PALGRAVE STUDIES IN SPORT AND POLITICS

Series Editor: Martin Polley

palgrave pivot

THE BRITISH WORLD AND AN AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL IDENTITY

Anglo-Australian Cricket, 1860-1901

Jared van Duinen

Palgrave Studies in Sport and Politics

Series Editor
Martin Polley
International Centre for Sports History
De Montfort University
Hampshire, UK

Palgrave Studies in Sport and Politics aims to nurture new research, both historical and contemporary, to the complex inter-relationships between sport and politics. The books in this series will range in their focus from the local to the global, and will embody a broad approach to politics, encompassing the ways in which sport has interacted with the state, dissidence, ideology, war, human rights, diplomacy, security, policy, identities, the law, and many other forms of politics. It includes approaches from a range of disciplines, and promotes work by new and established scholars from around the world.

Advisory Board:
Dr. Daphné Bolz, University of Normandy—Rouen, France
Dr. Susan Grant, Liverpool John Moores University, UK
Dr. Keiko Ikeda, Hokkaido University, Japan
Dr. Barbara Keys, University of Melbourne, Australia
Dr. Iain Lindsey, Durham University, UK
Dr. Ramon Spaaij, Victoria University, Australia and University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands

More information about this series at
http://www.springer.com/series/15061

Jared van Duinen

The British World and an Australian National Identity

Anglo-Australian Cricket, 1860–1901

palgrave
macmillan

Jared van Duinen
Charles Sturt University
Wagga Wagga, Australia

ISSN 2365-998X ISSN 2365-9998 (electronic)
Palgrave Studies in Sport and Politics
ISBN 978-1-137-52777-6 ISBN 978-1-137-52778-3 (eBook)
DOI 10.1057/978-1-137-52778-3

Library of Congress Control Number: 2017944705

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s) 2018
The author(s) has/have asserted their right(s) to be identified as the author(s) of this work in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.
This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.
The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.
The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Cover illustration: © saulgranda/Getty

Printed on acid-free paper

This Palgrave Pivot imprint is published by Springer Nature
The registered company is Macmillan Publishers Ltd.
The registered company address is: The Campus, 4 Crinan Street, London, N1 9XW, United Kingdom

Contents

1	**Introduction**	1
2	**Metropole-to-Colony Cultural Traffic and the Development of Australian Cricket, 1860–1877**	15
3	**Bi-directional Cultural Traffic and the Evolution of an Australian Cricketing Identity**	25
4	**Interlude: The British World Personified: Fred 'the Demon' Spofforth and Billy Midwinter**	43
5	**Lord Sheffield's 1891–1892 Tour and the Revitalisation of Australian Cricket**	49
6	**Conclusions**	65
Bibliography		73
Index		81

Abbreviations

ACC	Australasian Cricket Council
MCC	Marylebone Cricket Club
MCG	Melbourne Cricket Ground
NSWCA	New South Wales Cricket Association
SCG	Sydney Cricket Ground
VCA	Victorian Cricket Association

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Abstract This chapter introduces the subject matter and scope of the study. It outlines a brief historiography of the ongoing debate surrounding the evolution and nature of Australian nationalism and shows how Australian cricket historiography has also largely replicated these broader historiographical contours. The chapter also introduces the key theoretical constructs that inform the study: first, the British World framework, and second, the concept of cultural traffic. The introduction poses the central question of the study: what can Anglo-Australian cricketing relations in the later nineteenth century tell us about the composition of an Australian national identity that was a mediation of a more expansive British World loyalty and local Australian particularity?

Keywords British world · Cultural traffic · Australian nationalism
Australian national identity · Australian historiography · Australian cricket

The chief aim of this study is to explore the dynamics of Anglo-Australian cricketing relations within the 'British World' in the period from 1860 to 1901. In doing so, it will examine what this might tell us about broader Anglo-Australian relations during this period and, in particular, the evolution of an Australian national identity. This nexus between sport and national identity has been evoked by Graeme Davison through the metaphor of the 'imaginary grandstand'. 'Nations', according to Davison, 'continually perform their identity for an imaginary grandstand

© The Author(s) 2018

J. van Duinen, *The British World and an Australian National Identity*, Palgrave Studies in Sport and Politics,
DOI 10.1057/978-1-137-52778-3_1

of international spectators'. Significantly for this study, Davison goes on to contend that sport was the means through which colonial Australia first rehearsed its identity.[1] In other words, the medium of sport was used to rehearse an identity that would then emerge in broader cultural and political terms. Cricket is an apposite sport for interrogating this rehearsal since it more than any other sport is deeply imbued with imperial-colonial relations. Furthermore, for much of our period, it could also lay claim to being Australia's national sport. As R.E.N. Twopeny recounted in 1883, 'Cricket must, I suppose, take the first place amongst Australian sports, because all ages and all classes are interested in it; and not to be interested in it amounts almost to a social crime'.[2] This study will also comment on ways in which Australian cricket might have rehearsed aspects of that particular enactment of political union—Federation.

Cricket and Australian History

The role and function of cricket, in particular, in the formation and evolution of an Australian national identity has been the topic of some debate. This debate has often mirrored broader historiographical shifts in Australian history. In Australian historiography the 1960 and 1970s saw the emergence of a 'radical nationalist' perspective that sought to chart the evolution of an endemic Australian nationalism from the mid-nineteenth century onwards. To this end, these radical nationalist historians attempted to identify a number of figures in Australian politics or the arts in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries who could be presented as champions of an embryonic yet self-conscious nationalism.[3] However, all too often it was found that these proto-nationalist voices were drowned out by various manifestations of Britishness in early Australian society: determinedly close ties of trade, migration, defence and culture, as well as a pervasive pan-Britannic ethos that was avowed by many Australians of the time. The ensuing narrative for these radical nationalist historians was often therefore one of a perennially *thwarted* nationalism; Britishness and Australianness were framed as mutually exclusive, or even conflictive, with the British identity often trumping any distinctively endemic Australian identity.

Historians since the 1970s have been increasingly amenable to this centrality of Britishness in Australian society and culture in the period up to, at least, World War Two.[4] Rather than thwarted, Australian nationalism in the Federation decades constituted a kind of localised

Britishness, an identity that was an Australian adaptation of being British. As Schreuder and Ward have elaborated in *Australia's Empire*, '[A]t the heart of the evolving Australian sense of nationality was a hybrid ideology, one that drew from both a tenacious race identity of Britishness, together with an increasingly assertive sense of material self-interest, and an environmental sense of place'.[5] We can find such a hybrid identity being articulated by a number of contemporaries. For example, in 1884, Henry Parkes suggested that the Australian colonies should be renamed the 'British States of Australia', for '[i]n this designation the British feeling and the Australian feeling would habitually and perpetually blend … [and] the sentiments of British pride and Australian patriotism would commingle in one glow of loyalty'.[6] Although there is still some debate about when we should start to date the emergence of an endemic, non-British Australian nationalism—World War Two, the 'new nationalism' of the 1960 and 1970s, or as late as 1986—there seems little disagreement now about the inherence of Britishness in Australian society and culture in the Federation period.[7] Thus, these British Australia historians agreed with the radical nationalists about the pervasiveness of Britishness in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries; they disagreed about the conflictive relationship between, to quote Parkes, 'British feeling and Australian patriotism'.

Indeed, we can see the historiographical contours delineated above in discussions around Federation. For the radical nationalists, Federation represented the political actualisation of a nationalism that was foreshadowed in the literary and cultural output of the 1890s.[8] It stood as a crucial milestone in the evolution of Australian nationalism, linking the nascent nationalist feeling evident in pre-1901 events like the Eureka Stockade and colonial self-government with the more ebullient post-1901 nationalism represented by ANZAC and Billy Hughes's efforts towards an Australian presence, distinguished from Britain, on the world stage. This search for a Federation nationalism found some handy quotes from Australia's first prime minister, Edmund Barton, who proclaimed in the campaigns for Federation: 'For the first time in history, we have a nation for a continent, and a continent for a nation'.[9]

In contrast, those from the British Australia school of revisionism viewed Federation very differently. Although the significance of the constitutional act itself holds a diminished position in a British Australia narrative, it nevertheless forms an important chapter in the development of a 'British race patriotism' (the British Australia school's substitute for an

endemically Australian nationalism) that, temporally at least, mirrors the narrative of the radical nationalists (that is, British race patriotism prevails in Australian society and identity from the mid-nineteenth century to, roughly, the 1970s). So rather than a statement of emergent nationhood, Federation stood as further proof of an Anglo-Australian identity and culture. The inherent Britishness of Federation received an unsubtle exclamation point in one of the first acts of the new Australian government—the Immigration Restriction Act, or White Australia policy, of 1901. The MP for Southern Melbourne, James Ronald, expounded this in the debate on the Immigration Restriction Bill on 12 September 1901. Ronald reminded his listeners: 'When we are agitating for a white Australia we are assuming that a white Australia really means a British Australia'.[10] This sort of British race patriotism was a common refrain amongst Federation figures. For example, Alfred Deakin, an important proponent of Federation and the second prime minister of Australia, proclaimed in 1905: 'The same ties of blood, sympathy and tradition which make us one Commonwealth here make the British of today one people everywhere'.[11]

We can find similar interpretive shifts in the writings of cricket historians. The radical nationalist perspective was most clearly propounded in a 1973 essay by W.F. Mandle, 'Cricket and Australian Nationalism in the Nineteenth Century'. This seminal piece argued that the triumph of Australian cricket teams over the 'mother country' in the late nineteenth century coincided with, and indeed, helped foster, the newly emergent and strident nationalism prized by the radical nationalists. Mandle maintained that the success of nationally 'federated' Australian cricket teams against English teams in the late 1870s and early 1880s sparked a 'cricketing nationalism' that, in turn, helped pave the way for the political nationalism of Federation. In this way, Mandle argued for cricket to be placed alongside the purported literary and cultural nationalism of the same period. Thus Australians 'saw in their Australian test match sides symbols of a distinctive, developing sense of national identity that in other areas of society was producing the Federation movement, the trade unions and the Australian Labor Party (ALP), and the *Bulletin*'.[12] Indeed, the contribution of a sporting nationalism was acclaimed by the *Bulletin* in 1898 when it opined that the victory of Harry Trott's Australian cricket team over England had done more 'to enhance the

cause of Australian nationality than could ever be achieved by miles of erudite essays and impassioned appeal'.[13]

But almost from the moment it was published the Mandle thesis had its critics, particularly for what some saw as these overstated connections to an Australian 'nationalism'. Thus, in the same way that the radical nationalist thesis was revised by those from the British Australia school of thought, Mandle's claims were critiqued by historians who saw in cricket a striking illustration of the very opposite—the centrality of Britishness to Australian culture and identity. One of the earliest and most strident critics, K.S. Inglis, contended that Australia's wholehearted adoption of, and competence at, this most English of sports was actually 'a sign of how spontaneously and profoundly Australians embraced the culture of the motherland'.[14] In a similar vein, Keith Sandiford observed that cricket tours were 'consciously intended to act as a cementing link between colonies and metropolis'.[15] Rather than a spur to nationalistic pride, victories over the English were seen more as vindication that 'the English race is not disintegrating in a distant land'.[16]

Since the 1970s—as with the historical debate surrounding Australian nationalism more broadly—we have seen a growing appreciation of the importance of Britishness in Australian sports and sporting culture more generally. As Wray Vamplew has put it, 'Sport was part of the cultural baggage brought out to Australia … [and thereby] Britain's sporting heritage was transferred to the new Antipodean colonies'. Moreover, 'the continued flow of migrants to Australia from Britain throughout the nineteenth century reinforced [this] early cultural continuity in terms of sporting activities'.[17] And there was contemporary opinion to support such claims. For example, in 1873, the *Australasian* editorialised:

> Among many other essentially British attributes which the Victorian transplanted with himself to his adopted country, love of sport has taken deepest root. Racing, rowing, cricketing, all flourish here even to a greater extent, in proportion to our population, than they do in the old country. … And what we have done to show we are as fond of cricket as of rowing or racing, and so more than ever British-bred in bone and flesh.[18]

Consequently, the sports that were played in nineteenth-century Australia were part of a 'British inheritance' with cricket arguably the foremost of these.

Some have developed this point further to say that sport and the 'games ethic' generally played a key role in the imperialising mission itself. British sports not only offered comfort for homesick British imperialists and migrants, they also exemplified and communicated what it meant to be British. In other words, for both coloniser and colonised, British sports and sporting culture functioned as essential vehicles for the dissemination and inculcation of British values, customs and ideologies throughout the British Empire. In this context cricket is again presented as the prime example. According to J.A. Mangan, cricket was 'the symbol *par excellence* of imperial solidarity and superiority epitomising a set of consolidatory moral imperatives that both exemplified and explained imperial ambition'.[19] There is also evidence of contemporaries making similar claims. For example, that giant of Victorian cricket, W.G. Grace, remarked in his memoirs that 'the good fellowship born on the cricket-field has done more than is recognised to knot together the various sections of the British Empire and to advance the cause of civilisation'.[20] Such a belief in the imperial efficacy of cricket was again expressed just prior to World War One in Lord Hawke's introduction to P.F. Warner's *Imperial Cricket*:

> The greatest game in the world is played wherever the Union Jack is unfurled, and it has no small place in cementing the ties that bond together every part of the Empire. … The future of cricket and of the Empire … is so inseparably connected.[21]

Although the extent to which this moral or didactic element was a conscious part of imperial cricket in the earlier nineteenth century is debatable, these contemporary quotes attest that it had certainly come to carry that mantle by the end of the century (and into the next).[22]

So, as with the broader debate about the development and nature of Australian nationalism, we are presented with contrasting views of cricket being a conduit for either a non-British Australian identity or for British race patriotism. That said, it is probably misleading to draw too strong a demarcation between Mandle's burgeoning nationalism and Mangan's imperial solidarity. Indeed, while sporting relations could certainly serve an imperial purpose, they could just as easily convey, and, in fact, be a source of, tension between colony and metropole. The clearest example of such tension occurred in the 1932–1933 'Bodyline' series between Australia and England when frictions on the cricket field threatened to

severely impair diplomatic and political relations.[23] It appears, then, that the 'nationalism/imperial loyalty' dialectic was much more complicated than a simplistic binary choice, particularly for dominions like Australia. As Richard Holt has argued, 'All dominion sport mediated the desire for national self-determination and identity with a sense of imperial purpose'. He went on to observe that 'nowhere was the sense of shared [imperial] culture and of dominion independence more finely balanced than in Australia'.[24] This notion of a mediated national identity seems a more useful paradigm within which to navigate the complex, equivocal and, at times, contradictory beast that was Anglo-Australian relations in the late nineteenth century. This study explores this concept of a national identity that mediated between a broader British World association and a local Australian particularity; how these constitutive elements might have mixed and changed over time; and what these changes meant for the experience and performance of such an identity.

A brief note on terminology. This study employs the term 'national identity' in favour of 'nationalism'. This is because, as Meaney has noted, the theoretical concept of 'nationalism' commonly refers to the 'imagined communities' of Benedict Anderson or Ernst Gellner's largely Eurocentric theories of nationalism whereby the delimits of the political nation-state were defined by the ethno-cultural community.[25] If we talk about this kind of 'hard' nationalism, then, as Meaney and others have argued, Australia comes to this rather late in the twentieth century.[26] But if we talk instead about a 'softer' sense of a national identity, this study argues that it is possible to discern the contours of such an identity forming, even within an imperial context. Indeed, an early Australian national identity emerges from within an imperial context and, as will be demonstrated, in important ways is determinant upon the cultural traffic of this imperial context for its inception and evolution.

The British World and Cultural Traffic

To assist with this examination of Australia's mediated national identity, I am utilising a couple of theoretical concepts. The first is the 'British World'. The 'British World' rendition of British imperial history was conceived and developed over the course of a series of conferences held between 1998 and 2007 and the edited books that resulted.[27] It originally took its cue from J.G.A. Pocock's 1973 call for a 'new British history' that would bring into closer propinquity the hitherto largely

separate histories of the British dominions and the wider British Empire. Thus the British World's chief remit was to 'bring the old dominions back into the mainstream of imperial history and to examine their connections to the United Kingdom and with each other'.[28] The British World also has temporal and geographic boundaries. Temporally, it is concerned with the period c. 1850–1950 that witnessed an explosion of British migration to other parts of the Empire and, in particular, the dominions. And geographically, it relates to the destinations for those migrants, namely these settler colonies of Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and Canada. By bringing Britain and the settler colonies within the same frame of reference in this way, British World studies have deliberately sought to transcend the kind of insularly nationalist histories that have been described above. To this end, the British World framework is more concerned with exploring the movement and flow of people, goods and ideas through and between various settler colonial spaces and the metropole.

The adoption of such an explicitly transnational perspective fulfils a couple of functions. First, it sets the terms of reference beyond the strictures of the nation-state. As such, a settler colony like Australia is viewed not in terms of a nation-state-in-waiting, as has frequently been depicted in radical nationalist historiography (and also, albeit to a lesser degree, the British Australia school), but rather as one of many 'nodes' dotted around a British World web. These nodes could operate as regional centres to their immediate hinterland or periphery while simultaneously occupying a peripheral status to other centres, the most obvious and dominant centre being metropolitan Britain.[29] It is not surprising, then, that such a decentred, multi-nodal approach has led to an emphasis on networks as both a subject and mode of analysis. As Alan Lester has put it, a networked conception of empire allows for colonial relations to be 'stretched in contingent and non-deterministic ways, across space'. In other words, a networks-based approach seeks to privilege *neither* metropolitan nor colonial spaces but, rather, to reconfigure both spaces through the act of connecting them.[30] We can see, then, how the British World framework offers a means for re-examining imperial-colonial relations that deliberately moves away from a national/imperial binary. In particular, the emphasis on the functioning of networks—and the connection and reconfiguration of metropole and colony through networks—resonates with Holt's idea of a mediated colonial identity. By extension, the 'international spectators' that had seats in Davison's

'imaginary grandstand' for the period with which this study is concerned are those of this British World.

Furthermore, in a specifically Australian context, the significance placed on networks and the passage of people, goods and ideas between metropole and colony for the formation and evolution of a colonial identity has much in common with the concept of 'cultural traffic' as elaborated by Australian art historian and cultural theorist Bernard Smith. It is Smith's cultural traffic that serves as the second theoretical concept that features in this study.[31] Smith argued that Australian art history needed to be understood via a British artistic sensibility but, furthermore and somewhat more provocatively, to truly understand *British* art and, furthermore, the British Enlightenment, one needed to appreciate the cultural impact of the discovery of the Antipodes in the eighteenth century. That is to say, the exotic images and artefacts (and ideas) brought back from Cook's voyages around Australia and the South Pacific exerted an indelible influence on the metropolitan artistic sensibility and cultural consciousness more broadly. As Smith's foremost scholarly interpreter, the Australian sociologist Peter Beilharz, memorably put it, 'The reflux from below … returned to haunt the metropolitan consciousness'.[32] Thus, antecedent to Edward Said, Smith was already attentive to the centre-periphery dynamic and the significance of the cultural traffic conveyed by people, artefacts and beliefs passing between the two.[33]

Beilharz has developed these ideas to expound a conception of the Antipodean condition. For Beilharz, in contrast to the strict classical sense of the Antipodes having the feet distant from civilisation, 'the issue is not that Antipodeans have both feet elsewhere, but that we have one foot each in centre and periphery'.[34] In this way, the Antipodes are ineluctably connected to, but also dislocated from, the centre. As Beilharz puts it, 'To be Antipodean is to be other, displaced, a reflex of metropolitan culture, and yet part of it, elsewhere'; to be Antipodean is to be constructed into a relationship with the metropole that is mutually affective. Whilst cultural traffic, particularly initially, flows most strongly from the centre to the Antipodes, this flow is also reversed. Hence the Antipodes, from a British metropolitan perspective, are not only 'the dirty bits down below, the oddities of platypus and Aborigine' but also 'the rude bits, the bits that talk back, behave as though they are autonomous even when instructed to the contrary'.[35] It is this bi-directional flow of cultural traffic that is most crucial for the construction of national identity. In essence, the Antipodean condition:

> suggests that identity results from the relationship between places and cultures rather than emerging from place, or ground. We, in the Antipodes, do have practical as well as romantic connection to or affection for our place; *but we are placed in it by the movements of empire and world system, migration and cultural traffic*'.[36]

While Beilharz here is describing Australia c. 2005, this observation seems to be just as apposite, if not more so, for British World Australia. In particular, Beilharz's acknowledgement of the importance of transnational 'movements of empire and world system, migration and cultural traffic' is cognate to the British World networks-based framework. Likewise, his contention that 'identity results from relationship between places and cultures' is reminiscent of Holt's mediated dominion identity.

