

- Rowe, 'The Corporate Pitch: Televised Cricket Under Capitalism', reproduced in this book.
- 29 Bob Stewart, 'Financial Support for Sport', *op. cit.*
- 30 See *National Times*, 10 March 1979, p. 19.
- 31 Bob Stewart, 'Financial Support for Sport', *op. cit.*
- 32 Howard Nixon, *op. cit.*
- 33 R. Kennedy and N. Williamson, 'Money — The Monster Threatening Sports', *Sports Illustrated*, June/July 1978, pp. 34-50.
- 34 See *Age*, 5 April 1979.

Australia — this sporting life

JON STRATTON

'Well oi don't think much of their play, but they are a wonderful lot of drinking men.'

Robert Iddison,
Yorkshire batsman on 1862 tour of Australia

This chapter is a discussion of sport in the Australian context, that is to say, it is concerned with the position that sport holds in what might be called the Australian world-view. It is often argued by Marxist theoreticians that there is no such thing as a socially based world-view. Such arguments emphasise the importance of class-based ideologies as the loci for analysis. Althusser, on whose ideas much recent Marxist cultural analysis has been based, summed up his position like this:

As a first formulation I shall say: *all ideology hails or interpellates concrete individuals as concrete subjects*, by the functioning of the category of the subject.¹

By this he meant that the individual is always already *in* ideology. S/he can only think in and through ideology. At another point in the same essay Althusser sums up his delineation of ideology by writing:

It therefore appears that the subject acts insofar as he is acted by the following system (set out in the order of its real determination): ideology existing in a material ideological apparatus, prescribing material practices governed by a material ritual, which practices exist in the material actions of a subject acting in all conscience according to his belief.²

Althusser is arguing, as he puts it, that ideology has a material existence. Ideology, in other words, exists in practice, indeed practice is ideology. In modern Marxist theory this formulation is opposed by the 'cultural studies' approach of writers such as Richard Hoggart, Raymond Williams and E. P. Thompson. In his outline of the debate between these two positions Richard Johnson has described the group of cultural studies writers' definition of culture like this:

Cultural studies inherits [the ways-of-life conception of culture] and expands it further so that it contains matters as heterogeneous as language-in-general, the specific output of the mass media, the literary text, the values implicit in forms of working class collective action, the styles of sub-groups, and the general political discourse.³

As Johnson goes on to indicate there is a tendency on the one hand for the Althusserian formulation of ideology to overgeneralise, taking in all actual behaviour, whilst there is an equivalent tendency on the other hand for the 'cultural studies' formulation of 'way of life' to assimilate the category of ideology. Both these theoretical positions tend towards an elision of the awareness of the specificity of cultural patterns. Ideological themes, even if manifested in material practices, may be manifested in different practices in different socio-cultural orders. Reformulated from the 'cultural studies' position it can be suggested that a way of life may embody a variety of values and beliefs but the 'way of life' itself consists of certain behaviours and not others.

A distinction needs to be drawn between the ideological theme and the cultural materialisation of that theme. We need to recognise that there are, here, two levels of analysis. First, there needs to be discussion of the specific organisation of the cultural order. Second, there is the more 'micro' analysis (which the tools of semiotics can help us with) of the ideological themes implicit in the meaning of cultural manifestations.⁴

We may well be able to discuss 'middle-class ideology' as an aspect of the production and reproduction of capitalism, but the specific, lived formulation of that ideology is mediated through cultural concerns which are specific to particular socio-cultural orders and sometimes to specific groups within a socio-cultural order. Thus the articulation of ideological themes such as egalitarianism or individualism occurs in the context of, and is inflected by, broader cultural preoccupations which structure the uniqueness of a particular socio-cultural entity. John Hargreaves has expressed this well. He has written:

... culture is both constituted by people consciously making choices and evaluations of their experience AND simultaneously, because culture is also inherited from the choices and evaluations people have made in the past as tradition, it is also constitutive of choice and action, and therefore culture can also, though it never does entirely, act as a powerful constraint on understanding social life in appropriate terms and on taking appropriate forms of action.⁵

Hargreaves' argument implies a randomness to the production of culture. But the constitution of a particular society's cultural order, the

structure of meaning which, from the point of view of the individual who lives it we might term a world-view, is based on the negotiation of material conditions and social formations which come together in specific historical conjunctures.

Culture, like ideology, is an holistic concept. The difficulty which it poses for Althusserian-influenced Marxism lies in its relation to the idea of practice. Ideology may be conceived as being structurally articulated but this is because ideology is conceptualised as thematic. Culture may be understood as the material practice through which ideology is mediated and manifested. As a consequence, the category of culture tends towards the reintroduction of the human subject through the necessity of accounting for the 'random' signs which go to make up a society's cultural order. For the lived subject culture is not organised randomly. It is the product of ongoing historical, ideological and material determinations.⁶ It is also, in a specific sense, a product of invention. For example, whilst cricket at a specific historical moment might manifest a particular ideological theme or themes, we need to recognise that cricket itself was not inevitable in other socio-cultural orders, while other games may manifest the same ideological themes.

This rather arid discussion needs to be taken further — but not here. It would be possible to take sport in general, or indeed one particular sport such as cricket, and explain the material and ideological conditions surrounding its production in a specific socio-cultural order such as that constituted by Australia. Equally, it would be possible to examine some of the cultural myths surrounding sport, or particular sports, in, let us say, Australian culture. In this Chapter I will do a little of each. However, my main purpose is to bring both these analytical positions together in order to discuss the circumstances which produced an image of sport as an important aspect of Australia's *structure of culture*. The structure of culture refers to those ideas which form an essential part of the matrix (or framework) of the Australian socio-cultural order. What I want to argue is that the last part of the nineteenth century was the crucial period in the production of the Australian image of sport and its positioning in the structure of culture. Throughout this article there will be an interweaving of these two concerns.

In the context of the deployment of an Australian structure of culture one of the most important factors was the historical conjuncture which produced a conception of the un-naturalness of the Australian environment. Bill Mandle has already had something to say about

this in the context of developing attitudes towards sport in Australia.⁷ It is worth elaborating on his argument. In his article Mandle notes how, in the latter half of the nineteenth century, an anxiety about the quality of the Australian race developed from two sources. The first, which is not of concern here, was the question of the extent to which the convict origins of many Australians might provide the basis for the development of a degenerate people. The second source lay in a perception of the degenerating qualities of the Australian environment, including its climate. Mandle notes that, as Australian cricket teams started beating English teams during the 1870s:

Almost overnight the mood changed from one of doubt and relief to one of confidence, and the part that cricket played in generating that confidence cannot be underestimated.⁸

What we need to investigate here are, first, the changes which went on to produce cricket as what late nineteenth-century society understood as a sport (something I will return to later) and second, how cricket was being used within the Australian structure of culture (specifically how and to what extent it contributed to 'national confidence'). In order to do this we need to understand how sport was coming to be structured into the English middle-class's view of the world. Below I want to say more about the qualities, such as manliness, attributed to sport. Here we need to consider briefly how physical exercise came to provide the basis on which these qualities were articulated.

Bodies and bourgeois values

The late eighteenth century in England saw the rise of what is usually called the Romantic movement. One aspect of this was a celebration of the environment, of the natural world as being natural and, indeed, for *being* natural. In more general, cultural terms the English nineteenth-century intellectual middle-class had a certain revulsion against the growing industrialised urbanism and found in nature a nostalgia for a lost pastoral past.⁹ The human (male) body, an articulation of the natural, but carrying within it the mind — the basis of civilisation — lay at the intersection of the urbanised (and civilised) world. The deployment of the category of sport originated from within the English public schools, most obviously as a part of Thomas Arnold's reorganisation of Rugby which Simon has summed up like this:

... [Arnold] provided a form of education designed to fuse aristocracy and bourgeoisie, to make the aristocracy more useful and the bourgeoisie more polished — one which corresponded exactly

with, and in turn helped to form, the aspiration of the Victorian upper-middle class.¹⁰

The practice of sport, in the form of institutionalised and delimited physical activity, provided a training for the 'natural' body and a discipline which was a part of 'civilising' the mind. The body became the site of a complex resolution. On the one hand there was the attempt to eradicate nature in the form of the 'natural' child through the inculcation and internalisation of bourgeois values. On the other hand, however, nature as a general concept was valorised over the 'unnatural' depredations of city life. In practice, in the context of the child, this was represented in the celebration of exercise as the way to health. These contradictory positions were reconciled through the argument of '*mens sana in corpore sano*'. A new, natural bourgeois man would be developed as the mind, full of bourgeois values, was harmonised with the physical body of nature.

