Decentred Britons: amateurism and athletics in Australasia and beyond

Author:
Nielsen, Erik John

Publication Date:
2011

DOI:
https://doi.org/10.26190/unsworks/14993

Decentred Britons: Amateurism and Athletics in Australasia and Beyond

Erik Nielsen

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctorate of Philosophy from the School of History and Philosophy at the University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia

2011

PLEASE TYPE

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW SOUTH WALES
Thesis/Dissertation Sheet

Surname or Family name: Nielsen

First name: Erik Other name/s: John

Abbreviation for degree as given in the University calendar: PhD

School: School of History and Philosophy Faculty: Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences

Title: Decentred Britons: Amateurism and Athletics in Australasia and Beyond

Abstract 350 words maximum: (PLEASE TYPE)

This thesis investigates the relationship between the concept of amateurism and the notion of a pan-British community with regard to amateur athletics in Australasia. Amateurism is investigated through an analysis of its roots, its expression and the way that it was defined. The roots of amateurism are excavated through an examination of the early life of key administrator Richard Coombes in England. His education and experiences within the Coombes family business – the Greyhound Hotel – led to a conception of amateurism far removed from the elite English conception. This more earthy understanding of amateurism found expression in decisions made as a leading figure in Australasian amateur athletics. He oversaw the establishment of events aimed at popularising the sport – an endeavour that he was joined in with by his counterparts in New Zealand. He was instrumental in the institution of a liberal definition of amateurism that was further aimed at extending the amateur franchise.

This liberal definition of amateurism gravely influenced the relationship between the Amateur Athletic Union of Australasia [AAUA] and their English counterpart the Amateur Athletic Association [AAA]. This thesis uses what John Pocock has described as 'British History' to understand this relationship. The AAUA embodied what Neville Meaney would call 'Thwarted Britishness' in that it felt slighted by a lack of attention displayed by the AAA. It responded to this challenge by affirming its place within the British world rather than asserting its distinctiveness. It created bonds with amateur figures beyond the mainstream and claimed a place within domestic British debates, a strategy also pursued with respect to the United States and Canada. While relationships with amateur athletic figures from these countries provided support to the AAUA, national differences proved intractable.

A transnational approach is applied to the most important pan-British relationship of all to the AAUA – the relationship between Australia and New Zealand. The breakup of this relationship will be shown to be due to factors other than nationalism. The imperial context will be shown to be vital to the demise of Australasian Olympic representation. The unwillingness of Australians to reform the AAUA led to its demise.

Declaration relating to disposition of project thesis/dissertation

I hereby grant to the University of New South Wales or its agents the right to archive and to make available my thesis or dissertation in whole or in part in the University libraries in all forms of media, now or here after known, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968. I retain all property rights, such as patent rights. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this thesis or dissertation.

I also authorise University Microfilms to use the 350 word abstract of my thesis in Dissertation Abstracts International (this is applicable to doctoral theses only).

Signature	Witness	Date
		30-3-2011

The University recognises that there may be exceptional circumstances requiring restrictions on copying or conditions on use. Requests for restriction for a period of up to 2 years must be made in writing. Requests for a longer period of restriction may be considered in exceptional circumstances and require the approval of the Dean of Graduate Research.

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY Date of completion of requirements for Award:

THIS SHEET IS TO BE GLUED TO THE INSIDE FRONT COVER OF THE THESIS

ORIGINALITY STATEMENT

'I hereby declare that this submission is my own work and to the best of my knowledge it contains no materials previously published or written by another person, or substantial proportions of material which have been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma at UNSW or any other educational institution, except where due acknowledgement is made in the thesis. Any contribution made to the research by others, with whom I have worked at UNSW or elsewhere, is explicitly acknowledged in the thesis. I also declare that the intellectual content of this thesis is the product of my own work, except to the extent that assistance from others in the project's design and conception or in style, presentation and linguistic expression is acknowledged.'

Signed .....

Date 30-3-2011

COPYRIGHT STATEMENT

'I hereby grant the University of New South Wales or its agents the right to archive and to make available my thesis or dissertation in whole or part in the University libraries in all forms of media, now or here after known, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968. I retain all proprietary rights, such as patent rights. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this thesis or dissertation.
I also authorise University Microfilms to use the 350 word abstract of my thesis in Dissertation Abstract International (this is applicable to doctoral theses only).
I have either used no substantial portions of copyright material in my thesis or I have obtained permission to use copyright material; where permission has not been granted I have applied/will apply for a partial restriction of the digital copy of my thesis or dissertation.'

Signed .....

Date 2-10-2011

AUTHENTICITY STATEMENT

'I certify that the Library deposit digital copy is a direct equivalent of the final officially approved version of my thesis. No emendation of content has occurred and if there are any minor variations in formatting, they are the result of the conversion to digital format.'

Signed .....

Date 2-10-2011

Contents

Acknowledgements

I owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to Dr Sean Brawley, who acted as my supervisor. In addition to generously sharing his knowledge and offering astute comments, he acted as an advocate on my behalf in a number of contexts. Without his energetic support, 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 acted as my co-supervisor and provided invaluable advice and other support, particularly during the vital first semester of my candidature when he acted as my primary supervisor. 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 Geoffery Kohe, along with countless others.

Financial support for this thesis 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 thesis an international perspective.

In addition to financial help, the School of History and Philosophy at UNSW provided me with significant administrative support. Head of School Dr Paul Brown and Postgraduate Coordinators Dr Nick Doumanis, Dr Mina Roces and Dr Geoff

Nathan provided insightful suggestions and support during review meetings and at other times. Members of the administrative staff including Sally Pearson, Lekana Kim and Sam Russell helped me through the often onerous administrative tasks that accompany postgraduate study.

A number of librarians and archivists have provided me with invaluable assistance in the production of this thesis. 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 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 that contributed to these sessions – especially Anna Doukakis, Carlin de Montfort and Lindsay Yeates.

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.

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 or Australasian Union – Amateur Athletic Union of Australasia

AAUANZ – Amateur Athletic Union of Australia and New Zealand

AAUC or Canadian Union – Amateur Athletic Union of Canada

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 Journalist's 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 Cyclist's 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

Chapter One – Introduction

Amateurism has been described by Richard Cashman as 'the core and enduring ideal which dominated Australian sport for over a century.'[1] 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.'[2] This thesis explores the interrelated significance of these concepts to the development of Australian sporting culture. 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 thesis will provide 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 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.[3]

Australasia

New Zealand historian James Belich has argued that the legacy of a 'Tasman world' incorporating the east coast of Australia and the islands of New Zealand represents 'part of

---

[1] Richard Cashman, *Paradise of Sport: The Rise of Organised Sport in Australia*, South Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1995, p. 54.
[2] Stuart Ward, *Australia and the British Embrace: The Demise of the Imperial Ideal*, Carlton South: Melbourne University Press, 2001, p. 2.
[3] For a description of the changing definition of 'Australasia,' see Donald Denoon, 'Re-Membering Australasia: A Repressed Memory,' *Australian Historical Studies*, no. 122, October 2003, pp. 292-93. For a description of Australasia as a British community, see James Belich, *Paradise Reforged: A History of the New Zealanders From the 1880s to the Year 2000*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2001, pp. 440-41.

a joint past [that] historians in both countries seem reluctant to recognise.'[4] The disregard for a joint 'Australasian' past is particularly true of Australian historians, while New Zealanders such as Keith Sinclair had 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.'[5] Belich, along with Rollo Arnold, argues that a rich pan-Australasian culture developed in the nineteenth century. These links have been neglected by the historiography of both Australia and New Zealand, however. Belich argues that cultural and economic interactions mark 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.'[6] 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.'[7] He affirms that by 1888 the commonalities between the seven Australasian colonies rendered it 'absurd to contemplate two peoples.'[8] 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

---

[4] James Belich, *Making Peoples: A History of the New Zealanders From Polynesian settlement to the end of the nineteenth century*, Auckland, NZ: Penguin Books, 2007, p. 132.
[5] Quoted by Peter Gibbons, 'The Far Side of the Search for Identity: Reconsidering New Zealand History,' *New Zealand Journal of History*, vol. 37, no. 1, April 2003, p. 44.
[6] Belich, *Making Peoples*, p. 134.
[7] Rollo Arnold, 'Family or Strangers?' Trans-Tasman Migrants, 1870-1920,' *Australia-New Zealand: Aspects of a Relationship, Proceedings of the Stout Research Centre Eighth Annual Conference*, Victoria University of Wellington, September 1991, p. 8.
[8] Rollo Arnold, 'The Australasian Peoples and their World, 1888-1915,' Keith Sinclair (ed.), *Tasman Relations: New Zealand and Australia, 1788-1988*, Auckland, NZ: Auckland University Press, 1987, p. 52.

federation movement.[9] Recent developments have moved the debate towards comparative 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.[10]

The sport of track and field athletics offers an excellent opportunity to chart the continuing Trans-Tasman relationship in the post-Federation era. 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.[11] 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.'[12] 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.[13]

---

[9] E. J. Tapp, 'New Zealand and Australian Federation,' *Historical Studies*, vol. 5, no. 19, Nov. 1952, pp. 244-57; F. L. W. Wood, 'Why did New Zealand not join the Australian Commonwealth in 1900-1901?,' *New Zealand Journal of History*, vol. 2, no. 2, October 1968, pp. 115-29; Miles Fairburn, 'New Zealand and Australasian Federation, 1883-1901: Another View,' *New Zealand Journal of History*, vol. 4, no. 2, Oct. 1970, pp. 138-59; Keith Sinclair, 'Why New Zealanders Are Not Australians: New Zealand and the Australian Federal Movement, 1881-1901,' Keith Sinclair (ed.), *Tasman Relations: New Zealand and Australia, 1788-1988*, Auckland, NZ: Auckland University Press, 1987, pp. 90-103.

[10] Denoon, 'Re-Membering Australasia,' pp. 290-304; Philippa Mein Smith, 'New Zealand Federation Commissioners in Australia: One Past, Two Historiographies,' *Australian Historical Studies*, no. 122, October 2003, pp. 305-25; Donald Denoon and Philippa Mein Smith, with Marivic Wyndham, *A History of Australia, New Zealand, and the Pacific*, Oxford, UK and Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2000.

[11] William Thomas Kelly, *South Australian Amateur Athletic Association: A History, 1867-1973*, Adelaide, South Australian Amateur Athletic Association, 1973, p. 7. Richard Cashman and John A. Daly suggest 1864 as the foundation date of this club. [Cashman, *Paradise of Sport*, p. 57; John A. Daly, *Elysian Fields: Sport, Class and Community in Colonial South Australia 1836-1890*, Adelaide: the Author, 1982, p. 86.]

[12] Daly, *Elysian Fields*, p. 86.

[13] Daly, *Elysian Fields*, p. 88.

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, an immigrant from England who arrived in Melbourne in 1886. The first club formed in Sydney was the Sydney AAC founded in 1872, with ten other clubs formed before 1883.[14] 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. 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.[15] The success of these championships saw the foundation of a regional body, the Australasian Union, in 1899 following the Australasian Amateur Conference of 1897.[16] It survived until 1927, long after New Zealand had declined to join the Australian Commonwealth.[17]

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.[18] This thesis argues that the path to

---

[14] Anon., *100 Years of the NSW AAA*, Sydney: The Fairfax Library, 1987, pp. 16, 19.
[15] Harry Gordon, *Australia and the Olympic Games*, St Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1994, p. 16.
[16] Cashman, *Paradise of Sport*, p. 58.
[17] Anthony Hughes, 'Sporting Federations: The impact of Federation on sports governance,' Richard Cashman *et al* (eds.), *Sport, Federation, Nation*, Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW, 2001, pp. 124-25.
[18] Reet Howell and Max Howell, *Aussie Gold: The Story of Australia at the Olympics*, Melbourne: Brooks Waterloo, 1988, p. VIII; John Hoberman, 'Sport and ideology in the post-Communist age,' Lincoln Allison (ed.), *The Changing Politics of Sport*, Manchester, UK and New York, NY: Manchester University Press,

creating an Australian identity in athletics was influenced by this integration with New Zealand, a phenomenon which 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.[19]

Australasia and Amateur Sport

The concept of Australasia remained current in amateur sport well into the twentieth century within organisations such as the Australasian Union and in representative teams. These teams include joint Australasian teams that competed at the 1908 and 1912 Olympic Games in London and Stockholm respectively. The persistence of the concept after the federation of the Australian colonies has been the focus of historical attention, most notably in the edited volume *Sport, Federation, Nation.*[20] 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 the dispensation of Australasia in certain sports, resulting in a time lag between

---

1993, p. 16; John Hoberman, 'Sportive Nationalism and Globalization,' John Bale and Mette Krogh Christensen (eds.), *Post-Olympism: Questioning Sport in the Twenty-first Century*, Oxford, UK and New York, NY: Berg, 2004, p. 185. Barbara J. Keys, *Globalizing Sport: National Rivalry and International Community in the 1940s*, Cambridge, MA and London, UK: Harvard University Press, 2006, p. 17.

[19] W. F. Mandle, 'Cricket and Australian Nationalism in the Nineteenth Century,' *Journal of the Royal Australian Historical Society*, vol. 59, No. 4, December 1973, p. 238.

[20] Richard Cashman *et al* (eds.), *Sport, Federation, Nation*, Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW, 2001.

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.[21]

The persistence of the concept of Australasia 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.[22] Historians such as 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.[23] The persistence of Australasia within sport disrupts this teleology and 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. The organisation of Australasian teams 'allowed New Zealand athletes to surmount extremely limited financial and administrative resources.'[24] This argument has an in-built explanation for the demise of the Australasian team, as rising strength saw New Zealand branch out on its own once these difficulties have 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

---

[21] Richard Cashman, 'Part 2: A Changing Face of Sport?: Introduction,' Richard Cashman *et al* (eds.), *Sport, Federation, Nation,* Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW, 2001, pp. 60-61.
[22] Denoon *et al*, *A History of Australia, New Zealand, and the Pacific*, p. 30; Denoon, 'Re-Membering Australasia,' p. 293.
[23] Mandle, 'Cricket and Australian Nationalism,' p. 242.
[24] Greg Ryan, 'Commentary,' Richard Cashman *et al* (eds.), *Sport, Federation, Nation*, Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW, 2001, p. 133.

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.'[25] 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 in the list), Miles Fairburn and the late Keith Sinclair to explain New Zealand's reticence to federate with the other Australasian colonies. Tapp argued that little benefit was apparent to New Zealand as a result of federating and that there was a concern that joining the Commonwealth of Australia 'might jeopardise their own close relationship with Britain.' Wood explained New Zealand aloofness on reasons that also discouraged some Australian colonies from federating and the intransigence of New Zealand premier Richard Seddon. This view is controversial and generally repudiated. 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.[26] 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 affordable.[27]

---

[25] Unattributed, 'Preface,' Richard Cashman *et al* (eds.), *Sport, Federation, Nation,* Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW, 2001, p. v.
[26] Charles Little, 'Trans-Tasman Federations in Sport: The changing relationships between Australia and New Zealand,' Richard Cashman *et al* (eds.), *Sport, Federation, Nation,* Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW, 2001, pp. 65-66.
[27] See Ryan, 'Commentary,' p. 133.

The reliance on nationalism to explain New Zealand's reticence to join the Australian colonies in Federation 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.'[28] 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.'[29]

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 attributed to it. 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 focussed on Australia's convict heritage, while Australian literature warned prospective migrants about the likelihood of earthquakes striking in New Zealand.[30]

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

---

[28] Belich, *Paradise Reforged*, p. 30.
[29] Belich, *Paradise Reforged*, p. 50.
[30] Belich, *Making Peoples*, pp. 285-86.

to ‘write the convicts out of history and memory ... the convicts have served as icons carrying particular understandings of the [Australian] national past.’[31] New Zealand historian Rollo Arnold also illustrates how 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.[32] New Zealand’s tradition of distinguishing itself from Australia as identified by Belich and his 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 New Zealand in its response to its colonial siblings, but not to its response to its imperial parent.

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 thesis 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 background than those in England

[31] Marian Quartly, ‘Convict history,’ Graeme Davison *et al* (eds.), *The Oxford Companion to Australian History*, South Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 2001. http://www.oxfordreference.com/views/ENTRY.html?subview=Main&entry=t127.e362 Accessed 11 November 2010.
[32] Rollo Arnold, ‘Family or Strangers?’, p. 2.

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 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 Mandle have argued that dissension with English norms resulted in the formation of national identities, this thesis takes its cues from historians such as James Belich, Neville Meaney and Tony Collins who stress Australian and New Zealand continuity with British norms.[33] 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.

This critique of nationalism is explored through a re-examination of the forces that saw the Australasian Union dissolve. A conflict in priorities between a dynamic New Zealand and a more reticent Australia, rather than a rising sense of New Zealand nationalism, is promoted as the reason for the dissolution of the Union. New Zealand sought to reform the Australasian athletic community to better reflect their position within it, but received scant support from Australia. As a result the concepts of amateurism and

[33] Mandle, 'Cricket and Australian Nationalism,' p. 238; Belich, *Paradise Reforged*, p. 30; Neville Meaney, 'Britishness and Australian Identity: The Problem of Nationalism in Australian History and Historiography,' *Australian Historical Studies*, vol. 32, no. 116, April 2001, pp. 76-90; Tony Collins, 'Australian Nationalism and Working-Class Britishness: The Case of Rugby League Football,' *History Compass*, 3 AU 142, 2005, pp. 1-19; Tony Collins, 'The Tyranny of Deference: Anglo-Australian Relations and Rugby Union before World War II,' *Sport in History*, vol. 29, no. 3, September 2009, pp. 437-56.

identity are shown to influence the development of the other, rather than existing in a vacuum. This thesis shows how amateur officials adapted to a changing world, and their experience can offer an insight into how other communities of Australasians also faced the wider world. Imperial links between the antipodean colonies and Britain were also important. Key administrators such as Coombes and Basil Parkinson of the VAAA had experienced sport in England, and shared an Imperialist world view.[34] Amongst the most important legacies of English conceptions of sport was 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.'[35] To adherents of amateurism, professionalism destroyed the spirit of sport as it became overshadowed by the self-interest of the participants.[36] 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.'[37] Allison advocates for a form

[34] See Garth Henniker and Ian Jobling, 'Richard Coombes and the Olympic Movement in Australia: Imperialism and Nationalism in Action,' *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 6, no. 1, November 1989, pp. 2-15; Ian Jobling, 'In Pursuit of Status, Respectability and Idealism: Pioneers of the Olympic Movement in Australasia,' J.A. Mangan and John Nauright (eds.), *Sport in Australasian Society: Past and Present*, London, UK and Portland, OR: Frank Cass, 2000, pp. 142-63.
[35] Keys, *Globalizing Sport*, p. 22. See also Richard Holt, *Sport and the British: A Modern History*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1990, pp. 99-100.
[36] See Maurice T. Daly, *One Hundred Years of Australian Sport: A History of the New South Wales Sports Club*, Sydney: New South Wales Sports Club, 1996, pp. 40-42.
[37] Lincoln Allison, *Amateurism in Sport: An Analysis and a Defence*, London, UK and Portland, OR: Frank Cass, 2001, p. 3.

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 is finds the efforts of Avery Brundage the President of the International Olympic Committee [IOC] to enforce the amateur code as 'repulsive in its fanaticism.'[38] Allison's definition is ultimately philosophical. This thesis 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?

Proponents of amateurism express a desire to purify sport of the pernicious influence of professionalism.[39] 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.[40]

As noted at the outset of this thesis, amateurism became 'the core and enduring ideal which dominated Australian sport for over a century.'[41]

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.[42]

---

[38] Allison, *Amateurism*, p. 13.
[39] Robert J. Paddick, 'Amateurism,' Wray Vamplew *et al* (eds.), *Oxford Companion to Australian Sport*, South Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1994, pp. 11-12.
[40] Robert J. Paddick, 'Amateurism: An idea of the past or a necessity for the future?,' *Olympika: The International Journal of Olympic Studies*, vol. 3, 1994, p. 3.
[41] Cashman, *Paradise of Sport*, pp. 57, 54.

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.[43] The recruitment of games enthusiasts soon became unavoidable as school masters 'were recruited almost exclusively from Oxford and Cambridge,' which acted as 'little more than finishing schools for public school boys' in this period.[44] 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.[45] 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.[46]

To Adamson, '[s]port was an integral feature of social class, and it was the "purity" of amateur sport that appealed ...'[47] The influence of men such as Adamson saw sport attain 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

---

[42] Cashman, *Paradise of Sport*, p. 54; Richard Holt, 'The Amateur Body and the Middle-class Man: Work, Health and Style in Victorian Britain,' *Sport in History*, vol. 26, no. 3, December 2006, p. 353. For discussions of the development of athleticism, see J. A. Mangan, *Athleticism in the Victorian and Edwardian Public School: The Emergence and Consolidation of an Educational Ideology*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1981; David W. Brown, 'The Legacy of British Victorian Social Thought: Some Prominent Views on Sport, Physical Exercise and Society in Colonial Australia,' Wray Vamplew (ed.), *Sport and Colonialism in 19th Century Australasia*, Campbelltown: Australian Society of Sports Historians (ASSH), ASSH Studies in Sports History: No. 1, 1986, p. 24; Ray Crawford, 'Athleticism, Gentlemen and Empire in Australian Public Schools: L.A. Adamson and Wesley College, Melbourne,' Wray Vamplew (ed.), *Sport and Colonialism in 19th Century Australasia*, Campbelltown: Australian Society of Sports Historians (ASSH), ASSH Studies in Sports History: No. 1, 1986, p. 47; Martin Crotty, *Making the Australian Male: Middle-Class Masculinity 1870-1920*, Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2001, pp. 33-34, 41.
[43] Cashman, *Paradise of Sport*, p. 55.
[44] Mangan, *Athleticism*, p. 122.
[45] Crotty, *Making the Australian Male*, p. 51.
[46] Crawford, 'Athleticism, Gentlemen and Empire,' p. 44.
[47] Crawford, 'Athleticism, Gentlemen and Empire,' p. 49. Adamson prevented a member of staff from competing in the professional Victorian Football League in 1911.

> accept the results. Sport at school was alleged to teach boys to stand up for themselves, in both a moral and physical sense.[48]

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.[49]

While athleticism in Britain and Australia drew from the same well of inspiration, the adaptation of athleticism 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.[50] 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.[51] 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.'[52]

---

[48] Crotty, *Making the Australian Male*, p. 60.
[49] Crotty, *Making the Australian Male*, p. 61; Tony Collins, *Rugby's Great Split: Class, Culture and the Origins of Rugby League Football*, London, UK and Portland, OR: Frank Cass, 1998, p. 124.
[50] Crotty, *Making the Australian Male*, p. 11.
[51] Crotty, *Making the Australian Male*, p. 74.
[52] Crotty, *Making the Australian Male*, p. 86.

To this extent, sport followed the path of other forms of cultural expression, such as juvenile literature, that sought to standardise conceptions of masculinity.[53] 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.[54] 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.[55]

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.[56]

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

---

[53] Crotty, *Making the Australian Male*, p. 112.
[54] Jobling, 'In Pursuit of Status,' p. 151.
[55] Murray G. Phillips, 'Diminishing Contrasts and Increasing Varieties: Globalisation Theory and "Reading" Amateurism in Australian Sport,' *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 18, no. 1, November 2001, p. 25.
[56] Georges Rioux, 'Pierre de Coubertin's Revelation,' Norbert Müller (ed.), *Pierre de Coubertin 1863 – 1937: Olympism Selected Writings*, Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 2000, p. 27.

production of "Muscular Christians."'[57] 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.[58] 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 traditional 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.'[59] 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.[60] The necessity of comparison in both the case of amateurism and Britishness underlines that,

[57] John MacAloon, *This Great Symbol: Pierre de Coubertin and the Origins of the Modern Olympic Games*, Chicago, IL and London, UK: The University of Chicago Press, 1981, p. 51.
[58] MacAloon, *This Great Symbol*, pp. 60-63, 77.
[59] Phillips, 'Diminishing Contrasts,' p. 19.
[60] Malcolm MacLean, 'New Zealand,' S. W. Pope and John Nauright (eds.), *Routledge Companion to Sports History*, London, UK and New York, NY: Routledge, 2010, p. 513.

not only are these concepts linked in this thesis, previous studies into each suffer from similar drawbacks that need to be rectified.

This thesis attempts to overcome the shortcoming in Australian amateur historiography identified by Phillips. Despite being primarily focused with 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 of the rise of professionalism common to all amateur sport.[61] 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 athlete's 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.[62] The tension between athletics officials and those from other sports indicates that the relationship between those that organised the Olympic Movement in Australia was tenser than 'A Network of Friends' would suggest.[63] Phillips rejects the notion of a 'national' amateurism and argues that difference 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.[64] The case of the NSWAAA and the ASFNSW indicates significant divisions within the state of

[61] Phillips, 'Diminishing Contrasts,' p. 22.
[62] See Erik Nielsen, '"Oh Error, Ill-conceived:" The Amateur Sports Federation of New South Wales, Rugby League and Amateur Athletics,' Andrew Moore and Andy Carr (eds.), *Centenary Reflections: 100 Years of Rugby League in Australia*, Melbourne: Australian Society for Sports History, 2008, pp. 9-23.
[63] 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*, pp. 15-27.]
[64] Phillips, 'Diminishing Contrasts,' pp. 26-27.

New South Wales. This thesis 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.[65] 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.[66] He has further demonstrated that Coombes played an active role in urging the administrative reform of professional sculling.[67] His 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.[68] 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.'[69] 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

[65] Stuart Ripley, 'A Social History of New South Wales Professional Sculling 1876-1927,' unpublished PhD thesis, University of Western Sydney, 2003. Sculling involves one individual rowing against another, as opposed to the team rowing preferred by amateurs.
[66] Ripley, 'New South Wales Professional Sculling,' p. 102.
[67] Ripley, 'New South Wales Professional Sculling,' pp. 348, 366.
[68] Ripley, 'New South Wales Professional Sculling,' p. 102.
[69] Ripley, 'New South Wales Professional Sculling,' p. 169.

becoming a truism' in terms of the analysis of amateur ideology.[70] 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.

Ripley's research into Coombes' administrative career away from athletics offers 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 thesis is concerned with the manner in which Coombes and his ilk

[70] Ripley, 'New South Wales Professional Sculling,' pp. 7-8.
[71] S. W. Pope, *Patriotic Games: Sporting Traditions in the American imagination, 1876-1926*, Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press, 2007, p. 19.
[72] Pope, *Patriotic Games*, pp. 19-20.

formed international relationships aimed at developing amateur sport. This will answer a suggestion to pay greater attention to the role 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

[73] Christiane Eisenberg, '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 2005.
[74] Mandle, 'Cricket and Australian Nationalism,' p. 242.
[75] Mandle, 'Cricket and Australian Nationalism,' p. 242.
[76] Mandle, 'Cricket and Australian Nationalism,' p. 238.
[77] Richard White, *Inventing Australia: Images and Identity 1688-1980*, Sydney: George Allen and Unwin, 1981, p. 111.

categorised as 'one of those constitutional devices recommended by apologists for bourgeois democracy for containing political equality.'[78]

Historian 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 that

> 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 with relation to the Olympic movement in Australia and the

---

[78] Manning Clark, *A History of Australia: vol. 5: The People Make Laws, 1888-1915*, Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1981, p. 139. Cashman provides an introduction to the issue of Federation and sport. [Richard Cashman, 'Introduction,' Richard Cashman *et al* (eds.), *Sport, Federation, Nation*, Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW, 2001, pp. 1-13.]
[79] Ken S. Inglis, 'Imperial Cricket: Test Matches between Australia and England, 1871-1900,' Richard Cashman and Michael McKernan (eds.), *Sport in History: The Making of Modern Sporting History*, St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1979, p. 171.
[80] Cashman, 'Introduction,' p. 7.
[81] David Montefiore, *Cricket in the Doldrums: The Struggle between Private and Public Control of Australian Cricket in the 1880s*, Campbelltown: Australian Society for Sports History (ASSH), ASSH Studies in Sports History, no. 8, 1992, p. 80.
[82] Little, 'Trans-Tasman Federations in Sport,' p. 69.

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 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

---

[83] Henniker and Jobling, 'Imperialism and Nationalism in Action,' pp. 2-15; Jobling, 'In Pursuit of Status,' pp. 142-163; Michael Letters and Ian Jobling, 'Forgotten Links: Leonard Cuff and The Olympic Movement in Australasia, 1894-1905,' *Olympika: The International Journal of Olympic Studies*, vol. 5, 1996, pp. 91-110; Katharine Moore, 'One Voice in the Wilderness: Richard Coombes and the Promotion of the Pan-Britannic Festival Concept in Australia 1891-1911,' *Sporting Traditions*, May 1989, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 188-203. Ian Jobling, 'The Making of a Nation Through Sport: Australia and the Olympic Games from Athens to Berlin, 1898-1916,' *Australian Journal of Politics and History*, vol. 34, no. 2, August 1988, pp. 160-72.
[84] Gordon, *Australia and the Olympic Games*; Howell and Howell, *Aussie Gold*.
[85] Howell and Howell, *Aussie Gold*, p. VIII.
[86] Jobling, 'The Making of a Nation,' p. 163.

strength of Australian national feeling prevented the development of support for an Empire Team in Australia.[87]

Garth Henniker and Jobling's biographical study of Richard Coombes and his role in the Olympic Movement in Australia [1989] 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 thesis 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 examine the persistence of bodies such as the Australasian Union and the formation of

---

[87] Jobling, 'The Making of a Nation,' pp. 169-70.
[88] Henniker and Jobling, 'Imperialism and Nationalism in Action,' pp. 2-15.
[89] Henniker and Jobling, 'Imperialism and Nationalism in Action,' pp. 5-6.
[90] Henniker and Jobling, 'Imperialism and Nationalism in Action,' p. 12.

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 breakaway 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. Chapter eight will illustrate that the strength of the

[91] Little, 'Trans-Tasman Federations in Sport,' p. 79.
[92] Charles Little and Richard Cashman, 'Ambiguous and Overlapping Identities: Australasia at the Olympic Games, 1896-1914,' Richard Cashman *et al* (eds.), *Sport, Federation, Nation,* Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW, 2001, p. 96; Ryan, 'Commentary,' p. 133.
[93] Hughes, 'Sporting Federations,' p. 126.
[94] Unattributed, 'Preface,' p. v.

member associations made an Australasian umbrella identity plausible, despite New Zealand's position of strength. In terms of the relationship with Britain, this thesis will argue that the 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 way in which British and American influences combined with differing effects will be addressed through a comparison with Canada.

Recent reevaluations of the British influence on Australia and New Zealand mean a more nuanced investigation into the British influence on athletics is easier now than was the case when these issues were first addressed. In 2003, Neville Meaney argued that that 'Australia needs a new British history which incorporates the Oceanic Greater Britain into its tale.'[95] 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*.[96] 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.[97] 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".'[98] Furthermore '"*Australia's* Empire" was … as much the product of the Australian imagination as of the British Colonial Office.'

---

[95] Neville Meaney, 'Britishness and Australia: Some Reflections,' *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, vol. 31, no. 2, May 2003, p. 133.
[96] Derek M. Schreuder and Stuart Ward (eds.), *Australia's Empire*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2008.
[97] Meaney, 'Britishness and Australian Identity,' p. 77.
[98] Derek M. Schreuder and Stuart Ward, 'Introduction: What Became of Australia's Empire?,' Derek M. Schreuder and Stuart Ward (eds.), *Australia's Empire*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2008, p. 9.

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.'[99] The authors further argue that the 'Empire loomed larger in the Australian imagination' than the British; due to family, business and institutional links, as well as information flows, transport networks and cultural connections.[100]

A growing recognition of the importance of Britishness has been felt as acutely in New Zealand. J. G. A. Pocock made British history the subject of 'A Plea for a New Subject' in 1974 in the aftermath of the United Kingdom's decision to join the European Economic Community [EEC].[101] James Belich suggests '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.[102] 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 disregards cultural manifestations of identity, such as the partisanship of sports spectators.[103] While John Rickard argues for the importance of cultural expressions of identity, neither he nor Meaney challenge the assumption that sport expresses a

[99] Schreuder and Ward, 'Introduction,' pp. 11-12.
[100] Schreuder and Ward, 'Introduction,' p. 18.
[101] J. G. A. Pocock, 'British History: A Plea for a New Subject,' *New Zealand Journal of History*, vol. 8, no. 1, 1974, pp. 3-21.
[102] Belich, *Paradise Reforged*, p. 11.
[103] Meaney, 'Britishness and Australian Identity,' p. 78.

distinctive Australianness.[104] 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.[105] 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.[106] 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.[107] 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.[108] 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 Britishness on Australian culture. Recent innovations

---

[104] John Rickard, 'Response: Imagining the Unimaginable?,' *Australian Historical Studies*, vol. 32, no. 116, April 2001, pp. 129-30; Collins, 'The Tyranny of Deference,' pp. 437-38.
[105] John Hirst, 'Empire, State, Nation,' Derek M. Schreuder and Stuart Ward (eds.), *Australia's Empire*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2008, p. 162.
[106] Mark McKenna, 'Monarchy: From Reverence to Indifference,' Derek M. Schreuder and Stuart Ward (eds.), *Australia's Empire*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2008, pp. 284-85
[107] Angela Woollacott, 'Gender and Sexuality,' Derek M. Schreuder and Stuart Ward (eds.), *Australia's Empire*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2008, p. 317; Daryl Adair, John Nauright, and Murray Phillips, 'Playing Fields Through to Battle Fields: The Development of Australian Sporting Manhood in its Imperial Context,' *Journal of Australian Studies*, no. 56, 1998, pp. 51-67.
[108] Richard White and Hsu-Ming Teo, 'Popular Culture,' Derek M. Schreuder and Stuart Ward (eds.), *Australia's Empire*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2008, pp. 350-55; Henniker and Jobling, 'Imperialism and Nationalism in Action,' pp. 2-15; Collins, 'Australian Nationalism,' pp. 1-19.

can extend previous sporting studies of Australia's British relationship as expressed through sport.

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].[109] 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.[110] This movement found historical expression in the works of J. R. Seeley in the nineteenth century.[111] 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

[109] Eliga H. Gould, 'A Virtual Nation: Greater Britain and the Imperial Legacy of the American Revolution,' *The American Historical Review*, vol. 104, no. 2, April 1999, p. 486.
[110] See Duncan Bell, *The Idea of Greater Britain: Empire and the Future of World Order, 1860-1900*, Princeton, NJ and Oxford, UK: Princeton University Press, 2007.
[111] Bell, *The Idea of Greater Britain*, pp. 150-78.

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.[112]

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 such as Australia. The presence of the United States in this study occasionally forces it outside the realm of Britishness, and into the realm of transnational history. The rise of transnational history complements the contemporaneous rise of 'British history', although the two terms are undeniably different.[113] 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.[114] Iriye argued that historians 'should make an effort to discuss problems whose significance transcends local boundaries.'[115] Tyrrell explicitly argued for transnational history as a way to counter notions of exceptionalism that permeated American historiography.[116] 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

---

[112] J. G. A. Pocock, 'The New British History in Atlantic Perspective: An Antipodean Commentary,' *The American Historical Review*, vol. 104, no. 2, April 1999, p. 491.
[113] Gould, 'A Virtual Nation,' p. 476. See footnote 2.
[114] Akira Iriye, 'The Internationalization of History,' *The American Historical Review*, vol. 94, no. 1, February 1989, pp. 1-10; Ian Tyrrell, 'American Exceptionalism in an Age of International History,' *The American Historical Review*, vol. 96, no. 4, October 1991, pp. 1031-55.
[115] Iriye, 'The Internationalization of History,' p. 3.
[116] Tyrrell, 'American Exceptionalism,' p. 1038.

to international history, which 'implies a relationship among nations.'[117] To Tyrrell, transnational history 'concerns the movement of peoples, ideas, technologies and institutions across national boundaries.'[118] 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.'[119]

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 thesis, 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.[120] This thesis 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 thesis 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

---

[117] Akira Iriye, 'Internationalizing International History,' Thomas Bender (ed.), *Rethinking American History in a Global Age*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA and London, UK: University of California Press, 2002, p. 51.
[118] Ian Tyrrell, 'What is transnational history?,' Excerpt from a paper given at the Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociale, Paris, in January 2007, Downloaded from http://iantyrrell.wordpress.com/what-is-transnational-history/. Accessed 24 March 2009.
[119] Ann Curthoys and Marilyn Lake, 'Introduction,' Ann Curthoys and Marilyn Lake (eds.), *Connected Worlds: History in Transnational Perspective*, Canberra: ANU E Press, 2005, p. 5.
[120] Tyrrell, 'American Exceptionalism,' p. 1033.

transnational history, that a sense of nationality is 'profoundly affected by transnational contingencies.'[121]

Methodology

British historical theorist Alun Munslow ascertains 'three approaches to historical knowledge' – reconstructionism, constructionism and deconstructionism. Reconstructionist history is heavily rooted in empirical knowledge and the belief that the past can be unproblematically reproduced through historical study. Constructionist histories are based around 'general laws in historical explanation' and attempt to provide 'all-encompassing total explanations' through approaches such as Modernisation theory and the Marxist/neo-Marxist school. Deconstructionist histories emphasise the relationship between form (sources) and content (interpretations) rather than empirical knowledge or social theorising. They are based on a postmodern recognition of the 'unavoidable relativism of historical understanding' and are concerned with the literary process that creates historical knowledge.[122] Douglas Booth has applied Munslow's scheme to the practice of sports history, and argues that reconstructionism and constructionism dominate the field.[123] He also identifies seven explanatory paradigms that are prevalent in sports history.[124]

Booth recognises that the boundaries between the three different approaches to history are blurred.[125] Both reconstructionist and constructionist assumptions are implicit in

---

[121] Ian Tyrrell, 'Making Nations/Making States: American Historians in the Context of Empire,' *The Journal of American History*, vol. 86, no. 3, December 1999, p. 1020.
[122] Alun Munslow, *Deconstructing History*, Milton Park, UK: Routledge, 2006, pp. 20-21.
[123] Douglas Booth, *The field: truth and fiction in sport history*, London, UK and New York, NY: Routledge, 2005, pp. 7-13; Douglas Booth, 'Post-Øolympism?: Questioning Øolympic Historiography,' John Bale and Mette Krogh Christensen, *Post-Olympism? Questioning Sport in the Twenty-first Century*, Oxford, UK and New York, NY: Berg, 2004, pp. 14-18.
[124] Booth, *The field*, pp. 13-20; Booth, 'Post-Øolympism?,' pp. 19-31.
[125] Booth, *The field*, p. 20.

this study. These two approaches share a common 'belief in the separate existence of knowledge derived from observable evidence.' The concepts deviate over the question of whether 'it is possible to build high order and well-justified interpretations upon observable and singular evidence alone' with constructionists arguing that general laws are necessary.[126] The reconstructionist paradigm influences the first section of the thesis concerned with amateurism. The analysis of newspaper debates, programmes for athletic events and archival material is based on the assumption that this material truthfully represents the intention of the author to inform the general public and fellow administrators. This means that my role as an interpreter of historical sources needs to be recognised. In challenging the traditional understanding of the concept of amateurism, I am creating a narrative that is liable to be deconstructed. Deconstruction requires a multiplicity of narratives and this thesis contributes to this project by offering an alternative understanding of amateurism. However, it does not challenge the underlying assumptions of reconstructionist historical knowledge.

The constructionist approach is observable in the second section on the concept of Britishness, as it offers a challenge to the concept of nationalism. Booth does not explicitly recognise nationalism as a concept or theory employed by constructionists, and recognises 'nationalities' as a concept employed by reconstructionists despite their criticism of theory in general.[127] The development of a number of theories has enhanced the study of nationalism in general, most notably through Benedict Anderson's 'Imagined Communities.'[128] A rising theoretical engagement with the study of sport and nationalism

[126] Munslow, *Deconstructing History*, p. 25.
[127] Booth, *The field*, p. 10.
[128] Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London, UK and New York, NY: Verso, 2006.

is also evident in John Hoberman's 'sportive nationalism.'[129] Moreover, this thesis argues that nationalism has behaved in a manner akin to that of a 'general law' in terms of a teleology that leads from colonial dependency to independent nation. As noted above, historians such as Mandle have applied the concept of nationalism to Australian sport, with the development of a separate and unique national consciousness the end result of international sporting contacts. In a different context, Neville Meaney argues that the application of nationalism to Australian history is problematic as historians '[accept] uncritically nationalism's own teleological view of history, namely that all history is a struggle by "peoples" towards achieving self-realisation.'[130] As such, nationalism in Australian historiography plays a similar role to those 'general laws' such as Marxism (concerning the creation of classes) play in other contexts. Chris Connolly argues that the legacy of Karl Marx's concepts 'predisposes Marxist historians to look for explanations in terms of class and economic development.'[131] The explanatory concepts of Britishness and transnationalism challenge the concept of nationalism without challenging the assumption that 'general laws' such as nationalism are imperative to historical knowledge.

Of the explanatory paradigms that Booth recognises, the aims of this thesis fit best within the advocacy paradigm. He defines this paradigm as 'those works that specifically debunk sporting myths by forensic interrogation of the evidence and examination of the motives and interests of myth-makers.'[132] This thesis is concerned with two related myths – the notion of amateurism as pure sport and the nature of the relationship between

---

[129] Hoberman, 'Sport and ideology,' pp. 15-36; Hoberman, 'Sportive Nationalism,' pp. 177-188.
[130] Meaney, 'Britishness and Australian Identity,' p. 78.
[131] Chris Connolly, 'Marxist history,' Graeme Davison, John Hirst and Stuart Macintyre (eds.), *The Oxford Companion to Australian History*, South Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 2001. *Oxford Reference Online*. Oxford University Press. University of New South Wales. 17 August 2010 <http://www.oxfordreference.com/views/ENTRY.html?subview=Main&entry=t127.e948>
[132] Booth, *The field*, p. 15.

Australasian and British athletics officials. Richard Coombes has been identified as a key focus for myth-making; both in his role as a journalist and as a focus of historical study. The focus on Coombes (and fellow leaders of the Australasian Union) has resulted in a focus on sources and examples deriving from Sydney, the residence of Coombes, the author and also the base of the Union throughout the period in question. Sydney is the place in which Coombes' ideas about amateur sport found the fullest expression. International relations between the Union and international bodies were focused through Sydney. The transnational focus of the study means that this shortcoming is overcome by placing debates in an international structure. However, developments in other states and cities in Australia are not covered to the same extent as developments in Sydney, limiting the applicability of the conclusions drawn to other cities and states.

The bulk of this study will use newspaper discourse as a way of charting the relationship between athletics officials and the wider sporting public. Coombes sought to further his agenda through newspaper contributions. He was a prolific journalist, and contributed to the Sydney *Referee* from 1890 until his retirement in 1933. As Mandle points out, Coombes 'had the advantage of being able to report on his own case' during controversial disputes.[133] Newspapers have played an important role in asserting the rising popularity of sport in Australian society during the decades before the Great War. As Cashman suggests, sporting newspapers 'explained and interpreted sport, investing it with greater meaning and moral worth. Media helped legitimise this new sporting universe.'[134] As this statement suggests, journalists were not mere reporters of objective 'facts.' The

[133] W. F. Mandle, 'Coombes, Richard (1858 - 1935),' *Australian Dictionary of Biography*: *Volume 8*, Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1981, pp. 104-105. http://adbonline.anu.edu.au/biogs/A080115b.htm Accessed 17 February 2011. One such example was his disqualification of two Victorian walkers at the Australasian championships of 1922 held in Adelaide.

[134] Richard Cashman, *Sport in the National Imagination: Australian Sport in the Federation Decades*, Sydney: Walla Walla Press, 2002, p. 207.

financial imperative of providing entertainment for readers often leads to editors pressuring journalists to take license with 'facts.'[135]

In addition to distortion and fabrication, the relationship between journalist and reader is one based on an unequal power relationship. Jeffrey Hill's study of local celebrations commemorating the achievements of provincial football clubs reaching the Football Association [FA] Cup final led him to argue that

> [A newspaper] was complicit in the whole process of civic identity as both reporter and accomplice: by telling what was happening it also became the chief agency for communicating the ideology. Although the text itself might have been innocent, the medium itself occupied a very precise role in a knowledge/power situation.[136]

In the case of Australian amateur sport, the final qualification is not necessary. Coombes' position as athletics writer for the *Referee* offered a unique platform to promulgate his conception of amateur sport. 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 Nat Gould, to its staff.[137] Coombes was by no means the only significant administrator to have links to the print media. The aptly named Walter G. Atack, editor of the *Canterbury Times*, was also a prominent member of the NZAAA.[138] As Coombes engaged in many debates with this newspaper, and Atack himself, the print media offers an invaluable record of the disputes between athletic officialdom.

Coombes' privileged position was also constrained by a number of forces despite his position of power. The middle-class amateur view of sport was challenged by

---

[135] Jeffrey Hill, 'Anecdotal Evidence: Sport, the Newspaper Press, and History,' Murray G. Phillips (ed.), *Deconstructing Sport History: A Postmodern Analysis*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2006, p. 118.
[136] Hill, 'Anecdotal Evidence,' p. 122.
[137] Chris Cunneen, 'Elevating and Recording the People's Pastimes: Sydney Sporting Journalism 1886-1939,' Richard Cashman and Michael McKernan (eds.), *Sport: Money, Morality and Media*, Kensington: UNSW Press, 1981, p. 163, 165.
[138] *Otago Witness*, 17 July 1907, p. 31.

contrasting views within the Sydney media. The *Referee* was notable amongst Sydney newspapers in that it included reports on professional sports, while the dailies limited their coverage to more socially acceptable amateur sport.[139] The dynamic of the Sydney sporting press was altered in 1900 by the introduction of an aggressive and cheaper alternative, the Sydney *Sportsman*. While the *Sportsman* was never as successful as the *Referee*, it was able to attract a portion of the *Referee's* working class readership.[140] This influenced the *Referee* as it was reinvigorated through its purchase by Australian entrepreneur Hugh D. McIntosh in 1913, who enticed W. F. ('Bill') Corbett, the former boxing editor, back to the newspaper.[141] Corbett, along with his son Claude, was instrumental in defining the style of the *Referee*. Bill Corbett presided over the creation of a generation of Australian working class sporting heroes, from sports as diverse as professional boxing, swimming, professional football and cricket, in the period between the 1890s and 1920.[142] Claude Corbett was instrumental in establishing the code of rugby league and presided over an era when the *Referee* was usurped by the daily press from the 1920s until the closure of the paper in 1939.[143] As such the *Referee* does not represent a static platform for Coombes to assert his view, but a changing terrain that required Coombes to adapt or risk losing relevance.

In response to a perceived over-reliance on newspapers at the expense of archival sources, sports historians in Britain have been urged not to restrict their research itinerary to Colindale (where the British Library's newspaper collection is housed), but to also embrace Kew (the location of the National Archives of the United Kingdom) and Cambridge (the

[139] Cunneen, 'Elevating and Recording the People's Pastimes,' pp. 164-5.
[140] Cunneen, 'Elevating and Recording the People's Pastimes,' p. 168.
[141] Cunneen, 'Elevating and Recording the People's Pastimes,' p. 169.
[142] Cunneen, 'Elevating and Recording the People's Pastimes,' p. 173.
[143] Cunneen, 'Elevating and Recording the People's Pastimes,' pp. 171 -3.

location of various University and college archives).[144] This study will employ archival sources, although they are somewhat limited. The failure of sporting organisations to retain and deposit their collection of administrative record is an issue that plagues sport history, particularly in this period of 'kitchen-table' administration. There are no minute books from the period held by the New South Wales amateur athletic and swimming associations, for example. Fortunately, bodies outside Australia, such as the amateur athletic bodies of New Zealand, England and Canada, have maintained and deposited significant archival material. This allows some measure of archival research to take place.

Chapter Breakdown

The next chapter revisits the early life of key administrator Richard Coombes. He is presented within the historiography of sport in Australia as emblematic of the British upper class influence on Australian sport. He was chosen as a focus instead of other notable amateur figures, such as Ernest Samuel Marks, due to his unbroken record of involvement in key organisations and his journalistic career. The two had comparable administrative careers, but Marks did not have the same high-profile journalistic career as Coombes. The latter serves as a centerpiece for the thesis due to his dual role as an administrator and as a link between the administration and the public. This chapter delves into his earlier life and illustrates more humble origins. The school Coombes attended will be shown to be more humble than those encountered by Mangan in his study of athleticism in public schools. The involvement of the Coombes family in the sport of coursing will show middle class rather than elite origins and a pecuniary concern with sport. His father was part of a coterie of administrators that set up coursing events in competition to nearby elite events. The

[144] Hill, 'Anecdotal Evidence,' p. 119.

chapter will demonstrate that Richard Coombes was not directly influenced by classic British conceptions of amateurism and that the Coombes family offered a challenge to the established order of British sport through alternative coursing meetings. His father, Richard Coombes senior, used the development of coursing at Hampton Court to stimulate his business, the nearby Greyhound Hotel. This is vastly different to the characterisation of Coombes as a typical amateur, and it will be argued that this less pure conception of sport influenced the development of amateurism in Australia. This chapter is based on sources that vary from the usual pattern. Data concerning Coombes' school life is derived from the reports of the Schools Inquiry Commission, while data concerning coursing is derived from industry publications such as *The Coursing Calendar* and *The Greyhound Stud Book*.

Chapter three builds on the discussion of Coombes' diverse influences and will demonstrate that amateur officials employed similar tactics to raise the profile of amateur sport that Richard Coombes senior used to promote his business. 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 thesis uses Obel's insight to address the way in

[145] Camilla Obel, 'Amateur Rugby's Spectator Success: Cultivating Inter-Provincial Rugby Publics in New Zealand, 1902 -1995,' *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 21, no. 2, May 2005, p. 98.

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, which 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 four 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 the 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 five marks the point in this thesis when the focus shifts from amateurism towards Britishness. It explores the contentious relationship between Australasian and British officials hinted at in chapter three. 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 that 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 thesis demonstrates how Britishness constantly evolved rather than remained static.