To sum up, the following study uses cricket as the vehicle for exploring this mediated national identity. To do this it employs the British World framework of a multi-nodal, non-nationalistic network but focuses upon the Anglo-Australian thread in this web. It applies Smith's ideas of cultural traffic to this British World framework in order to explicate the significance of these transnational exchanges and intersections for the evolution of an Australian cricketing identity. Therefore, the cultural traffic that features in this study is the cultural traffic of cricket—tours of cricket teams, the migration and movement of individual players between metropole and colony, and the reportage of cricketing interactions in the media. In addition, it suggests ways in which this mediated cricketing identity may have influenced the formation and evolution of a similarly mediated national identity which received its public, political affirmation in the Act of Federation.

Notes

1. Graeme Davison (2002) 'The Imaginary Grandstand', *Meanjin*, 61, 3: 5–6.
2. R.E.N. Twopeny (1973; first published 1883) *Town Life in Australia* (Sydney: Sydney University Press), p. 204.
3. For examples, see Stephen Alomes (1988) *A Nation at Last? The Changing Character of Australian Nationalism, 1880–1988* (Sydney: Angus & Robertson); Manning Clark (1995; first published 1962–1988) *A History of Australia*, vols. 4, 5 and 6 (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press); David Day (1988) *The Great Betrayal: Britain, Australia and the Onset of the Pacific War, 1939–1942* (Sydney: Angus

& Robertson); David Day (1992) *The Reluctant Nation: Australia and the Allied Defeat* (Melbourne: Oxford University Press); Russel Ward (1977), *A Nation for a Continent: The History of Australia, 1901–1975* (Richmond: Heinemann Educational Australia).

4. For examples, see D. Cole, '"The Crimson Thread of Kinship": Ethnic Ideas in Australia, 1870-1914', *Historical Studies* 14, 56: 511–525; D. Cole (1971) 'The Problem of "Nationalism" and "Imperialism" in British Settlement Colonies', *Journal of British Studies* 10, 2: 160–182; Neville Meaney (2001) 'Britishness and Australian Identity: The Problem of Nationalism in Australian History and Historiography', *Australian Historical Studies* 32, 116: 76–90; Stuart Ward (2001) *Australia and the British Embrace: The Demise of the Imperial Ideal* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press); Kosmas Tsokhas (2001) *Making a Nation State: Cultural Identity, Economic Nationalism and Sexuality in Australian History* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press); James Curran and Stuart Ward (2010) *The Unknown Nation: Australia After Empire* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press). For the latest round in this debate, see the contributions to the symposium on transnationalism and Australian nationalism in the December 2013 issue of *History Australia* and the later exchanges that ensued: Neville Meaney (2015) 'The Problem with Nationalism and Transnationalism in Australian History: A Reply to Marilyn Lake and Christopher Waters', *History Australia* 12, 2: 209–231; Christopher Waters (2015) 'A Reply to Neville Meaney', *History Australia* 12, 2: 232–237.
5. Deryck M. Schreuder and Stuart Ward (2008) 'Introduction: What Became of Australia's Empire', in Deryck M. Schreuder and Stuart Ward (eds.) *Australia's Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp. 10–11.
6. Henry Parkes (1884) 'Our Growing Australian Empire', *The Nineteenth Century* 15, 83: 147.
7. W.J. Hudson and M.P. Sharp (1988) *Australian Independence: Colony to Reluctant Kingdom* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press); Deborah Gare (1999) 'Dating Australia's Independence: National Sovereignty and the 1986 Australia Acts', *Australian Historical Studies* 30: 251–266 (Gare 1999); Curran and Ward, *The Unknown Nation*. See also the March 2005 issue of *The Australian Journal of Politics and History* for a number of articles discussing 'post-imperial' Australia. Also, for a couple of recent critiques, see Marilyn Lake (2013) 'British World or New World? Anglo-Saxonism and Australian Engagement with America', *History Australia* 10, 3: 36–50 and John Griffiths (2014) *Imperial Culture in Antipodean Cities, 1880–1939* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan).

8. The significance of this literary nationalism of the 1890s was perhaps first propounded in Russel Ward (1958) *The Australian Legend* (Melbourne: Oxford University Press), Chap. 8. See also Bruce Nesbitt (1971), 'Literary Nationalism and the 1890s', *Australian Literary Studies* 5, 1: 3–17. For cultural nationalism in a broader sense, see Helen Irving (1997) *To Constitute a Nation: A Cultural History of Australia's Constitution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
9. R.R. Garran (1897) *The Coming Commonwealth* (Sydney: Angus & Robertson), frontispiece. This high road to nationhood can be found in many radical nationalists' works, including those cited in fn3 above. For some examples that emphasise the role of Federation, see Ward, *A Nation for a Continent*; Hudson and Sharp, *Australian Independence*; Robert Birrell (1995) *A Nation of Our Own: Citizenship and Nation-Building in Federation Australia* (Melbourne: Longman Cheshire).
10. Parliament of Australia, House of Representatives, 12 September 1901: http://parlinfo.aph.gov.au/parlInfo/search/display/display.w3p;query=Id%3A%22hansard80%2Fhansardr80%2F1901-09-12%2F0013%22 date accessed 20 July 2016.
11. Alfred Deakin (1905) *Imperial Federation: An Address Delivered by Hon. Alfred Deakin M.P. at the Annual Meeting of the Imperial Federation League of Victoria, 14 June 1905* (Melbourne: The League). For a British Australia article that focuses on Federation, see Russell McGregor (2006) 'The Necessity of Britishness: Ethno-Cultural Roots of Australian Nationalism', *Nations and Nationalism* 12, 3: 493–511. For a suggested corrective to this British Australia interpretation of the Federation decades, see Lake, 'British World or New World?'.
12. W.F. Mandle (1973) 'Cricket and Australian Nationalism in the Nineteenth Century', *Journal of the Royal Australian Historical Society* 59: 225–246. The role of sport in the Federation story has been explored in more detail in Richard Cashman (2002) *Sport in the National Imagination: Australian Sport in the Federation Decades* (Sydney: Walla Walla Press).
13. *The Bulletin* 19 March 1898.
14. K.S. Inglis (1979) 'Imperial Cricket: Test Matches Between Australia and England, 1877–1900', in Richard Cashman and Michael McKernan (eds.) *Sport in History: The Making of Modern Sporting History* (Brisbane: University of Queensland Press), pp. 148–179.
15. Keith Sandiford (1994) *Cricket and the Victorians* (Aldershot: Scholar Press), p. 157.
16. A.W. Pullin (1902) *Alfred Shaw, Cricketer: His Career and Reminiscences* (London: Cassell and Company), p. 190.

17. Wray Vamplew (1994) 'Australians and Sport', in Wray Vamplew and Brian Stoddart (eds.) *Sport in Australia: A Social History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 1, 7.
18. *The Australasian* 27 December 1873, p. 811.
19. J.A. Mangan (1992) 'Britain's Chief Spiritual Export: Imperial Sport as Moral Metaphor, Political Symbol and Cultural Bond', in *The Cultural Bond: Sport, Empire, Society* (London: Frank Cass), pp. 1–10. See also the other essays in *The Cultural Bond*, as well as J.A. Mangan (1998) *The Games Ethic and Imperialism: Aspects of the Diffusion of an Ideal* (London: Frank Cass); John O'Hara (1986) 'An Approach to Colonial Sports History', in Wray Vamplew (ed.) *Sport and Colonialism in Nineteenth Century Australasia* (Adelaide: The Australian Society for Sports History), pp. 3–18; Brian Stoddart (2008) 'Sport, Cultural Imperialism and Colonial Response in the British Empire', in *Sport, Culture and History: Region, Nation and Globe* (London: Routledge), pp. 114–140; Keith A.P. Sandiford and Brian Stoddart (1988) *The Imperial Game: Cricket, Culture and Society* (Manchester: Manchester University Press); Dean Allen (2012) 'England's "Golden Age": Imperial Cricket and Late Victorian Society', *Sport in Society* 15, 2: 209–226.
20. W.G. Grace (1989) *W.G.: Cricketing Reminiscences and Personal Recollections* (London: James Bowden), pp. 183–184.
21. Ric Sissons and Brian Stoddart, *Cricket and Empire: The 1932–1933 Bodyline Tour of Australia* (Sydney: Allen and Unwin), p. 34.
22. Dominic Malcolm (2013) *Globalizing Cricket: Englishness, Empire and Identity* (London: Bloomsbury), pp. 53–56.
23. Bodyline has been the subject of many books, articles and even a TV series in Australia. Some examples include David Frith (2003) *Bodyline Autopsy: The Full Story of the Most Sensational Test Cricket Series: Australia v England, 1932–1933* (Sydney: ABC Books); Ronald Mason (1984) *Ashes in the Mouth: The Story of the Bodyline Tour of 1932–1933* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books); A. Laurence Le Quesne (1983) *The Bodyline Controversy* (London: Unwin Paperbacks); Edward Wybergh Docker (1978) *Bradman and the Bodyline Series* (Brighton: Angus and Robertson). The series has been termed 'cricket's imperial crisis'; see Brian Stoddart (2008) 'Cricket's Imperial Crisis: The 1932-33 MCC Tour of Australia', in *Sport, Culture and History: Region, Nation and Globe* (London: Routledge). Also Jared van Duinen (2015) 'Bodyline, the British World and the Evolution of an Australian National Identity', *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 32, 2: 250–264.
24. Richard Holt (1989) *Sport and the British* (Oxford: Clarendon Press), p. 229.

25. Ernst Gellner (1983) *Nations and Nationalism* (Oxford: Blackwell); Benedict Anderson (1983) *Imagined Communities* (London: Verso).
26. See especially Meaney, 'Nationalism and Transnationalism'.
27. See Carl Bridge and Kent Fedorowich (2003) *The British World: Diaspora, Culture and Identity* (London: Frank Cass); Phillip Buckner and R. Douglas Francis (2006) *Canada and the British World* (Vancouver: UBC Press); Phillip Buckner and R. Douglas Francis (2005) *Rediscovering the British World* (Calgary: University of Calgary Press); Kate Darian-Smith, Patricia Grimshaw, Kiera Lindsay and Stuart Macintyre (2007) *Exploring the British World* (Melbourne: RMIT); Kate Darian-Smith, Patricia Grimshaw, and Stuart Macintyre (2007) *Britishness Abroad: Transnational Movements and Imperial Cultures* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press).
28. Buckner and Francis, *Rediscovering the British World*, p. 18.
29. Alan Lester (2006) 'Imperial Circuits and Networks: Geographies of the British Empire', *History Compass* 4, 1: 133.
30. Lester, 'Imperial Circuits and Networks', 131. See also Tony Ballantyne (2003) 'Rereading the Archive and Opening Up the Nation-State: Colonial Knowledge in South Asia (and Beyond)', in Antoinette Burton (ed.) *After the Imperial Turn: Thinking With and Through the Nation* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press), pp. 102–124.
31. John Hughson (2009) *The Making of Sporting Cultures* (Abingdon: Routledge), pp. 77–78.
32. Peter Beilharz (1997) *Imagining the Antipodes: Culture, Theory and the Visual in the Work of Bernard Smith* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), p. 78.
33. Bernard Smith (1960) *European Vision and the South Pacific, 1768–1850: A Study in the History of Art and Ideas* (Oxford: Clarendon Press); Bernard Smith (1992) *Imagining the Pacific: In the Wake of the Cook Voyages* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press).
34. Peter Beilharz (2005) 'Introduction', *Thesis Eleven* 82: 3.
35. Beilharz *Imagining the Antipodes*, p. 97. In a 1905 satirical piece in *British-Australasian*, Australia was described as 'Topsy-Turvy Land' where everything was 'upside down'; see Olwen Pryke (2009) 'As Others See Us: Representations of Australia in the British Press, 1900-1910', *Australian Studies* 1, 1: 5.
36. Peter Beilharz (2005) 'Australia: The Unhappy Country, or, a Tale of Two Nations', *Thesis Eleven* 82: 74 (emphasis added).

CHAPTER 2

Metropole-to-Colony Cultural Traffic and the Development of Australian Cricket, 1860–1877

Abstract This chapter looks at the first years of Anglo-Australian cricketing relations, which almost entirely consisted of metropole-to-colony cultural traffic. This cultural traffic was transmitted via the first international tours of English teams to the colony as well as the importation of metropolitan players and coaches in the 1860s and 1870s. This resulted in Australian cricket in these years largely being an attempt to mimic the metropolitan model. The gradual improvement in colonial cricket—and especially the first time an Australian Eleven beat an English Eleven in 1877—was framed as proof that the British 'race' had not been enervated in colonial conditions. This was consonant with a broader British race patriotism discourse that was prevalent at this time.

Keywords Cultural traffic · First test match · Greater Britain · British race patriotism · Australian cricket

Until the first tour of a (white) Australian cricket team to England in 1878, most of the cultural traffic between colony and metropole flowed one way: metropole → colony. This cultural traffic took the form of intermittent tours of English cricket teams organised by various interested parties as well as the migration of individual players and coaches to assist with the development of the game in the colonies. This movement of people and teams from the metropole to the Australian colonies provides a good, notwithstanding unidirectional, illustration of the cultural

© The Author(s) 2018

J. van Duinen, *The British World and an Australian National Identity*, Palgrave Studies in Sport and Politics,
DOI 10.1057/978-1-137-52778-3_2

traffic dynamic and the various ways in which it shaped a British World 'node' like Australia. The changes wrought by this cultural traffic had important ramifications for the evolution of an early colonial cricketing identity.

Obviously the very first instance of metropole-to-colony cultural traffic occurred when the early settlers brought with them a number of British games and sports, cricket being one. Cricket clubs were established in some colonies as early as the 1830s. These early clubs were fashioned on metropolitan models, some even going so far as to copy the names of English clubs like the Mary-Le-Bone club in Sydney. The ongoing infusion of British cultural traffic was sustained through the visits of travelling British regiments who would play games against these colonial clubs. It has been suggested that the popularity of cricket in these early years was precisely due to its close identification with the metropole—it was the most 'English of English sports'.[1] But although these cricket clubs helped the early settlers feel more 'English' in their strange surroundings, cricket in Australia didn't really begin to develop and expand until the vast increase in British cultural traffic that came with the explosion of metropole-to-colony migration in the second half of the nineteenth century—that is, with the formation of the British World.

The two most influential cricket clubs were the Albert Club in New South Wales and the Melbourne Cricket Club in Victoria. And just as the Marylebone Cricket Club (MCC) was the pre-eminent organisational and governing body in England, so too did these clubs occupy similar positions in Australian colonial society (and it is surely no coincidence that the most powerful colonial club—the Melbourne Cricket Club—shared the same acronym). As David Montefiore has noted, '[The leadership of the Melbourne Cricket Club] represented the colonial equivalent of the paternalist Tory-Anglican leadership of the senior English county clubs'.[2] Indeed, many prominent members of these clubs were brought up and/or educated in Britain. For example, the prominent sports journalist W.J. Hammersley was born in Surrey and educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, before migrating to Australia in 1856. He promptly joined the Melbourne Cricket Club and captained Victoria in its intercolonial match against New South Wales in 1857.[3] Hammersley's personal friend and fellow Melbourne Cricket Club member Tom Wills provides a good example of the significance of British World networks for these formative years of cricket in Australia. Born in New South Wales, Wills

went to school in Melbourne before being sent to Rugby School in England where he captained the school cricket team. Wills then returned to Melbourne in 1856, bringing back with him new innovations in cricket that he had observed in the metropole, such as overarm bowling and tossing a coin to decide who would have the first innings. He played for the Melbourne Cricket Club and was the club's secretary in 1857–1858. Then he re-traversed the British World as manager and coach of the aboriginal cricket team of 1868.[4]

Metropole-to-colony cultural traffic was further magnified with the commencement of tours of metropolitan teams to the Australian colonies in the 1860s. Indeed, the inaugural tour of an English cricket team to the Australian colonies in 1861–1862 offers an instructive example of British World networks in operation. The idea for the tour was prompted by the success of a similar tour to Canada and the United States in 1859. The planning for the tour was made possible via a number of British World contacts and demonstrates the intertwining networks of the British World.[5] There is evidence to show that the initial idea for the tour may have come from Melbourne Cricket Club committeeman Arthur Devlin, who was in Britain when the 1859 touring party left for North America. On 16 December 1859, the *Argus* reported: 'A letter has been received from an old Victorian Cricketer now resident in the mother country, to the effect that … the All England Eleven are prepared to peril the transit of the tropics, and the rolling forties, *with a view of showing this young country how cricket ought to be played*'.[6] The idea, however, appeared to founder when a number of important members of the 1859 tour ruled out a trip to Australia, citing that the £150 per player (plus fares and expenses) being offered was insufficient. It was the Surrey club, and in particular the Surrey captain, H.H. Stephenson, who stepped into the breach and agreed to organise a team with himself as captain.

It is not clear how the catering firm Spiers and Pond became aware of the proposal but it was they who ultimately decided to underwrite the costs of the venture. Spiers and Pond was itself the product of British World networks. The owners, Felix Spiers and Christopher Pond, were British catering entrepreneurs who migrated to Melbourne in the 1850s and established a number of successful restaurants and hotels.[7] The tour was immensely popular, with the Australian public with 45,000 paying to watch the first match against Eighteen of Victoria. The takings from this match alone ensured that Spiers and Pond recouped their expenses.[8] The tourists were greeted with similarly enthusiastic crowds at all the ensuing

fixtures (thirteen in all). All their matches were against odds (i.e. against teams of eighteen or twenty-two) with the visitors dominant. The success of the tour prompted a second tour in 1863–1864, which was again the product of British World cooperation. Although the exact arrangements are unclear, the tour was the result of negotiations between the Melbourne Cricket Club and the Nottinghamshire cricketers George Parr (who had captained the 1859 tour of North America) and George Marshall. This tour was, again, very popular with the Australian public and a great financial success.[9]

Another by-product of these early tours was the employment by colonial clubs of metropolitan professionals to assist with coaching and development. After the 1861–1862 tour, Charles Lawrence agreed to an offer by the Albert Club to stay on as a coach. Not to be outdone by their NSW rivals, the Melbourne Cricket Club obtained the services of their own English professional, William Caffyn, after the 1863–1864 tour. And there were a number of others after them who migrated from the metropole. Indeed, the 1865 New South Wales team to play the intercolonial match against Victoria featured four English professionals—Lawrence, Caffyn, Ned Gregory and Nathaniel Thompson. Three years later a number of English amateur cricketers studded the Victorian team. The phenomenon was commented on by the *Australasian* in 1872: 'Victorians must never forget how much they owe to the home polish, how much indebted they have been to men who learnt their cricket in the old country … in estimating the progress the game has made here … remember how much we owe of late years to home importations'.[10] These imports certainly had a marked impact on Australian cricket and, in this regard, the metropole more than delivered on its promise of 'showing this young country how cricket ought to be played'.

