook,' Commission d'amateurisme 1908 à 1971].
84. *Sporting Life*, 23 December 1908. 'Scrapbook,' Commission d'amateurisme 1908 à 1971, 23.
85. The banning of manual labourers from competing as amateurs.
86. Daryl Adair (1994) 'Rowing and Sculling', in Wray Vamplew and Brian Stoddart (eds), *Sport in Australia: A Social History* (Cambridge, New York and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press), 180.
87. Richard Holt (1990) *Sport and the British: A Modern History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press) 107–10; Phillips, 'Diminishing Contrasts', 24–25.
88. Stephen Wagg (2006) '"Base Mechanic Arms"? British Rowing, Some Ducks and the Shifting Politics of Amateurism', *Sport in History*, 26 (3), 526.
89. *Sporting Life*, 6 January 1909; 'Scrapbook', Commission d'amateurisme 1908 à 1971, 27–28.
90. *Sporting Life*, 1 December 1908; 'Scrapbook', Commission d'amateurisme 1908 à 1971, 17.
91. *Sporting Life*, 30 December 1908; 'Scrapbook', Commission d'amateurisme 1908 à 1971, 25.
92. *Sporting Life*, 30 December 1908; 'Scrapbook', Commission d'amateurisme 1908 à 1971, 25.
93. See Matthew P. Llewellyn (2008) 'A Nation Divided: Great Britain and the Pursuit of Olympic Excellence, 1912–1914', *Journal of Sport History*, 35 (1), 74–83.
94. Llewellyn, 'A Nation Divided', 78.
95. Allen Guttmann (2002) *The Olympics: A History of the Modern Games* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press), 35.
96. Llewellyn, 'A Nation Divided', 82–83.
97. Llewellyn, 'A Nation Divided', 88.
98. Llewellyn, 'A Nation Divided', 87.
99. Henniker and Jobling, 'Imperialism and Nationalism in Action', 9.
100. *The Referee,* 11 July 1900, 6.

101. *The Referee*, 18 July 1900, 6.
102. *The Referee*, 29 August 1900, 6.
103. Duncan Bell (2007) *The Idea of Greater Britain: Empire and the Future of World Order, 1860–1900* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press), 254–59.
104. Charles Bright and Michael Geyer (2002) 'Where in the World Is America? The History of the United States in the Global Age', in Thomas Bender (ed.), *Rethinking American History in a Global Age* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press), 81.
105. David Walker (1999) *Anxious Nation: Australia and the Rise of Asia 1850–1939* (St Lucia: University of Queensland Press), 93–97.
106. *The Referee*, 29 May 1907, 12.
107. *The Times*, 10 December 1906, 7.
108. *The Referee*, 29 May 1907, 12.
109. Christopher Love (2007) '"Whomsoever You See in Distress": Swimming, Saving Life and the Rise of the Royal Life Saving Society', *International Journal of the History of Sport*, 24, 671–72.
110. Christopher Love (2007) 'Social Class and the Swimming World: Amateurs and Professionals', *International Journal of the History of Sport*, 24 (5), 612.
111. Archibald Sinclair and William Henry (1894) *Swimming* (London: Longmans, Green), 25–28.
112. Alison C. Kay (2008) 'Villas, Values and the *Crystal Palace Company*, c.1852–1911', *The London Journal*, 33 (1), 36.
113. Moore, 'One Voice in the Wilderness', 200.
114. Sean Brawley (2001) '"Our Life-Savers": The Royal Life Saving Society and the Origins of Surf Life Saving in Federation Sydney', in Richard Cashman et al. (eds), *Sport, Federation, Nation* (Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW), 153.
115. *The Referee*, 7 December 1910, 9.
116. *The Referee*, 14 December 1910, 9.
117. Ramachandra Guha (2002) *A Corner of a Foreign Field: The Indian History of a British Sport* (London: Picador), 118.
118. Meaney, 'Britishness and Australia', 129–30.
119. Cashman, *Sport in the National Imagination*, 146.
120. Richard Coombes, 'Festival of Empire Games (London 1911) Report of the Tour of the Australasian Team', New Zealand Olympic Committee Records, Box 1A – Festival of Empire, 1911 Folder, Olympic Studies Centre, New Zealand Olympic Committee, Wellington, New Zealand.
121. See *The Times*, 18 August 1913, 6; and Llewellyn, 'A Nation Divided', 81.
122. Harold Hardwick, Diary Entries, 21 April 1911, 26 April 1911, 26 June 1911, Harold Hardwick Collection, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, CY 2481: diary, correspondence and related papers, 1911–1959, New South Wales, Australia [Hereafter Harold Hardwick Collection].
123. New Zealand Olympic Association, Minutes of Meeting, 30 October 1912, New Zealand Olympic Committee Records, Minute Book – October 1911 – March 1936, Olympic Studies Centre, New Zealand Olympic Committee, Wellington, New Zealand.

124. Harold Hardwick, Diary Entries, 11 April 1911 and 14 April 1911, Harold Hardwick Collection.
125. Moore, 'One Voice in the Wilderness', 198.
126. *The Referee*, 9 August 1911, 1.
127. *The Referee*, 9 August 1911, 1.
128. *The Referee*, 9 August 1911, 1.
129. Collins, *English Rugby Union*, 161.
130. Charles Little and Richard Cashman (2001) 'Ambiguous and Overlapping Identities: Australasia at the Olympic Games, 1896–1914', in Cashman et al. (eds), *Sport, Federation, Nation*, 87–88, 93.
131. Little and Cashman, 'Ambiguous and Overlapping Identities', 87–88.
132. *The Referee*, 18 October 1911, 9; 17 January 1912, 9.
133. *The Referee*, 27 September 1911, 9.
134. Llewellyn, 'A Nation Divided', 77; Amateur Athletic Union of Canada, Minutes of Annual Meeting, 25 November 1911, Amateur Athletic Union of Canada fonds, M3209, Library and Archives Canada, Ottawa, Canada, 14.
135. *The Referee*, 21 August 1912, 1.

5 North American Cousins: Relations with the United States and Canada

1. James Merrick, Letter to Henri Baillet-Latour, 9 January 1934, Correspondance de James Merrick 1913–1940, CIO MBR-MERRI-CORR, 7145, International Olympic Committee Archives, Lausanne, Switzerland [Hereafter Correspondance de James Merrick 1913–1940].
2. Carl Bridge and Kent Fedorowich (2003) 'Mapping the British World', in Bridge and Fedorowich (eds), *The British World: Diaspora, Culture and Identity* (London and Portland: Frank Cass) 8; Phillip Buckner and R. Douglas Francis (2005) 'Introduction', in Buckner and Francis (eds), *Rediscovering the British World* (Calgary: University of Calgary Press), 13.
3. Tony Abbott, Address to the Lowy Institute, Sydney: 'National Security Fundamentals', 23 April 2010. Accessed 16 June 2013 at: www.tonyabbott.com.au/LatestNews/Speeches/tabid/88/articleType/ArticleView/articleId/7347/Address-to-the-Lowy-Institute–National-Security-Fundamentals.aspx.
4. David Walker (1999) *Anxious Nation: Australia and the Rise of Asia 1850–1939* (St Lucia: University of Queensland Press), 94.
5. See Neville Meaney (1996) 'The Yellow Peril: Invasion Scare Novels and Australian Political Culture', in Ken Stewart (ed.), *The 1890s: Australian Literature and Literary Culture* (St Lucia: University of Queensland Press), 228–63.
6. Walker, *Anxious Nation*, 95–7.
7. Philippa Mein Smith (2012) *A Concise History of New Zealand* (Port Melbourne: Cambridge University Press), 125.
8. Elaine Thompson (1998) 'Political Culture', in Roger Bell and Philip Bell (eds), *Americanization and Australia* (Sydney: UNSW Press), 107.
9. Roger Bell and Philip Bell (1998) 'Introduction: The Dilemmas of "Americanisation"', in Bell and Bell (eds), *Americanization and Australia* (Sydney, UNSW Press), 5.

10. Richard Cashman and Anthony Hughes (1998) 'Sport', in Bell and Bell (eds), *Americanization and Australia*, 180–81.
11. Cashman and Hughes, 'Sport', 191.
12. Gregory S. Kealey and Greg Patmore (1996) 'Comparative Labour History: Australia and Canada', *Labour/Le Travail*, 38/*Labour History*, 71, 9.
13. A. Crichton (2005) *Children of a Common Mother: A Comparative Analysis of the Development of the Australian and Canadian Health Care Systems to 1995* (Kensington: School of Health Services and Management, University of New South Wales); C. D. Gilbert (1986) *Australian and Canadian Federalism 1867–1984: A Study of Judicial Techniques* (Carlton: Melbourne University Press); Helen Irving (1997) *To Constitute a Nation: A Cultural History of Australia's Constitution* (Cambridge and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press), 46–53.
14. The most recent comparative articles with a historical focus include A. J. Wolak (2007) 'Australia's "Irish Factor" as a Source of Cultural Difference from Canada', *Australasian-Canadian Studies*, 25 (1), 85–116; A. R. Buck (2004) 'Women, Dower, and the Courts of Equitable Jurisdiction: Comparing Upper Canada and New South Wales in the Nineteenth Century', *Australian Canadian Studies*, 22 (1), 57–76; and M. Sawer (2004) 'Suffrage Centenaries in Comparative Perspective', *Australian Canadian Studies*, 22 (1), 115–36.
15. Kealey and Patmore, 'Comparative Labour History', 11–12.
16. Don Morrow (1986) 'A Case-Study of Amateur Conflict: The Athletic War in Canada, 1906–1908', *The British Journal of Sports History*, 3 (2), 173.
17. W. R. Gilbert (1898) *Sports of Greater Britain: Comprising Shooting, Football, Hockey, Curling, Fishing, Cricket, Golf, Lacrosse, Together with a Short History of the Montreal Amateur Athletic Association* (Montreal: The "Shareholder" Office), 101. The Bibliothèque et Archives nationales Québec note that the Montreal *Witness* showed great intolerance to the Irish and to Catholics in general. ['Demeuré une entreprise familiale durant toute son existence, *The Montreal Witness* (1845–1938) manifestait une grande intolérance à l'égard des Irlandais et des catholiques en général.' Bibliothèque et Archives nationales Québec website. Accessed 16 November 2009 at: http://bibnum2.banq.qc.ca/bna/mtlwitness.]
18. Gilbert, *Sports of Greater Britain*, 103.
19. Gilbert, *Sports of Greater Britain*, 103–4.
20. Ian Tyrrell (2002) 'Beyond the View from Euro-America: Environment, Settler Societies, and the Internationalization of American History', in Thomas Bender (ed.), *Rethinking American History in a Global Age* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press), 171.
21. S. W. Pope (2007) *Patriotic Games: Sporting Traditions in the American Imagination, 1876–1926* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press), 23–24.
22. Pope, *Patriotic Games*, 23.
23. Chris Cunneen (1981) 'Elevating and Recording the People's Pastimes: Sydney Sporting Journalism 1886–1939', in Richard Cashman and Michael McKernan (eds), *Sport: Money, Morality and Media* (Kensington: New South Wales University Press), 164–65.
24. *The Referee*, 22 August 1900, 6.
25. *The Referee*, 29 August 1900, 6.