Chapter six 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 that decade, 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 two chapters are concerned with the breakup of the Australasian athletic relationship, particularly Australasian Olympic teams after 1912 and the Australasian Union in 1927. Chapter seven is focused on the adoption and ultimate dissolution of Australasian teams between 1897 and 1912. It looks beyond the Olympic Games to other efforts to send Australasian athletes abroad, such as a planned Australasian athletic tour of 1898 and Australian Olympic athletes between 1900 and 1906. In doing so, a tradition of local control over organisational efforts is identified. New Zealanders thus took control of their own affairs with regard to the Olympic Games of 1908 and 1912 and were able to express their own identity through their athletes. This disrupts the notion that New Zealanders used Australasia as a rubric of convenience until it was able to stand on its own two feet. The dissolution of Australasian teams is attributed to the demise of Imperial integration at the Olympic Games and a desire to secure representation on the IOC.

---

[146] Ian Tyrrell, 'Beyond the View from Euro-America: Environment, Settler Societies, and the Internationalization of American History,' Thomas Bender (ed.), *Rethinking American History in a Global Age*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA and London, UK: University of California Press, 2002, p. 170.

Chapter eight, the final data chapter, offers an explanation for the demise of the Australasian Union that moves beyond nationalism. New Zealand separatist sentiment was at its strongest within the Australasian Union some twenty years before the split. This national sentiment was quashed due to politics within the NZAAA, meaning that nationalism did not provide the dynamic for the split between it and Australia. Three interrelated factors provide the reason for the split. 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 chapters combine to provide an explanation for the breakup of the Australasian athletic relationship that goes beyond abstract notions of nationalism and examines specific features of the relationship in the same manner that the first chapter examines the actual experiences of Coombes.

Chapter Two – A Corinthian? A Blood? Rethinking the Amateur Ideology of Richard Coombes

At the 1922 Australasian athletics championship Richard Coombes, the English-born President of the Amateur Athletic Union of Australia and New Zealand [AAUANZ], disqualified two Victorian walkers, drawing the condemnation of the Victorian athletic community.[1] Invoking his formative years spent in England, the Sydney press headed off Victorian complaints of partiality. Coombes was represented by *Smith's Weekly* journalists Jack Drayton and R. J. H. Moses as a throwback to the classical days of English amateurism. The accusation that he had engaged in 'the cardinal sin of sportsmanship – bias' was unthinkable.[2]

The representation of Coombes as the classic English amateur has provided an important cornerstone for historians seeking to gain an understanding of amateurism in Australian sport. In *Paradise of Sport*, his influential general history of Australian sport, Richard Cashman describes Coombes as 'a dominant figure in many amateur sports' with influence deriving from his twin roles as journalist and administrator. He is described by Cashman as 'a lifelong imperialist and an apostle of amateur sport.'[3] 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 [Amateur Athletic Union of Australasia (AAUA – or Australasian Union)] well beyond his lifetime.'[4] These views are based on an abstraction of the 'typical' characteristics of amateur figures. This chapter uses a biography of Coombes to provide an alternative vision of Australian, and by extension Australasian, amateurism. Despite becoming something of a mythological

---

[1] W. F. Mandle, 'Coombes, Richard (1858 - 1935),' *Australian Dictionary of Biography*: *Volume 8*, Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1981, pp. 104-05. http://adbonline.anu.edu.au/biogs/A080115b.htm Accessed 17 February 2011.
[2] *Smith's Weekly*, 26 January 1924, p. 2.
[3] Richard Cashman, *Paradise of Sport: The Rise of Organised Sport in Australia*, South Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1995, p. 63.
[4] John A. Daly, 'Track and Field,' Wray Vamplew and Brian Stoddart (eds.), *Sport in Australia: A Social History*, Cambridge, UK, New York, NY and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1994, p. 260.

figure to contemporary commentators and later historians, Coombes' life history reflects anything but the classic English amateur. Stuart Ripley's study of professional sculling has demonstrated that Coombes was engaged in this sport as well as its amateur sport.[5]

An examination of the actual conditions of Coombes' early life will establish the background for the development of a conception of amateurism at odds with the gentlemanly prototype. Factors seen as key to the development of amateur consciousness in other administrators, education and class background, will be addressed in order to challenge the view that Coombes was a typical amateur. His education at Hampton Grammar School meant that Coombes did not become directly influenced by the games cult evident in elite Public Schools. His experiences as the son of a hotel owner engaged in the organisation of sporting events saw the development of a pecuniary interest in sport. Following chapters will demonstrate that these influences found expression in Australasian athletics, aiding in the efforts to popularise the sport and influencing the formation of identity.

For a figure that may justifiably be called the father of amateur sport in Australia, an in-depth study of Coombes' early influences is lacking. Coombes had an unparalleled administrative career in Australian sport. He was amongst the speakers that persuaded representatives of seven clubs to form the New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association [NSWAAA] at a meeting on 20 April 1887 and was appointed to a nine-man committee to formulate the rules of the association.[6] Coombes served as vice-president of the association from 1887 until 1893, when he became president until his death in 1935. He also helped to form the Australasian Union in 1897 and, as with the NSWAAA, was president until his death. Coombes was elected to the International

[5] Stuart Ripley, 'A Social History of New South Wales Professional Sculling 1876-1927,' unpublished PhD thesis, University of Western Sydney, 2003, pp. 348, 366.
[6] The *Sydney Morning Herald*, 21 April 1887, p. 9. In fact, the Victorian Amateur Athletic Association was not established until 1891

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.[7] Coombes' role as an athletics administrator was supplemented by key roles in the development of the New South Wales National Coursing Association and Australian Coursing Union.[8] However, Coombes' main sporting interest was athletics, and he bought to Australia a reputation as 'a champion walker and cross-country runner.'[9] As a journalist, Coombes wrote for newspapers such as the Sydney *Referee* on a multitude of topics, including athletics, coursing and rifle shooting.[10]

Coombes' Education in Historiography

Historians have allowed Coombes' image as the classical amateur, or 'Corinthian', that was promoted in the Sydney press after the confrontation with Victorian walkers in 1922 to stand. In the aftermath of the disqualification, Coombes was lauded as 'a living fossil – a Corinthian, a blood,' and a 'living link between the finest traditions of English sport at its most romantic period, and the actual accomplishments of Australian sport at its most business-like period.'[11] . 'Corinthian' and 'blood' were terms that placed Coombes at the apex of Australian sport's British inheritance. Mangan describes a *blood* as 'a member of the games aristocracy' at elite public schools such as Rugby. Bloods were 'persons of considerable importance [enjoying] not only official privileges

[7] The *Referee*, 18 April 1935, p. 3.
[8] The *Sydney Morning Herald*, 16 April 1935, p. 16.
[9] Ian Jobling, 'In Pursuit of Status, Respectability and Idealism: Pioneers of the Olympic Movement in Australasia,' J.A. Mangan and John Nauright (eds.), *Sport in Australasian Society: Past and Present*, London, UK and Portland, OR: Frank Cass, 2000, p. 151.
[10] Mandle, 'Coombes, Richard (1858 - 1935),' pp. 104-105. 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 novellist Nat Gould, to its staff. [Chris Cunneen, 'Elevating and Recording the People's Pastimes: Sydney Sporting Journalism 1886-1939,' Richard Cashman and Michael McKernan (eds.), *Sport: Money, Morality and Media*, Kensington: UNSW Press, 1981, pp. 163, 165.]
[11] The *Referee*, 18 April, 1935.

but also unofficial ones of their own making.'[12] A Corinthian was an ideal gentleman amateur, playing a number of sports well without apparent effort.[13] British historian 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.'[14]

The conception of amateurism based around elite schooling and the aristocracy inherent in Drayton and Moses' impression of Coombes is at odds with the more democratic expression of amateurism in Australia. There is thus a tension between the contemporary and historiographical renderings of Coombes as an ideal amateur through the influence of the English public school system and the type of amateurism that he was so instrumental in developing in Australia.

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 of 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.[15]

---

[12] J. A. Mangan, *Athleticism in the Victorian and Edwardian Public Schools: The Emergence and Consolidation of an Educational Ideology*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1981, p. 171.
[13] Richard Holt, *Sport and the British: A Modern History*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1990, pp. 99-100.
[14] Holt, *Sport and the British*, pp. 99-100. Details of G. O. Smith's career are available at Edward Grayson, 'Smith, Gilbert Oswald (1872–1943),' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2004. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/50310. Accessed 17 February 2011.
[15] Harold Perkin, 'Sport and society: Empire into Commonwealth,' J. A. Mangan and Roy B. Small, *Sport, Culture, Society: Proceedings of the VIII Commonwealth and International Conference on Sport, Physical Education, Dance, Recreation and Health*, London: E. & EN. Spon, 1986, p. 4. Jobling has used this statement at least twice; Garth Henniker and Ian Jobling, 'Richard Coombes and the Olympic Movement in Australia: Imperialism and Nationalism in Action,' *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 6, no. 1, November 1989, p. 2; and Jobling, 'In Pursuit of Status,' p. 151.

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.'[16]

While these statements offer valuable context, there is significant evidence that Coombes' comparatively brief school career did not conform to the pattern of public school graduates that developed into influential amateurs. Coombes only attended school until the age of fifteen, staying for only as long as necessary before embarking on his career, first as a clerk in England and then as a journalist in Australia.[17] By way of contrast, a common career path for many amateur ideologues was to remain at public school before receiving an Oxbridge degree, often devoid of outstanding academic achievement, and returning to the school system as an assistant master. Mangan argues that the development of 'a cycle of "schoolboy sportsman, university sportsman and schoolmaster sportsman …"' led to a situation of 'structural conduciveness' that permitted athleticism to flourish in the public school system.[18] Coombes did not linger at school in order to prolong the joys of a prolonged adolescence at school before university as many athletic students did. The focus on Coombes' school career also obscures the fact that the British public school was not the sole influence of the development of amateurism. As Wray Vamplew demonstrates, amateur codes of rowing and athletics developed in contradistinction to professional sport. He quotes one of the stated aims of the formation of Amateur Athletic Club of London as providing a context for amateur athletes to '[practice and compete] against one another, without being

[16] Henniker and Jobling, 'Imperialism and Nationalism in Action,' p. 2
[17] Henniker and Jobling, 'Imperialism and Nationalism in Action,' p. 2; The English Census of 1881 lists Coombes as a clerk at the Sun Fire Office. Ancestry.com and The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, *The 1881 English Census Database (online)*, Provo, UT: 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.
[18] Mangan, *Athleticism*, pp. 126-27.

compelled to mix with professional runners.'[19] While this was a club formed by gentlemen amateurs, the influence of professionals in the wider athletic community ensured that amateurism did not develop in a vacuum.

Coombes' reputation as a classically educated amateur rests on a fundamental error. He was not in fact educated at a public school. Rather than the Australian tradition of naming elite schools as 'Grammar' schools, in England grammar school refers to a less prestigious private school. 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.[20] The Taunton Commission was specifically charged with reporting on middle-class education and the very presence of Hampton School in the Taunton Commission is indicative that Coombes was not influenced directly by the elite Public School ethic.[21]

The Taunton Commission investigated Hampton Grammar School amongst others in 1866 and reported in 1867. It has been described by educational historian David Ian Allsobrook as having 'singular academic usefulness', despite its lack of legislative influence.[22] Oral evidence from close to 150 witnesses and responses from 'questionnaires [sent] to every school which might have a middle-class clientèle' were distilled into the Report of the Schools Inquiry [Taunton] Commission and its twenty

[19] Wray Vamplew, *Pay up and play the game: Professional Sport in Britain 1875-1914*, Cambridge, UK and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1988, pp. 185-87.
[20] David Ian Allsobrook, *Schools for the Shires: The Reform of Middle-Class Education in Mid-Victorian England*, Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 1986, p. 4.
[21] Allsobrook, *Schools for the Shires*, p. 2.
[22] Allsobrook, *Schools for the Shires*, pp. 2-3.

supporting volumes.[23] The Commission appointed 'a group of brilliant young assistant commissioners [and provided them] with the beehive of lower-middle-class life in London and the provinces.'[24] D. R. Fearon was charged with investigating London, and in this capacity visited Hampton Grammar.[25] As Coombes was born in 1858 and was at school until the age of fifteen, the Taunton Commission reports may offer an insight into Hampton Grammar School as experienced by Coombes himself rather than an abstraction of Public School life. The specific qualities of Hampton may well have influenced the manner in which Coombes expressed amateur ideals for, as Mangan has pointed out, 'the well-heads of athleticism were strikingly diverse in nature.'[26]

Coombes' Education

The statistical and anecdotal evidence presented in the Taunton Commission reports provides information as to the conditions of Coombes' education as an eight year-old boy, as the school was visited by Fearon on 11 October 1866.[27] 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.[28] As of 1866, the Hampton Grammar School was attended by 223 students, all of whom were day scholars who were offered a free education. None of the schools £341 income was received from the parents. The occupation of the student's parents were listed as B and

[23] Allsobrook, *Schools for the Shires*, pp. 2, 5.
[24] Allsobrook, *Schools for the Shires*, p. 5.
[25] Allsobrook, *Schools for the Shires*, p. 189.
[26] Mangan, *Athleticism*, p. 66.
[27] 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, p. 28.
[28] 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 patently not the case in England, where the term 'Grammar School' denotes a less prestigious school.

C categories, denoting farmers and shopkeepers (presumably where Coombes senior fitted) in the former case and artisans and labourers in the latter. By way of contrast Harrow School, which by way of quirk of alphabetisation was listed above Hampton and was unquestionably in the elite category, was populated by the offspring of A category parents, those of independent means, professionals and merchants. Hampton Grammar School was considered of Non-classical character and was ranked in the third class, essentially meaning that more than ten percent of its students were under the age of 14.[29] 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.[30] The report described the level of instruction in the English department as very fair, although there were clear deficiencies in the aptitude of the students

> The writing of the scholars in this department was good; their British History very fair; their reading and geography fair; they knew hardly any English grammar; and their arithmetic was unsound, and might be much improved.[31]

---

[29] 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, pp. 60-61. For a definition of the 'third class', see pp. 5-6.
[30] Labouchere, *Taunton Commission Volume XII*, p. 29.
[31] Labouchere, *Taunton Commission Volume XII*, p. 30.

Coombes was obviously one of the exceptional students at Hampton Grammar School if he was able to become a journalist out of this context. The head master of the grammar department was described as 'very old and infirm.' 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 'filled with ill-taught boys of the lowest orders so that the middle classes all withdrew.'[32] The premises of the school at this point in time bear no comparison to the array of playing fields that students of public schools, and today's Hampton School students, enjoyed:

> There are no classrooms or playgrounds, and the offices and external appurtenances in general are very inadequate. Indeed the whole of the premises are inferior to those most good National and British schools; and though a professional surveyor who was present informed me that their shell was sound, they would, I should think, scarcely repay such outlay as would be required to make them really adequate school buildings. The master's house would be barely considered by a Government Inspector as passable for the residence of an elementary teacher, and is decidedly unfit for the residence of a grammar schoolmaster.[33]

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.[34] 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. Under this

[32] Labouchere, *Taunton Commission Volume XII*, pp. 29-30.
[33] Labouchere, *Taunton Commission Volume XII*, p. 30.
[34] Labouchere, *Taunton Commission Volume XII*, pp. 30-31.

scheme, the Grammar school would be open to students 9-19 years old rather than the current 7-16 year old age range.[35]

There were differing opinions within the trustees over whether this scheme would be to the benefit of the school. While those that met the commissioners did not appear to be confident that it would attract more middle class patrons to the school, there was also a certain Machiavellian streak to some that thought that the scheme's failure would turn out to be beneficial in attracting a more lucrative clientele

> The trustees who met me did not appear to think that this new scheme would find favour with the middle classes of Hampton and its neighbourhood. The introduction of Greek, and the continued *exclusion of French and German* from the curriculum, would, they expected keep out the tradesman's and farmer's sons. Of this some of them felt glad, as they wished to have gentlemen's sons at the school; while others were of opinion that it would be a hardship to the middle class.[36]

Bernard Garside, a former Senior History Master at the school, wrote several histories of Hampton Grammar, and contends that Fearon's report 'would have been very different' if he had visited the school at the end of the 1860s. Two schemes to reinvigorate the school were implemented in 1866 (when Coombes attended the school) and 1878 (after he left). These schemes had the effect of making the school more exclusive, with the institution of fees and the admission of boarders and non-parishioners. The decision to charge fees was extremely unpopular with locals, whose children were locked out by the trustees of the school after staging a 'no fees' strike. Parents of students locked out reportedly encouraged their children to 'force their way into the building' and excluded boys staged a protest march through Hampton and 'dealt roughly with a suspected opponent.' [37] These demonstrations replicate the class tensions that were apparent in the teaching of the grammar school curriculum outlined above. While only nine students joined new headmaster the Reverend G. F. Heather in the

---

[35] Labouchere, *Taunton Commission Volume XII*, p. 31.
[36] Labouchere, *Taunton Commission Volume XII*, p. 31.
[37] Bernard Garside, *A Brief History of Hampton School: 1557-1957*, Richmond, UK: printed by Dimbleby's, 1957, pp. 32-33.

reconstructed grammar school in 1868, these numbers slowly grew until there were sixty-four students in 1877.[38] This indicates that the programme to reinvigorate the school was successful to some extent, although it remained far from an elite school. At the last prize-giving ceremony at the school before it moved to more salubrious accommodation in 1878, a trustee of the school expressed the hope that the school would 'take the position it should hold among the great public schools of the country.'[39] While this ambition may have been reached in the future, it cannot be asserted that it had been achieved during Coombes' stay at the school.

The 1878 school was built on land owned by the school, indicating that although no playgrounds were identified by Fearon during his visit the school had land at its disposal that could accommodate sport. 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* was given as a prize in 1874, perhaps to Coombes as he left the school.[40] 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.[41] This corresponds to the final years of Coombes' school career. 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

[38] Garside, *Hampton School*, pp. 34, 37.
[39] Garside, *Hampton School*, p. 35.
[40] Garside, *Hampton School*, pp. 42-43.
[41] Garside, *Hampton School*, pp. 46-48.

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.[42] If Hampton followed the same pattern, 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, Coombes would have entrenched sport into the school.

The statistical and anecdotal evidence presents a clear picture that Richard Coombes did not receive the sort of education that historians such as Mangan have argued produced 'bloods' and Corinthians. 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.[43] 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.'[44] 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. The absence of any meaningful classical education made it unlikely that Coombes adopted the Hellenism that marks both the Victorian middle class and the

---

[42] Mangan, *Athleticism*, p. 23. For the United States, see Stephan Wassong, *Pierre de Coubertin's American Studies and Their Importance for the Analysis of His Early Educational Campaign*, Würzburg, Germany: ERGON Verlag, 2004, pp. 97-99.
[43] J. A. Mangan, 'Bullies, beatings, battles and bruises: "great days and jolly days" at one mid-Victorian public school,' Mike Huggins and J. A. Mangan, *Disreputable Pleasures: Less Virtuous Victorians at Play*, London, UK and New York, NY: Frank Cass, 2004, p. 3.
[44] Mangan, *Athleticism*, p. 138.

foundation of the Olympic movement. Coombes' lack of familiarity with classical matters is exemplified by his attribution to traditional events – such as a marathon race, discus throwing and wrestling – at the 1906 intercalary games in Athens as those 'traditionally stated to have been instituted in honor of Jupiter.' As Jupiter is the Roman rendering of the Greek god Zeus, it appears that Coombes had a limited understanding or interest in classical matters. Coombes considered such events as 'historical anachronisms' and obviously did not see much athletic merit in them, though he was quick to reassure his readers that they 'do not detract from the attractiveness of the programme.'[45] Coombes was clearly out of step with Hellenist members of the IOC. Coombes did not receive the exclusive education which in turn manifested itself in an exclusive attitude to sport that Henniker and Jobling have attributed to him.[46] Coombes mixed with the lower orders at school in an atmosphere rife with class tension, as evidenced by the middle-class withdrawal from classes in the grammar school.[47] 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 or in terms of the subjects that were taught.

Coombes' Sporting Values in Historiography

While the traditional rendering of Coombes' education has hitherto been unchallenged, his status as an ideal amateur has recently come into question. Study of Coombes' place in rowing administration and journalism has demonstrated that he was involved in both amateur and professional rowing. Stuart Ripley has shown that Coombes played an active role in urging the administrative reform of professional

[45] The *Referee*, 6 September 1905, p. 8.
[46] Henniker and Jobling, 'Imperialism and Nationalism in Action,' pp. 2-3
[47] Labouchere, *Taunton Commission Volume XII*, pp. 29-30.

sculling.[48] He displays that the preference of organisers of professional sculling for *laissez faire* administrative procedures proved no match for the organisational vigour of the amateur bodies.[49] While professional administrators were content to allow the market to dictate the development of sculling, Coombes implored their professional counterparts to follow the amateur lead and '[consolidate] their organisational frameworks and [establish] efficient managerial networks.'[50]

> [Coombes] warned the professionals that if they failed to establish an organised system and a means of control then the public would unequivocally decide the sport's destiny.[51]

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.[52]

Coombes' advice to professional sculling officials indicates that he was not concerned with removing the financial element from sport in the same manner as other amateur officials, such as the Rugby Football Union [RFU] in England and athletics officials in the United States.[53] If these sporting values did not influence Coombes, what are the sporting values that did influence Coombes' conception of sport? This chapter employs Coombes' experiences as the son of a hotel owner in order to better understand his sporting values.[54]

---

[48] Ripley, 'New South Wales Professional Sculling,' pp. 348, 366.
[49] Ripley, 'New South Wales Professional Sculling,' p. 102.
[50] Ripley, 'New South Wales Professional Sculling,' p. 169.
[51] Ripley, 'New South Wales Professional Sculling,' p. 337.
[52] Ripley, 'New South Wales Professional Sculling,' p. 7-8.
[53] Tony Collins, *Rugby's Great Split: Class, Culture and the Origins of Rugby League Football*, London, UK and Portland OR: Frank Cass, 1998, pp. 59-61, 116-17; S. W. Pope, *Patriotic Games: Sporting Traditions in the American Imagination, 1876-1926*, Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press, 2007, pp. 19-20.
[54] Mandle, 'Coombes, Richard (1858 - 1935),' pp. 104-05.

Coombes' father was the long-standing proprietor of the Greyhound Hotel near Hampton Court Palace.[55] In this role, Coombes senior provided accommodation for coursers and their retinue and acted as an official at a number of coursing events held in the local area. Hotels were at the centre of many of the cultural practices, such as drinking and gambling, that amateurs were keen to excise from sport from the middle of the nineteenth century onwards.[56] 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.[57] The Greyhound Hotel at Hampton Court appears to be more upmarket, as Coombes senior was asked to provide refreshment to the royal sale of yearlings at Hampton Court in 1859 and 1863.[58] 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.[59] The attraction of upper-middle class and aristocratic customers indicates that the Greyhound Hotel managed by Coombes senior was more exclusive than a local alehouse patronised by the local community.

This does not necessarily mean that Coombes was sequestered from disreputable activities. 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

---

[55] Ancestry.com and The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, *The 1861 England Census Database (online)*, Provo, UT: 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; Ancestry.com and The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, *The 1871 England Census Database (online)*, Provo, UT: 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; Ancestry.com and The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, *The 1881 English Census*.

[56] Holt, *Sport and the British*, p. 63.

[57] Tony Collins and Wray Vamplew, *Mud, Sweat, and Beers: A Cultural History of Sport and Alcohol*, Oxford, UK and New York, NY: Berg, 2002, p. 5.

[58] The *Times*, 11 June, 1859, p. 12; The *Times*, 1 June 1863, p. 5.

[59] Unattributed, 'St. Andrew's Graduates' Association,' *The British Medical Journal*, vol. 1, no. 1016, 19 June 1880, p. 935.

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.'[60] Huggins recognises the 'ideological power' of notions of Victorian middle-class respectability, but advocates for historians to 'question critically both the extent to which such beliefs were actually held.'[61]

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.[62] Rather than a timeless concept, the Victorian concepts of sporting respectability were defined by a host of issues. 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.'[63] Collins has argued that the 'gentlemanly' ethics of Rugby Union were

> not the result of a codification of ideals, but a changing and fluid response both to suspicious sections of middle-class public opinion and to the influx of working-class

[60] Mike Huggins and J. A. Mangan, 'Prologue: All mere complexities,' Mike Huggins and J. A. Mangan, *Disreputable Pleasures: Less Virtuous Victorians at Play*, London, UK and New York, NY: Frank Cass, 2004, p. ix.
[61] Mike J. Huggins, 'More Sinful Pleasures? Leisure, Respectability and the Male Middle Classes in Victorian England,' *Journal of Social History*, vol. 33, no. 3, Spring 2000, p. 585.
[62] Tony Collins, 'Violence, gamesmanship and the amateur ideal in Victorian middle-class rugby,' Mike Huggins and J. A. Mangan, *Disreputable Pleasures: Less Virtuous Victorians at Play*, London, UK and New York, NY: Frank Cass, 2004, p. 172.
[63] John Pinfold, 'Dandy rats at play: the Liverpudlian middle classes and horse-racing in the nineteenth century,' Mike Huggins and J. A. Mangan, *Disreputable Pleasures: Less Virtuous Victorians at Play*, London, UK and New York, NY: Frank Cass, 2004, p. 78.

> players into rugby in the 1880s. The earlier, more overtly violent traditions of public-school and middle-class rugby were in effect 'uninvented', and replaced by an ethical system of 'fair play' that was used to justify the continued control of the game by its public-school-educated rulers. The gentleman rugby player may or may not have existed, but middle-class sporting bodies such as the RFU felt that it was necessary to invent him.[64]

Rather than a clearly defined approach to sport that may be seen as 'repressed and repressive' or 'serious, earnest and sober' depending on the subjective judgements of contemporary observers, the sporting values of Victorian England must be seen as the result of numerous factors that influenced the reaction of an elite leadership to perceived ills within sport. This recent realisation means that the abstract view of Coombes' approach to sport previously expressed by historians requires challenge and redefinition.

Coombes himself was subject to forces of time and location, and these must be taken into account in order to provide a clearer understanding of his approach to sport. Both association and rugby football were engaged in a definition of amateur sport at the time that Coombes arrived in Australia in 1886, the year that the RFU adopted its first code of amateurism. In the case of association football, professionalism was legalised by the Football Association [FA] in July 1885 and the Football League was set up in 1888 by twelve professional clubs in order to provide a regular basis for competition.[65] The process towards standardising amateurism was necessitated by what Pope describes as 'deep, internal ambiguities' within English amateur sport. These ambiguities meant that amateurism, 'an ideological construct [rather] than an actual set of practices and agreed-on rules', necessitated redefinition as the sporting power of the middle class was being threatened by the rising success of working class players and teams.[66] The English sporting culture, and its moral underpinning, was in a state of flux in the period during which Coombes left England. As such, comments such as Coombes being a

---

[64] Collins, 'Violence, gamesmanship,' p. 184.
[65] Collins, 'Violence, gamesmanship,' p. 174; Tony Mason, *Association Football and English Society 1863-1915*, Brighton, UK and Atlantic Highlands, NJ: The Harvester Press and Humanities Press, 1980, pp. 75, 16.
[66] Pope, *Patriotic Games*, p. 28.

‘living link between the finest traditions of English sport at its most romantic period, and the actual accomplishments of Australian sport at its most business-like period’ are more problematic than historians have allowed.[67]

The Coombes Family Involvement in English Coursing

The area that surrounded the Greyhound Hotel was conducive to outdoor sports. The grounds of Hampton Court Palace were opened to the public by Queen Victoria after serving as a royal palace since the days of King Henry VIII. The surrounding areas became a popular playground, which raised the anxieties of the former occupants of the area. Mollie Sands, author of a book on ‘the Gardens of Hampton Court,’ described ‘the new class of visitors’ to Hampton Court as ‘rowdy’, but was surprised that ‘so little damage was done.’[68] Lindsay describes ‘noisy mobs’ carried to Hampton Court to enjoy races at nearby Hurst Park, inviting the scorn of those that lamented that the mob ‘should walk where kings and gentlemen, such as they thought themselves, alone were once privileged to walk.’[69] Coombes formative years were thus spent in a charged social landscape. It is worth noting the aristocratic nature of coursing at this point in time. The National Coursing Club [NCC] was set up in 1858 in order ‘to regulate competition between the largely aristocratic clubs.’[70]

While Coombes senior was far from aristocratic, he seems to have shared the concern for regulating competition and providing a respectable face to coursing. He was the honorary secretary to the Hampton Court Champion meeting from 1858, the year of the birth of his eponymous son, until it was run at Hampton Court for the final time

[67] The *Referee*, 18 April 1935, p. 3.
[68] Mollie Sands, *The Gardens of Hampton Court: Four centuries of English History and Gardening*, London, UK: Evans Brothers Limited, 1950, p. 221-22.
[69] Philip Lindsay, *Hampton Court: A History*, London, UK: Meridian, 1948, p. 266.
[70] Holt, *Sport and the British*, 185.

under the title Metropolitan Clubs Champion Meeting in 1864.[71] Despite the short lifespan of the event in the local community, the Champion meeting gained a reputation for strong and effective management.

The Champion Meetings were considered to have been the best run amongst the coursing events at Hampton Court. A case in point is the fortunes of the Home Park (Hampton) Open and the Hampton Court Champion Club Meetings of November 1859. The former was marred by the negligent riding of Cockney supporters. Reflecting the class tensions that affected coursing in this locale, a commentator suggested that

> … when a royal park is thrown open to the public, the lieges of the Sovereign are supposed to enter it upon equal terms as regards each other, but that vaunted notion of equality ought not to lead them to mar each other's sport. That the Cockney cavalry did so on this occasion will be disputed by no *courser* who was present … Four horsemen are quite sufficient to ride behind the slipper in the Home Park, and we trust that at the Champion Meeting this reckless riding will be prevented.[72]

The hopes of the commentator were well and truly reached by the administrators of the Champion meeting, if the opening comment of the *Field* report republished in the *Coursing Calendar* is any indication

> 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 …[73]

In terms of the behaviour of supporters on horseback, the stewards were reported to have controlled the followers to perfection, ensuring that

> good order was preserved throughout the day, and I believe there never was an occasion on which so large a crowd, placed on a perfectly level plain, saw so well what was going on.[74]

The 1861 event drew similar praise, although by then the *Field* reporter saw it as

---

[71] 'Stonehenge' (ed.), *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, UK: John Crockford (The Field), 1859, p. 99.
[72] 'Stonehenge' (ed.), *The Coursing Calendar and Report of the Spring Season 1859-60: With Hints on Breeding, &.*, London, UK: John Crockford (The Field), 1859, p. 119.
[73] 'Stonehenge', *The Coursing Calendar (1859-60)*, p. 142.
[74] 'Stonehenge', *The Coursing Calendar (1859-60)*, p. 142.

> needless to remark that [the officials] performed their duties to perfection … It may therefore be assumed that so long as Mr Saxton, Mr East, and Mr Coombes continue their efforts to afford sport to the metropolitan coursers, they will be supported as well, and thanked as heartily as they now are, by all who know them.[75]

The importance of effective administration over sport was not lost on the Coombes family, particularly when the 'lower orders' were involved. Parallels can be seen with Richard Coombes junior's approach to professional sport in Australia.

Coombes senior's interest in local coursing was not limited to administration or racing. His role as an administrator was supplemented by an important and lucrative role providing hospitality to visitors to Hampton Court. The year 1858 was obviously an important and busy one for the whole Coombes family. In addition to his role in the management of the Champion Meeting and the addition of a son to the family, the Greyhound Hotel underwent a programme of renovations 'in order to accommodate the large parties likely to be present.'[76] Information provided to the Office of Works indicated that a portico to provide access to the hotel as well as 'a Coffee room, Billiard room, […] Small room, with a large Dining room' was amongst the renovations performed.[77] It seems likely that the improvements to the hotel and the management role were part of a strategy to improve the financial position of the Coombes family.

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

---

[75] 'Stonehenge', *The Coursing Calendar and Report of the Autumn Season 1861*, London, UK: John Crockford (The Field), 1861, p. 149.
[76] 'Stonehenge', *The Coursing Calendar (1858)*, p. 99.
[77] 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.

> 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.[78]

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.[79] By 1864 the Greyhound Hotel was considered the usual headquarters of coursing in Hampton Court.[80] The success of coursing in Hampton Court was thus intrinsically tied to the financial fortunes of the Coombes family. In addition to coursing meetings, the favourable impression generated by such reports may have been useful in terms of attracting visitors to the newly open surrounds of the Hampton Court precinct to stay at the Greyhound Hotel. 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.[81]

The Coombes family do not appear to have been considered disreputable, despite the clear connection between financial concerns and their sporting interests.

This indication is bolstered by the continued occupation of the Greyhound Hotel by the Coombes family after the death of Richard Coombes senior. The trustees of his estate sought to enfranchise the Greyhound Hotel upon his death. To this point it seems that the Greyhound Hotel was on Crown Land. During the process of selling the estate, the Crown Receiver for the County of Middlesex, Mr. Chilton, valued the Crown's interest in the property at £850. A conveyance report commented that

---

[78] 'Stonehenge', *The Coursing Calendar (1858)*, p. 99.
[79] 'Stonehenge', *The Coursing Calendar (Autumn Season 1861)*, pp. 149, 80.
[80] 'Stonehenge' (ed.), *The Coursing Calendar and Report of the Spring Season 1864: With Entries for the Produce Stakes of the Ensuing Season*, London, UK: John Crockford (The Field), 1864, p. 29.
[81] Mike Huggins and J. A. Mangan, 'Epilogue: The dogs bark but the caravan moves on,' Mike Huggins and J. A. Mangan, *Disreputable Pleasures: Less Virtuous Victorians at Play*, London, UK and New York, NY: Frank Cass, 2004, p. 208.

> The trustees' solicitors inform me that they have contracted to sell the premises and that the contract is to be completed by the 1st proxime – Under these circumstances they are pressing for the immediate completion of the enfranchisement.[82]

Coursers from the Coombes family were linked to Hampton Court in the *Greyhound Stud Book* throughout the mid-1880s, despite the sale of the Greyhound Hotel. In 1885, the *Greyhound Stud Book* listed brothers C. J. and R. Coombes of Hampton Court, while in 1887, the year after Richard Coombes junior had emigrated, C. J. Coombes of the Greyhound Hotel, Hampton Court, was listed as the owner of four dogs. [83] Despite the new ownership at the Greyhound Hotel, there is little evidence that the Coombes family's relationship to the premises changed. It appears that they still resided at the premises, or at least based their coursing operation there. The class background of Richard Coombes is thus more ambiguous than historians have traditionally recognised. His family was based in a sport that was necessarily linked with money and, although his father showed some administrative acumen, the livelihood of his family was linked intrinsically to the nexus between finance and sport.

Richard Coombes junior followed in his father's footsteps and acquired an interest in coursing in the years immediately preceding his emigration to Australia. The *Greyhound Stud Book* of 1885, a publication that consists of an alphabetical list of greyhound owners as well as a further list of greyhounds that have changed ownership, claims that Coombes entered ten dogs.[84] Whether the number 'ten' in the 'dogs entered' column means that Coombes entered ten dogs in races or indicates that Coombes was involved in ten transactions is unclear. There are details of at least eight transactions

---

[82] Charles Gore, Letter to the Office of Works, 21 December 1883, Hampton Court: Conveyance of the Greyhound Hotel and premises to the Trustees of the late Mr. R. Coombes, File T.1./15577, The National Archives, Kew, United Kingdom.
[83] National Coursing Club [Herafter NCC], (Compiled by David Brown), *The Greyhound Stud Book*, Dalry, UK: David Brown, 1885, p. lxxxiii; NCC (Compiled by David Brown), *The Greyhound Stud Book*, Dalry, UK: David Brown, 1887, p. cxxxvii.
[84] NCC, *The Greyhound Stud Book (1885)*, p. lxxxiii.

involving Coombes referring to six individual dogs.[85] Coombes bought and resold 'En Garde' to C. H. Home-Purves and 'Harbinger' to E. Williams in the period up to the compilation of the book.[86] It appears that he retained ownership of 'Cousin Elsie', 'Elbe', 'Mr. Jones' and 'Sang-Froid.'[87] The 1886 edition of the *Greyhound Stud Book* includes neither Coombes as an owner, or the sale of the dogs that Coombes evidently possessed in the previous twelve months.[88] The year 1886 was the year in which Coombes emigrated, which explains his absence from the list of English greyhound owners. What is less clear is the fate of the dogs in question. Coombes clearly created a stable of greyhounds in the year preceding his emigration to Australia. It is possible that Coombes had generated this collection while cognisant of his imminent departure as emigration from England to Australia in the mid-1880s was something that required a degree of forethought. It is possible that Coombes intended to import these dogs to Australia, as he undoubtedly incurred a great expense in collecting them and made no apparent effort to recoup his expenditure in the obviously flourishing market for greyhounds.

Judging by these experiences, the class background of Coombes seems to be that of lower middle class. According to Geoffrey Crossick this class at this time included similar petty bourgeois occupations, such as shopkeepers and small businessmen, as well as clerks, where Coombes junior found early employment.[89] This corresponds to the definition offered by the Taunton Commission and Garside differentiated sons of hotel proprietors, nurserymen and Palace officials from the 'families of doctors, lawyers, parsons, Army officers and London businessmen' when asserting the middle class

---

[85] NCC, *The Greyhound Stud Book (1885)*, pp. 149-51, 153-54.
[86] NCC, *The Greyhound Stud Book (1885)*, pp. 150-51.
[87] NCC, *The Greyhound Stud Book (1885)*, pp. 149-50, 153-54.
[88] NCC (Compiled by David Brown), *The Greyhound Stud Book*, Dalry, UK: David Brown, 1886, pp. 140-47.
[89] Geoffrey Crossick, 'The Emergence of the Lower Middle Class: A Discussion,' Geoffrey Crossick (ed.), *The Lower Middle Class in Britain 1870 - 1914*, London, UK: Croom Helm, 1977, p. 12.

character of Hampton Grammar School.[90] This differentiation perhaps reflects a division within the middle class, with the latter group indicating the composition of upper middle-class in Garside's conception. The career trajectory of Coombes junior fits a wider trend within lower-middle class employment. Sons of shopkeepers increasingly found employment as clerical workers in Kentish London between the 1850s and 1870s as a way to find positions of adequate status for non-inheriting sons.[91] This situation reflects Coombes junior's position in the family, and the relative proximity in terms of industry and location seems to indicate that this trend also influenced the direction of Coombes junior's career.

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.'[92] Hotel-owners gained a reputation for encouraging the less respectable aspects of sport, such as drinking and gambling. The regular compliments that Coombes senior received for his service indicates that he seen as quite respectable in the eyes of his social superiors. His provision of hospitality to the coursing community offered an opportunity to engage in the lower middle-class obsession of establishing and retaining social status. Crossick argues that displaying an understanding of the correct standards of behaviour became important to the lower-middle class as a way of asserting difference from manual labourers.[93] Coombes senior was able to satisfy this need by providing an improved social space in the form of the renovated Greyhound Hotel, and along with his wife was able to show personal competence through his provision of acceptable food and the correct wines.

---

[90] Garside, *Hampton School*, pp. 38-39.
[91] Crossick, 'The Emergence of the Lower Middle Class,' pp. 35-36.
[92] James Belich, *Paradise Reforged: A History of the New Zealanders From the 1880s to the Year 2000*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2001, p. 222.
[93] Crossick, 'The Emergence of the Lower Middle Class,' pp. 29-30.

Coombes senior's approach to sport also follows the pattern of the aspirant lower-middle-class. Despite his focus on administration, he only raced greyhounds and sponsored races at club and open meetings. His interest in participating in coursing seems to begin with the sponsorship of the Greyhound Stakes at an 1861 Amicable Club meeting.[94] In terms of racing, Coombes' dog 'Housemaid' won The Paddock Stakes in 1862, his dog 'Heavy Gun' was beaten in the Palace Stakes in 1863 at a meeting in which a Greyhound Stakes was also run, and in 1864 he was beaten in the Sapling Stakes.[95] While it is possible that his dogs were not of sufficient quality to race at more prestigious meetings, there may be class reasons for his exclusion. These two issues are not mutually exclusive, however, and a lack of money available influenced the quality and quantity of animals purchased. Coombes senior's assemblage of a modest stable despite an obvious interest in the sport indicates a lack of social status. The right to compete at the Champion meeting was restricted by a rule

> … which requires that each dog shall have been the property of some member of a club for three months prior to the meeting. This rule was made to meet the rush for nominations which it was expected would be made by the metropolitan coursers, who are many of them not attached to any club; and also to give some little bonus to the members of the Amicable, Spelthorn, and Cardington clubs, under whose auspices the Champion gathering is got up. We cannot help thinking that the rule is a good one, though, no doubt, to those who are not members of any club, it is galling to be excluded.[96]

The implication of the absence of Coombes' dogs at championship meetings and this ruling is that Coombes was not a member of the mentioned clubs. Club life in Victorian England was marked by class tension, with the upper class sequestering themselves from those they considered their social inferiors in the wider community. Perhaps there

---

[94] 'Stonehenge', *The Coursing Calendar (Autumn Season 1861)*, p. 66.
[95] 'Stonehenge' (ed.), *The Coursing Calendar and Report of the Spring Season 1862: With Entries for the Produce Stakes of the Ensuing Season*, London, UK: John Crockford (The Field), 1862, p. 2; 'Stonehenge' (ed.), *The Coursing Calendar and Report of the Autumn Season 1863*, London, UK: John Crockford (The Field), 1863, pp. 203-04, 'Stonehenge', *The Coursing Calendar (Spring Season 1864)*, p. 96.
[96] 'Stonehenge' ed., *The Coursing Calendar and Report of the Season 1860: With Hints on Breeding, &.*, London, UK: John Crockford (The Field), 1860, p. 128.

were limits to the amount of respect that Coombes senior was offered by upper-class coursers.

While attributing class is a difficult process due to its amorphous nature, these conclusions are important as historians argue that the differences within middle-class culture influenced the manner in which amateurism was understood. Dunning and Sheard have argued that differing educational backgrounds have led to differing understandings of amateurism, particularly with regard to the acceptance of broken-time payments by sectors of rugby officialdom in the north of England;

> Since few [Yorkshire rugby club administrators] had attended public schools, and had, therefore, not received a thorough grounding in amateur principles, it is hardly surprising that they were less than steadfast in their commitment [than leading Yorkshire administrators that had attended public schools]. Moreover, the fact that they were not integrated into the public school élite meant that, even though they were middle-class, they did not, for the most part, share the class antagonism from which the pristine amateur ethos derived much of its momentum.[97]

The relationship between the non-public school educated middle-class and a more open understanding of amateurism identified by Dunning and Sheard is reflected in Coombes' experiences. This provides a framework for understanding his attitude to sport. The remainder of this chapter will argue that his approach to greyhound racing displayed a conception of sport at odds with typical understandings of English amateur sport.

Coombes and the Development of Greyhound Racing in Australia

In what ways did Coombes' familial and personal involvement in coursing influence his approach to sport? As a journalist, Coombes was required to show as much interest in coursing as in other pursuits such as athletics. A useful site to investigate his approach to sport is the advent of mechanical hare coursing, today's greyhound racing, into

[97] Eric Dunning and Kenneth Sheard, *Barbarians, Gentlemen and Players: A Sociological Study of the Development of Rugby Football*, Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1979, p. 167.

Australia in 1927. Much like the sport of coursing, greyhound racing has not attracted as much historical attention as its more illustrious equine counterpart. What has been written focuses on the perception that greyhound racing was a plebeian and corrupt endeavour that was criticised by adherents of pure sport. Greyhound racing in its modern form came to prominence in the United States in 1921 and was introduced into the British market in 1925 and the Australian market in 1927.[98] Entrepreneurs were responsible for its introduction into both localities, with the Greyhound Racing Association (Manchester) Limited company formed 'by people with sporting connections and with money to invest' introducing the sport into Britain. One of the investors, Brigadier-General A. C. Critchley, saw an opportunity to develop greyhound racing tracks into 'the poor man's racecourse.'[99] Jack Munro and an evocatively-named American businessman, Frederik Swindell, were key figures in the introduction of the sport in Sydney, developing tracks at Mascot and what became Harold Park respectively.[100] Greyhound racing's commercial origins and working-class clientele saw it gain a reputation as a sport that required close government attention from both the left and right. Soon after the sport was introduced into Australia it was placed under severe government restrictions, with night meetings and betting on mechanical-hare racing banned by a conservative government. These restrictions were lifted upon the election of a Labor government, allowing the sport to flourish after 1931.[101] A rare scholarly article on greyhound racing by Norman Baker describes how puritanical nonconformist

[98] Mark Clapson, *A Bit of a Flutter: Popular Gambling and English Society, c. 1823-1961*, Manchester, UK and New York, NY: Manchester University Press, 1992, pp. 141, 144; Gerald Crawford, 'Greyhound-racing,' Wray Vamplew *et al* (eds.), *Oxford Companion to Australian Sport*, South Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1994, p. 193.
[99] Clapson, *A Bit of a Flutter*, p. 144.
[100] Crawford, 'Greyhound-racing,' p. 193.
[101] Crawford, 'Greyhound-racing,' p. 193.

elements within the Atlee Labour Government of Britain opposed greyhound racing in the atmosphere of post Second World War rations.[102]

While a number of coursing officials and participants became involved in greyhound racing in Britain, the sport attracted the opprobrium of officials concerned with amateur sport.[103] Coombes' contemporary on the IOC, Brigadier-General Kentish of Great Britain, severely criticised the sport in the course of a letter to leading IOC figure Comte Henri Baillet-Latour about the English press. Kentish was reporting on the fate of a letter from Baillet-Latour addressing a controversy about broken-time that was compromising British involvement in the Amsterdam Olympic Games of 1928. *The Times* had published the letter almost verbatim, but *Sporting Life* had not. Kentish attributed this negligence to a change in ownership. '[T]he [former] editor and an excellent fellow', Morley Brown, had left the paper and under the new editorship, the *Sporting Life* '[had] given itself over practically entirely to professional sport, e.g. horse racing and greyhound racing (a new plague spot on the social life of our country).'[104] Not only did Kentish see greyhound racing as a hindrance to discussion of amateur sport, he clearly identified it as an expression of professional sport. Not only was it intimately connected with gambling, greyhound racing in Britain aligned itself with rugby league football – the professional version of amateur rugby football.[105] Greyhound racing was both a philosophical and physical threat to amateur sport in Britain. A denigration of the sport's working-class clientele is also implied in Kentish's criticism of the sport as 'a new plague spot on the social life of our country.'

---

[102] Norman Baker, 'Going to the Dogs – Hostility to Greyhound Racing in Britain: Puritanism, Socialism and Pragmaticism,' *Journal of Sport History*, vol. 23, no. 2, Summer 1996, p. 106.
[103] Clapson, *A Bit of a Flutter*, pp. 144-45.
[104] Brigadier-General Kentish, Letter to Comte Henri Baillet-Latour, 27 March 1928, Grande Bretagne Correspondance 1892-1959, CIO CNO-GRABR-CORR, 9287, International Olympic Committee Archives, Lausanne, Switzerland.
[105] Tony Collins, *Rugby League in Twentieth Century Britain: A Social and Cultural History*, London, UK and New York, NY: Routledge, 2006, pp. 31, 68-69.

Kentish's view of the sport is clearly at odds with Coombes' understanding of the sport. Despite the sport's commercial origins and the misgivings of governments and fellow amateur administrators, Coombes used his position as a journalist with newspapers such as the Sydney *Referee* to promote the fledgling sport in Australia. Coombes played an important role in asserting the viability of the new sport as well as placing it in the sphere of respectable sport. Coombes offered opinions from racing figures in Sydney, such as popular jockey 'Bunty' Brown, as well as figures from New Zealand and California, that established the wide ranging interest in the coming of greyhound racing to New South Wales.[106] In more concrete terms, Coombes was keen to stress the success that greyhound racing was meeting in Britain. In the lead up to its debut in Sydney, Coombes provided a stream of information from England that emphasised the success that greyhound racing was enjoying in its inaugural season. In February 1927, Coombes relayed a cable from England that announced the development of a 50,000 capacity greyhound track in the city of Liverpool, close to Altcar, the home of the most prestigious coursing event in England (the Waterloo Cup), and essentially the heart of British coursing. Coombes suggested that this news

> clinches any argument about the success of the new form of sport which, carried on for some considerable time in the U.S.A., with remarkable success, caused a regular "boom" time when introduced last year into England at Manchester.[107]

Announcing the inaugural meeting of the Greyhound Coursing (Mechanical hares) Association Limited in Sydney in April, which was in fact delayed, Coombes continued to relay news of developments in England. Another 50,000 capacity track was scheduled to open at Harringay in May, while the White City stadium – a popular venue for amateur athletics – was to be fitted with a greyhound track. According to this cable, London was to be home of a grand championship bringing together the provincial

[106] The *Referee*, 2 February 1927, p. 9; The *Referee*, 9 March 1927, p. 9; The *Referee*, 16 March 1927, p. 16.
[107] The *Referee*, 2 February 1927, p. 9.

champions for a prize of £1800. Coombes stated that the success of greyhound racing in the North of England was likely to be replicated in the south if placed 'under good management.'[108] While it may fairly be argued that he was unlikely to suggest that the sport would flourish under poor management, in this context it is worth remembering the importance that Coombes' father placed on proper management of the Hampton Court coursing meetings in the mid-1800s. It is also worth noting the importance of English regional matters in the context of understandings of sport in Australia, and in particular the northern rugby playing states of New South Wales and Queensland. While the North of England is reputed to be more susceptible to cash infused and professional sports in a general sense, this was particularly pronounced in New South Wales and Queensland where the split of the rugby codes into the amateur rugby union and professional rugby league was replicated. Indeed, some commentators have attributed the success of rugby league in establishing a toehold in New South Wales and Queensland to the similarities between these states and the traditional rugby league counties of Lancashire and Yorkshire in the English north.[109] As such, while greyhound racing has remained synonymous with the North of England, the apparent potential of greyhound racing to penetrate the English south could be seen as a vindication of the sport by middle class observers.