The next tour of a metropolitan team did not take place until 1873 and the improvements that had taken place in Australian cricket were immediately apparent. Where the previous English teams had convincingly beaten teams of twenty-two, the 1873–1874 team was beaten by eighteens of NSW and Victoria. These changes were noted by the captain of the English side who, arguably, was cricket's first real superstar, William Gilbert Grace. 'W.G.' later wrote in his 'cricketing reminiscences', 'We could easily beat any team of fifteen that could be gathered together in Australia, but with eighteen or twenty-two against us victory was not so easy. The best cricketers we met were, as a rule, English University and Public School men, who had settled in the

Colony, but some of the native-born showed considerable aptitude, especially in bowling'.[11] The matches again proved extremely popular with the Australian public—a fact no doubt helped by the drawcard of W.G.—and, furthermore, the scores were telegraphed back to Britain for the first time.[12] After the tour, one Australian player was heard to say, 'Bar W.G. we're as good as they are, and some day we'll lick'em with eleven', a quote which could perhaps be interpreted as expressive of proto-nationalist Australian sentiment if it hadn't been uttered by Sam Cosstick, another Surrey player who had migrated to Australia.[13] These words were to prove prophetic when, in March 1877, a combined Melbourne and Sydney Eleven, branded 'All Australia', took on the next England touring party led by James Lillywhite. True to Cosstick's word, All Australia won this match. Lillywhite's team demanded a rematch a week later in which they levelled the score and these two matches received retrospective classification as the first in the long-standing tradition of Australia vs. England 'Test matches'.[14]

This early cricketing interaction between the metropole and colony is revealing of a couple of things. First, we can see how the construction of the British World in the latter part of the nineteenth century was reflected in cricket. In fact, to a large extent, this British World interaction was responsible for the rapid growth and development of cricket in Australia. For example, the explosion of metropole-to-colony migration that was constitutive of the British World is mirrored in the migration of individual metropolitan players and coaches to the Australian colonies. Furthermore, the networks established by this British World migration, and the cultural traffic that passed along these networks, were integral to the organisation of these first cricket tours. In turn, the tours themselves served to reinforce and sustain these networks. Indeed, the British World interplay effected by these tours was largely responsible for the success and popularity of cricket in the colony generally, as W.G. would later pronounce: 'I have no doubt that [the 1873–1874 tour] and the subsequent tours made by English teams had a most salutary influence on the development of Australian cricket; as, apart from the experience they gained by playing against the best cricketers we could send out, the vast interest taken in the various matches led to the adoption of cricket as the national game of the Colony'.[15]

Furthermore, we can find invocations of that cultural glue of the British World—Britishness—in many statements made by individuals on both sides of the metropole-colony nexus. For example, the first touring

team of 1861–1862 was received in Melbourne by the civil servant George William Rusden, who hailed them 'first as antagonists, secondly … as countrymen'.[16] Rusden's sentiment was echoed later in the tour by the English captain, Stephenson, who said in a speech in Sydney that

> English customs and English feelings were firmly implanted here; the same love of manly sport, the same appreciation of fair play existed that prevails in England. … Everything around us seems so thoroughly English that I could almost imagine we were still home.[17]

Likewise, even those who doubted the quality of Australian cricket, as 'Paul Jones' writing in the *Australasian* did, had 'too good an opinion of them as Britons to doubt their pluck and gameness'.[18] Moreover, it was hoped that the success of the tour would also help thicken the British World ties between colony and metropole in a more general sense. The Victorian treasurer, (English-born) William Haines, said he hoped the tourists would communicate to their compatriots back home 'the great progress [Australia] had made and the inducements there were for persons to settle in this country'.[19] And in a gesture that neatly symbolised not only the Britishness of this transnational British World but also the unidirectional flow of cultural traffic at this time, each member of the touring team was invited to plant a (British) elm tree at the Melbourne Cricket Ground.[20]

These expressions of pan-Englishness/Britishness did not diminish with the emergence of greater parity between English and Australian cricket. When an Australian Eleven defeated an English Eleven in the first 'Test match', Alfred Shaw, a member of the touring English team, later observed: 'The success of the Australians created immense jubilation in Melbourne and other Colonial centres. … For the time being the defeated Englishmen and their associates in the Colonies had to be content to eat humble pie—sweetened, it is true, with the thought that it was members of their own race who had offered it—but humble pie all the same'.[21] Indeed, this victory helped address a fear that had often pervaded colonial discourse in the nineteenth century, which was that the Australian climate would have an enervating effect on the British 'race'. For example, the Sydney-based *Daily News* hailed the win as a demonstration that 'the English race is not disintegrating in a distant land'.[22] Similarly the *Australasian* reported: 'The event marks the great improvement which has taken place in Australian cricket … and the proof which

the victory affords that the physical qualities of the English race show no sign of decline in these sunny southern lands'. In other words, the article continued, the win showed that 'the Englishmen born in Australia do not fall short of the Englishmen born in Surrey or Yorkshire'.[23] Furthermore, from a metropolitan perspective, this growing parity between English and Australian cricket could actually be viewed as testament to the strength of the imperial bond. As Shaw would later opine:

> Equality and fraternity between England and her Colonies are now established with a completeness that is at once the astonishment and the envy of the other nations of the world. Let it not be forgotten that cricket has played a most important part in this happy concord, and that the two events which marked its origin were the matches that James Lillywhite and his men played in March and April, A.D. 1877 at Melbourne.[24]

The 1860s and 1870s were a high-water mark for British race patriotism more generally. The creation of the British World through the mass migration of Britons to the settler colonies had stimulated a good deal of thinking and commentary on the fate of the British race in these far-flung locales. As we have seen, much of this was provoked by fear: fear of the unknown and, particularly, fear that the British race would degenerate in environments far removed from Britain itself. This British race patriotism discourse was promulgated by writers like Seeley and Dilke, who both employed the term 'Greater Britain' to describe this expanded British World. Seeley wrote: 'Those ten millions of Englishmen who live outside of the British Islands … are of our own blood, and are therefore united with us by the strongest tie'. Dilke also maintained that although the British had been dispersed throughout this Greater Britain, in 'essentials the race was always one'.[25] We can see that this British race discourse also permeated through Australian cricket in the 1860s and 1870s.

Notes

1. Richard Cashman (1998) 'Australia', in Keith A.P. Sandiford and Brian Stoddart (eds.) *The Imperial Game: Cricket, Culture and Society* (Manchester: Manchester University Press), pp. 34–35.

2. David Montefiore (1992) *Cricket in the Doldrums: The Struggle Between Private and Public Control of Australian Cricket in the 1880s* (Sydney: Australian Society for Sports History), p. 19.
3. W.F. Mandle (1973) 'Games People Played: Cricket and Football in England and Victoria in the Late Nineteenth Century', *Historical Studies* 15, 60: 519.
4. Mandle, 'Games People Played'; W.F. Mandle, (1976) 'Wills, Thomas Wentworth (1835–1880)', Australian Dictionary of Biography, National Centre of Biography, Australian National University, http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/wills-thomas-wentworth-4863/text8125, published first in hard copy 1976, accessed online 10 September 2015.
5. *Bell's Life in Victoria and Sporting Chronicle*, 4 January 1862, p. 3.
6. *Argus*, 16 December 1859, p. 5 (emphasis added).
7. Alf Batcheldor (2011–2012) 'A Revised Look at the Spiers and Pond Tour of 1861/62', *The Yorker* 46: pp. 16–23.
8. In fact, the tour was even more of a financial success than originally advertised, with Spiers later admitting that the total profits were actually closer to £19,000 than the £11,000 that was announced at the time—Jim Blair (2011–2012) 'Spiers and Pond in England', *The Yorker* 46: 24. And in a striking instance of colony-to-metropole cultural traffic, Spiers and Pond took their colonial catering experience (and handsome profits from the cricket tour) back to the metropole and established a string of very successful catering enterprises; see Blair, 'Spiers and Pond in England', pp. 24–27.
9. Jack Pollard (1987) *The Formative Years of Australian Cricket, 1803–1893* (Sydney: Angus and Robertson), pp. 112–133.
10. *The Australasian*, 30 March 1872, p. 394.
11. P.F. Warner (1912), *Imperial Cricket* (London: The London and Counties Press Association), p. 270; W.G. Grace (1899), *'W.G.': Cricketing Reminiscences and Personal Recollections* (London: James Bowden), p. 104.
12. Grace, *Cricketing Reminiscences*, p. 105.
13. Pollard, *Formative Years*, p. 175.
14. Pollard, *Formative Years*, ch. 12.
15. Grace, *Cricketing Reminiscences*, pp. 104–105.
16. *Bell's Life in Victoria and Sporting Chronicle*, 28 December 1861. This statement was probably particularly true for Rusden, who had emigrated with his family in 1833 at the age of fourteen and probably never stopped thinking of himself as English. In 1882 he retired to England but then in 1893, on health advice, he again made the British World perambulation back to Melbourne, where he resided until his death in 1903. In his obituary he was described thusly—'We don't know any Australian resident so

distinctively English'. Ann Blainey and Mary Lazarus (1976) 'Rusden, George William (1819–1903)', Australian Dictionary of Biography, National Centre of Biography, Australian National University, http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/rusden-george-william-4523/text7405 accessed online 10 September 2015.

17. *Bell's Life in Victoria and Sporting Chronicle*, 22 February 1862.
18. *The Australasian*, 22 June 1872.
19. *Bell's Life in Victoria and Sporting Chronicle*, 28 December 1861, 4 January 1862.
20. Richard Cashman (2002) *Sport in the National Imagination* (Sydney: Walla Walla Press), pp. 19–20.
21. A.W. Pullin, (1902) *Alfred Shaw Cricketer: His Career and Reminiscences* (London: Cassell and Company), p. 57.
22. Pullin, *Alfred Shaw*, p. 190.
23. *The Australasian*, 24 March 1877, 370. This statement is further complicated by the fact that six of the eleven All Australia team members were, in fact, born in England—Pollard, *Formative Years*, 186.
24. Pullin, *Alfred Shaw*, 61.
25. John Robert Seeley (2005; first published 1883) *The Expansion of England: Two Courses of Lectures* (New York: Cosimo), p. 11: Charles Dilke (1869) *Greater Britain: A Record of Travel in English-Speaking Countries in 1866–1867* (London: Macmillan), preface. See also, Duncan Bell (2007) *The Idea of Greater Britain* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press).

CHAPTER 3

Bi-directional Cultural Traffic and the Evolution of an Australian Cricketing Identity

Abstract This chapter examines the development of bi-directional cultural traffic as Australia began to send their own cricket teams to tour the metropole (or 'home', as it was often termed by contemporaries). These tours introduced Australians (and Australia) to a metropolitan audience, showing that while there were a number of similarities there were also discernable differences. Although it was common to hear contemporaries pronounce that these Anglo-Australian cricket tours contributed to British World unity and amity, this bi-directional cultural traffic also brought to light important sources of tension—the most rancorous being the categorisation of the Australians as semi-professionals—that served to undercut this British World hyperbole. In turn, these tensions effected subtle yet significant shifts in the mediated Australian cricketing identity.

Keywords Cultural traffic · Australian cricket · Amateur · Professional
Imaginary grandstand

The emerging parity between metropolitan and colonial cricket, exemplified most noticeably by the Australian victory in the 1877 Test match, prompted talk of the first tour of an Australian side to the 'home' country. Once again, British World connections were instrumental in the inception and organisation of the tour. According to Shaw, '[Lillywhite and I] had done our best to induce [the Australians] to tackle the

© The Author(s) 2018

J. van Duinen, *The British World and an Australian National Identity*, Palgrave Studies in Sport and Politics,
DOI 10.1057/978-1-137-52778-3_3

enterprise. We even offered to undertake the financial responsibility of the tour, which we had confidence would be a success [but] it was not until the victory alluded to that the decision to visit England was come to'.[1] The colonial liaison for Lillywhite's 1876–1877 team of professionals had been the Melbourne cricketer and entrepreneur John Conway. Indeed, as a mark of mutual respect and esteem the pair enjoyed, Lillywhite had presented Conway with a locket during the English team's farewell dinner at the Globe Hotel in Adelaide.[2] It was therefore no surprise that when Conway came on board as manager of this first tour of an Australia team to Britain, he, in turn, looked to Lillywhite for assistance on the British side of things. A member of the Australian team, Tom Horan, later described Conway as 'the presiding genius of the concept', but the success of the tour was arguably due just as much to the connections and industry of Lillywhite. In the end, Lillywhite was able to arrange an impressive fixture list of 37 matches, the only drawback being that it did not include a match against an England Eleven.[3]

The tourists did, however, play against a Marylebone Cricket Club Eleven in the second match of the tour. This was a very strong side that included W.G. Grace; as the *London Globe* reported, 'The Eleven was as good a one as could be found to represent London and England, and probably as good as the Club ever turned out'.[4] The Australians had been soundly defeated in their only previous match of the tour and at the start of the MCC match the spectators only numbered 500. Clearly a close contest was not expected. However, in what proved to be quite an incredible match, the Australian side defeated the MCC by nine wickets, with the match only lasting a total of 3 hours and 40 minutes. The news of the astonishing result quickly spread through London and further afield and resulted in the rest of the tourists' fixtures being extremely well attended which, in turn, guaranteed the financial success of the tour. The team finished the tour with an impressive record of 19 wins, 7 losses, and 15 draws.[5]

This tour and, more specifically, the victory at Lord's marks a pivotal moment in the history of Anglo-Australian cricketing relations. First, we can perhaps begin to discern certain traits of the 'mediated national identity' to which Holt alluded. Although the previous year had witnessed the first Australian Eleven compete against an English Eleven in the first ever 'Test match', in specific and self-conscious ways, the 1878 team and tour represented this 'national' characteristic to an even greater degree. The team had 'Australian Eleven' emblazoned on their equipment bag

and, indeed, they had a good claim to be more 'Australian' than the previous year's national side since the team contained a higher proportion of 'native-born' players (8 of 11 compared to 6 of 11).[6] Furthermore, Conway determinedly promoted this national aspect, stating that the tour needed to be regarded in 'a thoroughly *Australian* spirit' and that he hoped that the colonial cricket associations (the NSWCA and the VCA) might put aside their parochialism and 'lend every assistance to promote what is in reality a *national* undertaking'.[7]

However, such potential proto-'nationalist' stances need to be weighed against the continued presence of British World sentiment. For example, the Victorian politician J.G. Francis delivered a speech at the team's farewell dinner in which he averred they were 'going to a land which he felt assured they would consider their fatherland, and where they would meet with such a good and hearty welcome as the grand old nation from which they sprung always accorded to good men and true'. For, after all, 'when they said the Australian Eleven, they remembered that the Eleven were still Englishmen'.[8] Similar attitudes could be found expressed in the press. It was ubiquitous to refer to Britain as 'home' and describe, as the *Sydney Morning Herald* did, the Australian cricket team as embarking upon their 'homeward voyage'.[9] The *Australasian* hoped that 'the visit of an Australian Eleven will be productive of immense good, both to the colonies and the old country … [and would show] that the colonials are worthy descendants of the good old stock from which they have come'.[10] To some extent, it is a quote from a metropolitan figure, the noted cricket writer C.F. Pardon, which is most indicative of the mediated identity represented in this victory: 'That day … marked the birth of the Australian colonies as a cricketing *community* … we [in Britain] did not know how remarkably proficient the descendants of Englishmen had become under the glorious climate of the greater England below the line'.[11]

This tour was also a pivotal moment because it marked the beginnings of substantive bi-directional cultural traffic. As has been noted, the flow of cultural traffic until this point was essentially all one-way—metropole to colony. But this first tour of an Australian cricket team to the metropole signified an important reversal of this cultural traffic. One consequence was that the tour could have an educative function, informing a metropole that had been largely unaware of, or uninterested in, cricket in the colonies. The *Australasian* had observed before the commencement of the tour that the visit of the Australian Eleven could help 'dispel much

of the illusion still existing as to the Australian colonies … [since] much ignorance still exists in Great Britain respecting the colonies. Australia is regarded still as an almost *terra incognita*'.[12] Moreover, this was backed up in metropolitan sources. Lyttelton and Steel, in the publication *Cricket*, agreed that prior to this tour 'the English public [did not] take any real interest in Australian cricket, though in 1877 in their own country the Australians had defeated Lillywhite's eleven on even terms'.[13] Similarly, *Lillywhite's Cricketers' Annual* admitted that 'the idea of a visit from an Australian team, it may be safely stated, was at first treated as something of a joke by our English cricketers'.[14]

These statements in the *Australasian* show just how important the imaginary grandstand was for Australia's self-worth. This tour of an Australian cricket team to the 'home' of cricket offered a chance for the colony to present itself and perform for the most important imaginary grandstand of the British World—the metropolitan audience of Great Britain. Thus it was crucial that the team was able to hold its own. Most colonial commentators hoped that the team would, in captain Dave Gregory's words, 'come back with a good average of matches in their favour', but few predicted they would be successful against a team as strong as the MCC Eleven.[15] This is why this victory is arguably more significant for Australian cricket than the victory in the first Test match the previous year. In fact, the MCC side was probably stronger than Lillywhite's team of professionals since it included a mix of some of the best professionals and amateurs playing in England. But, more importantly, the match took place at the 'home' of cricket—Lord's cricket ground—in front of a metropolitan audience. The great Australian fast bowler and star of the 1878 side, Fred 'the Demon' Spofforth, certainly felt that it was 'impossible to over-estimate the importance of this victory in its effect on the future matches and the destiny of Australian cricket'.[16] The following quote from the *Australasian* articulates well both the significance of the imaginary grandstand and the intricacies of the mediated national identity of British World Australia:

> [The Australian cricketers] wish to show John Bull that we can play cricket here as well as the old folks at home can. They are proud of their skills, as they ought to be, and wish to prove at Lord's and the Oval and other grounds in England that the colonials are worthy descendants of the good old stock from which they have come. … Eleven stalwart Australian natives will be seen at Sheffield and Manchester and Birmingham and other places,

> in the cricket field, and people will say that the country that can produce such fine men and good cricketers cannot be a bad one by any means. … *And the Britishers will, if our men are properly supported, see an Australian Eleven in the cricket field, and when they have won a few matches and beaten the British cock on his own ground, they will have rendered good service to the colonies, and enhanced the prestige of that 'Britain of the South' which they represent, and which everyone of the Eleven can claim as his native land.*[17]

But if performing for the imaginary grandstand is important for the formation of identity, it follows, then, that the views of those in the grandstand are an essential aspect of this process. So what was the reception in the metropole like? The English public in general embraced the tour and attended in droves, particularly after the upset at Lord's. Lyttelton and Steel felt that tour had 'a wonderfully stimulating effect on English cricket'.[18] *Lillywhite's Annual* also commented that the tour did no less than usher in 'a new era into the history of the game'. Furthermore, *Lillywhite's* argued that English cricket could actually learn from certain aspects of the tourists' play: 'It is certain that in more than one respect they set an example that we might well imitate to advantage'. In particular, 'their success over here might well serve as a peg to hang a treatise on the obvious distaste of most of our English players, more particularly the amateurs, to devote a certain portion of the time they expend on the cultivation of batting to practice in bowling and fielding'.[19] Essentially, *Lillywhite's* is claiming here that this 1878 tour initiated a reciprocal transfer of cultural traffic between metropole and colony, at least in terms of bowling and fielding. Indeed, by the end of the tour there was a general consensus that the Australians had a decided edge over the English in the bowling stakes, with *Lillywhite's* averring that their bowling 'was superior to any that we can show, even in the best of our County Elevens'.[20] It is particularly interesting to note how *Lillywhite's* talked about aspects of the Australians' cricket which 'we might well imitate to advantage' when in the 1860s it had been the metropole 'showing this young country how cricket ought to be played'.[21]

In fact, the evolution of bowling actually offers an instructive case study of these bi-directional flows of cultural traffic. In the early years of cricket in both Australia and Britain, bowling had been delivered underarm, but over the course of the nineteenth century this gave way to overarm delivery. The Australian colonies persisted with the underarm delivery longer than the metropole, and the overarm innovation was

introduced to Australia through the British World figure Tom Wills, who had observed it while attending Rugby School and brought it back with him when he returned to Victoria in 1856. Gradually the new technique was adopted in all colonial cricket until, in 1871, an 'old member of the Melbourne Cricket Club' lamented in the *Australasian*, 'The tendency of the rising school of bowlers to copy … the pernicious example set by Mr. Wills … all young bowlers now attempt one thing before others. That one thing is to get the arm up as high as possible, to "bowl", in fact, over their heads. Pace and a high delivery is all that is sought after'.[22]

Then, in an apt example of the transmission of colony-to-metropole cultural traffic during the 1878 tour, *Lillywhite's* remarked how the English were surprised by the height of Spofforth's bowling arm during his delivery. R.L. Arrowsmith later noted that Spofforth's high action 'attracted considerable comment and this was no doubt partly responsible for the terror he inspired'.[23] James Pycroft, writing in the 1881 *Lillywhite's*, concurred with this view of Australian bowling, noting: 'As to the Australian way, they seem to have beaten us in one way … their *forte* is bowling and fielding; while our fault has been to attach too much honour to batting'. This from the Pycroft who mythologised the pastoral Englishness of cricket in his 1851 book *The Cricket Field*: 'The game of cricket, philosophically considered, is a standing panegyric on the English character: none but an orderly and sensible race of people would so amuse themselves … though, with good generalship, cricket is a game for Britons generally'.[24] So we can see here, through this rather prosaic example of the evolution of overarm bowling, the way in which the conveyance of cultural traffic between the colony and metropole could entail reciprocal impact and change. The 1883 *Lillywhite's* summed up this process succinctly: 'Our humble opinion is, that the Australians have sprung a point upon us by engrafting new ideas upon the old stock they received from us in bye-gone days'.[25]

This first visit from a white Australian cricket team also brought into relief other more contentious differences about Australian cricket and cricketers. On 2–4 September, the visitors were scheduled to play a team of All England professionals at The Oval. However, a dispute arose when the Australians refused to pay the professionals £20 each, a figure which Conway deemed excessive. The disagreement was not able to be resolved, the professionals boycotted the fixture, and the Australians ended up playing against a substitute eleven. At the conclusion of the

match, Conway agreed to pay this replacement team the disputed £20 in order to demonstrate that he was 'not actuated by a mercenary spirit … but from a disinclination not to be imposed on'.[26] The whole imbroglio was widely reported in the British press at the time, with some publications insinuating exactly the kind of 'mercenary spirit' to which Conway took exception.[27]

Although £20 was the figure in dispute, the likely real cause for disputation was the huge profits the tourists seemed set to make from the tour. The *Spectator* reported at the time that they 'heard it calculated that each man will net £1500'.[28] The official figure ended up being £750, but some players admitted many years later that the sum was closer to £1040.[29] The actual figure is not as important as the principle at issue. In Britain there was an official distinction between amateur and professional cricketers. Put simply, professionals were paid for their services whereas amateurs theoretically were not. Although the reality was a little more blurry, this was the rhetoric that was promulgated. This 1878 Australian tour was funded as a joint-stock enterprise, with each player contributing £50 and funds being raised via a 16-match preliminary tour around the colonies and return leg through America on the way home. If the tour resulted in a profit overall this would be distributed back to the playing group.