26. *The Referee*, 9 February 1898, 7.
27. *The Referee*, 2 February 1898, 1; 17 August 1898, 6.
28. *The Referee*, 2 February 1898, 1.
29. *The Referee*, 9 February 1898, 1.
30. *The Referee*, 28 December 1898, 6.
31. *The Referee*, 19 April 1899, 6.
32. Harry Gordon (1994) *Australia and the Olympic Games* (St Lucia: University of Queensland Press), 36–37.
33. Allen Guttmann (2002) *The Olympics: A History of the Modern Games* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press), 25.
34. Dikaia Chatziefstathiou argues that 'the IOC's attitudes to race and ethnicity were closer to those of British and French imperial paternalism than to any real humanism' [Dikaia Chatziefstathiou (2005) 'The Changing Nature of the Ideology of Olympism in the Modern Olympic Era', unpublished PhD thesis, Loughborough University, 105.]. Coubertin is quoted in Guttmann, *The Olympics*, 26.
35. Pierre de Coubertin (1997) *Olympic Memoirs* (Lausanne: International Olympic Committee), 103; Matthew P. Llewellyn (2011) *Rule Britannia: Nationalism, Identity and the Modern Olympic Games* (London: Routledge).
36. Guttmann, *The Olympics*, 24–25.
37. Stephan Wassong (2004) *Pierre de Coubertin's American Studies and Their Importance for the Analysis of His Early Educational Campaign* (Würzburg: ERGON Verlag), 13
38. Guttmann, *The Olympics*, 28.
39. James E. Sullivan, Letter to Pierre de Coubertin, 29 January 1904, Correspondance au sujet des Jeux Olympiques à Chicago puis St Louis (originaux) (1900–1904), CIO JO-1904S-CORR, 201289, International Olympic Committee Archives, Lausanne, Switzerland.
40. *The Referee*, 9 December 1903, 6.
41. *The Referee*, 11 May 1904, 6.
42. *The Referee*, 25 May 1904, 6.
43. *The Referee*, 6 July 1904, 6.
44. *The Referee,* 20 July 1904, 4.
45. Guttmann, *The Olympics*, 29–30.
46. *The Referee*, 16 September 1908, 1.
47. *The Referee*, 26 August 1908, 10; 21 October 1908, 10; 1 September 1909, 9.
48. *The Referee*, 21 October 1908, 10; 4 November 1908, 10
49. *The Referee*, 2 September 1908, 10
50. *The Referee*, 30 September 1908, 10.
51. *The Referee*, 16 September 1908, 1.
52. *The Referee*, 27 January 1909, 10.
53. *The Referee*, 31 October 1908, 10.
54. *The Referee*, 28 October 1908, 10.
55. *The Referee*, 20 January 1909, 10.
56. *The Referee*, 13 January 1909, 10.
57. *The Referee*, 31 October 1908, 10.
58. *The Referee*, 4 November 1908, 10.
59. *The Referee*, 9 August 1911, 1.
60. *The Referee*, 9 August 1911, 1.

61. *The Referee*, 17 April 1912, 9.
62. The AAUA delegates were listed in *The Referee*, 1 April 1914, 9.
63. *The Referee*, 15 July 1914, 11.
64. *The Referee*, 27 April 1921, 9.
65. Amateur Athletic Union of Canada, Minutes of Annual Meeting [Hereafter AAUC Minutes], 9 and 10 December 1921, Amateur Athletic Union of Canada fonds, M3209, Library and Archives Canada [LAC], Ottawa, Canada [Hereafter AAUC fonds – LAC], 24–25.
66. Unattributed (c.1921) *Minutes of Third Conference: Including Athletic Rules and World's Records: International Amateur Athletic Federation: Held at Geneva, Switzerland May 27–28, 1921* (New York: American Sports Publishing Co.), 22.
67. Garth Henniker and Ian Jobling (1989) 'Richard Coombes and the Olympic Movement in Australia: Imperialism and Nationalism in Action', *Sporting Traditions*, 6 (1), 7.
68. Richard Coombes, 'Festival of Empire Games (London 1911) Report of the Tour of the Australasian Team', New Zealand Olympic Committee [NZOC] Records, Box 1A – Festival of Empire, 1911 Folder, Olympic Studies Centre, New Zealand Olympic Committee, Wellington, New Zealand [Hereafter NZOC Records, Box 1A]. Emphasis in original.
69. Coombes, 'Festival of Empire Games (London 1911) Report of the Tour of the Australasian Team', NZOC Records, Box 1A.
70. Coombes, 'Festival of Empire Games (London 1911) Report of the Tour of the Australasian Team', NZOC Records, Box 1A.
71. AAUC Minutes, 25 November 1911, AAUC fonds – LAC, 50.
72. Morrow, 'The Athletic War in Canada', 173.
73. Morrow, 'The Athletic War in Canada', 177.
74. Morrow, 'The Athletic War in Canada', 179.
75. Morrow, 'The Athletic War in Canada', 179–80.
76. Morrow, 'The Athletic War in Canada', 183–84.
77. Morrow, 'The Athletic War in Canada', 184–85.
78. Garth A. Paton (2006) 'James G. B. Merrick (1871–1946): Sports Organizer, Negotiator, Canada's Second IOC Member', in Nigel B. Crowther, Robert Barney and Michael Heine (eds), *Cultural Imperialism in Action: Critiques in the Global Olympic Trust, Eighth International Symposium for Olympic Research* (London: University of Western Ontario), 255.
79. Paton, 'James G. B. Merrick', 256.
80. Paton, 'James G. B. Merrick', 258.
81. James G. Merrick, Annual Report of the President to the Board of Governors and Members of the Canadian Amateur Athletic Union, Minutes of Final Meetings of the Canadian Amateur Athletic Union and the Amateur Athletic Federation of Canada. Organisation Meeting of the Amateur Athletic Union of Canada and First Meeting of Board of Governors of A.A.U. of C., 27 November 1909, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Davis Sporting Collection 2, Box 14 Athletics: U.S.A. and Canada, Sydney, Australia, 6–8.
82. Matthew P. Llewellyn (2008) 'A Nation Divided: Great Britain and the Pursuit of Olympic Excellence, 1912–1914', *Journal of Sport History*, 35 (1), 77.

83. AAUC Minutes, 23 November 1912, AAUC fonds, 8–9.
84. Henniker and Jobling, 'Imperialism and Nationalism in Action', 8; Graeme Davison (2002) 'The Imaginary Grandstand', *Meanjin*, 61 (3), 7.
85. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 30 October 1912, 11.
86. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 30 October 1912, 11.
87. Tony Collins (2009) 'The Tyranny of Deference: Anglo-Australian Relations and Rugby Union before World War II', *Sport in History*, 29 (3), 438; Tony Collins (2005) 'Australian Nationalism and Working-class Britishness: The Case of Rugby League Football', *History Compass*, 3 (AU 142), 1–19.
88. Katharine Moore (1989) 'One Voice in the Wilderness: Richard Coombes and the Promotion of the Pan-Britannic Festival Concept in Australia 1891–1911', *Sporting Traditions*, 5 (2), 188–203.
89. Duncan Bell (2007) *The Idea of Greater Britain: Empire and the Future of World Order, 1860–1900* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press), 108.
90. Bell, *The Idea of Greater Britain*, 14.
91. Bell, *The Idea of Greater Britain*, 19.
92. Bell, *The Idea of Greater Britain*, 15–16.
93. Alan Metcalfe (1995) 'The Meaning of Amateurism: A Case Study of Canadian Sport, 1884–1970', *Canadian Journal of the History of Sport*, 26 (2), 34.
94. Metcalfe, 'The Meaning of Amateurism', 42.
95. The resolution in full read 'That, inasmuch as a difference of opinion has arisen as to the effect of Clause 6 in the Articles of Alliance between the Dominion of Canada Football Association and the A.A.U. of C., this meeting is of the opinion, and so instructs the Governors of the Union, that teams in the Dominion of Canada Football Association should not be permitted to play with or against professional teams from Canada or elsewhere' [AAUC Minutes, 22 November 1913, AAUC fonds – LAC, 86–87].
96. AAUC Minutes, 22 November 1913, AAUC fonds – LAC, 78
97. AAUC Minutes, 22 November 1913, AAUC fonds – LAC, 80.
98. AAUC Minutes, 22 November 1913, AAUC fonds – LAC, 79–82.
99. AAUC Minutes, 22 November 1913, AAUC fonds – LAC, 82.
100. AAUC Minutes, 22 November 1913, AAUC fonds – LAC, 80.
101. AAUC Minutes, 22 November 1913, AAUC fonds – LAC, 58.
102. AAUC Minutes, 22 November 1913, AAUC fonds – LAC, 80.
103. AAUC Minutes, 26 November 1910, AAUC fonds – LAC, 11.
104. AAUC Minutes, 22 November 1913, AAUC fonds – LAC, 80.
105. Charlotte Macdonald (2011) *Strong, Beautiful and Modern: National Fitness in Britain, New Zealand, Australia and Canada, 1935–1960* (Wellington: Bridget Williams Books), 129.
106. Bruce Kidd (1994) 'The First COA Presidents', *Olympika*, 3, 107–08.
107. Kealey and Patmore, 'Comparative Labour History', 12.
108. Morrow, 'The Athletic War in Canada', 174.
109. Allen Guttmann (1978) *From Ritual to Record: The Nature of Modern Sports* (New York: Columbia University Press), 128.
110. AAUC Minutes, 25 and 26 September 1919, AAUC fonds – LAC, 7–9.
111. AAUC Minutes, 25 and 26 September 1919, AAUC fonds – LAC, 23–24.
112. AAUC Minutes, 25 and 26 September 1919, AAUC fonds – LAC, 23–24.
113. AAUC Minutes, 25, 26 and 27 September 1924, AAUC fonds – LAC, 14.

114. AAUC Minutes, 25, 26 and 27 September 1924, AAUC fonds – LAC, 24.
115. AAUC Minutes, 10, 11 and 12 September 1925, AAUC fonds – LAC, 24.
116. AAUC Minutes, 10, 11 and 12 September 1925, AAUC fonds – LAC, 48; for details of the classes of amateurism employed in Canada, see Morrow, 'The Athletic War in Canada', 185. Class B professionals were those that had competed with or against a professional or entered a competition under a false name.
117. AAUC Minutes, 9, 10 and 11 December 1926, AAUC fonds – LAC, 6.
118. Metcalfe, 'The Meaning of Amateurism', 39. For details of Lamb's Australian birth and migration to Canada, see Macdonald, *Strong, Beautiful and Modern*, 109, 202.
119. AAUC Minutes, 9, 10 and 11 December 1926, AAUC fonds – LAC, 11
120. AAUC Minutes, 1, 2 and 3 December 1927, AAUC fonds – LAC, 5.
121. AAUC Minutes, 1, 2 and 3 December 1927, AAUC fonds – LAC, 12.
122. AAUC Minutes, 3, 4 and 5 December 1931, AAUC fonds – LAC, 96.
123. AAUC Minutes, 8, 9 and 10 December 1932, AAUC fonds – LAC, 82.
124. AAUC Minutes, 8, 9 and 10 December 1932, AAUC fonds – LAC, 95–100.
125. AAUC Minutes, 8, 9 and 10 December 1932, AAUC fonds – LAC, 95.
126. AAUC Minutes, 16, 17 and 18 November 1933, AAUC fonds – LAC, 77.
127. Leif Yttergren (2006) 'J. Sigfrid Edstrøm and the Nurmi Affair of 1932: The Struggle of the Amateur Fundamentalists against Professionalism in the Olympic Movement', in Nigel B. Crowther, Robert Barney and Michael Heine (eds), *Cultural Imperialism in Action: Critiques in the Global Olympic Trust, Eighth International Symposium for Olympic Research* (London: University of Western Ontario), 122.
128. AAUC Minutes, 16, 17 and 18 November 1933, AAUC fonds – LAC, 81.
129. AAUC Minutes, 16, 17 and 18 November 1933, AAUC fonds – LAC, 83.
130. AAUC Minutes, 16, 17 and 18 November 1933, AAUC fonds – LAC, 84.
131. AAUC Minutes, 16, 17 and 18 November 1933, AAUC fonds – LAC, 84.
132. John Herd Thompson (2008) 'Canada and the "Third British Empire", 1901–1939', in Phillip Buckner (ed.), *Canada and the British Empire* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press), 100.
133. AAUC Minutes, 16, 17 and 18 November 1933, AAUC fonds – LAC, 107.
134. AAUC Minutes, 16, 17 and 18 November 1933, AAUC fonds – LAC, 108.
135. AAUC Minutes, 16, 17 and 18 November 1933, AAUC fonds – LAC, 112.
136. AAUC Minutes, 16, 17 and 18 November 1933, AAUC fonds – LAC, 120.
137. AAUC Minutes, 16, 17 and 18 November 1933, AAUC fonds – LAC, 118.
138. James Merrick, Letter to Henri Baillet-Latour, 9 January 1934. Correspondance de James Merrick 1913–1940.
139. The reinstatement clauses of the AAUA can be found at Amateur Athletic Union of Australasia [AAUA] (1899) *Articles of Agreement, Laws for Athletic Meetings, Rules for Competitions, Record conditions, etc.* (Sydney: AAUA), 13–15.
140. AAUA, Minutes of Meeting, 19 August 1909, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia, 15.
141. AAUA, Minutes of Meeting, 27 December 1911, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia, 11.
142. AAUA, Minutes of Meeting, 6 December 1920, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia, 15–16.