The nineteenth-century arguments about such things as the violence of football were carried out in precisely these terms. Dunning and Sheard note, for example, in relation to the debate over the acceptability, or not, of hacking — a debate which played a large part in the formation of the Rugby Football Union — that:

... Rugby supporters were the most persistent advocates of a rougher and, as they saw it, more 'manly' game. However, a growing body of opinion, inside as well as outside Rugby circles, regarded practices such as 'hacking' as barbaric.¹¹

The young middle-class male's body became the site for a set of arguments which amounted to a debate about what the synthesis between nature and bourgeois values was to be and how it was to be articulated in practice.

With this background we can now appreciate how much importance the Anglo-Australian middle class would have placed on sport. In England sport mediated and reconciled the natural and the civilised. The natural, however, was implicitly associated with the British (and European) environment. As Richard White notes:

Such attitudes raised intriguing questions about the development of new types from British stock. When transplanted to other parts of the world, did the Anglo-Saxon racial type continue to progress, or did it degenerate?¹²

In Australia this question was asked against a backdrop of the perceived 'enervating nature of our climate'¹³ and the experienced alienness of the environment in which, for example, Flinders abandoned his attempt to use the Linnean system of classification, whilst the Reverend Sydney Smith simply thought that here nature 'seems

determined to have a bit of play'.¹⁴ In Australia, then, sport did not mediate and reconcile the lived-in nature with civilisation but rather provided a bulwark, a protection against this new, un-natural environment. In the background was the residue of that English middle-class preoccupation. In the foreground was the mobilisation of sport as the method for preserving and asserting the physical and the mental health of the race in an alien land. It was this shift in context which provided the basis for the increased importance of sport in the Australian structure of culture when compared to the position which it occupies within the British structure of culture.

Aborigines and sport

Having come thus far along this line of argument we can now say something about the problematic relationship between Aborigines and sport in the white Australian context. Unlike the Negroid blacks the Australian Aborigines were never successfully implicated in that other great Romantic myth of the Noble Savage. Rather, the Aborigines came to epitomise the degenerative quality of the environment.¹⁵ Specifically, the *Australasian* of 14 October 1871 asked 'Is there a tendency . . . to revert to the aboriginal type?'¹⁶

I will return later to the period between the 1870s and the turn of the century in the context of an argument about the re-working of sports as mass spectator entertainment. Here, however, the period is prominent as the coming of age of the first generation since the ending of transportation (1840 in New South Wales, 1852 elsewhere in eastern Australia and 1868 in Western Australia). The timing of this question in the *Australasian* is particularly interesting because the tour of an Aboriginal cricket team of England had occurred in 1868 — three years earlier and fully ten years before the first white Australian tour. As Australia developed as a colony (rather than a prison) the problem of the effect of the environment on the English type became of increasing importance. Sport, for the reasons discussed above, became increasingly important in the construction of a positive image of white Australians. Simultaneously, Aborigines (or those who were left) played a decreasing part in sport in Australia, whilst the memory of their integration into this increasingly segregated area of colonial life was rapidly lost. At the same time, the memory of their achievements, which called into question the supremacy of white players, was also eradicated.

The history of Aboriginal participation in boxing, for example, was, at the time this question was being raised, following a path of decline, claimed by the white population to reflect the degeneration of

the Aboriginal race in general. In the nineteenth century Aboriginal fighters such as Yellow Johnny, Yellow Jimmy and 'Perry's Pet'¹⁷ had relatively successful fighting records. Indeed, Peter Corris notes that in the mid-nineteenth century ' . . . unlike the situation in America, colour was no bar to a man's rise'.¹⁸

However, according to Corris, after the retirement of Jerry Jerome in 1915, Aborigines were not significant in the ring until the 'middle decades of the [twentieth] century'.¹⁹ Furthermore, Corris claims that Jerome's career was extraordinary for an Aborigine anyway. Here we can see clearly how the late nineteenth century concern with the Australian type parallels the exclusion of Aborigines from sports (in this case boxing).

Through the early years of the twentieth century, Aborigines disappeared from top-line boxing to be relegated to tent-fights against the likes of Jimmy Sharman. Through these travelling side-shows small town whites thought they could measure themselves (and, by association, their race and their culture) against the despised Aborigines and their culture. What seems to have occurred, in broad terms, is that Aboriginal involvement in top-line boxing declined from the later part of the nineteenth century, began to pick up a little during the 1930s and became accepted again only from the 1950s on.

Unlike the situation of blacks in America, boxing ceased to become a channel for upward mobility for Aborigines until the 1960s. In 1968 Aboriginal boxer Lionel Rose became the NBC World Bantamweight Champion and seems to have been regarded by the white Australian boxing public as a legitimate representative of Australia.²⁰ In America, the 'colour line', reimposed when white boxer Hoss Willard defeated black boxer Jack Johnson in 1915 (but then refused to fight other black challengers) was eroded through the early decades of the century. Boxing thereafter became a clear channel for upward mobility for American blacks in a socio-cultural context in which sport was not so closely linked to a (white) preoccupation with the effects of the environment. Of course, many other factors were involved in America, including, most obviously in relation to the above argument, the non-native status of American blacks. But another was the different perception among whites in both countries of Negroid blacks.

There had been Negroid boxers in Australia throughout the nineteenth century. Indeed, the most successful black boxer of the later decades of the last century was the Negroid 'Black' Perry who had been born in Dublin in 1819. In the later years of the nineteenth

century not only was the distinction between white and black made more overt (one symptom was the gradual imposition of the White Australia policy) but, in addition, distinctions began to be made between Negroid and Aboriginal attributes. Negroid blacks became positioned by the Australian boxing audience as the Noble Savage — quite the reverse of the white attitude to Aborigines.

One example of the attitude to Negroid blacks may be found in the legendary Jack Johnson/Tommy Burns boxing match at the Sydney Stadium in 1908. In this it is clear that Johnson was considered to be so successful precisely because of his closeness to the 'primitive'. Broome, in his discussion of the fight, provides this account from *Fairplay*, the Liquor Trades' weekly:

[The fight] seemed a reminiscence of a huge primordial ape . . . carrying off a pre-Adamite man, worrying his victim in deathly playfulness.²¹

The association of the Negroid blacks with the primitive made their sporting prowess 'understandable' as well as to be expected and feared. Aborigines, defined as degenerate primitives, were not expected to be successful at sport.

Nevertheless, by the early twentieth century Negroid boxers could expect to be on the receiving end of Australian racism. If Aborigines were considered to be primitive, degenerate and to be despised, then Negroid blacks were considered to be primitive, powerful and to be feared. Whilst Peter Jackson, a black originally from the West Indies, could in the opening years of this century make his home here,²² the hostile reaction to Jack Johnson showed that this would become an increasingly less pleasant and therefore less likely possibility. Negroid boxers increasingly only 'visited' from the United States rather than settled here.

Through the early decades of this century one Aboriginal boxer appeared to stand out against the general trend. However, the myth/reality of Ron Richards' career eventually epitomised the way Aboriginal boxers were constructed into boxing:

In retrospect Richards' career looks like a series of fantasies — the tent-fighting, back-blocks Aborigine who made good financially, who overcame Americans and other foreigners, who *could* have won the world title, but who fell on bad times. He was proof that an [Aborigine] could succeed in Australia and at the same time proof that the Aborigines were a fatally flawed race.²³

Richards' apogee was in the 1930s; by the late 1940s he was a drunken destitute. Richards' career is indeed the stuff of myth for that period because he 'wrote large' what was happening to the majority of

Aboriginal boxers at this time. Here we can see the way in which the image of the Aborigine in Australia during this period was superimposed on, and constructed a reality for, Aborigines competing in boxing. The final image of Richards is one of apparently self-inflicted failure, an individual example of a race that is fundamentally flawed. The myth is of a liberal white society which gave him every chance and an Aborigine unable to make a success of himself in that area, which as we have seen, was regarded as having important connotations of civilisation.