From an Australian perspective this arrangement was unproblematic; the *Australasian* remarked, 'If the Australians pay their expenses they will be satisfied, and if they get something to the good, and we hope they will, they will be agreeably surprised. They are actuated by higher motives'.[30] Most significantly, this profit did not affect their claim to amateur status; as the *Australasian* stated, 'The Australians, we must remember, pride themselves on having been received at home [i.e. Britain] as amateurs'. Although there was some demurring about the commercial aspect that was starting to infiltrate cricket in Australia generally, the *Australasian* was adamant about the amateur status of the national side. As if to reinforce this point, the editorial recommended that the national side be welcomed home with 'a banquet in the Townhall and a grand match in the Melbourne cricket-ground'.[31]

However, from a metropolitan perspective it was not so clear-cut, for there was an apparent contradiction when cricketers claimed amateur status yet profited handsomely from a cricket tour. The British newspaper the *Sporting Gazette* stopped short of questioning the amateur status of the Australians, but it did suggest that a better response from Conway

and the Australians would have been to simply pay the disputed £20, as 'it would have been a fine advertisement for them, and would have raised them in the estimation of those who do not admire their money-hunting'.[32] It is perhaps also not a coincidence that midway through the tour the MCC issued a resolution attempting to define an amateur (or 'gentleman' in the language of the MCC): '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 Gentleman against The Players at Lord's'.[33] Although this ruling was ostensibly directed at English domestic cricket, it was perhaps also intended as a shot across the bows of the visiting Australians.

As we can see, this first instance of bi-directional cultural traffic accentuated some confusion over the status of the Australian players. When the flow of cultural traffic had all been one-way—metropole to colony—the emphasis had been on just how similar everything was in this 'Britain of the South'. To repeat the sentiments of Stephenson, the captain of the 1861–1862 English touring side, 'English customs and English feelings were firmly implanted here; the same love of manly sport, the same appreciation of fair play existed that prevails in England. … Everything around us seems so thoroughly English that I could almost imagine we were still home'. However, once a two-way flow of cultural traffic was established with this first tour of an Australian team to the metropole, the magnified focus of the audience in the imaginary grandstand brought into relief the fact that perhaps not all was as uniformly metropolitan as Stephenson had claimed. In the metropolitan gaze, there were a number of differences about these avowedly British brethren from the Antipodes, the most awkward of which was this ambiguity concerning their status. The Australians seemed to occupy a classification that was peculiar to themselves—a kind of 'semi-professional', as Lord Harris would later term it.[34]

This uncertainty surrounding the classification of Australians was a running sore throughout later tours. In an effort to mollify the issue, the next tour of an English team to Australia in 1878–1879, under the captaincy of Lord Harris, was presented as an 'all amateur' affair, with the matches between Victoria and the tourists being billed as 'The Gentlemen of Victoria' vs. 'The Gentlemen of England'.[35] Unfortunately this tour was also not without controversy, with a crowd 'riot' interrupting the second day of the match between the England Eleven and the New South Wales Eleven. It was reported that the riot

was sparked by 'the impunity with which open betting was transacted in the pavilion', but the situation was also not ameliorated by reports that certain English players were heard to call the crowd 'sons of convicts'.[36] Once the English team had returned to Britain, Lord Harris wrote an open letter that appeared in the London *Daily Telegraph* in which he complained about how the team had been 'insulted and subjected to indignities'. In turn, the NSWCA wrote a defensive letter of reply:

> Lord Harris, by what we feel to be a most ungenerous suppression of the facts, has led the British public to believe that in New South Wales, to quote his own words, 'a party of gentlemen travelling through these colonies for the purpose of playing a few friendly games of cricket should have been insulted and subjected to indignities,' while the Press and inhabitants of Sydney neither showed surprise, indignation nor regret. We cannot let a libel on the people of New South Wales so unfounded as this to pass without challenge. The country upon which such a reproach could be fastened would be unworthy of a place among civilised communities, and the imputation is especially odious to Australians, *who claim to have maintained the manly, generous, and hospitable character of the British race*.[37]

As can be seen, by virtually paraphrasing Stephenson's British World sentiment of sixteen years earlier, this letter invokes a common cultural Britishness in its defence of New South Wales cricket and, more broadly, Australians.

It was clear that the ill feeling that the incident had aroused had not dissipated by the time a second Australian team toured Britain in 1880. And, once again, the issue of the status of the Australians raised its head, with Lord Harris sending a telegram that stipulated the Australian team would be received as professionals and, as such, would be paid 75% of the gate money for their fixtures. They were not scheduled any matches against representative teams like an MCC Eleven or a Gentlemen Eleven, let alone an England Eleven. Certain sections of the metropolitan press branded the Australians 'commercial cricketers' and 'money-grubbing strollers' while *Bell's Life in London* felt it pertinent to remark that 'if cricket is worth playing at all it must be played in the true spirit of the game'.[38] Even the usually more restrained *Lillywhite's Annual* commented that 'if the Australians did not make cricket their profession in their native land, they most certainly did when they came to this country'.[39]

Back in the colonial press, the reception given to this Australian Eleven was contrasted with that given to the 1878 Australian side. Where the previous team had been 'feted and lionised wherever they went … [and] received as honorary members by the Surrey and Marylebone clubs', this time there was 'a general desire evinced by the cricketers of Great Britain, both gentlemen and professionals, to give [this] Eleven the cold shoulder'.[40] Eventually, at the very end of the tour, a match between an English Eleven and the Australians was scrambled together. The prevailing tension was papered over by a civic reception with the Lord Mayor of London. The metropolitan press, which had previously been so critical of the Australians, reported the speech of Lord Harris, in which he took the opportunity to indulge in some hyperbolic expressions of British World amity and unity:

> It is also pleasant for the mother country to see that her descendants in the most distant possessions of the Queen change their sky but not their character, carry with them the love of an honest, manly sport which exists among us at home. … Such a community of tastes must always be a powerful bond of sympathy between nations even otherwise estranged … this common passion for the same sport and the interchange of visits by the cricketers of the two countries have done more to knit the Australian colonies with home than years of beneficial legislation.[41]

Notwithstanding this outpouring of British World sentiment, the professional-amateur issue was kept simmering in Britain with the unprecedented strike of seven leading Notts professionals during the 1881 county season.[42] *Lillywhite's Annual*, for one, cited the bi-directional cultural traffic effected by the Australian tours as a cause:

> The precise origin of the movement is difficult to trace, but indirectly the visits of the two Australian Elevens to England may be held responsible for the sudden and extraordinary change which took place in the bearing of professionals who had previously comported themselves most becomingly. The terms on which the Colonial Players were accepted over here were utterly false to men like Shaw, who knew that the home *status* of some was certainly not above the level of professional cricket in England.[43]

The next tour of an Australian team to England took place in 1882 and is most famous for the first victory of an Australian Eleven against an English Eleven at 'home'. This match inaugurated the 'Ashes' tradition

whereby Test matches between representative teams of Australia and England began to be known as contests for the 'Ashes'.[44] A number of steps were taken to try to ameliorate the frictions of previous tours and restore British World goodwill between the colony and the metropole. For example, the itinerary of matches this time was organised by the MCC, ensuring that matches against an MCC Eleven, a Gentlemen Eleven, a Players Eleven and, of course, an English Eleven were scheduled well in advance. All parties agreed to the Australians receiving 50% of the gate money—an appreciable reduction on the 75% which the 'commercial cricketers' had received on the previous tour.[45] The Australians defeated almost all comers with twenty-four wins and four losses, which included an innings defeat of the Gentlemen and, most important of all, victory in the all-important, one-off Test match. W.G. would write later that this 1882 team was the best that ever toured the 'mother country'.[46] At the close of the tour, the team were feted at a farewell banquet at—in a nice piece of symmetry with the very first tour of 1861–1862—a Spiers and Pond establishment: the Criterion Restaurant in Piccadilly.[47]

As with earlier colonial victories, the metropole could always have recourse to the salve provided by the Britishness of the British World. When it reported on this Ashes defeat, *Lillywhite's Companion* of 1883 stressed that 'after all, those who distinguished themselves so eminently last season are British, and, at any rate, have learned the game from Englishmen'. Nevertheless, later in the piece, the same writer couldn't help mentioning the fracas concerning the apparent impact the commercialism of the Australians was having on English professionals: 'Already are to be heard the loud demands of professionals for increased pay. Unconsciously, and perhaps without any suspicion on their parts that such is the case, the visits of the Australians have seriously and perceptibly aggravated the symptoms of a commercial spirit in cricket'.[48] Furthermore, *Lillywhite's Annual* of the same year seemed to hint at a distinctive Australian way of playing: 'The Australians always worked like a machine, being ever consistent in their good fielding, their good batting, and their good bowling'.[49] Although this is not an overtly negative appraisal, it nevertheless is intended to contrast with the English amateur's more elegant and carefree style.

Obviously the Ashes victory was an unambiguous demonstration of the standard to which Australian cricket had reached; however, the colonial articulations of this achievement again often possessed the hallmarks of a

mediated national identity. In the speech which Australian captain William Murdoch delivered at the farewell banquet, there was both a national(ist) identity expressed—'When we quitted Australia we did so … determined to do our best to uphold the reputation of the land of our birth. … We knew very well that the eyes of all Australia were upon us, and that the honour of Australia had been entrusted to our hands'—as well as an acknowledgement of the influence of the metropole: 'If we have attained any position as cricketers, you in England have yourselves to thank for it, for you have been our instructors. We have been very ready and willing to learn, for the cricketing spirit is as strong in Australia as in England. It is the national game of the colonies'.[50] Similarly mediated Anglo-Australian sentiments could be found echoed back in Australia. When the team arrived in Wodonga, the mayor noted that the team 'had shown themselves to be possessed of plenty of British pluck, energy and perseverance, and that they were true Australians'.[51] This idea that 'British pluck' was inherent in Australians was again invoked in a poem that was published in the programme of a banquet held in Melbourne in honour of the team. The poem neatly encapsulated both the national triumphalism and the British World unity of the victory and concluded in this manner:

> The palm of victory 'Our Boys' have won;
>
> The cricket sceptre in triumph now is our own!
>
> Fraught with marvellous pluck—pluck we know must run
>
> Through true Australians from our British sires.
>
> Fairly! Nobly! have their glorious honours come.
>
> Australia longs today to praise her every noble son
>
> Of our cricket heroes. All! All! have shown
>
> Grand British pluck beneath a British sun.[52]

Unfortunately this British World bonhomie would not prevail into the next tour by an Australian team in 1884. This time around there were three Test matches that were billed as 'Australia v. England'. Australia had the better of two draws with England winning the third. But it was again the status of the Australians that was the source of some tension. The year before, Lord Harris had offered some free advice to 'Australian

cricket' in which he remarked that 'they should discourage any too anxious inclination among amateurs towards turning cricket into a lucrative profession. If professional cricketers prove to be necessary in Australia, as I say they are in England, encourage their appearance by all means; but do not do anything to encourage the formation of a class of *semi-professionals*'.[53] When it was discovered that the Australian tourists had negotiated to take all the gate money proceeds from the Lord's Test, sections of the metropolitan press echoed Lord Harris's complaints. The team were referred to as 'gate money' cricketers, with the *Sporting and Dramatic News* accusing them of undertaking 'their enterprise less for honour than the filthy lucre'.[54] In a summation of the 1884 tour, the *World* pointedly stated that 'the Australians make their own terms, insist on them, not always very gracefully, and play too obviously for the money's sake. They arrogate to themselves the rank of gentlemen. It should be made clear to them that if they visit England to make money, they must rank, with others in the same condition, as paid professionals'. To underscore the point, some papers began publishing the names of the Australians without the customary 'Mr.' denoted to gentlemen.[55] And, as in 1881, there was a suggestion that this contested status of the Australians was an influence on three Notts professionals, Barnes, Flowers and Shrewsbury, demanding £15 instead of the usual £10 to play against the Australians.[56]

The seriousness of the discord was apparent in a lengthy article written in the London *Saturday Review* and re-reported back in Australia in the *Brisbane Courier*. The article is structured as a rebuttal of the basic claim that Anglo-Australian cricket tours are good for the game itself. Rather, that article argued, the visits from Australian Elevens has brought about a corruption of the 'true spirit' of cricket. The writer places the blame for this squarely on the shoulders of the Australians and their, in his view, sham status as amateurs. He expostulates that it is an 'absurdity' that the Australians 'receive all the courtesies due to "gentlemen," to amateur players, players who do not make money by their skill' since 'Murdoch and Spofforth and the rest of these fine players are as surely "professional" cricketers as any player engaged for a weekly salary to play for the Marylebone Club'. The writer also alludes to the influence this had exerted on the Notts professionals. As before, it was also claimed that the commercial imperatives that inspired the Australians affected the way they played cricket and that 'a defeat coming at the end of the

three long, rainless days is far dearer to their hearts than a victory won in half the time'. This way of playing was 'foreign, and adverse to all our notions of the game'. Finally, in a statement that emphasised the differences between the colony and the metropole, the writer contended that if there were to be more visits from Australian Elevens that 'they must come as professional cricketers, and they must play, like other professionals, in conformity with the rules established and practised in England. On their own grounds, of course, they do as they please; on English grounds they must do as English players do'.[57]

These descriptions of the team in the metropolitan press provoked some reaction in the colonial press. A perspicacious writer in the regional newspaper, the *Clarence and Richmond Examiner and New England Advertiser*, reminded readers of the funding arrangements of the first English tours of the 1860s: 'As to the Australians receiving "gate-money", they merely do so according to English practice. In no place in the world was cricket ever played more for love of sport than it was in Australia, until the advent of English teams … [therefore] if there is anything wrong in the practice, it is certainly not Englishmen who should reprove them'.[58] In the *Australasian*, 'a member of the MCC' (which, on this occasion, referred to the 'Melbourne Cricket Club') expatiated on the issue in more detail. He presented the case for the Australians by saying that in the colony there was 'little difference between amateur players and professionals. Ever since cricket has been played in Australia there has never been such a person as "a professional," as is understood by the term at home'. He then alluded to the murky practice in Britain of paying the 'expenses' of amateurs, citing, in particular, the example of the great W.G. Grace: 'As "an amateur," he has been the best paid professional ever known'. He finished by declaring that 'the present [Australian] team, if they are wise, will go home to play cricket, and make what money they can, and not bother their heads with any impertinent questions on the subject of "amateurs and professionals"'.[59]

These were not lone opinions. 'Observer' in the *Argus* directed his criticisms at the metropolitan press, pronouncing that the 'the attitude of the English press towards the Australians has not been at all generous' and deploring the 'universal mud-throwing to which our cricketers have been subjected in the home of that much-vaunted factor "fair play"'. He ended with the barbed point that 'in a social sense, the greatest mistake the Australians ever made was when they vanquished an All-England Eleven on even terms. … Had they been content to give and

take with amateur elevens from third-rate counties instead of ruffling British conceit and hurting British dignity by throwing out a challenge to the United Kingdom and maintaining it in the field, there would have been less trenchant criticism'.[60] And finally, 'Censor' in the *Sydney Mail* also protested that 'the amateur question has cropped up during every Australian Eleven to the old country' and, interestingly, went on to allude to deeper social differences that this 'question' may denote:

> The whole matter rests on the title of amateur. In cricket there seems to be a stigma attaching to the term 'professional' … I do not know why that should be so. The position of a professional cricketer can be filled with respectability and even dignity. … Strictly speaking the Australians are professionals in England, but why England should ask our men to dub themselves so when W.G. Grace, the champion amateur, has for years taken more than his actual expenses when playing cricket, it is difficult to say.[61]

Clearly the appearance and debate of such differences brings into question the contemporaneous British World rhetoric that emphasised unanimity and amity between the metropole and the 'Britain of the South'. On this point it is particularly interesting to note how 'Observer' had distinguished between Australian social mores and 'British conceit' and 'British dignity'. Importantly, these comments also demonstrate a willingness to defend the Australian difference and, to some extent, 'own' it.

Thus these first few years of bi-directional cultural traffic, enacted mainly through these regular tours between colony and metropole, reveal a couple of things. First, it demonstrates the growing parity between Australian and English cricket. This helped alleviate the fear that the British race was degenerating in its Antipodean locale and, in addition, produced instances of colony-to-metropole cultural impact, particularly in regards to the development of bowling. While differences regarding bowling styles were fairly innocuous, this bi-directional cultural traffic also brought to light more profound differences between colonial and metropolitan cricketers, the most disruptive being the controversies over the status of Australian players. Although this success at 'home' provided a boost for colonial confidence, any expressions of national identity were characterised by a sense of mediation between a nascent 'Australianness' and the bond of British imperial unity. These differences began to detract from the confident Greater Britain discourse of the previous decades. Although George Brumfitt could still write,

'May the interchange of visits between English and Australian cricketers continue to assist in keeping the two countries closely welded together in the grand bond of brotherhood', an undercurrent of uncertainty can perhaps be detected in the addition of his hope that 'the game [would] ever continue to be played in true cricketing spirit'.[62]

This bi-directional cultural traffic also instigated the evolution of a much more mediated Australian cricketing identity. However, as any family law court will attest, mediation is very often a far from straightforward process. We can see in this period that Australian cricket still had a desire to be analogous to the metropolitan model back 'home', but the transmission of cultural traffic highlighted ineluctable differences. Ironically, the very networks which are often thought to bolster the British World worked to disclose these subtle yet significant divergences. While some of these divergences, like the bi-directional development of fast bowling, could be mutually beneficial, others, like the contestation over the status of the Australian players, were less so. However, as we will see in Chap. 4, these disruptive differences are key to provoking important shifts in the mediated cricketing identity.

Notes

1. A.W. Pullin (1902) *Alfred Shaw, Cricketer: His Career and Reminiscences* (London: Cassell and Company), p. 61.
2. John Lazenby (2015) *The Strangers Who Came Home: The First Australian Cricket Tour of England* (London: Bloomsbury), p. 14.
3. Lazenby, Strangers *Who Came Home*, quote from p. 3; Malcolm Knox (2011) 'Day of the Windjammer' in Christian Ryan (ed.) *Australia: Story of a Cricket Country* (Melbourne: Hardie Grant Books), pp. 90–105.
4. Lazenby, *Strangers Who Came Home*, p. 88.
5. Jack Pollard (1987) *The Formative Years of Australian Cricket, 1803–1893* (Sydney: Angus and Robertson), p. 209.
6. Fred Spofforth (1894) 'Australian Cricket and Cricketers', *New Review* 59: 514.
7. Lazenby, *Strangers Who Came Home*, p. 4; David Montefiore (1992) *Cricket in the Doldrums: The Struggle Between Private and Public Control of Australian Cricket in the 1880s* (Sydney: Australian Society for Sports History), p. 29.
8. *The Australasian*, 30 March 1878, p. 396.
9. *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 30 March 1878, p. 5.
10. *The Australasian*, 29 December 1877, p. 811.