143. AAUA, Minutes of Meeting, 29 December 1921, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia, 7.
144. Amateur Athletic Union of Australia and New Zealand, Minutes of Meeting, 4 February 1924, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia, 6–7.
145. AAUC Minutes, 16, 17 and 18 November 1933, AAUC fonds – LAC, 78. The NZAAA included much the same sports as covered in the original AAUA definition, with the addition of basketball and bowling.
146. *The Referee*, 17 June 1908, 10.
147. *The Referee*, 27 May 1908, 10.
148. New Zealand Amateur Athletic Association, Minutes of Meeting, 1 February 1926, Athletics New Zealand Records, MSY – 0659: Minute Book – New Zealand Amateur Athletic Association 1913–1927, Alexander Turnbull Library, National Library of New Zealand, Wellington, New Zealand, 286.
149. New Zealand Olympic Association, Minutes of Meeting, 7 May 1931, NZOC Records, Minute Book – October 1911 – March 1936, Olympic Studies Centre, New Zealand Olympic Committee, Wellington, New Zealand [Hereafter NZOC Records, Minute Book], 175.
150. New Zealand Olympic Association, Minutes of Meeting, 10 November 1931, NZOC Records, Minute Book, 180.
151. AAUC Minutes, 15, 16 and 17 November 1934, AAUC fonds – LAC, 5.
152. AAUC Minutes, 15, 16 and 17 November 1934, AAUC fonds – LAC, 20.
153. AAUC Minutes, 15, 16 and 17 November 1934, AAUC fonds – LAC, 29.
154. AAUC Minutes, 15, 16 and 17 November 1934, AAUC fonds – LAC, 73.
155. AAUC Minutes, 15, 16 and 17 November 1934, AAUC fonds – LAC, 105–06.
156. AAUC Minutes, 21 and 22 November 1935, AAUC fonds – LAC, 64–65.
157. AAUC Minutes, 21 and 22 November 1935, AAUC fonds – LAC, 79–80.
158. See Metcalfe, 'The Meaning of Amateurism', 42–44.
159. AAUC Minutes, 21 and 22 November 1935, AAUC fonds – LAC, 74.
160. W. F. Mandle (1973) 'Cricket and Australian Nationalism in the Nineteenth Century', *Journal of the Royal Australian Historical Society*, 59 (4), 242.
161. AAUC Minutes, 21 and 22 November 1935, AAUC fonds – LAC, 91.
162. AAUC Minutes, 21 and 22 November 1935, AAUC fonds – LAC, 69.

6 A Question of Nationalism? The Dissolution of the Australasian Amateur Athletic Relationship

1. *New Zealand Times*, 25 November 1924, 11.
2. New Zealand Olympic Association, *Minutes of Annual Meeting*, 1 May 1935, New Zealand Olympic Committee [Hereafter NZOC] Records, Minute Book – October 1911 – March 1936, Olympic Studies Centre, New Zealand Olympic Committee, Wellington, New Zealand [Hereafter NZOC Records, Minute Book], 232–33.
3. Neville Meaney (2001) 'Britishness and Australian Identity: The Problem of Nationalism in Australian History and Historiography', *Australian Historical Studies*, 32 (116), 78.

4. James Belich (2001) *Paradise Reforged: A History of the New Zealanders from the 1880s to the Year 2000* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press), 440–41.
5. James Belich (2007) *Making Peoples: A History of the New Zealanders from Polynesian Settlement to the End of the Nineteenth Century* (Auckland: Penguin Books), 132.
6. Belich, *Making Peoples*, 131.
7. Belich, *Making Peoples*, 134.
8. Quoted by Peter Gibbons (2003) 'The Far Side of the Search for Identity: Reconsidering New Zealand History', *New Zealand Journal of History*, 37 (1), 44.
9. Belich, *Making Peoples*, 134.
10. Rollo Arnold (1991) 'Family or Strangers?' Trans-Tasman Migrants, 1870–1920', in *Australia-New Zealand: Aspects of a Relationship, Proceedings of the Stout Research Centre Eighth Annual Conference* (Wellington: Victoria University of Wellington), 8.
11. Rollo Arnold (1987) 'The Australasian Peoples and their World, 1888–1915', in Keith Sinclair (ed.), *Tasman Relations: New Zealand and Australia, 1788–1988* (Auckland: Auckland University Press), 52.
12. E. J. Tapp (1952) 'New Zealand and Australian Federation', *Historical Studies*, 5 (19), 244–57; F. L. W. Wood (1968) 'Why Did New Zealand Not Join the Australian Commonwealth in 1900–1901?', *New Zealand Journal of History*, 2 (2), 115–29; Miles Fairburn (1970) 'New Zealand and Australasian Federation, 1883–1901: Another View', *New Zealand Journal of History*, 4 (2), 138–59; Keith Sinclair (1987) 'Why New Zealanders Are Not Australians: New Zealand and the Australian Federal Movement, 1881–1901', in Keith Sinclair (ed.), *Tasman Relations: New Zealand and Australia, 1788–1988* (Auckland: Auckland University Press), 90–103.
13. Donald Denoon (2003) 'Re-Membering Australasia: A Repressed Memory', *Australian Historical Studies*, 34 (122), 290–304; Philippa Mein Smith (2003) 'New Zealand Federation Commissioners in Australia: One Past, Two Historiographies', *Australian Historical Studies*, 34 (122), 305–25; Donald Denoon and Philippa Mein Smith, with Marivic Wyndham (2000) *A History of Australia, New Zealand, and the Pacific* (Oxford and Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers).
14. Philippa Mein Smith (2009) 'The Tasman World', in Giselle Byrnes (ed.), *The New Oxford History of New Zealand* (South Melbourne: Oxford University Press), 298–99.
15. Mein Smith, 'The Tasman World', 318.
16. Belich, *Paradise Reforged*, 47.
17. Belich, *Paradise Reforged*, 47, 52.
18. Belich, *Paradise Reforged*, 316–17, 328–32, 384–85, 440.
19. David Grant (1994) *On a Roll: A History of Gambling and Lotteries in New Zealand* (Wellington: Victoria University Press), 59, 63, 167–69, 226.
20. Richard Waterhouse (1995) *Private Pleasures, Public Leisure: A History of Australian Popular Culture Since 1788* (South Melbourne: Longman), 71.
21. Helen M. van der Poorten (1976) 'Williamson, James Cassius (1845–1913)', *Australian Dictionary of Biography: Volume 6* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press), 406–07. Accessed 1 March 2011 at: http://adbonline.anu.edu.au/biogs/A060439b.htm

22. Belich, *Paradise Reforged*, 329.
23. Later the Australian Rugby League [ARL] and later still the National Rugby League [NRL].
24. Belich, *Paradise Reforged*, 385.
25. Harry Gordon (1994) *Australia and the Olympic Games* (St Lucia: University of Queensland Press), 15–16.
26. The Australasian Amateur Conference [AAC] (1897) *Minutes of Meeting of Delegates from the Amateur Athletic Associations of New South Wales, New Zealand, Victoria and Queensland, Held at N.S.W. Amateur Sports Club, 43 Rowe Street, Sydney, 1st to 8th October, 1897* (Sydney: Printed by F. W. White).
27. Amateur Athletic Union of Australasia [AAUA] (1899) *Articles of Agreement, Laws for Athletic Meetings, Rules for Competitions, Record conditions, etc.* [Hereafter *Handbook*] (Sydney: AAUA), 16.
28. Richard Cashman et al. (eds) (2001) *Sport, Federation, Nation* (Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW).
29. Richard Cashman (2001) 'Part 2: A Changing Face of Sport?: Introduction', in Cashman et al. (eds), *Sport, Federation, Nation*, 60–61.
30. Denoon et al., *A History of Australia, New Zealand, and the Pacific*, 30; Denoon, 'Re-Membering Australasia', 293.
31. W. F. Mandle (1973) 'Cricket and Australian Nationalism in the Nineteenth Century', *Journal of the Royal Australian Historical Society*, 59 (4), 242.
32. Daryl Adair and Wray Vamplew (1997) *Sport in Australian History* (Melbourne: Oxford University Press), 43.
33. Greg Ryan (2001) 'Commentary', in Richard Cashman et al. (eds), *Sport, Federation, Nation*, 133.
34. Unattributed (2001) 'Preface', in Richard Cashman et al. (eds), *Sport, Federation, Nation*, v.
35. Charles Little (2001) 'Trans-Tasman Federations in Sport: The Changing Relationships between Australia and New Zealand', in Richard Cashman et al. (eds.), *Sport, Federation, Nation* (Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW), 65–66.
36. See Ryan, 'Commentary', 133.
37. Belich, *Paradise Reforged*, 30.
38. Belich, *Paradise Reforged*, 50.
39. Belich, *Making Peoples*, 285–86.
40. Marian Quartly (2001) 'Convict History', in Graeme Davison et al. (eds), *The Oxford Companion to Australian History* (South Melbourne: Oxford University Press). Accessed 11 November 2010 at: www.oxfordreference.com/views/ENTRY.html?subview=Main&entry=t127.e362
41. Arnold, 'Family or Strangers?', 2.
42. Charles Little and Richard Cashman (2001) 'Ambiguous and Overlapping Identities: Australasia at the Olympic Games, 1896–1914', in Richard Cashman et al. (eds), *Sport, Federation, Nation* (Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW), 86. Little and Cashman incorrectly suggest that the athletes paid their own fares.
43. Australasian Amateur Conference, *Minutes of Meeting*, 12.
44. Australasian Amateur Conference, *Minutes of Meeting*, 14–15.
45. *The Referee*, 22 December 1897, 1; 29 December 1897, 7.

46. The *Referee*, 22 December 1897, 1; The *Referee*, 29 December 1897, 7; *Weekly Press [New Zealand Referee]*, 8 December 1897, 35. The *New Zealand Referee* was included in the *Weekly Press* at this time.
47. *Weekly Press*, 8 December 1897, 35.
48. *The Star*, 7 July 1902, 3.
49. *The Referee*, 25 April 1900, 6.
50. *The Referee*, 9 May 1900, 6.
51. *The Referee*, 22 August 1900, 6.
52. Imke Fischer (2001) 'The Involvement of the Commonwealth Government in Physical Education: From Defence to National Fitness', in Cashman et al. (eds), *Sport, Federation, Nation*, 16–35; Andrew Honey (2001) 'Sport, Immigration Restriction and Race: The Operation of the White Australia Policy', in Cashman et al. (eds), *Sport, Federation, Nation*, 26–46; Bernard Whimpress (2001) 'Absent Aborigines: The Impact of Federation on Indigenous Sport', in Cashman et al. (eds), *Sport, Federation, Nation*, 47–54; John O'Hara (2001) 'Commentary', in Cashman et al. (eds), *Sport, Federation, Nation*, 57.
53. *The Argus*, 16 April 1904, 18.
54. *The Australasian*, 18 June 1904.
55. Richard Cashman and Tom Hickie (1990) 'The Divergent Sporting Cultures of Sydney and Melbourne', *Sporting Traditions*, 7 (1), 26.
56. *The Referee*, 27 April 1904, 6.
57. Quoted in *The Referee*, 8 June 1904, 6.
58. *The Referee*, 29 June 1904, 6.
59. These Games were held on the tenth anniversary of the first Modern Olympic Games. The International Olympic Committee does not recognise these games as official Olympic Games.
60. C. D. Jones (N.S.W. Representative Fund), Letter to Nigel C. Barker, 13 February 1906, Biography File, BIOG 648 – Nigel Barker, University of Sydney Archives, Sydney, Australia.
61. *The Australasian*, 24 February 1906.
62. *The Referee*, 28 February 1906, 8.
63. *The Referee*, 28 February 1906, 8.
64. *Evening Post*, 11 April 1908, 2; *The Star*, 14 April 1908, 2; *Evening Post*, 8 February 1908, 14.
65. *Taranaki Herald*, 6 May 1908, 7.
66. *The Star*, 25 April 1908, 4; *Evening Post*, 25 April 1908, 5; *Otago Witness*, 6 May 1908, 62.
67. *Evening Post*, 28 April 1908, 6.
68. *The Star*, 25 April 1908, 4.
69. *Otago Witness*, 29 April 1908.
70. *Taranaki Herald*, 6 May 1908, 7.
71. *Otago Witness*, 29 April 1908, 62.
72. *The Referee*, 2 March 1904, 6.
73. *Otago Witness*, 24 June 1908, 71; 8 July 1908, 63; 15 July 1908, 63.
74. Little and Cashman, 'Ambiguous and Overlapping Identities', 90.
75. Ian F. Jobling (1986) 'The Lion, the Eagle and the Kangaroo: Politics and Proposals for a British Empire Team at the 1916 Berlin Olympics', in Gerald Redmond (ed.), *Sport and Politics* (Champaign: Human Kinetics Publishers), 105; Jobling, 'In Pursuit of Status', 153–54; Garth Henniker and Ian