In cricket, as I noted earlier, a tour of England by an Aboriginal cricket team occurred in 1868 — ten years earlier than the first white Australian tour. The *Australian Encyclopaedia of Sport* lists only four Aborigines (apart from that first team) who have played first-class cricket, saying they are 'the best' and implying that there have been few others. Yet Mulvaney writes that the 1868 team's visit to England resulted in it playing forty-seven matches, winning fourteen, losing fourteen and drawing nineteen.²⁴ The Aborigines who formed the team were drawn from western Victoria where they had been coached by Tom Wills who, at that time, was regarded as one of the finest cricketers in the colony. Mulvaney notes how, in the 1840s when the area was being settled, race relations were conducted by whites with guns. In spite of this, when Edenhope formed its cricket club around 1864 an Aborigine called Peter played in its first match and, similarly, Bullocky, who was to be such a force on the English tour, played for Balmoral.²⁵ In fact, throughout this period it seems to have been both common and acceptable for Aborigines and whites to play cricket together. In addition to Mulvaney's numerous examples Gillespie records it as a matter of regular occurrence in the Queanbeyan region.²⁶ At this point in the nineteenth century cricket, like boxing, was not yet perceived as a site of civilisation in Australia.

The relocation of Aborigines in the image of Australian sport is epitomised by the lack of folk knowledge about the 1868 tour. In popular books on cricket it is either not mentioned at all — the first tour of England then becomes the 1878 white tour — or it is dismissed in such terms as these:

Sensing it was time to press on with international cricket, Conway suggested that a . . . team tour England in 1878. Laurence had already proved this feasible in 1868 with a troupe of [Aborigines] in whose bags boomerangs were bedfellows with bats.

Thus is the memory of the tour reconstructed when it is not completely elided. The team did not represent Australia, the players were entertainers, a troupe (as in 'circus') rather than cricketers, and they

carried non-white (that is, odd) belongings with them.²⁷ By the 1970s even the national boomerang throwing champion was white. By the mid-1870s Aborigines had disappeared from representative cricket at the national level. During this same period, referring back to Mandle's argument, cricket became closely linked with nationalism and, as I have noted above, became invested more strongly than in England with connotations of civilisation.

We might, then, trace the demise of Aboriginal involvement in sport to a number of factors. Obviously, one of the most important was the destruction of Aboriginal society and the concomitant destruction of the people. Aborigines participated in one white sport, hunting, right into this century. They were, of course, the hunted.²⁸ Another important factor in the decreasing Aboriginal involvement in cricket was the end-of-the-century completion of the shift of cricket from a ritual of interaction to one dominated by competition, a shift which moved sport further away from traditional Aboriginal preoccupations. The third factor was the increasing emphasis on the degraded status of the Aborigine as a part of an un-natural environment. This, as we have seen, was coupled with the increasing importance attached to sport as a way of protecting the white race from the environment and the connotations of civilisation with which it came to be invested. In the production of sport as an 'image' in Australia between the 1870s and the 1960s the perception of the health of sport and, therefore, the nation, may only be described as having been inversely proportional to the contribution of Aborigines.

Sport and Australian culture

The centrality of sport to the Australian structure of culture has been repeatedly, if not repetitiously, commented on by academic and non-academic writers alike. McKernan, for example, has written:

The Australian male, it is alleged, is addicted to sport, whether as player, spectator, gambler, or bar-breasting expert. Sport is the Australian national religion: Australians are a race of 'sports'.²⁹

Mandle, in another of his articles, has demonstrated that:

... Australia, as an offshoot of British 19th century society, did not escape the mother country's new obsession with sport.³⁰

However, perhaps the two most sustained accounts of the production of sport as a prominent feature of the Australian structure of culture are those by Elford and Dunstan. Elford, in his article, 'Sport in Australian Society: A Perspective' seeks to:

... define, through examples drawn from colonial South Australia, the type of social virtues sport was supposed to establish.³¹

Elford is concerned with exploring the link between the British Victorian connection of sport with the rhetoric of 'manliness' and the mobilisation of the same connection in nineteenth-century Australia. None of these writers, however, is concerned primarily with the precise location of sport in Australian culture or with attempting to account for this location. On these twin issues perhaps the most informative discussion comes from Keith Dunstan in the first chapter of his book with the engagingly simple title of *Sports*.³² Dunstan lists four possible contributing factors to the importance attached to sport in Australia. The first he refers to is the climate, a climate in which 'long warm summers were guaranteed'.³³

So that unlike in Britain, people were tempted into the outdoors. The second factor Dunstan mentions is derived from John Daley's argument that:

... a distinctive Australian 'type' developed during the nineteenth century ... There was almost a mystique about the Australian pioneer — here was toughness, manliness, a never-give-in attitude.³⁴

Sport, Dunstan seems to claim, got caught up in this matrix. One assumes this was because of its ability to enhance fitness.

Dunstan's third factor is the preponderance of males in the early pioneer society. All-male companionship, Dunstan implies, is a good precondition for the development of sport. Dunstan's fourth fact is that:

The urge for sport has always been used as a method for easing Australian masculine aggressions.³⁵

In relation to this last point Dunstan invokes the connection between homosexuality — the Australian male's 'super-male-ego' — and sport as the Arnoldian formula for working-off surplus energies. Before commenting in general on these factors it is worth dwelling on this last point for a moment because, in it, we can catch a glimpse of what is implied when talking of the cultural specificity of sport and the relativity of its modes of cultural incorporation.

Dunstan notes that sport in Australia is deeply associated with politics. Sportsmen (sic) move, more often than in either Britain or America, into politics and political leaders gain stature from their association with sport or sports personalities. Most recently Bob Hawke has gained great prestige from this linkage, but it is not a new one. In America, however, as Dunstan again notes, it is from show-business that politicians can draw popularity. The example of Ronald Reagan here should not require further comment. In both countries, politics, as an area of practice, draws on a cultural *topos* which has a more entrenched and accepted set of cultural meanings; that is, from

the point of view of day to day living, a more legitimate position in the structure of culture. In Britain, on the other hand, politics has a very strong and complex cultural legitimation in its own right. This legitimation resides in Britain's 'political heritage', its site as the Mother of Parliaments, its history of democratic/aristocratic stability. In Britain the transfer is the other way around. Politicians give respectability to business ventures, sit on charity boards, become academics. In terms of the structure of culture, then, sport is more significant in Australia than in Britain. It occupies a more established and evocative position.

The incorporation of sport

None of Dunstan's four factors outlined above answer the question of why sport — rather than anything else — should have been taken up in the contexts which he outlines. Rather than a solution to the question of 'why?', what Dunstan provides us with is an outline of the conditions within which sport became deployed in its modern form in Australia. These, in turn, provide us with an insight into the way in which sport is constructed as an aspect of the present day Australian cultural order.

From the mid-nineteenth century the importance of sport, both as a practice among certain groups in the population and, at large, as an image incorporated into a generalised Australian world-view, cannot be denied. We might, for example, cite Trollope who travelled in Australia in the 1870s. He wrote:

The English passion for the amusements which are technically called 'sports', is not a national necessity with the Americans, whereas with the Australians it is almost as much so as at home.³⁶

Trollope, here, is not talking about the working class, rather he is discussing the sports of the people with whom he mixed, namely the Australian graziers and their associates who, he tells us, indulged in cricket, athletics, rowing matches, shooting, hunting, flat-racing and steeple-chasing. This list comprises those sports which, in England, were associated with the aristocracy and the landed gentry. However, in Australia the bulk of the people with whom Trollope was associating would have been from what came to be known as the squattocracy, a group which had no landed wealth or hereditary titles, but rather had been, from its inception, tied very closely to Australia's colonial rural bourgeoisie. The personal backgrounds of members of the group were very much of the order of the English upper middle class.³⁷ In other words, the men would have been precisely the sorts of males who would have been to public schools such as Rugby, where

the role of sport in the production of masculine virtues was being emphasised.