11. Charles Frederick Pardon (1984; first published 1884) *The Australians in England: A Complete Record of the Cricket Tour of 1884* (Cambridge: J.W. McKenzie), p. 512.
12. *The Australasian*, 29 December 1877, p. 811.
13. A.G. Steel and R.H. Lyttelton (1898) *Cricket* (London: Longmans, Green and Co.), p. 313.
14. *James Lillywhite's Cricketers' Annual*, *1879* (London: Lillywhite, Frowd and Co.), p. 1.
15. *The Australasian*, 30 March 1878, p. 396.
16. Fred Spofforth (1894) 'English Cricket and Cricketers', *New Review* 60: 628.
17. *The Australasian*, 29 December 1877, p. 811 (emphasis added).
18. Lyttelton and Steel, *Cricket*, p. 315.
19. *Lillywhite's Cricketers' Annual*, *1879*, pp. 2–4, 40.
20. *Lillywhite's Cricketers' Annual*, *1879*, p. 4.
21. See Chap. 1.
22. *The Australasian*, 4 February 1871, p. 139.
23. Richard Cashman (2014) *The Demon Fred Spofforth* (Sydney: Walla Walla Press), pp. 22–24.
24. James Pycroft (1851) *The Cricket Field* (London: Longmans), pp. 14–15.
25. *James Lillywhite's Cricketers' Annual*, *1883* (London: Lillywhite, Frowd and Co.), p. 8.
26. Quoted in Montefiore, *Cricket in the Doldrums*, p. 38.
27. Lazenby, *Strangers Who Came Home*, pp. 177–181.
28. *The Spectator*, 20 July 1878, p. 12.
29. Pollard, *Formative Years*, p. 216.
30. *The Australasian*, 29 December 1877, p. 811.
31. *The Australasian*, 5 October 1878, p. 427.
32. *The Australasian*, 19 October 1878, p. 492.
33. Pollard, *Formative Years*, p. 206.
34. See p. 11 below.
35. Montefiore, *Cricket in the Doldrums*, p. 42.
36. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 8 February 1879, p. 6; *Sydney Morning Herald*, 10 February 1879, p. 6; Pollard, *Formative Years*, pp. 223–226.
37. Pollard, *Formative Years*, pp. 227–228 (emphasis added).
38. *Bell's Life in London and Sporting Chronicle*, 1 May 1880, p. 9; *Nelson Evening Mail*, 12 April 1880, p. 2; Pollard, *Formative Years*, p. 234.
39. *James Lillywhite's Cricketers' Annual, 1881* (London: Lillywhite, Frowd and Co.), p. 39.
40. *The Australasian*, 7 August 1880, p. 172.
41. *The Times*, 5 October 1880, p. 9.

42. Ric Sissons (1988) *The Players: A Social History of the Professional Cricketer* (Sydney: Pluto Press), pp. 174–178.
43. *James Lillywhite's Cricketers' Annual, 1882* (London: Lillywhite, Frowd and Co.), pp. 8–9 (emphasis added).
44. There is a great mass of writing on the 'Ashes', but for a comprehensive publication, see Steven Lynch (2015) *Wisden on the Ashes: The Authoritative Story of Cricket's Greatest Rivalry* (London: Bloomsbury Publishing).
45. Pollard, *Formative Years*, pp. 248–258.
46. W.G. Grace (1899) *'W.G.': Cricketing Reminiscences and Personal Recollections* (London: James Bowden), p. 175.
47. K.S. Inglis (1979) 'Imperial Cricket: Test Matches Between Australia and England, 1877–1900', in Richard Cashman and Michael McKernan (eds.) *Sport in History: The Making of Modern Sporting History* (Brisbane: University of Queensland Press), p. 156.
48. *James Lillywhite's Cricketers' Companion*, 1883 (London: Lillywhite, Frowd and Co.), pp. 17, 20.
49. *James Lillywhite's Cricketers' Annual, 1883* (London: Lillywhite, Frowd and Co.), p. 16.
50. Chris Harte (1987) 'Mr. Murdoch's Speech', *Australian Cricket Journal* 2, 3.
51. *Sydney Mail and New South WalesAdvertiser*, 2 December 1882, p. 995.
52. *Cricket*, 16 February 1883, p. 9: http://stats.acscricket.com/Cricket/1883/index.html, accessed 19/11/15.
53. Lord Harris (1883) 'The Development of Cricket', *The National Review* 2, 7: 79 (emphasis added).
54. Quote from Montefiore, *Cricket in the Doldrums*, p. 53.
55. Quote from Pollard, *Formative Years*, p. 273.
56. Pardon, *Australians in England*.
57. *The Brisbane Courier*, 30 October 1884, pp. 2–3.
58. *Clarence and Richmond Examiner and New England Advertiser*, 16 August 1884, p. 6.
59. *The Australasian*, 6 March 1880, p. 300.
60. *The Argus*, 16 September 1884, p. 7.
61. *The Sydney Mail and New South Wales Advertiser*, 9 August 1884, p. 277.
62. George Brumfitt (1887) *England v. Australia at the Wicket* (Ilkley: Brumfitt & Kirby), p. 293.

CHAPTER 4

Interlude: The British World Personified: Fred 'the Demon' Spofforth and Billy Midwinter

Abstract This brief chapter explores ways in which the tensions created and revealed by this bi-directional cultural traffic could be personified. It does so by examining two key figures in Australian cricket: Fred 'the Demon' Spofforth and Billy Midwinter. By attempting to identify as both Australian and British, these men embody the tensions and complexities of the emergent mediated Australian identity.

Keywords Australian cricket · William 'Billy' Midwinter · Fred 'the Demon' Spofforth · Cultural traffic · Australian national identity

The previous chapters have described the movement of cricketing cultural traffic in the British World and its significance for the composition of an early, mediated Australian cricketing identity. Another way in which this process can be explicated is through case studies of individuals. Fred 'the Demon' Spofforth provides a particularly apposite example. As we have already seen, Spofforth's bowling exemplified the way in which the movement of cultural traffic around the British World could result in reciprocal cultural impact. Spofforth himself freely admitted that he copied his bowling style from British models and that his bowling was an attempt to meld the attributes of three metropolitan bowlers—the sheer pace of George Tarrant along with the control and guile of James Lillywhite and James Southerton.[1] This led to him being one of the first practitioners of overarm bowling in Australia, a skill he developed

© The Author(s) 2018

J. van Duinen, *The British World and an Australian National Identity*, Palgrave Studies in Sport and Politics,
DOI 10.1057/978-1-137-52778-3_4

to such a degree that the height of his arm was, in turn, a revelation to metropolitan audiences on the 1878 Australian tour of England. The 1883 *Lillywhite's* described this impact by noting, 'It is true that we, in England, have had our eminent fast-bowlers, but none of these can come near to the "demon" as a typical specimen of all that a fast bowler is. Spofforth is truly an embodiment of the best qualities of the ideal quick trundle'.[2] So we can see how Spofforth embodies the reciprocal impact of the bi-directional flow of cultural traffic in the British World.

But Spofforth can also personify the mediated national identity that such British World cultural traffic engendered. He was born and schooled in Sydney and played all his first-class cricket for Australia. However, when he retired from cricket in Australia he settled back 'home' in England with his English wife. He went on to play for Derbyshire in 1889 and 1890, captaining the county in the 1890 season.[3] Nevertheless, this transition was not as smooth and seamless as British World rhetoric sometimes purported it to be. Certainly, as happened with the Australians generally upon their early successes in the 1870s, the metropolitan press claimed the 'Britishness' of Spofforth after he burst onto the international cricketing scene. For example, in 1878, *Vanity Fair* declared that 'Mr. Spofforth is Australian by origin and breeding, yet like all the better kind of Australians, he is not distinguishable from an English gentleman'.[4] Indeed, once he'd settled in England, Spofforth also remarked, 'Personally, I regard myself as an Englishman'.[5] But despite these British World assertions, Derbyshire still insisted upon Spofforth sitting out a two-year residential rule before he could qualify to play and, years later, the celebrated British cricket writer Neville Cardus would describe him as 'the Australian of Australians'.[6] The complexities of the mediated national identity which he personified are perhaps best encapsulated in a quote from Spofforth himself. At a farewell dinner in his honour, Spofforth was asked whether, if picked for an English Eleven, he would play against Australia. He responded that 'he could tell them that if as a member of an English team he was instrumental in beating an Australian Eleven, he would feel all the more proud of it for the sake of Australia'.[7]

Spofforth did not end up being selected for England; however, there were five other cricketers who played for both Australia and England in the period before 1900, including the captain of the Australian Eleven between 1880 and 1884, William Murdoch.[8] But perhaps the individual who best represents the tensions that could sometimes be associated with British World movement and identity is William "Billy' Midwinter.

Midwinter was born and raised in England until his family migrated to Australia in 1862. He represented Australia in the first two Test matches of 1877, but once these were concluded, he travelled to England to play in the 1877 county season with Gloucestershire. Midwinter was selected in the first Australian side to tour England in 1878 and then was selected in the 1881–1882 English side to tour Australia and played in all four Test matches. He then played for Australia in the 1882–1883 series against the visiting English side and, finally, was a member of the 1884 Australian side to tour England.[9] Thus, at first glance, it would appear that Midwinter perfectly embodies the cultural glue of Britishness and the ease with which members of the British World could oscillate between various nodes. But this apparent facility often masked tensions and fault lines within the British World.

During the inaugural 1878 Australian tour of Britain, an incident occurred which was symptomatic of these tensions. Just before the Australians were due to play Middlesex at Lord's, W.G. Grace suddenly demanded that Midwinter play for Gloucestershire in a county match that was taking place at the same time across London at The Oval. Midwinter was bundled into a coach and he departed. A number of the Australians gave chase and confronted W.G. outside The Oval but to no avail. W.G. had his way and Midwinter didn't play for the Australians for the rest of the tour. More significantly, Midwinter's British World facility began to attract criticism from the Australian press. In 1882, the *Bulletin* wryly commented on the way in which 'in Australia he plays as an Englishman; in England as an Australian', while 'Censor' in the *Sydney Mail* was more forthright:

> *Apropos* of Midwinter, I would ask seriously, are the cricketers of the colony … going to submit to another season of vagaries from this very slippery character? One day he is an Australian, and next day an English player. Last season he played with England against Australia, and wanted badly to go to England immediately after as a full-blown Australian cricketer in Murdoch's team. … One year he plays with Shaw's Eleven, for England, against Australia; and after spending the intervening time in the old country as a professional cricketer, and emphasising his position as an English player, he appears, in the short space of less than six months as an Australian against England.[10]

In February 1883, Midwinter responded to these criticisms by declaring once and for all that he 'considers himself an Australian to the

heart's core … he objects therefore to the term "Anglo-Australian" being applied to him, for he felt as much an Australian at heart when playing for Marylebone club or Gloucestershire county as he does now'.[11] Unfortunately this did not stop him being described in 1884 as 'Midwinter … the Anglo-Australian'.[12]

Both of these examples are illustrative of a couple of things regarding the nature of the British World. First, they are indicative of the movement of cultural traffic around the British World. In this way, they embody the manner by which cultural traffic oscillated between metropolitan and colonial nodes but also, particularly via the example of Spofforth, the ways in which such movement enacted change at these nodes. More significantly, both men personify the cultural facility of Britishness but also the tensions and fault lines that could be encapsulated within this cultural identity. Both men were identified as being 'Anglo-Australian' and even, at certain times, self-identified as such. However, this mediated identity could be the focus of some dispute in the metropole, in the case of Spofforth, or the colony, in the case of Midwinter. Thus these 'Anglo-Australians' personify the inherent tensions that lay at the heart of the mediated national identity of this period.

Notes

1. Fred Spofforth (1894) 'Australian Cricket and Cricketers', *New Review* 59: 512.
2. *James Lillywhite's Cricketers' Annual, 1883* (London: Lillywhite, Frowd and Co.), p. 16.
3. Christopher Morris (1976) 'Spofforth, Frederick Robert (1853–1926)', Australian Dictionary of Biography, National Centre of Biography, Australian National University, http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/spofforth-frederick-robert-4629/text7625, accessed 1 December 2015.
4. Quoted in Richard Cashman (2014) *The Demon Fred Spofforth* (Sydney: Walla Walla Press), p. 8.
5. *Birmingham Daily Mail*, 10 June 1889.
6. Neville Cardus (1948), *Days in the Sun: A Cricketer's Book* (London: Rupert Hart-Davis), p. 124.
7. *The Australasian*, 9 June 1888, p. 126.
8. For more on these players, see Richard Cashman (1992) 'Symbols of Imperial Unity: Anglo-Australian Cricketers, 1877–1900', in J.A. Mangan (ed.) *The Cultural Bond: Sport, Empire, Society* (London: Frank Cass), pp. 131–140.

9. Cashman, 'Symbols of Imperial Unity', pp. 137–139.
10. *The Bulletin*, 7 January 1882; *Sydney Mail and New South Wales Advertiser*, 16 December 1882.
11. *Cricket*, 16 February 1883, p. 9: http://stats.acscricket.com/Cricket/1883/index.html, accessed 12 December 2015.
12. Charles Frederick Pardon (1984; first published 1884) *The Australians in England: A Complete Record of the Cricket Tour of 1884* (Cambridge: J.W. McKenzie), p. 104.

CHAPTER 5

Lord Sheffield's 1891–1892 Tour and the Revitalisation of Australian Cricket

Abstract This chapter focuses on the decade before Federation. It shows how the tour of Lord Sheffield's team (featuring a now-aging W.G. Grace) played a key role in the revitalisation of Australian cricket in the 1890s. Not only did this tour help make Australian cricket popular and successful in the colony, it also helped enact some noteworthy structural reforms, including the organisation of a formal, regular intercolonial competition and the establishment of a federated governing body in the Australasian Cricket Council. Thus this tour also demonstrated the continuing importance of the British World scaffold for the development of Australian cricket. However, this renaissance in Australian cricket also witnessed the local Australian particularity within the mediated identity becoming increasingly assertive.

Keywords Lord sheffield · Australian cricket · Cultural traffic
Barracking

Despite the impressive progress made by colonial cricket in the 1870s and early 1880s, cricket in Australia experienced a regression in the late 1880s, a development amply documented by Montefiore's *Cricket in the Doldrums*.[1] This waning was the result of two chief problems: firstly, intercolonial tension between New South Wales and Victoria, and secondly, tensions between the top players (that is, those players who had undertaken many of the previous tours to Britain) and

© The Author(s) 2018

J. van Duinen, *The British World and an Australian National Identity*, Palgrave Studies in Sport and Politics,
DOI 10.1057/978-1-137-52778-3_5

cricket administrators. The exacerbation of these two factors in the late 1880s severely impaired the organisation and running of tours between Australia and Britain. Spofforth may even have offered a prescient comment on this development when he was asked in an interview in 1886 whether Australia would continue to send such high-quality opposition to tour Britain. He answered, 'Cricketers, I think, come in cycles … [and] if you think my opinion worth repeating, it is that there are interregnums in cricket'.[2]

A players' strike in 1885 by the returning 1884 tourists, prompted by the Australian players demanding a larger cut of the gate money, meant that none of the five Test matches played on the 1885–1886 English tour of Australia fielded a full-strength Australian Eleven. These disagreements between colonial administrative authorities and leading players also marred the following 1886 tour of England. This was the first tour to be organised and funded by the Melbourne Cricket Club instead of the usual joint-stock enterprise of previous tours. It was conspicuously publicised as an 'all-amateur' affair and received the following glowing approbation from *Lillywhite's Annual*:

> The visit was invested with additional importance and it certainly appealed more forcibly to the sympathy of English cricketers, from the fact that it was made under the auspices and management of a body which had identified itself actively and closely with the cricket of the Old Country. Exception had been frequently, and with reason, taken to the principles on which the previous tours of Australian teams had been conducted. It was felt, and generally I think, that the best interests of the game were not consulted when the trip was a merely speculative undertaking on cooperative lines run by the players themselves, or a section of them, as a show.[3]

Unfortunately, this encomium could not stop the tour from being, in the words of *Wisden's Cricketers' Almanac*, 'an emphatic failure; whether we regard it as an event of itself or compare it with previous visits to this country of the picked teams of the Australian colonies'.[4]

Anglo-Australian cricket only went from bad to worse with two English teams touring Australia in competition with each other in 1887–1888. Shaw blamed this sorry state of affairs on intercolonial rivalry, with Victoria and New South Wales organising separate tours.[5] Unsurprisingly, both tours were a financial disaster. On 12 November 1887, 'Felix' (ex-Australian cricketer Tom Horan) in the *Australasian*

compared the state of cricket in Britain—where it 'was never so popular as it is now'—to that in Australia, where there had 'been a very pronounced falling off of public support … during the last two or three seasons'.[6] The wrangles between Australian cricket's administration and the players meant that the 1888 Australian side to tour Britain was forced to embark upon the tour without any preliminary matches against sanctioned colonial elevens. *Lillywhite's* claimed that 'never assuredly did a party of cricketers set out on an extensive tour under circumstances so thoroughly calculated to discourage as the Sixth Australian Team which has visited England'. However, it's not entirely clear whether this judgement was prompted more by the fact that the organisation and finances of the tour were once again in the hands of the players.[7] The scheduling of English tours to Australia then went from the one extreme to the other, with no tour taking place at all in the Australian summer of 1888–1889. And last, the 1890 Australian tour of Britain again had to make do without any preliminary matches against colonial elevens and ended up being the first Australian team to lose more matches than it won. The situation was so dire that instead of hailing the benefits that regular tours had on the health of cricketing relations (and British World relations generally), one observer in the *Sydney Mail*, in a peculiar echo of Spofforth's terminology of four years before, pronounced that 'in the interests alike of Australian and English cricket … there is a strong feeling that an interregnum of several years should now occur'.[8]

It is against this backdrop of Australian cricket 'in the doldrums' that a plan was devised for W.G. Grace to once again undertake a cricket tour of Australia after a seventeen-year absence. The man who has been commonly accepted as the architect of this plan was the wealthy aristocrat and cricket enthusiast Lord Sheffield. According to the manager of the 1891–1892 English team, Alfred Shaw, the tour sought to bring 'new life to Australian cricket' and 're-solder, as it were, the links of affection and interest that bound cricketers in the Old Country and the Colonies together'.[9] Australia ended up winning two out of the three Tests with all three matches being very well patronised by the Australian public. For the first Test in Melbourne alone, 75,000 spectators paid to attend over the course of the match.[10] The *Age* reported that these kinds of attendance numbers had not been seen since the English tour of 1882–1883.[11]

As evidenced by Shaw's comments above, the tour had a couple of objectives. The first was to revitalise Australian cricket and, in so doing, resubstantiate British World cricketing bonds. In regards to the former,

the tour was an immense success. The matches were very popular with the Australian public, a fact undoubtedly assisted by both the presence of W.G. and the success of the Australian team, and the consensus in the colonial press was that the tour overall had an extremely positive bearing on cricket in Australia. 'Mid-On' in the *Age* attributed this directly to Lord Sheffield: the tour 'marked a most important epoch in the history of Australian cricket … Twelve months ago the suggestion of such a marvellous revival in the grand old game being probable or even possible would have been laughed to scorn, and therefore the cricketers of Australia cannot too sincerely thank Lord Sheffield for what he has accomplished'. 'Felix' concurred, reporting that the tour 'gave a splendid and much-needed stimulus to cricket throughout Australia. That success acted like an electric current. Everybody talked cricket, everybody was roused to enthusiasm, everybody was delighted. Memories of disastrous defeats on English fields in 1890 died away'.[12] In regards to the 're-soldering' of British World relations, Lord Sheffield, for his part, re-emphasised in his farewell speech the importance of regular cricket tours between Australia and the 'Mother Country' for British World amity and unity.[13]

Lord Sheffield's tour was also of some assistance in another important development—the organisation of a more regularised intercolonial domestic competition. At the start of the tour, Sheffield had communicated to Ben Wardill, secretary of the Melbourne Cricket Club, his desire to provide a trophy worth £150 for a formal competition between the three major cricket-playing colonies of New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia. The issue was taken up at the inaugural meeting of a new body designed to manage Australian cricket—the Australasian Cricket Council (ACC), the membership of which was composed of representatives from these three colonies.[14] It is sometimes thought that the formation of the ACC was also prompted by Lord Sheffield's visit, but there had actually been talk of the need for such an organisation since at least 1890. On 15 November 1890, the *Sydney Mail* reported: 'The New South Wales Cricket Association has decided to communicate with the other colonial associations, with a view to appoint an Australian Cricket Council on the lines of the English County Council'.[15] Obviously Sheffield was in support of such an idea and, indeed, remarked in his speech in Sydney on the necessity that future cricket tours be 'undertaken with the unanimous concurrence and consent of the leading associations of Australia'.[16] When the ACC met for the first time

in September 1892, they agreed on the need for the establishment of a formal intercolonial competition and that 'the £150 offered by Lord Sheffield for promoting cricket in the colonies be devoted to the purchase of a shield, to be called the Sheffield Shield'.[17] This shield would be awarded to the winner of an annual competition between the three member colonies of the ACC. The design of the shield neatly symbolised the Anglo-Australian origins of the competition, with the depiction of a batsman and a bowler beside a plate depicting Lord Sheffield's personal cricket ground, Sheffield Park. It also bore the coat of arms of the earl next to the kangaroo and emu of Australia.