Jobling (1989) 'Richard Coombes and the Olympic Movement in Australia: Imperialism and Nationalism in Action', *Sporting Traditions*, 6 (1), 8.
76. *The Referee*, 20 June 1906, 6.
77. David Guiney (1996) 'The Olympic Council of Ireland', *Citius, Altius, Fortius*, 4 (3), 33.
78. Little and Cashman, 'Ambiguous and Overlapping Identities', 87–88, 93.
79. Little and Cashman, 'Ambiguous and Overlapping Identities', 87–88.
80. Gordon, *Australia and the Olympic Games*, 62, 84.
81. *The Referee*, 3 April 1912, 9.
82. Little and Cashman, 'Ambiguous and Overlapping Identities', 93.
83. See Pierre de Coubertin (1997) *Olympic Memoirs* (Lausanne: International Olympic Committee), 100.
84. Theodore Andrea Cook (c. 1909) *The Fourth Olympiad, Being the Official Report: The Olympic Games of 1908* (London: British Olympic Association), 29.
85. Richard White (1981) *Inventing Australia: Images and Identity 1688–1980* (Sydney: George Allen & Unwin), 111.
86. Cook, *Official Report*, 12.
87. *The Referee*, 14 August 1913, 1.
88. *The Referee*, 21 August 1913, 1.
89. New Zealand Amateur Athletic Association [NZAAA], Unattributed newspaper report, Athletics New Zealand Records, MSY – 0658: Minute Book – New Zealand Amateur Athletic Association 1908–1913, Alexander Turnbull Library, National Library of New Zealand, Wellington, New Zealand [Hereafter NZAAA Records: MSY – 0658], 23.
90. Little and Cashman, 'Ambiguous and Overlapping Identities', 89–90.
91. NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 3 May 1909, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0658, 26.
92. Matthew P. Llewellyn (2011) *Rule Britannia: Nationalism, Identity and the Modern Olympic Games* (London: Routledge).
93. New Zealand Olympic Association, Minutes of Meeting, 27 February 1920, NZOC Records, Minute Book, 38.
94. Belich, *Paradise Reforged*, 51.
95. Belich, *Paradise Reforged*, 46; Christopher Pugsley (2004) *The ANZAC Experience: New Zealand, Australia and Empire in the First World War* (Auckland: Reed Military), 20–21.
96. Anthony Hughes (2001) 'Sporting Federations: The Impact of Federation on Sports Governance', in Cashman et al. (eds), *Sport, Federation, Nation*, 124–25.
97. Charles Little (2001) 'Trans-Tasman Federations in Sport: The Changing Relationships between Australia and New Zealand', in Cashman et al. (eds), *Sport, Federation, Nation*, 69.
98. *Evening Post*, 18 November 1905, 6.
99. *The Referee*, 1 April 1903, 6; 29 April 1903, 6.
100. *The Star*, 8 November 1906, 8.
101. *The Referee*, 13 March 1907, 8.
102. *The Referee*, 12 June 1907, 8.
103. *Weekly Press*, 26 June 1907, 52.
104. Quoted in *The Referee*, 10 July 1907, 8.
105. *Weekly Press*, 18 April 1906, 51–52; 9 May 1906, 56.

106. *Otago Witness*, 3 July 1907, 62.
107. Nadia Elsaka (2004) 'Beyond Consensus?: New Zealand Journalists and the Appeal of "Professionalism" as a Model for Occupational Reform', unpublished PhD thesis, University of Canterbury, 105.
108. Elsaka, 'Beyond Consensus?', 116.
109. Elsaka, 'Beyond Consensus?' 120–22.
110. *The Referee*, 25 November 1908, 10; 2 December 1908, 10.
111. 'Independent Political Labour League of New Zealand – Fighting Platform', *The Beacon*, 30 March 1907.
112. *Weekly Press*, 18 April 1906, 51.
113. *Evening Post*, 7 December 1908, 2.
114. *Otago Witness*, 3 July 1907, 62.
115. *Weekly Press*, 14 October 1908, 55.
116. *Evening Post*, 17 October 1908, 9; *Otago Witness*, 21 October 1908, 62.
117. *Evening Post*, 28 November 1908, 3.
118. *The Star*, 20 November 1908, 3.
119. *Evening Post*, 7 December 1908, 2.
120. *Otago Witness*, 24 March 1909, 63.
121. *Weekly Press*, 19 May 1909, 52.
122. Colin Howell and Daryl Leeworthy (2010) 'Borderlands', in S. W. Pope and John Nauright (eds), *Routledge Companion to Sports History* (London and New York: Routledge), 72; Belich, *Paradise Reforged*, 50.
123. Howell and Leeworthy, 'Borderlands', 80.
124. NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 1 June 1925, Athletics New Zealand Records, MSY – 0659: Minute Book – New Zealand Amateur Athletic Association 1913–1927, Alexander Turnbull Library, National Library of New Zealand, Wellington, New Zealand [Hereafter NZAAA Records: MSY – 0659], 252.
125. NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 1 June 1925, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0659, 252.
126. W. F. Mandle (1981) 'Coombes, Richard (1858–1935)', in *Australian Dictionary of Biography*: *Volume 8* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press) 104–05. Accessed 17 February 2011 at: http://adbonline.anu.edu.au/biogs/A080115b.htm
127. *The Australasian*, 18 March 1922; 19 January 1924.
128. *The Australasian*, 19 January 1924.
129. Amateur Athletic Union of Australia and New Zealand [Hereafter AAUANZ], Minutes of Meeting, 7 February 1924, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia, 15.
130. NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 1 March 1926, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0659, 292.
131. Gordon, *Australia and the Olympic Games*, 53.
132. Joseph Heenan, Letter to Richard Coombes, 22 October 1926, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Davis Sporting Collection 1, Box 21 – Olympic Games, Sydney, Australia [Hereafter DSC 1, Box 21].
133. Hughes, 'Sporting Federations', 123.
134. NZAAA, *Programme – Australasian Championship Carnival*, Wellington, 26 December 1911, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Davis Sporting Collection 1, Box 6 – Amateur athletics association carnivals, 1899–1931, Sydney, Australia, 1.

135. AAUA, Minutes of Meeting, 28 January 1904, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, 3; AAUA, Minutes of Meeting, 8 November 1905, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, 4.
136. Belich, *Paradise Reforged*, 47.
137. John A. Daly (1982) *Elysian Fields: Sport, Class and Community in Colonial South Australia 1836–1890* (Adelaide: the Author), 86.
138. AAUA, Minutes of Meeting, 27 February 1908, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, 3.
139. AAUA, Minutes of Meeting, 19 August 1909, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, 13.
140. AAUA, Minutes of Meeting, 26 December 1911, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, 8.
141. *The Referee*, 22 May 1907, 8.
142. AAUA, Minutes of Meeting, 27 and 29 February 1908, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, 3, 11.
143. AAUA, Minutes of Meeting, 24 January 1914, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, 14.
144. Amateur Athletic Union of Australia, Minutes of Meeting, 24 January 1930, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, 3.
145. Denoon, 'Re-membering Australasia', 298.
146. Denoon et al., *A History of Australia, New Zealand, and the Pacific*, 198.
147. NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 1 May 1922, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0659, 145.
148. For details of the match, see *Evening Post*, 27 February 1922, 10; *New Zealand Times*, 27 February 1922, 10; *The Dominion*, 27 February 1922, 6; The comparison to the rugby series was made in the *New Zealand Times*, 25 February 1922, 9.
149. AAUA, Minutes of Meeting, 30 December 1921, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, 12.
150. *The Referee*, 10 May 1922, 9; *The Australasian*, 19 August 1922.
151. Sean Brawley (2007) '"Our Bright Young American Cousins": Internationalising Rugby, Trans-Pacific Connections and the American Universities Rugby Tour of Australasia, 1910', in Mary Bushby and Thomas V. Hickie (eds), *Rugby History: The Remaking of the Class Game* (Melbourne: Australian Society for Sports History), 73–101; Andy Carr (2009) '"My Good Comrade of the Rugby League": Discovering the Writings of Harry Sunderland in the State Library of New South Wales', *Australian Society for Sports History Bulletin*, 49, 10.
152. *The Referee*, 18 March 1914, 16.
153. John A. Lucas and Ian Jobling (1995) 'Troubled Waters: Fanny Durack's 1919 Swimming Tour of America amid Transnational Amateur Athletic Prudery and Bureaucracy', *Olympika*, 4, 96–97. While the AAUA was strictly concerned with amateur athletics, the AAU of the United States and the Amateur Athletic Union of Canada (AAUC) were federations that organised a number of sports, including swimming.
154. *The Referee*, 28 August 1912, 1.
155. See The *Referee*, 4 December 1912, 9 and The *Referee*, 15 January 1913, 9.

156. *The Referee*, 6 October 1909, 9; 29 January 1913, 9.
157. NZAAA, Minutes of Annual General Meeting, 23 November 1914, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0659, 51–52.
158. NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 3 February 1913, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0658, 244; NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 10 March 1913, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0658, 248.
159. NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 19 May 1913, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0658, 256.
160. NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 9 June 1913, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0658, 258–60; NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 7 July 1913, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0658, 262.
161. NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 2 March 1914, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0659, 26. Despite Templeton's praise, the NZAAA suffered a loss of £30. [*Evening Post*, 21 April 1914, 6.]
162. For details of the events, see *The Referee*, 17 December 1913, 9; 24 December 1913, 9; 31 December 1913, 11; 7 January 1914, 9; 14 January 1914, 9.
163. NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 19 May 1913, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0658, 256.
164. *Evening Post*, 3 December 1913, 10.
165. *Evening Post*, 17 December 1913, 8.
166. *The Referee*, 23 June 1920, 8; 30 June 1920, 8; 17 November 1920, 9.
167. NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 12 June 1922, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0659, 147; NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 14 August 1922, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0659, 153.
168. NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 18 December 1922, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0659, 167; NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 8 January 1923, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0659, 170.
169. NZAAA, Minutes of Annual General Meeting, 26 November 1923, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0659, 199.
170. NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 8 January 1923, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0659, 170.
171. *The Referee*, 28 February 1923, 9; 7 March 1923, 13–14.
172. *The Referee*, 19 December 1923, 9.
173. AAUANZ, Minutes of Meeting, 4 February 1924, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, 9–10.
174. Joseph Heenan, Letter to Richard Coombes, 22 October 1926, DSC 1, Box 21. Emphasis in original.
175. Charlotte Macdonald (2011) *Strong, Beautiful and Modern: National Fitness in Britain, New Zealand, Australia and Canada, 1935–1960* (Wellington: Bridget Williams Books), 70–72.
176. Joseph Heenan, Letter to Richard Coombes, 22 October 1926, DSC 1, Box 21.
177. NZAAA, Minutes of Annual General Meeting, 19 November 1928, Athletics New Zealand Records, MSY – 0660: Minute Book – New Zealand Amateur Athletic Association 1927–1938, Alexander Turnbull Library, National Library of New Zealand, Wellington, New Zealand [Hereafter NZAAA Records: MSY – 0660], 48. Coombes' failing health, and particularly his lack of mobility, was referred to during a testimonial held in his

honour on 27 April 1931. ['The Richard Coombes Testimonial', 27 April 1931, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, E. S. Marks Sporting Collection, Box Q 82 – Miscellaneous sports – Letters and Minute Books, Sydney, Australia.]
178. Hughes, 'Sporting Federations', 125.
179. NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 7 September 1925, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0659, 262.
180. NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 12 October 1925, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0659, 265–66.
181. NZAAA, Minutes of Annual General Meeting, 23 November 1925, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0659, 281.
182. Unknown, 'Council', Athletics New Zealand Records, MS Papers 1238–132: Jubilee Material 1906–1907, Alexander Turnbull Library, National Library of New Zealand, Wellington, New Zealand.
183. *Evening Post*, 24 October 1925, 18; *The Dominion*, 4 November 1925, 4; *Evening Post*, 8 June 1926, 5.
184. NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 23 September 1926, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0659, 338.
185. AAUANZ, Minutes of Meeting, 23 December 1927, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, 12.
186. Hughes, 'Sporting Federations', 126.
187. *Evening Post*, 27 February 1922, 10; *New Zealand Times*, 27 February 1922, 10; *The Dominion*, 27 February 1922, 6.
188. NZAAA, Minutes of Annual General Meeting, 19 November 1928, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0660, 50.
189. NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 3 December 1928, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0660, 51.
190. NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 8 May 1929, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0660, 53.
191. NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 5 October 1931, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0660, 127.
192. Amateur Athletic Union of Australia, Minutes of Meeting, 15 January 1932, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, 18–19.
193. *The Argus*, 27 January 1930, 7.
194. NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 2 November 1931, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0660, 129; NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 10 December 1931, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0660, 133.
195. Amateur Athletic Union of Australia, Minutes of Meeting, 15 January 1932, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, 7–8.
196. New Zealand Olympic Association, Minutes of Annual Meeting, 1 May 1935, NZOC Records, Minute Book, 233.