There were two important factors in the production of middle-class sport in England which require noting here. The first was the fundamental importance of amateurism. Amateurism, the perception that sport was only truly sport, let alone worthwhile sport, if it was played outside of the cash nexus, was to have far reaching effects on sport in Australia. McKernan,³⁸ for example, has discussed how the equation of professionalism/working class and amateurism/middle class spilled over into class misunderstanding concerning the playing of sport in Australia during the First World War.

In Australia it was the ideology of amateurism, not its articulation and limitation within class-based sports practices, which gained the ascendancy. In England the rationale within which, for example, football was taught to an urban working class dispossessed of the original peasant game, was one which constantly re-affirmed the class hierarchy. It was one in which the 'deficient' working class was taught both a sport and a set of values clearly defined as being upper middle class in origin. This education was, as the importance of the proselytisers of Muscular Christianity in the spread of sport demonstrates, a part of the attempt by the middle class to 'improve' the working class. In this, football may be set side-by-side with the movements bringing schooling to the working class.

The development of professionalism and the production of sport both as work and entertainment was, from the point of view of the original middle-class ideology of sport, a rejection of the middle-class values which had originally framed it. In England limited professionalism in soccer was finally legalised after much struggle and as an attempt to preserve the amateur — and middle class — dominance of the game in 1885.³⁹ The upper middle class produced 'sport' as a way of inculcating aspects of bourgeois ideology in the form of reified values; the working class reproduced sport as that ideology. Sport was an element of working-class life, the working class actively adopting the values the middle class had embedded in it. Sport was being reconstructed in terms of the twin concerns of work and entertainment.

However, the English middle-class attitude to sport was not only that it should be amateur, but that it should, at all costs, be distinguished from working-class activities. Thus Bailey notes that:

The enthusiasts who founded the A.A.C. and like bodies had some initial difficulties in persuading their elders that the practice of athletic

sports outside the confines of public schools and university was not vulgar and morally ruinous. . . . It was in order to avoid such opprobrium that early amateurs wore masks and competed incognito.⁴⁰

The category of 'sport' was generated and given meaning within the context of the public school. Outside the public school all games provided the possibility for stigma, but those not yet valorised by the public schools, such as athletics, were down-right dangerous. There was, however, another group of 'sports' which were perfectly acceptable. These were the games of the aristocracy, hunting, shooting and, of course, cricket. In Britain access to such games for the middle class was barred. In Australia, where the English upper middle-class sons were the new gentry, they could take on the sporting trappings of the English gentry. In Australia, then, middle-class sports were much more diversified than in England, running a gamut from cricket — and subsequently football — through to hounds, and all carrying the associations of manly virtue and health.

Cricket and social class in the colony

Cricket is important in any discussion of the relationship between sport and class in England and Australia. Like football, it originated in England as a folk game. During the eighteenth century, however, it was taken up by the English aristocracy.⁴¹ It seems to have been played at English public schools from their inception.⁴² From the 1830s it gained full acceptance in these schools having previously been, as one cricket historian terms it, 'something of a cult'.⁴³ At the time that the schools were appropriating and codifying football⁴⁴ from its pre-industrial folk base, they were also appropriating *from* the aristocracy the already partly codified game of cricket which had previously been appropriated *by* the aristocracy.

It is not new to remark that cricket came to Australia already codified — a clear, colonial, cultural import — while the late codification of football enabled the production of a differentiated, colonial version. However, the contextualisation of cricket in Australia was rather different from that of England. In England, cricket retained its aristocratic aura; it was the game of true gentlemen, not those made in the public schools. The middle-class appropriation of cricket represented, among other things, the attempt to appropriate the status with which the game was associated. In Australia, without an aristocracy cricket was a more completely middle-class game articulating the public school characteristics which we have already identified. Its popularity among the working class may be seen not so

much in the context of the hegemonic thrust of the middle-class ideology associated with sport, but more in terms of its associations with civilisation, nationalism and entertainment. It became a game for all males, regardless of class.

In nineteenth-century cricket, before the incorporation of ideologies of competition and achievement, the most celebrated performer on the field was the batsman. The batsman was the star around whom the other players, literally, revolved. In that game the aristocracy would bat and the peasantry would bowl. In later periods, up to and including the Bodyline series, this social division was largely reproduced — the middle-class would bat and the working class, in the person of, for example, Larwood, would bowl. In Australia such a class-based division of labour, with no entrenched history behind it, was less likely to appear. This is not to say that there were not class-based disagreements within Australian cricket (there were, as Bradman's conflicts with the Australian Cricketing Board of Control amply illustrate) but that in Australia the division was not a literal one concerned with a separation of roles but a more generalised one concerning the ideology of the game. The controllers of cricket in Australia inherited the middle-class concerns of manliness, sportsmanship and — above all — of amateurism.

The Australians had always considered the distinction between amateurism and professionalism to be pecuniarily based. They were shocked, for example, by the amounts of money demanded by W. G. Grace.⁴⁵ They perceived his argument for his amateur status as being money-based. He, however, considered himself an amateur because of his class position, not as a function of whether or not money changed hands. In England the inherited division of labour provided a basis for legitimising the distinction between amateurs and professionals in the same team. In Australia, where no such legitimisation existed, the distinction was between those who supported — or were able to support — the ideology of amateurism and those who accepted the need, in practice, for some kind of payment.

It is important to note that amateurism is an ideology; it is concerned with a particular view of what sport is and how, specifically, individuals should assimilate by way of sport a particular set of ideas and values. An amateur may be defined as somebody who does not receive payment, but this is not a necessary definition. The ideology of amateurism is not matched by an ideology of professionalism unless one argues for the importation of an equivalent workerist supplement of skill, unionism and the like. The professional ideology is

not, however, an idealist structure of socially preferred values. In England, non-payment reinforced class distinction and amateurism was a class-based ideology. The two together reinforced class separation while attempts were made to imbue the working class with some 'appropriate' aspects of the ideology of amateurism. In Australia, by contrast, amateurism, particularly in relation to cricket, represented a much more hegemonic force if only because it was not linked to a class-based, status-determined division of labour. In Australia, the distinction between amateur and professional was located straightforwardly in whether or not a player was paid. In England, such a consideration was secondary to the player's class position, which was represented by specialisms on the field.

Earlier I noted how important the practice of sport was for the new Australian gentry. In addition I made a distinction between the actual activity of sport and the image of sport as it has been articulated in the Australian structure of culture. Mandle has argued for four stages in the relationship between nationalism and cricket during the nineteenth century. He argues that by:

... the nineties a revival of interest, coupled with some crushing victories, gave to Australia a sense of cricketing confidence, even arrogance, that was specifically held up as an example of what federation and co-operation might do and what nationhood had already achieved.⁴⁶

One point which requires comment here is that, by the beginning of this century, it was no longer important for Australians to *play* sport — sport had become a central part of the *image* of 'Australianness'. It was not the practice of sport which was hegemonically spread (for example, McKernan has argued that in the first World War there was a radical class-based misunderstanding about what exactly were the objects of sport). Rather, the idea of sport began to be loaded with a set of cultural connotations which had previously not been associated with it. The link between sport and nationalism is, perhaps, the dominant and mediating connection. When Inglis published his *Sports and Pastimes in Australia* in 1912 he began with an acknowledgement of the importance of the image of sport. He wrote:

When one wrote a book about Australian sport people may say 'Oh that is all very well, but it seems to us that this country thinks about sport and nothing else.'⁴⁷

He then goes on to give the middle-class justifications for the importance of sport. He talks of 'duties and responsibilities' and links sport with the preparedness of a citizen soldiery for war. In other words Inglis recognised the importance of sport as an *idea* in Australia and

then collapsed it into the standard middle-class account of the values accruing from the *practice* of sport. This, indeed, has been a common aspect of Australian discussions of sport.