In words that were remarkably similar to those quotes describing the effect of the 1878 Australian tour of England, Shaw noted that Lord Sheffield's tour 'gave new life to Australian cricket, and opened out a new era for the game in the land of the Golden Fleece'.[18] But what did this new era look like? Would Australian cricket be able to maintain the unprecedented success and popularity of the 1891–1892 season without the drawcards of W.G. Grace and Sheffield himself? Secondly, and importantly for this study, was Lord Sheffield also successful in the other stated aim—the 're-soldering' of British World relations? Certainly Sheffield's tour had signified the continued importance of Anglo-Australian networks and there was much British World rhetoric surrounding the tour. But did this augur stronger British World connections and associations in the long term? And what would be the significance of this new era for the finely tuned balance of the mediated national identity in the years leading up to Federation?

That the new era might be marked by continued success and organisational harmony was not immediately apparent for the next tour of the metropole. The 1893 team to visit England was riven with internal schisms with rumours of fights, catches deliberately dropped, drunkenness, and financial deception on the part of the team manager, Victor Cohen. This division off the field translated to poor performances on it, particularly when compared with the thrilling two-Tests-to-one defeat of Lord Sheffield's team in Australia. From the three Tests, the Australians had to settle for two draws and a loss and ended up losing ten first-class matches in total. Furthermore, the friction evident between the players and Cohen, whom the players suspected of taking a cut of the profits for the benefit of the impecunious ACC, was indicative of future difficulties.[19]

The calamities of the 1893 tour were soon forgotten when an England Eleven toured Australia in 1894–1895. In a close-fought affair, England won the first Test by eleven runs and, in doing so, became the first team in Test history to win after following on. They followed this with another win in Melbourne. Australia then won the third Test in Adelaide in blistering heat and easily won the fourth in Sydney by an innings and 147 runs. With the series tied at two-all, the fifth and deciding Test was held back in Melbourne. Public interest in this 'historic Test match' reached unprecedented heights, surpassing even the 1892 matches that had featured the great W.G. Hundreds of fans arrived by train from Adelaide and Sydney, with 28,000 attending the second day alone—a world record for a cricket match—and it was reported that 100,000 attended over the course of the five days. The scores were wired to newspaper offices in Sydney and large crowds blocked the streets to watch the updates being posted in the windows.[20] The *Australasian* described the intense interest that the game aroused in lengthy and vivid detail, claiming that 'no Victorian event … has created so much excitement … [and] those who could get down to the ground every day were looked upon as the lucky ones of this earth'.[21]

The 1896 Australian tour of England continued where the 1894–1895 England tour of Australia left off. In a close-fought three-Test series, Australia was unlucky to lose two to one. Overall, the series enjoyed large crowds, high scoring and very sporting relations between the two teams. The Australian Eleven were disciplined, popular and highly respected and went a long way towards remedying the image left by the previous Australian team in England. The rejuvenation of Australian cricket was well and truly on display when England toured in 1897–1898. After losing the first Test, the Australians went on to win the next four by convincing margins. Of the Australian Eleven, 'Felix' said they were 'the finest combination of players I have ever seen in action. They played as if the eleven had only one mind and that a master-mind of cricket'. The English press, for its part, carped about the fact that the metropole had not sent their best team to the colony.[22] The progress made by Australian cricket since the 'doldrums' of the late 1880s received its ultimate validation when the 1899 Australian side toured England and won the series. This was the first series win in England since the famous 1882 tour. Indeed, the *Times* went one better and concluded that 'Mr Darling's Eleven of 1899 is the best that has ever come from the Antipodes'.[23] The outbreak of the Boer War

on 11 October 1899 then prevented any further international tours until the 1901–1902 English tour of Australia.

Clearly the 1890s saw a resurgence of cricket in Australia, a development that was undoubtedly assisted by the resumption of regular, popular and successful Anglo-Australian tours. But did this period also fulfil Lord Sheffield's other desired outcom—the 're-soldering' of British World bonds between metropole and colony? At a more general level, there was certainly a noticeable upsurge in imperial sentiment in the 1890s. Inspired by the work of Seeley and Dilke regarding Greater Britain, there were various discussions about the possibility of an Imperial Federation. In the sporting sphere there were calls for a kind of pan-Britannic festival that would be held periodically in order to showcase the industrial, cultural and athletic achievements of Greater Britain. Moreover, the 'athletic' part of the festival was by no means to be undervalued since, as the *St James Gazette* reported, 'strong is the bond of nationality, strong are the ties of commerce, but stronger than either is the "union of heart" which comes from devotion to the same forms of recreation'.[24]

Lord Sheffield's tour should be viewed as a manifestation of this new pan-Britannic ideal, this urge to bind closer the far-flung component parts of Greater Britain. As we have seen, Sheffield consciously invoked the British World on the tour and played a role in the amelioration of differences between the colonies through the organisation of the Sheffield Shield. Indeed, at the administrative level there were signs that the newly formed ACC might act as a catalyst for closer cooperation not only between the colonies but with the metropole as well. Upon his departure, Sheffield had advocated for the leading cricketing associations of each state to take over the management of all future tours, and the obvious administrative body for doing so was the ACC. Sheffield's desire received support from the MCC in England which resolved in 1893 that 'if the Australasian Cricket Council find it possible to send over a representative team, it will be welcomed by MCC'.[25] Such official patronage of an Australian team by the MCC was unprecedented.

But if there were plans being laid for a closer union between these governing bodies in the metropole and the colony, they were sabotaged by competing vested interests in Australia. The ACC was hamstrung from its inception by two key rival sources of power in Australian cricket. The first was the traditional administrative bodies in NSW and Victoria that had hitherto shared (and competed for) control of Australian

cricket—the Melbourne Cricket Club and the SCG Trustees. The second rival power source was the players themselves, who had always wielded a significant chunk of control over Anglo-Australian tours and team selection. The formation of the ACC represented a potential loss of control and prestige for both these traditional power centres and thus it never received the support of either; indeed, both consistently acted against it. It was also hampered by persistent financial woes. As C.F.W. Lloyd, vice president of the NSWCA, commented, 'Throughout the period of the Council's existence, international cricket remained in the control of the Melbourne Club. The council was an effete body. It had little, if any, power, and even less control'.[26] On 15 May 1899, NSW resigned from the council, and the life of this purportedly federal body ended with a whimper when the remaining delegates from Victoria and South Australia formally disbanded it in January 1900.[27]

Furthermore, below the administrative level, familiar tensions reappeared which mitigated against any exaggerated aspirations of pan-Britannic concord that may have been being voiced in the upper echelons of Anglo-Australian cricketing administration. Perhaps the most familiar of these tensions was the ongoing wrangles over the status of the Australian cricketers. Again, the Australians were criticised for their crass commercialism and for assuming amateur status when, in metropolitan eyes, they were clearly anything but. The chorus of reproach from the British press was possibly even more acerbic than in previous years. For example, the *Sporting Chronicle* complained in 1899: 'We wine and dine [the Australians], we dub them "Esq." on some of the cricket cards, we treat him to the prefix of "Mr" in some of our leading newspapers, we elevate him above the pronounced professional, yet the Australian cricketers are on a trip in quest of boodle'.[28] Writing in the *Fortnightly Review* in 1900, N.L. Jackson spoke of the scourge of the 'promateur' and singled out the Australian cricketers as 'those great offenders against the first principles of amateurism … [and] why these evils have been so long tolerated by those in authority it is difficult to conceive'.[29] These criticisms were shared at the highest level of cricket administration, with Lord Hawke, a prominent member of the MCC committee, declaring in 1892:

> What I do most strongly object to is that one or two men should 'run' the thing as a commercial proposition and spoil our cricket. If the teams are coming over for the one object of making money, I maintain that they are

> not wanted. But if the Melbourne CC, for instance, will send over men whose object is to play the game, without consideration of how much money it will bring them, then by all means let us welcome such a team. It is one thing to pay an amateur's legitimate expenses, it is another to put money in his pocket.[30]

These issues came to a head on the 1896 Australian tour of England. In scenes reminiscent of the 1881 players' strike by seven Notts professionals, four Surrey professionals and one Notts professional who had been picked for the forthcoming Third Test against the Australians refused to play unless their fee was increased from £10 to £20. On the eve of the match, three players backed down but also signed a letter of explanation in which they proclaimed: 'The Australians have made and are making large sums by these fixtures and it seemed to us only reasonable that we should beneficiate in a small way out of the large amount of money received'. Clearly the striking professionals were equating their status with that of the Australians, a belief which was widespread in Britain. This conflation was made explicit by one journalist in 1896 who asserted:

> As regards the class of the men socially, it is much the same as that of most previous Australian elevens—good, straightforward fellows of the rough and ready sort, but the majority of whom in this country would undoubtedly go into the players' room rather than the pavilion. Not that there is any disgrace in being a pro, for there are no men more respected in the world of sport than such as Lohmann, Briggs, Peel. [31]

Although this statement was made prior to the strike, it is interesting that the three professionals mentioned were also amongst those who went on strike later in the year. The implication, from both the perspective of the English professionals and the metropolitan press, was that 'in this country' the Australians should be categorised as professionals.

This conflation often extended to the way that the Australians played cricket. As we have seen, the Australians had begun to acquire a reputation for slow, obdurate batting in the 1880s. This was even more the case in the 1890s. Arthur Budd, in the *Athletic News and Cyclist's Journal*, wrote that they are 'slow and studiously correct in their cricket, sometimes wearisomely so. They hit at nothing but loose balls, but the fact remains that they are terribly difficult to get rid of'.[32] These sentiments were shared by C.B. Fry who, in the *New Review*, observed that the Australians 'set about

the game with a determination and dogged pluck that are very effective … moreover they are never defeated until the last ball has been bowled … as a rule their batsmen have adopted methods which may be sure, but which are certainly slow'. The end result was that 'the general impression left on the minds of the cricket-watching public is that the batting of the Australian team is dull'.[33] Many of these reports were too diplomatic to make any overt statements regarding the reasons behind such a style of play, but Alfred Lyttelton wasn't so reticent. In explicitly comparing the Australian teams of the 1890s with previous teams of the 1880s, he observed that 'defensive play has become the rule in Australia'. He elaborated further that 'cricket as played by the Australians in England is cricket played straightforwardly and above-board for money and though no suggestion or hint of blame is implied by mentioning the fact, it is obvious that as a result different considerations than those of pure sport may enter into the question of the duration of matches'.[34]

A related issue which became more prominent in the 1890s was the way in which these discussions concerning the cricket status of the Australians began to imply social and cultural differences between the colony and the metropole. That a tacit sociocultural distinction accompanied many of the above quotes concerning the status of the Australian cricketers was always more or less insinuated. That the Australians were equated with English professionals was always not solely a comment on their practice of making money from cricket tours but also on their social position. Indeed, such an insinuation was made explicit in the above quote that described the 'class of the men socially … as good straightforward fellows of the rough and ready sort, but the majority of whom in this country would undoubtedly go into the players' room rather than the pavilion'.

But what is most significant in the 1890s is that the Australians began to talk back to the metropole and criticise the class distinctions embedded in English cricket. Thus, again, there was real bi-directional cultural traffic being transacted on this issue. The Australian batsman M.A. Noble was on record stating that 'the Australians cannot understand the amateurs having one building to themselves, and the professionals another. Then, too, the separate treatment is kept up on the field. The amateurs come out in one group to field, and the professionals another. They lunch apart. Now, this would be quite impossible in Australia'.[35] The manager of the 1899 Australian side, J.H. Phillips, went further to argue that these class distinctions were to the detriment of English cricket:

> Off the field an Australian captain receives the benefit of the opinions of his comrades as if he were chairman of a board of directors. The average English captain is more of an autocrat. He rarely seeks advice from his men. If a consultation be held it is invariably confined to the amateurs and the batsmen, not the professionals and the bowlers … Another mistake is made in England which does not improve cricket as a science—that is, the system of isolating professionals off the field. Surely, if a man is good enough to play on the same side he is good enough to dress in the same dressing-room. It is there most useful hints and ideas are exchanged when a game is in progress, which cannot be done so well on the field.[36]

As always, the response from the metropole is telling. There were some, like Fred A. McKenzie, writing in the *Windsor Magazine*, who saw the more egalitarian element in Australian cricket in a largely positive light. He wrote that the 1896 Australian team was 'a standing witness to the democratic tendencies of colonial life. Our southern dominions know nothing of the sharp divisions between "gentlemen" and "players" that time-honoured custom has sanctioned in England. … Everyone who can do good work is welcome on equal terms with the others, altogether apart from his social position'.[37] However, the response from one of the top English administrators of the game in the 1890s, Lord Hawke, is perhaps more pertinent. In his memoirs, Hawke observed:

> It is rather curious that the Australians themselves do not realise that our Professionals prefer to be 'on their own' off the field rather than to be in the same hotel as the amateurs. Indeed, I know that some of our professionals would prefer to have second-class passages on board ship rather than having to dress each night for dinner. This is not the least diminishing the perfect accord between English amateurs and professionals, both on and off the field … It is merely the statement of a psychological fact, which seems to puzzle our friends in the Antipodes, and which to us, within the group of English cricket, is quite comprehensible and rational.[38]

Whether the metropolitan response was positive (McKenzie) or otherwise (Hawke), the salient point for our purposes is that both opinions were noting a difference between the cricketing culture of the colony and that of the metropole.

In the 1890s, there was another way in which the colony demonstrated an increased assertiveness and that was through the emergence of the 'barracker'. Barracking described the habit of those spectators

in the cheap seats who would indulge in shouting derogatory remarks towards the opposition players. The practice was particularly apparent on the 1897–1898 English tour of Australia, with the captain of the English team, A.E. Stoddart, complaining in his speech at the end of the tour:

> I have the right as an English cricketer who has been out here so often to make a reference to the insults which have been poured upon me and my team during our journey through this country. I can assure you that by a section of the crowd we have been insulted, hooted at, and hissed in every match and on every ground without exception. Another matter is that a certain section of the press has been equally insulting to the team.[39]

Another member of Stoddart's team, Prince Ranjitsinhji, backed up his captain's comments and stated that he had 'never witnessed [in Britain] such continual "barracking" or such abuse meted out in the press'.[40] The *Bulletin* described the barracker as 'fiercely partisan, and the Australian sentiment comes out on top with a decidedly anti-British flavour, expressed in bloodthirsty Australian patois'.[41] It is not immediately apparent whether this was meant as a criticism of the barracker or the opposite. Felix voiced a more reasoned defence of the barracker, maintaining that 'barracking can never be wholly put down in a crowd of 20,000 or 25,000. Roughs who are very insulting may be singled out and removed, but that is all that can be done, or, in fact, need be done. There is no harm in such comments as "'Allo, Mac; the kangaroo is still 'opping"'.[42]

The 1890s bore witness to two developments: one, the resurgence of Australian cricket, both in terms of success on the field and popularity, and two, the continuation of bi-directional cultural traffic and, with this, further shifts in a mediated Australian cricketing identity. To turn to the first point, this second wave of Australian cricketing prowess was subtly different to that of the all-conquering 1882 side. The success of the Australian sides of the late 1890s was built upon solid, defensive batting and close-knit teamwork. This style was criticised in the British press as slow and boring and, in some quarters, prompted more by a concern for gate money than any genuine desire to win the game. But the Australian style found a defender in 'Felix', the Australian ex-cricketer Tom Horan, who commented in 1892 that 'the majority of the English batsmen want to get the runs on the slate a bit too rapidly, and so come to grief

rather speedily. … Australia's batting was sounder, if less showy'.[43] These descriptions of the Australian style in the metropole overlapped with the next issue—the bi-directional cultural traffic associated with the status of the Australian players.

While there still might have been those who would have agreed with the governor of Victoria, Lord Brassey, when he pronounced in 1898 that Anglo-Australian cricket tours 'tend to engage the attention of both England and Australia towards each other, and hence a close relationship of good feeling and brotherhood results', the ongoing and obvious tensions over the status of Australian players increasingly undercut this.[44] In the past, Australian commentators had sought to defend the Australian position, but what is different in the 1890s is a greater propensity to not only defend but to turn the criticism back on the metropole. Hence, the Australian press and players were increasingly forthright in their critique of the social distinctions inherent in the British cricketing world. This decade also saw the emergence of the Australian barracker. While barracking may not represent the kind of demotic expression of partisan nationalism suggested by the *Bulletin*, at the very least it indicates a disinclination to exhibit the deference awarded to previous English tours.

To demonstrate how far we've come from the earliest metropole-to-colony cultural traffic of the 1860s, it would be difficult in the 1890s to see another visiting metropolitan captain echoing H.H. Stephenson's feelings that 'English customs and English feelings were firmly implanted here; the same love of manly sport, the same appreciation of fair play existed that prevails in England. … Everything around us seems so thoroughly English that I could almost imagine we were still home'. There is a neat analogy of this shift in metropole/colony relations that is inadvertently provided in P.F. Warner's *Cricket Across the Seas*. Warner notes that a different follow-on rule had developed in Australia and writes that he was 'very much surprised to learn that this practice had been adopted in all recent Test Matches in Australia, for I had previously imagined that the laws of the Marylebone C.C. extended everywhere, and that in whatever part of the world the game was played those laws were religiously observed'.[45] Again, this is very different to the 1860s and 1870s when Australian cricketers slavishly mimicked the imported English coaching professionals. It is also symbolic of an emergent Australian way of playing cricket that was at odds with the metropolitan model.

Notes

1. Much of the information in the following two paragraphs comes from David Montefiore (1992) *Cricket in the Doldrums: The Struggle Between Private and Public Control of Australian Cricket in the 1880s* (Sydney: Australian Society for Sports History), pp. 56–72. See also Jack Pollard (1987) *The Formative Years of Australian Cricket, 1803–1893* (Sydney: Angus & Robertson), ch. 18.
2. *Pall Mall Gazette*, 8 June 1886, p. 2.
3. *James Lillywhite's Cricketers' Annual, 1887* (London: Lillywhite, Frowd and Co.), p. 18.
4. Quoted in Montefiore, *Cricket in the Doldrums*, pp. 68–69.
5. A.W. Pullin (1902) *Alfred Shaw, Cricketer: His Career and Reminiscences* (London: Cassell and Company), p. 101.
6. *The Australasian* 12 November 1887, p. 933.
7. *James Lillywhite's Cricketers' Annual 1889* (London: Lillywhite, Frowd and Co.), p. 20.
8. *Sydney Mail and New South Wales Advertiser*, 8 November 1890, p. 1053.
9. Pullin, *Alfred Shaw, Cricketer*, p. 104.
10. Pollard, *Formative Years*, p. 309.
11. *The Age* 2 January 1892, p. 9.
12. *The Age*, 29 March 1892, p. 6; *The Australasian*, 24 September 1892, p. 595.
13. Pullin, *Alfred Shaw, Cricketer*, p. 106.
14. Pollard, *Formative Years*, p. 307–13.
15. *Sydney Mail and Daily Advertiser* 15 November 1890, p. 1109.
16. Pullin, *Alfred Shaw, Cricketer*, p. 106.
17. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 15 September 1892, p. 9.
18. Pullin, *Alfred Shaw, Cricketer*, p. 104. This idea of a 'new era' in Australian cricket was echoed by George Giffen (1898) *With Bat and Ball: Twenty-Five Years' Reminiscences of Australian and Anglo-Australian Cricket* (London: Ward, Lock and Co.), p. 120. Cf. quotes about the 1878 tour in chapter two.
19. W.F. Mandle (1973) 'Cricket and Australian Nationalism in the Nineteenth Century', *Journal of the Royal Australian Historical Society* 59: 239; Jack Pollard (1987) *The Turbulent Years of Australian Cricket, 1893–1917* (Sydney: Angus and Robertson), pp. 4–11.
20. Nat Gould (1895) *On and Off the Turf in Australia* (London: George Routledge and Sons), pp. 186–88; *Stoddart's Team in Australia, 1894-1895* (London: A.J. Fiettkau, 1895); Inglis, 'Imperial Cricket', p. 162.
21. *The Australasian*, 9 March 1895, pp. 455–458 (quote from 455).
22. Pollard, *Turbulent Years*, p. 62.