Conclusion

1. Richard Cashman (1995) *Paradise of Sport: The Rise of Organised Sport in Australia* (South Melbourne: Oxford University Press), 63; John A. Daly (1994) 'Track and Field', in Wray Vamplew and Brian Stoddart (eds),

Sport in Australia: A Social History (Cambridge, New York and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press), 260; Garth Henniker and Ian Jobling (1989) 'Richard Coombes and the Olympic Movement in Australia: Imperialism and Nationalism in Action', *Sporting Traditions*, 6 (1), 2–3.

2. Cashman, *Paradise of Sport*, 97.
3. John A. Daly (1994) 'Athletics', in Wray Vamplew et al. (eds), *Oxford Companion to Australian Sport* (South Melbourne: Oxford University Press), 23–24; Percy Mason (1985) *Professional Athletics in Australia* (Adelaide: Rigby), 5, 12.
4. Camilla Obel (2005) 'Amateur Rugby's Spectator Success: Cultivating Inter-Provincial Rugby Publics in New Zealand, 1902–1995', *Sporting Traditions*, 21 (2), 97–117.
5. Colin Tatz (1996) *The Obstacle Race: Aborigines in Sport* (Sydney: University of New South Wales Press), 88.
6. Stuart Ripley (2003) 'A Social History of New South Wales Professional Sculling 1876–1927', unpublished PhD thesis, University of Western Sydney, 7.
7. Neville Meaney (2001) 'Britishness and Australian Identity: The Problem of Nationalism in Australian History and Historiography', *Australian Historical Studies*, 32 (116), 89; James Belich (2001) *Paradise Reforged: A History of the New Zealanders From the 1880s to the Year 2000* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press), 29–30; Derek M. Schreuder and Stuart Ward (2008) 'Introduction: What Became of Australia's Empire?', in Schreuder and Ward (eds), *Australia's Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 11–12.
8. Belich, *Paradise Reforged*, 316–17, 328–32, 384–85, 440.
9. Daryl Adair (1994) 'Rowing and Sculling', in Wray Vamplew and Brian Stoddart (eds), *Sport in Australia: A Social History* (Cambridge, New York and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press), 179–80; Stuart Ripley (2009) *Sculling and Skulduggery: A History of Professional Sculling* (Sydney: Walla Walla Press).
10. Obel, 'Amateur Rugby's Spectator Success', 97–117.
11. Meaney, 'Britishness and Australian Identity', 76–90; Tony Collins (2005) 'Australian Nationalism and Working-class Britishness: The Case of Rugby League Football', *History Compass*, 3 (AU 142), 1–19; Tony Collins (2009) 'The Tyranny of Deference: Anglo-Australian Relations and Rugby Union before World War II', *Sport in History*, 29 (3), 437–56.
12. Charles Little and Richard Cashman (2001) 'Ambiguous and Overlapping Identities: Australasia at the Olympic Games, 1896–1914', in Richard Cashman et al. (eds) *Sport, Federation, Nation* (Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW), 90; Charles Little (2001) 'Trans-Tasman Federations in Sport: The Changing Relationships between Australia and New Zealand', in Cashman et al. (eds), *Sport, Federation, Nation*, 69.

Select Bibliography

Archival collections

Amateur Athletic Association Collection, University of Birmingham Special Collections Department, Birmingham, United Kingdom.

Amateur Athletic Union of Canada fonds, Library and Archives Canada, Ottawa, Canada.

Athletics New Zealand Records, Alexander Turnbull Library, National Library of New Zealand, Wellington, New Zealand.

Biography File, BIOG 648 – Nigel Barker, University of Sydney Archives, Sydney, Australia.

Davis Sporting Collection 1, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia.

Davis Sporting Collection 2, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia.

E. S. Marks Sporting Collection, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia.

First Australian Imperial Force Personnel Dossiers, Series B2455, Item No. 11506714, National Archives of Australia, Canberra, Australian Capital Territory, Australia. http://naa12.naa.gov.au/scripts/imagine.asp?B=11506714&I=1&SE=1 [Accessed 7 November 2009].

Harry Gordon Papers, National Library of Australia, Canberra, Australian Capital Territory, Australia.

Harold Hardwick Collection, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.

International Olympic Committee Archives, Lausanne, Switzerland.

New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association Records, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.

New Zealand Olympic Committee Records, Olympic Studies Centre, New Zealand Olympic Committee, Wellington, New Zealand.

Royal Parks, Park – Bushy, Hampton Court Gdns & Longford River: Greyhound Hotel & Stables (now Tea Gardens), National Archives, Kew, United Kingdom.

Government publications

Ancestry.com and The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, *The 1861 England Census Database (online)*, Provo: The Generations Network Inc., 2005. http://content.ancestrylibrary.com/iexec/default.aspx?htx=view&r=5542&dbid=8767&iid=KENRG9_456_458-0760&fn=Richard&ln=Coombes&st=r&ssrc=&pid=6949541

——, *The 1871 England Census Database (online)*, Provo: The Generations Network Inc., 2004. http://content.ancestrylibrary.com/iexec/?htx=view&r=

5542&dbid=7619&iid=MDXRG10_865_866-0306&fn=Richard&ln=Coombes&st=r&ssrc=&pid=2694089

——, *The 1881 English Census Database (online)*, Provo: The Generations Network Inc., 2004; http://content.ancestrylibrary.com/iexec/?htx=view&r=5542&dbid=7572&iid=MDXRG11_840_843-0442&fn=Richard&ln=Coombes&st=r&ssrc=&pid=15588974

Labouchere, Henry (Baron Taunton), *Royal Commission to Inquire into Education in England and Wales: Volume XII. Special Reports (S. Midland Counties)*, London: House of Commons (United Kingdom) Parliamentary Papers, Command Papers; Reports of Commissioners, 1867–68.

——, *Royal Commission to Inquire into Education in England and Wales: Volume XXI. Tables of Income, Fees, Pupils, Buildings, Exhibitions of Grammar and Secondary Schools*, London: House of Commons (United Kingdom) Parliamentary Papers, Command Papers; Reports of Commissioners, 1867–68.

Media

Abbott, Tony, Address to the Lowy Institute, Sydney: 'National Security Fundamentals', 23 April 2010; www.tonyabbott.com.au/LatestNews/Speeches/tabid/88/articleType/ArticleView/articleId/7347/Address-to-the-Lowy-Institute–National-Security-Fundamentals.aspx [Accessed 16 June 2013].

Davison, Graeme, 'The Imaginary Grandstand', *Sports Factor*, Radio National 2001; www.ausport.gov.au/fulltext/2001/sportsf/s340348.htm [Accessed 11 April 2007].

Hindsight radio programme, 'The Greatest Game', ABC Radio National, Broadcast on 19 March 2009 at 1 pm, www.abc.net.au/rn/hindsight/stories/2009/2515606.htm [Accessed 19 March 2009].

Newspapers

The Argus (Melbourne)
Athletic News (Manchester)
The Australasian (Melbourne)
The Beacon
Brisbane Courier
The Dominion (Wellington)
Evening Post (Wellington)
Hobart Mercury
New Zealand Times
Otago Witness
The Queenslander
The Referee (Sydney)
Smith's Weekly (Sydney)
Sporting Life (London)
The Star
Sydney Morning Herald
Sydney Sportsman
Taranaki Herald

The Times (London)
Wanganui Herald
Weekly Press. This newspaper also included the *New Zealand Referee*.

Periodicals and regular publications

Amateur Athletic Union of Australasia, Minutes of Meetings, 1899–1921, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia. [Note : While the Amateur Athletic Union of Australasia (AAUA) changed its name in 1914, the minutes of the meetings held in 1920 and 1921 were printed as minutes of the AAUA.]

Amateur Athletic Union of Australia, Minutes of Meetings, 1930–1932, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.

Amateur Athletic Union of Australia and New Zealand, Minutes of Meetings, 1924–1927, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.

Ingram, Wallie, 'Maori Personalities in Sport', *Te Ao Hou* [*The New World*], 4, Autumn 1953, 61–64.

New Zealand Amateur Athletic Association, *Programme – Australasian Championship Carnival*, Christchurch, 4 January 1896, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia.

Ruhl, Arthur, 'The Men Who Set The Marks', *Outing Magazine*, 52 (4), July 1908, 387–402.

Unattributed, 'St. Andrew's Graduates' Association', *The British Medical Journal*, 1 (1016), 19 June 1880, 935.

Books

Adair, Daryl and Wray Vamplew (1997) *Sport in Australian History* (Melbourne: Oxford University Press).

Allison, Lincoln (2001) *Amateurism in Sport: An Analysis and a Defence* (London and Portland: Frank Cass).

Allsobrook, David Ian (1986) *Schools for the Shires: The Reform of Middle-class Education in Mid-Victorian England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press).

Amateur Athletic Union of Australasia [AAUA] (1899) *Articles of Agreement, Laws for Athletic Meetings, Rules for Competitions, Record conditions, etc.* (Sydney: AAUA).

Amateur Athletic Union of Canada [AAUC] (1909) *Constitution and By-Laws of the Amateur Athletic Union of Canada* (Toronto: AAUC).

The Amateur Sporting Federation of New South Wales [ASFNSW] (1908) *Articles of Agreement* (Sydney: ASFNSW).

Attwood, Bain and Andrew Markus (2007) *The 1967 Referendum: Race, Power and the Australian Constitution* (Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press).

The Australasian Amateur Conference [AAC] (1897) *Minutes of Meeting of Delegates from the Amateur Athletic Associations of New South Wales, New Zealand, Victoria and Queensland, Held at N.S.W. Amateur Sports Club, 43 Rowe Street, Sydney, 1st to 8th October, 1897* (Sydney: Printed by F. W. White).

Belich, James (2001) *Paradise Reforged: A History of the New Zealanders from the 1880s to the Year 2000* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press).

—— (2007) *Making Peoples: A History of the New Zealanders from Polynesian Settlement to the End of the Nineteenth Century* (Auckland: Penguin Books).
Bell, Duncan (2007) *The Idea of Greater Britain: Empire and the Future of World Order, 1860–1900* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press).
Birley, Derek (1989) *The Willow Wand: Some Cricket Myths Explored* (London: Simon and Schuster [Sportspages]).
Blainey, Geoffrey (2003) *The Rush that Never Ended: A History of Australian Mining* (Carlton: Melbourne University Press).
Booth, Douglas and Colin Tatz (2000) *One-eyed: A View of Australian Sport* (St Leonards: Allen and Unwin).
Cashman, Richard (1990) *The 'Demon' Spofforth* (Kensington: New South Wales University Press).
—— (1995) *Paradise of Sport: The Rise of Organised Sport in Australia* (South Melbourne: Oxford University Press).
—— (2002) *Sport in the National Imagination: Australian Sport in the Federation Decades* (Sydney: Walla Walla Press).
—— et al. (eds.) (2001) *Sport, Federation, Nation* (Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW).
Crichton, Anne (2005) *Children of a Common Mother: A Comparative Analysis of the Development of the Australian and Canadian Health Care Systems to 1995* (Kensington: School of Health Services and Management, University of New South Wales).
Clark, Manning (1981) *A History of Australia: vol. 5: The People Make Laws, 1888–1915* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press).
Colley, Linda (2003) *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707–1837* (London: Pimlico).
Collins, Tony (1998) *Rugby's Great Split: Class, Culture and the Origins of Rugby League Football* (London and Portland: Frank Cass).
—— (2009) *A Social History of English Rugby Union* (London and New York: Routledge).
—— and Wray Vamplew (2002) *Mud, Sweat, and Beers: A Cultural History of Sport and Alcohol* (Oxford and New York: Berg).
Cook, Theodore Andrea (c. 1909) *The Fourth Olympiad, Being the Official Report: The Olympic Games of 1908* (London: British Olympic Association).
De Coubertin, Pierre (1997) *Olympic Memoirs* (Lausanne: International Olympic Committee).
Crotty, Martin (2001) *Making the Australian Male. Middle-class Masculinity 1870–1920* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press).
Curran, James and Stuart Ward (2010) *The Unknown Nation: Australia after Empire* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press).
Daly, John A. (1982) *Elysian Fields: Sport, Class and Community in Colonial South Australia 1836–1890* (Adelaide: the Author).
Daly, Maurice T. (1996) *One Hundred Years of Australian Sport: A History of the New South Wales Sports Club* (Sydney: New South Wales Sports Club).
Denoon, Donald and Philippa Mein Smith, with Marivic Wyndham (2000) *A History of Australia, New Zealand, and the Pacific* (Oxford and Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers).
Dunning, Eric and Kenneth Sheard (1979) *Barbarians, Gentlemen and Players: A Sociological Study of the Development of Rugby Football* (Canberra: Australian National University Press).