However, the development of the idea of sport in Australia occurred in the context of changes in the understanding of specific games. In order to appreciate how cricket came to be of such importance in the Australian structure of culture we first need to unravel certain changes which have taken place around the idea and practice of cricket. Mandle, in his delineation of the four nineteenth-century phases of cricket and nationalism, notes that the 1880s was a 'slack phase', a period of little Australian interest in cricket, which he associates with a lack of success in the England-versus-Australian matches. In 1891-2, for example, Lord Sheffield brought out an English team, including W. G. Grace, at a personal loss of £4000. Other reasons may be given for this 'slack phase', which relate more specifically to changes in the game itself and the perception of it within society at large. Not only was the image of cricket altering in the general re-alignment of the idea of sport in relation to Australian nationalism, but the experience of what constituted cricket was changing. The 1880s marks a watershed in the reorganisation of cricket from a game still significantly constituted around ritual, exhibition and involvement to a sport organised in relation to a set of capitalist ideological assumptions involving competition, equal opportunity, achievement and, most fundamental of all, winning. This last was of course a necessary ideological prerequisite if the game was to have a utility for 'proving' the quality of the Australian type against the quality of the English.

The 1880s was also the moment when, with the increasingly rapid demarcation between players and non-players, spectators began to learn their role. Previously, as a carry-over from folk games, times when cricket or other sports occurred were also times when other entertainments took place. Collar grinning, in which competitors put their heads through a horse collar and attempted to contort their faces in extraordinary ways, was a very common game. Athletics, in which a running backwards race was common, were also informally organised at this time. When the Aboriginal cricket team toured England such practices were still common. Dick-a-Dick, a good batsman, excelled in addition at running backwards and usually won.⁴⁸ But the members of the team also gave exhibitions of distinctively Aboriginal arts such as boomerang throwing. Folk games were integrated into a pattern of communal life in which the demarcations of game from festivity, and player from spectator, were blurred. Folk

games often formed a part of the general festivities during rituals of inversion when the 'world was turned upside down', the popularity of running backwards races illustrates how images of inversion could be carried over into the games themselves.

A number of factors can be cited in relation to the development of sport as separate from the community. One of the most important was the gradual loss during the mid-nineteenth century of these community rituals of inversion⁴⁹ which relates, more generally, to the disappearance of locally integrated social groups.

Sport became a distinct entity separated from, but parallel with, day-to-day life rather than being an inversion of it. Thus, for example, the cricket boundary developed during this period, implying both the recognition of a limit to the cricket ground and also the place beyond which those who were now for the first time clearly marked off as not playing the game would have to reside (becoming, in the process, spectators). This literal demarcation symbolised a greater demarcation in which the game shifted from being a community enterprise to becoming a sport perceived as distinct from day-to-day activities. The development of the spectator both affirmed this shift towards distinction and reconstituted the game as a community activity in a new form. This new form was constructed around ideas of pleasure and entertainment in the context of the emerging distinction between work and leisure. It was this shift in the social context of cricket, and games in general, which allowed them to take on characteristics (such as payment for players) associated with work, thus producing the apparent paradox that some people work so that others may have leisure entertainment.

As sports developed out of games they changed fundamentally, not least in their new codification. Earliest (the most obvious) was the introduction of umpires. The original role of the umpire was not as an impartial referee between two competing sides but as a site of resort for an interpretation of the rules. In other words, umpires became important when folk-games started to be codified. This is clear in the rules of football first drawn up at Rugby in 1845 where:

... the heads of sides, or two deputies appointed by them, are the sole arbiters of all disputes.⁵⁰

At this transitional moment in the development of football the players were still expected not only to know the rules but to accept them as absolute. They were not a list to be examined and worked within but an internalised absolute to be lived.⁵¹ Specifically, in relation to cricket, a number of other factors may be mentioned. For example,

the gradual introduction in both England and Australia of the toss, replaced the practice of allowing the visiting team to bat first. This introduction seems to have occurred during the period between 1860 and 1880. The formalisation and standardisation of team sizes occurred during this period also. Whilst eleven-a-side had been common for some time, numbers would often nevertheless vary. Again, a transitional moment here can be found in the early England-Australia matches where eleven English players would face Australian XVIIIs and XXIIIs. The final shift to eleven-a-side competitions in the 1870s is usually understood as an acceptance of the new ability of the Australian players, but it is also an acknowledgement of a new code of play which insisted on both teams having formal equality.

In cricket, though, the most important change was the new emphasis on competition. In football this shift was masked by the folk-game's attitude towards 'goals'. That is to say, under normal circumstances the gaining of a goal finished the game. It would be better to say 'completed' here rather than 'ended' because of the importance of ritual in folk-games. Such games were not timed, they finished when a goal was scored. By introducing fixed time periods the possibility of the 'goal' becoming an aspect of an ongoing competition was also introduced. In cricket a similar shift moved the game from an emphasis on display, in this case of the batsman, to the importance of runs and wickets. The shift here, then, was a double one. On the one hand there developed the importance of batting technique; on the other, bowling became increasingly important as the way of determining the result. One-day cricket shows up these shifts in emphasis caused by a time limit better than does the five day Test Match.

It is often noted that all the great early cricketers were batsmen.⁵² This was because of the importance of ritual and display. Of course, display would resurface as sport came to be perceived as entertainment. In cricket the development of the one day 'entertainment' game has seen, again, the rise of the batsman. Bowling was originally under-arm and mostly along the ground. The 1850s saw the rise of round-arm bowling and, finally, over-arm bowling. In Australia the returning ex-Rugbean, Tom Wills, introduced tossing the coin to Victoria in 1858⁵³ and, more generally, is regarded as having introduced round-arm bowling to this country. Round-arm bowling had been legalised in the 1835 codification of the laws.

Thus, the deployment of cricket as a site for Australia's sense of nationalism could only occur after cricket itself had undergone a series of changes which rearticulated it both as a 'sport' and as having

the possibility of becoming a 'spectator sport'. For this to occur cricket required fixed time periods, accepted limits to the 'pitch' — the already-mentioned 1884 introduction of the boundary (which had previously had an irregular existence before) was important here — an acknowledged division between players and 'spectators' and the production of a set of spectatorial conditions.⁵⁴ One of the most important changes was the development of interest in the score. In general, as Mandle again notes:

Facilities for spectators were better (in Australia) at cricket grounds as well as at other sporting arenas. Visiting players remarked on the number of grandstands, the provision of good vantage points for the general public and, of course, after 1896, the scoreboards, their size, the detail of the game provided and their efficiency.⁵⁵

Over-arm bowling (used later, to good effect, by Spofforth) was tolerated but not legalised until 1864. Once again the rules lagged behind *de facto* changes caused by the increasing perception of the game as a competition. Thus, the period of Mandle's 'slack phase' was, in fact, the time when cricket in Australia was completely reorganised as a 'sport' which, in turn, enabled it to be mobilised as an element in the articulation of Australian nationalism.

Spectatorism

In Australia, sport is constituted as a site of maleness. It is a male prerogative, not simply in the playing but in the spectating as well. A part of the construction of sport in Australia lies in a specific late nineteenth-century conjuncture of the Victorian middle-class preoccupation with 'manliness' and the British working-class appropriation of sport in the context of the established male/female division of labour. Spectating in Britain and Australia became a male phenomenon, an assertion of working-men's solidarity. Women, whose place was in the home, were engaged in home-based 'entertainments' including tasks such as sewing (which could equally well be described as work).

The development of spectatorism in Britain and Australia in the late nineteenth century would seem to have had a two-fold origin. On the one hand, it can be related to the middle-class development of sport as a form of school (and subsequently country) patriotism where cheering on one's team was a part of such patriotism. On the other hand, the working class appropriated the spread of institutionalised sport, taking it on board as another male entertainment. Of course, these two elements were never so entirely class differentiated. In Australia, as we have seen, and to a lesser extent in England, the link

between sport and nationalism spread across classes, as did the perception of sport as entertainment.

In America, by contrast, spectatorism was a late development, one which grew in the period between the wars and which seems to have self-consciously linked the entertainment and the commercial spheres.⁵⁶ For example, in the context of American football (which developed as a middle-class game in the universities) Rader has noted:

Attendance at college football games grew at a much faster pace than the population. Between 1921 and 1930 attendance at all college games doubled and gate receipts tripled. . . . In the 1930s, attendance fell . . . but estimates in 1937 placed total fandom at twenty million, a figure twice as high as that of 1930.⁵⁷

American football was, at this time, still nominally an amateur sport.