Coombes was also keen to stress the bona fides of J. Galbraith, the secretary of the New South Wales Greyhound Coursing (Mechanical hares) Association Limited, as a paragon of the coursing community. Coombes described Galbraith as a 'well-known supporter of the leash' and sought his opinion on issues that affected the traditional coursing community.[110] The coursing community of New South Wales was in a state of

---

[108] The *Referee*, 6 April 1927, p. 17.
[109] Tony Collins, 'Australian Nationalism and Working-Class Britishness: The Case of Rugby League Football,' *History Compass*, 3 AU 142, 2005, p. 12.
[110] The *Referee*, 9 March 1927, p. 9.

disarray during this period, with the New South Wales body separating from the Australasian body and the Metropolitan sector of the community drawing the ire of the coursers of the Western Districts for planning a meeting on the date that they had previously claimed as their own.[111] On the matter of the New South Wales body separating from the Australasian body, Galbraith criticised the decision on the grounds that it would be more constructive to have a set of uniform rules as well as the promotion of a national event. Galbraith finished the letter thus

> There are a thousand and one ways in which the different States could help one another, and the whole, for the good of the sport throughout Australia. At the moment I think the sport is on the boom, and it occurs to me that the present is an opportune time, thus might I take the liberty of suggesting to you [Coombes], or other able followers of the sport, that during this season's "Waterloo" in Victoria, a conference be held with all the States having a heart-to-heart talk over the matter. Even though no concrete matter might accrue – such a meeting would bring us closer together – we are all big brothers nationally, and let us be so in this national sport.[112]

Galbraith was from Corowa in country New South Wales, and thus had a specific interest in the second matter. While he admitted the traditional wariness with which country sports people viewed decisions made in Sydney, he claimed to not 'find any concrete evidence for that feeling.' Galbraith suggested that the Western District concentrate on establishing their own prestigious events rather than engage in bitterness with metropolitan coursers.[113]

These contributions to the debate facilitated by Coombes present Galbraith as a figure that represents the unification of coursers across New South Wales, and indeed Australasia, rather than a figure that served to tear the fabric of traditional coursing. Coombes was keen to present the New South Wales coursing community as united in its support for racing, as opposed to the case in England, and painted the racing community in England as supportive of traditional coursing by pointing to the Greyhound Racing

---

[111] The *Referee*, 23 February 1927, p. 15; The *Referee*, 6 April 1927, p. 17.
[112] The *Referee*, 9 March 1927, p. 9.
[113] The *Referee*, 6 April 1927, p. 17.

Association of England's presentation of a prize worth 50 guineas to the Hockwold and Feltwell [Coursing] Club's meeting of January 1927.[114] Rather than a clear break between the traditional and exclusive sport and an opportunistic and potentially corrupt interloper, the favourable press that Coombes provided the sport and its promoters display that he saw that greyhound racing had a place in the sporting landscape of Australia. This differs greatly from Kentish's denigration of the sport as a 'plague spot.'

However, there were limits to the tolerance Coombes showed to greyhound racing. He insisted on the primacy of traditional coursing and hoped that its season would not be interrupted. Traditional coursing was a winter sport in England and the United States, and Coombes suggested that climatic factors prevented a clash in these nations. However, the more temperate climate of Australia provided no such natural barrier between coursing and greyhound racing. The result was extremely untidy as far as Coombes was concerned

> we find owners running some of their dogs at both sets of meetings at one and the same time – after live hares one day, and after the "tinned" article a few days , or may be a few hours, later. And they are the same class of dog, because at both sports only [National Coursing Association] registered dogs are eligible to compete.
> When things have settled down, I hope to see the overlap done away with, or, if there must be an overlap, perhaps some scheme might be evolved by which the greyhounds can be put into two classes – the "racers" and the "chasers" – or something of the sort.[115]

So, while Coombes was supportive of the sport of greyhound racing, he insisted on a clear delineation between the two. Even within the *Referee*, the coverage of coursing and greyhound racing eventually separated. Coombes was happy to bounce from coursing to greyhound racing in his column under the pseudonym 'Amesbury' during the establishment of greyhound racing. However, once the racing started, the reports of greyhound racing were excised and written under the pseudonym 'Terminus.'[116]

---

[114] The *Referee*, 30 March 1927, p. 15; The *Referee*, 9 March 1927, p. 9.
[115] The *Referee*, 8 June 1927, p. 14.
[116] For an example of this division, see The *Referee*, 8 June 1927, p. 14.

Whether Coombes himself provided the reports under this name is unclear. After the New South Wales Betting Act was extended to greyhound racing and gambling was allowed on greyhound racing as well as coursing, the racing column was renamed 'Greyhound Betting.'[117] Perhaps this indicates a new front being opened up in this dispute, with the title being pejorative despite the fact that gambling was clearly a part of coursing as well. Nevertheless, the division of the sports into distinct areas of the newspaper points to a desire to keep the new sport from the traditional. Later chapters will demonstrate that the desire to keep amateur sport separate from professional sport, without seeking to destroy professional sport or even keep professional ethics out of amateur sport, was a key aspect of amateur athletics in Australasia.

Conclusions

This chapter has fleshed out the formative experiences of Richard Coombes, that have previously been written using abstract notions, and offered an example of how these experiences influenced his conception of sport. The next chapters will demonstrate how these experiences also influenced track and field athletics. Coombes did not receive the elite education that historians have traditionally ascribed to him and other amateur ideologues in general. The subjects that were taught to Coombes were unlikely to inculcate a '*mens sana corpore sano*' attitude or any philhellenism. This seems to be proved in his conflation of the Roman god Jupiter with the Greek Zeus and his lack of interest in traditional Greek events with regard to the 1906 intercalary games at Athens. The facilities at Hampton Grammar School bore no comparison to the playing fields of Eton or any other Public School where the cult of athleticism would inform the development of aspects of amateurism. Coombes was not sheltered from the so-called 'lower orders' in his school career, but instead interacted with them in what was

[117] The *Referee*, 22 June 1927, p. 9, 14.

effectively a local parish school that made slow progress towards exclusivity. A sporting culture did develop at Hampton Grammar School, but this developed late in Coombes' career at the school. If the development of sport at the school was due to the initiative of students themselves, as was the case at other schools, it is more likely that Coombes entrenched sporting culture at the school rather than sporting ethics being inculcated into him.

The Coombes family business, the Greyhound Hotel at Hampton Court, was intrinsically tied to sport as it became a key destination for coursers. As a result, the Coombes family became interested in the financial aspects of sport. The hospitality that the Coombes family provided became well-known, and was a staple of contemporary press reports of coursing in the Hampton Court precinct. Coombes senior was instrumental in the organisation of the Hampton Court Champion Meeting – later renamed the Metropolitan Champion Meeting, which was better administered than those run in the area by prestigious clubs. This is illuminating with regard to the tension between organisation and ideology within amateur sport. What is less clear is the class implications of the involvement of the Coombes family in greyhound racing. While Coombes senior was amongst the administrators of the Champion Meeting, he was not able to race at these meetings. Remaining family members also retained occupancy of the Greyhound Hotel despite it being sold after the death of Richard Coombes senior. This perhaps indicates that the hospitality skills of the Coombes family remained important to their livelihood. This is important due to the traditional link between amateur sport and the elite of society.

The involvement of Richard Coombes junior in coursing in his youth and professional life indicates that the experiences of his forebears had some impact on his own understanding of sport. Coombes was quite active in the market for dogflesh and

accumulated a substantial stable of greyhounds in the period preceding his departure for Australia. There is no evidence that he disposed of these costly investments before he departed for Australia, despite the fact that he had a close relative, C. J. Coombes, involved in coursing. Coombes' attitude to the development of greyhound racing with a mechanical hare was somewhat supportive, although there were limitations to his acceptance of the sport. He maintained that there should be a strict distinction in terms of the seasons of each sport as well as the type of dogs that should compete in each form of the sport. The tendency to divide sport into competing camps is clearly an important aspect of an amateur worldview, although Coombes' support – contingent as it was – for greyhound racing placed him in conflict with other amateur figures such as Brigadier-General Kentish of the IOC.

This chapter opened up the debate about the inspiration behind amateurism in Australia by offering an alternative to the traditional understanding of the background of Richard Coombes, one of Australian amateurism's leading proponents. Amongst the most important aspects of this rethinking of Coombes' background is an awareness of the importance of the nexus of sport, finance and the consumer in his understanding of sport. This chapter has argued that Richard Coombes was not influenced by elite English conceptions of amateurism, but was influenced by sporting traditions that created amateurs that were not as steadfast as the leaders of the amateur movement. As such, it is vital to trace this nexus through Coombes' influence in Australian amateur sport.

The next chapter will argue that Coombes' background, divorced from elite conceptions of sport, found resonance in Australasian amateur athletics. Amateur athletics officials, including Coombes in a central role, employed measures to popularise the sport similar to those employed by Richard Coombes senior to improve

his business, the *Greyhound* Hotel. Included amongst these measures were those that verged perilously close to the edge between amateurism and professionalism, and some that were undeniably equivalent to actions undertaken by professional sporting bodies.

The next chapter focuses on the manner in which athletic events themselves were used to popularise the sport of athletics. The New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association [NSWAAA] will be shown to be one of several sporting amateur organisations that attempted to harness the patronage of the wider community through activities that are generally attributed to professional sport. It was one amongst several amateur sporting bodies that employed a district scheme of representation in metropolitan competition. While the promotion of district sport and local rivalry has previously been understood as a tactic used by professional sporting bodies to attract attention for their sport, the next chapter will demonstrate that amateur bodies, including the NSWAAA, were at the vanguard of the promotion of district sport. While the district scheme ultimately did not prove successful in athletic circles, the NSWAAA instituted a sophisticated competition structure. Australasian championships were also used to promote the sport and raise funds for the member associations of the Amateur Athletic Union of Australasia.

The most overtly professional tactic employed by the NSWAAA and other Australasian athletic bodies was the promotion of tours by athletes from abroad. These bodies sought to promote tours by overseas athletes as spectacles to attract the attention of the sporting public. The most egregious example of a tour organised by Australasian amateur athletics officials on professional lines was the tour undertaken by American sprinter Arthur Duffey and English middle-distance runner Alfred Shrubb. The tactics employed by the organisers of the tour in trying to attract these athletes, as well as the conduct of Shrubb and Duffey themselves, shows that amateur athletics officials

engaged in a supply and demand relationship with overseas athletes rather than a detached relationship concerned only with the promotion of pure sport.

Chapter Three – Amateur Athletics as a Spectacle in Australasia

> 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 (Melbourne) *Australasian*.

If the name 'Cavill' was not synonymous with Australian swimming at the turn of the twentieth century, the casual 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.

Building on the previous chapter, this chapter demonstrates that the entrepreneurial skill of Richard Coombes Senior influenced the way that Richard Coombes Junior conducted amateur athletics in Australasia. The sport in Australasia was 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] This study of the characteristics of amateur sport will

---

[1] The *Australasian*, 7 April 1900.

[2] Maurice T. Daly, *One Hundred Years of Australian Sport: A History of the New South Wales Sports Club*, Sydney: New South Wales Sports Club, Sydney, 1996, pp. 40-42; Robert J. Paddick, 'Amateurism: An idea of the past or a necessity for the future?,' *Olympika: The International Journal of Olympic Studies*, vol. 3, 1994, p. 3.

flesh out its actual practice in Australasia in the same way that the previous chapter fleshed out the actual experiences of Richard Coombes Junior.

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]

---

[3] For the Olympic Games see Harry Gordon, *Australia and the Olympic Games*, St Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1994; Reet and Max Howell, *Aussie Gold: The Story of Australia at the Olympics*, Melbourne: Brooks Waterloo, 1988; Garth Henniker and Ian Jobling, 'Richard Coombes and the Olympic Movement in Australia: Imperialism and Nationalism in Action,' *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 6, no. 1, November 1989, pp. 2-15; Ian Jobling, 'In Pursuit of Status, Respectability and Idealism: Pioneers of the Olympic Movement in Australasia,' J.A. Mangan and John Nauright (eds.), *Sport in Australasian Society: Past and Present*, London, UK and Portland, OR: Frank Cass, 2000, pp. 142-163; and Michael Letters and Ian Jobling, 'Forgotten Links: Leonard Cuff and The Olympic Movement in Australasia, 1894-1905,' *Olympika: The International Journal of Olympic Studies*, vol. 5, 1996, pp. 91-110. For the importance of pan-Britannic sports see Katherine Moore, 'One Voice in the Wilderness: Richard Coombes and the Promotion of the Pan-Britannic Festival Concept in Australia 1891-1911,' *Sporting Traditions*, May 1989, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 188-203.

[4] Adrian Smith, 'Black against gold: New Zealand-Australia sporting rivalry,' Adrian Smith and Dilwyn Porter (eds.), *Sport and national identity in the post-war world*, London, UK and New York, NY: Routledge, 2004, p. 175.

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. 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.[8] 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.[9] David Montefiore

---

[5] Howell and Howell, *Aussie Gold*, p. VIII.
[6] Howell and Howell, *Aussie Gold*, p. 14.
[7] The *Referee*, 21 February 1900, p. 6.
[8] W.F. Mandle, 'Cricket and Australian Nationalism in the Nineteenth Century,' *Journal of the Royal Australian Historical Society*, vol. 59, No. 4, December 1973, pp. 224-46.
[9] Graeme Davison, 'The imaginary grandstand,' *Meanjin*, vol. 61 issue 3, September 2002, pp. 4-18; John Hoberman, 'Sport and ideology in the post-Communist age,' Lincoln Allison (ed.), *The Changing Politics of Sport*, Manchester, UK, and New York, NY: Manchester University Press, 1993, pp. 15-36; John Hoberman, 'Sportive Nationalism and Globalization,' John Bale and Mette Krogh Christensen (eds.),

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.[10] Montefiore moves the focus away from outward expressions of identity to internal aspects in establishing the significance of sport.

The New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association [NSWAAA] and 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 reforms 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

---

Post-Olympism: Questioning Sport in the Twenty-first Century, Oxford, UK and New York, NY: Berg, 2004, pp. 177-88.

[10] David Montefiore, *Cricket in the Doldrums: The Struggle between Private and Public Control of Australian Cricket in the 1880s*, Campbelltown: Australian Society for Sports History (ASSH), ASSH Studies in Sports History, no. 8, 1992.

> central issues as sport organisations 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.[11]

This chapter will demonstrate that these were not simply the concerns of 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 soccer football 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.[12] 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 at the outset of this thesis, 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.'[13] Allison sees this trend as a result of historical processes, such as the 'wholesale demolition of constraints and

[11] Stephen Hardy, 'Entrepreneurs, Organizations, and the Sport Marketplace: Subjects in Search of Historians,' *Journal of Sport History*, vol. 13, no. 1, Spring 1986, p. 16.
[12] Dilwyn Porter, 'Entrepreneurship,' S. W. Pope and John Nauright, *Routledge Companion to Sports History*, London, UK and New York, NY: Routledge, 2010, pp. 197-98.
[13] Lincoln Allison, *Amateurism in Sport: An Analysis and a Defence*, London, UK and Portland, OR: Frank Cass, 2001, p. 147.

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.[14] 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.[15] 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.[16] 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.

Sociologists Eric Dunning and Kenneth Sheard see the development of amateur rugby union football 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

[14] Allison, *Amateurism*, p. 141.
[15] Allison suggests that the years between 1895 and 1961 mark the period of 'the maintenance of amateur hegemony.' [Allison, *Amateurism*, p. 38.]
[16] For example, see Allen Guttmann's treatment of cases involving athletes such as Jim Thorpe, Paavo Nurmi and Karl Schranz [Allen Guttmann, *The Olympics: A History of the Modern Games*, Urbana and Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2002, pp. 34, 51, 134-35.]

> replacement by attitudes, values and structures which are 'professional' in one sense or another of that term.[17]

Dunning and Sheard point to the development of large arenas that generate income, which is then used to pay for groundstaff that maintain the facilities, as an example of the way that professionalism has influenced rugby union. They use the example of Twickenham stadium, where gate money pays the wages of ground staff. While writing before rugby union turned professional in 1995, they 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.[18]

In a similar vain, John Bale has used Pierre Bourdieu's concept of social capital to explain how athletes such as Roger Bannister obtained benefits through their fame as athletes. These benefits could be capitalised upon regardless of whether they were paid for their performances.[19] 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. The Ranfurly Shield competition between New Zealand's provincial unions 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.[20] 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.[21]

---

[17] Eric Dunning and Kenneth Sheard, *Barbarians, Gentlemen and Players: A Sociological Study of the Development of Rugby Football*, Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1979, pp. 9-10.
[18] Dunning and Sheard, *Barbarians, Gentlemen and Players*, pp. 241-42.
[19] John Bale, 'Amateurism, Capital and Roger Bannister,' *Sport in History*, vol. 26, no. 3, December 2006, p. 493.
[20] Camilla Obel, 'Amateur Rugby's Spectator Success: Cultivating Inter-Provincial Rugby Publics in New Zealand, 1902 -1995,' *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 21, no. 2, May 2005, pp. 100-01.
[21] Obel, 'Amateur Rugby's Spectator Success,' p. 105.

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".'[22] 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.'[23] The league structure of the NPC 'represented [the larger provincial union's] first attempt at cultivating local publics for season-long competitions.'[24] It was able to create a national television public in the early 1990s through measures such as streamlining the draw and instituting a finals series that prevented the title being decided long before the season was completed.[25] 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.'[26] 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.[27] 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. Coombes' experiences during the period when his father used coursing to supplement the Greyhound Hotel's business proved invaluable as the NSWAAA and

[22] Obel, 'Amateur Rugby's Spectator Success,' p. 98.
[23] Obel, 'Amateur Rugby's Spectator Success,' p. 101.
[24] Obel, 'Amateur Rugby's Spectator Success,' p. 105.
[25] Obel, 'Amateur Rugby's Spectator Success,' p. 110.
[26] Obel, 'Amateur Rugby's Spectator Success,' p. 98.
[27] Stuart Ripley, 'A Social History of New South Wales Professional Sculling 1876-1927,' unpublished PhD thesis, University of Western Sydney, 2003, p. 337.

the Australasian Union attempted to establish their popularity using forms similar to those employed by professional organisations.

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'.[28]

This is significant in the case of athletics in Australasia as any interest in the sport is 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.

Internal Reforms

The NSWAAA adopted 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 sport. 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.[29]

This view should be challenged, as sporting bodies professing adherence to amateur ideology instituted the policy of district competition in New South Wales. The NSWAAA followed in the footsteps of other sporting bodies, such as the New South Wales Cricket Association [NSWCA] and Metropolitan Rugby Union [MRU], in

[28] Obel, 'Amateur Rugby's Spectator Success,' p. 97.
[29] Richard Waterhouse, *Private Pleasures, Public Leisure: A History of Australian Popular Culture Since 1788*, South Melbourne: Longman, 1995, p. 78.

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 Cashman, proponents of the district scheme in rugby argued that it 'would increase spectator interest [and] … enhance the competition.'[30] Little has argued that fervent local support for the 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.[31] 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 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 community itself. Dr. Herbert Moran, the university-educated captain of the 1908 Australian rugby union team (the Wallabies) suggests that the decision to employ the district scheme disrupted the 'corporative spirit and a tradition' of establishment clubs.[32] 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 Kings 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

[30] Richard Cashman, *Paradise of Sport. The Rise of Organised Sport in Australia*, Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1995, p. 97.
[31] Charles Little, '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, 2000, p. 71.
[32] Herbert Moran, *Viewless Winds: Being the Recollections and Digressions of an Australian Surgeon*, London, UK: Peter Davies, 1939, p. 35.

Arnold brothers were closely linked to the Kings 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 importance for the formation of the district competition.[33]

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 the ideology of rugby, with Glebe noted for 'rough and illegal play.'[34] 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.

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

[33] Richard Cashman, *Sport in the National Imagination: Australian Sport in the Federation Decades*, Sydney: Walla Walla Press, 2002, pp. 52-53.
[34] Cashman, *Sport in the National Imagination*, pp. 53-55.

Amateur Athletic Club, and clubs outside the metropolitan area.[35] The success of the scheme would be based on creating what Leifer would describe as a local public.[36] Residents of Sydney's burgeoning suburbs, replete with newly established ovals, would be able to support local players and engage in civic pride.[37] 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.'[38] A meeting in 1901 between East and South was reputed to have drawn five to six thousand spectators, a crowd that compared favourably with contemporary football attendances.[39]

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.[40] 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.'[41] The area that the Sydney Harriers club would draw their members appears to be 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 No organised resistance seems to have been offered to the NSWAAA's plans, however, and there seems to be a general sense of apathy towards the issue. The meeting that the leadership of the NSWAAA intended to use to explain

---

[35] The *Referee*, 2 May 1900, p. 6.
[36] See Obel, 'Amateur Rugby's Spectator Success,' p. 98.
[37] Cashman, *Paradise of Sport*, pp. 96-97.
[38] New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association, *Annual Report*, 11 April 1900, New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association Records, ML MSS 5573: Box 3 – Annual Reports, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia (Hereafter Box 3, NSWAAA Records).
[39] New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association, *Annual Report*, 30 April 1902, Box 3, NSWAAA Records.
[40] The *Referee*, 2 May 1900, p. 6.
[41] The *Referee*, 6 June 1900, p. 6.

the district scheme to its members did not attract a quorum on the first two occasions, and was finally successfully held at the third attempt.[42] While Coombes considered the attendance poor at even the third attempt, the *Sydney Morning Herald* correspondent displayed a more realistic attitude, considering the crowd 'good.'[43]

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 …[44]

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 city suburbs of Newtown, Eveleigh, Erskineville, Alexandria and Mascot.[45] By contrast, the western boundaries of the athletic club consisted of an imaginary line taken from the 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.[46] 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

---

[42] It should be noted that wet weather excused some non-attendees to the second meeting. The *Referee*, 6 June 1900, p. 6.
[43] The *Sydney Morning Herald*, 2 June 1900, p. 14.
[44] Little, 'Sport, Communities and Identities,' p. 12.
[45] Little, 'Sport, Communities and Identities,' p. 14.
[46] The *Referee*, 2 May 1900, p. 6.

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.[47] The scheme was rejected two years later, which brought 'more harmony between the clubs.'[48] 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 to 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.[49] It was named after Jack Dunn, a Vice-President of the Newtown Harriers. This club promoted and hosted the 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.'[50] The

---

[47] New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association, *Annual Report*, 27 April 1922 Box 3, NSWAAA Records.
[48] New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association, *Annual Report*, 30 April 1924, Box 3, NSWAAA Records.
[49] R. P. B. White and Malcolm Harrison, *100 Years of the NSW AAA*, Sydney: The Fairfax Library/NSWAAA, 1987, p. 125.
[50] Newtown Harriers Athletic Club, *Programme – The Dunn Challenge Shield*, Newtown, 3 and 10 December 1910, Davis Sporting Collection 1, Box 10 – Harriers athletic club carnivals, 1890-1930 and

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.'[51] The *Sydney Morning Herald* estimated that 'probably not less than 9000 visitors' attended the Carrington First Grand Handicap on 18 December 1886.[52] Both the idea of a 'monster carnival' to inaugurate the operation and the boast of records were common to the promotion of the first Carrington and 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.'[53] Not only did these events offer the prospect of a large paying crowd, the promotion of the carnival offered the opportunity for clubs to

---

Highlanders' picnics and athletics carnivals, 1898-1932, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia [Hereafter DSC 1, Box 10].

[51] The *Sydney Morning Herald*, 18 December 1886, p. 2.

[52] The *Sydney Morning Herald*, 20 December 1886, p. 9.

[53] Newtown Harriers Athletic Club, *Programme – The Dunn Challenge Shield*, Newtown, 3 and 10 December 1910, DSC 1, Box 10.

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.[54]

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.[55] 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.[56] 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.'[57] 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.[58] 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.[59] Nevertheless, with the Dunn Shield and Thompson Cup (and its descendants), the NSWAAA had quite a sophisticated competition structure.

---

[54] 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, Davis Sporting Collection 1, Box 12 – NSWAAA Carnivals, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, 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, Davis Sporting Collection 1, Box 11 – Highlanders' Carnivals and NSWAAA carnivals, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia [Hereafter DSC 1, Box 11].
[55] The *Sydney Morning Herald*, 6 October 1924, p. 9.
[56] The *Sydney Morning Herald*, 17 December 1924, p. 19; The *Sydney Morning Herald*, 10 February 1925, p. 12.
[57] The *Sydney Morning Herald*, 11 February 1925, p. 20.
[58] The *Sydney Morning Herald*, 27 February 1925, p. 12.
[59] The *Sydney Morning Herald*, 29 November 1926, p. 15.

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.[60] The RFU finally instituted a full league structure in 1987, but local leagues were developed in the Southwest and Midland regions of England in the early 1900s to face the threat of soccer football. The organisers of these competitions faced the chagrin of the RFU, but not expulsion from the rugby union game as their Northern counterparts had.[61] 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 more liberal strand.

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.[62] 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, much in the same manner as Coombes' heritage as the son of a hotel-owner that used sport to promote his business interests has not been recognised.

---

[60] Tony Collins, *Rugby's Great Split: Class, Culture and the Origins of Rugby League Football*, London, UK and Portland OR: Frank Cass, 1998, p. 134.
[61] Tony Collins, *A Social History of English Rugby Union*, London, UK and New York, NY: Routledge, 2009, pp. 111-12, 196.
[62] The *Sydney Morning Herald*, 8 December 1924, p. 6.

Intercolonial – later interstate and interdominion – competitions were also infused with a financial 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'.[63] 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.[64]

The adoption of a more streamlined approach resulted in the establishment of handicap events, 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.[65] While it is unlikely that all these athletes actually competed,

---

[63] The Australasian Amateur Conference, *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, 1897, p. 11.

[64] 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, E. S. Marks Sporting Collection, Q46 Box 2 – Athletics, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia [Hereafter Marks Q46].

[65] New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association [NSWAAA], *Programme – Australasian Championship Carnival*, Sydney, 11 and 13 November 1905, Marks Q46.

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.[66] 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.'[67] 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,

[66] Amateur Athletic Union of Australasia, Minutes of Meeting, 28 January 1904, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, p. 11.
[67] Gordon, *Australia and the Olympic Games*, p. 16.

> … 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.[68]

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... [69]

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.[70] 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 such contests 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

---

[68] Victorian Amateur Athletic Association [VAAA], *Victorian Amateur Athletic Handbook, Rules of the Victorian Amateur Athletic Association, Australasian Records, The Harriers, &c.*, Melbourne: The VAAA, 1894, p. 14.
[69] NSWAAA, *Programme – Australasian Championship Carnival*, 1905. Other programmes carried a 'mission statement' to this effect.
[70] Montefiore, *Cricket in the Doldrums*, p. 74.

between the NSWCA and the Melbourne Cricket Club drew the ire of the VCA, who suspended the club.[71] 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 focussing 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.'[72] 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 following part of the chapter will address the most overtly mercantile of amateur sporting operations, the organisation of

[71] Montefiore, *Cricket in the Doldrums*, p. 72.
[72] Stuart Ripley, *Sculling and Skulduggery: A history of professional sculling*, Sydney: Walla Walla Press, 2009, p. vi.

tours to Australasia. These breaches of amateurism *did* result in personal financial gain for participants, and were enabled to exist within amateurism due to the ethic outlined above.

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.'[73] 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.'[74] 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.[75] Moreover, the tours from America in particular indicated that Australia had embraced modernity and saw itself as part of a transnational Anglo-Saxon community. Waterhouse argues that minstrel troupes played a role in

[73] John Hirst, 'Distance in Australia – Was it a Tyrant?,' *Historical Studies*, vol. 16, no. 64, April 1975, p. 447.
[74] Waterhouse, *Private Pleasures, Public Leisure*, p. 135
[75] Waterhouse, *Private Pleasures, Public Leisure*, p. 69.

‘introducing American commercial advertising techniques to Australian show business and bringing modern forms of entertainment to city and the bush.’[76]

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.[77] 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.[78] 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.[79] 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

---

[76] Waterhouse, *Private Pleasures, Public Leisure*, p. 72.
[77] Bruce Mitchell, ‘Baseball in Australia. Two Tours and the Beginnings of Baseball in Australia,’ *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 7, no. 1, November, 1990, p. 4.
[78] Mandle, ‘Cricket and Australian Nationalism,’ pp. 224-46.
[79] Montefiore, *Cricket in the Doldrums*, pp. 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.

substandard.[80] 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.[81] These athletes include 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.[82] 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 4 miles and 10 miles championship double from 1901 until 1904 and added the mile championship in 1903 and 1904.[83] In 1904 he broke multiple world records in a single run at Ibrox in Glasgow, including the six, eight and ten 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.[84] Performances such as these saw Shrubb considered the finest English

[80] Waterhouse, *Private Pleasures, Public Leisure*, p. 74.
[81] The issue of amateur athletes in other sports touring Australia has received growing historical attention recently, see Sean Brawley, '"They Came, They Saw, They Conquered": The Takaishi/Saito Tour of 1926-27 and Australian Perceptions of Japan,' *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 26, no. 2, November 2009, pp. 49-66; Gary Osmond, '"Honolulu Maori": Racial dimensions of Duke Kahanamoku's tour of Australia and New Zealand, 1914-1915,' *New Zealand Journal of History*, vol. 44, no. 1, April 2010, pp. 22-34.
[82] John A. Daly, 'Athletics,' Wray Vamplew *et al* (eds.), *Oxford Companion to Australian Sport*, South Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1994, pp. 23-24; Percy Mason, *Professional Athletics in Australia*, Adelaide: Rigby, 1985, pp. 5, 12.
[83] Athletics Weekly, 'British Athletics Championships 1876-1914,' http://www.gbrathletics.com/bc/bc1.htm, Accessed 16 February 2009.
[84] Report of the *Athletic News*. Reprinted the *Wanganui Herald*, 6 January 1905, p. 2.

distance runner since George. The management of the antipodean tours of both George and Shrubb shared a mercantile 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.[85]

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.[86]

The Shrubb-Duffey Tour had its genesis in a request from the NZAAA to James E. Sullivan, secretary-treasurer of the AAU 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.[87] The NZAAA explored other avenues after the American was unable to commit enough time to the project. The tour - apparently stillborn 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.[88]

---

[85] Arthur Ruhl, 'The Men Who Set The Marks,' *Outing Magazine*, vol. 52, no. 4, July 1908, p. 391.
[86] Sports Reference LLC, 'Arthur Duffey,' http://www.sports-reference.com/olympics/athletes/du/arthur-duffey-1.html. Accessed 13 February 2009.
[87] The *Referee*, 27 April 1904, p. 6.
[88] The *Otago Witness*, 12 October 1904, p. 57.

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 that filled this role.[89] 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.'[90] 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.[91]

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.[92] Herbert claimed confusion rather than disinterest on his

---

[89] James Belich, *Paradise Reforged: A History of the New Zealanders From the 1880s to the Year 2000*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2001, pp. 82-83.
[90] The *Referee*, 30 November 1904, p. 6.
[91] Ripley, 'New South Wales Professional Sculling,' p. 337.
[92] The *Weekly Press*, 28 December 1904, p. 50. The *New Zealand Referee* was included in the *Weekly Press* at this time.

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.[93] 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.[94] 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.[95] 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.[96] The desire for lucrative celebrities is reflective of lessons learnt by Richard Coombes through his father's experiences in organising lucrative coursing events outlined in Chapter two. The demand was made with the express knowledge that Duffey at least was a compromised figure. 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 accepted expenses from

[93] The *Weekly Press*, 25 January 1905, p. 55. J. F. Grierson was the chairman of the council of the NZAAA.
[94] Belich, *Paradise Reforged*, pp. 29-30.
[95] The *Referee*, 19 October 1904, p. 6.
[96] The *Referee*, 14 September 1904, p. 6.

clubs wishing to add 'tone and importance to what would otherwise have been obscure meetings.'[97] 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.[98] 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.[99] 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.'[100] 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 disinterest in these games.[101] 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 was to be paid for this purpose. The Englishman countered that if the extra money were not paid, he would

---

[97] The *Referee*, 22 January 1902, p. 7.
[98] Gordon, *Australia and the Olympic Games*, p. 41.
[99] The *Referee*, 18 January 1905, p. 1.
[100] The *Weekly Press*, 25 January 1905, p. 55.
[101] Matthew P. Llewellyn, 'Chariots of Discord: Great Britain, Nationalism and the "Doomed" 1924 Paris Olympic Games,' *Contemporary British History*, vol. 24, no. 1, March 2010, p. 72.

immediately return home. Eventually a sum of £60 was agreed upon, allowing the tour to continue.[102] 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.[103] 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.[104] 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.'[105] 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*.[106] 'Tattler', the *Sportsman's* athletic writer, questioned whether Shrubb and Duffey deserved the title of 'gentleman amateurs.'[107] 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

[102] The *Otago Witness*, 9 May 1906, p. 53.
[103] The *Otago Witness*, 3 February 1909, p. 62.
[104] For an example of an amateur apologist, see Daly, *One Hundred Years of Australian Sport*, pp. 40-2.
[105] Amateur Athletic Union of Australasia [Hereafter AAUA], *Articles of Agreement, Laws for Athletic Meetings, Rules for Competitions, Record conditions, etc.*, Sydney: AAUA, 1899, p. 12.
[106] Ripley, 'New South Wales Professional Sculling,' p. 13.
[107] The *Sydney Sportsman*, 5 April 1905, p. 6.

tour as a cynical money-making exercise. To this writer, 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.'[108] 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.[109]

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 banning bookmakers from the track.[110] Nevertheless these criticisms constitute a writer for a working class newspaper criticising his middle class contemporary 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.'[111] This conflict is significant in Australian Olympic historiography as working class athletes have traditionally been disproportionately successful in Olympic competition.[112] '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

---

[108] The *Sydney Sportsman*, 29 March 1905, p. 2.
[109] The *Sydney Sportsman*, 29 March 1905, p. 2.
[110] The *Sydney Sportsman*, 19 April 1905, p. 4.
[111] Cashman, *Paradise of Sport*, p. 54.
[112] Howell and Howell, *Aussie Gold*, p. 358.

with the receipt of expenses.'[113] The revelation of Duffey's suspension a matter of weeks later was 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.[114]

Coombes' response to the news of Shrubb's disqualification was quite astonishing. 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.[115]

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 that:

> 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.[116]

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

---

[113] The *Referee*, 11 October 1905, p. 6.
[114] The *Referee*, 1 November 1905, p. 6.
[115] The *Referee*, 11 October 1905, p. 6.
[116] The *Referee*, 13 April 1904, p. 6.

> 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.[117]

'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 for 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.[118]

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.[119] 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

[117] The *Star*, 11 March 1904, p. 1.
[118] Ray Crawford, 'Athleticism, Gentlemen and Empire in Australian Public Schools: L.A. Adamson and Wesley College, Melbourne,' Wray Vamplew (ed.), *Sport and Colonialism in 19th Century Australasia*, Campbelltown: Australian Society of Sports Historians (ASSH), ASSH Studies in Sports History: No. 1, 1986, p. 49.
[119] The *Referee*, 1 November 1905, p. 6.

> 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.[120]

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.[121] 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 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.[122]

Rather than accepting his complicity 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:

---

[120] The *Referee*, 29 November 1905, p. 8.
[121] The *Referee*, 29 November 1905, p. 8.
[122] The *Referee*, 17 January 1906, p. 6.

> [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.[123]

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 was pure, while more northerly regions were especially prone to deviant acts. Shrubb was referred to as the Horsham wonder and was a member of the South London Harriers club.[124] 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.[125]

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.[126]

The Rowley Tour

Coombes' denigration of 'promoting clubs' was disingenuous given the support that Sydney athlete Stanley Rowley received from 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 Paris in 1900.[127] The matter was taken up by Coombes in his role as athletics

[123] The *Referee*, 11 October 1905, p. 6.
[124] The *Referee*, 11 October 1905, p. 6.
[125] The *Referee*, 7 March 1906, p. 8.
[126] The *Referee*, 7 March 1906, p. 8.
[127] Amateur Athletic Union of Australasia, Minutes of Meeting, 10 November 1899, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, p. 8. Ironically, Rowley, along with P. Frankel of Queensland, moved the motion to defer consideration of the question.

contributor to the *Referee* and given a measure of support by the *Sydney Morning Herald*, who printed details of the foundation of a fund-raising committee.[128] 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."[129]

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 citizen's 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.[130]

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.[131]

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

---

[128] The *Sydney Morning Herald*, 2 March 1900, p. 3.
[129] The *Referee*, 11 April 1900, p. 6.
[130] The *Referee*, Wednesday, May 9, 1900, p. 6.
[131] The *Australasian*, 13 January 1900.

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.[132] Coombes expressed surprise at this development, and speculated that he had competed at a charity meet in aid of the Boer War effort.[133] 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.[134] 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.'[135] Rowley thus took advantage of the very northern athletic culture that Coombes would blame for Shrubb's professional conduct.

Rowley also spent significant time racing in the Midlands. Amongst his most significant performances were those at 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 9000 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

[132] 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.
[133] The *Referee*, 20 June 1900, p. 6.
[134] The *Referee*, 11 July 1900, p. 6.
[135] The *Referee*, 22 August 1900, p. 6.

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.[136] 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.'[137] 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.[138] 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.[139]

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

[136] The *Referee*, 15 August 1900, p. 6.
[137] The *Referee*, 18 July 1900, p. 6.
[138] The *Referee*, 26 March 1902, p. 6.
[139] The *Referee*, 9 July 1902, p. 6; The *Referee*, 29 August 1902, p. 6.

clubs also joining the Football League proper.[140] 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.[141] 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.[142] 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.'[143] While this may indicate a stricter awareness about the implications of the tour, 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.[144] While this may be true in this breach, Duffey's reputation would have been as known to Melburnians as to Sydneysiders given the regard that the *Referee*

---

[140] For an idea of the distribution of clubs in these leagues, see Tony Mason, *Association Football and English Society 1863-1915*, Brighton, UK and Atlantic Highlands, NJ: The Harvester Press and Humanities Press, 1980, pp. 64-68.
[141] Mason, *Association Football and English Society*, pp. 45-46. Charles P. Korr, 'West Ham United Football Club and the Beginnings of Professional Football in East London, 1895-1914,' *Journal of Contemporary History*, vol. 13, no. 2, April 1978, p. 213.
[142] Mason, *Association Football and English Society*, p. 157.
[143] The *Australasian*, 29 October 1904.
[144] The *Australasian*, 4 November 1905.

was held in sporting circles.[145] 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 recognition 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 cricket and athletics 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 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 crossed amateur lines. The divergent circumstances of the various sports have obscured this commonality. These processes have become synonymous with professional sport as

[145] For a discussion of the regard in which the *Referee* was held, see Chris Cunneen, 'Elevating and Recording the People's Pastimes: Sydney Sporting Journalism 1886-1939,' Richard Cashman and Michael McKernan (eds.), *Sport: Money, Morality and the Media*, Kensington: New South Wales University Press, 1981, pp. 162-76.

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 as 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 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 of northern professionalism from 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 Midland clubs during his tour of England in 1900. This displays a contingent response to issues related to amateurism and raises questions as to his 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. Whereas the first chapter suggested that the background of Richard Coombes was not compatible with traditional understandings of amateurism, this chapter 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.

Chapter Four – Defining the Australasian Amateur Community

The Carrington Athletic Grounds at Moore Park in Sydney were named after Englishman Lord Carrington, the Liberal Governor of New South Wales.[1] He 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

---

[1] John A. Daly, 'Track and Field,' Wray Vamplew and Brian Stoddart (eds.), *Sport in Australia: A Social History*, Cambridge, UK, New York, NY and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1994, p. 257.
[2] New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association, *Annual Report*, 17 July 1889, New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association Records, ML MSS 5573: Box 3 – Annual Reports, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, 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] The *Sydney Morning Herald*, 21 July 1887, p. 5.

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 athletes who competed in professional football competitions – 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 gives an insight into the ambiguities of amateurism. Despite the English roots of amateurism, a path suited to local conditions was sought by Australasian officials.

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 who played these and other games in a

[4] Jeffrey Hill, '"I'll Run Him": Alf Tupper, Social Class and British Amateurism,' *Sport in History*, vol. 26, no. 3, December 2006, p. 511.
[5] Tony Collins, 'The Ambiguities of Amateurism: English Rugby Union in the Edwardian Era,' *Sport in History*, vol. 26, no. 3, December 2006, p. 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, *Paradise of Sport: The Rise of Organised Sport in Australia*, South Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1995, pp. 54-71.], or as sections within a chapter [Daryl Adair and Wray Vamplew, *Sport in Australian History*, Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1997, pp. 37-40].

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 James Thorpe at the 1912 Olympic Games was due to class issues rather than racial discrimination.[11] Apologists for amateurism often view professional sport as inherently corrupt and so 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 'indolent and idle; even wastrels and parasites.'[12] As such, the sad decline of Aboriginal professional sprinter Charlie Samuels into alcohol abuse and early death suits Daly's gloomy perspective. By contrast

---

[7] Richard Holt, *Sport and the British: A Modern History*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1990, p. 98.
[8] Adair and Vamplew, *Sport in Australian History*, p. 38.
[9] Douglas Booth and Colin Tatz, *One-Eyed: A View of Australian Sport*, St Leonards: Allen and Unwin, 2000, p. 50.
[10] S.W. Pope, *Patriotic Games: Sporting Traditions in the American imagination, 1876-1926*, Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press, 2007, p. 19.
[11] Allen Guttmann, *The Olympics: A History of the Modern Games*, Urbana and Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2002, p. 34.
[12] Maurice T. Daly, *One Hundred Years of Australian Sport: A History of the New South Wales Sports Club*, Sydney: New South Wales Sports Club, 1996, p. 41.

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.[13] 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.'[14] 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.[15] 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.'[16] This chapter extends Tatz's attempts to bring to light the experiences of aboriginals in amateur athletics. It compares the overtly racist views of bodies such as the Queensland Amateur

---

[13] Colin Tatz, *Obstacle Race: Aborigines in Sport*, Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 1996, p. 91.
[14] Tatz, *Obstacle Race*, p. 88.
[15] See Tatz, *Obstacle Race* and Brendan Hokowhitu, 'Rugby and *Tino Rangatiratanga*: Early Māori Rugby and the Formation of "Traditional" Māori Masculinity,' *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 21, no. 2, May 2005, pp. 75-95.
[16] Tatz, *Obstacle Race*, p. 103.

Athletic Association [QAAA] with the superficially liberal views of other administrators. The QAAA bore an extremely intolerant attitude towards indigenous involvement 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.[17] 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 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.[18] 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 a blanket ban, commenting that 'there are intelligent Australian

[17] Tatz, *Obstacle Race*, p. 88.
[18] Tatz, *Obstacle Race*, p. 88.

Aboriginals in the land without question. I am told Tommy is very intelligent and educated into the bargain.'[19]

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 James 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.[20] 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.[21] 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 elsewhere.

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 *Referee* correspondent in Brisbane

[19] The *Referee*, 25 March 1903, p. 6.
[20] Daryl Adair, 'Rowing and Sculling,' Wray Vamplew and Brian Stoddart (eds), *Sport in Australia: A Social History*, Cambridge, UK, New York, NY and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1994, pp. 179-80; Stuart Ripley, *Sculling and Skulduggery: A history of professional sculling*, Sydney: Walla Walla Press, 2009.
[21] Reet Howell and Max Howell, *Aussie Gold: The Story of Australia at the Olympics*, Melbourne: Brooks Waterloo, 1988, p. 358.

was certainly disappointed at the handicap Campbell was given at the St Patrick's Day Sports in question.[22] He was an experienced athlete and selected as a representative on the prospective 1898 Australasian athletic tour of England.[23] 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.[24] 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 amateur athletes.

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'.[25] 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

---

[22] The *Referee*, 25 March 1903, p. 6.
[23] The Australasian Amateur Conference, *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, 1897, p. 14.
[24] Murray G. Phillips, *From sidelines to centre field: A history of sports coaching in Australia*, Sydney: UNSW Press, 2000, p. 19.
[25] The *Referee*, 29 July 1903, p. 6.

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. [26] 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.[27]

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.'[28] 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.[29] Influential Māori activist Peter 'Te Rangihiroa' Buck was the long jump champion of New Zealand in 1903.[30] 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.'[31] The NZAAA considered Māori 'to be on a

---

[26] Helen Irving, *To Constitute a Nation: A Cultural History of Australia's Constitution*, Cambridge, UK and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1997, p. 112.
[27] Bain Attwood and Andrew Markus, *The 1967 Referendum: Race, Power and the Australian Constitution*, Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press, 2007, p.vi.
[28] The *Referee*, 29 July 1903, p. 6.
[29] Victorian Amateur Athletic Association, *Programme - Australasian Athletics Championships*, Melbourne, 26 January 1914, Davis Sporting Collection 1, Box 6 – Amateur athletics association carnivals, 1899-1931, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia [Hereafter DSC 1 Box 6]. p. 13.
[30] James Belich, *Paradise Reforged: A History of the New Zealanders From the 1880s to the Year 2000*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2001, p. 213. Buck's Māori appellation was derived from Brendan Hokowhitu, '"Physical Beings": Stereotypes, Sport and the "Physical Education" of New Zealand Māori,' *Sport in Society*, vol. 6, no. 2, June 2003, p. 208.
[31] Donald Denoon and Philippa Mein Smith, with Marivic Wyndham, *A History of Australia, New Zealand, and the Pacific*, Oxford, UK and Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2000, p. 197.

different footing from Australian aboriginals.'[32] 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.[33]

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.'[34] The willingness of New South Wales athletic administrators to legitimise the overtly racist policies of the QAAA by not demanding that a racially non-discriminatory amateur standard be applied also requires criticism. 'Liberal' states legitimising the more reactionary views of overtly racist states by allowing them to frame particularly discriminatory laws is part of a wider socio-legal pattern. As Helen Irving argues, the Australian constitution 'addressed [indigenous Australians] only as [the] antithesis of the white Australian.'[35] 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.

---

[32] The *Otago Witness*, 5 August 1903, p. 50.
[33] Quoted in Greg Ryan, '"Extravagance of Thought and Feeling": New Zealand Reactions to the 1932/33 Bodyline Controversy,' *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 13, no. 2, May 1997, p. 43.
[34] Tatz, *Obstacle Race*, p. 88.
[35] Irving, *To Constitute a Nation*, p. 113.

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 the name of James Thorpe 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.[36] 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.'[37] 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.[38]

He 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 [noted American shot-putter, discus and hammer thrower] Ralph Rose.[39]

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:

---

[36] The *Referee*, 15 April 1914, p. 9.
[37] The *Referee*, 13 January 1909, p. 10.
[38] The *Argus*, 17 February 1914, p. 12; The *Brisbane Courier*, 17 February 1914, p. 3; The *Hobart Mercury*, 17 February 1914, p. 5; The *Sydney Morning Herald*, 17 February 1914, p. 10. My thanks to Bruce Coe for informing me about this suggestion.
[39] The *Referee*, 15 April 1914, p. 9.

> [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.[40]

'Tattler' of the *Sydney Sportsman*, a critic of the suggestion, described 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].'[41] Both these responses rely on racist assumptions based on stereotyped views about the capabilities of Aboriginal people, most obviously in the *Sydney Morning Herald's* representation of Aboriginal culture as primitive. A similar observation, that Aboriginals possessed a limited skill set and that their capabilities were restricted, is also observable in 'Tattler's' criticism of the scheme.

Racial stereotyping also influenced the access of New Zealand Māori to amateurism. Hokowhitu argues that Māori rugby footballers have been represented 'typically for their physicality as opposed to the innovativeness, intelligence and the *tino rangatiratanga* that Tom Ellison embodied.'[42] At first glance, it appears that the experience of Māori athletes defies this view, as they were perceived to possess greater intelligence and 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

[40] The *Sydney Morning Herald*, 17 February 1914, p. 10.
[41] The *Sydney Sportsman*, 18 February 1914, p. 5.
[42] Hokowhitu, 'Rugby and *Tino Rangatiratanga*,' p. 89. Hokowhitu defines *Tino Rangatiratanga* as 'chieftainship – also commonly referred to as self-determination.' [Hokowhitu, 'Rugby and *Tino Rangatiratanga*, p. 76.]

evinced by white colonials.'[43] 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. Coombes' use of inverted commas around the word 'developed' could be perceived to betray doubts over whether such a project was truly possible.

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.'[44] 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.'[45] The views of 'Amateur' and Ingram regarding Māori correlate to early twentieth century stereotypes of African-American athletes and performers that presuppose

---

[43] Mark Williams, '"The finest race of savages the world has seen": How Empire Turned Out Differently in Australia and New Zealand,' Vanessa Agnew and Jonathon Lamb with Daniel Spoth (eds.), *Settler and Creole Reenactment*, Basingstoke, UK and New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009, p. 223.
[44] The *Otago Witness*, 27 January 1909, p. 62.
[45] Wallie Ingram, 'Maori Personalities in Sport,' *Te Ao Hou* [*The New World*], No. 4, Autumn 1953, p. 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.), *The Oxford Companion to New Zealand Literature*, Auckland, NZ: Oxford University Press, 1998. http://teaohou.natlib.govt.nz/journals/teaohou/about.html#oxford_en. Accessed on 13 June 2009]

a ‘natural rhythm.’ This view has been given fresh impetus in more recent times by the success of Polynesian rugby footballers.[46] 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.[47]

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 involvement 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.

---

[46] John M. Hoberman, *Darwin’s Athletes: How Sport has Damaged Black America and Preserved the Myth of Race*, Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 1997, p. 126.

[47] For a criticism of this view, see Chris Valiotis, ‘Suburban Footballers of Pacific Islander Ancestry: The Changing Face of Rugby League in Greater Western Sydney,’ Andrew Moore and Andy Carr (eds.), *Centenary Reflections: 100 Years of Rugby League in Australia*, Melbourne: Australian Society for Sports History, 2008, pp. 145-46.

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'.[48] 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 County Championship, which saw first-class competition based on locality.[49] 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 akin to professionalism.[50]

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

[48] Holt, *Sport and the British*, p. 25.
[49] James Bradley, 'Inventing Australians and Constructing Englishness: Cricket and the Creation of a National Consciousness, 1860-1914,' *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 11, no. 2, May 1995, pp. 43-44.
[50] Bradley, 'Inventing Australians,' pp. 35, 42.