23. *The Times*, 11 September 1899, p. 7.
24. J.A. Mangan (1988) *The Games Ethic and Imperialism: Aspects of the Diffusion of an Ideal* (London: Frank Cass, 1998), pp. 52–54.
25. James Bradley (1990) 'The MCC, Society and Empire: A Portrait of Cricket's Ruling Body, 1860–1914', *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 7, 1: 16.
26. Philip Derriman (1985) *True to the Blue: A History of the New South Wales Cricket Association* (New South Wales: Richard Smart), p. 105.
27. Radcliffe Grace (1985) 'The Rise and Fall of the Australasian Cricket Council, 1892–1900', *Sporting Traditions* 2, 1: 37–46.
28. *Sporting Chronicle* 12 August 1899.
29. N.L. Jackson (1990), 'Professionalism and Sport', *Fortnightly Review*: 160.
30. Interview in *The Cricket Field* (1892): 92.
31. Cited in James Bradley (1991) 'Cricket, Class and Colonialism, c. 1860–1914: A Study of 2 Elites. The Marylebone and Melbourne Cricket Clubs', unpublished Ph.D. thesis (University of Edinburgh), p. 64.
32. Cited in Bradley, 'Cricket, Class and Colonialism', p. 65.
33. C.B. Fry (1896) 'Cricket in '96', *The New Review* (1896): p. 366.
34. Alfred Lyttelton (1899) 'Cricket Reform', *The National Review* 34, 200: p. 233.
35. Quoted in Mandle 'Cricket and Australian Nationalism', 241.
36. *The Australasian* 21 October 1899, p. 917.
37. Fred A. McKenzie, (1896), 'The Australian Cricketers', *The Windsor Magazine*: An Illustrated Monthly for Men and Women, 168. See also the thoughts of British novelist and sports lover Nat Gould, who spent eleven years in Australia between 1884 and 1895. In commenting on the pleasure of attending the cricket grounds of Australia, he wrote, 'In the old country there is far too much catering for the privileged few at the expense of the many. The Australians would never stand for such absurd arrangements as are in force at an Oxford and Cambridge or an Eton and Harrow match. … It is a pleasure to watch a match on the Association Ground, Sydney. It is anything but a pleasure to do so on many English cricket grounds'. Nat Gould (1895) *On and Off the Turf in Australia* (London: George Routledge), pp. 189–190.
38. Lord Hawke (1924) *Recollections and Reminiscences* (London: Williams and Norgate), p. 98.
39. *The Australasian* 5 March 1898, p. 521.
40. Prince Ranjitsinhji (1898) *With Stoddart's Team in Australia* (London: James Bowden), 285–286.
41. *The Bulletin* 23 March 1895, p. 16.
42. *The Australasian*, 26 March 1898, p. 688.

43. *The Australasian* 30 January 1892, p. 209.
44. Prince Ranjitsinhji, *With Stoddart's Team in Australia*, p. 253.
45. P.F. Warner (1903), *Cricket Across the Seas: Being an Account of the Tour of Lord Hawke's Team in New Zealand and Australia* (London: Longmans), pp. 149–52.

CHAPTER 6

Conclusions

Abstract This chapter concludes that, at least from a cricketing standpoint, an Australian national identity in the late nineteenth century was a mediation between a broad British World association and a local Australian particularity. However, the precise mix of these elements within the mediated identity changed and shifted over time. The most important factor for causing change to the mix was the bi-directional cultural traffic that was transmitted with the Anglo-Australian cricket tours. This cultural traffic brought into relief important differences between metropolitan and colonial cricketers, the most significant being the disputed status of the Australian cricketers. Crucially, the 'owning' or defending of this difference before the metropolitan grandstand elicits a more assertive Australianness that stands in contradistinction with a British World affiliation.

Keywords Antipodean condition · Cultural traffic · British World Australian nationalism · Australian national identity · Imaginary grandstand

The period 1860–1901 witnessed the emergence of a mediated national identity in the domain of Australian cricket. In other words, Australian cricket denoted a national identity that was a complex and nuanced compound of feelings of imperial unity and localised national sentiment. The particular balance that was struck between these elements shifted over

© The Author(s) 2018

J. van Duinen, *The British World and an Australian National Identity*, Palgrave Studies in Sport and Politics,
DOI 10.1057/978-1-137-52778-3_6

time, with the localised national sentiment gradually becoming more prominent. Both the constitution of this national identity compound and the changes that took place over time were a consequence of the flows of cultural traffic that passed between metropole and colony. In the early years this cultural traffic was typically metropole-to-colony, which led to a national cricketing identity that was predominantly 'imperial' or British/English. Australian cricket and cricketers strove to achieve a similitude with their metropolitan counterparts by mimicking the metropolitan exemplar that was communicated via the visits of metropolitan cricket teams and the importation of English coaches and players. This found cultural expression in the many articulations of Australia as a 'Britain of the south'.

However, with the first tour of an Australian side to Britain, and hence establishment of more bi-directional cultural traffic, the balance of this mediated national identity began to shift. The first tour, in particular, informed and educated the metropolitan audience concerning Australian cricket and cricketers. This was a point that Lord Sheffield enlarged upon in his speech in Sydney in 1892. He asked rhetorically:

> If any event in the whole history of the Colonies had awakened more interest in the minds of a large section of the community at home, to whom Australia would have otherwise been a sealed book, than the advent of the Australian cricketers. He did not wish to exaggerate … but he claimed that the advent of Australian cricketers to England did discover to a vast portion of the English community the real Australia. It led them to open their maps, and, more than that, their eyes and minds. The knowledge so acquired brought Australia nearer to England.[1]

Thus with the advent of a more bi-directional flow of cultural traffic came a greater awareness and knowledge of Australia in the metropole. As a result, the 'imaginary grandstand' of the metropole became a much more important aspect of identity formation. Most significantly, despite continuing expressions of British World unity and similitude, these bi-directional flows also brought into relief certain differences between metropolitan and colonial cricket. The most obvious and contentious of these was the differing views regarding the status of the Australian players. The less rigid demarcation between professional and amateur status that existed in Australian cricket led to them being classified, from the point of view of the metropole, as 'semi-professionals'

or 'promateurs'—neither amateur nor professional but in an ambiguous, 'other' category. This difference then also began to find expression in descriptions of the Australian way of playing cricket and, in particular, their apparently slow, careful way of batting was likened to the style of English professionals. It was suggested, implicitly or explicitly, that this way of playing proceeded directly from their 'promateur' concern for gate money.

It is clear that for the period of this study, the elements within this national identity rearranged so that the local Australian particularity became more pronounced and assertive. Therefore, this study argues that the composition of this national identity was not a result of local, endemic forces within Australia, but rather a product of the cultural traffic that flowed between colony and metropole. *Despite* the aspirations for British similitude and solidarity, marked cultural differences were revealed and began to be a source of friction. These frictions can also be seen personified through the figures of 'Anglo-Australians' like Spofforth and Midwinter. But it is when Australians begin to defend or 'own' these differences—this Australianness—that we begin to see the first stirrings of a distinctively Australian, non-British aspect to the national identity. This national identity was still a mediated composite of Australian/national particularity and British/imperial association but, by Federation, the Australian sentiment is not only much more assertive but often stands in contradistinction to the British association. This fact was recognised by the British Australian writer Francis Adams, who wrote of Australia and Britain in the 1890s as 'communities far removed and strange to one another, by reason of in many ways very dissimilar natural and social conditions'. Adams was no proto-radical nationalist—he still longed for a closer union between Australia and Britain, but this union would need to be 'one based on the principle of "Alliance not Dependence"'.[2]

This mediated national identity is probably best understood as Antipodean, in the way that Beilharz conceptualised it. As noted in the introduction, the Antipodean identity 'results from the relationship between places and cultures rather than emerging from place, or ground'. And, 'to be Antipodean is to be other, displaced, a reflex of metropolitan culture, and yet part of it, elsewhere'. I think we can see this exemplified in the categorising of the Australian cricketers as semi-professionals or 'promateurs'—a category that was different, or 'other'. Furthermore, Beilharz argued that, from a metropolitan perspective, the

Antipodes were 'the rude bits, the bits that talk back'. I think we can see evidence of this in the 1890s with the Australian criticism of the class distinctions that were embedded within metropolitan cricket. The rise of the barracker in Australian crowds might also represent, at least, the 'rude bits'.

So what does all this tell us about the British World, the imaginary grandstand, and sport as a rehearsal for national concerns? First, it demonstrates that while Australia most definitely saw itself as part of the British World, its place and role within this British World was complex. Despite the many pronouncements of pan-Britannic imperial unity (and uniformity) from both colony and metropole, there were obvious points of disunity and difference. Somewhat ironically, it is the very networks which are purported to underpin the British World that elicit these tensions and ruptures. In this study, the networks are the cricket tours that were conducted at regular intervals between metropole and colony. These cricket tours brought into relief the differences which would work to undercut the many expressions of pan-Britannic harmony. Therefore this study suggests that to gain a deeper knowledge of the British World of c. 1850–1950, one needs to pay more attention to these points of difference and disjuncture. These points of difference are crucial for understanding how feelings of national identity and, in time, nationalism begin to emerge within, or alongside, feelings of imperial loyalty. Or, as others have put it, how Australia begins to see itself as a 'nation-in-Empire'.[3] For while 'nation-in-Empire' looks simple enough on paper, this study has shown that the actual lived experience and performance can be a tricky business, as the two parts of that phrase don't always accord.

Second, are there other ways that this example of cricket can shed light on broader developments, other ways in which, as Davison contends, sport acted as a rehearsal for broader social and political developments? Certainly there were contemporaries who believed in a kind of crossover between sporting concerns and broader society. After the first defeat of an English Eleven by an Australian Eleven in 1877, the *Australasian* propounded:

> For although cricket is, when all is said in its favour, merely an amusement and recreation, yet, nevertheless, the great proficiency attained by colonial players is a most hopeful sign, and gives us reason to believe that the same energy and determination which have led to such happy results in the

> cricket field will be displayed also in the more important concerns which tend to the advancement of the colonies at large.[4]

Somewhat conversely, Shaw worried that the wrangles over the status of the Australian cricketers might affect the imperial relationship. He noted that 'the question was seriously asked if the cricket rivalries of England and the Colonies might not have a lamentable influence upon the more vital relations between the Mother Country and its off-shoots'.[5]

One way in which cricket may have rehearsed larger political developments is in relation to Federation. As noted in the introduction, this was a claim that was first made by Mandle. At first glance, the ACC of the 1890s might seem the obvious example to use as it was evidently an attempt at a federated governing body. Although it ultimately proved a failure, in an oblique way it may have offered salutary lessons to political Federationists of what not to do. It was certainly a good example of what could happen if a federated governing body did not enjoy the support of important vested interests in the individual colonies.[6] Spofforth had recognised some of the intrinsic difficulties of Federation when he stated in the 1880s, 'I doubt if Englishmen will ever understand the spirit of rivalry that runs high between the colonies of Victoria and New South Wales. The spirit is not limited to the field: it extends to politics, to society, to every side of life, indeed, in which the two are brought into contact one with another'.[7]

But the Australian cricket team could also suggest the success that Federation could bring. This was most conspicuous in the form of the Australian Eleven, which was, from the start, a federated entity. As we've seen, the 1878 team that toured England was described as a 'national undertaking' and had 'Australian Eleven' emblazoned on their team bag. The lesson was not lost on contemporaries—for example, the mayor of Albury toasted the 1882 side and remarked that 'the successful result of a cricket federation should be a lesson to the politicians of Australia, who ought to see the advantages which must result from federation of the colonies'.[8] The Australian cricket team represented an even more federated and 'national' entity in the 1890s. The 1899 team included three South Australians, six New South Welshmen, and five Victorians. This team also chose 'a very attractive arrangement of green and gold colours' for their uniforms, colours which were chosen both in an attempt to adopt new colours that would transcend intercolonial rivalries and for the association these colours had with the Australian landscape.

These colours would later be adopted as the national colours of Australia.[9] The point was also acknowledged in the metropole; a cartoon in *Punch* in 1899 under the heading 'Combine Australia' depicted a federated Australian cricket team of kangaroos encircling a British lion with the umpire observing, 'You've done jolly well by combination in the cricket field, and now you're going to federate at home'.[10] This response in the metropole indicates, once again, the efficacy of cultural traffic and significance of the imaginary grandstand.

An examination of an Australian cricketing identity can also afford insights into the character of a broader national identity around the time of Federation. On this issue, the study owes a conceptual debt to Mandle, who was the first to claim such a role for cricket. However, it also departs from the Mandle thesis in important ways. First, as indicated in the introduction, I have deliberately used the term 'national identity' instead of 'nationalism'. This is because, despite Mandle's claims, I don't think we can talk about nationalism per se, at least as defined by Gellner and Anderson, at this point in Australia's history. But we *can* talk about a national identity that was becoming more Australian and less British. Second, and perhaps more fundamentally, this study places this developing Australianness within a broader transnational context. Indeed, it argues that bi-directional flows of cultural traffic between metropole and colony were necessary for the inception and development of the Australian part of this national identity.

To this end, the study also weighs into the historiographical debate concerning 'Australian nationalism'. It suggests that while we may not have the partisan nationalism of Mandle and other radical nationalists, we also do not have the pro-British deference of the British race patriots either. The radical nationalists claimed that a nascent Australian nationalism was always thwarted by the ubiquitous Britishness of the late nineteenth century. But this study has shown that an identifiably Australian identity existed as part of this mediated national identity and, rather than being thwarted, it actually became more conspicuous and assertive. By the same token, this calls into question the claim on the part of the British Australia school that 'Britishness was the dominant cultural myth in Australia, the dominant social idea giving meaning to "the people"'.[11] Instead, this study suggests that both Britishness and a growing sense of Australianness formed a mediated national identity, but the precise balance that was struck between the two shifted and changed over time. While these two elements were not necessarily mutually conflictive,

tensions existed between them and, moreover, these tensions were the key to the local, national element becoming more self-assured. At bottom, this study indicates that the British component, at least in terms of a cricketing identity, was not nearly as hegemonic as both the radical nationalists and the British Australia historians have claimed.

Notes

1. A.W. Pullin (1902) *Alfred Shaw, Cricketer: His Career and Reminiscences* (London: Cassell and Company), pp. 106–107.
2. Francis Adams (2011; first published 1893) *The Australians: A Social Sketch* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 2, 7.
3. Kate Darian-Smith, Patricia Grimshaw and Stuart Macintyre (2007) *Britishness Abroad: Transnational Movements and Imperial Cultures* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press), p. 10.
4. *The Australasian*, 24 March 1877, p. 363.
5. Pullin, *Alfred Shaw, Cricketer*, p. 85.
6. And there's an intriguing overlap between the ACC and Federation in the person of George Reid who was both the president of the NSWCA, which was always the driving force in the ACC, and the NSW premier between 1894 and 1899. He was a supporter of Federation and would go on to be prime minister of Australia in 1904–1905. See Chris Harte (1987) *The History of the Sheffield Shield* (Sydney: Allen and Unwin), p. 16.
7. Fred Spofforth (1894) 'Australian Cricket and Cricketers', *New Review* 59: 515.
8. *Sydney Mail and New South Wales Advertiser*, 2 December 1882, p. 995.
9. Quoted in Peter Sharpham (1994) 'The Origin of the Green and Gold', *Sporting Traditions*: 127–129.
10. *Punch, or the London Charivari*, 28 June 1899, p. 302.
11. Neville Meaney (2001) 'Britishness and Australian Identity: The Problem of Nationalism in Australian History and Historiography', *Australian Historical Studies* 32, 116: 79.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Newspapers

The Age.
Argus.
The Australasian.
Bell's Life in London and Sporting Chronicle.
Bell's Life in Victoria and Sporting Chronicle.
Birmingham Daily Mail.
The Brisbane Courier.
The Bulletin.
Clarence and Richmond Examiner and New England Advertiser.
Nelson Evening Mail.
Pall Mall Gazette.
Punch, or the London Charivari.
The Spectator.
Sporting Chronicle.
Sydney Mail and New South Wales Advertiser.
The Sydney Morning Herald.
The Times.

Other primary sources

Adams, Francis. 2011. First published 1893. *The Australians: A Social Sketch*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s) 2018

J. van Duinen, *The British World and an Australian National Identity*, Palgrave Studies in Sport and Politics,
DOI 10.1057/978-1-137-52778-3

Brumfitt, George. 1887. *England vs. Australia at the Wicket*. Ilkley: Brumfitt & Kirby.

Cricket. 16 February 1883, p. 9. http://stats.acscricket.com/Cricket/1883/index.html. Accessed 19 Nov 2015.

Deakin, Alfred. 1905. *Imperial Federation: An Address Delivered by Hon*. In M.P. Alfred Deakin at the *Annual Meeting of the Imperial Federation League of Victoria*, 14 June 1905. Melbourne: The League.

Dilke, Charles. 1869. *Greater Britain: A Record of Travel in English-Speaking Countries in 1866-1867*. London: Macmillan.

Fry, C.B. 1896. Cricket in '96. *New Review*.

Garran, R.R. 1897. *The Coming Commonwealth*. Sydney: Angus & Robertson.

Giffen, George. 1898. *With Bat and Ball: Twenty-Five Years' Reminiscences of Australian and Anglo-Australian Cricket*. London: Ward, Lock and Co.

Gould, Nat. 1895. *On and Off the Turf in Australia*. London: George Routledge.

Grace, W.G. 1899. '*W.G.': Cricketing Reminiscences and Personal Recollections*. London: James Bowden.

Harris, Lord. 1883. The Development of Cricket. *The National Review* 2 (7).

Hawke, Lord. 1924. *Recollections and Reminiscences*. London: Williams and Norgate.

Jackson, N.L. 1900. Professionalism and Sport. *Fortnightly Review* 73.

James Lillywhite's Cricketers' Annual, 1879. London: Lillywhite, Frowd and Co.

James Lillywhite's Cricketers' Annual, 1881. London: Lillywhite, Frowd and Co.

James Lillywhite's Cricketers' Annual, 1882. London: Lillywhite, Frowd and Co.

James Lillywhite's Cricketers' Annual, 1883. London: Lillywhite, Frowd and Co.

James Lillywhite's Cricketers' Annual, 1887. London: Lillywhite, Frowd and Co.

James Lillywhite's Cricketers' Annual, *1889*. London: Lillywhite, Frowd and Co.

James Lillywhite's Cricketers' Companion, 1883. London: Lillywhite, Frowd and Co.

Lyttelton, Alfred. 1899. Cricket Reform. *The National Review* 34: 200.

McKenzie, Fred A. 1896. The Australian Cricketers. *The Windsor Magazine: An Illustrated Monthly for Men and Women*.

Pardon, Charles Frederick. 1984. First published 1884. *The Australians in England: A Complete Record of the Cricket Tour of 1884*. Cambridge: J.W. McKenzie.

Parkes, Henry. 1884. Our Growing Australian Empire. *The Nineteenth Century* 15 (83): 138–149.

Parliament of Australia, House of Representatives, 12 September 1901. http://parlinfo.aph.gov.au/parlInfo/search/display/display.w3p;query=Id%3A%22hansard80%2Fhansardr80%2F1901-09-12%2F0013%22. Accessed 20 July 2016.

Pullin, A.W. 1902. *Alfred Shaw, Cricketer: His Career and Reminiscences*. London: Cassell.
Ranjitsinhji, Prince. 1898. *With Stoddart's Team in Australia*. London: James Bowden.
Spofforth, Fred. 1894a. Australian Cricket and Cricketers. *New Review* 59.
Spofforth, Fred. 1894b. English Cricket and Cricketers. *New Review* 60.
Steel, A.G., and R.H. Lyttelton. 1898. *Cricket*. London: Longmans, Green and Co.
Stoddart's Team in Australia, 1894–95. 1895. London: A.J. Fiettkau.
Twopeny, R.E.N. 1973. *First Published 1883. Town Life in Australia*. Sydney: Sydney University Press.
Warner, P.F. 1903. *Cricket Across the Seas: Being an Account of the Tour of Lord Hawke's Team in New Zealand and Australia*. London: Longmans.
Warner, P.F. 1912. *Imperial Cricket*. London: The London and Counties Press Association.

Secondary Sources

Allen, Dean. 2012. England's 'Golden Age': Imperial Cricket and Late Victorian Society. *Sport in Society* 15 (2): 209–226.
Alomes, Stephen. 1988. *A Nation at Last? The Changing Character of Australian Nationalism, 1880–1988*. Sydney: Angus & Robertson.
Anderson, Benedict. 1983. *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso.
Ballantyne, Tony. 2003. Rereading the Archive and Opening Up the Nation-State: Colonial Knowledge in South Asia (and Beyond). In *After the Imperial Turn: Thinking with and Through the Nation*, ed. Antoinette Burton. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Batcheldor, Alf. 2011–2012. A Revised Look at the Spiers and Pond Tour of 1861/62. *The Yorker* 46: 16–23.
Beilharz, Peter. 1997. *Imagining the Antipodes: Culture, Theory and the Visual in the Work of Bernard Smith*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Beilharz, Peter. 2005. Australia: The Unhappy Country, or, a Tale of Two Nations. *Thesis Eleven* 82: 73–87.
Beilharz, Peter. 2005. Introduction. *Thesis Eleven* 82: 3–4.
Bell, Duncan. 2007. *The Idea of Greater Britain*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Birrell, Robert. 1995. *A Nation of Our Own: Citizenship and Nation-Building in Federation Australia*. Melbourne: Longman Cheshire.
Blainey, Ann, and Mary Lazarus. 1976. Rusden, George William (1819–1903). Australian Dictionary of Biography, National Centre of Biography. Australian National University. http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/rusden-george-william-4523/text7405. Accessed 10 Sep 2015.