Fagan, Sean (2005) *Rugby Rebellion: The Divide of League and Union* (Kellyville: RL2008).

—— (2008) *'Nothing but a Nine-Day Wonder': The Founding of Rugby League – Australia's First Professional Code – 9th Annual Tom Brock Lecture* (Sydney: Australian Society for Sports History and the Tom Brock Bequest Committee).

Garside, Bernard (1957) *A Brief History of Hampton School: 1557–1957* (Richmond: printed by Dimbleby's).

Gilbert, C. D. (1986) *Australian and Canadian Federalism 1867–1984: A Study of Judicial Techniques* (Carlton: Melbourne University Press)

Gilbert, W. R. (1898) *Sports of Greater Britain: Comprising Shooting, Football, Hockey, Curling, Fishing, Cricket, Golf, Lacrosse, Together with a Short History of the Montreal Amateur Athletic Association* (Montreal: The 'Shareholder' Office).

Gordon, Harry (1994) *Australia and the Olympic Games* (St Lucia: University of Queensland Press).

Grant, David (1994) *On a Roll: A History of Gambling and Lotteries in New Zealand* (Wellington: Victoria University Press).

Guha, Ramachandra (2002) *A Corner of a Foreign Field: The Indian History of a British Sport* (London: Picador).

Guttmann, Allen (1978) *From Ritual to Record: The Nature of Modern Sports* (New York: Columbia University Press).

—— (2002) *The Olympics: A History of the Modern Games* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press).

Heads, Ian (1992) *True Blue: The Story of the NSW Rugby League* (Randwick: Ironbark Press).

Hoberman, John M. (1997), *Darwin's Athletes: How Sport has Damaged Black America and Preserved the Myth of Race* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin).

Holt, Richard (1990) *Sport and the British: A Modern History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Howell, Reet and Max Howell (1988) *Aussie Gold: The Story of Australia at the Olympics* (Melbourne: Brooks Waterloo).

Irving, Helen (1997) *To Constitute a Nation: A Cultural History of Australia's Constitution* (Cambridge and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press).

Kelly, William Thomas (1973) *South Australian Amateur Athletic Association: A History, 1867–1973* (Adelaide: South Australian Amateur Athletic Association).

Keys, Barbara J. (2006) *Globalizing Sport: National Rivalry and International Community in the 1940s* (Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press).

Llewellyn, Matthew P. (2011) *Rule Britannia: Nationalism, Identity and the Modern Olympic Games* (London: Routledge).

Lovesey, Peter (1979) *The Official Centenary History of the Amateur Athletic Association* (Enfield: Guinness Superlatives).

MacAloon, John (1981) *This Great Symbol: Pierre de Coubertin and the Origins of the Modern Olympic Games* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press).

Macdonald, Charlotte (2011) *Strong, Beautiful and Modern: National Fitness in Britain, New Zealand, Australia and Canada, 1935–1960* (Wellington: Bridget Williams Books).

Mangan, J. A. (1981) *Athleticism in the Victorian and Edwardian Public Schools: The Emergence and Consolidation of an Educational Ideology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Martin, Charles H. (2010) *Benching Jim Crow: The Rise and Fall of the Color Line in Southern College Sports, 1890–1980* (Urbana, Chicago and Springfield: University of Illinois Press).
Mason, Percy (1985) *Professional Athletics in Australia* (Adelaide: Rigby).
Mason, Tony (1980) *Association Football and English Society 1863–1915* (Brighton and Atlantic Highlands: Harvester Press and Humanities Press).
Mein Smith, Philippa (2012) *A Concise History of New Zealand* (Port Melbourne: Cambridge University Press).
Montefiore, David (1992) *Cricket in the Doldrums: The Struggle between Private and Public Control of Australian Cricket in the 1880s*, ASSH Studies in Sports History, no. 8 (Campbelltown: Australian Society for Sports History [ASSH]).
Moran, Herbert (1939) *Viewless Winds: Being the Recollections and Digressions of an Australian Surgeon* (London: Peter Davies).
Murray, Francis (2000) *The British Open: A History of Golf's Greatest Championship* (Lincolnwood: Contemporary Books).
New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association (1896) *Handbook* (Sydney: New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association).
Perry, John (2002) *The Quick & the Dead: Stawell & Its Race Through Time* (Sydney: UNSW Press).
Phillips, Murray G. (ed.) (2000) *From Sidelines to Centre Field: A History of Sports Coaching in Australia* (Sydney: UNSW Press).
Pope, S. W. (2007) *Patriotic Games: Sporting Traditions in the American Imagination, 1876–1926* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press).
Pugsley, Christopher (2004) *The ANZAC Experience: New Zealand, Australia and Empire in the First World War* (Auckland: Reed Military).
'Qrius' (1907), *South African Champions . . . Springbok Athletes (Illustrated)* (Durban: P. Davis and Sons).
Ripley, Stuart (2009) *Sculling and Skulduggery: A History of Professional Sculling* (Sydney: Walla Walla Press).
Robinson, Roger and Nelson Wattie (eds) (1998) *The Oxford Companion to New Zealand Literature* (Auckland: Oxford University Press).
Schreuder, Derek M. and Stuart Ward (eds) (2008) *Australia's Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
Sinclair, Archibald and William Henry (1894) *Swimming* (London: Longmans, Green).
Smith, Rick (2001) *Australian Test Cricketers* (Sydney: ABC Books).
'Stonehenge' (ed.) (1859) *The Coursing Calendar and Report of the Autumn Season 1858: With Hints on Breeding and Tables of the Performances of the Stock of the Chief Public Stallions* (London: John Crockford [The Field]).
—— (1859) *The Coursing Calendar and Report of the Spring Season 1859–60: With Hints on Breeding, &.* (London: John Crockford [The Field]).
—— (1861) *The Coursing Calendar and Report of the Autumn Season 1861* (London: John Crockford [The Field]).
—— (1864) *The Coursing Calendar and Report of the Spring Season 1864: With Entries for the Produce Stakes of the Ensuing Season* (London: John Crockford [The Field]).
Tatz, Colin (1996) *Obstacle Race: Aborigines in Sport* (Sydney: University of New South Wales Press).

Unattributed (c.1921) *Minutes of Third Conference: Including Athletic Rules and World's Records: International Amateur Athletic Federation: Held at Geneva, Switzerland May 27-28, 1921* (New York: American Sports Publishing Co.).
Victorian Amateur Athletic Association [VAAA] (1894) *Victorian Amateur Athletic Handbook, Rules of the Victorian Amateur Athletic Association, Australasian Records, The Harriers, &c.* (Melbourne: The VAAA).
Walker, David (1999) *Anxious Nation: Australia and the Rise of Asia 1850–1939* (St Lucia: University of Queensland Press).
Ward, Stuart (2001) *Australia and the British Embrace: The Demise of the Imperial Ideal* (Carlton South: Melbourne University Press).
Wassong, Stephan (2004) *Pierre de Coubertin's American Studies and Their Importance for the Analysis of His Early Educational Campaign* (Würzburg: ERGON Verlag).
Waterhouse, Richard (1995) *Private Pleasures, Public Leisure: A History of Australian Popular Culture since 1788* (South Melbourne: Longman).
White, R. P. B. and Malcolm Harrison (1987) *100 Years of the NSW AAA* (Sydney: Fairfax Library/NSWAAA).
White, Richard (1981) *Inventing Australia: Images and Identity 1688–1980* (Sydney: George Allen and Unwin).
Williams, Terry (2008) *Through Blue Eyes: A Pictorial History of Newtown RLFC* (Newtown: Newtown RLFC).

Chapters in edited volumes

Adair, Daryl (1994) 'Rowing and Sculling', in Wray Vamplew and Brian Stoddart (eds), *Sport in Australia: A Social History* (Cambridge, New York and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press).
Arnold, Rollo (1987) 'The Australasian Peoples and their World, 1888–1915', in Keith Sinclair (ed.), *Tasman Relations: New Zealand and Australia, 1788–1988* (Auckland: Auckland University Press).
—— (1991) 'Family or Strangers? Trans-Tasman Migrants, 1870–1920', in *Australia-New Zealand: Aspects of a Relationship, Proceedings of the Stout Research Centre Eighth Annual Conference* (Wellington: Victoria University of Wellington).
Ballantyne, Tony and Antoinette Burton (2005) 'Postscript: Bodies, Genders, Empire: Reimagining World Histories', in Ballantyne and Burton (eds), *Bodies in Contact: Rethinking Colonial Encounters in World History* (Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press).
Bell, Roger and Philip Bell (1998) 'Introduction: The Dilemmas of "Americanisation"', in Bell and Bell (eds), *Americanization and Australia* (Sydney: UNSW Press).
Brawley, Sean (2001) '"Our Life-Savers"': The Royal Life Saving Society and the Origins of Surf Life Saving in Federation Sydney', in Richard Cashman et al. (eds), *Sport, Federation, Nation* (Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW).
—— (2007) '"Our Bright Young American Cousins": Internationalising Rugby, Trans-Pacific Connections and the American Universities Rugby Tour of Australasia, 1910', in Mary Bushby and Thomas V. Hickie (eds), *Rugby History:*

The Remaking of the Class Game (Melbourne: Australian Society for Sports History).

Bridge, Carl and Kent Fedorowich (2003) 'Mapping the British World', in Bridge and Fedorowich (eds), *The British World: Diaspora, Culture and Identity* (London and Portland: Frank Cass).

Bright, Charles and Michael Geyer (2002) 'Where in the World Is America? The History of the United States in the Global Age', in Thomas Bender (ed.), *Rethinking American History in a Global Age* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press).

Brown, David W. (1986) 'The Legacy of British Victorian Social Thought: Some Prominent Views on Sport, Physical Exercise and Society in Colonial Australia', in Wray Vamplew (ed.), *Sport and Colonialism in 19th Century Australasia*, ASSH Studies in Sports History: No. 1 (Campbelltown: Australian Society for Sports History [ASSH]).

Buckner, Phillip and R. Douglas Francis (2005) 'Introduction', in Buckner and Francis (eds), *Rediscovering the British World* (Calgary: University of Calgary Press).

—— (2006) 'Introduction', in Buckner and Francis (eds), *Canada and the British World: Culture, Migration, and Identity* (Vancouver: UBC Press).

Cannadine, David (1995) 'British History as a "New Subject": Politics, Perspectives and Prospects', in Alexander Grant and Keith J. Stringer (eds), *Uniting the Kingdom? The Making of British History* (London: Routledge).

—— (1988) 'The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual: The British Monarchy and the "Invention of Tradition", c. 1820–1977', in Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (eds), *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Cashman, Richard (2001) 'Introduction', in Richard Cashman et al. (eds), *Sport, Federation, Nation* (Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW).

—— (2001) 'Part 2: A Changing Face of Sport?: Introduction', in Richard Cashman et al. (eds), *Sport, Federation, Nation* (Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW).

—— and Anthony Hughes (1998) 'Sport', in Roger Bell and Philip Bell (eds), *Americanization and Australia* (Sydney: UNSW Press).

Collins, Tony (2004) 'Violence, Gamesmanship and the Amateur Ideal in Victorian Middle-class Rugby', in Mike Huggins and J. A. Mangan (eds), *Disreputable Pleasures: Less Virtuous Victorians at Play* (London and New York: Frank Cass).

Crawford, Ray (1986) 'Athleticism, Gentlemen and Empire in Australian Public Schools: L. A. Adamson and Wesley College, Melbourne', in Wray Vamplew (ed.), *Sport and Colonialism in 19th Century Australasia,* ASSH Studies in Sports History No. 1 (Campbelltown: Australian Society for Sports History [ASSH]).