> 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 feel 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.[51]

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".'[52] 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, from Lord Frederick Beauclerk, who reckoned to make six hundred guineas a year from the game, through W.G. Grace to twentieth-century 'shamateurs', 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.[53]

Rather than forbidding amateurs to play against professionals, cricket developed a division of labour within teams. Amateurs 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

---

[51] Tony Collins, *Rugby's Great Split: Class, Culture and the Origins of Rugby League Football*, London, UK and Portland, OR: Frank Cass, 1998, p. 51.
[52] Collins, *Rugby's Great Split*, p. 51.
[53] Derek Birley, *The Willow Wand: Some Cricket Myths Explored*, London, UK: Simon and Schuster [Sportspages], 1989, p. 13.

convenient, and bows to those social regulations.'[54] The simplicity with which Harris broaches the subject indicates that cricket had not 'passed through the scathing fires' at all, but had not faced the hard questions that football and athletics were in the process of dealing with. This suggests that multiple currents of amateurism were developing even within British circles.

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.[55] 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.'[56] The dominance of professional soccer was so firmly established by 1914 that it was the AFA 'that was now subject to "stringent conditions."'[57] In contrast, the English Rugby Football Union [RFU] remained an amateur body in principle, and contact with professionals was

[54] The *Times*, 22 January 1909, p. 19.
[55] Tony Mason, *Association Football and English Society 1863-1915*, Brighton, UK and Atlantic Highlands, NJ: The Harvester Press and Humanities Press, 1980, pp. 74-76.
[56] Dilwyn Porter, 'Revenge of the Crouch End Vampires: The AFA, the FA and English Football's "Great Split", 1907-1914,' *Sport in History*, vol. 26, no. 3, December 2006, p. 407.
[57] 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,' p. 425.]

strictly prohibited. Its refusal to allow broken-time payment, or money lost through playing the game, contributed to the formation of the breakaway Northern Union in 1895.[58] 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.[59]

The Australasian Union and team sports

Of 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.[60] The great Australian cricketer Victor Trumper won this event at the athletics carnival held in conjunction with Australian Federation celebrations in January 1901.[61] 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.'[62]

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

[58] See Collins, *Rugby's Great Split*, pp. 138-148. Amateur rugby footballers aligned to the RFU remained hostile to their professional rugby league counterparts until professionalism was legalised in 1995.
[59] Francis Murray, *The British Open: A History of Golf's Greatest Championship*, Lincolnwood, IL: Contemporary Books, 2000, p. 11.
[60] See Amateur Athletic Union of Australasia [Hereafter AAUA], *Articles of Agreement, Laws for Athletic Meetings, Rules for Competitions, Record conditions, etc.* [Hereafter *Handbook*], Sydney: AAUA, 1899, p. 27, for rules regarding the 'Throwing Cricket Ball' competition.
[61] Richard Cashman, *Sport in the National Imagination: Australian Sport in the Federation Decades*, Sydney, Walla Walla Press, p. 221.
[62] AAUA, *Handbook*, p. 12.

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.'[63] This was similar to By-Law IX of the Amateur Athletic Union of Canada agreed to at its founding in 1909. This read '[a]n amateur shall not lose his amateur status by competing with or against a professional in cricket, golf or indoor bowling.'[64] In 1896 the English Amateur Athletic Association [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.[65] This decision was ratified at the AAA's Annual General Meeting in March.[66]

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.[67] The exceptions to the definition, including the games clause, were unanimously agreed to during the third sitting

---

[63] New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association, *Handbook*, Sydney: New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association, 1896, p. 15.
[64] Amateur Athletic Union of Canada [AAUC], *Constitution and By-Laws of the Amateur Athletic Union of Canada*, Toronto, ON: AAUC, 1909, p. 15, Davis Sporting Collection 2, Box 18 Athletics: Australia, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia.
[65] 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, University of Birmingham Special Collections Department, Birmingham, United Kingdom [Hereafter AAA/4/1].
[66] 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, University of Birmingham Special Collections Department, Birmingham, United Kingdom [Hereafter AAA/1/2/2/4].
[67] Australasian Amateur Conference, *Minutes of Meeting*, p. 3.

of the meeting on 5 October.[68] 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.[69] 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.[70]

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.[71]

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.[72] 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.

---

[68] Australasian Amateur Conference, *Minutes of Meeting*, pp. 5-6.
[69] The *Referee*, 6 October 1897, p. 6; The *Referee*, 13 October 1897, p. 7; The *Sydney Morning Herald*, 8 October 1897, p. 6.
[70] AAUA, *Handbook*, pp. 12-13.
[71] AAUA, *Handbook*, pp. 13.
[72] Murray G. Phillips, 'Diminishing Contrasts and Increasing Varieties: Globalisation Theory and "Reading" Amateurism in Australian Sport,' *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 18, no. 1, November 2001, p. 22.

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.[73]

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.'[74] 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.[75] 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.[76]

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

---

[73] The *Referee*, 17 June 1908, p. 10.
[74] The *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, pp. 29-30. (Hereafter 'Scrapbook,' Commission d'amateurisme 1908 á 1971)].
[75] The Amateur Sporting Federation of New South Wales [ASFNSW], *Articles of Agreement*, Sydney: ASFNSW, 1908, p. 7. Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia.
[76] The *Referee*, 17 June 1908, p. 10.

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.[77] 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 only required to wait one year.[78] High rates of applications for reinstatement were taken by amateur athletic bodies as evidence that amateurism was usurping professionalism as the

[77] The *Sporting Life*, 13 January 1909, 'Scrapbook,' Commission d'amateurisme 1908 á 1971, p. 30.
[78] AAUA, *Handbook*, p. 13-14.

dominant sporting form in Australasia. The 1906 Annual Report of the NZAAA commented that

> 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.[79]

The NSWAAA made similar claims in its annual report of 1910.[80] 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.[81]

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 importance of the reinstatement clause to rural athletes was particularly strong 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.[82]

In 1907 the NZAAA suggested a change in the reinstatement laws, whereby an athlete that 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

---

[79] 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.
[80] New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association, *Annual Report*, 27 April 1910, Box 3, NSWAAA Records.
[81] 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.
[82] The *Star*, 14 December 1905, p. 1.

the larger New South Wales and Queensland voted against the measure.[83] 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, an issue that will be more thoroughly dealt with in Chapter eight.

The reinstatement programme of Australasian athletics officials seems to have 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. [84] 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.'[85]

Australasian amateurism rested on a premise foreign to most conceptions of amateurism, that amateur status could be conferred on a subject by merit rather than birth or social standing as was the case in Britain. This is particularly true when amateurism sought to establish itself in regions where professionalism was dominant, such as in the foundation

[83] The *Referee*, 12 June 1907, p. 8.
[84] Amateur Athletic Union of Australasia, Minutes of Meeting, 17 August 1909, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, p. 7.
[85] 'Qrius' (Sports Editor *Natal Advertiser*), *South African Champions … Springbok Athletes (Illustrated)*, Durban, SA: P. Davis and Sons, 1907, p. 15.

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.[86] 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[87]

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.'[88] 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

[86] 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*, E. S. Marks Sporting Collection, Box Q82 – Miscellaneous sports – Letters and Minute Books, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia [Hereafter Marks Q 82], pp. 1-7.
[87] The *Referee*, 8 August 1894, p. 3.
[88] The *Referee*, 8 August 1894, p. 3.

> to the Secretary of the Q.A.A.A. on or before MONDAY, the 15th October, 1894, otherwise their claims will not be considered.[89]

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.[90] 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.[91] R. C. Reid, a New South Wales athlete who traveled to Brisbane, commented that he 'was glad that kindred associations were springing up' during an unofficial reception to welcome the intercolonial athletes.[92]

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 suggested that a sort of amnesty be offered to athletes who become 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

[89] The *Brisbane Courier*, 21 September 1894, p. 8; The *Queenslander*, 29 September 1894, p. 578.
[90] The *Brisbane Courier*, 6 October 1894, p. 5.
[91] The *Brisbane Courier*, 8 October 1894, p. 4.
[92] The *Brisbane Courier*, 16 October 1894, p. 4.

Australia Amateur Athletic Association be formed in Perth with a self-governing centre in the goldfields.[93]

Central Queensland and the Western Australian goldfields are historically two of Australia's most significant mining regions.[94] 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.'[95] 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.[96]

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. Richard Coombes' unorthodox English influences meant that Australasian amateurism was not constrained by abstract notions of amateurism aped from an idealised conception of English amateurism.

---

[93] The *Referee*, 15 February 1905, p. 6.
[94] Geoffrey Blainey, *The Rush That Never Ended: A History of Australian Mining*, Carlton: Melbourne University Press, 2003, pp. 87, 178, 190-93.
[95] John Perry, *The Quick & the Dead: Stawell & Its Race Through Time*, Sydney: UNSW Press, 2002, p. 1.
[96] Percy Mason, *Professional Athletics in Australia*, Adelaide: Rigby, 1985, p. 35.

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.[97] 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

[97] Ian Heads, *True Blue: The Story of the NSW Rugby League*, Randwick: Ironbark Press, 1992, pp. 76, 81, 121 and 127.

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.[98]

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.[99] 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.[100] Miller's middle-class status was underlined by gossip that he would underwrite any loss incurred by James Joynton Smith, the entrepreneur that orchestrated the conversion of the Wallabies, through the fourth Wallabies versus Kangaroos match.[101]

Despite these actions, Miller successfully maintained his amateur 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

---

[98] For details of Miller's biographical details, see the Hindsight radio programme, 'The Greatest Game,' ABC Radio National, Broadcast on 19 March 2009 at 1 p.m., http://www.abc.net.au/rn/hindsight/stories/2009/2515606.htm Accessed on 19 March 2009.

[99] '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, 'From Suburban Football to International Spectacle: The Commodification of Rugby League in Australia, 1907-1995,' *Australian Historical Studies*, vol.29, no.110, April 1998, pp. 33-36.

[100] Sean Fagan, *Rugby Rebellion: The Divide of League and Union*, Kellyville: RL2008, 2005, pp. 277-81. See The *Referee*, 21 August 1907, p. 10 for an example of Giltinan's claims to the amateur nature of the rugby league movement.

[101] Smith had organised a fourth match after the takings from the first matches had proved insufficient. [Fagan, *Rugby Rebellion*, p. 299.]

amateur status.[102] Miller was suspended as an amateur athlete after being suspended by the NSWRU. 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.[103] 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.'[104]

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.'[105] 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 – now known as the Sydney Cricket Ground,

[102] The *Referee*, 20 January 1909, p. 10.
[103] The ASFNSW, *Articles of Agreement*, p. 14.
[104] The *Referee*, 27 January 1909, p. 10.
[105] The *Referee*, 4 May 1909, p. 9.

Sydney's most important sports venue during the late nineteenth and for most of the twentieth century – offers an indication of Royston College's status.[106] Marks had a successful athletics career at Royston, winning events over 150 and 220 yards during the school's sports meet in 1889 and being appointed an honorary secretary of the school's amateur athletic club in 1888.[107] 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.[108] Marks' response to the disqualification of Miller indicates that he was influenced by a more idealistic and less tolerant view than Coombes. They derived their conceptions of amateurism from different sources, Coombes from his experiences of English amateur sport as it actually was and Marks from an abstract diffusion of ideals through education. This distinction provided an important tension in the development of amateurism in Australia.

Nevertheless, the actions of the Australasian Union were in keeping with decisions reached 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.[109]

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

---

[106] The *Sydney Morning Herald*, 21 May 1887, p. 2; The *Sydney Morning Herald*, 13 June 1889, p. 9.
[107] The *Sydney Morning Herald*, 13 June 1889, p. 9; The *Sydney Morning Herald*, 16 April 1888, p. 5.
[108] The *Queenslander*, 6 August 1898, p. 266; The *Brisbane Courier*, 23 January 1899, p. 7; The *Sydney Morning Herald*, 24 June 1930, p. 9.
[109] Amateur Athletic Association, Minutes of Meeting, 23 November 1895, AAA/1/2/2/4.

recognise the suspensions of the A.A.A.'[110] This motion ratified a decision reached at a conference between the AAA, the National Cyclist's Union and the Amateur Swimming Association on 16 November 1895.[111]

Despite the ruling of the Union executive, 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.[112] 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.'[113] A motion to secede from the ASFNSW was debated by the NSWAAA on 27 April 1910.[114] Coombes related that:

> 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.[115]

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.[116] The decision of Coombes and Rowley was also employed in New Zealand. The NZAAA

---

[110] Amateur Athletic Association, Minutes of Meeting, 23 November 1895, AAA/1/2/2/4.
[111] Amateur Athletic Association, Report of A.A.A., N.C.U. and A.S.A. Conference Adjourned Meeting, 16 November 1895, AAA/4/1.
[112] The *Sydney Morning Herald*, 15 October 1909, p. 7
[113] The *Sydney Morning Herald*, 29 April 1910, p. 7.
[114] The *Sydney Morning Herald*, 28 April 1910, p. 7.
[115] The *Referee*, 4 May 1910, p. 9.
[116] The *Sydney Morning Herald*, 23 July 1910, p. 13.

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.[117] It reiterated this decision in advice to the Canterbury Rugby League after it inquired into the status of rugby league players in 1913.[118]

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.[119]

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.[120] The *Sydney Morning Herald* 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.[121]

---

[117] 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], pp. 216-18.
[118] NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 3 February 1913, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0658, p. 244.
[119] Ernie Howes, Circular to New South Wales amateur sporting bodies, 21 March 1908, Marks Q 82.
[120] Howes, Circular, Marks Q 82.
[121] The *Sydney Morning Herald*, 20 March 1908, p. 10.

Despite the views of the NSWASA, the ASFNSW definition of what constituted an amateur included a similar games clause to that of the NSWAAA.[122]

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.'[123] 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.[124] 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.'[125]

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.[126] Professional boxers were considered particularly offensive to strict amateurs, due to the disdain for prize fighting. According to Bob Petersen, boxing 'has hardly ever been considered, along with wrestling, as more than

---

[122] ASFNSW, *Articles of Agreement*, p. 7.
[123] Sean Fagan, '"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, 2008, p. 21.
[124] W. F. Mandle, 'Baker, Reginald Leslie (Snowy) (1884-1953),' *Australian Dictionary of Biography: Volume 7*, Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1979, pp. 150-52. http://adbonline.anu.edu.au/biogs/A070152b.htm Accessed on 30 September 2009.
[125] Cashman, *Sport in the National Imagination*, p. 229. Mandle, 'Baker.'
[126] The *Sydney Morning Herald*, 22 April 1909, p. 10.

a low sport, though higher than cock-fighting and ratting.'[127] Correspondents to the *Referee* 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.'[128] However, in 1932 boxing writer Jack Gell criticised Baker for his role in the professionalisation of swimmer and boxer Harold Hardwick in 1915.[129] 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.[130]

Gell considered that Hardwick had been matched with a tough opponent too early in his career. Not only did this cruel his boxing career, it left him unable to compete as a 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 lax amateur standards. The Victorian Amateur Rowing Association allowed manual labourers and those

---

[127] Bob Petersen, 'Boxer Shorts,' *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 26, no. 1, May 2009, p. 88.
[128] The *Referee*, 22 April 1925, p. 10.
[129] Hardwick's battle to return to the amateur swimming fold is covered in Katherine Moore and Murray Phillips, 'The Sporting Career of Harold Hardwick: One Example of the Irony of the Amateur-Professional Dichotomy,' *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 7, no. 1, November 1990, pp. 61-76.
[130] The *Referee*, 2 March 1932, p. 11.

that had accepted money in other sports to compete as amateurs.[131] 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.[132] 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.'[133] 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.'[134] 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.'[135]

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 that committed a breach after 1 January 1911.[136] This new definition also included a games

---

[131] Ripley, *Sculling and Skulduggery*, p. 8.
[132] Ripley, *Sculling and Skulduggery*, pp. 9-11, vi.
[133] The *Sydney Morning Herald*, 22 April 1909, p. 10.
[134] The *Referee*, 28 April 1909, p. 10.
[135] The *Referee*, 9 June 1909, p. 10.
[136] 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,

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).'[137] 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.[138] 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.[139] He played for the Newtown rugby league club during its premiership season of 1910, but thereafter played for Marrickville at the sub-district level.[140]

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

---

whether in the form of a pize, 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, E. S. Marks Sporting Collection, Q51 Box 7b – Football, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, p. B1.]

[137] NSWRU, Circular to members, p. B2.

[138] The *Referee*, 7 December 1910, p. 9.

[139] 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. http://naa12.naa.gov.au/scripts/imagine.asp?B=11506714&I=1&SE=1 Accessed on 7 November 2009.

[140] Terry Williams, *Through Blue Eyes: A Pictorial History of Newtown RLFC*, Newtown: Newtown RLFC, 2008, p. 23.

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.[141] 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.'[142]

Legislative action on the part of the executive was necessary as the clubs refused to acquiesce to this suggestion. The move was 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.'[143] This exchange suggests that Coombes did not have a free hand with which to operate. While it is apparent that he did not want

[141] The *Sydney Morning Herald*, 19 August 1910, p. 8.
[142] The *Sydney Morning Herald*, 23 July 1910, p. 13. Coombes obviously supported this interview, as he reprinted in his *Referee* column on the 27th with only minor changes.
[143] The *Referee*, 28 September 1910, p. 9.

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.[144] 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.[145] 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.[146]

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, he expressed concerns that players allowed to remain amateurs would later join the professional ranks.[147]

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

---

[144] For details of the manner in which Sullivan obtained and abused power, see Pope, *Patriotic Games*, pp. 31-32, 42-54.
[145] The *Referee*, 7 June 1911, p. 9.
[146] The *Sydney Sportsman*, 26 July 1911, p. 5.
[147] The *Referee*, 14 June 1911, p. 9.

debarred from other forms of amateur sport.[148] 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.'[149] 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,[150] commented that

> 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.[151]

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

---

[148] The *Referee*, 25 October 1911, p. 9.
[149] The *Sydney Morning Herald*, 14 June 1911.
[150] As Coombes was in England managing the Australasian Festival of Empire team at the time, it is unlikely that he made the comment.
[151] The *Referee*, 7 June 1911, p. 9.

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 Australasia, although its application was contingent on 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.[152] 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.'[153] This effectively drove a wedge between Coombes and the rest of New South Wales' 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.'[154] 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.'[155]

[152] The *Referee*, 28 October 1914, p. 10.
[153] The *Referee*, 12 July 1911, p. 9; The *Referee*, 19 July 1911, p. 9.
[154] The *Referee*, 7 April 1920, p. 10.
[155] The *Referee*, 28 March 1923, p. 9.

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.[156] 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.[157] 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.[158] This is despite the florid and often overwrought recognition of the deaths of other less important figures within the NSWOC minutes.[159] 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.'[160] 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,

---

[156] 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.]

[157] New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association, *Annual Report*, 28 April, 1932, Box 3, NSWAAA Records.

[158] 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].

[159] New South Wales Olympic Council, Minutes of Council Meetings, 18 September 1929 and 22 December 1930, Harry Gordon Papers, NSWOC Records.

[160] The Richard Coombes Testimonial, 27 April 1931, Marks Q 82.

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 thesis 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 opening 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 that 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

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 that 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 espousing a liberal conception of amateurism, and 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. Previous chapters have demonstrated that Richard Coombes was influenced by more diverse 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 thesis where Britishness is subordinate to the concept of amateurism. The previous chapters would perhaps indicate that this thesis 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.[161] 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 espoused by radical nationalists.[162] 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.[163] 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.[164]

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 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

---

[161] Neville Meaney, 'Britishness and Australian Identity: The Problem of Nationalism in Australian History and Historiography,' *Australian Historical Studies*, vol. 32, no. 116, April 2001, p. 84; Tony Collins, 'Australian Nationalism and Working-Class Britishness: The Case of Rugby League Football,' *History Compass*, 3 AU 142, 2005, p. 7.
[162] Meaney, 'Britishness and Australian Identity,' p. 89.
[163] Belich, *Paradise Reforged*, pp. 29-30.
[164] Derek M. Schreuder and Stuart Ward, 'Introduction: What Became of Australia's Empire?,' Derek M. Schreuder and Stuart Ward (eds.), *Australia's Empire*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2008, pp. 11-12.

show how the Australasian Union engaged in English domestic debates, placing it in its international context.

Chapter Five – '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, wrote this series and played his only two test matches for England before it was printed. Portus' 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.'[2] However, during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries the distinction between nations was not stark and a number of individuals represented adopted and multiple countries.[3] Portus' 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 Three 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

---

[1] The *Referee*, 22 April 1908, p. 8.
[2] John Hoberman quoted in Richard Cashman, *Sport in the National Imagination: Australian Sport in the Federation Decades*, Sydney: Walla Walla Press, 2002, p. 233.
[3] For example, a number of cricketers represented Australia after being 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, *Australian Test Cricketers*, Sydney: ABC Books, 2001.]

entice Alfred Shrubb and Arthur Duffey to tour Australasia in 1905. Chapter Four has demonstrated that a differing conception of amateurism 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 that 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

[4] See Garth Henniker and Ian Jobling, 'Richard Coombes and the Olympic Movement in Australia: Imperialism and Nationalism in Action,' *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 6, no. 1, November 1989, pp. 2-15; Ian Jobling, 'In Pursuit of Status, Respectability and Idealism: Pioneers of the Olympic Movement in Australasia,' J.A. Mangan and John Nauright (eds.), *Sport in Australasian Society: Past and Present*, London, UK and Portland, OR: Frank Cass, 2000, pp. 142-63; Katharine Moore, 'One Voice in the Wilderness: Richard Coombes and the Promotion of the Pan-Britannic Festival Concept in Australia 1891-1911,' *Sporting Traditions*, May 1989, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 188-203; Ian Jobling, 'The Making of a Nation Through Sport: Australia and the Olympic Games from Athens to Berlin, 1898-1916,' *Australian Journal of Politics and History*, vol. 34, no. 2, August 1988, pp. 160-72.

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 expatriate New Zealand historian J. G. A. Pocock's concept of 'British History' 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

[5] Henniker and Jobling, 'Imperialism and Nationalism in Action,' p. 13.
[6] J. G. A. Pocock, 'British History: A Plea for a New Subject,' *New Zealand Journal of History*, vol. 8, no. 1, 1974, p. 7.
[7] J. G. A. Pocock, 'Conclusion: Contingency, Identity, Sovereignty,' Alexander Grant and Keith J. Stringer (eds.), *Uniting the Kingdom? The Making of British History*, London, UK: Routledge, 1995, p. 295.
[8] Pocock, 'Conclusion,' p. 300.

Europeans all the time.'[9] Pocock criticised this view from a New Zealand perspective, 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 our own.'[11]

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.'[12] 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.'[13] Pocock argues that British History 'takes on a global dimension' through the establishment of colonial societies.[14] British History offers a way to avoid histories of former colonies falling into a 'highly insular mode of its own derivation.'[15] Neville Meaney

---

[9] Pocock, 'British History,' p. 4.
[10] Pocock, 'Conclusion,' p. 297.
[11] J. G. A. Pocock, 'The New British History in Atlantic Perspective: An Antipodean Commentary,' *The American Historical Review*, vol. 104, no. 2, April 1999, p. 493.
[12] Stuart Ward, 'Sentiment and Self-interest: The Imperial ideal in Anglo-Australian Commercial Culture,' *Australian Historical Studies*, vol. 32, no. 116, April 2001, pp. 102, 104.
[13] Pocock, 'Conclusion,' p. 297; David Cannadine, 'British History as a "new subject": Politics, perspectives and prospects,' Alexander Grant and Keith J. Stringer (eds.), *Uniting the Kingdom? The Making of British History*, London, UK: Routledge, 1995, p. 16.
[14] Pocock, 'British History,' p. 19.
[15] Pocock, 'British History,' p. 20.

has argued that 'Australia needs a new British history which incorporates the Oceanic Greater Britain into its tale.'[16] 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.'[17] Meaney argues that 'the heroes of 'nationalist history [such as John Curtin and Ben Chifley] appear to have identified with this myth of Britishness.'[18]

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.'[19] 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.[20] 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.'[21] 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.'[22] Collins suggests that aspects of Australian sporting culture considered expressions of Australian nationalism, such as forthrightness, egalitarianism and opposition to snobbery,

---

[16] Neville Meaney, 'Britishness and Australia: Some Reflections,' *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, vol. 31, no. 2, May 2003, p. 133.
[17] Neville Meaney, 'Britishness and Australian Identity: The Problem of Nationalism in Australian History and Historiography,' *Australian Historical Studies*, vol. 32, no. 116, April 2001, p. 77.
[18] Meaney, 'Britishness and Australian Identity,' p. 80.
[19] Tony Collins, 'Australian Nationalism and Working-Class Britishness: The Case of Rugby League Football,' *History Compass*, 3 AU 142, 2005, p. 6.
[20] Collins, 'Australian Nationalism,' pp. 2-4.
[21] Tony Collins, 'The Tyranny of Deference: Anglo-Australian Relations and Rugby Union before World War II,' *Sport in History*, vol. 29, no. 3, September 2009, p. 443.
[22] Meaney, 'Britishness and Australian Identity,' p. 84.

were identical to aspects of northern English sport that stressed difference with southern English sporting culture.[23]

While not explicitly adopting a British History 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 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.[24] 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.[25] 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.'[26] 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.[27] As such, an investigation of sporting aspects is necessary for the innovations of British History to be fully realised. Historians employing a British History posture cannot cede the cultural practice of sport as an irredeemable site of nationalism. The insights of British History are as applicable to the study of sport as they are to other fields of academic study.

---

[23] Collins, 'Australian Nationalism,' p. 7.
[24] Richard Cashman, *The 'Demon' Spofforth*, Kensington: New South Wales University Press, 1990, p. 194.
[25] John Rickard, 'Response: Imagining the Unimaginable?' *Australian Historical Studies*, vol. 32, no. 116, April 2001, p. 129.
[26] Meaney, 'Britishness and Australian Identity,' p. 78; Rickard, 'Response,' p. 130.
[27] Collins, 'The Tyranny of Deference,' p. 438.

Three elements of British 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.'[28] 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.'[29] 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."'[30] This aspect of British 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

[28] Meaney, 'Britishness and Australian Identity,' p. 89.
[29] James Belich, *Making Peoples: A History of the New Zealanders From Polynesian settlement to the end of the nineteenth century*, Auckland, NZ: Penguin Books, 2007, p. 304.
[30] Derek M. Schreuder and Stuart Ward, 'Introduction: What Became of Australia's Empire,' Derek M. Schreuder and Stuart Ward (eds.), *Australia's Empire*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2008, pp. 11-12.

each other. By employing both, the complexities of imperial relations can be better expressed. While Belich's definition of 'Better Briton' 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 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.[31]

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

[31] Collins, 'The Tyranny of Deference,' p. 438.

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.[32] 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 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].[33] 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.'[34] 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.[35] However, a closer examination of sources demonstrates that English delegates at this meeting in fact displayed a lack of advocacy on

[32] 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, University of Birmingham Special Collections Department, Birmingham, United Kingdom.
[33] Michael Letters and Ian Jobling, 'Forgotten Links: Leonard Cuff and The Olympic Movement in Australasia, 1894-1905,' *Olympika: The International Journal of Olympic Studies*, vol. 5, 1996, pp. 92-94.
[34] Harry Gordon, *Australia and the Olympic Games*, St Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1994, pp. 36-37.
[35] For a reproduction of the letter, see Gordon, *Australia and the Olympic Games*, pp. 441-43.

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 Cyclist's 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.[36] 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.[37]

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

[36] 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 a 1971].
[37] International Athletics Congress of Paris Commission on Amateurism, Minutes of Meeting, 20 June 1894, Commission d'amateurisme 1908 a 1971.

their word of honour.'[38] 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.[39] These examples indicate that the English delegates did not advocate on the Victorian's behalf, despite Gordon's assertion. Rather, French delegates that 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.[40]

Such assertions are problematised when Coombes' publicity efforts to secure passage for 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.[41] While 'Harrier' in the Melbourne

---

[38] International Athletics Congress of Paris Commission on Amateurism, Minutes of Meeting, 20 June 1894, Commission d'amateurisme 1908 a 1971.
[39] International Athletics Congress of Paris Commission on Amateurism, Minutes of Meeting, 20 June 1894, Commission d'amateurisme 1908 a 1971.
[40] Jobling, 'The Making of a Nation,' p. 161.
[41] The *Referee*, 26 January 1898, p. 7.

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.'[42]

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 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 that 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.[43] 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.'[44] 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

[42] The *Australasian*, 5 February 1898.
[43] The *Referee*, 12 April 1899, p. 6.
[44] The *Referee*, 25 January 1899, p. 6.

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 honor that can be attained.[45]

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.[46] The *Referee* contained reports about the 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.'[47]

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 100 yards. 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,

---

[45] The *Referee*, 16 August 1899, p. 6.
[46] Peter Lovesey, *The Official Centenary History of the Amateur Athletic Association*, Enfield, UK: Guinness Superlatives, 1979, p. 50.
[47] The *Referee*, 5 March 1899, p. 5.

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.[48]

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.[49] The 'Olympic Medal Winners' database on the official International Olympic Committee [IOC] website, lists America as winning sixteen events to Britain's four.[50] 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.[51]

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 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:

---

[48] The *Referee*, 25 April 1900, p. 6.
[49] Lovesey, *The Amateur Athletic Association*, p. 50.
[50] 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,' http://www.olympic.org/uk/athletes/results/search_r_uk.asp, Accessed on 18 August 2009].
[51] Gordon, *Australia and the Olympic Games*, pp. 36-37.

> 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.[52]

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.[53]

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.'[54] Nevertheless, he adopted a thwarted Britishness posture 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.'[55] The circumstances surrounding Sydney sprinter Stanley Rowley's tour of England and France in 1900 provide the context for this outburst.

---

[52] *The Referee*, 29 August 1900, p. 6.
[53] The *Australasian*, 29 December 1900.
[54] The *Referee*, 16 January 1901, p. 6.
[55] The *Referee*, 23 October 1901, p. 6.

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.'[56] David Cannadine has demonstrated 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.'[57] During this period, ritual surrounding the monarchy became inherently imperial. Three years prior to Rowley's visit, colonial premiers and troops marched in the parade honouring the fiftieth anniversary of Victoria's coronation.[58] Herbert's rejection of

[56] The *Referee*, 5 September 1900, p. 6.
[57] David Cannadine, 'The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual: The British Monarchy and the "Invention of Tradition", c. 1820-1977,' Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (eds.), *The Invention of Tradition*, Cambridge, UK, New York, NY and Oakleigh, VIC: Cambridge University Press, 1988, p. 120.
[58] Cannadine, 'The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual,' p. 124.

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.[59] 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.[60] 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.[61] Speculation reigned that Voigt would defy his resultant AAA suspension and run for Victoria at the 1911 Australasian championships after he migrated to Melbourne.[62] 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 Voigt 'incurr[ing] the displeasure of the English A.A.A.' through his actions.[63] In any event, Voigt did not run at this or any other Australasian championships. Nevertheless, the resolution of the NZAAA reiterates the gulf

[59] Collins, 'Australian Nationalism,' p. 7.
[60] Lovesey, *The Amateur Athletic Association*, p. 62.
[61] Emil Voigt, 'Inauguration of the A.A.U.,' The *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, University of Birmingham Special Collections Department, Birmingham, United Kingdom.
[62] The *Referee*, 20 September 1911, p. 9.
[63] 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, p. 178.

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 that were more closely aligned with their own views. This enabled the Australasian Union to remain within the British fold despite them rejecting aspects of the AAA approach to amateurism.

Better Britain: The Australasian Union and the Sympathetic English

Although funds were eventually found to send Rowley abroad in 1900, the inaugural meeting of the Australasia Union Board of Control held in Brisbane in December 1899 decided that there were insufficient funds to him abroad.[64] 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 that Rowley was able to tour. 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.[65] 'Old Blue' (probably in the *Sporting Life*) 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

[64] Amateur Athletic Union of Australasia, Minutes of Meeting, 10 November 1899, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, p. 8.
[65] Reprinted in The *Referee*, 28 March 1900, p. 6.

stated objective of 'foster[ing] and popularis[ing]' the sport, and argued that the AAA's responsibility extended beyond England's shores.[66]

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.[67]

'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 that:

> 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.[68]

The Australian athlete-as-loyalist representation was particularly powerful at this point in time as South African sportsman 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 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

[66] The *Referee*, 17 January 1900, p. 5.
[67] The *Referee*, 28 March 1900, p. 6.
[68] The *Referee*, 17 January 1900, p. 5.

volunteers had done.[69] 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.[70]

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.' [71] 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' are 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. Historians have traditionally used press debates about amateurism to

---

[69] Dean Allen, '"Cricket's Laird": James Logan and the Development of the "Imperial Game" in South Africa, 1888-1902,' *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 26, no. 1, May 2009, pp. 63-65.
[70] Tony Collins, *A Social History of English Rugby Union*, London, UK and New York, NY: Routledge, 2009, pp. 168-69.
[71] The *Sydney Morning Herald*, 16 April 1900, p. 5.

differentiate the nature 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' on the basis of 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.'[72] 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 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.[73] 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.'[74] In short, British journalists criticised Australian and American amateur standards as part of a defence of Britain's position as the leaders 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

---

[72] S. W. Pope, *Patriotic Games: Sporting Traditions in the American imagination, 1876-1926*, Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press, 2007, pp. xxiv-xxv.
[73] James Bradley, 'Inventing Australians and Constructing Englishness: Cricket and the Creation of a National Consciousness, 1860-1914,' *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 11, no. 2, May 1995, pp. 42-43.
[74] Pope, *Patriotic Games*, p. 46.

supremacy. They sought to ensure that their criticism of English amateurism as it stood remained at the centre of debates. '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.[75] 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.[76] This exchange culminated in 'Old Blue's' suggestion that £250 be made available to Australasian athletes as a way to forestall American athletic dominance.[77] 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* submission to the IOC on a general definition of amateurism in his capacity as a senior writer for that paper. Chapter Four of this thesis 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.'[78] '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]

[75] The *Referee*, 11 January 1899, p. 6.
[76] The *Referee*, 26 July 1899, p. 5.
[77] The *Referee*, 17 January 1900, p. 5.
[78] Murray G. Phillips, 'Diminishing Contrasts and Increasing Varieties: Globalisation Theory and "Reading" Amateurism in Australian Sport,' *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 18, no. 1, November 2001, p. 23.

could serve '[a]s a basis' for a general definition of an amateur athlete.[79] This suggestion also enhanced the position of Australasian governing bodies within the British amateur fold, as it conferred a degree of prestige on them absent in their 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.[80]

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[81], 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.[82] This is certainly true when the Amateur Rowing Association is considered, but does not take into account the wide-

---

[79] The *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, pp. 29-30 [Hereafter 'Scrapbook,' Commission d'amateurisme 1908 á 1971].
[80] The *Sporting Life*, 23 December 1908. 'Scrapbook,' Commission d'amateurisme 1908 á 1971, p. 23.
[81] The banning of manual labourers from competing as amateurs.
[82] Daryl Adair, 'Rowing and Sculling,' Wray Vamplew and Brian Stoddart (eds.), *Sport in Australia: A Social History*, Cambridge, UK, New York, NY and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1994, p. 180.

ranging controversy surrounding the manual bar in English rowing circles.[83] 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.[84] '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.'[85] 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 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.[86] 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

[83] Richard Holt, *Sport and the British: A Modern History*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1990, pp. 107-10; Phillips, 'Diminishing Contrasts,' pp. 24-25.
[84] Stephen Wagg, '"Base Mechanic Arms"? British Rowing, Some Ducks and the Shifting Politics of Amateurism,' *Sport in History*, vol. 26, no. 3, December 2006, p. 526.
[85] The *Sporting Life*, 6 January 1909. 'Scrapbook,' Commission d'amateurisme 1908 á 1971, pp. 27-28.
[86] The *Sporting Life*, 1 December 1908. 'Scrapbook,' Commission d'amateurisme 1908 á 1971, p. 17.

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.'[87]

'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.'[88] 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 hosted 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.'[89] 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 M.P.

---

[87] The *Sporting Life*, 30 December 1908. 'Scrapbook,' Commission d'amateurisme 1908 á 1971, p. 25.
[88] The *Sporting Life*, 30 December 1908. 'Scrapbook,' Commission d'amateurisme 1908 á 1971, p. 25.
[89] See Matthew P. Llewellyn, 'A Nation Divided: Great Britain and the Pursuit of Olympic Excellence, 1912-1914,' *Journal of Sport History*, vol. 35, no. 1, Spring 2008, pp. 74-83.

and former secretary of the ARA Rudolph C. Lehmann 'fulminated that the Olympic scheme proposed to the public "means specialisation."'[90] Specialisation was a key criticism of American sport made by British critics, particularly after the 1908 Olympic Games that saw relations strained between the two countries.[91]

The centrepiece of the Special Committee was an £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* newspaper characterised the work of the Special Committee (which included a number of aristocrats) as 'plebian fussiness.'[92] The apathy of the general public was underlined as the Special Committee failed to meet its objective as under £11000 was raised by the end of 1913, a result that saw the Committee retired.[93] This public apathy reiterates that the fear of specialisation was widespread amongst the British sporting public.[94]

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.'[95] 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

---

[90] Llewellyn, 'A Nation Divided,' p. 78.
[91] Allen Guttmann, *The Olympics: A History of the Modern Games*, Urbana and Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2002, p. 35.
[92] Llewellyn, 'A Nation Divided,' pp. 82-83.
[93] Llewellyn, 'A Nation Divided,' p. 88.
[94] Llewellyn, 'A Nation Divided,' p. 87.
[95] Henniker and Jobling, 'Imperialism and Nationalism in Action,' p. 9.

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.[96]

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 resulted in 'a veritable champion of champions.' Coombes characterized 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.[97]

[96] The *Referee*, 11 July 1900, p. 6.
[97] The *Referee*, 18 July 1900, p. 6.

Again, Coombes supported his views with the testimony of likeminded 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.'[98]

Coombes' call for the emulation of American methods was based on the assumption that it was 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 seen as 'the epitome of modernity' and as a potential threat to British claims to international pre-eminence.[99] 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.[100]

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. American journalists such as Franklin Matthews that 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

[98] The *Referee*, 29 August 1900, p. 6.
[99] Duncan Bell, *The Idea of Greater Britain: Empire and the Future of World Order, 1860-1900*, Princeton, NJ and Oxford, UK: Princeton University Press, 2007, pp. 254-59.
[100] Charles Bright and Michael Geyer, 'Where in the World Is America? The History of the United States in the Global Age,' Thomas Bender (ed.), *Rethinking American History in a Global Age*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA and London, UK: University of California Press, 2002, p. 81.

Australian naval defence increasingly in the hands of Japan and its resultant refusal to allow Australia to create a navy of its own.[101] 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.

Austral[as]ia's Empire: The Australasian Union and Like-minded English Officials

The trend towards embracing likeminded 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 that 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 Swimdom.' Henry had advocated a tour by an English swimming champion to Australia in his role as 'consul for Australia.'[102] 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.' The refusal to relax the 'stringent [amateur] rules at present laid down' provided echoes of the AAA's decision not to provide

[101] David Walker, *Anxious Nation: Australia and the Rise of Asia 1850-1939*, St Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1999, pp. 93-97.
[102] The *Referee*, 29 May 1907, p. 12

assistance to the Union in 1900 and proved the death knell for the tour.[103] George Hearn, the honorary secretary of the Amateur Swimming Association [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.'[104]

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 life saving focus in swimming. After seeking to place life saving 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.[105] 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 breaches of the amateur statutes.[106] These ideas rested on the promotion of sport as a

---

[103] The *Times*, 10 December 1906, p. 7.
[104] The *Referee*, 29 May 1907, p. 12.
[105] Christopher Love, '"Whomsoever You See in Distress": Swimming, Saving Life and the Rise of the Royal Life Saving Society,' *International Journal of the History of Sport*, vol. 24, no. 5, May 2007, pp. 671-72.
[106] Christopher Love, 'Social Class and the Swimming World: Amateurs and Professionals,' *International Journal of the History of Sport*, vol. 24, no. 5, May 2007, p. 612.

recreational avocation. 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:

> 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*.[107]

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.

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 that shared similar understandings about the nature of amateur sport. Not only were they able to reaffirm their British status through these bonds, they were able 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.' The remaining part of this chapter will concentrate on Australasian responses to the 1911 Festival of Empire. A focus on this event will demonstrate how these three concepts related to each other in a more compact context.

[107] Archibald Sinclair and William Henry, *Swimming*, London, UK: Longmans, Green, 1894, pp. 25-28.

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.[108] 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. Katherine 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.'[109] The remainder of this chapter will address the impact of this issue on developing notions of Britishness in Australian sport.

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.[110] 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 Sports. Henry 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

[108] Alison C. Kay, 'Villas, Values and the *Crystal Palace Company*, c.1852-1911,' *The London Journal*, vol. 33, no. 1, March 2008, p. 36.
[109] Moore, 'One Voice in the Wilderness,' p. 200.
[110] Sean Brawley, '"Our Life-Savers"': The Royal Life Saving Society and the origins of surf life saving in Federation Sydney,' Richard Cashman *et al* (eds.), *Sport, Federation, Nation*, Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW, 2001, p. 153.

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.[111] 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.[112]

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.[113] 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 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.[114] 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

[111] The *Referee*, 7 December 1910, p. 9.
[112] The *Referee*, 14 December 1910, p. 9.
[113] Ramachandra Guha, *A Corner of a Foreign Field: The Indian History of a British Sport*, London, UK: Picador, 2002, p. 118.
[114] Meaney, 'Britishness and Australia,' pp. 129-30.

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.'[115] 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 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.[116]

The special mentions offered to these two figures reflects the manner in which Australian officials embraced English figures that 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.[117]

---

[115] Cashman, *Sport in the National Imagination*, p. 146.
[116] 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.
[117]See The *Times*, 18 August 1913, p. 6; and Llewellyn, 'A Nation Divided,' p. 81.

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.[118] Henry also offered extensive help to New Zealand swimmer Malcolm Champion during the Stockholm Olympics, advancing him a sum of £66. 19. 2 to allow Champion to compete.[119] 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 leveled 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 travelers' while in Marseilles en route to London.[120]

Moore has pointed out that Coombes took the opportunity to criticise the lack of interest taken by English sporting figures in the Dominions when in England.[121] The explanatory paradigm outlined throughout this chapter 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

[118] Harold Hardwick, Diary Entries, 21 April 1911, 26 April 1911, 26 June 1911, Harold Hardwick Collection, CY 2481: diary, correspondence and related papers, 1911-1959, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia [Hereafter Harold Hardwick Collection].
[119] 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.
[120] Harold Hardwick, Diary Entries, 11 April 1911 and 14 April 1911, Harold Hardwick Collection.
[121] Moore, 'One Voice in the Wilderness,' p. 198.

central to Coombes' criticisms. Three aspects of Coombes' dealings with British administrators offer an indication about the type of Britishness that was expressed through athletics. In terms of thwarted Britishness, 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 the athletic organisations of the Empire to 'find a means of returning the visits of Australasian, Canadian and South African athletes, and also controlling inter-Empire sport.'[122]

Coombes' solutions to these issues continued to place Australasia as an integral part of the Empire and reflected the idea of 'Australia's Empire' and recolonial tendencies. Coombes 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 pointed to 'a [political] conference, upon terms of equality, between the Overseas Dominions and the Mother Country; could not the same kind be brought about in athletics?'[123] 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 dispute between the AAA and the NCU.[124] 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 were 'an equal member of the British family of nations.'

[122] The *Referee*, 9 August 1911, p. 1.
[123] The *Referee*, 9 August 1911, p. 1.
[124] The *Referee*, 9 August 1911, p. 1.

But, as Collins has argued with respect to rugby, English sporting administrators took the position of leadership 'and expected everyone else to follow.'[125] 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. For all his pleas to be considered as a leader of Imperial athletic affairs comparable to the most senior English administrator, he clung tenaciously to the notion of Imperial unity. It was in this forum 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.[126] 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.[127] 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

[125] Collins, *English Rugby Union*, p. 161.
[126] Charles Little and Richard Cashman, 'Ambiguous and Overlapping Identities: Australasia at the Olympic Games, 1896-1914,' Richard Cashman *et al* (eds.), *Sport, Federation, Nation*, Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW, 2001, pp. 87-88, 93.
[127] Little and Cashman, 'Ambiguous and Overlapping Identities' pp. 87-88.

Empire Sports.[128] 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.'[129] This scheme was later approved by the Olympic reform movement in England and by the AAUC.[130]

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.[131] 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

[128] The *Referee*, 18 October 1911, p. 9; The Referee, 17 January 1912, p. 9.
[129] The *Referee*, 27 September 1911, p. 9.
[130] Llewellyn, 'A Nation Divided,' p. 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, p. 14
[131] The *Referee*, 21 August 1912, p. 1.

aimed at attracting her attention and affirming the place of her offspring as an important and integral part of the family.

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. This can be viewed as both a recolonial response, as Australasians tenaciously held on to their British status, and as an expression of a more localised expression of imperialism. The interrelated nature of these expressions of Britishness was underlined in Richard Coombes' 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 the 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. Canada steadfastly employed their amateur definition, rather than engaging in the gymnastics that allowed the Australasian Union to extend the franchise of amateurism. 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.

Chapter Six – North American Cousins: Relations with the United States and Canada

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 that 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

[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].

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.

The place of Canada in the pan-British community is compromised by its large Francophone community, particularly in the province of Quebec. Gregory S. Kealey and Greg Patmore also describe this community as 'the major difference' when trying to compare Canada to Australia.[2] However, 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 waned throughout the early twentieth century.[3] Even at the zenith of Montréal's influence over Canadian sport, the Francophone influence appears to be 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.'[4] Gilbert concluded that the success of the MAAA was due to

---

[2] Gregory S. Kealey and Greg Patmore, 'Comparative Labour History: Australia and Canada,' *Labour/Le Travail*, vol. 38, Fall 1996/*Labour History*, vol. 71, November 1996, pp. 11-12.
[3] Don Morrow, 'A Case-Study of Amateur Conflict: The Athletic War in Canada, 1906-1908', *The British Journal of Sports History*, vol. 3, no. 2,December 1986, p. 173.
[4] W. R. Gilbert, *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, 1898, p. 101. The Bibliothèque et Archives nationales Québec note that the Montreal Witness showed great intolerance to the Irish and 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, 'The Montreal witness [microforme]', http://bibnum2.banq.qc.ca/bna/mtlwitness/ Accessed 16 November 2009.]

> 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.[5]

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.[6] In a sporting context, it remains apt to describe Canadian amateur sport as part of a pan-British community.

It will become clear that 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.

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 cofounder of the New York Athletic Club

[5] Gilbert, *Sports of Greater Britain*, p. 103.
[6] Gilbert, *Sports of Greater Britain*, pp. 103-4.

[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.[7] 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.[8] 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.'[9]

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' death after being caught in a blizzard on the weekend of 30 June and 1 July 1900. Coombes had previously refrained from announcing the calamity in the vain hope that 'the rumors [of his death] might prove foundationless.' Coombes asked his readers to pardon him from making an in-depth declaration about Curtis' 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.[10]

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

---

[7] S. W. Pope, *Patriotic Games: Sporting Traditions in the American Imagination, 1876-1926*, Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press, 2007, pp. 23-24.
[8] Pope, *Patriotic Games*, p. 23.
[9] Chris Cunneen, 'Elevating and Recording the People's Pastimes: Sydney Sporting Journalism 1886-1939,' Richard Cashman and Michael McKernan (eds.), *Sport: Money, Morality and Media*, Kensington: New South Wales University Press, 1981, pp. 164-65.
[10] The *Referee*, 22 August 1900, p. 6.

which I am reminded of the deceased.'[11] While much of this tribute is consistent with 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.[12] This offer was one amongst several offered by American athletics figures, including an offer from AAU Registration Committee chairman James E. Sullivan to pay forty percent 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.[13] 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

[11] The *Referee*, 29 August 1900, p. 6.
[12] The *Referee*, 9 February 1898, p. 7.
[13] The *Referee*, 2 February 1898, p. 1; The *Referee*, 17 August 1898, p. 6.

[AAA] steadfastly refused to take.[14] 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.[15]

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 that 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

[14] The *Referee*, 2 February 1898, p. 1.
[15] The *Referee*, 9 February 1898, p. 1.

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.[16] 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.[17] Curtis in fact was used as a link to the outside world that Gordon has previously argued that Herbert played.[18] 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.[19] 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

[16] The *Referee*, 28 December 1898, p. 6.
[17] The *Referee*, 19 April 1899, p. 6.
[18] Harry Gordon, *Australia and the Olympic Games*, St Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1994, pp. 36-37.
[19] Allen Guttmann, *The Olympics: A History of the Modern Games*, Urbana and Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2002, p. 25.

‘[i]n no place but America’.[20] Coubertin also criticised Sullivan’s nationalist tendency, arguing that his vigorous support for the American team caused the ‘Battle of Shepherd’s Bush’ between American and British athletes at the London Olympics of 1908.[21] Taking their cues from Coubertin, historians have generally presented Sullivan as a disruptive influence within the Olympic Movement.[22] Wassong’s work that 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.[23] Even Sullivan’s attempts to patch up his differences with Coubertin after the 1908 Olympic Games have been viewed as cynical.[24]

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 …[25]

---

[20] 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, ‘The Changing Nature of the Ideology of Olympism in the Modern Olympic Era,’ unpublished PhD Thesis, Loughborough University, 2005, p. 105.]. Coubertin is quoted in Guttmann, *The Olympics*, p. 26.
[21] Pierre de Coubertin, *Olympic Memoirs*, Lausanne, Switzerland: International Olympic Committee, 1997, p. 103; Matthew P. Llewellyn, *Rule Britannia: Nationalism, Identity and the Modern Olympic Games*, London, UK: Routledge, 2011. Forthcoming.
[22] Guttmann, *The Olympics*, pp. 24-5.
[23] Stephan Wassong, *Pierre de Coubertin's American Studies and Their Importance for the Analysis of His Early Educational Campaign*, Würzburg, Germany: ERGON Verlag, 2004, p. 13
[24] Guttmann, *The Olympics*, p. 28.
[25] 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.