Baseball, in spite of its middle-class origins in the 1840s, had become both professional and spectator-oriented by the 1870s.⁵⁸ However, it was not until the 1920s that a number of rule changes were combined with the use of a ball of a different composition in order to give the hitter more of an advantage and make the game more visually spectacular. It is worth remembering that it was during this same period in England and Australia that in cricket, with an already assured audience, pace bowling was being increasingly used, thereby forcing batsmen to develop an increasingly 'scientific' technique. The effect of pace bowling combined with a more complex batting technique was to heighten the visual drama of the game as a duel between bowler and batsman. From the point of view of the spectator pace bowling is more obvious and less subtle than spin but more spectacular to watch.

In America the late development of spectatorism (even in the more middle-class sports) enabled sport to be much more clearly positioned than in England or Australia as an aspect of commercial entertainment and, therefore, as a part of show business. Rader describes the development of the spectator in American sport like this:

Central to the ascendancy of the spectator in sport was a vastly expanded market for all forms of entertainment. Apart from the growth in population, real income, and leisure time, a concerted attack upon Victorian values created a more favourable climate for the pursuit of commercial amusements.⁵⁹

Unlike the puritan America which had continually fought a rear-guard action against all sport and entertainment, English and Australian middle-class society had been dominated by that combination of Protestantism and the games ethos which produced Muscular

Christianity in which spectating was an important aspect of the 'team spirit'. Sport as entertainment was, for these countries, grafted onto spectating as a form of participation.

Spectatorism in America developed as more of a shared diversion, like going to films. In Australia, as in England, the sexual aspect of sport was articulated as a complete all-male structure of expression and repression — one manifestation of mateship. In America the sexual aspect of sport became a variation on the heterosexuality of show business. Sport generated a sexualised male image epitomised in such relationships as that between Marilyn Monroe and Joe Di Maggio. The mythical nature of this relationship was founded on the sexual overtones attributed to both show business and sport. It should be added, though, that during this period of American sport it was only the sportsman who was sexualised. The general historical construction of sport as a site of middle-class 'manliness' or working-class male street prowess has overdetermined and unsexed the sportswoman.

Unlike in England and Australia, American sports heroes suddenly burgeon in the 1920s at the same time that sport became a mass, spectator-oriented, entertainment. In England and Australia there were well-known sports personalities before this period. They, however, were appreciated as particularly good examples of the striven-for synthesis of body and mind. To take perhaps the best known examples from the Bodyline cricket series (when such a view still held) Bradman was constituted as the player who Played The Game whilst Larwood was stigmatised as the working class lad who had not learnt the rules properly. In America sports heroes were generated as one aspect of the production of the new commercial mass (popular) culture based on show business.⁶⁰

Sport and sex

The American understanding of sport mobilises it as an arena for sex in ways which the Australian understanding does not. For example, one could cite the invention of cheer-leaders⁶¹ as well as the link between sport and sex in numerous films, perhaps most flagrantly in the well-known pornographic film *Debbie Does Dallas*. In addition, the link between sport and sex is present in many American popular songs. For example, in one song by Meatloaf on *Bat Out of Hell* called 'Paradise by the Dashboard Light', a baseball commentary becomes a metaphor for a couple's sexual liaison in a car. In America there is an image of the sportsman-as-stud. In his outline of the myth/reality of Babe Ruth, for example, Rader describes how the press celebrated his

hedonism, including his sexual athleticism. The American image brings together the pre-nineteenth century low-life idea of sport with the American post-1920s mass cultural pre-occupation with sex and/as entertainment.

In fifteenth-century England, according to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, the word 'sport' was used as a general term to mean a pleasant pastime, an entertainment or diversion. Sixteenth-century usage generalised the term and began employing it in a sexual context. Farmer, in *Slang and Its Analogues*,⁶² gives a number of examples. In America, colonised from the seventeenth century, the slang usage of 'sport' — as in 'sporting house' for a brothel — still had in the first quarter of this century a lower-class and, particularly, black currency. In England by the nineteenth century this usage seems to have disappeared. Simultaneously as the upper middle class turned games into 'sports', so 'sport' came to be applied to a person with those qualities attached to sport. It remained, however, a middle-class usage. In late nineteenth-century Australia, by contrast, and reflecting the fact that sport in Australia was a less (middle) class specific pastime, the term came into more general usage but with similar connotations. In America, the Victorianisation of sport failed to occur. Rader, again, argues for its increasing association with notions of health and as a reaction to the evils, both physical and spiritual, of the city.⁶³ But sport never took on those English middle-class concerns of 'manliness' which are evoked in such phrases as 'playing the game' and 'team-spirit'. Rather, existing in opposition to the ascendant puritanism, it returned transformed from folk game to mass entertainment, but with echoes of its original formulation surviving more than in England or in Australia.

In American sport the sexuality is often manifest. Increasingly in the post-war period it has become mobilised as, for example, male tennis and swimming stars become sex-symbols on a par with film stars. Most obviously, one could point to Johnny Weismuller as an early example of someone who brought the two cultural areas of sport and film together in the (sexualised) image of Tarzan. In Norman Mailer's novelised commentary on the Vietnam war, *Why are we in Vietnam?*,⁶⁴ he implies a link between sex, sport (in the form of hunting) and war. It is interesting that Mailer should choose hunting here because the old English aristocratic sports such as hunting and fishing have tended to be the last, in America, to move out of their male-centredness. With their English colonial heritage coupled with the late development of spectator sport, a tension has developed between

the values and male orientation of sport and the sexualisation which is an aspect of the American mass entertainment tradition.

Sport, leisure and the production of cultural meanings through sporting myths

The reorganisation of communal games as competitive sport and as entertainment did not happen outside of an historical context. Here it is important to note the importance during the nineteenth century of the production of the idea of leisure as a counterbalance to work. E. P. Thompson, in his seminal article on 'Time, Work-Discipline and Industrial Capitalism', argues that:

Mature industrial societies of all varieties are marked by time-thrift and by a clear demarcation of 'work' and 'life'.⁶⁵

Thompson's article is a discussion of the production of a division between work and leisure in the late eighteenth century. The argument is couched in terms of the importance of a sense of linear time in the articulation of standardised work patterns. What is important for us here is the implication for the production of leisure.

Sociologists of sport⁶⁶ tend to discuss the place of sport in society without reference to leisure. One way of approaching this relationship is through the way the terms work and leisure are used in English. We use work to refer to both the period of time which is segmented and classified as work, as well as to what is done during that time. Leisure is different. It is used to refer to that period which is not taken up with work. Indeed, there is a sense in which only if a person works (or is perceived as working) can s/he be said, in non-work periods, to have leisure. The unemployed do not have leisure — though what they do have is unclear. The confusion over whether or not students work gives them a confused status in relation to leisure. Much of this confusion is caused by the conflation of the idea of work with paid labour. Leisure, then, comes to be defined as time during which one is not being paid.

To understand leisure as a production of the evolution of industrial capitalism requires both a recognition of the importance of time and of the Romantic understanding that leisure provides the opportunity for inverting the alienation of the cash nexus. It is only within the articulation and deployment of leisure that we can understand the restructuring and positioning of sport through the nineteenth and early twentieth century. Only when we recognise that sport is *always* mentally constructed within the capitalist formulation of leisure can we start to make sense of arguments about sport as relaxation or sport as an aspect of bourgeois hegemony.⁶⁷ When Hargreaves argues that

sport needs to be examined in the context of three dimensions of hegemony, namely 'the extent of incorporation, the strategic mode of incorporation, and the mode of compliance',⁶⁸ we need to recognise that, in a fundamental way, sport is already incorporated. Indeed, the very conceptualisation of sport with which our society operates is dependent on that incorporation. Thus, arguments about, for example, the working-class (re)appropriation of football from its middle-class development as a competitive team game require a recognition that football must be considered within the determination of the entire enterprise of sport as a capitalist cultural production. In Australia, as elsewhere, sport took on the replication of capitalist ideological forms, but the centrality of sport in the Australian structure of culture enables aspects of sport to provide a focus for other understandings of social relations. At this point, having explained the position which sport occupies in the Australian cultural order, we can now turn briskly to specific aspects of the Australian cultural usage of sport. In this way we will be able to see how certain ideological themes are manifested in the formulation of sport in the Australian context. One of the most important examples here is the deployment of the original English middle-class linkage of sport and manliness in its guise as an aid to warfare. This link became very important in Australia. So important, indeed, that at times it has been inverted. In Australia war has, at times, become the very image of sport. The most obvious example here is Gallipoli which, as an already established cultural object, was in the Peter Weir film given meaning around athletics.