Cunneen, Chris (1981) 'Elevating and Recording the People's Pastimes: Sydney Sporting Journalism 1886–1939', in Richard Cashman and Michael McKernan (eds), *Sport: Money, Morality and the Media* (Kensington: New South Wales University Press).

Curthoys, Ann and Marilyn Lake (2005) 'Introduction', in Curthoys and Lake (eds), *Connected Worlds: History in Transnational Perspective* (Canberra: ANU E Press).

Daly, John A. (1994) 'Athletics', in Wray Vamplew et al. (eds), *Oxford Companion to Australian Sport* (South Melbourne: Oxford University Press).

—— (1994) 'Track and Field', in Wray Vamplew and Brian Stoddart (eds), *Sport in Australia: A Social History* (Cambridge, New York and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press).

Fischer, Imke (2001) 'The Involvement of the Commonwealth Government in Physical Education: From Defence to National Fitness', in Richard Cashman et al. (eds), *Sport, Federation, Nation* (Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW).

Hardy, Stephen (1990) 'Entrepreneurs, Structures, and the Sportgeist: Old Tensions in a Modern Industry', in Donald G. Kyle and Gary D. Stark (eds), *Essays on Sport History and Sport Mythology* (College Station: Texas A & M Press).

Hirst, John (2008) 'Empire, State, Nation', in Derek M. Schreuder and Stuart Ward (eds), *Australia's Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Hoberman, John (1993) 'Sport and Ideology in the Post-Communist Age', in Lincoln Allison (ed.), *The Changing Politics of Sport* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press).

—— (2004) 'Sportive Nationalism and Globalization', in John Bale and Mette Krogh Christensen (eds), *Post-Olympism: Questioning Sport in the Twenty-first Century* (Oxford and New York: Berg).

Honey, Andrew (2001) 'Sport, Immigration Restriction and Race: The Operation of the White Australia Policy', in Richard Cashman et al. (eds), *Sport, Federation, Nation* (Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW).

Howell, Colin and Daryl Leeworthy (2010) 'Borderlands', in S. W. Pope and John Nauright (eds), *Routledge Companion to Sports History* (London and New York: Routledge).

Huggins, Mike and J. A. Mangan (2004) 'Epilogue: The Dogs Bark but the Caravan Moves On', in Huggins and Mangan (eds), *Disreputable Pleasures: Less Virtuous Victorians at Play* (London and New York: Frank Cass).

—— (2004) 'Prologue: All Mere Complexities', in Huggins and Mangan (eds), *Disreputable Pleasures: Less Virtuous Victorians at Play* (London and New York: Frank Cass).

Hughes, Anthony (2001) 'Sporting Federations: The Impact of Federation on Sports Governance', in Richard Cashman et al. (eds), *Sport, Federation, Nation* (Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW).

Inglis, Ken S. (1979) 'Imperial Cricket: Test Matches between Australia and England, 1877–1900', in Richard Cashman and Michael McKernan (eds), *Sport in History: The Making of Modern Sporting History* (St Lucia: University of Queensland Press).

Iriye, Akira (2002) 'Internationalizing International History', in Thomas Bender (ed.), *Rethinking American History in a Global Age* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press).

Jobling, Ian (1986) 'The Lion, the Eagle and the Kangaroo: Politics and Proposals for a British Empire Team at the 1916 Berlin Olympics', in Gerald Redmond (ed.), *Sport and Politics* (Champaign: Human Kinetics Publishers).

—— (2000) 'In Pursuit of Status, Respectability and Idealism: Pioneers of the Olympic Movement in Australasia', in J. A. Mangan and John Nauright (eds),

Sport in Australasian Society: Past and Present (London and Portland: Frank Cass).

Little, Charles (2001) 'Trans-Tasman Federations in Sport: The Changing Relationships between Australia and New Zealand', in Richard Cashman et al. (eds), *Sport, Federation, Nation* (Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW).

Little, Charles and Richard Cashman (2001) 'Ambiguous and Overlapping Identities: Australasia at the Olympic Games, 1896–1914', in Richard Cashman et al. (eds), *Sport, Federation, Nation* (Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW).

Macdonald, Charlotte (2009) 'Ways of Belonging: Sporting Spaces in New Zealand History', in Giselle Byrnes (ed.), *The New Oxford History of New Zealand* (South Melbourne: Oxford University Press).

McKenna, Mark (2008) 'Monarchy: From Reverence to Indifference', in Derek M. Schreuder and Stuart Ward (eds), *Australia's Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

MacLean, Malcolm (2010) 'New Zealand', in S. W. Pope and John Nauright (eds), *Routledge Companion to Sports History* (London and New York: Routledge).

Mandle, W. F. (1979) 'Baker, Reginald Leslie (Snowy) (1884–1953)', *Australian Dictionary of Biography: Volume 7* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press). http://adbonline.anu.edu.au/biogs/A070152b.htm [Accessed 30 September 2009].

—— (1981) 'Coombes, Richard (1858–1935)' in *Australian Dictionary of Biography*: *Volume 8* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press). http://adbonline.anu.edu.au/biogs/A080115b.htm [Accessed 17 February 2011].

Mangan, J. A. (2004) 'Bullies, Beatings, Battles and Bruises: "Great Days and Jolly Days" at One Mid-Victorian Public School', in Mike Huggins and J. A. Mangan (eds), *Disreputable Pleasures: Less Virtuous Victorians at Play* (London and New York: Frank Cass).

Meaney, Neville (1996) 'The Yellow Peril: Invasion Scare Novels and Australian Political Culture', in Ken Stewart (ed.), *The 1890s: Australian Literature and Literary Culture* (St Lucia: University of Queensland Press).

Mein Smith, Philippa (2009) 'The Tasman World', in Giselle Byrnes (ed.), *The New Oxford History of New Zealand* (South Melbourne: Oxford University Press).

Nielsen, Erik (2008) '"Oh Error, Ill-conceived:" The Amateur Sports Federation of New South Wales, Rugby League and Amateur Athletics', in Andrew Moore and Andy Carr (eds), *Centenary Reflections: 100 Years of Rugby League in Australia* (Melbourne: Australian Society for Sports History).

O'Hara, John (2001) 'Commentary', in Richard Cashman et al. (eds), *Sport, Federation, Nation* (Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW).

Paddick, Robert J. (1994) 'Amateurism', in Wray Vamplew et al. (eds), *Oxford Companion to Australian Sport* (South Melbourne: Oxford University Press).

Paton, Garth A. (2006) 'James Gw. B. Merrick (1871–1946): Sports Organizer, Negotiator, Canada's Second IOC Member', in Nigel B. Crowther, Robert Barney and Michael Heine (eds), *Cultural Imperialism in Action: Critiques in the Global Olympic Trust, Eighth International Symposium for Olympic Research* (London, ON: University of Western Ontario).

Perkin, Harold (1986) 'Sport and Society: Empire into Commonwealth', in J. A. Mangan and Roy B. Small (eds), *Sport, Culture, Society: Proceedings of the VIII Commonwealth and International Conference on Sport, Physical Education, Dance, Recreation and Health* (London: E. N. Spon).

Pinfold, John (2004) 'Dandy Rats at Play: The Liverpudlian Middle Classes and Horse-racing in the Nineteenth Century', in Mike Huggins and J. A. Mangan (eds), *Disreputable Pleasures: Less Virtuous Victorians at Play* (London and New York: Frank Cass).

Pocock, J. G. A. (1995) 'Conclusion: Contingency, Identity, Sovereignty', in Alexander Grant and Keith J. Stringer (eds), *Uniting the Kingdom? The Making of British History* (London: Routledge).

Van der Poorten, Helen M. (1976) 'Williamson, James Cassius (1845–1913)', *Australian Dictionary of* Biography: *Volume 6* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press). http://adbonline.anu.edu.au/biogs/A060439b.htm [Accessed 1 March 2011].

Porter, Dilwyn (2010) 'Entrepreneurship', in S. W. Pope and John Nauright (eds), *Routledge Companion to Sports History* (London and New York: Routledge).

Quartly, Marian (2001) 'Convict History', in Graeme Davison et al. (eds), *The Oxford Companion to Australian History* (South Melbourne: Oxford University Press). http://www.oxfordreference.com/views/ENTRY.html?subview=Main&entry=t127.e362 [Accessed 11 November 2010].

Rioux, Georges (2000) 'Pierre de Coubertin's Revelation', in Norbert Müller (ed.), *Pierre de Coubertin 1863–1937: Olympism: Selected Writings* (Lausanne: International Olympic Committee).

Ryan, Greg (2001) 'Commentary', in Richard Cashman et al. (eds), *Sport, Federation, Nation* (Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW).

Schreuder, Derek M. and Stuart Ward (2008) 'Introduction: What Became of Australia's Empire?', in Schreuder and Ward (eds), *Australia's Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Sinclair, Keith (1987) 'Why New Zealanders Are Not Australians: New Zealand and the Australian Federal Movement, 1881–1901', in Sinclair (ed.), *Tasman Relations: New Zealand and Australia, 1788–1988* (Auckland: Auckland University Press).

Smith, Adrian (2004) 'Black against Gold: New Zealand-Australia Sporting Rivalry', in Adrian Smith and Dilwyn Porter (eds), *Sport and National Identity in the Post-war World* (London and New York: Routledge).

Thompson, Elaine (1998) 'Political Culture', in Roger Bell and Philip Bell (eds), *Americanization and Australia* (Sydney: UNSW Press).

Thompson, John Herd (2008) 'Canada and the "Third British Empire", 1901–1939', in Phillip Buckner (ed.), *Canada and the British Empire* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press).

Tyrrell, Ian (2002) 'Beyond the View from Euro-America: Environment, Settler Societies, and the Internationalization of American History', in Thomas Bender (ed.), *Rethinking American History in a Global Age* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press).

Unattributed (2001) 'Preface', in Richard Cashman et al. (eds), *Sport, Federation, Nation* (Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW).

Valiotis, Chris (2008) 'Suburban Footballers of Pacific Islander Ancestry: The Changing Face of Rugby League in Greater Western Sydney', in Andrew Moore and Andy Carr (eds), *Centenary Reflections: 100 Years of Rugby League in Australia* (Melbourne: Australian Society for Sports History).

Whimpress, Bernard (2001) 'Absent Aborigines: The Impact of Federation on Indigenous Sport', in Richard Cashman et al. (eds), *Sport, Federation, Nation* (Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW).

White, Richard and Hsu-Ming Teo (2008) 'Popular Culture', in Derek M. Schreuder and Stuart Ward (eds), *Australia's Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Williams, Mark (2009) '"The Finest Race of Savages the World Has Seen": How Empire Turned Out Differently in Australia and New Zealand', in Vanessa Agnew and Jonathon Lamb, with Daniel Spoth (eds), *Settler and Creole Reenactment* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Woollacott, Angela (2008) 'Gender and Sexuality', in Derek M. Schreuder and Stuart Ward (eds), *Australia's Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Yttergren, Leif (2006) 'J. Sigfrid Edstrøm and the Nurmi Affair of 1932: The Struggle of the Amateur Fundamentalists against Professionalism in the Olympic Movement', in Nigel B. Crowther, Robert Barney and Michael Heine (eds), *Cultural Imperialism in Action: Critiques in the Global Olympic Trust, Eighth International Symposium for Olympic Research* (London, ON: University of Western Ontario).

Journal articles

Adair, Daryl, John Nauright, and Murray Phillips (1998) 'Playing Fields through to Battle Fields: The Development of Australian Sporting Manhood in its Imperial Context', *Journal of Australian Studies*, 56, 51–67.

Allen, Dean (2009) '"Cricket's Laird": James Logan and the Development of the "Imperial Game" in South Africa, 1888–1902', *Sporting Traditions*, 26 (1), 49–69.

Bale, John (2006) 'Amateurism, Capital and Roger Bannister', *Sport in History*, 26 (3), 484–501.

Ballantyne, Tony (2005) 'Religion, Difference, and the Limits of British Imperial History', *Victorian Studies*, 47 (3), 427–55.

Bradley, James (1995) 'Inventing Australians and Constructing Englishness: Cricket and the Creation of a National Consciousness, 1860–1914', *Sporting Traditions*, 11 (2), 35–60.

Brawley, Sean (2009) '"They Came, They Saw, They Conquered": The Takaishi/Saito Tour of 1926–27 and Australian Perceptions of Japan', *Sporting Traditions*, 26 (2), 49–66.

Buck, A. R. (2004) 'Women, Dower, and the Courts of Equitable Jurisdiction: Comparing Upper Canada and New South Wales in the Nineteenth Century', *Australian-Canadian Studies*, 22 (1), 57–76.