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.[26] 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.[27]

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].[28] Coombes eventually received a cablegram on the 30th of 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.[29] The funds sent by Sullivan were returned to him despite the departure of Victorians Corrie Gardner and Leslie Macintosh to St Louis. The funds were returned on the basis that no 'representative

[26] The *Referee*, 9 December 1903, p. 6.
[27] The *Referee*, 11 May 1904, p. 6.
[28] The *Referee*, 25 May 1904, p. 6.
[29] The *Referee*, 6 July 1904, p. 6.

champions in accordance with the special cabled invitation', indicating the lack of regard with which these athletes were held.[30]

The relationship between Coombes and Sullivan inevitably lost its intensity following the unsatisfactory completion of these negotiations. Chapter Three 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 accused 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.[31]

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.'[32]

[30] The *Referee*, 20 July 1904, p. 4.
[31] Guttmann, *The Olympics*, pp. 29-30. Pietri had collapsed before the line and was helped over by British officials, who declared him the winner.
[32] The *Referee*, 16 September 1908, p. 1.

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[33], the Australasian manager, spectators and athletes[34], Belgians[35], Swedes[36], Canadians[37] and Hungarians[38] 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's reported 'very kind treatment' on the part of British officials.[39] Victorian long distance runner George Blake criticised his treatment by English administrators in the 'thwarted Britishness' tradition, but was repudiated by Coombes.[40]

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.[41] 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

[33] The *Referee*, 26 August 1908, p. 10; The *Referee*, 21 October 1908, p. 10; The *Referee*, 1 September 1909, p. 9.
[34] The *Referee*, 21 October 1908, p. 10; The *Referee*, 4 November 1908, p. 10
[35] The *Referee*, 2 September 1908, p. 10
[36] The *Referee*, 30 September 1908, p. 10.
[37] The *Referee*, 16 September 1908, p. 1.
[38] The *Referee*, 27 January 1909, p. 10.
[39] The *Referee*, 31 October 1908, p. 10.
[40] The *Referee*, 28 October 1908, p. 10.
[41] The *Referee*, 20 January 1909, p. 10.

Robertson, a friend and erstwhile doubles partner of Australia's first Olympic champion Edwin Flack.[42] 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.'[43] 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.[44] 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.

Canada

James Merrick stepped into the breach created by the rift with American athletics figures. A mutually beneficial administrative relationship between he 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

[42] The *Referee*, 13 January 1909, p. 10.
[43] The *Referee*, 31 October 1908, p. 10.
[44] The *Referee*, 4 November 1908, p. 10.

> 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.[45]

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.[46]

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.[47] 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

[45] The *Referee*, 9 August 1911, p. 1.
[46] The *Referee*, 9 August 1911, p. 1.
[47] The *Referee*, 17 April 1912, p. 9.

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.[48] 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.[49]

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.[50] 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[51] 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

[48] The AAUA delegates were listed in the *Referee*, 1 April 1914, p. 9.
[49] The *Referee*, 15 July 1914, p. 11.
[50] The *Referee*, 27 April 1921, p. 9.
[51] 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], pp. 24-25.

finishing point.'[52] 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 Canadian. 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 distanced 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.[53] 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.'[54] The Australasian failure drew Coombes to conclude that

---

[52] Unattributed, *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, NY: American Sports Publishing Co., c.1921, p. 22.
[53] Garth Henniker and Ian Jobling, 'Richard Coombes and the Olympic Movement in Australia: Imperialism and Nationalism in Action,' *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 6, no. 1, November 1989, p. 7.
[54] 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.

> 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.[55]

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 whose word was a law unto them subject to no appeal whatsoever.[56]

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.[57]

While Coombes saw similarities between the administration of Canadian and American teams, Merrick 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 (Quebec). 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

---

[55] Coombes, 'Festival of Empire Games (London 1911) Report of the Tour of the Australasian Team,' NZOC Records, Box 1A.
[56] Coombes, 'Festival of Empire Games (London 1911) Report of the Tour of the Australasian Team,' NZOC Records, Box 1A.
[57] AAUC Minutes, 25 November 1911, AAUC fonds – LAC, p. 50.

emerging centre of sport in twentieth century Canada, Toronto, and the revered hub of organized sport in nineteenth century Canada, Montreal.'[58] The war was sparked off by the decision of the 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.[59] 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.[60] The MAAA then set up the AAFC in February 1907 in an attempt to usurp the authority of the CAAU.[61]

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].'[62] 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.[63]

[58] Morrow, 'The Athletic War in Canada,' p. 173.
[59] Morrow, 'The Athletic War in Canada,' p. 177.
[60] Morrow, 'The Athletic War in Canada,' p. 179.
[61] Morrow, 'The Athletic War in Canada,' pp. 179-80.
[62] Morrow, 'The Athletic War in Canada,' pp. 183-84.
[63] Morrow, 'The Athletic War in Canada,' pp. 184-85.

Merrick 'negotiated an agreement between the two warring factions' and served as the first president of the AAUC.[64] 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.[65] He also served as vice-president and president of the CAAU during the war with the AAFC.[66] 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.[67] 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

---

[64] Garth A. Paton, 'James G. B. Merrick (1871-1946): Sports Organizer, Negotiator, Canada's Second IOC Member,' 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, 2006, p. 255.
[65] Paton, 'James G. B. Merrick,' p. 256.
[66] Paton, 'James G. B. Merrick,' p. 258.
[67] 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, Davis Sporting Collection 2, Box 14 Athletics: U.S.A. and Canada, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, pp. 6-8.

effect, modernity was naturalized 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.[68] 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.'[69] Merrick's critique of Coombes' scheme following initial support for a less radical scheme 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.

[68] Matthew P. Llewellyn, 'A Nation Divided: Great Britain and the Pursuit of Olympic Excellence, 1912-1914,' *Journal of Sport History*, vol. 35, no. 1, Spring 2008, p. 77.
[69] AAUC Minutes, 23 November 1912, AAUC fonds, pp. 8-9.

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.[70] 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 …[71]

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 affect 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

[70] Henniker and Jobling, 'Imperialism and Nationalism in Action,' p. 8; Graeme Davison, 'The imaginary grandstand,' *Meanjin*, vol. 61, no. 3, September 2002, p. 7.
[71] The *Sydney Morning Herald*, 30 October 1912, p. 11.

about the overall administration of the team.[72] 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.[73] 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.[74] 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.[75]

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

---

[72] The *Sydney Morning Herald*, 30 October 1912, p. 11.
[73] Tony Collins, 'The Tyranny of Deference: Anglo-Australian Relations and Rugby Union before World War II,' *Sport in History*, vol. 29, no. 3, September 2009, p. 438; Tony Collins, 'Australian Nationalism and Working-Class Britishness: The Case of Rugby League Football,' *History Compass*, 3 AU 142, 2005, pp. 1-19.
[74] Katharine Moore, 'One Voice in the Wilderness: Richard Coombes and the Promotion of the Pan-Britannic Festival Concept in Australia 1891-1911,' *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 5, no. 2, May 1989, pp. 188-203.
[75] Duncan Bell, *The Idea of Greater Britain: Empire and the Future of World Order, 1860-1900*, Princeton, NJ and Oxford, UK: Princeton University Press, 2007, p. 108.

scheme would operate, with a loose meeting of Empire leaders competing with parliamentary (in Westminster) and extra-parliamentary forms for legitimacy.[76] 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.[77] 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.[78] 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 Four, the Australasian bodies allowed amateur athletes that 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

[76] Bell, *The Idea of Greater Britain*, p. 14.
[77] Bell, *The Idea of Greater Britain*, p. 19.
[78] Bell, *The Idea of Greater Britain*, pp. 15-16.

toughest possible standard to both. 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.'[79] The CAHA disaffiliated from the Canadian Union following a decision to assert that professionals in one sport could not be amateurs in other sports.[80] This decision needs to be seen in light of a nearly quarter of a decade-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.'[81] 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].[82] It claimed to have 'killed [professional football] for good' in Quebec

[79] Alan Metcalfe, 'The Meaning of Amateurism: A Case Study of Canadian Sport, 1884-1970,' *Canadian Journal of the History of Sport*, vol. 26, no. 2, December 1995, p. 34.
[80] Metcalfe, 'The Meaning of Amateurism,' p. 42.
[81] 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, pp. 86-87.]
[82] AAUC Minutes, 22 November 1913, AAUC fonds – LAC, p. 78

during the previous year and reiterated that it sought to 'control professionalism, by keeping it down.'[83] 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.[84] 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.

James Merrick was openly contemptuous of this view, arguing that professional football in Quebec was only 'killed' by a lack of public interest, and that those that attempted to play professionally sought to reclaim their amateur status as a result.[85] 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.'[86] 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.'[87] 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 percent of his members that were also

[83] AAUC Minutes, 22 November 1913, AAUC fonds – LAC, p. 80.
[84] AAUC Minutes, 22 November 1913, AAUC fonds – LAC, pp. 79-82.
[85] AAUC Minutes, 22 November 1913, AAUC fonds – LAC, p. 82.
[86] AAUC Minutes, 22 November 1913, AAUC fonds – LAC, p. 80.
[87] AAUC Minutes, 22 November 1913, AAUC fonds – LAC, p. 58.

engaged in other sport under the control of the Canadian Union.[88] The Canadian Union adopted the 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.'[89] 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.'[90] The ambiguousness in this statement reflects the distance of Canadian sport from sectors of British sport, despite the traditional British influence on Canadian society. 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

[88] AAUC Minutes, 22 November 1913, AAUC fonds – LAC, p. 80.
[89] AAUC Minutes, 26 November 1910, AAUC fonds – LAC, p. 11.
[90] AAUC Minutes, 22 November 1913, AAUC fonds – LAC, p. 80.

Club.[91] 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.[92] 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*.).'[93]

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.[94]

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.

---

[91] Bruce Kidd, 'The First COA Presidents,' *Olympika: The International Journal of Olympic Studies*, vol. 3, 1994, pp. 107-08.
[92] Gregory S. Kealey and Greg Patmore, 'Comparative Labour History: Australia and Canada,' *Labour/Le Travail*, vol. 38, Fall 1996/*Labour History*, vol. 71, November 1996, p. 12.
[93] Morrow, 'The Athletic War in Canada,' p. 174.
[94] Allen Guttmann, *From Ritual to Record: The Nature of Modern Sports*, New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1978, p. 128.

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.'[95] 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.[96] 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.[97] This view has obvious resonances with Vicary Horniman's response to the reinstatement of 'Snowy' Baker outlined in Chapter Four, and underlines the fact that Canada adopted a more exclusivist conception of amateurism than Australasia.

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 that had played professional

[95] AAUC Minutes, 25 and 26 September 1919, AAUC fonds – LAC, pp. 7-9.
[96] AAUC Minutes, 25 and 26 September 1919, AAUC fonds – LAC, pp. 23-24.
[97] AAUC Minutes, 25 and 26 September 1919, AAUC fonds – LAC, pp. 23-24.

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.'[98] The DFA declined to accept these advances, however, and no agreement was reached.[99]

The willingness of the Canadian Union to accept such measures was indicative of a more tolerant attitude within the body to 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.'[100] The new tolerance was reflected in the decision to allow the reinstatement of Class B professionals for a year's trial period.[101] 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.[102]

This view was challenged by the secretary, A. S. 'Pop' Lamb, whom Metcalfe describes as 'a leading defender of the most conservative definition of an amateur.'[103] Lamb suggested that the Canadian 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.[104]

[98] AAUC Minutes, 25, 26 and 27 September 1924, AAUC fonds – LAC, p. 14.
[99] AAUC Minutes, 25, 26 and 27 September 1924, AAUC fonds – LAC, p. 24.
[100] AAUC Minutes, 10, 11 and 12 September 1925, AAUC fonds – LAC, p. 24.
[101] AAUC Minutes, 10, 11 and 12 September 1925, AAUC fonds – LAC, p. 48; for details of the classes of amateurism employed in Canada, see Morrow, 'The Athletic War in Canada,' p. 185. Class B professionals were those that had competed with or against a professional or entered a competition under a false name.
[102] AAUC Minutes, 9, 10 and 11 December 1926, AAUC fonds – LAC, p. 6.
[103] Metcalfe, 'The Meaning of Amateurism,' p. 39.
[104] AAUC Minutes, 9, 10 and 11 December 1926, AAUC fonds – LAC, p. 11

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.[105]

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.'[106]

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.[107] 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'.[108]

---

[105] AAUC Minutes, 1, 2 and 3 December 1927, AAUC fonds – LAC, p. 5.
[106] AAUC Minutes, 1, 2 and 3 December 1927, AAUC fonds – LAC, p. 12.
[107] AAUC Minutes, 3, 4 and 5 December 1931, AAUC fonds – LAC, p. 96.
[108] AAUC Minutes, 8, 9 and 10 December 1932, AAUC fonds – LAC, p. 82.

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.'[109]

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.[110] 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 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

[109] AAUC Minutes, 8, 9 and 10 December 1932, AAUC fonds – LAC, pp. 95-100.
[110] AAUC Minutes, 8, 9 and 10 December 1932, AAUC fonds – LAC, p. 95.

swimming authorities in Britain allowed greater freedom than it did in terms of competing with or against professionals.[111] However, the committee also sought the opinion of IAAF president Sigfrid Edström, who has been described as an 'amateur fundamentalist.'[112] He reiterated that 'in our sports no competitions against professionals, under any circumstances whatsoever, can be permitted.'[113] 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.'[114]

Those that 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'.[115]

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.'[116] The phrase 'British principles' did not just refer to the manner in which British sporting bodies defined amateurs, it had resonances with the way in which middle-class Anglophone Canadians viewed their place in the world. American-funded research conducted by social

---

[111] AAUC Minutes, 16, 17 and 18 November 1933, AAUC fonds – LAC, p. 77.
[112] Leif Yttergren, 'J. Sigfrid Edstrøm and the Nurmi Affair of 1932: The Struggle of the Amateur Fundamentalists Against Professionalism in the Olympic Movement,' 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, 2006, p. 122.
[113] AAUC Minutes, 16, 17 and 18 November 1933, AAUC fonds – LAC, p. 81.
[114] AAUC Minutes, 16, 17 and 18 November 1933, AAUC fonds – LAC, p. 83.
[115] AAUC Minutes, 16, 17 and 18 November 1933, AAUC fonds – LAC, p. 84.
[116] AAUC Minutes, 16, 17 and 18 November 1933, AAUC fonds – LAC, p. 84.

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.'[117] Battrum's use of the phrase 'British principles' employed a wider meaning that would have found resonances with 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.[118]

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.[119]

This view seems to have predominated at this meeting, and the decision to allow reinstatement was made.[120] The Canadian Union also took the decision to place 'soccer football' on the list of pastimes whereby an amateur could compete with or against

---

[117] John Herd Thompson, 'Canada and the "Third British Empire", 1901-1939,' Phillip Buckner (ed.), *Canada and the British Empire*, Oxford, UK and New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2008, p. 100.
[118] AAUC Minutes, 16, 17 and 18 November 1933, AAUC fonds – LAC, p. 107.
[119] AAUC Minutes, 16, 17 and 18 November 1933, AAUC fonds – LAC, p. 108.
[120] AAUC Minutes, 16, 17 and 18 November 1933, AAUC fonds – LAC, p. 112.

professionals without losing their amateur status.[121] It 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 committed themselves to tackling these issues.[122] After a torrid debate it had decided to employ these measures, and had not fallen into bad hands as Merrick had suggested.[123] 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 that 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 that had 'absolutely refrained from professional practices for at least two years.' Those that 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 that had previously been a member of an amateur club before turning professional were required to stand down for three years.[124] 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.[125] Coombes was asked by fellow members of the executive to suggest to the

[121] AAUC Minutes, 16, 17 and 18 November 1933, AAUC fonds – LAC, p. 120.
[122] AAUC Minutes, 16, 17 and 18 November 1933, AAUC fonds – LAC, p. 118.
[123] James Merrick, Letter to Henri Baillet-Latour, 9 January 1934. Correspondance de James Merrick 1913-1940.
[124] The reinstatement clauses of the AAUA can be found at Amateur Athletic Union of Australasia [Hereafter AAUA], *Articles of Agreement, Laws for Athletic Meetings, Rules for Competitions, Record conditions, etc.*, Sydney: AAUA, 1899, pp. 13-15.
[125] AAUA, Minutes of Meeting, 19 August 1909, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia, p. 15.

1911 conference that no amateur that had forfeited their status could be reinstated under any circumstances. The conference paid no heed to this suggestion, and declined to take any action.[126] 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 that had forfeited their status from being reinstated at its 1920 meeting. The decision offered protection to youths that might carelessly lose their amateur status and athletes in rural areas that lived more than fifty miles from an amateur club, however.[127] This decision was softened at the next meeting in 1921 to allow those that had transgressed the amateur statutes before this decision to have the right to apply for reinstatement until February 1923.[128] It struck out the portion of the reinstatement clauses that allowed someone that had knowingly forfeited their amateur status after consultation with Edstrøm in 1924.[129] 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.'[130]

---

[126] AAUA, Minutes of Meeting, 27 December 1911, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia, p. 11.
[127] AAUA, Minutes of Meeting, 6 December 1920, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia, pp. 15-16.
[128] AAUA, Minutes of Meeting, 29 December 1921, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia, p. 7.
[129] 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, pp. 6-7
[130] AAUC Minutes, 16, 17 and 18 November 1933, AAUC fonds – LAC, p. 78. The NZAAA included much the same sports as covered in the original AAUA definition, with the addition of basketball and bowling.

This movement away from reinstatement was also manifested in Australasian representatives in international competitions. New Zealand walker Harry Kerr competed at the 1908 London Olympic Games after being reinstated as a professional 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.'[131] 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.'[132] There appears to be a deliberate campaign of misinformation aimed at ensuring that Kerr's entry for the 1908 Olympics would be accepted despite his past as a professional athlete.

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.'[133] In 1931 the New Zealand Olympic Association sought the opinion of the IOC as to the eligibility of reinstated athletes.[134] The advice that a reinstated athlete that had not knowingly turned professional could compete was unofficially relayed to the NZAAA.[135] From showing open contempt for international

[131] The *Referee*, 17 June 1908, p. 10.
[132] The *Referee*, 27 May 1908, p. 10.
[133] 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, p. 286.
[134] 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], p. 175.
[135] New Zealand Olympic Association, Minutes of Meeting, 10 November 1931, NZOC Records, Minute Book, p. 180.

standards on reinstatement, the athletics community of Australasia came to accept the international norms just at the point when Canada was beginning to rebel.

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."'[136] 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.[137]

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.'[138] 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.'[139] 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 soccer football as a

[136] AAUC Minutes, 15, 16 and 17 November 1934, AAUC fonds – LAC, p. 5.
[137] AAUC Minutes, 15, 16 and 17 November 1934, AAUC fonds – LAC, p. 20.
[138] AAUC Minutes, 15, 16 and 17 November 1934, AAUC fonds – LAC, p. 29.
[139] AAUC Minutes, 15, 16 and 17 November 1934, AAUC fonds – LAC, p. 73.

‘pastime’ lead to confusion amongst the Union’s members as to what actually constituted a pastime.[140]

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 CABA, all presented resolutions to the meeting seeking to allow intermingling. The CABA also sought to have basketball recognised as a pastime.[141] The Canadian Union was growing tired of these interminable debates, and its attitude hardened. Formerly pro-intermingling, P. J. Mulqueen argued that it needed to ‘get rid … of all these cursed resolutions asking to wreck this Union.’ He described the conduct of the CAHA 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.[142] This provided the context for the CAHA to disaffiliate in 1936 and begin the process of the erosion of the Union’s authority.[143]

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.[144] 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.[145] While the Australian criticisms of this tradition celebrated the expression of a more progressive cricket culture, Canadian

---

[140] AAUC Minutes, 15, 16 and 17 November 1934, AAUC fonds – LAC, pp. 105-06.
[141] AAUC Minutes, 21 and 22 November 1935, AAUC fonds – LAC, pp. 64-65.
[142] AAUC Minutes, 21 and 22 November 1935, AAUC fonds – LAC, pp. 79-80.
[143] See Metcalfe, ‘The Meaning of Amateurism,’ pp. 42-44.
[144] AAUC Minutes, 21 and 22 November 1935, AAUC fonds – LAC, p. 74.
[145] W. F. Mandle, ‘Cricket and Australian Nationalism in the Nineteenth Century,’ *Journal of the Royal Australian Historical Society*, vol. 59, No. 4, December 1973, p. 242.

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.

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 find illegal payments.[146] 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.'[147]

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 disinterest of their English counterparts. William 'Father Bill' Curtis and James Sullivan displayed an enthusiasm for Australasian affairs that was lacking from Amateur Athletic Association [AAA] figures such as Charles Herbert. The American relationship

[146] AAUC Minutes, 21 and 22 November 1935, AAUC fonds – LAC, p. 91.
[147] AAUC Minutes, 21 and 22 November 1935, AAUC fonds – LAC, p. 69.

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 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 athletes at the London Games. Coombes was able to solve 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 used 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. Athletic figures 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 that 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 that played football as its amateur statutes prohibited competition with or against professionals and 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 eschewed 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. British influence was also 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 two chapters continue this challenge to nationalism through an investigation of the breakup of 'Australasia' in an athletic sense. The first of these chapters explains the demise of joint Australasian teams. Rather than focusing on the Olympic Games, where joint Australasian representation was most visible, earlier successful and unsuccessful attempts to send Australasian athletes abroad will be examined. The excavation of these administrative efforts will display a tradition of delegating the responsibility of funding 'Australasian' representatives to the constituent members of the Australasian Union. As a result, New Zealand took responsibility for funding its early Olympic representatives rather than being reliant on Australian help. This realisation challenges the previously excepted rationale for the adoption of Australasian representation – that New Zealand required Australian assistance in order to compete at the Olympic Games. The adoption and ultimate rejection of Australasian representation at the Olympic Games will be shown to be related to the Imperial context and the position of Australasia on the International Olympic Committee. The next chapter thus continues the investigation of the expression of a pan-British identity in amateur sport.

Chapter Seven – A Question of Nationalism? The Dissolution of the Australasian Amateur Athletic Relationship – Part 1: Australasian Teams

In 1923, an unknown Australian visitor to New Zealand was disappointed to find Australians held in low regard across the Tasman Sea. The visitor – presumably Victorian – helpfully suggested that the problem could be remedied by the press widening its horizons. He suggested that they look beyond the sensational stories of labour troubles and vice emanating from Sydney. A more favourable opinion of Australia may be developed in New Zealand, he argued, if the uplifting stories of cultural refinement and public works undertaken in Victoria were relayed to the readers of the *New Zealand Times.*[1] This exchange shows that the relationship between Australia and New Zealand was not a simple bilateral engagement, and that factors other than nationalism affected the relationship between the two communities. The relationship between Australia and New Zealand was subject to intercolonial rivalries that developed into interstate and interdominion rivalries as political circumstances changed.

New Zealand historian James Belich describes the nineteenth century Australasian relationship 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 in the Federation of the Australian colonies.[2] The existence of the Amateur Athletic Union of Australasia [AAUA or Australasian Union] and Australasian Olympic teams indicates that this relationship existed in athletics well into the twentieth century. By placing the

[1] The *New Zealand Times*, 19 December 1923, p. 7.
[2] James Belich, *Paradise Reforged: A History of the New Zealanders From the 1880s to the Year 2000*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2001, pp. 440-41.

focus on the relationship between Australia and New Zealand, this chapter extends the analysis contained in the previous two chapters. The foregoing investigation into the vertical relationship has indicated that the concept of nationalism provides insufficient explanatory power to understand the nature of Australia and New Zealand's relationship with Britain and other dominions. Is this true of the Australasian relationship itself? Does nationalism provide sufficient explanatory power to explain the eventual rift in the horizontal relationship between the societies of Australasia? The following two chapters will argue that the dominance of nationalism in the historical understanding needs to be overturned if the Australasian athletic relationship is to be fully understood.

This chapter will address these questions with respect to the formation and ultimate rejection of joint Australasian teams. Existing interpretations that rely on the development of New Zealand nationalism are rejected in favour of an explanation that takes into account Australia and New Zealand's wider imperial context. This context is vital to an understanding of the forces that made Australasia a plausible form of representation at the Olympic Games. New Zealand was not forced into 'partnership' with a dominant Australia until national assertion was possible. This chapter will show that, rather than being weak, New Zealand was capable of selecting and funding its own representatives in Australasian teams. A sense of New Zealand identity was able to be expressed due to the achievements of New Zealand athletes at the Olympic Games and at other important international sporting events. The wider imperial context came under threat from both international pressures and forces within the British world that finally saw national representation embraced by the two communities of Australasia. This factor cannot explain the reasons for the eventual dissolution of the Australasian Union in 1927, and for this reason the discussion of this event is contained within a separate

chapter. An examination of specific developments within the organisation itself offer a more nuanced explanation of the reasons for why this organisation existed for as long as it did before dissolving at a specific historical juncture.

This chapter rejects the notion that a rising New Zealand capability and resultant sense of nationalism are responsible for the shift from Australasian to national representation. New Zealanders were always capable of administering their own affairs and were able to express an identity of their own throughout the era of Australasian representation. This will be established through an examination of not only the Australasian teams that competed at the Olympic Games in 1908 and 1912, but also the planned Australasian tour of 1898 and earlier Australian engagement with the Olympic Games. These earlier efforts will demonstrate that Australian representation at the Olympic Games was based on a tradition of self-reliance on the part of the Australian colonies/states. These units took responsibility for funding their own athletes, developing a pattern that informed the organisational efforts aimed at sending New Zealand athletes to the Olympic Games from 1908. This quasi-independence in terms of administering teams was also evident in the expression of identity. New Zealand was able to express what could be termed a national identity throughout the period of Australasian representation through the achievements of her athletes. A rising capacity and a developing nationalism thus cannot explain the demise of Australasia in Olympic terms. Attention must be paid to the wider imperial context and the position of Australia and New Zealand on the International Olympic Committee [IOC] if the shift towards national representation is to be properly understood.

Australasian Teams 1898-1906

Trans-Tasman athletic contacts were established soon after the independent foundation of the New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association [NSWAAA] and New Zealand Amateur Athletic Association [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 next 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 local 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.[3] 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.[4] They agreed to found the Australasian Union, a decision ratified by the various member associations between December 1898 and March 1899.[5]

The concept of an Australasian athletic team was developed at the same time as the Australasian Union was founded. The Australasian Amateur Conference was

---

[3] Harry Gordon, *Australia and the Olympic Games*, St Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1994, pp. 15-16.
[4] The Australasian Amateur Conference, *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, 1897.
[5] Amateur Athletic Union of Australasia [Hereafter AAUA], *Articles of Agreement, Laws for Athletic Meetings, Rules for Competitions, Record conditions, etc.* [Hereafter *Handbook*], Sydney: AAUA, 1899, p. 16.

charged with developing a scheme for an Australasian athletic tour to England in 1898.[6] While the team was nominally Australasian, deference was paid to the status of the 'member associations' of the concurrently formed Union. The proposed Australasian athletic tour of 1898 contradicts Ryan's argument as New Zealand was called upon to contribute to the fund to the same or greater extent as any other member association. Six athletes were selected for the tour, with two each from New South Wales and New Zealand, with an athlete each from Queensland and Victoria making up the balance. Representatives from all four colonies were selected for what the committee considered 'obvious reasons.' These reasons seem to be motivated by financial reasons as much as idealistically fostering a sense of shared Australasian purpose in all the colonies. £900 was agreed to be the necessary sum, covering passage and three month's residence in England to allow 'a fair and satisfactory test of Australasian athletic ability.' This money was to be 'raised by the four colonies in proportion (roughly) to the number of their representatives' through public subscription. If the required sum was not forthcoming, a benefit meeting could be held in Sydney for the 'Australians' in the team before a second meeting held in New Zealand with the whole team.[7]

The decentralised manner of fundraising meant that the various member associations remained important in deciding the fate of the tour, with New Zealand and New South Wales particularly vital. These associations were conferred with responsibilities befitting their position as senior members of the Australasian athletic community. The NZAAA was required to find £300 and two athletes worthy of representing Australasia, not the sort of task that would be presented to a developing association. The ultimate failure of the efforts to send this team perhaps indicates that

[6] Australasian Amateur Conference, *Minutes of Meeting*, p. 12.
[7] Australasian Amateur Conference, *Minutes of Meeting*, pp. 14-15.

this confidence was misplaced and New Zealand was not as capable as their fellow Australasians suspected. Such a view does not take into account that in 1892 a team of five New Zealand athletes toured Europe, competing in the Amateur Athletic Association [AAA] championships and in the *Union des Société Françaises Sports Athlétiques* [USFSA] fifth anniversary meeting in Paris. New Zealand athletes won three events at the latter meeting, but the event's true significance was in the meeting of athlete and team manager Leonard Cuff with Pierre de Coubertin, which was instrumental in seeing Cuff appointed to the IOC in 1894.[8] This tour was undertaken at a time when most Australian colonies did not boast an amateur athletic association, let alone the capacity to send athletes abroad.

The attitude of New Zealand to the 1898 tour is instructive as to their attitude towards Australasian representation. Hori Eruera, a Māori pole vaulter, and his prospective replacement, walker Frank Creamer, declared themselves unavailable for the tour along with the Victorian and Queensland representatives and potential New South Wales representative Mat Roseingrave.[9] New Zealand administrators were as antagonistic to the tour as their athletes. W. G. Garrard, also a prominent rugby official, was critical of the selection process. He argued that:

> [t]he selection committee should give preference to those absolutely at the top of the tree in their particular branch of sport. He did not believe in a "sop" team. If New Zealand had the best men send hers; if Queensland, send hers: and so on.[10]

Coombes suggested that he was 'in accord with Mr. Garrard's views … but the exigencies of the case have been conclusively proved to demand what he designates a

---

[8] Michael Letters and Ian Jobling, 'Forgotten Links: Leonard Cuff and The Olympic Movement in Australasia, 1894-1905,' *Olympika: The International Journal of Olympic Studies*, vol. 5, 1996, pp. 92-93.
[9] The *Referee*, 22 December 1897, p. 1; The *Referee*, 29 December 1897, p. 7.
[10] The *Weekly Press [New Zealand Referee]*, 8 December 1897, p. 35. The *New Zealand Referee* was included in the *Weekly Press* at this time.

"sop" team.'[11] However, like Coombes, Garrard eventually adopted a pragmatic course, and was elected to the sub-committee 'to draw up a scheme to provide necessary funds' formed at this meeting.[12] He was thus willing to provide administrative assistance to this tour despite his misgivings about the scheme. Despite the willingness of Garrard and others to serve, New Zealand could not ultimately provide the funds necessary for the tour to take place.

The matter of identity provides an answer to why New Zealand did not embrace this tour. At the same meeting, L. W. Harley, the honorary secretary of the NZAAA, expressed antagonism to the Australasian team as:

> [i]f the team were successful, New Zealand would not get any credit, which would go to Australia. Far better would it be to wait a few years, and send a representative team of their own.[13]

This, in fact, was the option that was taken up by New Zealand in 1902. A two-man New Zealand team of hurdler and future rugby dual-international George Smith[14] and W.F. Simpson toured Europe in that year, with Smith winning a prestigious English AAA championship in the 120 yards hurdles.[15] As seen in Chapter Five, the AAA championships were considered the world championship by many Anglophones at this point in time. The Christchurch *Star* revelled in 'The New Zealand Victory' and noted that Smith was 'the first New Zealander who has ever secured a win at that historic fixture.'[16] The attitude of Harley and the response to Smith's later victory indicates that a sense of New Zealand identity was present at this early stage. This should not be a surprise given the tradition in New Zealand of distinguishing itself from Australia in

[11] The *Referee*, 22 December 1897, p. 7.
[12] The *Weekly Press*, 8 December 1897, p. 35.
[13] The *Weekly Press*, 8 December 1897, p. 35.
[14] Smith represented New Zealand in both amateur rugby union and professional rugby league.
[15] The *Referee*, 9 July 1902, p. 6.
[16] The *Star*, 7 July 1902, p. 3.

cultural terms. The delegation of responsibility and the assertion of identity by the constituent units of the Australasian Union were themes that continued throughout the era of Australasian representation.

Australian Engagement with the Olympic Games – 1900 to 1906

The reliance on the member associations to raise funds separately demonstrated in the 1898 tour was replicated in early attempts to send Australian athletes to Olympic Games, with the exception of Rowley's trip to Britain and Paris in 1900. This tour drew support from Victorian and Queensland administrators in a clear expression of pre-Federation colonial cooperation. An impromptu meeting was held in Melbourne while Rowley was *en route* to Europe after plans for a race between Rowley and Victorian sprinters W. Shea and G. A. Moir fell through. The hastily arranged meeting was held at the Melbourne Cricket Ground following the persuasive efforts of the VAAA. The success of this event was hampered by the inability to charge admission fees, and any funds collected as a result were gathered by organising a collection at the ground.[17] These methods of collecting funds were indistinguishable from the manner in which professional cricketers were rewarded for outstanding performances. Ric Sissons suggests that the practice of rewarding players in this manner 'became a regular occurrence in the 1890s.'[18] Rowley's funds were also supplemented by 'a couple of guineas contributed in a sportsmanlike way by Brisbane sympathisers.'[19]

The interstate amity evident in this endeavour was a casualty in the post-Federation era. Several contributors to *Sport, Federation, Nation* are concerned with

[17] The *Referee*, 25 April 1900, p. 6.
[18] Ric Sissons, *The Players: A Social History of the Professional Cricketer*, Sydney: Pluto Press, 1988, p. 105.
[19] The *Referee*, 9 May 1900, p. 6.

establishing whether there was '[a] Federation Factor in Sport?'[20] John O'Hara disagrees with Imke Fischer and Andrew Honey that there was an identifiable Federation factor in sport, and argues that any factor was 'slight and incidental.'[21] The intercolonial unity evident in attempts to send Rowley overseas in 1900 suggests that athletic bodies expressed a degree of national unity as Australia prepared to be officially federated on 1 January 1901. However any Federation factor was fleeting as a familiar tone of interstate rivalry was established with regard to the organisational efforts surrounding Australian participation at the St Louis Olympic Games of 1904. The organisational efforts to send Australian athletes to St Louis in 1904 were split between two different campaigns as Victoria grew impatient with the intricate, but apparently fruitless, negotiations between Coombes and James Sullivan outlined in the previous chapter. The matter of Olympic representation was raised at the annual meeting of the Melburnian Hare and Hounds Club as club member W. Kent Hughes charged the Australasian Union with inaction. The club responded to Hughes' claim that 'nothing had been done by the Australasian Union or the [VAAA]' by forming a publicity committee.[22] 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.[23]

---

[20] Imke Fischer, 'The Involvement of the Commonwealth Government in Physical Education: From defence to national fitness,' Richard Cashman *et al* (eds.), *Sport, Federation, Nation,* Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW, 2001, pp. 16-35; Andrew Honey, 'Sport, Immigration Restriction and Race: The operation of the White Australia Policy,' Richard Cashman *et al* (eds.), *Sport, Federation, Nation,* Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW, 2001, pp. 26-46; Bernard Whimpress, 'Absent Aborigines: The impact of Federation on indigenous sport,' Richard Cashman *et al* (eds.), *Sport, Federation, Nation,* Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW, 2001, pp. 47-54.
[21] John O'Hara, 'Commentary,' Richard Cashman *et al* (eds.), *Sport, Federation, Nation,* Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW, 2001, p. 57.
[22] The *Argus*, 16 April 1904, p. 18.
[23] The *Australasian*, 18 June 1904.

The debate between Hughes and Coombes was marked by clear interstate tensions. The NSWAAA president responded to the criticism by suggesting that the Victorian 'make some inquiry about the subject he is handling before making comments' and pointed to the hitherto private negotiations with Sullivan as evidence of action on the part of the NSWAAA. He clearly 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.[24] Hughes returned fire with a criticism of 'provincial jealousies' emanating from New South Wales, claiming that while Victoria were 'ready and willing to subscribe to send a Sydney athlete to America … Sydney people [were] unwilling … to subscribe anything.'[25]

Significantly, Hughes made this comment during a debate over the relative merits of the codes of football prevalent in both Sydney and Melbourne. Richard Cashman and Thomas Hickie have argued that the adoption of rugby football in Sydney and Australian Rules football in Melbourne was indicative of more deep-seated differences between the cities.[26] The divergent sporting values of Melbourne and Sydney clearly played some role in these organisational efforts. The 'Victorianness' of Gardner 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.[27] In keeping with the context of pre-Federation cooperation, Rowley was pictorially

[24] The *Referee*, 27 April 1904, p. 6.
[25] Quoted in The *Referee*, 8 June1904, p. 6.
[26] Richard Cashman and Tom Hickie, 'The Divergent Sporting Cultures of Sydney and Melbourne,' *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 7, no. 1, November 1990, p. 26.
[27] The *Referee*, 29 June 1904, p. 6.

represented wearing an Australian coat of arms at the English championships of 1900, indicating that he styled himself as an Australian at the Olympic Games.[28]

The decentralised nature of Australian representation at the 1904 Games was replicated with regard to the 1906 intercalary Games held in Athens.[29] Another layer of complexity was added to the organisation of this team due to the influence of Sydney University. A strong committee including sporting administrators, members of the sporting press and University identities was responsible for fundraising on sprinter Nigel Barker's behalf. The letter sent to the athlete after sufficient funds were raised informed him that he was selected to 'represent the Sydney University Athletic Club & the State of [New South Wales] at the Olympian Games to be held at Athens (Greece) commencing on Apr. 22 1906.'[30] While state identification was subordinated in this case, it was superseded by a smaller local identity rather than the larger national identity.

The importance of state identity was reinforced through an offer from Greek authorities of £100 in order alleviate the costs of Australians travelling to Athens. This subsidy was arranged as a result of the intervention of the VAAA. Reports from London suggested that the Greek government had offered 5000 francs (£200) to help British athletes make the trip to Athens. On receipt of this fact, the VAAA proposed to the Greek consul that funds be made available to Australians on the grounds that 'Australians had a still greater reason for assistance'.[31] While the VAAA might have expected a share of the money offered to Britain, a further 2500 francs (£100) was set

[28] The *Referee*, 22 August 1900, p. 6.
[29] 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.
[30] 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.
[31] The *Australasian*, 24 February 1906.

aside for the exclusive use of Australian athletes.[32] However, the offer stipulated that £50 each be set aside for both Victoria and New South Wales, allowing Victorian long-distance runner George Blake and New South Wales swimmer Cecil Healy to make the trip. The strained relations between the states evident in 1904 were again on show in 1906 as Coombes criticised the Victorians in a patronising manner for requesting the funds. He suggested that the NSWAAA '[did] not require the money', even if Victoria did, and pulled rank as Australasian Union president. He scolded the VAAA for not going through the proper channels and indicated that the Union executive would consider suspending the funds to avoid '[getting] into trouble with English and foreign bodies over the matter of "expenses."'[33] No such decision was made, of course, but the opportunity to sanctimoniously put Victoria in its place was too good to pass up.

To a certain extent, the contemporary political context of Australia bore much responsibility for the division between the states. While the request was made through the Consul for Greece in Melbourne, the funds were distributed to J. R. Love, the Consul-General for Greece based in Sydney.[34] Canberra, the future capital city and administrative centre of Australia, had not been developed at this time. Foreign governments were thus forced to conduct their business with Australia in a framework developed at a time when the states of Australia were separate colonial units. This served to perpetuate differences between New South Wales and Victoria. Nevertheless, the centrality of state identification in this instance was replicated in other attempts to send athletes abroad. The tradition of state identification continued throughout the era of Australasian representation at the Olympic Games and calls into question the argument

[32] The *Referee*, 28 February 1906, p. 8.
[33] The *Referee*, 28 February 1906, p. 8.
[34] The *Referee*, 28 February 1906, pp. 6, 8.

that New Zealand required Australian assistance in order to send its own athletes abroad.

New Zealand and the Australasian Olympic Teams of 1908 and 1912

The tradition of the decentralised organisation of 'teams' remained a factor with respect to the two teams that represented Australasia at the Olympic Games held in London in 1908 and Stockholm in 1912. It may be considered misleading to call these Australasian teams due to the decentralised nature of the organisational efforts. As Little and Cashman point out, athletes from the Australian states and New Zealand that comprised the Australasian Olympic teams 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.[35] As such, New Zealand officials were responsible for sending athletes from the Dominion. These athletes were supplemented by Australasians resident overseas, such as the New Zealand walker Arthur Rowland, who competed at London in 1908.[36] This section will focus on the administrative efforts geared towards sending New Zealand athletes to London to compete in the 1908 Olympic Games, although reference will be made to the Stockholm Games of 1912. Australian help that facilitated New Zealand Olympic participation would be more likely to be present in earlier efforts if New Zealand weakness was responsible for the two countries being united in Australasian teams. The fundraising attempts aimed at securing the berths of hurdler H. St. A Murray of Christchurch and walker Harry Kerr of Taranaki on board

[35] Charles Little and Richard Cashman, 'Ambiguous and Overlapping Identities: Australasia at the Olympic Games, 1896-1914,' Richard Cashman *et al* (eds.), *Sport, Federation, Nation*, Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW, 2001, p. 86. Little and Cashman incorrectly suggest that the athletes paid their own fares.
[36] The *Otago Witness*, 8 July 1908, p. 63.

ships destined for London clearly demonstrate that New Zealand and the NZAAA played the same role that the states played in 1904 and 1906.

The efforts to send New Zealand athletes to London commenced in earnest following the return in March 1908 of New Zealand athletes from the Australasian championships held in Hobart. A meeting of the Wellington Centre of the NZAAA held on 10 April received a letter from the national secretary J. E. Green stating that this body would accredit New Zealand athletes if the required funds could be found. J. H. Pollock suggested that the Wellington Centre find means to raise half of the £200 required to send Murray and Kerr abroad, a measure that was voted down by the meeting by a margin of nine to four.[37] Four days later the *Star*, a Christchurch newspaper, published a list of subscriptions received totalling in excess of £70.[38] The large size of this sum indicates that funds were collected before the Wellington meeting, although the Wellington *Evening Post* claimed that £20 had been raised in half a day to allow Kerr to compete at the Australasian championships earlier in the year.[39] By this rate, the Christchurch efforts were positively pedestrian.

While this comment may seem facetious, tension existed between the Wellington and Christchurch Centres, not least of all as a result of a contemporaneous dispute between the two centres that will be fully addressed in the next chapter. After the Canterbury centre was criticised for its 'niggardly spirit' in terms of funds allowed the athletes, 'prime mover' J. H. Aitken pointed out that while Canterbury had raised £110 towards Murray's expenses, the 'most influential centre' Wellington had raised only £40.[40] The New Zealand attempts to send athletes abroad were thus beholden to

[37] The *Evening Post*, 11 April 1908, p. 2
[38] The *Star*, 14 April 1908, p. 2.
[39] The *Evening Post*, 8 February 1908, p. 14.
[40] The *Star*, 25 April 1908, p. 4.

the same inter-community tensions that had plagued previous Australian efforts. Regardless of the apparent tensions between centres, the funds required to send the two athletes were collected with such alacrity that Murray was sent, along with a letter of introduction and £5 5s donation from New Zealand Prime Minister Joseph Ward, on 24 April.[41] Kerr followed on 15 May.[42]

The success of the efforts to send New Zealand athletes to the 1908 Games could be attributed to the groundswell of local support that accompanied the movement. The efforts of the local community to send the athletes to London were praised by 'Amateur' of the *Otago Witness* newspaper, who paid tribute to the 'whole-hearted manner in which the admirers of the athletes have taken the matter up.'[43] New Zealand representation at the Olympic Games of 1908 was based on local efforts that received no Australian help. The importance of local support is especially shown in the case of Kerr. Of the £110 required to allow Kerr to travel, £16 15s. (about fifteen percent) was raised in Kerr's home town, the sparsely populated locality of Tariki.[44] This local support was a double-edged sword, as it placed undue pressure on small organisations. The trip of Auckland runner Neville Hill to Stockholm four years later was jeopardized as a result of the slow collection of pledges in the region. Two-thirds of the £75 pledged to the fund in Auckland was not forthcoming by the time Hill had set sail, leading the New Zealand Olympic Council [NZOC] to threaten to cancel Hill's nomination if the funds were not forthcoming. The members of the NZOC noted mournfully that they were personally liable for the shortfall.[45] Supporters of Hill in Auckland attributed the

[41] The *Star*, 25 April 1908, p. 4; The *Evening Post*, 25 April 1908, p. 5; The *Otago Witness*, 6 May 1908, p. 62.
[42] The *Evening Post*, 28 April 1908, p. 6.
[43] The *Otago Witness*, 29 April 1908.
[44] The *Taranaki Herald*, 6 May 1908, p. 7.
[45] The *Evening Post*, 27 April 1912, p. 6.

delay in collecting the funds to the absence of 'the Secretary.'[46] New Zealand did not send a raft of athletes likely to win scores of events at the London and Stockholm Olympic Games of 1908 and 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.

As in the case of the proposed Australasian team of 1898, New Zealand national pride was expressed within the confines of Australasian Olympic teams. The participation at the 1908 London Olympic Games of Murray and Kerr was viewed in national terms by sectors of the New Zealand press. Kerr was accorded a send off by his local community of Tariki, where he was feted as a representative of the Dominion of New Zealand. The meeting was chaired by local dignitary J. Knowles, who confessed to 'not [taking] an enthusiastic interest in sports.' Nevertheless:

> he considered it was only right and proper that [the community] should meet together to bid farewell 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.[47]

The speakers also expressed the hope that Kerr would 'uphold the credit of the Dominion' in London. The local context was particularly important to Kerr, as he spent two years 'clearing bush on the family farm' regaining his amateur status rather than competing at NZAAA events.[48] Kerr raced as a professional prior to 1905, but under the rules of the Australasian Union an athlete could be reinstated as an amateur if he 'absolutely refrained from professional practices for at least two years.'[49]

---

[46] The *Evening Post*, 26 April 1912, p. 7.
[47] The *Taranaki Herald*, 6 May 1908, p. 7.
[48] New Zealand Olympic Committee, 'Harry Kerr,' http://www.olympic.org.nz/Athletes/AthleteProfile.aspx?Print=&ContactID=856&id=3774 Accessed 20 March 2009.
[49] AAUA, *Handbook*, p. 13.

While the experiences of Kerr and his community at Tariki may have been sheltered from the wider New Zealand athletic community, the views of 'Amateur' of the *Otago Witness* are more closely aligned. 'Amateur' consistently referred to Kerr, Rowland and Murray as representatives of New Zealand. Even so, 'Amateur' was somewhat ambivalent about the chances of Kerr and Murray, and was unenthused about their chosen events:

> It's a long way to despatch a man for one race … with the chance of being defeated in the first heat. Now, had we a representative who could worthily uphold the Dominion in the big event at the Olympic Games – the Marathon Road Race, to wit, I should say send him by all means, and give him money in his scrip to make the way easy. The Marathon is 'the' event at the greatest athletic gathering of all time, and the winning of the classic race … would indeed be honour and glory to the Dominion. But what availeth it if Kerr does win the walks and Murray the Quarter Hurdles?[50]

Not only does 'Amateur' clearly express a New Zealand identity within this passage, he expresses a view of competition at odds with other Australasians. Coombes had advocated New Zealander George Smith as a possible representative in 1904 due to the paucity of international talent in his event. With the strength of the overseas athletics generally presenting Australasia's small talent pool with seemingly insurmountable odds, '[o]ur greatest hope of success would be in some event not usually in vogue, such, for example, as the 400 metre hurdle race.'[51]

The differing response of 'Amateur' and Coombes to Australasian representation at the Olympic Games indicates that New Zealand identity was not smothered in this process. The expression of New Zealand identity continued even after correspondence from England had asserted the existence of an Australasian team. A cable from London dated 16 June printed in the *Otago Witness* asserted that:

---

[50] The *Otago Witness*, 29 April 1908, p. 62.
[51] The *Referee*, 2 March 1904, p. 6.

> There are over 1200 entries for the Olympic games, including representatives of Great Britain, Canada, *Australasia*, South Africa, United States, Germany, and most of the other European nations.[52]

Despite this, 'Amateur' persisted in describing Rowland as a representative of New Zealand throughout July.[53] The national identity of New Zealand athletes was further demonstrated in 1912 at Stockholm through the way that the 'Australasian team' was represented. Australasian athletes 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.[54]

'Amateur's' views are important due to the role that athletics figures in Otago and the *Otago Witness* itself played in campaigning for separate representation for New Zealand ahead of the Stockholm games. Little and Cashman argue that this movement reflected 'a very evident strain of an emerging New Zealand national consciousness.'[55] While this is an undeniably separatist movement, the extent to which it is emerging is debatable in light of the response of the athletes of 1898 and 1908. New Zealand distinctiveness and New Zealand nationalism were easily expressible within the context of Australasian teams. A wider cultural tradition of New Zealand distinguishing itself from Australia was replicated in discourse surrounding joint Australasian teams. The existence of this strand of distinctiveness allowed for more explicitly nationalist arguments that developed within New Zealand Olympic discourse to be contained within the structure provided by Australasian teams.

Imperialism and Australasian Representation

[52] The *Otago Witness*, 24 June 1908, p. 71. Emphasis added.
[53] The *Otago Witness*, 8 July 1908, p. 63; The *Otago Witness*, 15 July 1908, p. 63.
[54] Little and Cashman, 'Ambiguous and Overlapping Identities,' p. 93.
[55] Little and Cashman, 'Ambiguous and Overlapping Identities,' p. 90.

The question remains, if New Zealand identity was strong enough to assert itself within the confines of the Australasian relationship and New Zealand administration was strong enough to organise a small team to tour Europe, why was the Australasian form of representation adopted and ultimately rejected? The views of the people of Tariki and 'Amateur' indicate that the concept of Australasian representation did not permeate the wider community. Chapter Five illustrated how the imperial context informed Australian engagement with the 1900 Olympic Games. This continued to be the case throughout the pre-World War One era as Imperial symbolism marked Australian participation at the Olympic Games. Freddie Lane remarked in a later radio broadcast that his victory in the 200 metres at Paris saw 'for the first time in the history of the great Olympics … the Australian flag … hoisted to the mast top.'[56] A number of historians have pointed out that Australian victory before Federation in 1901 would have to have been greeted by the Union Jack.[57] An affinity for the Union Jack continued to be expressed post-Federation, exemplified in the lead-up to both the 1906 intercalary games and the 1912 Olympic Games in Stockholm.