The above example (of the cultural connection between sport and war) was of sport considered as a general cultural area helping to organise the meaning of another cultural area. In this way it demonstrates the power of sport as an aspect of the Australian cultural order. However, it is worth ending this section with a brief discussion of three Australian sporting myths in order to demonstrate how they are invested with ideological themes. With the development of sport as competition a trophy such as the Ashes could become a part of the iconography of Australian nationalism. However, other images have served different and possibly more radical purposes. The myths of Phar Lap, William Griffin and Les Darcy have been produced and mobilised by the Australian working class as ways of expressing distrust for (American) bourgeois capitalism. At its simplest the myth argues that 'We sent over our best and they destroyed them', but the myths are more complex than this suggests. Phar Lap was the stayer,

the horse that always won. Phar Lap took the chance out of working-class life by allowing the worker to beat the odds. Life was, paradoxically, no longer a gamble. Phar Lap beat the bookie in a way the Australian worker could not beat his boss. In 1930, at the height of the recession, Phar Lap became the only odds-on favourite to win the Melbourne cup.

All three images are, in fact, images of failure: Les Darcy dying, unable to get the fight that would prove him a champion; Bill Griffin never acknowledged by the American Boxing Board of Control, living out his last years as a bum in New York; and Phar Lap poisoned, or so the myth claims, because he was too good. Australians believe it was the Americans who had destroyed them. In order to understand the implications of this belief it should be remembered that America stands as a complex icon. It was both another colony and the site of twentieth-century capitalism. Carbine, that great horse of the last decade of the nineteenth century, was sold to England for stud. The myth that surrounds Carbine's move to England connotes a mother claiming her right from a proud child. Kinship imagery has been very important in the mythology of British colonialism. Within the same mythic complex, at a later date, Bradman was produced as an image of defiance; in the first place to the unfair demands of the mother country and, in the second place, to the strictures of the recession. In this second context Bradman's professionalism was seen in the same way that the economic success of sportsmen (sic) has always been seen, as an achievement which showed the working-man (sic) that success was possible — and which did not jeopardise the 'ethics' of sport.

In terms of the kinship imagery mobilised around colonialism, America was perceived as the mature elder sibling — in this case — in the practice of capitalism. For the Australian working-class America also became the site of the Other denied in the hegemonic egalitarianism of Australia, in this case the Other being the bosses, the capitalist owners of the means of production. Within the sporting myths of William Griffin, Les Darcy and Phar Lap the hegemonic constitution of Australian society was challenged, albeit in an alienated form. The America of these three myths was a place where the bourgeois capitalists, who occupy no place in Australia, live. It is 'they' who destroy the aspirations of the Australian workers. The colonialism of Australian bourgeois hegemony as manifested in the success of ideological themes such as egalitarianism is enacted in the image of a greater colonisation, that of America, the elder sibling, destroying Australia's home-grown, independent successes. Thus, these myths

are constituted as a product, not only of specific historical conjunctures, but also as a consequence of the position of sport in Australian society.

Conclusion

In Australia the rapid deployment of the new mass spectator-oriented sport was a product of a special historical conjuncture — namely the colonisation of this continent at a time when games in England were undergoing a radical restructuring as well as a major shift in image. The success of the new understanding of sport in Australia was a consequence of, among other things, the lack of a secure tradition and vested interests supporting the old ways.

The period between about 1870 and the turn of the century was the most crucial for this development. It was then that the middle-class ideology of 'sport' became wedded to the new production of sport as a leisure-time experience. At this moment games started to be redeployed as spectacles for mass entertainment. In Australia the importance of sport to middle-class understandings of the world was re-emphasised during the nineteenth century and came to be rearticulated as a part of the deployment of a more generalised Australian structure of culture at the same time as sport itself underwent a reconstruction. Once we have reached an understanding of the position of sport in the Australian structure of culture, it is then possible to analyse Australian sporting myths in order to see how they articulate specific lived preoccupations of members of different classes within Australia. This chapter is a move in the direction of such an understanding.

Notes and References

- 1 Louis Althusser, 'Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses' in *Lenin and Philosophy*, London, New Left Books, 1971, p. 162.
- 2 *Op. cit.*, p. 159.
- 3 Richard Johnson, 'Histories of Culture/Theories of Ideology' in Michèle Barrett, Philip Corrigan, Annette Kuhn and Janet Wolff eds, *Ideology and Cultural Production*, London, Croom Helm, 1979, p. 58.
- 4 For a general introduction to this area see the seminal article by Barthes 'Myth Today' in Roland Barthes, *Mythologies*, New York, Hill and Wang, 1972.
- 5 John Hargreaves, 'Sport, Culture and Ideology' in Jennifer Hargreaves ed., *Sport, Culture and Ideology*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982, p. 47.
- 6 A general introduction to this type of approach to culture is to be found in Raymond Williams, *Culture*, London, Fontana, 1981.
- 7 Bill Mandle, 'Cricket and Australian Nationalism in the Nineteenth Century', *Journal of the Royal Australian Historical Society*, 59, 1973, pp. 223-246.
- 8 *Ibid.*, p. 56.

- 9 A good background to this history is Raymond Williams, *The Country and the City*, London, Chatto and Windus, 1973.
- 10 Brian Simon, *The Two Nations and the Educational Structure 1780-1870*, London, Lawrence and Wishart, 1974, p. 284. T. Banford, in his biography of Thomas Arnold, *Thomas Arnold*, London, The Cresset Press, 1960, argues that organised games were introduced at Rugby in the period immediately subsequent to Arnold's headmastership: '... to cure the disciplinary troubles which Arnold had never conquered... by providing'... a legitimate outlet for energy within sight of the law' (p. 188).
- 11 Eric Dunning and Kenneth Sheard, *Barbarians, Gentlemen and Players: A Sociological Study of Rugby Football*, Oxford, Martin Robertson, 1979, p. 113.
- 12 Richard White, *Inventing Australia*, Sydney, Allen and Unwin, 1981, pp. 66-67.
- 13 Quoted in Mandle, *op. cit.*, p. 56.
- 14 White, *op. cit.*, pp. 8-9.
- 15 White, *op. cit.*, pp. 12-15.
- 16 Quoted in Mandle, *op. cit.*, p. 56.
- 17 Peter Corris, *Lords of the Ring*, North Ryde, Cassell, 1980, p. 27.
- 18 *Ibid.*
- 19 *Ibid.*
- 20 *Ibid.*, pp. 180-181.
- 21 R. Broome, 'The Australian Reaction to Jack Johnson, Black Pugilist, 1907-9' in Richard Cashman and Michael McKernan eds, *Sport in History*, Brisbane, Queensland University Press, 1979, p. 357.
- 22 Jackson died in Roma, Queensland, in 1901.
- 23 Corris, *op. cit.*, p. 142.
- 24 Derek Mulvaney, *Cricket Walkabout*, Melbourne, Melbourne University Press, 1967, p. 50.
- 25 *Ibid.*, p. 18.
- 26 L. Gillespie, 'Early Recreation, Entertainment', *Canberra Historical Journal*, 3, 1979, pp. 14-24.
- 27 R. Robertson, *On Top Down Under*, Sydney, Cassell, 1975, p. 9.
- 28 I have no room here to discuss hunting in any detail. Dunstan, *op. cit.*, writes about it in his chapter 'The Killing Passion'. Of most interest from the point of view of my discussion of the environment is the way that the Australian fauna was not considered suitable for good hunting. So much was this the case that rabbits, foxes and even deer, were imported by those who wanted British-style hunts. Hunting, therefore, operated in a particular context of the 'natural' man and 'natural' nature. In Australia, where this 'natural' relationship with the environment did not obtain, the practice of hunting was experienced as more problematic.
- 29 Michael McKernan, 'Sport, War and Society: Australia 1914-18' in Richard Cashman and Michael McKernan eds, *op. cit.*, p. 1.
- 30 Bill Mandle, 'Games People Played: Cricket and Football in England and Victoria in the Late Nineteenth Century', *Historical Studies*, 15, 1973, pp. 511-535.
- 31 K. Elford, 'Sport in Australian Society: A Perspective' in T. Jaques and G. Pavia eds, *Sport in Australia: Selected Readings*, Australia, McGraw-Hill, 1976, p. 35.
- 32 Keith Dunstan, *Sports*, Melbourne, Cassell, 1973.
- 33 *Ibid.*, p. 8.
- 34 *Ibid.*
- 35 Sport has, traditionally, been a male activity both from the point of view of playing and that of spectating. It is, therefore, with males and sport that this chapter is principally concerned. In an already over-crowded piece there has been, unfortunately, little room to expand the analysis to the complex and problematic construction of the sports-woman and the female spectator.
- 36 Anthony Trollope, *Australia*, extracted in T. Jaques and G. Pavia, *op. cit.*, 1976, p. 24.