Carr, Andy (2009) '"My Good Comrade of the Rugby League": Discovering the Writings of Harry Sunderland in the State Library of New South Wales', *Australian Society for Sports History Bulletin*, 49, 7–14.

Cashman, Richard and Tom Hickie (1990) 'The Divergent Sporting Cultures of Sydney and Melbourne', *Sporting Traditions*, 7 (1), 26–46.

Collins, Tony (2005) 'Australian Nationalism and Working-class Britishness: The Case of Rugby League Football', *History Compass*, 3 (AU 142), 1–19.
—— (2006) 'The Ambiguities of Amateurism: English Rugby Union in the Edwardian Era', *Sport in History*, 26 (3), 386–405.
—— (2009) 'The Tyranny of Deference: Anglo-Australian Relations and Rugby Union before World War II', *Sport in History*, 29 (3), 437–56.
Curran, James (2013) 'Australia at Empire's End: Approaches and Arguments', *History Australia*, 10 (3), 23–35.
Davison, Graeme (2002) 'The Imaginary Grandstand', *Meanjin*, 61 (3), 4–18.
Denoon, Donald (2003) 'Re-Membering Australasia: A Repressed Memory', *Australian Historical Studies*, 34 (122), 290–304.
Eisenberg, Christiane (2005) 'Sport and Politics. Some Considerations for Future Research Perspectives. Discussion of the Papers Presented to the Panel on "Sport, Politics and Business"', unpublished Conference Paper, 20th International Congress of Historical Sciences, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, 3–9 July.
Fairburn, Miles (1970) 'New Zealand and Australasian Federation, 1883–1901: Another View', *New Zealand Journal of History*, 4 (2), 138–59.
Gibbons, Peter (2003) 'The Far Side of the Search for Identity: Reconsidering New Zealand History', *New Zealand Journal of History*, 37 (1), 38–49.
Gould, Eliga H. (1999) 'A Virtual Nation: Greater Britain and the Imperial Legacy of the American Revolution', *The American Historical Review*, 104 (2), 476–89.
Guiney, David (1996) 'The Olympic Council of Ireland', *Citius, Altius, Fortius*, 4 (3), 31–33.
Hardy, Stephen (1986) 'Entrepreneurs, Organizations, and the Sport Marketplace: Subjects in Search of Historians', *Journal of Sport History*, 13 (1), 14–33.
Henniker, Garth and Ian Jobling (1989) 'Richard Coombes and the Olympic Movement in Australia: Imperialism and Nationalism in Action', *Sporting Traditions*, 6 (1), 2–15.
Hill, Jeffrey (2006) '"I'll Run Him": Alf Tupper, Social Class and British Amateurism', *Sport in History*, 26 (3), 502–19.
Hirst, John (1975) 'Distance in Australia – Was It a Tyrant?', *Historical Studies*, 16 (64), 435–47.
Hokowhitu, Brendan (2003) '"Physical Beings": Stereotypes, Sport and the "Physical Education" of New Zealand Māori', *Sport in Society*, 6 (2), 192–218.
—— (2005) 'Rugby and *Tino Rangatiratanga*: Early Māori Rugby and the Formation of "Traditional" Māori Masculinity', *Sporting Traditions*, 21 (2), 75–95.
Holt, Richard (2006) 'The Amateur Body and the Middle-class Man: Work, Health and Style in Victorian Britain', *Sport in History*, 26 (3), 352–69.
Huggins, Mike (2000) 'More Sinful Pleasures? Leisure, Respectability and the Male Middle Classes in Victorian England', *Journal of Social History*, 33 (3), 585–600.
Iriye, Akira (1989) 'The Internationalization of History', *The American Historical Review*, 94 (1), 1–10.
Jobling, Ian (1988) 'The Making of a Nation through Sport: Australia and the Olympic Games from Athens to Berlin, 1898–1916', *Australian Journal of Politics and History*, 34 (2), 160–72.
Kay, Alison C. (2008) 'Villas, Values and the *Crystal Palace Company*, c.1852–1911', *The London Journal*, 33 (1), 21–39.

Kealey, Gregory S. and Greg Patmore (1996) 'Comparative Labour History: Australia and Canada', *Labour/Le Travail*, 38/*Labour History*, 71, 1–15.
Kidd, Bruce (1994) 'The First COA Presidents', *Olympika*, 3, 107–10.
Korr, Charles P. (1978) 'West Ham United Football Club and the Beginnings of Professional Football in East London, 1895–1914', *Journal of Contemporary History*, 13 (2), 211–32.
Letters, Michael, and Ian Jobling (1996) 'Forgotten Links: Leonard Cuff and the Olympic Movement in Australasia, 1894–1905', *Olympika*, 5, 91–110.
Llewellyn, Matthew P. (2008) 'A Nation Divided: Great Britain and the Pursuit of Olympic Excellence, 1912–1914', *Journal of Sport History*, 35 (1), 73–97.
—— (2010) 'Chariots of Discord: Great Britain, Nationalism and the "Doomed" 1924 Paris Olympic Games', *Contemporary British History*, 24 (1), 67–87.
Love, Christopher (2007) 'Social Class and the Swimming World: Amateurs and Professionals', *International Journal of the History of Sport*, 24 (5), 603–19.
—— (2007) '"Whomsoever You See in Distress": Swimming, Saving Life and the Rise of the Royal Life Saving Society', *International Journal of the History of Sport*, 24 (5), 667–81.
Lucas, John A. and Ian Jobling (1995) 'Troubled Waters: Fanny Durack's 1919 Swimming Tour of America amid Transnational Amateur Athletic Prudery and Bureaucracy', *Olympika*, 4, 93–112.
Mandle, W. F. (1973) 'Cricket and Australian Nationalism in the Nineteenth Century', *Journal of the Royal Australian Historical Society*, 59 (4), 224–46.
Meaney, Neville (2001) 'Britishness and Australian Identity: The Problem of Nationalism in Australian History and Historiography', *Australian Historical Studies*, 32 (116), 76–90.
—— (2003) 'Britishness and Australia: Some Reflections', *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 31 (2), 122–35.
Mein Smith, Philippa (2003) 'New Zealand Federation Commissioners in Australia: One Past, Two Historiographies', *Australian Historical Studies*, 34 (122), 305–25.
Metcalfe, Alan (1995) 'The Meaning of Amateurism: A Case Study of Canadian Sport, 1884–1970', *Canadian Journal of the History of Sport*, 26 (2), 33–48.
Mitchell, Bruce (1990) 'Baseball in Australia. Two Tours and the Beginnings of Baseball in Australia', *Sporting Traditions*, 7 (1), 2–24.
Moore, Katharine (1989) 'One Voice in the Wilderness: Richard Coombes and the Promotion of the Pan-Britannic Festival Concept in Australia 1891–1911', *Sporting Traditions*, 5 (2), 188–203.
Moore, Katharine and Murray Phillips (1990) 'The Sporting Career of Harold Hardwick: One Example of the Irony of the Amateur–Professional Dichotomy', *Sporting Traditions*, 7 (1), 61–76.
Morrow, Don (1986) 'A Case Study of Amateur Conflict: The Athletic War in Canada, 1906–1908', *The British Journal of Sports History*, 3 (2), 173–90.
Obel, Camilla (2005) 'Amateur Rugby's Spectator Success: Cultivating Inter-Provincial Rugby Publics in New Zealand, 1902–1995', *Sporting Traditions*, 21 (2), 97–117.
Osmond, Gary (2010) '"Honolulu Maori": Racial Dimensions of Duke Kahanamoku's Tour of Australia and New Zealand, 1914–1915', *New Zealand Journal of History*, 44 (1), 22–34.

Paddick, Robert J. (1994) 'Amateurism: An Idea of the Past or a Necessity for the Future?', *Olympika*, 3, 1–15.
Petersen, Bob (2009) 'Boxer Shorts', *Sporting Traditions*, 26 (1), 88–91.
Phillips, Murray G. (1998) 'From Suburban Football to International Spectacle: The Commodification of Rugby League in Australia, 1907–1995', *Australian Historical Studies*, 29 (110), 27–48.
—— (2001) 'Diminishing Contrasts and Increasing Varieties: Globalisation Theory and "Reading" Amateurism in Australian Sport', *Sporting Traditions*, 18 (1), 19–32.
Pickles, Katie (2011) 'The Obvious and the Awkward: Postcolonialism and the British World', *New Zealand Journal of History*, 45 (1), 85–101.
Pocock, J. G. A. (1974) 'British History: A Plea for a New Subject', *New Zealand Journal of History*, 8 (1), 3–21.
—— (1999) 'The New British History in Atlantic Perspective: An Antipodean Commentary', *The American Historical Review*, 104 (2), 490–500.
Porter, Dilwyn (2006) 'Revenge of the Crouch End Vampires: The AFA, the FA and English Football's "Great Split", 1907–1914', *Sport in History*, 26 (3), 406–28.
Rickard, John (2001) 'Response: Imagining the Unimaginable?', *Australian Historical Studies*, 32 (116), 128–31.
Ryan, Greg (1997) '"Extravagance of Thought and Feeling": New Zealand Reactions to the 1932/33 Bodyline Controversy', *Sporting Traditions*, 13 (2), 41–58.
—— (2000) '"A Lack of Esprit De Corps": The 1908–09 Wallabies and the Legacy of the 1905 All Blacks', *Sporting Traditions*, 17 (1), 39–55.
Sawer, M. (2004) 'Suffrage Centenaries in Comparative Perspective', *Australian-Canadian Studies*, 22 (1), 115–36.
Tapp, E. J. (1952) 'New Zealand and Australian Federation', *Historical Studies*, 5 (19), 244–57.
Tyrrell, Ian (1991) 'American Exceptionalism in an Age of International History', *The American Historical Review*, 96 (4), 1031–55.
—— (1999) 'Making Nations/Making States: American Historians in the Context of Empire', *The Journal of American History*, 86 (3), 1015–44.
Vincent, Geoffrey T. (1998) 'Practical Imperialism: The Anglo-Welsh Rugby Tour of New Zealand, 1908', *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 15 (1), 123–40.
Wagg, Stephen (2006) '"Base Mechanic Arms"? British Rowing, Some Ducks and the Shifting Politics of Amateurism', *Sport in History*, 26 (3), 520–39.
Ward, Stuart (2001) 'Sentiment and Self-interest: The Imperial Ideal in Anglo-Australian Commercial Culture', *Australian Historical Studies*, 32 (116), 91–108.
Wolak, A. J. (2007) 'Australia's "Irish Factor" as a Source of Cultural Difference from Canada', *Australasian Canadian Studies*, 25 (1), 85–116.
Wood, F. L. W. (1968) 'Why Did New Zealand Not Join the Australian Commonwealth in 1900–1901?', *New Zealand Journal of History*, 2 (2), 115–29.

Theses

Chatziefstathiou, Dikaia (2005) 'The Changing Nature of the Ideology of Olympism in the Modern Olympic Era', unpublished PhD thesis, Loughborough University.

Elsaka, Nadia (2004) 'Beyond Consensus?: New Zealand Journalists and the Appeal of "Professionalism" as a Model for Occupational Reform', unpublished PhD thesis, University of Canterbury.
Kohe, Geoffery Z. (2010) 'Making it Ordinary: An Unexceptional History of the Early Olympic Movement in New Zealand', unpublished PhD thesis, University of Otago.
Little, Charles (2000) 'Sport, Communities and Identities: A Case Study of Race, Ethnicity and Gender in South Sydney Sport', unpublished PhD thesis, School of History, University of New South Wales.
Ripley, Stuart (2003) 'A Social History of New South Wales Professional Sculling 1876–1927', unpublished PhD thesis, University of Western Sydney.

Websites

Athletics Weekly, 'British Athletics Championships 1876–1914', www.gbrathletics.com/bc/bc1.htm [Accessed 16 February 2009].
Bibliothèque et Archives nationales Québec, 'The Montreal Witness [microforme]', http://bibnum2.banq.qc.ca/bna/mtlwitness [Accessed 16 November 2009].
International Olympic Committee, 'Olympic Medal Winners', www.olympic.org/uk/athletes/results/search_r_uk.asp [Accessed 18 August 2009].
Sports Reference LLC, 'Arthur Duffey', www.sports-reference.com/olympics/athletes/du/arthur-duffey-1.html [Accessed 13 February 2009].
Tyrrell, Ian (2007) 'What Is Transnational History?', paper given at the Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociale, Paris, January, http://iantyrrell.wordpress.com/what-is-transnational-history [Accessed 24 March 2009].

Index