With regard to the 1906 intercalary games held at Athens, some confusion was expressed over the nature of Australian representation. According to Coombes, the Australian athletes sought to be considered a separate team from the British team due to the status of the Australasian Union as 'quite distinct' from the AAA. However, the fact that no representative of the Australasian Union served on the international jury saw the

[56] Gordon, *Australia and the Olympic Games*, p. 33.
[57] Gordon, *Australia and the Olympic Games*, p. 33, Little and Cashman, 'Ambiguous and Overlapping Identities,' p. 82, Ian Jobling, 'In Pursuit of Status, Respectability and Idealism: Pioneers of the Olympic Movement in Australasia,' J.A. Mangan and John Nauright (eds.), *Sport in Australasian Society: Past and Present*, London, UK and Portland, OR: Frank Cass, 2000, p. 149; Tara Magdalinski 'The Reinvention of Australia for the 2000 Olympic Games,' J.A. Mangan and John Nauright (eds.), *Sport in Australasian Society: Past and Present*, London, UK and Portland, OR: Frank Cass, 2000, p. 315; Daryl Adair, 'Sports History in the "Antipodes" and "Australasia,"' *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 19, no. 1, November 2002, pp. 70-71.

organisers include them within a wider British team. The athletes were apparently 'quite satisfied' with this arrangement, as was Coombes:

> As it was, the English, Irish, Scotch, Australian, Canadian and South African competitors were bracketed, and correctly so, in my opinion, as British, and a victory of any member of the combination was announced by the hoisting of the Union Jack. The Irish walked about the green waving green flags after scoring a win. The Canadians were particularly proud of being included in the British team.[58]

The dearth of Australian success at these games makes it impossible to judge the response of Australian athletes to this form of representation. Nevertheless, this description indicates that Coombes' stated aim for an Imperial team at the ultimately postponed Berlin games of 1916 had a precedent.

This type of identification continued throughout the Australasian era. Organisers of the Stockholm Games wrote to Coombes asking for an Australasian flag to be sent for decorating the stadium and celebrating Australasian success. Coombes relayed to the readers of his *Referee* column that he had replied to the effect that:

> the president of our team would take with him examples of the Australian and New Zealand flags. If they arrived too late, I added that Australasia would be quite satisfied if the Union Jack was hoisted should an Australian or a New Zealander prove successful.[59]

The ambiguous nature of representation was also expressed through the symbolism that accompanied the Games, especially at the Opening Ceremonies. The pattern for the Parade of Nations, with Greece leading the teams out followed by the teams in alphabetical order with the host nation appearing last, was established at the London Games. However, at the London Opening Ceremony this order was complicated, as the Great Britain team was preceded by the Australasian, Canadian and South African

---

[58] The *Referee*, 20 June 1906, p. 6. David Guiney reproduces a more detailed account of the Irish protests by athlete Peter O'Connor in David Guiney, 'The Olympic Council of Ireland,' *Citius, Altius, Fortius*, vol. 4, no. 3, Autumn 1996, p. 33.
[59] The *Referee*, 3 April 1912, p. 9.

teams. Australasia was again bracketed with Britain and her fellow Dominions at the Stockholm Opening Ceremony, although this time the Dominions followed the Great Britain team.[60] 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.[61]

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.[62] This imperial context provided an atmosphere whereby national identity was not ferociously expressed. 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. The nationalism apparently inherent in the participation of an Olympic team was hence not as strong a factor during this period as it would be in a later period. As a result, the imperative to express New Zealand nationalism was not as strong. This goes some way to explain why New Zealand joined with Australia, despite being able to send its own athletes and expressing a sense of nationalism in its competitors.

The type of imperial identification favoured in the Olympic sphere allowed Australasian, but not national representation. To a certain extent, this was due to the influence of British officials. While Coubertin favoured a *laissez faire* approach to the registration of athletes, the Council of the British Olympic Association [BOA] sought to regulate the number of competitors at the London Games by limiting the number of

[60] Little and Cashman, 'Ambiguous and Overlapping Identities,' pp. 87-88, 93.
[61] Gordon, *Australia and the Olympic Games*, pp. 62, 84.
[62] Little and Cashman, 'Ambiguous and Overlapping Identities,' pp. 87-88.

entries from each country. The general regulations drawn up by the BOA and passed by the Hague session of the IOC in 1907 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.'[63]

Both aspects of this formulation were problematic. The idea of representation on the IOC was an 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. Coubertin would later chide Coombes for inelegantly passing on New Zealand's decision to replace the retiring Arthur Marryatt with J. P. Firth in 1923. Coubertin had asked Coombes to suggest a replacement rather than make an appointment, and in a drafted letter expressed his frustration at Coombes' inability to understand the distinction.[64]

The notion of a territory under sovereign jurisdiction was problematic for settler societies such as Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and Canada as they remained self-governing Dominions with the monarch of Great Britain as the 'sovereign.' Noted Australian cultural historian Richard White starkly asserts the lack of sovereignty held by 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.[65]

Coubertin evidently did not know what to make of the representation of British subjects:

---

[63] Theodore Andrea Cook, *The Fourth Olympiad, Being the Official Report: The Olympic Games of 1908*, London, UK: British Olympic Association, c. 1909, p. 29.
[64] Gordon, *Australia and the Olympic Games*, p. 53. Gordon is uncertain whether this letter was actually sent.
[65] Richard White, *Inventing Australia: Images and Identity 1688-1980*, Sydney: George Allen & Unwin, 1981, p. 111.

> What would be the status, for example, of a Canadian living in England? Would he be free to choose to join either the Canadian or the British team as he liked? What decision was to be made concerning the so-called "natives", who were British subjects in one of Britain's colonies? And once a rule had been adopted for England, how would it apply in the case of Germany, for example, if Bavaria or Saxony suddenly decided to demand a team of their own?[66]

The case of Canada, and indeed South Africa, was compromised by the fact that at the time of the London Games the IOC did not include members from either of these 'nations'.[67] The grounds on which separate Canadian and South African teams could compete are unclear given the definition of a 'country', although Coombes' inheritance of Cuff's place on the IOC entitled Australasia to representation.

Coombes' response to 'the identity question' during debates over the Empire 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. Coombes also argued disingenuously that Finnish athletes had expressed their own identity despite having their points accrued towards Russia, a situation that the Finnish athletes themselves

[66] Pierre de Coubertin, *Olympic Memoirs*, Lausanne, Switzerland: International Olympic Committee, 1997, p. 100.
[67] Cook, *Official Report*, p. 12.

would have strongly disagreed with.[68] Guttmann reports that Finland proudly marched under its own flag, which greeted many athletics victories.[69]

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 and Finland as unworthy of separate national representation due to its lack of representation on the IOC. This raises the intriguing counterfactual of how Australia would have been represented had Leonard 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.'[70] 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 Oympic representation would be eradicated by the ultimate realisation of Imperial integration that would render differences between the Dominions obsolete.

[68] The *Referee*, 14 August 1913, p. 1.
[69] Allen Guttmann, *The Olympics: A History of the Modern Games*, Urbana and Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2002, p. 34.
[70] The *Referee*, 21 August 1913, p. 1.

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.[71]

Little and Cashman argue that the NZAAA '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.[72] However, the newspaper report quoted above indicated that this idea was raised in a conversation rather than a letter, indicating that this issue was raised 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).'[73] It is significant that the NZAAA resolved to seek separate representation on the IOC first rather than a separate team as the Otago movement would in 1911.

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,

---

[71] 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], p. 23.
[72] Little and Cashman, 'Ambiguous and Overlapping Identities,' pp. 89-90.
[73] NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 3 May 1909, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0658, p. 26.

Matthew P. Llewellyn has suggested that this organisation sought to further its influence by seeking to promote acquiescent Dominion representatives to the IOC. According to this author, English-born Imperialists – including Coombes (joined 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.'[74] 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 IOC was at this point under threat from American athletic figures. While Sullivan is notorious for attempting to usurp Coubertin[75], there was a wider movement seeking to replace the IOC with a body that more genuinely reflected athletic strength. Caspar Whitney, editor of *Outing* magazine, expressed as much in an extraordinary letter to Lord Desborough of the BOA. He described the IOC as 'a perfectly ridiculous organization … no more or less than a personal plaything for de Coubertin', who he described as 'a well-meaning, fussy and incompetent little Frenchman.' Whitney suggested

> the organisation of an entirely new international committee. It may be called 'Olympic' or anything, but I am going to support its organization for the purposes of conducting and officering these Olympic Games. My idea is, - to invite a representative each from France, from Germany, from Sweden, from Greece and Italy, the United Kingdom and the United States. I am going to propose to these representatives that a new international committee be organized and I am going to propose you for its president. Will you serve?
> It is idiotic that England and America, who supply seven-eighths of the athletes of the world, should be at the pleasure of such a foolish organization as this present

[74] Matthew P. Llewellyn, *Rule Britannia: Nationalism, Identity and the Modern Olympic Games*, London, UK: Routledge, 2011. Forthcoming.
[75] Guttmann, *The Olympics*, pp. 24-25.

> International Committee, although it has members from Mexico and Peru and Russia and Turkey! (Good Lord, think of it), and yet ignores Canada entirely.[76]

While this movement failed to receive support in England, the letter indicates a feeling of subjugation on the part of the traditionally strong sporting nations. It is possible that Coombes suggested that a New Zealand member of the IOC would be politically beneficial in this climate. This was certainly a tactic pursued by Britain. It is noteworthy that New Zealand did not field a separate team at an Olympic Games until after Arthur Marryatt was elected to the IOC in 1919, despite being responsible for the fundraising efforts of its own athletes in 1908 and 1912.[77]

The Imperialist position was made untenable by the rejection of a formal Imperial team as a result of dwindling interest throughout the Empire and by edict of the IOC in 1913, although the previous chapter showed that Coombes remained committed to the scheme to the end.[78] The decision to forbid an Imperial team firmly placed the nation at the centre of sporting representation. Without the cocoon provided by Imperial identification, 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.[79] New Zealand was thus recognised as a separate nation by

---

[76] Caspar Whitney, Letter to Lord Desborough, 31 July 1908, Articles de presse compilés par Lord Desborough sur les Jeux Olympiques d'été de Londres 1908, CIO JO-1908S-ARTPR, 9854, International Olympic Committee Archives, Lausanne, Switzerland, pp. 106-08.
[77] New Zealand Olympic Association, Minutes of Meeting, 27 February 1920, New Zealand Olympic Committee [NZOC] Records, Minute Book – October 1911 – March 1936, Olympic Studies Centre, New Zealand Olympic Committee, Wellington, New Zealand, [Hereafter NZOC Records, Minute Book], p. 38.
[78] See also Ian F. Jobling, 'The Lion, the Eagle and the Kangaroo: Politics and Proposals for a British Empire Team at the 1916 Berlin Olympics,' Gerald Redmond (ed.), *Sport and politics*, Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics Publishers, 1986, p. 105; Jobling, 'In Pursuit of Status,' pp. 153-54; Garth Henniker and Ian Jobling, 'Richard Coombes and the Olympic Movement in Australia: Imperialism and Nationalism in Action,' *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 6, no. 1, November 1989, p. 8.
[79] New Zealand Olympic Association, Minutes of Meeting, 27 February 1920, NZOC Records, Minute Book, p. 38.

the international athletic community from this point. New Zealanders had been aware of their separateness from the very beginning.

Conclusion

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, an examination of previous joint Australasian and Australian efforts reveals a tradition of member associations being responsible for funding their own representatives abroad. They were also able to express a degree of separatist identity despite the overarching Australasian umbrella. New Zealand both helped establish this tradition during the failed efforts to send an Australasian team to Europe in 1898, and also fit into this tradition throughout the period of joint Australasian Olympic representation.

During planning for the 1898 tour, the New Zealand Amateur Athletic Association [NZAAA] was expected to take a leading role in keeping with its status as one of the most senior member associations of the recently formed Amateur Athletic Union of Australasia [AAUA or Australasian Union]. In a vote of confidence in its organisational capabilities, the body was required to provide and fund two athletes as part of the team. In addition to this measure of responsibility, New Zealand athletics officials expressed a keen sense of distinctiveness from their Australian counterparts. A key reason for New Zealand's less than whole-hearted response to this tour was the suspicion that its identity would be swamped. This belief gave rise to the opinion that a purely New Zealand team should tour Europe in this team's stead. This was an option that was eventually taken in 1902, with George Smith's victory in the 120 yards hurdles

at the Amateur Athletic Association [AAA] Championship meeting provoking an outpouring of New Zealand nationalism. Capability on the part of the NZAAA to administer its own athletes and expressions of New Zealand nationalism were quite clearly evident before the adoption of the Australasian form of representation for Olympic purposes. This realisation problematises the notion that developing capability and rising nationalism can explain the demise of Australasian representation after 1912.

Australian efforts to send athletes to the Olympic Games between 1900 and 1906 were almost entirely state-specific affairs, with the exception of 1900 as Australia prepared to federate. The ever-present rivalry between New South Wales and Victoria provided an important aspect of the discourse surrounding Olympic representation in 1904 and 1906, underlining the centrality of more localised identities to Australia's Olympic history at that point in time. New Zealand's involvement with the Olympic Movement within an Australasian context continued to reflect this tradition. New Zealand participation at international competitions, such as the Olympic Games of 1908 and 1912, was not contingent on Australian assistance as sufficient funds were raised locally. Nationalistic representations of New Zealand athletes came to the fore in the New Zealand press and during public receptions as the country engaged in the Olympic Games. A sense of New Zealand nationality was thus contained within the structure of joint Australasian Olympic representation, and the rise of the former cannot explain the demise of the latter.

The demise of the joint Australasian Olympic team can be attributed to a changing environment whereby imperial identification by dominion athletes was marginalised by national identification. Symbolic representations such as flags and arrangements at opening ceremonies that accompanied Australasian Olympic

representation in the pre-World War One era was marked by a clear imperial focus. Regulations put in place by the British Olympic Association [BOA] opened the way for Australasian representation due to a clause that permitted separate representation to nations with an International Olympic Committee [IOC] representative. The IOC position accepted by Leonard Cuff in 1894 and inherited by Richard Coombes in 1905 unquestionably entitled Australasia to the provision of independent representation at the Olympic Games. The centrality of this formulation to Coombes' conception of what entitled separate representation at the Olympic Games was demonstrated in his journalism and in his work as an administrator. His contributions to debates about the Empire Olympic Team drew a distinction between the situation that faced Australasian athletes and their counterparts from South Africa and Finland that, did not have IOC members. He also suggested that New Zealand apply for independent representation on the IOC following the London Olympics of 1908, which would have entitled it to separate representation. This suggestion existed amidst a British strategy of stacking the IOC with acquiescent colonials that could further the BOA's agenda within the IOC. This form of representation existed within a context whereby closer Imperial links were being sought, and Coombes envisaged a situation whereby New Zealand would be 'liberated' from Australasia not through the assertion of independent nationality, but through the formation of an Imperial team. This proved a vain hope, and national representation was in turn adopted by New Zealand.

The next chapter constitutes the final data chapter of this thesis. It will provide an explanation for the demise of the other aspect of the Australasian athletic relationship, the Australasian Union. It will continue the excavation of New Zealand's true role within Australasian athletics contained in this chapter and will also be

characterised by the same wariness about the role of nationalism in this body's demise. Just as New Zealand competence was an ever-present aspect of Australasian teams, a sense of New Zealand nationalism was always present within the Australasian Union. In fact, New Zealand nationalism was at its strongest within the Australasian Union some twenty years before the body's ultimate demise. As such, the development of New Zealand nationalism cannot explain the rejection of the Australasian Union just as it cannot explain the rejection of joint Australasian representation at the Olympic Games. A confluence of factors, including the shift in emphasis away from a Trans-Tasman community to one that reflected a more continental vision of Australia, the inability or unwillingness of Australian administrators to keep pace with their New Zealand counterparts and the election of an especially robust NZAAA council, caused the eventual demise of the Australasian Union.

Chapter Eight – A Question of Nationalism? The Dissolution of the Australasian Amateur Athletic Relationship – Part 2: The Amateur Athletic Union of Australia and New Zealand

At the 1924 Annual General Meeting of the New Zealand Amateur Athletic Association [NZAAA], Auckland delegate Harold Amos railed against the influence of the rules of the Amateur Athletic Union of Australia and New Zealand [formerly the Amateur Athletic Union of Australasia or Australasian Union] on the affairs of New Zealand athletics. According to the *New Zealand Times* newspaper, 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 had seceded from the Union, Amos emerged as the last remaining advocate of a proposed international test match between Australia and New Zealand. This idea had been first articulated as a way to modernise the Australasian athletic relationship in the early 1920s.[2]

The experience of Amos indicates that questions of national identity provide insufficient explanatory power for the dissolution of the Australasian athletic relationship. His expression of separatist nationalism followed by a later desire to re-establish close links with Australia subverts a nationalist teleology. Australian historian Neville Meaney has identified this teleology as adopting the position that 'history is a

[1] The *New Zealand Times*, 25 November 1924, p. 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], pp. 232-33.

struggle by "peoples" towards achieving self-realisation.'[3] Rather than slowly and inexorably emerging and providing the spur towards secession, New Zealand nationalism was ever-present in the workings of the Australasian Union, but waxed and waned throughout the lifespan of this institution.

This chapter will continue the process of unravelling the reasons behind the demise of the Australasian athletic relationship begun in Chapter Seven. It will supplement Chapter Seven's focus on external matters with a closer investigation of issues internal to the Australasian Union. Nationalist tensions were an ongoing aspect of the Australasian athletic relationship, much as New Zealanders continued to express a distinct identity within the framework of Australasian teams. However, these tensions did not provide sufficient impetus to cause a rupture between Australian and New Zealand bodies. The distinction between Australia and New Zealand will be shown to be simplistic due to the tensions between New South Wales and Victoria at the time when New Zealand seceded from the Australasian Union. Attention will be paid to the changing dynamics of the Australasian athletic relationship, as the Union changed 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 Australasian Union. Less innovative Australian bodies rejected proposals made by New Zealand to reform the Australasian athletic relationship to better reflect these changing conditions. This provided the spur for New Zealand to ultimately secede.

Strength and Assertion in the Australasian Union

[3] Neville Meaney, 'Britishness and Australian Identity: The Problem of Nationalism in Australian History and Historiography,' *Australian Historical Studies*, vol. 32, no. 116, April 2001, p. 78.

James Belich has argued that New Zealand was in a strong position amongst the seven Australasian colonies at the point of Federation. Of the seven Australasian colonies, New Zealand ranked a close third to Victoria and New South Wales in terms of population and production before 1901. This position of strength lead to hopes that New Zealand could dominate a joint Australasian political entity, a hope 'which can seem ludicrous in modern Australasian eyes.'[4] However, Belich has argued that while New Zealand's askance attitude to Federation marked a sense of independence, its refusal to join the Commonwealth also served to suddenly make New Zealand small.[5] Military historian Christopher Pugsley has characterised New Zealand as a 'junior partner' in military collaborations with Australia.[6] The Australasian athletic relationship confounds the characterisation of New Zealand as a 'junior partner' to Australia. Cashman has noted the agitation of New Zealand sporting bodies being considered one of seven Australasian colonies rather than as equal partners with Australia.[7]

Just as Ryan identified pragmatism as central to the adoption of Australasian teams, Charles Little also identifies pragmatism as a reason for the foundation of the Australasian Union. He also contextualises the development of this body within the context of an existing relationship between the NZAAA and its Australian contemporaries. It was founded in order to organise Australasian championship meetings and also sought to organise an Australasian athletic team to tour Britain in

---

[4] James Belich, *Paradise Reforged: A History of the New Zealanders From the 1880s to the Year 2000*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2001, p. 51.
[5] Belich, *Paradise Reforged*, p. 46.
[6] Christopher Pugsley, *The ANZAC Experience: New Zealand, Australia and Empire in the First World War*, Auckland, NZ: Reed Military, 2004, pp. 20-21.
[7] Richard Cashman, 'Part 2: A Changing Face of Sport?: Introduction,' Richard Cashman *et al* (eds.), *Sport, Federation, Nation*, Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW, 2001, p. 61.

1898. He notes that the Union's longevity could be attributed to its refusal 'to usurp the rights normally associated with national bodies.'[8]

The NZAAA's position of strength relative to other Australasian colonies persisted in athletics throughout the life of the Australasian Union. It held a powerful position within the sport's administration, hosting more Australasian championship carnivals and winning more overall championships than any other member association.[9] Chapter Three demonstrated the key role that the played in the organisation of Arthur Duffey and Alfred Shrubb's 1905 tour of Australasia. It continued to play this central role in the organisation of such tours with only isolated exceptions. It provided the most capable and dynamic administration in Australasian athletic circles. This realisation is central to understanding why New Zealand seceded from the Australasian Union. But it is first necessary to demonstrate that nationalism did not play a decisive role in the dissolution of the Union.

Nationalism in the Australasian Union

A movement suggesting secession from the Australasian Union quickly developed within New Zealand amateur athletics circles due to differing conceptions of amateurism. Secession was raised as early as March 1903; with 'Sprinter' of the *Canterbury Times* newspaper suggesting that a championship agreement as in operation between the Australian and New Zealand swimming bodies was preferable to a joint governing body. Australia in general and membership of the Union in particular was seen by 'Sprinter' as an 'anchor' that prevented 'the development of the sport' in New

[8] Charles Little, 'Trans-Tasman Federations in Sport: The changing relationships between Australia and New Zealand,' Richard Cashman *et al* (eds.), *Sport, Federation, Nation*, Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW, 2001, p. 69.
[9] Anthony Hughes, 'Sporting Federations: The impact of Federation on sports governance,' Richard Cashman *et al* (eds.), *Sport, Federation, Nation*, Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW, 2001, pp. 124-5.

Zealand.[10] The views of 'Sprinter' are important due to the links between his newspaper and the leadership of the NZAAA. Walter G. Atack of Christchurch was editor of the newspaper and was elected president of the NZAAA in November 1905.[11] Tension between the executive in Australia and 'Sprinter' was reignited in 1906 over the issue of reinstatement. 'Sprinter' made a number of secessionist statements in the course of a debate with Coombes over the suitability of these laws to New Zealand. He suggested that:

> the wedge of separation is being gradually driven into the Amateur Athletic Union of Australasia, and it is not beyond the bounds of possibility that it will be driven right home at the next Board of Control meeting. The aspirations of New Zealanders, in sport as in politics, show a tendency to run in a groove of their own untrammelled by hoary-headed usage and custom …[12]

It is noteworthy that 'Sprinter's' view of New Zealand athletic independence was linked to New Zealand's political independence from Australia. Separatist feeling thus did not develop slowly but was a key element of New Zealand's engagement with Australia from the beginning.

'Sprinter's' claim that he was unaware of the existence of a secession motion discussed by the Otago Centre of the NZAAA was greeted with much mirth by Coombes.[13] Coombes was able to stave off this movement by 'clear[ing] up points which had previously been somewhat obscure' at a meeting with the NZAAA council during a visit to Christchurch.[14] Any trans-Tasman goodwill that developed through this encounter was soon extinguished due to Coombes' handling of a 1907 New Zealand proposal to change the reinstatement laws [see Chapter Four]. He embarked in some constitutional gymnastics in order to prevent this proposal from being ratified by a mail vote. The geographically smaller member associations of Victoria, Tasmania and New

---

[10] The *Referee*, 1 April 1903, p. 6; The *Referee*, 29 April 1903, p. 6.
[11] The *Evening Post*, 18 November 1905, p. 6.
[12] The *Star*, 8 November 1906, p. 8.
[13] The *Referee*, 30 January 1907, p. 8.
[14] The *Referee*, 13 March 1907, p. 8.

Zealand voted in favour of the motion, while the larger states of New South Wales and Queensland voted against. The matter was still technically undecided as no reply had been received from the effectively moribund associations of South and Western Australia. Coombes disingenuously argued that:

> there being no machinery at [the Australasian Union's] disposal to [compel a reply], there is a dead-lock, for there is not a majority of the affiliated associations in favour of the proposal.[15]

Some New Zealanders, such as 'Vaulter' of the *New Zealand Referee*, accepted this view, but firmly suggested that the 'machinery' at the disposal of the Union needed to be quickly bolstered.[16]

'Sprinter' however had no patience for Coombes' position. After suggesting that the NSWAAA had not held a meeting for nine months and had deliberately stymied the movement, he argued that its response

> was bad enough in all conscience, but when we are told that until the semi-defunct Associations of South and Western Australia record their votes nothing further can be done in the matter, the position is simply scandalous. The sooner New Zealand asserts its independence and cuts the painter that is dragging it at the heels of half-dead and alive Associations in Australia, the better it will be for the welfare of the sport in its own country.[17]

Coombes described these views as 'claptrap' and remarked that 'New Zealanders know the old gag about being "dragged at the heels of Australia" too well to pay the least heed to it.'[18]

The debate between Coombes and 'Sprinter' reflected developments within 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].[19] The Otago, Wellington and the newly-

---

[15] The *Referee*, 12 June 1907, p. 8.
[16] The *Weekly Press*, 26 June 1907, p. 52. The *New Zealand Referee* was included in The *Weekly Press* at this time.
[17] Quoted in The *Referee*, 10 July 1907, p. 8.
[18] The *Referee*, 10 July 1907, p. 8.
[19] The *Weekly Press*, 18 April 1906, pp. 51-52; The *Weekly Press*, 9 May 1906, p. 56.

formed Southland centres of the NZAAA all opposed the movement, 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 movement, commented that 'the Wellington, Otago and Southland Centres must accept all responsibility for having provoked the [hostilities].'[20] The final defeat of the reciprocal agreement saw Atack agitate for constitutional reform aimed at developing a more centralised structure for the NZAAA. He claimed that:

> A mistake had been made in the beginning in the delegation of too much power to the centres, and their original power of managing their internal affairs was apparently growing so large as to mean management of the whole colony. Mr Atack said that when the centre system was instituted there was no trouble, but there had been trouble in the last two years.[21]

Atack's advocacy of the controversial reciprocal agreement rather than structural issues were to blame for the ill feeling within the NZAAA at this point. By Atack's own admission, the centres were able to work with other presidents effectively.

While it is tempting to suggest that the split represented a conservative counterrevolution in response to an increasingly liberal conception of amateurism, politically radical elements sat amongst the conservatives typical of amateur sport on both sides of the debate. Atack was a committed 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.[22] As a member of the CJU, founded in 1901, Atack railed against the low salaries paid to journalists and the

[20] The *Otago Witness*, 3 July 1907, p. 62.
[21] The *Otago Witness*, 3 July 1907, p. 62.
[22] Nadia Elsaka, 'Beyond Consensus?: New Zealand Journalists and the Appeal of "Professionalism" as a Model for Occupational Reform,' unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Canterbury, 2004, p. 105.

lack of support afforded to journalists by the institute on this matter.[23] The CJU eventually folded due to pressure put to bear by newspaper proprietors who made it clear that members would face dismissal.[24] It was replaced by a more moderate body, the New Zealand Journalists' Association, which was more successful in attracting members.[25]

Arthur Paape of the Southland centre possessed radical credentials that were in fact more impressive than Atack's. He 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.[26] The goals of this organisation were as radical as their counterparts in the Australian Labor Party. The demands of the League included the foundation of a State bank, the 'Nationalisation of the Land and Means of Production' as well as a White New Zealand.[27] Paape played an integral role in causing the athletic split through his work in forming the Southland centre of the NZAAA, and was eulogised as 'a man whose heart is in his work' before the split.[28] Paape showed his social democratic conscience in suggesting that 'Mr. Atack would make a very good Tsar' in response to that figure's conduct.[29] 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 political principles. Their influence on amateur athletics disrupts the notion that its administrators were all middle class conservatives.

The continuing animosity between Atack and the centres ultimately led to his undoing. Seven members of the Wellington centre nominated for the election of council members due to be held in October 1908. Atack's opinion as to the validity of these

[23] Elsaka, 'Beyond Consensus?,' p. 116.
[24] Elsaka, 'Beyond Consensus?,' p. 120.
[25] Elsaka, 'Beyond Consensus?,' p. 122.
[26] The *Referee*, 25 November 1908, p. 10; The *Referee*, 2 December 1908, p. 10.
[27] 'Independent Political Labour League of New Zealand – Fighting Platform,' The *Beacon*, 30 March 1907.
[28] The *Weekly Press*, 18 April 1906, p. 51.
[29] The *Evening Post*, 7 December 1908, p. 2.

nominations was sought by the NZAAA secretary, acting as the returning officer. 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. The animosity between Atack in Canterbury and the Wellington centre was central to this decision, as the nomination was seen as 'merely a preliminary to the removal of the headquarters to the Empire City [Wellington].'[30] Atack's decision was not surprisingly heavily criticised by the Wellington council. Dr. A. K. Newman of that body characterised the decision as 'a deliberate attempt on Mr. Atack's part to disenfranchise the Wellington and other provincial centres.'[31] A motion in favour of 'the removal of the headquarters of the association to Wellington' was unanimously passed at the 1908 annual meeting of the Otago centre on 15 October.[32] 'Amateur' of the Wellington *Evening Post* argued that opposition to the reciprocal arrangement had resulted in the dissident centres 'being snubbed on every possible occasion.'[33]

The Canterbury Council's refusal to send Wellington's complaint about the conduct of the disputed election to the Union executive constitutes an example of such a 'snubbing'.[34] Complaints about this refusal dominated the meeting in Wellington that saw the decision to push for the establishment of a rival council in that city reached. R. W. McVilly – one of the delegates that secured New Zealand's secession from the Australasian Union in 1927 – was particularly defensive of the Wellington centre's right to appeal to the executive. He commented that 'I don't think we should take this [decision] sitting down' and suggested that the Canterbury Council would have 'welcomed the opportunity of referring the question to the [executive]' if it was

[30] The *Weekly Press*, 14 October 1908, p. 55.
[31] The *Evening Post*, 17 October 1908, p. 9.
[32] The *Otago Witness*, 21 October 1908, p. 62.
[33] The *Evening Post*, 5 December 1908, p. 14.
[34] The *Star*, 20 November 1908, p. 3.

confident in its decision.[35] The (Christchurch) *Star* described the decision of the Canterbury council not to refer the decision to the executive as correct and insinuated that the 'thwarted ambition' of the 'parochial' Wellington centre explained the fracas between the two communities.[36]

This criticism – while partisan – points to a truth about the response of different aspects of the New Zealand athletic community to the Australasian Union at this point in time. The Canterbury centre framed its criticism of what it saw as the restrictive amateur definition of the Union as a nationalist crusade against Australian influence. President Atack suggested that he refused to send the appeal to the executive 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.[37]

This statement encapsulates the situation in New Zealand athletics that had been developing as a result of Atack's agenda of reforming the amateur statutes. The influence of Australia acted as a rhetorical tool with which support could have galvanised. On the other hand, the dissidents saw Australian influence as a way to mitigate what it saw as the excesses of the regime. Integration with the Australasian executive was integral to its battle for control of New Zealand athletics. A sector of New Zealand's athletic community sought to ingratiate itself with Australia not because it was weak, but because it served its own political interests.

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 that view this body of water 'as a highway of cultural transmission

[35] The *Evening Post*, 28 November 1908, p. 3.
[36] The *Star*, 7 December 1908, p. 2.
[37] The *Star*, 20 November 1908, p. 3.

rather than a barrier to understanding' in the same way that Belich views the Tasman Sea as 'more bridge than barrier.'[38] 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 Canadian cities Toronto and Montreal than by Boston.[39] This situation perfectly mirrors the Wellington response to the competing influence of Canterbury and Australia.

The Wellington Council harnessed its indignation towards creating a new NZAAA council. 'Amateur' explained to his readers that:

> [t]he episode in connection with the rejection of candidates for seats on the council will be fresh in the recollection of those taking an interest in amateur athletic doings; the upshot may result in absolute revolt, and the formation of an entirely new governing body. The majority of the centres appear determined that a change must be brought about, and the conference held today at Christchurch should end the deadlock.[40]

The conference referred to saw the Wellington, Otago and Southland centres form a rival council.[41] 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.[42] The Canterbury council only slowly handed over power, with Atack asking for a letter of indemnity. 'Vaulter' of the *New Zealand Referee*, published in Atack's former stronghold of Christchurch, asked

> Why could not the Councillors resign unconditionally, and have done with the unseemly squabble that has caused so much unpleasantness in amateur athletic circles? Their latest actions have not tended to gain them any respect.[43]

The rejection of the Canterbury council served to stall the movement towards separate conceptions of amateurism that created distance between New Zealand and the

---

[38] Colin Howell and Daryl Leeworthy, 'Borderlands,' S. W. Pope and John Nauright (eds.), *Routledge Companion to Sports History*, London, UK and New York, NY: Routledge, 2010, p. 72; Belich, *Paradise Reforged*, p. 50
[39] Howell and Leeworthy, 'Borderlands,' p. 80.
[40] The *Evening Post*, 5 December 1908, p. 14.
[41] The *Evening Post*, 7 December 1908, p. 2.
[42] The *Otago Witness*, 24 March 1909, p. 63.
[43] The *Weekly Press*, 19 May 1909, p. 52.

executive of the Australasian Union. These debates contained a clear separatist edge, with advocates of the alliance with the NZAU and a less exacting standard of amateurism also advocating separation from the Union. The replacement of the Canterbury council thus laid a path towards less antagonistic relations within the Australasian athletic relationship.

While vigorous criticism of Australian influence abated after the usurpation of the Canterbury council, the amateur issue continued to mark the relationship between the NZAAA and the other members of the Australasian Union. 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 'lack of understanding of conditions prevailing in [New Zealand].'[44] 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].'[45] The New Zealand response in this instance has much in common with Richard Coombes' strong criticism of English administrators outlined in Chapter Five. 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.

The close links between the NZAAA and the Australasian Union executive was exemplified by the former's role in a dispute between the New South Wales association and their Victorian counterparts. The age-old tensions between New South Wales and

[44] New Zealand Amateur Athletic Association [Hereafter 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], p. 252.
[45] NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 1 June 1925, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0659, p. 252.

Victoria caused the dissolution of two Australasian sporting bodies. A dispute between the two states saw the New South Wales National Coursing Association leave the Australasian Coursing Union in 1927, the same year that New Zealand seceded from the Union.[46] The Australasian Cricket Council [ACC] was wound up after the New South Wales Cricket Association voted to leave the council in March 1899, in part because of the economic influence of the Melbourne Cricket Club.[47] Admittedly, the refusal of New Zealand to join meant that the ACC was not a truly Australasian body.[48] Nevertheless, divisions between New South Wales and Victoria had potentially enormous implications for the survival of Australasian sporting organisations.

Coombes' disqualification of two Victorian walkers at the 1921-22 Australasian championship meeting held in Adelaide resulted in acrimony between the NSWAAA and the VAAA. Bill Mandle remarks that Coombes 'was never forgiven by the Victorians, who in 1924 and 1926 challenged his presidency of the [Australasian Union].'[49] In addition to their actions at board level, the VAAA passed a resolution criticising Coombes' capability as a walking judge. It also threatened to boycott the next Australasian championships in Hobart if Coombes was appointed a referee.[50] The Tasmanian Amateur Athletic Association [TAAA] refused to accept this demand and appointed Coombes. 'Harrier' of the *Australasian* commented that:

> [o]ut of a dozen possible referees, and knowing that Victoria might withdraw her team, [the TAAA] deliberately selects the one person objected to. Incidentally, it thereby does that gentleman, by the resulting publicity, the greatest disservice; provokes the

---

[46] The *Referee*, 9 March 1927, p. 9.
[47] Radcliffe Grace, 'The Rise and Fall of the Australasian Cricket Council 1892-1900,' *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 2, no. 1, November 1985, p. 45; David Montefiore, *Cricket in the Doldrums: The Struggle between Private and Public Control of Australian Cricket in the 1880s*, Campbelltown: Australian Society for Sports History (ASSH), ASSH Studies in Sports History, no. 8, 1992, p. 76.
[48] Richard Cashman, *Sport in the National Imagination: Australian Sport in the Federation Decades*, Sydney, Walla Walla Press, 2002, p. 135; Hughes, 'Sporting Federations,' p. 122.
[49] W. F. Mandle, 'Coombes, Richard (1858 - 1935),' *Australian Dictionary of Biography*: *Volume 8*, Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1981, pp. 104-05. http://adbonline.anu.edu.au/biogs/A080115b.htm Accessed 17 February 2011.
[50] The *Australasian*, 18 March 1922; The *Australasian*, 19 January 1924.

> withdrawal of one of the most important competitors; and sets the athletic world in turmoil.[51]

While the VAAA eventually sent a team to the championships, it prevented its members from officiating while Coombes was present.

New Zealand joined with the other member associations in condemning the Victorian response. Former test cricketer and TAAA delegate Charles Eady

> moved: "That this conference regrets the resolution by the Victorian Amateur Athletic Association in refusing to allow any of its members to act as officials at the Carnival in Hobart, owing to the appointment by Tasmania of Mr. Richard Coombes as referee, and considers that the action is derogatory and against the interests of amateur athletics." He added that Tasmania had been much hurt by the Victorian Association's actions.[52]

This motion was carried without opposition, although the VAAA delegates H. A. Abbott and G. E. Langford did not vote. The NZAAA firmly aligned itself with the wider Australasian athletic community, rather than the antagonistic VAAA, by supporting Coombes in this dispute. Abbott responded to the Tasmanian complaints by arguing that 'Victoria recently had had a lot to complain of and had not been getting a fair deal in many directions.'[53]

Rather than indulge the concerns of the VAAA, the NZAAA appointed Coombes as a walking judge for the New Zealand championships in 1926.[54] It continued to express respect for Coombes before and after its secession from the Australasian Union. 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 Coombes' tenure as

---

[51] The *Australasian*, 19 January 1924.
[52] 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, p. 15.
[53] AAUANZ, Minutes of Meeting, 7 February 1924, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia, p. 15.
[54] NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 1 March 1926, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0659, p. 292.

president ended.[55] 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 the secession of New Zealand from the Union. The letter also offered a warning that the relationship needed to continue to evolve if it were to continue in the future – a warning that was not heeded.[56]

The remainder of this chapter will provide an explanation for the demise of the Australasian Union that moves beyond notions of nationalism. It is time now to consider the affect that New Zealand's administrative strength had on the demise of the Union. This strength is related to three inter-connected factors that explain the Union's demise. The strength of the NZAAA was instrumental in the development of a Trans-Pacific community through the organisation of tours of American athletes. This leads into the first factor as the Union shifted from a strictly Pacific community at its foundation to one that increasingly encompassed continental Australia. Secondly, the Australian bodies could not maintain pace with the innovative NZAAA in terms of reforming the Trans-Tasman relationship to reflect these changes. Thirdly, a particularly mercantile NZAAA council was elected in the mid-1920s, providing the impetus for a split. The hitherto patient New Zealanders severed ties following the Australian refusal to implement a biennial test match between the two countries. The confluence of these factors explains the demise of the Australasian athletic relationship.

The Construction of a Pacific Community

The notion of a transnational community linking Australia's East Coast with New Zealand has gained wide historical currency in recent years. Belich has described early

[55] Harry Gordon, *Australia and the Olympic Games*, St Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1994, p. 53.
[56] Joseph Heenan, Letter to Richard Coombes, 22 October 1926, Davis Sporting Collection 1, Box 21 – Olympic Games, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia [Hereafter DSC 1, Box 21].

nineteenth century sealers, whalers and sailors that worked on either side of the Tasman Sea 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.'[57] The industries that Tasmen were employed in relied on Sydney, as '[m]ost whaling, timber and trading stations were funded and staffed from Sydney.' As a result, '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 hinterland.'[58] This link was added to during the New Zealand goldrushes as Victorian influences played a similar role in the province of Westland in the 1860s to that which Sydney played earlier.[59] He furthermore describes the Tasman Sea as 'more bridge [between the communities] than barrier [separating the communities].'[60]

Belich conflates this trans-Tasman community with Australasia, which he conventionally defines as 'Australia plus New Zealand.' To Belich:

> Australasia was a very loose, vague and semi-tangible imagined community. But it was real; there were many links beyond the conceptual ... Sydney and Old New Zealand were an important metropolis and hinterland for each other before 1840. In the 1860s, gold-rush Westland was economically and demographically part of Victoria rather than Canterbury. Also in the 1860s, thousands of Australians helped Pakeha [European New Zealanders] fight Maori, and was New Zealand's main trading partner.[61]

Belich's reflection on the nature of pre-Federation 'Australasian' links is focussed on the East Coast and is interchangeable with links that he has attributed to the Tasman World. He suggests that the Tasman World was a casualty of New Zealand's decision not to Federate, although residues remained.[62] An examination of the vestiges of this relationship lends further credence to the notion that Belich has conflated Australasia

---

[57] James Belich, *Making Peoples: A History of the New Zealanders From Polynesian settlement to the end of the nineteenth century*, Auckland, NZ: Penguin Books, 2007, p. 131.
[58] Belich, *Making Peoples*, p. 134.
[59] Belich, *Making Peoples*, p. 348.
[60] Belich, *Making Peoples*, p. 134.
[61] Belich, *Paradise Reforged*, p. 47.
[62] Belich, *Paradise Reforged*, pp. 47, 52.

with the Tasman World. Evidence of twentieth century links between Australia and New Zealand includes New Zealanders playing in Australian lotteries and links in popular culture, literature, sport, migration and banking.[63]

An examination of these continuing links show an overwhelming majority reflect the resonance of the Tasman World, as the Australian aspects of these links 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.[64] 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 – rendered Rickards by Richard Waterhouse – opened vaudeville theatres in Sydney and Melbourne in 1892 and 1894 respectively, but later also opened theatres in Adelaide and Perth.[65] 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.[66] Belich suggests that the Sydney *Bulletin* periodical could be called 'a Tasman, or Australasian, journal' due to the influence of New Zealand authors in its literature pages until the 1960s.[67] Given its place of publication, the former appellation is most appropriate. The influence of 'Aussie league' – the Sydney-based New South Wales Rugby League[68] – over New

---

[63] Belich, *Paradise Reforged*, pp. 316-17, 328-32, 384-85, 440.
[64] David Grant, *On a Roll: A History of Gambling and Lotteries in New Zealand*, Wellington, NZ: Victoria University Press, 1994, pp. 59, 63, 167-69, 226.
[65] Richard Waterhouse, *Private Pleasures, Public Leisure: A History of Australian Popular Culture Since 1788*, South Melbourne: Longman, 1995, p. 71.
[66] Helen M. van der Poorten, 'Williamson, James Cassius (1845 - 1913),' *Australian Dictionary of Biography: Volume 6*, Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1976, pp. 406-07. http://adbonline.anu.edu.au/biogs/A060439b.htm. Accessed 1 March 2011.
[67] Belich, *Paradise Reforged*, p. 329.
[68] Later the Australian Rugby League [ARL] and later still the National Rugby League [NRL].

Zealand from the 1980s is to Belich 'a part of the recent revival of the Tasman World.'[69]

The vestiges of the relationship between Australia and New Zealand as identified by Belich were thus based around the familiar trans-Tasman community. 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 that New Zealand was less proximate too. This difference is significant in terms of the secession of New Zealand from the Australasian Union.

Despite becoming less important in Australian politics, the Pacific community remained important within Australian sport well into the twentieth century. For example, key figures in both codes of rugby football in Australia saw San Francisco as a viable and important site of potential expansion.[70] However, it was the influence of New Zealand that gave the operations of the Australasian Union a truly Pacific focus. The NZAAA exploited a Trans-Pacific network in order to secure the services of a series of teams to tour New Zealand and – on most occasions – Australia. The successful organisation of these tours demonstrates the strong position of the NZAAA within the Union. It also provided a dynamic that would ultimately force New Zealand apart from Australia in athletic terms.

---

[69] Belich, *Paradise Reforged*, p. 385.
[70] Sean Brawley, '"Our Bright Young American Cousins": Internationalising Rugby, Trans-Pacific Connections and the American Universities Rugby Tour of Australasia, 1910,' Mary Bushby and Thomas V. Hickie, *Rugby History: The Remaking of the Class Game*, Melbourne: Australian Society for Sports History, 2007, pp.73-101; Andy Carr, '"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*, no. 49, February 2009, p. 10.

In contrast to Belich's concept of the Tasman World, Keith Sinclair describes the concept of the Pacific Triangle, 'a branch of New World civilization, the main centres of which are Sydney, San Francisco and Auckland', which Peter Gibbons cites as defining a Pacific community.[71] This community has often been ignored by historians of Australia and New Zealand due to the importance of nationalism and imperialism within the respective historiographies of the two nations. 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 took its inspiration from 'the real Australia and real Australians west of the dividing range' that separated cities such as Sydney from the bush.[72] Denoon *et al* argue that while this Pacific community lost favour in Australia, it remained an important and controversial aspect of New Zealand foreign policy after Federation:

> As Australians sidled towards a continental federation, New Zealand politicians, presenting themselves as experts in living with Maori, hoped to rule other Polynesian polities. These aspirations touched Fiji as well as Samoa and Tonga, but commanded no support in Westminster …[73]

The authors further assert that New Zealand politicians were inspired by 'a vision of an island empire to balance the continental federation of Australia.'[74]

Just as New Zealand politicians remained committed to the notion of a Pacific community, New Zealand athletics administrators cultivated such a community of their own. The Pacific community of Australasian athletics extended towards the expatriate community in San Francisco. 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

---

[71] Peter Gibbons, 'The Far Side of the Search for Identity: Reconsidering New Zealand History,' *New Zealand Journal of History*, vol. 37, no. 1, April 2003, p. 44.
[72] Donald Denoon, 'Re-Membering Australasia: A Repressed Memory,' *Australian Historical Studies*, no. 122, October 2003, p. 298.
[73] Donald Denoon and Philippa Mein Smith, with Marivic Wyndham, *A History of Australia, New Zealand, and the Pacific*, Oxford, UK and Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2000, p. 30.
[74] Denoon *et al*, *A History of Australia, New Zealand, and the Pacific*, p. 198.

'apt knowledge of the sporting world in Australasia.'[75] Despite a focus on boxing, Naughton offered opinions on a range of sports including athletics. He warned his readers about the notorious reputation that Arthur Duffey was developing, and gave a frank description of the fallout that accompanied the revelations that ended his running career.[76]

Another key figure of the San Francisco expatriate community was William Unmack, the driving force behind a 1914 American athletic tour of Australasia. This tour 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.[77] Unmack was an active member of the Pacific division of the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States [AAU] and an 'athletic authority' at the San Francisco *Daily Call* newspaper. He proposed this tour in a letter to Coombes, who described Unmack as:

> a Queenslander … I can remember him some 12 to 14 years ago competing in heel and toe [walking] events against the Corrigan brothers, Wilcox, P. Flanagan, and other Northern walking celebrities of the period.[78]

Although a relatively obscure figure in Australian sports historiography, Unmack is remembered for his role in the ill-fated tour of America undertaken by Australian female swimmers Sarah 'Fanny' Durack and Wilhemina 'Mina' Wylie in 1919.[79] The 1914 athletic tour proved an extension of the pattern formed by the Shrubb-Duffey

---

[75] The *Referee*, 18 March 1914, p. 16.
[76] The *Referee*, 22 January 1902, pp. 1, 7; The *Referee*, 18 January 1905, p. 1; The *Referee*, 1 November 1905, p. 6.
[77] NZAAA, Minutes of Annual General Meeting, 23 November 1914, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0659, pp. 51-52.
[78] The *Referee*, 28 August 1912, p. 1.
[79] John A. Lucas and Ian Jobling, 'Troubled Waters: Fanny Durack's 1919 Swimming Tour of America Amid Transnational Amateur Athletic Prudery and Bureaucracy,' *Olympika: The International Journal of Olympic Studies*, vol. 4, 1995, pp. 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.

Tour, as the organisational vigour of the NZAAA allowed the tour to be rescued. Despite the exposure Coombes was able to give the tour's plans through his newspaper column, it appeared destined to come to nothing as Unmack was unable to organise a satisfactory team to tour in 1913.[80]

The tour might have been scrapped as a proposed tour of South African athletes after the London Olympics of 1908 had been if not for the persistence of the NZAAA. Protracted negotiations between the executive of the Australasian Union and their South African counterparts aimed at securing a tour by Olympic medallists Reg Walker and Charles Hefferon collapsed in August 1909.[81] Matters were complicated by the decision of Hefferon to turn professional, although Walker's team mate on his 1909 tour of Europe, Vincent Duncker, was drafted as a replacement. The South African Amateur Athletic and Cycling Association rejected the Australasian offer, citing Hefferon's status as a professional and the fact that Walker and Duncker could not spend more than the six months allotted to the European tour away from South Africa. Coombes remained hopeful of a tour by Walker despite this rejection, although the closest the Australasian amateur audience came to seeing the athlete was as part of a professional tour in 1913.[82]

The American tour suggested by Unmack to Coombes was reinvigorated by the dedication of the NZAAA. In February 1913 it communicated with Coombes a desire to continue with the organisation of the tour. After receiving a series of letters from Unmack explaining why the tour did not proceed, it

> agreed to communicate with the A.A.U. of America as to what terms [a] first class team could be obtained for a tour of New Zealand and Australia commencing late in December 1913 and extending to late in March.

---

[80] See The *Referee*, 4 December 1912, p. 9 and The *Referee*, 15 January 1913, p. 9.
[81] Walker won the hundred metres championship at the 1908 Olympic Games held in London, while Hefferon was officially awarded second place in the controversial marathon.
[82] The *Referee*, 6 October 1909, p. 9; The *Referee*, 29 January 1913, p. 9.

The NZAAA also decided to communicate this resolution to its fellow member associations and to president Coombes.[83] Any deference to Coombes was misplaced, as he asked the NZAAA to take the matter in hand and communicate with the state bodies themselves as, 'much more detailed information could be given than if the information was supplied by the Union.'[84] This admission reflects the degree to which the Union relied on New Zealand to organise tours to Australasia at this point in time. The lackadaisical response of Coombes to New Zealand's efforts was matched by that of Sullivan of the AAUUS, who 'preferred delegating the arranging of a team to Mr Unmack who was better able to handle it than the [American] Union.'[85] The outsourcing of the tour's organisation from Sullivan in New York to Unmack in San Francisco illustrates that this tour was a truly Pacific undertaking.

The NZAAA was officially notified that Sullivan had sanctioned the tour and the appointment of Unmack as manager in June 1913. However, at the same meeting, J. H. Pollock drew attention to the continuing disengagement of the Australian bodies with the tour. That the NZAAA was more committed than the Australian bodies is underscored by its resolution 'that unless more enthusiasm was shown the tour should be called off.'[86] The hitherto dormant New South Wales and Victorian bodies were shaken into action, and both had posted letters to their New Zealand counterpart by the time that the next meeting of the NZAAA took place on 7 July 1913. Negotiations with Unmack resumed at pace as a result of this development.[87] New Zealand's role in cajoling the diffident Australian bodies into action is further evidence of their status as administrative powerhouse in the region.