- 37 Here I have no space to discuss in more detail the social origins of the squattocracy. For a general introduction to the importation of games to Australia with reference to class, see Sandercock and Turner, *op. cit.*, Chapter 1.
- 38 McKernan, *op. cit.*
- 39 On the development of professionalism in football and its class basis see Dunning and Sheard, *op. cit.*, Chapter 9, *passim*.
- 40 Peter Bailey, *Leisure and Class in Victorian England*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978, pp. 134-5.
- 41 Christopher Brookes, *English Cricket*, London, Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1978, pp. 134-5.
- 42 Rowland Bowen, *Cricket*, London, Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1970, p. 70.
- 43 *Ibid.*, p. 82.
- 44 Tom Wills, who played such an important part in the development of an Aboriginal cricket team, was also central in the construction of the Australian Rules football code. On this see Leonie Sandercock and Ian Turner, *op. cit.*, Chapter 2.
- 45 On professionalism and cricket in late nineteenth-century Australia see Bill Mandle, 'Games People Played', *op. cit.*, pp. 529-530.
- 46 Bill Mandle, 'Cricket and Australian Nationalism in the Nineteenth Century', *op. cit.*
- 47 Gordon Inglis, *Sports and Pastimes in Australia*, London, Methuen, 1912.
- 48 Mulvaney, *op. cit.*, p. 96.
- 49 An introduction to this side of nineteenth century popular culture in England is Robert Storch ed., *Popular Culture and Custom in Nineteenth Century England*, London, Croom Helm, 1982. In the present state of social history research in Australia one can, unfortunately, do no more than speculate as to the extent to which rituals of inversion were transported here.
- 50 Quoted in Dunning and Sheard, *op. cit.*, p. 96.
- 51 The development of Australian Rules football followed an analogous pattern. In the games of the 1850s there were no umpires, following the English public school tradition the captains resolved arguments. Later each side appointed an umpire to check goals. This was provided for in the rules drafted in 1866. In 1870 a 'central umpire' was added. At this point he only had the ability to arbitrate appeals but his use as an upholder of the rules followed soon after. Similarly, it was not until 1869 that the rule that the winning team was the first to score two goals was altered to the winning team being the one to score most goals in 100 minutes. This information comes from Leonie Sandercock and Ian Turner, *op. cit.*
- 52 See, for example, C. L. R. James' introduction to Rowland Bowen, *op. cit.* James writes:
'Everybody knows more or less what is meant by the Golden Age of cricket. Ask anyone who has the faintest knowledge and he will tell you it is the age which began towards the end of the nineteenth century and continued at least to 1914. It was the age of a new style of batsman who took batting into reaches undreamed of by their ancestors: Ranjitsinhji, Fry, A. C. MacLaren, R. E. Foster, Johnny Tyldesley, J. B. Hobbs, R. H. Spooner. The same phenomenon appeared in Australia, Victor Trumper, R. A. Duff and Clem Hill', p. 17.
- 53 Mulvaney, *op. cit.*, p. 50.
- 54 One aspect of cricket as it is now played which still echoes its origin is the lack of a standard size of cricket ground. Some grounds have long boundaries, some short, many have irregular boundaries. Very few institutionalised spectator sports would tolerate such a lack of standardisation.
- 55 Mandle, 'Games People Played', *op. cit.*, p. 522.
- 56 On the rise of spectator sport in America see Peter Shergold, 'The Growth of American Spectator Sport: A Technological Perspective' in Richard Cashman and Michael McKernan eds, *op. cit.*, pp. 21-24. There are also some useful references in David

- Riesman and Reuel Denney, 'Football in America: A Study in Cultural Diffusion' reprinted in Eric Dunning ed., *The Sociology of Sport*, London, Cassell, 1971. Most important, however, is Benjamin Rader, *American Sports*, Englewood Cliffs, Prentice Hall, 1983, especially Part III, 'The Age of the Spectator'.
- 57 Rader, *ibid.*, p. 209.
- 58 *Ibid.*, pp. 111-112.
- 59 *Ibid.*, p. 197.
- 60 Rader has some good ideas on this — and some useful references. Rader, *op. cit.*, pp. 176-177.
- 61 Cheerleaders were introduced into VFL during the 1979 season by Carlton. On this see M. Brady, 'Miss and Mrs Football, but no Ms Football', in Leonie Sandercock and Ian Turner, *Up Where Cazaly?*, Sydney, Granada, 1981.
- 62 John Farmer, *Slang and its Analogues*, priv. pub., Seven volumes 1890-1904.
- 63 Rader, *op. cit.*, pp. 146-169. Muscular Christianity was important in America, as Rader discusses, particularly in the context of sport and the YMCA. However, my point is that only certain aspects of the English conceptualisation of sport and its role were imported.
- 64 Norman Mailer, *Why Are We In Vietnam?*, New York, Putnam, 1967.
- 65 E.P. Thompson, 'Time, Work-Discipline and Industrial Capitalism', *Past and Present*, 38, 1967, p. 93.
- 66 See, for example, Jennifer Hargreaves ed., *op. cit.*, though not, as I have noted, the article by John Hargreaves.
- 67 Bero Rigauer, *Sport and Work*, New York, Columbia University Press, trans. 1981. Jean-Marie Brohm in a collection of articles, some dating back to the late 1960s, translated as *Sport — A Prison of Measured Time*, London, Ink Links, 1978 argued similarly. Rigauer uses a classical Marxist economy and ideology (base and superstructure) model; Brohm mobilises Althusserian Marxism.
- 68 John Hargreaves, 'Sport and Hegemony: Some Theoretical Problems' in Hart Cantelon and Richard Gruneau eds, *Sport, Culture and the Modern State*, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1982, p. 119.

Hegemony, the state and Australian sport

JIM MCKAY

Introduction

In recent years there has been a burgeoning literature on the 'crisis' of the state in Western liberal democracies. In this paper, I apply to Australian sport some of the concepts central to 'post-Marxist' theories of the state.¹ Since overviews and critiques can be found elsewhere, I will summarise some of the main points arising from this recent perspective of the state:²

- (a) Western politicians and state bureaucrats live in societies whose economies are based on the accumulation of capital and whose meaning-systems are dominated by emphases on values such as achievement, progress, quantitative material growth and instrumental rationality. Regardless of how they feel about the desirability of these social and cultural features, politicians and state functionaries must act within the present constraints and possibilities of industrial capitalism in liberal democracies.
- (b) Ideas about the state either being 'smashed' or 'withering away' seem chimerical in light of: (a) the increasing penetration of the state into almost every niche of public and private life in capitalist (and 'actually existing socialist') societies; (b) the tenacity of nationalism in the international geopolitical arena; (c) the complex spatial organisation and bureaucratic nature of industrial societies (both 'socialist' and capitalist).
- (c) The institutional articulation between the state and the economy puts state functionaries in a contradictory position. Although it does not *directly* control capital accumulation, the state is vitally dependent upon the revenues it extracts in a variety of ways from the exchange process. Hence, to undermine