Blair, Jim. 2011–2012. Spiers and Pond in England. *The Yorker* 46: 24–27.
Bradley, James. 1990. The MCC, Society and Empire: A Portrait of Cricket's Ruling Body, 1860–1914. *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 7 (1): 3–22.
Bradley, James. 1991. Cricket, Class and Colonialism, c. 1860–1914: A Study of 2 Elites. The Marylebone and Melbourne Cricket Clubs. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis. University of Edinburgh.
Bridge, Carl, and Kent Fedorowich. 2003. *The British World: Diaspora, Culture and Identity*. London: Frank Cass.
Buckner, Phillip, and R. Douglas Francis. 2005. *Rediscovering the British World*. Calgary, AB: University of Calgary Press.
Buckner, Phillip, and R. Douglas Francis. 2006. *Canada and the British World*. Vancouver: UBC.
Cardus, Neville. 1948. *Days in the Sun: A Cricketer's Book*. London: Rupert Hart-Davis.
Cashman, Richard. 1992. Symbols of Imperial Unity: Anglo-Australian Cricketers, 1877–1900. In *The Cultural Bond: Sport, Empire, Society*, ed. J.A. Mangan. London: Frank Cass.
Cashman, Richard. 1998. Australia. In *The Imperial Game: Cricket, Culture and Society*, ed. Keith A.P. Sandiford and Brian Stoddart. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
Cashman, Richard. 2002. *Sport in the National Imagination: Australian Sport in the Federation Decades*. Sydney: Walla Walla Press.
Cashman, Richard. 2014. *The Demon Fred Spofforth*. Sydney: Walla Walla Press.
Clark, Manning. 1995. First published 1962–1988. In *A History of Australia*, 6 vols. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.
Cole, D. 1971. The Crimson Thread of Kinship: Ethnic Ideas in Australia, 1870–1914. *Historical Studies* 14 (56): 511–525.
Cole, D. 1971. The Problem of 'Nationalism' and 'Imperialism' in British Settlement Colonies. *Journal of British Studies* 10 (2): 160–182.
Curran, James, and Stuart Ward. 2010. *The Unknown Nation: Australia After Empire*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.
Darian-Smith, Kate, Patricia Grimshaw, Kiera Lindsay, and Stuart Macintyre. 2007. *Exploring the British World*. Melbourne: RMIT.
Darian-Smith, Kate, Patricia Grimshaw, and Stuart Macintyre. 2007. *Britishness Abroad: Transnational Movements and Imperial Cultures*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.
Davison, Graeme. 2002. The Imaginary Grandstand. *Meanjin* 61 (3): 4–18.
Day, David. 1988. *The Great Betrayal: Britain, Australia and the Onset of the Pacific War, 1939–42*. Sydney: Angus & Robertson.
Day, David. 1992. *The Reluctant Nation: Australia and the Allied Defeat*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Derriman, Philip. 1985. *True to the Blue: A History of the New South Wales Cricket Association*. New South Wales: Richard Smart.

Docker, Edward Wybergh. 1978. *Bradman and the Bodyline Series*. Brighton: Angus & Robertson.

Frith, David. 2003. *Bodyline Autopsy: The Full Story of the Most Sensational Test Cricket Series: Australia v England, 1932–33*. Sydney: ABC.

Gare, Deborah. 1999. Dating Australia's Independence: National Sovereignty and the 1986 Australia Acts. *Australian Historical Studies* 30: 251–266.

Gellner, Ernst. 1983. *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Grace, Radcliffe. 1985. The Rise and Fall of the Australasian Cricket Council, 1892–1900. *Sporting Traditions* 2 (1): 37–46.

Griffiths, John. 2014. *Imperial Culture in Antipodean Cities, 1880–1939*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Harte, Chris. 1987a. Mr. Murdoch's Speech. *Australian Cricket Journal* 2 (3).

Harte, Chris. 1987b. *The History of the Sheffield Shield*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Holt, Richard. 1989. *Sport and the British*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Hudson, W.J., and M.P. Sharp. 1988. *Australian Independence: Colony to Reluctant Kingdom*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.

Hughson, John. 2009. *The Making of Sporting Cultures*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Inglis, K.S. 1979. Imperial Cricket: Test Matches Between Australia and England, 1877–1900. In *Sport in History: The Making of Modern Sporting History*, ed. Richard Cashman, and Michael McKernan. Brisbane: University of Queensland Press.

Irving, Helen. 1997. *To Constitute a Nation: A Cultural History of Australia's Constitution*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Knox, Malcolm. 2011. Day of the Windjammer. In *Australia: Story of a Cricket Country*, ed. Christian Ryan. Melbourne: Hardie Grant.

Lake, Marilyn. 2013. British World or New World? Anglo-Saxonism and Australian Engagement with America. *History Australia* 10 (3): 36–50.

Lazenby, John. 2015. *The Strangers Who Came Home: The First Australian Cricket Tour of England*. London: Bloomsbury.

Le Quesne, A. Laurence. 1983. *The Bodyline Controversy*. London: Unwin.

Lester, Alan. 2006. Imperial Circuits and Networks: Geographies of the British Empire. *History Compass* 4 (1): 124–141.

Lynch, Steven. 2015. *Wisden on the Ashes: The Authoritative Story of Cricket's Greatest Rivalry*. London: Bloomsbury.

Malcolm, Dominic. 2013. *Globalizing Cricket: Englishness, Empire and Identity*. London: Bloomsbury.

Mandle, W.F. 1973. Cricket and Australian Nationalism in the Nineteenth Century. *Journal of the Royal Australian Historical Society* 59: 225–246.

Mandle, W.F. 1973. Games People Played: Cricket and Football in England and Victoria in the Late Nineteenth Century. *Historical Studies* 15 (60): 511–535.

Mandle, W.F. 1976. Wills, Thomas Wentworth (1835–1880). Australian Dictionary of Biography, National Centre of Biography, Australian National University. http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/wills-thomas-wentworth-4863/text8125. Accessed 10 Sep 2015.

Mangan, J.A. 1992. Britain's Chief Spiritual Export: Imperial Sport as Moral Metaphor, Political Symbol and Cultural Bond. In *The Cultural Bond: Sport, Empire, Society*, ed. J.A. Mangan. London: Frank Cass.

Mangan, J.A. 1998. *The Games Ethic and Imperialism: Aspects of the Diffusion of an Ideal*. London: Frank Cass.

Mason, Ronald. 1984. *Ashes in the Mouth: The Story of the Bodyline Tour of 1932–33*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

McGregor, Russell. 2006. The Necessity of Britishness: Ethno-Cultural Roots of Australian Nationalism. *Nations and Nationalism* 12 (3): 493–511.

Meaney, Neville. 2001. Britishness and Australian Identity: The Problem of Nationalism in Australian History and Historiography. *Australian Historical Studies* 32 (116): 76–90.

Meaney, Neville. 2015. The Problem with Nationalism and Transnationalism in Australian History: A Reply to Marilyn Lake and Christopher Waters. *History Australia* 12 (2): 209–231.

Montefiore, David. 1992. *Cricket in the Doldrums: The Struggle Between Private and Public Control of Australian Cricket in the 1880s*. Sydney: Australian Society for Sports History.

Morris, Christopher. 1976. Spofforth, Frederick Robert (1853–1926). Australian Dictionary of Biography, National Centre of Biography, Australian National University. http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/spofforth-frederick-robert-4629/text7625. Accessed 1 Dec 2015.

Nesbitt, Bruce. 1971. Literary Nationalism and the 1890s. *Australian Literary Studies* 5 (1): 3–17.

Pycroft, James. 1851. *The Cricket Field*. London: Longmans.

O'Hara, John. 1986. An Approach to Colonial Sports History. In *Sport and Colonialism in Nineteenth Century Australasia*, ed. Wray Vamplew. Adelaide: The Australian Society for Sports History.

Pollard, Jack. 1987. *The Formative Years of Australian Cricket, 1803–93*. Sydney: Angus & Robertson.

Pollard, Jack. 1987. *The Turbulent Years of Australian Cricket, 1893–1917*. Sydney: Angus & Robertson.

Pryke, Olwen. 2009. As Others See Us: Representations of Australia in the British Press, 1900–1910. *Australian Studies* 1 (1): 1–23.

Sandiford, Keith. 1994. *Cricket and the Victorians*. Aldershot: Scholar.

Sandiford, Keith A.P., and Brian Stoddart. 1998. *The Imperial Game: Cricket, Culture and Society*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Schreuder, Deryck M., and Stuart Ward. 2008. Introduction: What Became of Australia's Empire. In *Australia's Empire*, ed. Deryck M. Schreuder, and Stuart Ward. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Seeley, John Robert. 2005. First published 1883. *The Expansion of England: Two Courses of Lectures*. New York: Cosimo.

Sharpham, Peter. 1994. The Origin of the Green and Gold. *Sporting Traditions* 10 (2): 123–130.

Sissons, Ric. 1988. *The Players: A Social History of the Professional Cricketer*. Sydney: Pluto.

Sissons, Ric, and Brian Stoddart. 1984. *Cricket and Empire: The 1932–33 Bodyline Tour of Australia*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Smith, Bernard. 1960. *European Vision and the South Pacific, 1768–1850: A Study in the History of Art and Ideas*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Smith, Bernard. 1992. *Imagining the Pacific: In the Wake of the Cook Voyages*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.

Stoddart, Brian. 2008a. Cricket's Imperial Crisis: The 1932–33 MCC Tour of Australia. In *Sport, Culture and History: Region, Nation and Globe*. London: Routledge.

Stoddart, Brian. 2008b. Sport, Cultural Imperialism and Colonial Response in the British Empire. In *Sport, Culture and History: Region, Nation and Globe*. London: Routledge.

The Cricket Field. 1892. London.

Tsokhas, Kosmas. 2001. *Making a Nation State: Cultural Identity, Economic Nationalism and Sexuality in Australian History*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.

van Duinen, Jared. 2015. Bodyline, the British World and the Evolution of an Australian National Identity. *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 32 (2): 250–264.

Vamplew, Wray. 1994. Australians and Sport. In *Sport in Australia: A Social History*, ed. Wray Vamplew, and Brian Stoddart. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ward, Russel. 1958. *The Australian Legend*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Ward, Russel. 1977. *A Nation for a Continent: The History of Australia, 1901–1975*. Richmond, VIC: Heinemann Educational Australia.

Ward, Stuart. 2001. *Australia and the British Embrace: The Demise of the Imperial Ideal*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.

Waters, Christopher. 2015. A Reply to Neville Meaney. *History Australia* 12 (2): 232–237.

Index

A
Aboriginal cricket team (1868), 17
Adams, Francis, 67, 71
Adelaide, 26, 54
The Age, 51, 62
Albert Club, 16, 18
Amateur/professional status, 31, 37, 56, 66
Anderson, Benedict, 7, 14, 70
Anglo-Australian cricket tours
1861–62 (to Australia), 35
1863–64 (to Australia), 18
1873–74 (to Australia), 19
1876–77 (to Australia), 26
1878 (to England), 15, 26, 44, 45, 53, 69
1878–79 (to Australia), 32
1880 (to England), 33
1882 (to England), 34, 54
1884 (to England), 36, 37, 45
1885–1886 (to Australia), 50
1886 (to England), 50
1887–88 (to Australia), 50
1888 (to England), 51
1888–89 (to Australia), 51
1890 (to England), 51
1891–92 (to Australia), 51
1893 (to England), 53
1894–95 (to Australia), 54
1896 (to England), 54, 57
1897–98 (to Australia), 54, 60
1899 (to England), 54
Antipodean condition, 9
Antipodes, 9, 10, 32, 54, 59, 68
ANZAC, 3
Argus, 17, 22, 38, 42
Arrowsmith, R.L., 30
The Ashes, 34, 35
Athletic News and Cyclist's Journal, 57
The Australasian, 5, 13, 18, 20, 22, 23, 27, 28, 30, 31, 38, 40–42, 46, 50, 54, 62–64, 68, 71
Australasian Cricket Council (ACC), 52, 53, 55, 69, 71
Australian Labor Party, 4
Australianness, 2, 39, 67, 70

B
Barracking, 59–61
Barton, Edmund, 3
Batting, 29, 30, 35, 57, 60, 61, 67

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s) 2018

J. van Duinen, *The British World and an Australian National Identity*, Palgrave Studies in Sport and Politics,
DOI 10.1057/978-1-137-52778-3

Beilharz, Peter, 9, 10, 14, 67
Bell's Life in London, 33, 41
Birmingham, 28
Bodyline, 6, 13
Boer War, 54
Bowling, 17, 19, 29, 30, 35, 39, 40, 43
Brassey, Lord, 61
Brisbane Courier, 37, 42
British Empire, 6, 8
British Enlightenment, 9
Britishness, 2–5, 19, 20, 33, 35, 44–46, 70
British race patriotism, 3, 4, 6, 21
British World, 1, 7, 8, 10, 16, 17, 19–22, 25, 27, 28, 30, 33–36, 39, 40, 43–46, 51–53, 55, 66, 68
Brumfitt, George, 39, 42
Budd, Arthur, 57
The Bulletin, 4, 12, 45, 47, 60, 61, 63

C
Caffyn, William, 18
Canada, 8, 14, 17
Cardus, Neville, 44, 46
Clarence and Richmond Examiner and New England Advertiser, 38, 42
Cohen, Victor, 53
Conway, John, 26, 27, 30, 31
Cook, James, 9
Cosstick, Sam, 19
Cricket, 2, 4–6, 10, 16–21, 25, 27–40, 44, 49–56, 58, 59, 61–63, 65, 66, 68–70
The Cricket field, 6, 29, 30, 32, 41, 63, 68, 70
Crowd riot, 32
Cultural traffic, 7, 9, 10, 15–17, 19, 20, 22, 27, 29, 30, 32, 39, 40, 43, 44, 46, 58, 60, 61, 66, 67, 70

D
Daily News, 20
Daily Telegraph, 33
Darling, Joe, 54
Davison, Graeme, 1, 8, 10, 68
Deakin, Alfred, 4, 12
Derbyshire, 44
Devlin, Arthur, 17
Dilke, Charles, 21, 23, 55

E
England, 4, 6, 12, 13, 15–17, 19–23, 26–28, 30, 32, 34, 36–40, 42, 44, 45, 50, 51, 53–55, 57–59, 61, 66, 69
Eureka Stockade, 3

F
Federation, 2–4, 10, 12, 53, 67, 69–71
Fielding, 29, 30, 35
Fortnightly Review, 56, 63
Francis, J.G., 27
Fry, C.B., 57, 63

G
Gate money, 33, 35, 37, 50, 60, 67
Gellner, Ernst, 7, 14, 70
Gloucestershire, 45, 46
Grace, William Gilbert ('W.G.'), 6, 13, 18, 22, 26, 38, 39, 42, 45, 51, 53
Greater Britain, 21, 23, 28, 34, 39, 55
Gregory, Dave, 28
Gregory, Ned, 18

H
Haines, William, 20
Hammersley, W.J., 16

Holt, Richard, 7, 8, 10, 13, 26
Horan, Tom ('Felix'), 50, 60
Hughes, Billy, 3

I
Imaginary grandstand, 1, 9, 10, 28, 29, 32, 66, 68, 70
Immigration Restriction Act (White Australia policy), 4
Imperial Federation, 12, 55
Imperialism, 11, 13, 63
Inglis, K.S., 5, 12, 42, 62
Intercolonial tension, 49

J
Jackson, N.L., 56, 63

L
Lawrence, Charles, 18
Lester, Alan, 8, 14
Lillywhite, James, 19, 21, 26, 28–30, 43, 51
Lillywhite's Cricketers' Annual, 28, 29, 33–35, 41, 42, 46, 50, 62
Lillywhite's Cricketers' Companion, 35, 42
Lloyd, C.F.W., 56
London Globe, 26
Lord Harris, 32–34, 36, 37, 42
Lord Hawke, 6, 56, 59, 63
Lord Sheffield, 51–53, 55, 66
Lord's cricket ground, 28
Lyttelton, Alfred, 58, 63

M
Manchester, 21, 28
Mandle, W.F., 4–6, 12, 22, 62, 63, 69, 70
Mangan, J.A., 6, 13, 63
Marshall, George, 18
Mary-Le-Bone Cricket Club (MCC), 13, 16, 26, 28, 32, 35, 38, 55, 56
McKenzie, Fred A., 59, 63
Meaney, Neville, 7, 11, 71
Melbourne, 11, 12, 17, 19–22, 26, 36, 51, 54, 57
Melbourne Cricket Club, 16–18, 30, 38, 50, 52, 56, 63
Melbourne Cricket Ground (M.C.G.), 20, 31
Middlesex, 45
Midwinter, William 'Billy', 44–46, 67
Montefiore, David, 16, 22, 40, 42, 49, 62
Murdoch, William, 36, 37, 42, 44, 45

N
National colours, 70
National identity, 1, 2, 4, 7, 9, 10, 13, 26, 28, 36, 39, 44, 46, 53, 65–68, 70
Nationalism, 2–7, 11, 12, 61, 62, 68, 70, 71
Networks, 8, 10, 16, 17, 19, 40, 53, 68
New Review, 40, 41, 46, 57, 63, 71
New South Wales, 16, 18, 32, 33, 42, 49, 50, 52, 69
New South Wales Cricket Association (NSWCA), 27, 33, 52, 56, 71
New Zealand, 8, 64
Noble, M.A., 58
Nottinghamshire (Notts), 18, 34, 37, 57

O
The Oval cricket ground, 28

P
Pardon, C.F., 27, 41, 47
Parkes, Henry, 3, 11
Parr, George, 18
Phillips, J.H., 58
Players' strikes, 50, 57
Pocock, J.G.A., 7
Prince Ranjitsinhji, 60, 63, 64
Professional cricketers, 31, 37–39, 42, 45
Punch, or the London Charivari, 70, 71
Pycroft, James, 30, 41

R
Radical nationalist historians, 2, 3, 8
Revisionism, 3
Ronald, James, 4
Rugby School, 17, 30
Rusden, George William, 20, 23

S
Said, Edward, 9
Sandiford, Keith, 5, 12
Saturday Review, 37
Seeley, John, 21, 23, 55
Semi-professionals, 32, 37, 66, 67
Settler colonies, 8, 21
Shaw, Alfred, 12, 20, 21, 23, 25, 34, 40, 45, 50, 51, 53, 62, 69, 71
Sheffield, 28, 52, 53, 55
Sheffield Park, 53
Sheffield Shield, 53, 55
Smith, Bernard, 9, 10, 14
South Australia, 52, 56
Southerton, James, 43
The Spectator, 31, 41
Spiers and Pond, 17, 22, 35
Spofforth, Fred 'the Demon', 28, 41, 43, 46
Sporting and Dramatic News, 37
Sporting Chronicle, 22, 23, 41, 56, 63
Sporting Gazette, 31
St.James Gazette, 55
Stephenson, H.H., 17, 20, 32, 33, 61
Stoddart, A.E., 60
Surrey, 16, 17, 19, 21, 34, 57
Sydney, 10, 12, 16, 19, 20, 33, 44, 52, 54, 63, 66
Sydney Mail, 39, 42, 45, 47, 51, 52, 62, 71
Sydney Morning Herald, 27, 40, 41, 62

T
Tarrant, George, 43
Test matches, 12, 19, 35, 36, 42, 45, 50, 61
The Times, 41, 54, 63
Thompson, Nathaniel, 18
Trade unions, 4
Transnationalism, 11, 14
Trinity College, Cambridge, 16
Trott, Harry, 4
Twopeny, R.E.N., 2, 10

U
United States, 17

V
Vamplew, Wray, 5, 13
Vanity Fair, 44
Victoria, 16–18, 22, 23, 30, 32, 49, 50, 52, 55, 56, 61, 69
Victorian Cricket Association (VCA), 27

W
Wardill, Ben, 52
Warner, P.F., 6, 22, 61, 64
Wills, Tom, 16, 30
The Windsor Magazine, 59, 63
Wisden's Cricketers' Almanac, 50
The World, 37

Y
Yorkshire, 21