---

[83] NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 3 February 1913, 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], p. 244.
[84] NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 10 March 1913, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0658, p. 248.
[85] NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 19 May 1913, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0658, p. 256.
[86] NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 9 June 1913, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0658, pp. 258-60.
[87] NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 7 July 1913, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0658, p. 262.

The efforts of the NZAAA were rewarded as a team was duly sent to New South Wales, Victoria and New Zealand in December 1913. Its efforts in hosting the tourists moved American team member Ruric Templeton to describe 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.'[88] The NZAAA's administrative dominance extended to fundraising, as it raised half of the £480 that the tour was projected to cost. The team's engagements were distributed on a pro rata basis, meaning that New Zealand hosted the majority of meetings. The tour began unofficially with an unplanned excursion to compete in a small meeting at Waikanae. New Zealand officially hosted the tourists at Christchurch, Invercargill, Dunedin, Wellington (two day meeting), Masterton, Wanganui, Palmerston North and Auckland before travelling to Australia.[89] In Melbourne, the Americans competed at the Australasian championship meeting in addition to two specially arranged meetings. In Sydney, they competed at the New South Wales championships held over two Saturdays with a night meeting on the Tuesday in between.[90] After completing their Australian engagements, the Americans finished the New Zealand leg with appearances at Wellington, Masterton and Hamilton.[91]

The scheduling of dates provoked animosity between the VAAA and the NZAAA. The VAAA was due to host the Australasian championships in 1913-14, and chose 24 and 26 January 1914 for this event. The NZAAA independently chose 10, 14 and 17 January as the final dates of its leg of the tour.[92] It suggested that the dates of the

---

[88] NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 2 March 1914, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0659, p. 26. Despite Templeton's praise, the NZAAA suffered a loss of £30. [The *Evening Post*, 21 April 1914, p. 6.]
[89] For details of the events, see The *Referee*, 17 December 1913, p. 9; The *Referee*, 24 December 1913, p. 9; The *Referee*, 31 December 1913, p. 11; The *Referee*, 7 January 1914, p. 9; The *Referee*, 14 January 1914, p. 9.
[90] For details of the Australian itinerary, see the *Referee's* 'Amateur Athletic Fixtures' on 21 January 1914. [The *Referee*, 21 January 1914, p. 9.]
[91] The *Referee*, 4 March 1914, p. 9; The *Referee*, 11 March 1914, p. 9.
[92] NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 19 May 1913, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0658, p. 256.

Australasian championships be changed in order to allow it and the Americans to compete at the meeting. This provoked a blistering reply from the VAAA, in which it threatened to pull out of the tour. Basil Parkinson of the VAAA claimed that the NZAAA's action on this matter and the scheduling of only two Saturday meetings in Australia

> was unfair, and the neglect of New Zealand's part in withholding essential information and ignoring the joint nature of the undertaking might now make it impossible for the Australian body to have the Americans.[93]

Parkinson's memory was faulty, as the inability of the VAAA to respond to the entreaties of the NZAAA had previously threatened the tour. The criticism of New Zealand's ignorance of the 'joint nature of the undertaking' was unfair to say the least given the effort it expended in organising the tour and cajoling the Australian bodies to take part. New Zealand accepted a compromise offer whereby the VAAA would contribute further funds and the tourists would leave Auckland for Australia on 12 January, allowing the tourists and the New Zealand team to compete in the Australasian championships. The American team would complete its scheduled New Zealand engagements prior to departure for America.[94] The NZAAA's willingness to compromise in the face of provocation from the Victorian body indicates a less combative approach than that evident during the reign of the Christchurch council. While this tour was a financial failure, it offered the opportunity for athletes in New Zealand, Victoria and New South Wales to learn from the performances of the American athletes and imbibe the lessons that Peixotto offered in a series of public lectures.[95] Unfortunately, these lessons would not influence Australasian performances at international athletic competitions due to the onset of World War I later in 1914.

---

[93] The *Evening Post*, 3 December 1913, p. 10.
[94] The *Evening Post*, 17 December 1913, p. 8.
[95] NZAAA, Minutes of Annual General Meeting, 23 November 1914, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0659, pp. 51-52; The *Referee*; 18 February 1914, p. 16.

Australasia was graced by a tour of South African athletes and cyclists in 1921-22 as a result of the initiative of Ira Emery, the General Secretary of the Olympic Games South African Executive Council.[96] New Zealand administrative dominance was restored following this tour when it suggested a tour by 'a team of American Athletes' to the other members of the Australasian Union.[97] It was again forced to take the matter into its own hands after the executive of the Union found the proposal 'not entirely favourable.'[98] The organisation of this tour was exclusively restricted to the North Island of New Zealand, a factor which saw the athletes compete only in this part of Australasia. The organisation of this tour was far from smooth sailing, with the Auckland centre suggesting that the tour should be cancelled as a result of the weakening of the team. Reigning Olympic 100 metres champion Charles Paddock was unable to tour as previously hoped.[99] The Canterbury centre earned the opprobrium of the council by refusing to accept the tourists.[100] This tour was extremely financially lucrative as profits from the tour exceeded £200 despite total costs exceeding £1000. Amidst general celebration about the NZAAA's financial position, Wellington delegate to the 1923 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.[101]

Australians were not completely left out of the plans, as the NZAAA invited Australian sprinter Edwin 'Slip' Carr to compete against American sprinter Morris Kirskey.[102] Kirskey proved Carr's superior, although the Australian suffered an ankle injury and won the respect of the American, who suggested that Carr 'ranks with the

[96] The *Referee* 23 June 1920 p. 8; The *Referee* 30 June 1920 p. 8; The *Referee* 17 November 1920 p. 9.
[97] NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 12 June 1922, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0659, p. 147.
[98] NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 14 August 1922, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0659, p. 153.
[99] NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 18 December 1922, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0659, p. 167.
[100] NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 8 January 1923, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0659, p. 170.
[101] NZAAA, Minutes of Annual General Meeting, 26 November 1923, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0659, p. 199.
[102] NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 8 January 1923, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0659, p. 170.

world's best sprinters. When he is more matured he should hold his own with anyone.'[103] Despite early promise, Carr did not prove to be a genuinely world class sprinter. A more reliable gauge of Carr's ability may have been obtained had reigning Olympic 100 metres champion Charles Paddock toured as hoped. New Zealand actually alleviated Australian weakness in this case, as it offered an Australian sprinter the opportunity to test himself against a world-class sprinter during the southern season. The NZAAA was the only sporting organisation in Australasia that could offer Carr this opportunity. The administrative strength of the NZAAA, exemplified by its ability to secure the success of planned tours to Australasia and to organise profitable tours without the aid of their Australian counterparts, runs counter to the view which sees New Zealand as slowly achieving its independence. Far from being a junior member of the Australasian Union, the NZAAA was an extremely capable organisation. This tradition of New Zealand administrative strength within the Union influenced its response to the changing nature of the Australasian athletic community from a Pacific community to one that more closely resembled the Australian Commonwealth.

At its foundation, the Australasian Union represented a strictly Pacific community. It was founded amidst the Federation process that saw the colonies of Australia unite in the 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.'[104] 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 and Western

[103] The *Referee*, 28 February 1923, p. 9; The *Referee*, 7 March 1923, pp. 13-14.
[104] Hughes, 'Sporting Federations,' p. 123.

Australia forming in 1905.[105] Despite the formation of these bodies, their existence and place within the Union was precarious until after the First World War. While the TAAA was affiliated to the Union by the time of the Australasian championship meeting of 1904, it provided no delegates to the concurrent Board of Control meeting.[106] The meeting two seasons later in November 1905 was delayed as the Tasmanian delegates did not attend the first sitting.[107] The TAAA became established within the Union when it hosted the 1908 Australasian championship meeting.

Despite the first Australian amateur athletic club being founded in Adelaide, the South Australian Amateur Athletic Association [SAAAA] faced similar obstacles in establishing itself within the Australasian Union.[108] Its contribution to the 1908 Championship meeting and Board of Control meeting held at Hobart was limited to a telegram from honorary secretary G. Elston Mayo 'regretting that the Association would not be represented at the Conference.'[109] Its continuing lethargy raised concerns within the Union establishment at the 1909 meeting held in Brisbane, as the executive were 'instructed to communicate with the S.A.A.A.A. in reference to matters athletic in that State, and that the assistance of the Victorian A.A.A. be invoked.' There was nevertheless some sympathy for the plight of the SAAAA, as it was resolved that 'the matter of their indebtedness to the Union be held over.'[110] This compassion was again extended at the next meeting held at Wellington in 1911. A £5 fine imposed on it 'for

[105] NZAAA, *Programme – Australasian Championship Carnival*, Wellington, 26 December 1911, Davis Sporting Collection 1, Box 6 – Amateur athletics association carnivals, 1899-1931, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, p. 1.
[106] Amateur Athletic Union of Australasia [AAUA], Minutes of Meeting, 28 January 1904, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, p. 3.
[107] AAUA, Minutes of Meeting, 8 November 1905, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, p. 4.
[108] John A. Daly, *Elysian Field: Sport, Class and Community in Colonial South Australia 1836-1890*, Adelaide, the Author, 1982, p. 86.
[109] AAUA, Minutes of Meeting, 27 February 1908, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, p. 3.
[110] AAUA, Minutes of Meeting, 19 August 1909, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, p. 13.

being unrepresented at the Championship Meeting' was remitted by virtue of a unanimous decision.[111]

The West Australian Amateur Athletic Association [WAAAA] was unable to send representatives to the 1905 Board of Control Meeting held concurrently with the Australasian championships and was represented by Sydney resident E. S. Marks.[112] Its troubles became more apparent in 1907, when correspondence from Coombes was returned marked 'dead.' Coombes flippantly mused that 'whether this means that the secretary is dead or the association, I cannot say.'[113] The moribundity of the association was confirmed at the 1908 Board of Control meeting held at Hobart. A letter from P. Byrne of Kalgoorlie informed the gathering that the WAAAA was defunct, with Byrne requesting that he be allowed to compete at the concurrent Australasian championships. The WAAAA was officially declared defunct later during the same meeting.[114] Despite another body forming the same year, the second incarnation of the WAAAA was not affiliated to the Australasian Union until 1914. The Board of Control meeting at Wellington in 1911 empowered the Union Executive to take appropriate steps towards '[a]n athletic body, with headquarters at Fremantle, W.A., ask[ing] to be recognised as the West Australian A.A.A.'[115] It was finally recognised in 1914 after assuring the Board of Control that it 'was formed on a firm basis', with ten clubs affiliated.[116] The

[111] AAUA, Minutes of Meeting, 26 December 1911, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, p. 8.
[112] AAUA, Minutes of Meeting, 9 November 1905, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, p. 4.
[113] The *Referee*, 22 May 1907, p. 8.
[114] AAUA, Minutes of Meeting, 27 and 29 February 1908, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, pp. 3, 11.
[115] AAUA, Minutes of Meeting, 26 December 1911, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, p. 5.
[116] AAUA, Minutes of Meeting, 24 January 1914, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, p. 14.

WAAAA lapsed once more after the Great War and did not become a permanent fixture of the Union until after New Zealand had left the organisation in 1927.[117]

The relative success of Tasmania in establishing itself within the Australasian Union, and the travails experienced by the other prospective members, is instructive. The geographical proximity of Tasmania and New Zealand meant that the addition of the former did not materially affect the latter's response to the Union. Belich reports that nineteenth century descriptions of the region often referred to "'Australia, New Zealand and Tasmania", indicating a great archipelago in which New Zealand was no more separate than Tasmania.'[118] The Pacific community was maintained by the inclusion of Tasmania. Problems arose when South Australia became entrenched within the Union. Borderlands scholarship is again instructive here. Howell and Leeworthy stress the strength of the East-West axis that linked South Wales to the West Country of England compared to the 'historically absent North-South axis of communications in Welsh history.' To these authors, this explains the close links between Welsh and English rugby union and association football (soccer) clubs compared to the weakness of the quintessentially Northern English sport of rugby league in Wales.[119] The next section will display that it proved impossible to extend the East-West axis that linked New Zealand and the East Coast of Australia to cover the entirety of the Australian continent. New Zealand entrepreneurship offered a way to meet this challenge, but Australian conservatism and reticence failed to take this opportunity.

The End Game: The Final Dissolution of the Australasian Union

[117] Amateur Athletic Union of Australia, Minutes of Meeting, 24 January 1930, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, p. 3.
[118] Belich, *Paradise Reforged*, p. 47.
[119] Howell and Leeworthy, 'Borderlands,' pp. 76-77.

The NZAAA suggested that the Australasian championship meeting be replaced by a biennial test match between Australia and New Zealand throughout the 1920s. Members of the council expressed anxiety about their access to the Australasian championship meetings. Leaving aside the extra distance to cities away from Australia's Pacific Coast, the system of rotating the host cities was felt especially keenly in New Zealand. The addition of extra cities had less impact in Australia, where the meetings were held exclusively in the capital cities of the affiliated states. However, New Zealand's system of centres meant that four cities (Auckland, Wellington, Christchurch and Dunedin) were part of its rotation. One administrator pointed out that under the current arrangements these cities could expect to host an Australasian championship once every forty-eight years.[120] For a body with the NZAAA's administrative zeal, an interlude such as this required remedy. The suggested institution of a test match reflected New Zealand's strength in two ways. Firstly, it recognised New Zealand as a competitor equal to Australia. Secondly, it demonstrated the innovative thinking that had seen the successful organisation of lucrative tours to Australasia. New Zealand's response to the changing nature of the Union was entirely consistent with its approach to other opportunities.

It brought the issue before the Australasian Union at the 1921 Board of Control meeting held at Adelaide, claiming that it was finding difficulties sending the team 'under present conditions.'[121] The timing, the site and the way this motion was expressed are significant. New Zealand was due to host South Africa in an international match during its leg of the tour held concurrently with this meeting.[122] Adelaide was outside the original scope of the Union, indicating that the changing structure was

[120] NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 18 December 1923, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0659, p. 204.
[121] NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 1 May 1922, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0659, p. 145.
[122] For details of the match, see The *Evening Post*, 27 February 1922, p. 10; The *New Zealand Times*, 27 February 1922, p. 10; The *Dominion*, 27 February 1922, p. 6.

affecting New Zealand's ability to remain a part of this community. The choice of phrase is significant and indicates a willingness to reform the relationship rather than split from the Union, even though such an event firmly placed national affiliation at the centre of the relationship. 'Hurdler' of the *New Zealand Times* newspaper viewed the match against South Africa as a continuation of the recent drawn rugby series between the two countries.[123] The introduction of such a match between Australia and New Zealand would have been 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 comprising Coombes, Parkinson and New Zealand delegate S. Cox appointed at the Adelaide meeting informed New Zealand delegates

> that their proposal would merely transfer the same disabilities [cost and excessive leave] to the Australian states and that matches Australia v. New Zealand would on the present programme necessitate a large increase in the number of men sent from [New Zealand] every fourth year, thus cancelling any assumed saving in the cost of teams … Your committee does not disapprove of such contests, but considers that a reduced programme of about nine events and special financial arrangements would be called for, and suggests that New Zealand consider the matter further …[124]

Coombes expressed some sympathy for the movement, although other key administrators within Australia were antagonistic towards the proposal. The VAAA could not support such a proposal, as it would impose too great a cost on them.[125] This was ironic, as Victorians had earlier criticised the conservative attitude of the English

[123] The *New Zealand Times*, 25 February 1922, p. 9.
[124] AAUA, Minutes of Meeting, 30 December 1921, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, p. 12.
[125] The *Referee*, 10 May 1922, p. 9; The *Australasian*, 19 August 1922.

AAA, who had refused to support tours to Australasia prior to the Great War as outlined in Chapter Three.

The refusal of the Australian bodies to take New Zealand's position into account gave the impression that the Australasian body was under threat. In the lead up to the 1924 Board of Control meeting in Hobart, Coombes suggested that the 'writing [was] on the wall' as far as New Zealand's membership of the Australasian Union was concerned, and that 'the separate nation idea' was in the ascendency. He argued that the scheme '[had] not received the consideration, in some quarters, that it surely deserves.'[126] However, despite the underwhelming support of their Australian counterparts, New Zealand continued to press for a biennial test match against Australia rather than secede. This continuing advocacy offers an indication of the NZAAA's commitment to the Union even at this point. 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 voting on this motion was tied, with five delegates (both delegates from New Zealand and Tasmania, along with Victorian delegate G. Langford) voting for the motion, five (the two delegates from New South Wales and Queensland along with Abbott of Victoria) voting against and the South Australians not recording a vote. Bizarrely, given his recent support for the idea, Coombes voted against the motion in his capacity as New South Wales delegate. His muddled state is reflected in his decision to eschew his other responsibility as chairman and cast the deciding vote, instead declaring 'the motion "not carried" on account of the tied vote.'[127] Despite the continuing antipathy of the Australian bodies, Coombes' fears of secession did not eventuate.

---

[126] The *Referee*, 19 December 1923, p. 9.
[127] AAUANZ, Minutes of Meeting, 4 February 1924, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, pp. 9-10.

Although the NZAAA did not present a motion on the issue to the following meeting held in Brisbane, the scheme remained the subject of discussion between Australian and New Zealand officials. Joseph Heenan, a recently resigned delegate of Otago on the NZAAA, offered Coombes a detailed plan of the way the Australasian relationship could be altered to better suit New Zealand:

> It seems to me that the real solution of the question the way for which will be paved by [New Zealand's] withdrawal from the present scheme of Australasian championships after the next gathering, will be the formation of an Australian A.A.A., and the holding of annual Australian Championships, with a biennial meeting between Australia and New Zealand.
> The A.A.U. I would suggest be turned into an A.A. Federation of Australia and [New Zealand] charged particularly with the care of the Amateur Statutes, Australasian Records, and the biennial contests.
> The present body is to my mind somewhat of a survival of past pre-Commonwealth days, and it is surprising that for 25 years there has been no move to set up an Australian A. A. A. and Australian championships. Personally I think the change would be to the advantage of all parties.[128]

The tenor of this letter is completely different from the way the Canterbury council approached conflict with Coombes. Heenan appealed to Coombes' sense of importance rather than forcing Coombes 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.'[129] 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.[130] It is also significant that Heenan expressed surprise that no

[128] Joseph Heenan, Letter to Richard Coombes, 22 October 1926, DSC 1, Box 21. Emphasis in original.
[129] Joseph Heenan, Letter to Richard Coombes, 22 October 1926, DSC 1, Box 21.
[130] 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], p. 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, E. S. Marks Sporting Collection, Box Q82 – Miscellaneous sports – Letters and Minute Books, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia.]

Australian body had been formed or Australian championships held since Federation. This indicates that New Zealand did not see the body as a national federation as would be understood in today's international sporting structure.

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.[131] 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 the 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. Plans for a tour of American athletes in 1925-26 were scrapped in September 1925.[132] However, a committee formed by the Wellington centre, including Tracy, of the NZAAA drew up plans to reinvigorate the faltering scheme.[133] After dissension between this group and the council, it was decided that a joint committee be formed. Hugo's reading of this as a vote of no-confidence led him to tender his resignation, which he refused to withdraw at the next council meeting after being asked to reconsider.[134] At the next meeting, he commented that 'he had been discredited both at home and abroad, and consequently did not feel disposed to reconsider [his] decision to resign.'[135] Members of the Wellington Committee, including McVilly and Tracy that had reinvigorated the tour were elected to key posts at the Annual Meeting of the

[131] Hughes, 'Sporting Federations,' p. 125.
[132] NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 7 September 1925, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0659, p. 262.
[133] NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 12 October 1925, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0659, pp. 265-66.
[134] NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 22 October 1925, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0659, p. 269.
[135] NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 2 November 1925, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0659, p. 271.

NZAAA in November 1925.[136] Tracy had no prior experience with the NZAAA council, although McVilly had been part of the movement to wrest control of the council from Canterbury in 1908.[137]

The actions of the old council were heavily criticised in the Wellington press, with their 'bungling' compared to the energy of the Wellington committee.[138] The Wellington committee were not only successful in gaining control of the Association, the tour undertaken by athletes Jackson Scholz and Lloyd Hahn realised a profit of £1255 14s. 2d.[139] Nevertheless, McVilly and Tracy's tenure was quite controversial as their endeavours to attract tours created clear fault-lines within New Zealand's athletic firmament. Otago delegate F. W. Wilton accused the council of 'acting like a body of showmen' after plans were made to organise yet another tour in 1926.[140] Wilton earned a suspension for these remarks, which McVilly considered 'offensive.'[141] Wilton represented a view that these administrators had gone too far in pursuit of a tour, even by the standards of the NZAAA. The characteristics of this group of administrators explain why the decision was made to secede at this point. Wilton's criticisms indicate that the McVilly council was particularly mercantile in its outlook, even for a body as energetic as the NZAAA. This particular council had less patience to exhaust than previous incarnations, explaining why the body decided to secede at this point in time when the issue had been discussed for the best part of a decade.

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 employed a

---

[136] NZAAA, Minutes of Annual General Meeting, 23 November 1925, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0659, p. 281.
[137] 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.
[138] The *Evening Post*, 24 October 1925, p. 18; The *Dominion*, 4 November 1925, p. 4.
[139] The *Evening Post*, 8 June 1926, p. 5.
[140] NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 23 September 1926, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0659, p. 338.
[141] NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 15 November 1926, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0659, p. 346.

rather strained metaphor that betrayed a lack of historical knowledge about the development of amateur athletics in Australasia:

> When the [Union] was formed many years ago, athletics were but in their infancy: now I think we can safely say we have attained our majority, so to speak, and want to break from our father to control our own destinies.[142]

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.[143] Thus Tracy's ignorance could be attributed to his relative inexperience in athletic administration. Not only did the NZAAA pre-exist the majority of the Australian bodies by a significant amount of time, it demonstrated that it did not require the assistance of its Australian counterparts in its dealings with prospective tourists. 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.[144] While Hughes diagnoses confusion on the part of New Zealand in its response to Australia, Tracy's inexperience may better explain the differing opinion between the New Zealand delegates.

Despite leaving the Australasian Union, the NZAAA attempted to continue to cultivate a relationship with their Australian counterparts. Rather than let the biennial meeting scheme rest, it continued to suggest this scheme to their Australian counterparts. An effort was made in 1928-29 to constitute biennial matches against Australia, and a further effort was made in 1931. A sub-committee 'to bring down proposals in connection with biennial meetings with Australia' was appointed at the

---

[142] AAUANZ, Minutes of Meeting, 23 December 1927, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, p. 12.
[143] The *Evening Post*, 27 February 1922, p. 10; The *New Zealand Times*, 27 February 1922, p. 10; The *Dominion*, 27 February 1922, p. 6.
[144] Hughes, 'Sporting Federations,' p. 126.

1928 NZAAA Annual General Meeting.[145] The sub-committee's positive report led the NZAAA to communicate with the Amateur Athletic Union of Australia, but also refuse a request from that body to return the Australasian Championship Shield to Australia. It believed that the shield, won by New Zealand in Wellington in 1927, could be used as a trophy for the biennial test match.[146] The Australian body again declined to take up the New Zealand proposal.[147] The scheme was revived in 1931 by Harold Austad of the NZAAA council, who was of the opinion that the improved financial position of the Amateur Athletic Union of Australia meant that the scheme 'would receive favourable consideration.'[148] It is noteworthy that this decision was reached within a month of the first Bledisloe Cup rugby match played between New Zealand and Australia in Auckland.

Despite the Great Depression, the Amateur Athletic Union of Australia was for the first time establishing a powerful financial position in 1931. This was due to its receiving a ten percent share of profits from the first Australian championship meeting. The Australasian Union resolved in 1901 'that at all Australasian Championships the promoting Association should devote ten percent of all net profits, when the total exceeded £100, to the Union.'[149] This resolution had largely been window dressing until the Amateur Athletic Union of Australia received £37 17s. as a result of the final Australasian championships in Wellington.[150] This figure was dwarfed by the £112 17s. 6d. that it received following the first Australian meeting in Melbourne. The success of this meeting was due in significant part to the presence of German athlete Dr Otto

[145] NZAAA, Minutes of Annual General Meeting, 19 November 1928, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0660, p. 50.
[146] NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 3 December 1928, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0660, p. 51.
[147] NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 8 May 1929, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0660, p. 53.
[148] NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 5 October 1931, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0660, p. 127.
[149] AAUA, Minutes of Meeting, 22 December 1901, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, p. 16.
[150] Amateur Athletic Union of Australia, Minutes of Meeting, 24 January 1930, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, p. 18.

Peltzer and American athlete Leo Lermond, which aroused great enthusiasm on the part of Melburnians. The Melbourne *Argus* newspaper reported that fifteen thousand spectators attending the first day of competition, when Victorian W. M. Whyte defeated both the visitors in the mile race.[151] The Australian national body recorded a credit balance of £81 14s. 3d. as a result of this windfall, which supports Austad's claim that the body was in a financial position to allow consideration of the scheme.[152] However, given the financial struggles of the body in the era of Australasian championships, it seems unlikely that it saw the projected meetings between Australia and New Zealand as a potential fundraising opportunity.

The familiar pattern of New Zealand enthusiasm and Australian reticence was played out yet again in 1931. Marks informed the NZAAA that the scheme would be placed before the next Amateur Athletic Union of Australia board of control meeting. The NZAAA's query as to whether the matter could be expedited through the holding of a mail vote was answered by Marks in the negative.[153] The Board of Control rejected the New Zealand overture and reaffirmed the view that

> this conference does not consider the proposed scheme of interchange of visits between New Zealand and Australia practicable, and suggests that visits should be left to the Australian and New Zealand bodies to decide upon themselves, the tours, if so desired, to be at their own expense, and invitations be issued by either body.

The only two dissenting voices came from New South Wales delegates Myer Rosenblum and R. B. Casimir.[154] This decision 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 the New Zealand body. The NZAAA's continuing commitment to this scheme in the face of Australia's lack of

[151] The *Argus*, 27 January 1930, p. 7.
[152] Amateur Athletic Union of Australia, Minutes of Meeting,15 January 1932, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, pp. 18-19.
[153] NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 2 November 1931, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0660, p. 129; NZAAA, Minutes of Meeting, 10 December 1931, NZAAA Records: MSY – 0660, p. 133.
[154] Amateur Athletic Union of Australia, Minutes of Meeting, 15 January 1932, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, pp. 7-8.

interest is far removed from an expression of separatist nationalism. While the NZAAA saw limited utility in the Australasian Union, 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.'[155] Thus the flame of the Australasian athletic relationship was extinguished.

Conclusion

The development of nationalism does not explain the decision of New Zealand to secede from the Amateur Athletic Union of Australia and New Zealand [Australasian Union] in 1927. 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. Tensions between the leadership of the NZAAA and the Australasian Union developed early, and were fuelled by accusations that the Union's amateur laws were too exacting. Walter Atack, president of the NZAAA between 1905 and 1908, attempted to institute a series of reforms that would lead to a more liberal conception of amateurism dominating New Zealand. The tensions between the NZAAA and the Union were intimately linked to this reform agenda. Wellington led three Centres in vigorous opposition to the reform agenda, leading to a split in the NZAAA. This Centre took advantage of links to the Australasian Union to gain control of the NZAAA. Once Wellington assumed control of the NZAAA, tensions between that body and the Union were effectively neutralised to the point that the NZAAA

[155] New Zealand Olympic Association, Minutes of Annual Meeting, 1 May 1935, New Zealand Olympic Committee Records, Minute Book – October 1911 – March 1936, Olympic Studies Centre, New Zealand Olympic Committee, Wellington, New Zealand, p. 233.

provided the Union executive with invaluable support in its battles with the Victorian Amateur Athletic Association [VAAA].

The ultimate dissolution of the Australasian Union was due to the inability of that Union 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 Australasian amateur relationship, of which 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 thirty-year long transnational community which embraced the British world and beyond. This thesis will finish with concluding remarks about what this relationship has to tell us about sport and culture in general.

Conclusion

This thesis 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 thesis has showed him to have had more humble origins.[1] His local school – Hampton Grammar – 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.

The Coombes family used the development of coursing around the family business – the *Greyhound* Hotel at Hampton Court – to further their business interests. The establishment became recognised as the home of coursing in Hampton Court under the stewardship of Richard Coombes senior and his wife. These experiences did not provide Richard Coombes junior with a classic English understanding of amateurism, as

---

[1] Richard Cashman, *Paradise of Sport: The Rise of Organised Sport in Australia*, South Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1995, p. 63; John A. Daly, 'Track and Field,' Wray Vamplew and Brian Stoddart (eds.), *Sport in Australia: A Social History*, Cambridge, UK, New York, NY and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1994, p. 260; Garth Henniker and Ian Jobling, 'Richard Coombes and the Olympic Movement in Australia: Imperialism and Nationalism in Action,' *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 6, no. 1, November 1989, pp. 2-3.

demonstrated by his somewhat helpful response to the development of greyhound racing in Sydney in the 1920s. This research provides a fresh examination of the context that saw the development of Australian amateurism, which was only partly due to the influence of elite British schools.

Coombes inherited his father's eye for the spectacular and his English experiences influenced the way that he administered the sport of amateur athletics in Australasia. He 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

---

[2] Cashman, *Paradise of Sport*, p. 97.

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 athletes, 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 the sport to Australasian sporting culture. Following the insights provided by Camilla Obel, this research displays 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 their 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 –

---

[3] John A. Daly, 'Athletics,' Wray Vamplew *et al* (eds.), *Oxford Companion to Australian Sport*, South Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1994, pp. 23-24; Percy Mason, *Professional Athletics in Australia*, Adelaide: Rigby, 1985, pp. 5, 12.
[4] Camilla Obel, 'Amateur Rugby's Spectator Success: Cultivating Inter-Provincial Rugby Publics in New Zealand, 1902-1995,' *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 21, no. 2, May 2005, pp. 97-117.

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 American 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 that had played with or against professionals in games to continue to compete as amateur athletes. This was a measure that 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 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 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

[5] Colin Tatz, *Obstacle Race: Aborigines in Sport*, Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 1996, p. 88.

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 own dalliances with professional sport. This body was seen as carrying out a vendetta against a competitor rather than 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 identified with 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 the 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 that shared a pan-Imperial worldview. Coombes

---

[6] Stuart Ripley, 'A Social History of New South Wales Professional Sculling 1876-1927,' unpublished PhD thesis, University of Western Sydney, 2003, p. 7.

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 as better and more loyal Britons than South Africans during the Boer War. Coombes was able to participate in domestic English debates about the nature of sport, thereby asserting for himself and his organisation a place within the British world.

In 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 that insisted upon 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 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 displayed 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 the Canadian 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 developments have provided a more

---

[7] Neville Meaney, 'Britishness and Australian Identity: The Problem of Nationalism in Australian History and Historiography,' *Australian Historical Studies*, vol. 32, no. 116, April 2001, p. 89; James Belich, *Paradise Reforged: A History of the New Zealanders From the 1880s to the Year 2000*, Honolulu:

sophisticated context with 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' 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 allegations against 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 mentality. A relationship was cultivated with the Canadian Union in response to this shift, having the effect of harmonising modernity and Britishness. This is not to say that unanimity was found 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.

University of Hawai'i Press, 2001, pp. 29-30; Derek M. Schreuder and Stuart Ward, 'Introduction: What Became of Australia's Empire?,' Derek M. Schreuder and Stuart Ward (eds.), *Australia's Empire*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2008, pp. 11-12.

The relationship between Australia and New Zealand was based firmly on ideas of pan-British unity. This thesis 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 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 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 with close links to the NZAAA leadership. 'Sprinter' – a leading voice of dissent against the Union executive within the Christchurch press – consistently framed his arguments in nationalist terms against Australian influence over New Zealand affairs. These arguments found little favour within wider New Zealand athletic circles. 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 Australian continent throughout the twentieth century. The addition of the South Australian Amateur Athletic Association [SAAAA] in particular provided the NZAAA with difficulties in remaining part of the Union. Greater travelling commitments and less opportunity to host Australasian championships meant that the Union needed to be modified to continue to serve New Zealand's interests. 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 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 thesis 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 is the case with rugby union in New Zealand, amateur athletic bodies across Australasia exploited the spectacular in order to boost the popularity of the sport.[10] However, this thesis contributes important new insights into the development of Australasian sport. Nationalism did not provide the dynamic for key developments in Australasian athletics, including somewhat fraught dealings with the AAA and the dissolution of the Australasian Union. Key insights from scholars such as Neville Meaney and Tony

---

[8] Belich, *Paradise Reforged*, pp. 316-17, 328-32, 384-85, 440.
[9] Daryl Adair, 'Rowing and Sculling,' Wray Vamplew and Brian Stoddart (eds), *Sport in Australia: A Social History*, Cambridge, UK, New York, NY and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1994, pp. 179-80; Stuart Ripley, *Sculling and Skulduggery: A history of professional sculling*, Sydney: Walla Walla Press, 2009.
[10] Obel, 'Amateur Rugby's Spectator Success,' pp. 97-117.

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 employ nationalism in order to understand the way that sporting bodies from Australia and New Zealand viewed their place in the world. Pan-British identities and transnational flows are vital to understanding the way that Australasians engaged with the rest of the world.

This thesis has opened up a new agenda for historians of Australasian sport. It employed a methodology that could 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 tell us 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.

---

[11] Neville Meaney, 'Britishness and Australian Identity,' pp. 76-90; Tony Collins, 'Australian Nationalism and Working-Class Britishness: The Case of Rugby League Football,' *History Compass*, 3 AU 142, 2005, pp. 1-19; Tony Collins, 'The Tyranny of Deference: Anglo-Australian Relations and Rugby Union before World War II,' *Sport in History*, vol. 29, no. 3, September 2009, pp. 437-56.
[12] Charles Little and Richard Cashman, 'Ambiguous and Overlapping Identities: Australasia at the Olympic Games, 1896-1914,' Richard Cashman *et al* (eds.), *Sport, Federation, Nation*, Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW, 2001, p. 90; Charles Little, 'Trans-Tasman Federations in Sport: The changing relationships between Australia and New Zealand,' Richard Cashman *et al* (eds.), *Sport, Federation, Nation*, Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW, 2001, p. 69.

Sources Consulted

Archival Sources

Amateur Athletic Association Collection, AAA/1/2/2/2: General Committee Minutes Vol. 2 – 1883-1886, University of Birmingham Special Collections Department, Birmingham, United Kingdom.

——————, AAA/1/2/2/4: General Committee Minutes vol. 4 – 1889-1911, University of Birmingham Special Collections Department, Birmingham, United Kingdom.

——————, AAA/3/7/3: News cuttings relating to the National Cyclists Union and the AAA 1910-11, University of Birmingham Special Collections Department, Birmingham, United Kingdom.

——————, AAA/4/1: Compilation of conference reports – 1891-1906, University of Birmingham Special Collections Department, Birmingham, United Kingdom.

Amateur Athletic Union of Canada fonds, M3209, Library and Archives Canada, Ottawa, Canada.

Articles de presse compilés par Lord Desborough sur les Jeux Olympiques d'été de Londres 1908, CIO JO-1908S-ARTPR, 9854, International Olympic Committee Archives, Lausanne, Switzerland.

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.

——————, MSY – 0659: Minute Book – New Zealand Amateur Athletic Association 1913-1927, Alexander Turnbull Library, National Library of New Zealand, Wellington, New Zealand.

——————, MSY – 0660: Minute Book – New Zealand Amateur Athletic Association 1927-1938, Alexander Turnbull Library, National Library of New Zealand, Wellington, New Zealand.

——————, MS Papers 1238-132: Jubilee Material 1906-1907, Alexander Turnbull Library, National Library of New Zealand, Wellington, New Zealand.

Biography File, BIOG 648 – Nigel Barker, University of Sydney Archives, Sydney, Australia.

Commission d'amateurisme: Rapports et definitions de l'amateurisme 1908 á 1971, CIO COMMI-ADMIS-RAPPO, 2047668, International Olympic Committee Archives, Lausanne, Switzerland.

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.

Correspondance de James Merrick 1913-1940, CIO MBR-MERRI-CORR, 7145, International Olympic Committee Archives, Lausanne, Switzerland.

Davis Sporting Collection 1, Box 6 – Amateur athletics association carnivals, 1899-1931, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia.

——————, Box 10 – Harriers athletic club carnivals, 1890-1930 and Highlanders' picnics and athletics carnivals, 1898-1932, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia.

——————, Box 11 – Highlanders' Carnivals and NSWAAA carnivals, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia.

——————, Box 12 – NSWAAA Carnivals, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia.

——————, Box 21 – Olympic Games, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia.

Davis Sporting Collection 2, Box 14 Athletics: U.S.A. and Canada, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia.

——————, Box 18 Athletics: Australia, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia.

E. S. Marks Sporting Collection, Q46 Box 2 – Athletics, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia.

——————, Q51 Box 7b – Football, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia.

——————, Box Q82 – Miscellaneous sports – Letters and Minute Books, Mitchell Library, 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 on 7 November 2009.

Grande Bretagne Correspondance 1892-1959, CIO CNO-GRABR-CORR, 9287, International Olympic Committee Archives, Lausanne, Switzerland.

Hampton Court: Conveyance of the Greyhound Hotel and premises to the Trustees of the late Mr. R. Coombes, File T.1./15577, The National Archives, Kew, United Kingdom.

Harry Gordon Papers, MS ACC 02/143: Box 2C – NSW Olympic Council, National Library of Australia, Canberra, Australian Capital Territory, Australia.

Harold Hardwick Collection, CY 2481: diary, correspondence and related papers, 1911-1959, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.

New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association Records, ML MSS 5573: Box 3 – Annual Reports, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.

New Zealand Olympic Committee Records, Box 1A – Festival of Empire, 1911 Folder, Olympic Studies Centre, New Zealand Olympic Committee, Wellington, New Zealand.

——————, Minute Book – October 1911 – March 1936, 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), Work 16/71, The 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, UT: 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, UT: 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, UT: 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

Davison, Graeme, 'The Imaginary Grandstand', *Sports Factor*, Radio National 2001, http://www.ausport.gov.au/fulltext/2001/sportsf/s340348.htm, Accessed on 11 April 2007.

Hindsight radio programme, 'The Greatest Game', ABC Radio National, Broadcast on 19 March 2009 at 1 p.m.,

http://www.abc.net.au/rn/hindsight/stories/2009/2515606.htm Accessed on 19 March 2009.

Newspapers

The *Argus*.

The *Athletic News*.

The *Australasian*.

The *Beacon*.

The *Brisbane Courier*.

The *Dominion*.

The *Evening Post*.

The *Hobart Mercury*.

The *New Zealand Times*.

The *Otago Witness*.

The *Queenslander*.

The *Referee*.

Smith's Weekly.

The *Sporting Life*.

The *Star*.

The *Sydney Morning Herald*.

The *Sydney Sportsman*.

The *Taranaki Herald*.

The *Times*.

The *Wanganui Herald*.

The *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*], No. 4, Autumn 1953, pp. 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*, vol. 52, no. 4, July 1908, pp. 387-402.

Unattributed, 'St. Andrew's Graduates' Association,' *The British Medical Journal*, vol. 1, no. 1016, 19 June 1880, p. 935.

Books

Adair, Daryl, and Wray Vamplew, *Sport in Australian History*, Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Allison, Lincoln, *Amateurism in Sport: An Analysis and a Defence*, London, UK and Portland, OR: Frank Cass, 2001.

Allsobrook, David Ian, *Schools for the Shires: The Reform of Middle-Class Education in Mid-Victorian England*, Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 1986.

Amateur Athletic Union of Australasia [Hereafter AAUA], *Articles of Agreement, Laws for Athletic Meetings, Rules for Competitions, Record conditions, etc.*, Sydney: AAUA, 1899.

Amateur Athletic Union of Canada [AAUC], *Constitution and By-Laws of the Amateur Athletic Union of Canada*, Toronto, ON: AAUC, 1909.

The Amateur Sporting Federation of New South Wales [ASFNSW], *Articles of Agreement*, Sydney: ASFNSW, 1908, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.

Anderson, Benedict, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London, UK and Brooklyn, NY: Verso, 2006.

Attwood, Bain and Andrew Markus, *The 1967 Referendum: Race, Power and the Australian Constitution*, Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press, 2007

The Australasian Amateur Conference, *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, 1897.

Bale, John, and Mette Krogh Christensen (eds.), *Post-Olympism: Questioning Sport in the Twenty-first Century*, Oxford, UK and New York, NY: Berg, 2004.

Bale, John, Mette Krogh Christensen and Gertrud Pfister (eds.), *Writing Lives in Sport: Biographies, Life-Histories and Methods*, Aarhus, DK and Oakville, CT: Aarhus University Press, 2004.

Belich, James, *Making Peoples: A History of the New Zealanders From Polynesian settlement to the end of the nineteenth century*, Auckland, NZ: Penguin Books, 2007.

——————, *Paradise Reforged: A History of the New Zealanders From the 1880s to the Year 2000*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2001.

Bell, Duncan, *The Idea of Greater Britain: Empire and the Future of World Order, 1860-1900*, Princeton, NJ and Oxford, UK: Princeton University Press, 2007.

Bender, Thomas, (ed.), *Rethinking American History in a Global Age*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA and London, UK: University of California Press, 2002.

Birley, Derek, *The Willow Wand: Some Cricket Myths Explored*, London, UK: Simon and Schuster [Sportspages], 1989.

Blainey, Geoffrey, *The Rush That Never Ended: A History of Australian Mining*, Carlton: Melbourne University Press, 2003.

Booth, Douglas, *The field: truth and fiction in sport history*, London, UK and New York, NY: Routledge, 2005.

Booth, Douglas and Colin Tatz, *One-Eyed: A View of Australian Sport*, St Leonards: Allen and Unwin, 2000.

Brohm, Jean-Marie, *Sport – A Prison of Measured Time*, London, UK: Ink Links Ltd., 1978.

Cashman, Richard, *Paradise of Sport: The Rise of Organised Sport in Australia*, South Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1995.

——————, *Sport in the National Imagination: Australian Sport in the Federation Decades*, Sydney: Walla Walla Press, 2002.

——————, *The 'Demon' Spofforth*, Kensington: New South Wales University Press, 1990.

Cashman, Richard *et al* (eds.), *Sport, Federation, Nation*, Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW, 2001.

Clapson, Mark, *A Bit of a Flutter: Popular Gambling and English Society, c. 1823-1961*, Manchester, UK and New York, NY: Manchester University Press, 1992.

Clark, Manning *A History of Australia: vol. 5: The People Make Laws, 1888-1915*, Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1981.

Collins, Tony, *A Social History of English Rugby Union*, London, UK and New York, NY: Routledge, 2009.

——————, *Rugby's Great Split: Class, Culture and the Origins of Rugby League Football*, London, UK and Portland, OR: Frank Cass, 1998.

——————, *Rugby League in Twentieth Century Britain: A Social and Cultural History*, London, UK and New York, NY: Routledge, 2006.

Collins, Tony and Wray Vamplew, *Mud, Sweat, and Beers: A Cultural History of Sport and Alcohol*, Oxford, UK and New York, NY: Berg, 2002.

Cook, Theodore Andrea, *The Fourth Olympiad, Being the Official Report: The Olympic Games of 1908*, London, UK: British Olympic Association, c. 1909.

De Coubertin, Pierre, *Olympic Memoirs*, Lausanne, Switzerland: International Olympic Committee, 1997.

Crotty, Martin, *Making the Australian Male. Middle-Class Masculinity 1870-1920*, Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2001.

Curthoys, Ann and Marylin Lake (eds.), *Connected Worlds: History in Transnational Perspective*, Canberra: ANU E Press, 2005.

Daly, John A., *Elysian Fields: Sport, Class and Community in Colonial South Australia 1836-1890*, Adelaide: the Author, 1982.

Daly, Maurice T., *One Hundred Years of Australian Sport: A History of the New South Wales Sports Club*, Sydney: New South Wales Sports Club, 1996.

Denoon, Donald, and Philippa Mein Smith, with Marivic Wyndham, *A History of Australia, New Zealand, and the Pacific*, Oxford, UK and Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2000.

Dunning, Eric and Kenneth Sheard, *Barbarians, Gentlemen and Players: A Sociological Study of the Development of Rugby Football*, Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1979.

Fagan, Sean, *Rugby Rebellion: The Divide of League and Union*, Kellyville: RL2008, 2005.

Gallie, W. B., *Philosophy and the Historical Understanding*, New York, NY: Schocken Books, 1968.

Garside, Bernard, *A Brief History of Hampton School: 1557-1957*, Richmond, UK: printed by Dimbleby's, 1957.

Gilbert, W. R., *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, 1898.

Gordon, Harry, *Australia and the Olympic Games*, St Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1994.

Grant, David, *On a Roll: A History of Gambling and Lotteries in New Zealand*, Wellington, NZ: Victoria University Press, 1994.

Guha, Ramachandra, *A Corner of a Foreign Field: The Indian History of a British Sport*, London, UK: Picador, 2002.

Guttmann, Allen, *From Ritual to Record: The Nature of Modern Sports*, New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1978.

——————, *Games and Empires: Modern Sports and Cultural Imperialism*, New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1994.

——————, *The Olympics: A History of the Modern Games*, Urbana and Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2002.

Heads, Ian, *True Blue: The Story of the NSW Rugby League*, Randwick: Ironbark Press, 1992.

Hibbins, Gillian, *Sport and Racing in Colonial Melbourne: The Cousins and Me: Colden Harrison, Tom Wills and William Hammersley: Being reminiscences of colonial sporting life in Melbourne 1856-1883 and biographies of Colden Harrison, Tom Wills, and William Hammersley*, Melbourne: Lynedoch Press, 2006.

Hoberman, John M., *Darwin's Athletes: How Sport has Damaged Black America and Preserved the Myth of Race*, Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 1997.

Hobsbawm, Eric and Terence Ranger (eds.), *The Invention of Tradition*, Cambridge, UK, New York, NY and Oakleigh, VIC: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Holt, Richard, *Sport and the British: A Modern History*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Howell, Reet and Max Howell, *Aussie Gold: The Story of Australia at the Olympics*, Melbourne: Brooks Waterloo, 1988.

Huizinga, Johan, *Homo Ludens: A Study of the Play-Element in Culture*, Boston, MA: The Beacon Press, 1955.

Irving, Helen, *To Constitute a Nation: A Cultural History of Australia's Constitution*, Cambridge, UK and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Kelly, William Thomas, *South Australian Amateur Athletic Association: A History, 1867-1973*, Adelaide: South Australian Amateur Athletic Association, 1973.

Keys, Barbara J., *Globalizing Sport: National Rivalry and International Community in the 1940s*, Cambridge, MA and London, UK: Harvard University Press, 2006.

Lindsay, Philip, *Hampton Court: A History*, London, UK: Meridian, 1948.

Llewellyn, Matthew P., *Rule Britannia: Nationalism, Identity and the Modern Olympic Games*, London, UK: Routledge, 2011. Forthcoming.

Lovesey, Peter, *The Official Centenary History of the Amateur Athletic Association*, Enfield, UK: Guinness Superlatives, 1979.

MacAloon, John, *This Great Symbol: Pierre de Coubertin and the Origins of the Modern Olympic Games*, Chicago, IL and London, UK: The University of Chicago Press, 1981.

Mangan, J. A., *Athleticism in the Victorian and Edwardian Public Schools: The Emergence and Consolidation of an Educational Ideology*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Mason, Percy, *Professional Athletics in Australia*, Adelaide: Rigby, 1985.

Mason, Tony, *Association Football and English Society 1863-1915*, Brighton, UK and Atlantic Highlands, NJ: The Harvester Press and Humanities Press, 1980.

Meaney, Neville, *The Search for Security in The Pacific: 1901-1914 [Volume 1: A History of Australian Defence and Foreign Policy 1901-23]*, Sydney: Sydney University Press, 2009.

Montefiore, David, *Cricket in the Doldrums: The Struggle between Private and Public Control of Australian Cricket in the 1880s*, Campbelltown: Australian Society for Sports History (ASSH), ASSH Studies in Sports History, no. 8, 1992.

Moran, Herbert. *Viewless Winds: Being the Recollections and Digressions of an Australian Surgeon*, London, UK: Peter Davies, 1939.

Munslow, Alun, *Deconstructing History*, Milton Park, UK: Routledge, 2006.

Murray, Francis, *The British Open: A History of Golf's Greatest Championship*, Lincolnwood, IL: Contemporary Books, 2000.

National Coursing Club [Herafter NCC] (Compiled by David Brown), *The Greyhound Stud Book*, Dalry, UK: David Brown, 1885.

——————, *The Greyhound Stud Book*, Dalry, UK: David Brown, 1886.

——————, *The Greyhound Stud Book*, Dalry, UK: David Brown, 1887.

New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association, *Handbook*, Sydney: New South Wales Amateur Athletic Association, 1896.

Nicholson, Geoffrey, *The Professionals*, London, UK: Andre Deutsch, 1964.

Perry, John, *The Quick & the Dead: Stawell & Its Race Through Time*, Sydney: UNSW Press, 2002.

Phillips, Murray G. (ed.), *Deconstructing Sport History: A Postmodern Analysis*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2006.

——————, *From sidelines to centre field: A history of sports coaching in Australia*, Sydney: UNSW Press, 2000.

Pope, S. W., *Patriotic Games: Sporting Traditions in the American imagination, 1876-1926*, Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press, 2007.

Pugsley, Christopher, *The ANZAC Experience: New Zealand, Australia and Empire in the First World War*, Auckland, NZ: Reed Military, 2004.

'Qrius' (Sports Editor *Natal Advertiser*), *South African Champions … Springbok Athletes (Illustrated)*, Durban, SA: P. Davis and Sons, 1907.

Ripley, Stuart, *Sculling and Skulduggery: A history of professional sculling*, Sydney: Walla Walla Press, 2009.

Robinson, Roger and Nelson Wattie (eds.), *The Oxford Companion to New Zealand Literature*, Auckland, NZ: Oxford University Press, 1998. http://teaohou.natlib.govt.nz/journals/teaohou/about.html#oxford_en. Accessed on 13 June 2009.

Sands, Mollie, *The Gardens of Hampton Court: Four centuries of English History and Gardening*, London, UK: Evans Brothers Limited, 1950.

Schreuder, Derek M. and Stuart Ward (eds.), *Australia's Empire*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Sinclair, Archibald and William Henry, *Swimming*, London, UK: Longmans, Green, 1894.

Sissons, Ric, *The Players: A Social History of the Professional Cricketer*, Sydney: Pluto Press, 1988.

Smith, Rick, *Australian Test Cricketers*, Sydney: ABC Books, 2001.

'Stonehenge' (ed.), *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, UK: John Crockford (The Field), 1859.

——————, *The Coursing Calendar and Report of the Spring Season 1859-60: With Hints on Breeding, &.*, London, UK: John Crockford (The Field), 1859.

——————, *The Coursing Calendar and Report of the Season 1860: With Hints on Breeding, &.*, London, UK: John Crockford (The Field), 1860.

——————, *The Coursing Calendar and Report of the Autumn Season 1861*, London, UK: John Crockford (The Field), 1861.

——————, *The Coursing Calendar and Report of the Spring Season 1862: With Entries for the Produce Stakes of the Ensuing Season*, London, UK: John Crockford (The Field), 1862.

——————, *The Coursing Calendar and Report of the Autumn Season 1863*, London, UK: John Crockford (The Field), 1863.

——————, *The Coursing Calendar and Report of the Spring Season 1864: With Entries for the Produce Stakes of the Ensuing Season*, London, UK: John Crockford (The Field), 1864.

Tatz, Colin, *Obstacle Race: Aborigines in Sport*, Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 1996.

Unattributed, *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, NY: American Sports Publishing Co., c.1921.

Victorian Amateur Athletic Association [VAAA], *Victorian Amateur Athletic Handbook, Rules of the Victorian Amateur Athletic Association, Australasian Records, The Harriers, &c.*, Melbourne: The VAAA, 1894.

Walker, David, *Anxious Nation: Australia and the Rise of Asia 1850-1939*, St Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1999.

Ward, Stuart, *Australia and the British Embrace: The Demise of the Imperial Ideal*, Carlton South: Melbourne University Press, 2001.

Wassong, Stephan, *Pierre de Coubertin's American Studies and Their Importance for the Analysis of His Early Educational Campaign*, Würzburg, Germany: ERGON Verlag, 2004.

Waterhouse, Richard, *Private Pleasures, Public Leisure: A History of Australian Popular Culture Since 1788*, South Melbourne: Longman, 1995.

White, R. P. B. and Malcolm Harrison, *100 Years of the NSW AAA*, Sydney: The Fairfax Library/NSWAAA, 1987.

White, Richard, *Inventing Australia: Images and Identity 1688-1980*, Sydney: George Allen and Unwin, 1981.

Williams, Terry, *Through Blue Eyes: A Pictorial History of Newtown RLFC*, Newtown: Newtown RLFC, 2008.

Chapters in Edited Volumes

Adair, Daryl, 'Rowing and Sculling,' Wray Vamplew and Brian Stoddart (eds), *Sport in Australia: A Social History*, Cambridge, UK, New York, NY and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1994, pp. 172-92.

Allen, Dennis W., 'Young England: muscular Christianity and the politics of the body in "Tom Brown's Schooldays,"' Donald E. Hall, *Muscular Christianity: Embodying the Victorian Age*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1994, pp. 114-32.

Arnold, Rollo, 'The Australasian Peoples and their World, 1888-1915,' Keith Sinclair (ed.), *Tasman Relations: New Zealand and Australia, 1788-1988*, Auckland, NZ: Auckland University Press, 1987, pp. 52-70.

Belich, James, 'Colonization and History in New Zealand,' Robin W. Winks (ed.), *The Oxford History of the British Empire: volume V - Historiography*, Oxford, UK and New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1999, pp. 182-93.

Booth, Douglas, ‘Post-Øolympism?: Questioning Øolympic Historiography,’ John Bale and Mette Krogh Christensen, *Post-Olympism? Questioning Sport in the Twenty-first Century*, Oxford, UK and New York, NY: Berg, 2004, pp. 13-32.

Brawley, Sean, ‘“Our Life-Savers”’: The Royal Life Saving Society and the origins of surf life saving in Federation Sydney,’ Richard Cashman *et al* (eds.), *Sport, Federation, Nation*, Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW, 2001, pp. 139-64.

——————, “‘Our Bright Young American Cousins”: Internationalising Rugby, Trans-Pacific Connections and the American Universities Rugby Tour of Australasia, 1910,’ Mary Bushby and Thomas V. Hickie, *Rugby History: The Remaking of the Class Game*, Melbourne: Australian Society for Sports History, 2007, pp. 73-101.

Bright, Charles and Michael Geyer, ‘Where in the World Is America? The History of the United States in the Global Age,’ Thomas Bender (ed.), *Rethinking American History in a Global Age*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA and London, UK: University of California Press, 2002, pp. 63-99.

Brown, David W., ‘The Legacy of British Victorian Social Thought: Some Prominent Views on Sport, Physical Exercise and Society in Colonial Australia,’ Wray Vamplew (ed.), *Sport and Colonialism in 19th Century Australasia*, Campbelltown: Australian Society of Sports Historians (ASSH), ASSH Studies in Sports History: No. 1, 1986, pp. 19-41.

Cannadine, David, ‘British History as a “new subject”: Politics, perspectives and prospects,’ Alexander Grant and Keith J. Stringer (eds.), *Uniting the Kingdom? The Making of British History*, London, UK: Routledge, 1995, pp. 12-28.

——————, 'The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual: The British Monarchy and the "Invention of Tradition", c. 1820-1977,' Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (eds.), *The Invention of Tradition*, Cambridge, UK, New York, NY and Oakleigh, VIC: Cambridge University Press, 1988, pp. 101-64.

Cashman, Richard, 'Introduction,' Richard Cashman *et al* (eds.), *Sport, Federation, Nation*, Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW, 2001, pp. 1-13.

——————, 'Part 2: A Changing Face of Sport?: Introduction,' Richard Cashman *et al* (eds.), *Sport, Federation, Nation*, Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW, 2001, pp. 58-62.

——————, 'The Phenomenon of Indian Cricket,' Richard Cashman and Michael McKernan (eds.), *Sport in History: The Making of Modern Sporting History*, St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1979, pp. 180-204.

Collins, Tony, 'Violence, gamesmanship and the amateur ideal in Victorian middle-class rugby,' Mike Huggins and J. A. Mangan, *Disreputable Pleasures: Less Virtuous Victorians at Play*, London, UK and New York, NY: Frank Cass, 2004, pp. 172-84.

Connolly, Chris, 'Marxist history,' Graeme Davison, John Hirst and Stuart Macintyre (eds.), *The Oxford Companion to Australian History*, South Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 2001. *Oxford Reference Online*. Oxford University Press. University of New South Wales. 17 August 2010 http://www.oxfordreference.com/views/ENTRY.html?subview=Main&entry=t127.e948

Crawford, Gerald, 'Greyhound-racing,' Wray Vamplew (*et. al*), *Oxford Companion to Australian Sport*, South Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1994, pp. 192-93.

Crawford, Ray, 'Athleticism, Gentlemen and Empire in Australian Public Schools: L.A. Adamson and Wesley College, Melbourne,' Wray Vamplew (ed.), *Sport and Colonialism in 19th Century Australasia*, Campbelltown: Australian Society of Sports Historians (ASSH), ASSH Studies in Sports History: No. 1, 1986, pp. 42-64.

Crossick, Geoffrey, 'The Emergence of the Lower Middle Class: A Discussion,' Geoffrey Crossick (ed.), *The Lower Middle Class in Britain 1870 - 1914*, London, UK: Croom Helm, 1977, pp. 11-60.

Cunneen, Chris, 'The Rugby War: the Early History of Rugby League in New South Wales, 1907-15,' Richard Cashman and Michael McKernan (eds.), *Sport in History: The Making of Modern Sporting History*, St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1979, pp. 293-306.

——————, 'Elevating and Recording the People's Pastimes: Sydney Sporting Journalism 1886-1939,' Richard Cashman and Michael McKernan (eds.), *Sport: Money, Morality and the Media*, Kensington: New South Wales University Press, 1981, pp. 162-76.

Curthoys, Ann and Marilyn Lake, 'Introduction,' Ann Curthoys and Marilyn Lake (eds.), *Connected Worlds: History in Transnational Perspective*, Canberra: ANU E Press, 2005, pp. 5-20.

Daly, John A., 'Athletics,' Wray Vamplew *et al* (eds.), *Oxford Companion to Australian Sport*, South Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1994, pp. 23-26.

——————, 'Track and Field,' Wray Vamplew and Brian Stoddart (eds.), *Sport in Australia: A Social History*, Cambridge, UK, New York, NY and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1994, pp. 255-68.

Fischer, Imke, 'The Involvement of the Commonwealth Government in Physical Education: From defence to national fitness,' Richard Cashman *et al* (eds.), *Sport, Federation, Nation,* Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW, 2001, pp. 16-35.

Grayson, Edward, 'Smith, Gilbert Oswald (1872–1943),' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2004. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/50310. Accessed 17 February 2011.

Hardy, Stephen, '"Adopted By All The Leading Clubs": Sporting Goods and the Shaping of Leisure, 1800-1900,' Richard Butsch (ed.), *For Fun and Profit: The Transformation of Leisure into Consumption***,** Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 1990, pp. 71-101.

——————, 'Entrepreneurs, Structures, and the Sportgeist: Old Tensions in a Modern Industry,' Donald G. Kyle and Gary D. Stark (eds.), *Essays on Sport History and Sport Mythology*, College Station, TX: Texas A & M Press, 1990, pp. 45-82.

Haskell, Dennis, 'The heroism of comedy: Smith's Weekly in the 1930s,' Bruce Bennett and Dennis Haskell (eds.), *Myths, Heroes and Anti Heroes: Essays on the Literature and Culture of the Asia Pacific Region*, Nedlands: Centre for Studies in Australian Literature, University of Western Australia, 1992, pp. 107-19.

Hill, Jeffrey, 'Anecdotal Evidence: Sport, the Newspaper Press, and History,' Murray G. Phillips (ed.), *Deconstructing Sport History: A Postmodern Analysis*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2006, pp. 117-29.

Hirst, John, 'Empire, State, Nation,' Derek M. Schreuder and Stuart Ward (eds.), *Australia's Empire*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2008, pp. 141-62.

Hoberman, John, ‘Sport and ideology in the post-Communist age,’ Lincoln Allison (ed.), *The Changing Politics of Sport*, Manchester, UK and New York, NY: Manchester University Press, 1993, pp. 15-36.

——————, ‘Sportive Nationalism and Globalization,’ John Bale and Mette Krogh Christensen (eds.), *Post-Olympism: Questioning Sport in the Twenty-first Century*, Oxford, UK and New York, NY: Berg, 2004, pp. 177-88.

Honey, Andrew, ‘Sport, Immigration Restriction and Race: The operation of the White Australia Policy,’ Richard Cashman *et al* (eds.), *Sport, Federation, Nation*, Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW, 2001, pp. 26-46.

Howell, Colin and Daryl Leeworthy, ‘Borderlands,’ S. W. Pope and John Nauright (eds.), *Routledge Companion to Sports History*, London, UK and New York, NY: Routledge, 2010, pp. 71-84.

Huggins, Mike and J. A. Mangan, ‘Epilogue: The dogs bark but the caravan moves on,’ Mike Huggins and J. A. Mangan, *Disreputable Pleasures: Less Virtuous Victorians at Play*, London, UK and New York, NY: Frank Cass, 2004, pp. 204-10.

——————, ‘Prologue: All mere complexities,’ Mike Huggins and J. A. Mangan, *Disreputable Pleasures: Less Virtuous Victorians at Play*, London, UK and New York, NY: Frank Cass, 2004, pp. ix – xx.

Hughes, Anthony, ‘Sporting Federations: The impact of Federation on sports governance,’ Richard Cashman *et al* (eds.), *Sport, Federation, Nation*, Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW, 2001, pp. 118-32.

Inglis, Ken S. 'Imperial Cricket: Test Matches between Australia and England, 1877-1900,' Richard Cashman and Michael McKernan (eds.), *Sport in History: The Making of Modern Sporting History*, St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1979, pp. 148-79.

Iriye, Akira, 'Internationalizing International History,' Thomas Bender (ed.), *Rethinking American History in a Global Age*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA and London, UK: University of California Press, 2002, pp. 47-62.

Jobling, Ian, 'In Pursuit of Status, Respectability and Idealism: Pioneers of the Olympic Movement in Australasia,' J.A. Mangan and John Nauright (eds.), *Sport in Australasian Society: Past and Present*, London, UK and Portland, OR: Frank Cass, 2000, pp. 142-63.

——————, 'The Lion, the Eagle and the Kangaroo: Politics and Proposals for a British Empire Team at the 1916 Berlin Olympics,' Gerald Redmond (ed.), *Sport and Politics*, Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics Publishers, 1986, pp. 99-107.

Little, Charles, 'Trans-Tasman Federations in Sport: The changing relationships between Australia and New Zealand,' Richard Cashman *et al* (eds.), *Sport, Federation, Nation*, Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW, 2001, pp. 63-80.

Little, Charles and Richard Cashman, 'Ambiguous and Overlapping Identities: Australasia at the Olympic Games, 1896-1914,' Richard Cashman *et al* (eds.), *Sport, Federation, Nation*, Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW, 2001, pp. 81-96.

Macintyre, Stuart, 'Australia and the Empire,' Robin W. Winks (ed.), *The Oxford History of the British Empire: volume V - Historiography*, Oxford, UK and New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1999, pp. 163-81.

McKenna, Mark, 'Monarchy: From Reverence to Indifference,' Derek M. Schreuder and Stuart Ward (eds.), *Australia's Empire*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2008, pp. 261-87.

MacLean, Malcolm, 'New Zealand,' S. W. Pope and John Nauright (eds.), *Routledge Companion to Sports History*, London, UK and New York, NY: Routledge, 2010, pp. 510-25

Magdalinski, Tara, 'The Reinvention of Australia for the 2000 Olympic Games,' J.A. Mangan and John Nauright (eds.), *Sport in Australasian Society: Past and Present*, London, UK and Portland, OR: Frank Cass, 2000, pp. 305-22.

Mandle, W. F., 'Baker, Reginald Leslie (Snowy) (1884-1953),' *Australian Dictionary of Biography: Volume 7*, Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1979, pp. 150-52. http://adbonline.anu.edu.au/biogs/A070152b.htm Accessed on 30 September 2009.

——————, 'Coombes, Richard (1858 - 1935),' *Australian Dictionary of Biography*: *Volume 8*, Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1981, pp. 104-05. http://adbonline.anu.edu.au/biogs/A080115b.htm Accessed 17 February 2011.

Mangan, J. A., 'Bullies, beatings, battles and bruises: "great days and jolly days" at one mid-Victorian public school,' Mike Huggins and J. A. Mangan, *Disreputable Pleasures: Less Virtuous Victorians at Play*, London, UK and New York, NY: Frank Cass, 2004, pp. 3-34.

Morgan, William J., 'Coubertin's Theory of Olympic Internationalism: A Critical Reinterpretation,' Robert K. Barney & Klaus V. Meier (eds.), *Critical*

Reflections on Olympic Ideology. Second International Symposium for Olympic Research, London, ON: University of Western Ontario, 1994, pp. 10-25.

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

O'Hara, John, 'Commentary,' Richard Cashman *et al* (eds.), *Sport, Federation, Nation*, Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW, 2001, pp. 55-57.

Owram, D. R., 'Canada and the Empire,' Robin W. Winks (ed.), *The Oxford History of the British Empire: volume V - Historiography*, Oxford, UK and New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1999, pp. 146-62.

Paddick, Robert J., 'Amateurism,' Wray Vamplew *et al* (eds.), *Oxford Companion to Australian Sport*, South Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1994, pp. 11-15.

Paton, Garth A., 'James G. B. Merrick (1871-1946): Sports Organizer, Negotiator, Canada's Second IOC Member,' 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, 2006, pp. 254-277.

Perkin, Harold, 'Sport and society: Empire into Commonwealth,' J. A. Mangan and Roy B. Small, *Sport, Culture, Society: Proceedings of the VIII Commonwealth and International Conference on Sport, Physical Education, Dance, Recreation and Health*, London: E. & EN. Spon, 1986, pp. 3-5.

Pinfold, John, 'Dandy rats at play: the Liverpudlian middle classes and horse-racing in the nineteenth century,' Mike Huggins and J. A. Mangan, *Disreputable*

Pleasures: Less Virtuous Victorians at Play, London, UK and New York, NY: Frank Cass, 2004, pp. 55-79.

Pocock, J. G. A., 'Conclusion: Contingency, Identity, Sovereignty,' Alexander Grant and Keith J. Stringer (eds.), *Uniting the Kingdom? The Making of British History*, London, UK: Routledge, 1995, pp. 292-302.

Van der Poorten, Helen M., 'Williamson, James Cassius (1845 - 1913),' *Australian Dictionary of* Biography*: Volume 6*, Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1976, pp. 406-407. http://adbonline.anu.edu.au/biogs/A060439b.htm. Accessed 1 March 2011.

Porter, Dilwyn, 'Entrepreneurship,' S. W. Pope and John Nauright, *Routledge Companion to Sports History*, London, UK and New York, NY: Routledge, 2010, pp. 197-215.

Quartly, Marian, 'Convict history,' Graeme Davison *et al* (eds.), *The Oxford Companion to Australian History*, South Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 2001. http://www.oxfordreference.com/views/ENTRY.html?subview=Main&entry=t127.e362 Accessed 11 November 2010.

Rioux, Georges, 'Pierre de Coubertin's Revelation,' Norbert Müller (ed.), *Pierre de Coubertin 1863 – 1937: Olympism Selected Writings*, Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 2000, pp. 23-31.

Ryan, Greg, 'Commentary,' Richard Cashman *et al* (eds.), *Sport, Federation, Nation*, Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW, 2001, pp. 133-36.

Schreuder, Derek M. and Stuart Ward, 'Introduction: What Became of Australia's Empire?,' Derek M. Schreuder and Stuart Ward (eds.), *Australia's Empire*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2008, pp. 1-23.

Sinclair, Keith 'The beginnings of a colonial nationalism: Richard Jebb in New Zealand, 1899,' John J. Eddy and Derek Schreuder (eds.), *The Rise of Colonial Nationalism: Australia, New Zealand, Canada and South Africa First assert their Nationalities, 1880-1914*, Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1988, pp. 111-30.

——————, 'Why New Zealanders Are Not Australians: New Zealand and the Australian Federal Movement, 1881-1901,' Keith Sinclair (ed.), *Tasman Relations: New Zealand and Australia, 1788-1988*, Auckland, NZ: Auckland University Press, 1987, pp. 90-103.

Smith, Adrian, 'Black against gold: New Zealand-Australia sporting rivalry,' Adrian Smith and Dilwyn Porter (eds.), *Sport and national identity in the post-war world*, London, UK and New York, NY: Routledge, 2004, pp. 168-93.

Thompson, John Herd, 'Canada and the "Third British Empire", 1901-1939,' Phillip Buckner (ed.), *Canada and the British Empire*, Oxford, UK and New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2008, pp. 87-106.

Thornton, A. P., 'The Shaping of Imperial History,' Robin W. Winks (ed.), *The Oxford History of the British Empire: volume V - Historiography*, Oxford, UK and New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1999, pp. 612-34.

Tyrrell, Ian, 'Beyond the View from Euro-America: Environment, Settler Societies, and the Internationalization of American History,' Thomas Bender (ed.), *Rethinking American History in a Global Age*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA and London, UK: University of California Press, 2002, pp. 168-91.

——————, ‘Money and Morality: The Professionalisation of American Baseball,’ Richard Cashman and Michael McKernan (eds.), *Sport: Money, Morality and the Media*, Kensington: New South Wales University Press, 1981, pp. 86-103.

——————, ‘The Emergence of Modern American Baseball c. 1850-80,’ Richard Cashman and Michael McKernan (eds.), *Sport in History: The Making of Modern Sporting History*, St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1979, pp. 205-26.

Unattributed, ‘Preface,’ Richard Cashman *et al* (eds.), *Sport, Federation, Nation*, Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW, 2001, p. v.

Valiotis, Chris, ‘Suburban Footballers of Pacific Islander Ancestry: The Changing Face of Rugby League in Greater Western Sydney,’ Andrew Moore and Andy Carr (eds.), *Centenary Reflections: 100 Years of Rugby League in Australia*, Melbourne: Australian Society for Sports History, 2008, pp. 141-56.

Whimpress, Bernard, ‘Absent Aborigines: The impact of Federation on indigenous sport,’ Richard Cashman *et al* (eds.), *Sport, Federation, Nation*, Sydney: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW, 2001, pp. 47-54.

White, Richard and Hsu-Ming Teo, ‘Popular Culture,’ Derek M. Schreuder and Stuart Ward (eds.), *Australia’s Empire*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2008, pp. 336-62.

Williams, Mark, ‘“The finest race of savages the world has seen”: How Empire Turned Out Differently in Australia and New Zealand,’ Vanessa Agnew and Jonathon Lamb with Daniel Spoth (eds.), *Settler and Creole Reenactment*, Basingstoke, UK and New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009, pp. 223-44.

Winks, Robin W., 'The Future of Imperial History,' Robin W. Winks (ed.), *The Oxford History of the British Empire: volume V - Historiography*, Oxford, UK and New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1999, pp. 653-68.

Woollacott, Angela, 'Gender and Sexuality,' Derek M. Schreuder and Stuart Ward (eds.), *Australia's Empire*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2008, pp. 312-35.

Yttergren, Leif, 'J. Sigfrid Edstrøm and the Nurmi Affair of 1932: The Struggle of the Amateur Fundamentalists Against Professionalism in the Olympic Movement,' 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, 2006, pp. 111-26.

Journal Articles and Conference Papers

Adair, Daryl, 'Australian Sport History: From the Founding Years to Today,' *Sport in History*, vol. 29, no. 3, September 2009, pp. 405-36.

——————, 'Competing or Complementary Forces? The "Civilising" Process and the Commitment to Winning in Nineteenth Century English Rugby and Association Football,' *Canadian Journal of the History of Sport*, vol. 24, no. 2, December 1993, pp. 47-67.

——————, 'Paradise of Sport? The Cashman Thesis and Australian Sports History,' *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 12, no. 1, November 1995, pp. 121-132.

——————, 'Sports History in the "Antipodes" and "Australasia,"' *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 19, no. 1, November 2002, pp. 65-74.

Adair, Daryl, John Nauright, and Murray Phillips, 'Playing Fields Through to Battle Fields: The Development of Australian Sporting Manhood in its Imperial Context,' *Journal of Australian Studies*, no. 56, 1998, pp. 51-67.

Allen, Dean, '"Cricket's Laird": James Logan and the Development of the "Imperial Game" in South Africa, 1888-1902,' *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 26, no. 1, May 2009, pp. 49-69.

Armitage, David, 'Greater Britain: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis?,' *The American Historical Review*, vol. 104, no. 2, April 1999, pp. 427-45.

Arnold, Rollo, 'Family or Strangers? Trans-Tasman Migrants, 1870-1920,' *Australia-New Zealand: Aspects of a Relationship, Proceedings of the Stout Research Centre Eighth Annual Conference*, Victoria University of Wellington, September 1991, pp. 1-18.

Baker, Norman, 'Going to the Dogs – Hostility to Greyhound Racing in Britain: Puritanism, Socialism and Pragmaticism,' *Journal of Sport History*, vol. 23, no. 2, Summer 1996, pp. 97-119.

Bale, John, 'Amateurism, Capital and Roger Bannister,' *Sport in History*, vol. 26, no. 3, December 2006, pp. 484-501.

Bayly, C. A. *et al*, 'AHR Conversation: On Transnational History,' *The American History Review*, vol. 111, no. 5, December 2006, pp. 1441-64.

Berger, Stefan and Greg Patmore, 'Comparative Labour History in Britain and Australia,' *Labour History*, vol. 88, May 2005. http://www.historycooperative.org/journals/lab/88/berger.html, Accessed on 30 August 2009.

Bergquist, Charles, ‘Postscript: Comparative Research and the “New World Order,”’ *Labour/Le Travail*, vol. 38, Fall 1996/*Labour History*, vol. 71, November 1996, pp. 278-88.

Booth, Douglas, ‘Searching for the past: Sport Historiography in New Zealand,’ *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 21, no. 2, May 2005, pp. 1-28.

——————, ‘Sites of Truth or metaphors of Power? Refiguring the Archive,’ *Sport in History*, vol. 26, no. 1, April 2006, pp. 91-109.

Bradley, James, ‘Inventing Australians and Constructing Englishness: Cricket and the Creation of a National Consciousness, 1860-1914,’ *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 11, no. 2, May 1995, pp. 35-60.

Brawley, Sean, ‘“They Came, They Saw, They Conquered”: The Takaishi/Saito Tour of 1926-27 and Australian Perceptions of Japan,’ *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 26, no. 2, November 2009, pp. 49-66.

Bray, Mark and Jacques Rouillard, ‘Union Structure and Strategy in Australia and Canada,’ *Labour/Le Travail*, vol. 38, Fall 1996/*Labour History*, vol. 71, November 1996, pp. 198-238.

Canny, Nicholas, ‘Writing Atlantic History; or, Reconfiguring the History of Colonial British America,’ *The Journal of American History*, vol. 86, no. 3, December 1999, pp. 1093-1114.

Carr, Andy, ‘“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*, no. 49, February 2009, pp. 7-14.

Cashman, Richard, ‘Asia’s place in the imaging of Australian Sport,’ *Sport in Society*, vol. 12, no. 7, September 2009, pp. 933-46.

Cashman, Richard and Tom Hickie, 'The Divergent Sporting Cultures of Sydney and Melbourne,' *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 7, no. 1, November 1990, pp. 26-46.

Clark, J. C. D., 'The Strange Death of British History? Reflections on Anglo-American Scholarship,' *The Historical Journal*, vol. 40, no. 3, September 1997, pp. 787-809.

Clark, Manning, 'Writing History in Australia,' *Historical Studies*, vol. 16, no. 64, April 1975, pp. 425-34.

Clément, Dominque, '"It is Not the Beliefs but the Crime That Matters": Post-War Civil Liberties Debates in Canada and Australia,' *Labour History*, vol. 86, May 2004, pp. 1-32.

Cole, Douglas, 'The Problem of "Nationalism" and "Imperialism" in British Settlement Colonies,' *Journal of British Studies*, vol. 10, no. 2, May, 1971, pp. 160-82.

Collins, Tony, 'Australian Nationalism and Working-Class Britishness: The Case of Rugby League Football,' *History Compass*, 3 AU 142, 2005, pp. 1-19.

——————, 'From Bondi to Batley: Australian Players in British Rugby League 1907 – 1995,' *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 16, no. 2, May 2000, pp. 71-86.

——————, 'The Ambiguities of Amateurism: English Rugby Union in the Edwardian Era,' *Sport in History*, vol. 26, no. 3, December 2006, pp. 386-405.

——————, 'The Tyranny of Deference: Anglo-Australian Relations and Rugby Union before World War II,' *Sport in History*, vol. 29, no. 3, September 2009, pp. 437-56.

Connellan, Mark, 'From Manliness to Masculinities,' *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 17 no. 2, May 2001, pp. 49-63.

Connors, Jane, 'Response: Identity and History,' *Australian Historical Studies*, vol. 32, no. 116, April 2001, pp. 132-36.

Daley, Caroline, 'Women Endurance Swimmers: Dissolving Grease Suits and Decentring New Zealand History,' *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 21, no. 2, May 2005, pp. 29-55.

Davison, Graeme, 'The imaginary grandstand,' *Meanjin*, vol. 61, issue 3, September 2002, pp. 4-18.

Denoon, Donald, 'Re-Membering Australasia: A Repressed Memory,' *Australian Historical Studies*, no. 122, October 2003, pp. 290-304.

Eisenberg, Christiane, '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 2005.

Fagan, Sean, '"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, 2008.

Fairburn, Miles, 'New Zealand and Australasian Federation, 1883-1901: Another View,' *New Zealand Journal of History*, vol. 4, no. 2, Oct. 1970, pp. 138-59.

Ferland, Jacques and Christopher Wright, 'Rural and Urban Labour Processes: A Comparative Analysis of Australian and Canadian Development,' *Labour/Le Travail*, vol. 38, Fall 1996/*Labour History*, vol. 71, November 1996, pp. 142-69.

Ford, Lisa, 'Yellow(s) (im)peril(led): reinventing the colonial nightmare,' *Australian Studies*, v.18, no.1, Summer 2003, pp. 67-114.

Frances, Raelene, Linda Kealey, and Joan Sangster, 'Women and Wage Labour in Australia and Canada, 1880-1980,' *Labour/Le Travail*, vol. 38, Fall 1996/*Labour History*, vol. 71, November 1996, pp. 54-89.

Frederickson, George M., 'From Exceptionalism to Variability: Recent Developments in Cross-National Comparative History,' *The Journal of American History*, vol. 82, no. 2, September 1995, pp. 587-604.

Friesen, Gerald and Lucy Taksa, 'Workers' Education in Australia and Canada: A Comparative Approach to Labour's Cultural History,' *Labour/Le Travail*, vol. 38, Fall 1996/*Labour History*, vol. 71, November 1996, pp. 170-97.

Gabaccia, Donna R., 'Is Everywhere Nowhere? Nomads, Nations, and the Immigrant Paradigm of United States History,' *The Journal of American History*, vol. 86, no. 3, December 1999, pp. 1115-34.

Garton, Stephen and Margaret E. McCallum, 'Workers' Welfare: Labour and the Welfare State in 20th-century Australia and Canada,' *Labour/Le Travail*, vol. 38, Fall 1996/*Labour History*, vol. 71, November 1996, pp. 116-41.

Gibbons, Peter, 'Cultural Colonization and National Identity,' *New Zealand Journal of History*, vol. 36, no. 1, April 2002, pp. 5-17.

——————, 'The Far Side of the Search for Identity: Reconsidering New Zealand History,' *New Zealand Journal of History*, vol. 37, no. 1, April 2003, pp. 38-49.

Gillis, John R., 'The Future of European History,' *Perspectives*, no. 34, April 1996. http://www.historians.org/perspectives/issues/1996/9604/9604PRO.CFM Accessed on 14 August 2009.

Gordon, Ian, 'The symbol of a nation: Ginger Meggs and Australian national identity,' *Journal of Australian Studies*, no.34, September 1992, pp. 1-14.

Gould, Eliga H., ‘A Virtual Nation: Greater Britain and the Imperial Legacy of the American Revolution,’ *The American Historical Review*, vol. 104, no. 2, April 1999, pp. 476-89.

Grace, Radcliffe, ‘The Rise and Fall of the Australasian Cricket Council 1892-1900,’ *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 2, no. 1, November 1985, pp. 37-46.

De Groen, Frances, ‘Xavier Herbert, journalist?,’ *Australian Literary Studies*, v.16, no.1, May 1993, pp. 116-18.

Guiney, David, ‘The Olympic Council of Ireland,’ *Citius, Altius, Fortius*, vol. 4, no. 3, Autumn 1996, pp. 31-33.

Guttmann, Allen, ‘Review Essay: The Ludic and the Ludicrous,’ *International Journal of the History of Sport*, vol. 25, no. 1, January 2008, pp. 100-12.

Hartley, Jackie, ‘Black, White … and Red? The Redfern All Blacks Rugby League Club in the Early 1960s,’ *Labour History*, no. 83, November 2002, pp. 149-71.

Hardy, Stephen, ‘Entrepreneurs, Organizations, and the Sport Marketplace: Subjects in Search of Historians,’ *Journal of Sport History*, vol. 13, no. 1, Spring 1986, pp. 14-33.

Haskell, Dennis, ‘Hyperborea vs uninteresting facts: Kenneth Slessor's journalism in the early 1920s,’ *Southerly*, v.52, no.4, December 1992, pp. 15-29.

Henniker, Garth and Ian Jobling, ‘Richard Coombes and the Olympic Movement in Australia: Imperialism and Nationalism in Action,’ *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 6, no. 1, November 1989, pp. 2-15.

Hill, Jeffrey, ‘“I’ll Run Him”: Alf Tupper, Social Class and British Amateurism,’ *Sport in History*, vol. 26, no. 3, December 2006, pp. 502-19.

Hilliard, Chris, ‘Colonial Culture and the Province of Cultural History,’ *New Zealand Journal of History*, vol. 36, no. 1, April 2002, pp. 82-97.

Hirst, John, ‘Distance in Australia – Was it a Tyrant?,’ *Historical Studies*, vol. 16, no. 64, April 1975, pp. 435-47.

Hoberman, John, ‘Toward a Theory of Olympic Internationalism,’ *Journal of Sport History*, vol. 22, no. 1, Spring 1995, pp. 1-37.

Hokowhitu, Brendan, ‘Authenticating Māori Physicality: Translations of “Games” and “Pastimes” by Early Travellers and Missionaries to New Zealand,’ *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, vol. 25, no. 10, September 2008, pp. 1355-73.

——————, ‘“Physical Beings”: Stereotypes, Sport and the “Physical Education” of New Zealand Māori,’ *Sport in Society*, vol. 6, no. 2, June 2003, pp. 192-218.

——————, ‘Rugby and *Tino Rangatiratanga*: Early Māori Rugby and the Formation of “Traditional” Māori Masculinity,’ *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 21, no. 2, May 2005, pp. 75-95.

Holt, Richard, ‘The Amateur Body and the Middle-class Man: Work, Health and Style in Victorian Britain,’ *Sport in History*, vol. 26, no. 3, December 2006, pp. 352-69.

Howe, K. R., ‘Two Worlds?,’ *New Zealand Journal of History*, vol. 37, no. 1, April 2003, pp. 50-61.

Huggins, Mike, ‘“Everybody’s Going to the Dogs”? The Middle Classes and Greyhound Racing in Britain between the Wars,’ *Journal of Sport History*, vol. 34, no. 1, Spring 2007, pp. 96-120.

——————, ‘More Sinful Pleasures? Leisure, Respectability and the Male Middle Classes in Victorian England,’ *Journal of Social History*, vol. 33, no. 3, Spring 2000, pp. 585-600.

Iacovetta, Franca, Michael Quinlan, and Ian Radforth, 'Immigration and Labour: Australia and Canada Compared,' *Labour/Le Travail*, vol. 38, Fall 1996/*Labour History*, vol. 71, November 1996, pp. 90-115.

Iriye, Akira, 'The Internationalization of History,' *The American Historical Review*, vol. 94, no. 1, February 1989, pp. 1-10.

Irving, Terry, and Allen Seager, 'Labour and Politics in Canada and Australia: Towards a Comparative Approach to Developments to 1960,' *Labour/Le Travail*, vol. 38, Fall 1996/*Labour History*, vol. 71, November 1996, pp. 239-77.

Jobling, Ian, 'The Making of a Nation Through Sport: Australia and the Olympic Games from Athens to Berlin, 1898-1916,' *Australian Journal of Politics and History*, vol. 34, no. 2, August 1988, pp. 160-72.

Johnes, Martin, 'Archives, Truths and the Historian at Work: A Reply to Douglas Booth's "Refiguring the Archives",' *Sport in History*, vol. 27, no. 1, March 2007, pp. 127-35.

Kay, Alison C., 'Villas, Values and the *Crystal Palace Company*, c.1852-1911,' *The London Journal*, vol. 33, no. 1, March 2008, pp. 21-39.

Kealey, Gregory S. and Greg Patmore, 'Comparative Labour History: Australia and Canada,' *Labour/Le Travail*, vol. 38, Fall 1996/*Labour History*, vol. 71, November 1996, pp. 1-15.

Kidd, Bruce, 'The First COA Presidents,' *Olympika: The International Journal of Olympic Studies*, vol. 3, 1994, pp. 107-10.

Kirk, Neville, 'The Power of Comparative History,' *Labour History Review*, vol. 62, no. 3, Winter 1997, pp. 326-32.

Korr, Charles P., ‘West Ham United Football Club and the Beginnings of Professional Football in East London, 1895-1914,’ *Journal of Contemporary History*, vol. 13, no. 2, April 1978, pp. 211-32.

Lennartz, Karl, ‘The 2nd International Olympic Games in Athens 1906,’ *Journal of Olympic History*, vol 10, Special issue, March 2002.

Letters, Michael, and Ian Jobling, ‘Forgotten Links: Leonard Cuff and The Olympic Movement in Australasia, 1894-1905,’ *Olympika: The International Journal of Olympic Studies*, vol. 5, 1996, pp. 91-110.

Lindsay, Vane, ‘Stan Cross in Smith's Weekly,’ *La Trobe Journal*, no.65, Autumn 2000, pp. 44-56.

Little, Charles, ‘More Green than Red: Sectarianism and Rugby League in Otago, 1924-35,’ *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 21, no. 1, November 2004, pp. 33-51.

Llewellyn, Matthew P., ‘A Nation Divided: Great Britain and the Pursuit of Olympic Excellence, 1912-1914,’ *Journal of Sport History*, vol. 35, no. 1, Spring 2008, pp. 73-97.

——————, ‘Chariots of Discord: Great Britain, Nationalism and the “Doomed” 1924 Paris Olympic Games,’ *Contemporary British History*, vol. 24, no. 1, March 2010, pp. 67-87.

Love, Christopher, ‘Social Class and the Swimming World: Amateurs and Professionals,’ *International Journal of the History of Sport*, vol. 24, no. 5, May 2007, pp. 603-19.

——————, ‘“Whomsoever You See in Distress”: Swimming, Saving Life and the Rise of the Royal Life Saving Society,’ *International Journal of the History of Sport*, vol. 24, no. 5, May 2007, pp. 667-81.

Lucas, John A. and Ian Jobling, 'Troubled Waters: Fanny Durack's 1919 Swimming Tour of America Amid Transnational Amateur Athletic Prudery and Bureaucracy,' *Olympika: The International Journal of Olympic Studies*, vol. 4, 1995, pp. 93-112.

McGregor, Russell, 'The necessity of Britishness: ethno-cultural roots of Australian nationalism,' *Nations and Nationalism*, vol. 12, no. 3, July 2009, pp. 493-511.

McGrath, Ann and Winona Stevenson, 'Gender, Race, and Policy: Aboriginal Women and the State in Canada and Australia,' *Labour/Le Travail*, vol. 38, Fall 1996/*Labour History*, vol. 71, November 1996, pp. 37-53.

Mandle, W. F., 'Cricket and Australian Nationalism in the Nineteenth Century,' *Journal of the Royal Australian Historical Society*, vol. 59, No. 4, December 1973, pp. 224-46.

Masters, Roy, '"And I awoke, and found me here on the cold hill side:" Rugby League and the Decline of Working Class Culture,' *Meanjin*, vol.54, no.3, 1995, pp. 397-409.

Meaney, Neville, 'Britishness and Australia: Some Reflections,' *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, vol. 31, no. 2, May 2003, pp. 122-35.

——————, 'Britishness and Australian Identity: The Problem of Nationalism in Australian History and Historiography,' *Australian Historical Studies*, vol. 32, no. 116, April 2001, pp. 76-90.

Mein Smith, Philippa, 'New Zealand Federation Commissioners in Australia: One Past, Two Historiographies,' *Australian Historical Studies*, no. 122, October 2003, pp. 305-325.

Metcalfe, Alan, 'The Meaning of Amateurism: A Case Study of Canadian Sport, 1884-1970,' *Canadian Journal of the History of Sport*, vol. 26, no. 2, December 1995, pp. 33-48.

Mitchell, Bruce, 'Baseball in Australia. Two Tours and the Beginnings of Baseball in Australia,' *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 7, no. 1, November, 1990, pp. 2-24.

Moore, Andrew, 'Opera of the Proletariat: Rugby League, the Labour Movement and Working-Class Culture in New South Wales and Queensland,' *Labour History*, no. 79, November 2000, pp. 57-70.

——————, 'Political Football: The end of Rugby League as we know it? Super League versus the ARL,' *Evatt Papers*, vol. 3, no. 2, 1995, pp. 158-71.

——————, 'Super League and 'The Decline of Working Class Culture,' *Overland*, no. 149, Summer 1997: pp. 69-73.

Moore, Katharine, 'One Voice in the Wilderness: Richard Coombes and the Promotion of the Pan-Britannic Festival Concept in Australia 1891-1911,' *Sporting Traditions*, May 1989, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 188-203.

Moore, Katharine and Murray Phillips, 'The Sporting Career of Harold Hardwick: One Example of the Irony of the Amateur-Professional Dichotomy,' *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 7, no. 1, November 1990, pp. 61-76.

Morrow, Don, 'A Case-Study of Amateur Conflict: The Athletic War in Canada, 1906-1908,' *The British Journal of Sports History*, vol. 3, no. 2, December 1986, pp. 173-90.

Murray, Bill, '"Amateurs at Play": Sport and the Making of the British Ruling Class,' *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 16, no. 2, May 2000, pp. 117-26.

Obel, Camilla, ‘Amateur Rugby’s Spectator Success: Cultivating Inter-Provincial Rugby Publics in New Zealand, 1902-1995,’ *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 21, no. 2, May 2005, pp. 97-117.

Ochert, Morris S., ‘Dr Fanny Reading v Smith's Weekly,’ *Australian Jewish Historical Society Journal*, v.13, no.2, June 1996, pp. 308-42.

Osmond, Gary, ‘“Honolulu Maori”: Racial dimensions of Duke Kahanamoku’s tour of Australia and New Zealand, 1914-1915,’ *New Zealand Journal of History*, vol. 44, no. 1, April 2010, pp. 22-34.

Paddick, Robert J., ‘Amateurism: An idea of the past or a necessity for the future?,’ *Olympika: The International Journal of Olympic Studies*, vol. 3, 1994, pp. 1-15.

Palmer, Bryan D., ‘Nineteenth-Century Canada and Australia: The Paradoxes of Class Formation,’ *Labour/Le Travail*, vol. 38, Fall 1996/*Labour History*, vol. 71, November 1996, pp. 16-36.

Petersen, Bob, ‘Boxer Shorts,’ *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 26, no. 1, May 2009, pp. 88-91.

Phillips, Jock, ‘Of Verandahs and Fish and Chips and Footie on Saturday Afternoon: Reflections on 100 Years of New Zealand Historiography,’ *New Zealand Journal of History*, vol. 24, no. 2, October 1990, pp. 118-134.

Phillips, Murray G. ‘Deconstructing Sport History: The Postmodern Challenge,’ *Journal of Sport History*, vol. 28, no. 3, Fall 2001, pp. 327-43.

——————, ‘Diminishing Contrasts and Increasing Varieties: Globalisation Theory and “Reading” Amateurism in Australian Sport,’ *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 18, no. 1, November 2001, pp. 19-32.

——————, ‘From Suburban Football to International Spectacle: The Commodification of Rugby League in Australia, 1907-1995,’ *Australian Historical Studies*, vol.29, no.110, April 1998, pp. 27-48.

Pocock, J. G. A., ‘British History: A Plea for a New Subject,’ *New Zealand Journal of History*, vol. 8, no. 1, 1974, pp. 3-21.

——————, ‘The New British History in Atlantic Perspective: An Antipodean Commentary,’ *The American Historical Review*, vol. 104, no. 2, April 1999, pp. 490-500.

Polley, Martin, ‘“No Business of ours”?: The Foreign Office and the Olympic Games, 1896-1914,’ *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, vol. 13, no. 2, August 1996, pp. 96-113.

——————, ‘The Amateur Ideal and British Sports Diplomacy, 1900-1945,’ *Sport in History*, vol. 26, no. 3, December 2006, pp. 450-67.

Porter, Dilwyn, ‘Revenge of the Crouch End Vampires: The AFA, the FA and English Football’s “Great Split”, 1907-1914,’ *Sport in History*, vol. 26, no. 3, December 2006, pp. 406-28.

Reséndez, Andrés, ‘National Identity on a Shifting Border: Texas and New Mexico in the Age of Transition, 1821-1848,’ *The Journal of American History*, vol. 86, no. 2, September 1999, pp. 668-88.

Rickard, John, ‘Response: Imagining the Unimaginable?,’ *Australian Historical Studies*, vol. 32, no. 116, April 2001, pp. 128-31.

Ripley, Stuart, ‘The Golden Age of Australian Professional Sculling or Skullduggery?,’ *International Journal of the History of Sport*, vol. 22, no. 5, September 2005, pp. 867-82.

Ross, Dorothy, ‘Grand Narrative in American Historical Writing: From Romance to Uncertainty,’ *The American Historical Review*, vol. 100, no. 3, June 1995, pp. 651-77.

Ryan, Greg, '"Extravagance of Thought and Feeling": New Zealand Reactions to the 1932/33 Bodyline Controversy,' *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 13, no. 2, May 1997, pp. 41-58.

Simpson, Clare, 'Editorial: Breadth and Depth in New Zealand Sport History,' *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 21, no. 2, May 2005, pp. v-vi.

——————, 'Sights from the Saddle: Early Cycle Touring in New Zealand,' *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 21, no. 2, May 2005, pp. 141-60.

Sloane, William M., 'History and Democracy,' *The American Historical Review*, vol. 1, no. 1, October 1895, pp. 1-23.

——————, 'The World Aspects of the Louisiana Purchase,' *The American Historical Review*, vol. 9, no. 3, April 1904, pp. 507-21.

Taylor, III, Joseph E., 'Boundary Terminology,' *Environmental History*, vol. 13, no. 3, July 2008, pp. 454-81.

Tapp, E. J. 'New Zealand and Australian Federation,' *Historical Studies*, vol. 5, no. 19, November 1952, pp. 244-57.

Thelen, David, 'Rethinking History and the Nation-State: Mexico and the United States,' *The Journal of American History*, vol. 86, no. 2, September 1999, pp. 439-52.

——————, 'The Nation and Beyond: Transnational Perspectives on United States History,' *The Journal of American History*, vol. 86, no. 3, December 1999, pp. 965-75.

Ticher, Mike, 'Notional Englishmen, Black Irishmen and Multicultural Australians: Ambiguities in National Sporting Identities,' *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 75-91.

Tyrrell, Ian, 'American Exceptionalism in an Age of International History,' *The American Historical Review*, vol. 96, no. 4, October 1991, pp. 1031-55.

——————, 'Making Nations/Making States: American Historians in the Context of Empire,' *The Journal of American History*, vol. 86, no. 3, December 1999, pp. 1015-44.

——————, 'What is transnational history?,' paper given at the Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociale, Paris, January 2007, http://iantyrrell.wordpress.com/what-is-transnational-history/ Accessed on 24 March 2009.

Vincent, Geoffrey T., 'Practical Imperialism: The Anglo-Welsh Rugby Tour of New Zealand, 1908,' *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, vol. 15, no. 1, April 1998, pp. 123-40.

——————, '"Stupid, Uninteresting and Inhuman" Pedestrianism in Canterbury, 1860-1885,' *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 18, no. 1, November 2001, pp. 43-55.

Vincent, Geoffrey, Catriona E. Timms and Toby Harfield, 'Running, Jumping and Rowing to Marginalisation: The Māori Experience of Sport in Canterbury, 1850-1880,' *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 21, no. 2, May 2005, pp. 57-74.

De Wael, Herman, '"Olympic or Not?" A Discussion about the Status of Events of 1900 and 1904,' *Journal of Olympic History*, vol. 11 no. 1, January 2003, pp. 21-27.

Wagg, Stephen, '"Base Mechanic Arms"? British Rowing, Some Ducks and the Shifting Politics of Amateurism,' *Sport in History*, vol. 26, no. 3, December 2006, pp. 520-39.

Ward, Stuart, 'Sentiment and Self-interest: The Imperial ideal in Anglo-Australian Commercial Culture,' *Australian Historical Studies*, vol. 32, no. 116, April 2001, pp. 91-108.

Ward, Tony, ‘Sport and national identity,’ *Soccer and Society*, vol. 10, no. 5, September 2009, pp. 518-31.

——————, ‘The heart of what it means to be Australian,’ *Soccer and Society*, vol. 10, no. 5, September 2009, pp. 532-43.

——————, ‘Visions of Australian sport in 1900,’ *Soccer and Society*, vol. 10, no. 5, September 2009, pp. 599-613.

Watson, Geoff, ‘Affirming Indian Identities: An Analysis of Imperial Rhetoric and Orientalism in the Tours of Indian Hockey Teams to New Zealand in 1926, 1935 and 1938,’ *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 21, no. 2, May 2005, pp. 119-40.

White, Richard, ‘Cooees across the Strand: Australian Travellers in London and the Performance of National Identity,’ *Australian Historical Studies*, vol. 32, no. 116, April 2001, pp. 109-27.

White, Richard, ‘The Nationalization of Nature,’ *The Journal of American History*, vol. 86, no. 3, December 1999, pp. 976-86.

Wood, F. L. W., ‘Why did New Zealand not join the Australian Commonwealth in 1900-1901?,’ *New Zealand Journal of History*, vol. 2, no. 2, October 1968, pp. 115-29.

Theses

Chatziefstathiou, Dikaia, ‘The Changing Nature of the Ideology of Olympism in the Modern Olympic Era,’ unpublished PhD Thesis, Loughborough University, 2005.

Elsaka, Nadia, ‘Beyond Consensus?: New Zealand Journalists and the Appeal of “Professionalism” as a Model for Occupational Reform,’ unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Canterbury, 2004.

Kohe, Geoffery Z., ‘Making it ordinary: An unexceptional history of the early olympic movement in New Zealand,’ unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Otago, 2010.

Little, Charles, ‘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, 2000.

Ripley, Stuart, ‘A Social History of New South Wales Professional Sculling 1876-1927,’ unpublished PhD thesis, University of Western Sydney, 2003.

Websites

Athletics Weekly, ‘British Athletics Championships 1876-1914,’ http://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,’ http://www.olympic.org/uk/athletes/results/search_r_uk.asp, Accessed 18 August 2009.

New Zealand Olympic Committee, ‘Harry Kerr’, http://www.olympic.org.nz/Athletes/AthleteProfile.aspx?Print=&ContactID=856&id=3774 Accessed 20 March 2009.

Sports Reference LLC, ‘Arthur Duffey,’ http://www.sports-reference.com/olympics/athletes/du/arthur-duffey-1.html. Accessed 13 February 2009.