

May the Best Man Win
Sport, Masculinity, and Nationalism in
Great Britain and the Empire, 1880–1935

Patrick F. McDevitt

CHAPTER FIVE

Defending White Manhood: The Bodyline Affair in England and Australia

Life is short, but cricket is long. We live in a world which shakes on its foundations. We have seen stable things totter and fall before our eyes. Great empires have passed away, great kings and Churches have fallen in ruin. American prosperity, the faith of the naïf, has shown itself the plaything of time. Even the pound sterling, the rock of ages, has crumbled in our sight. Darwin has disturbed our pride, and Galileo has undermined our fables. Einstein has upturned our calculations, and Freud our notions of morality. The stable things are shaky things, no match in their pretentiousness for time and tide. The simple things outlive them. After all successive ruins we still find the sand, the grass, life, and human impulse, much as they were before. Because of this nexus with simple things, none of the shakers has been able to shake our English soul and spirit which takes its form in cricket.

—"Gryllus," *Homage to Cricket*, 1933¹

Ludus enim genuit trepidum certamen et iram;

Ira truces inimicitias et funebre bellum!

("A game may beget dreadful strife and wrath,

and from wrath may spring savage enmities and murderous war.")

—Mr. Reginald Carter, letter to *The Times*, January 26, 1933²

In the Australian summer of 1932–33, a cricket team sponsored by the Marleybone Cricket Club (MCC) and representing England was placed under the command of a dour Scotsman named Douglas Jardine and sent to Australia to avenge their humiliating defeat at the hands of the Australians in the English summer of 1930. Hoping to curtail the prolific scoring of a young New South Welsh batsman named Don Bradman, who had embarrassingly dominated the English in 1930, Jardine devised an arguably novel form of bowling attack which eventually came to be referred to as "Bodyline," or as many English commentators preferred,

“fast leg-theory.” Bodyline involved the highly dangerous and ethically dubious practice of bowling fast, high-bouncing balls at or near the upper-body and head of the batsman while a semicircle of fielders was menacingly placed within yards of the wicket. This left the batsman no sporting chance of success and a great likelihood of sustaining an injury.³ This would all be unremarkable except for the fact that the Australian furor in response to this bowling attack, coupled with the English refusal to abandon it, led to a scandal which shook the imperial sporting world; it led to a significant loss of prestige for the English in the eyes of many in the Empire and opened the door for a variety of challenges to English preeminence in imperial culture. The game, which had previously been viewed, as illustrated above in Grylls’s *Homage to Cricket*, as more stable than any other institution, had succumbed to the turbulence of the twentieth century. Furthermore, the controversy provided an empire-wide stage for a prolonged debate between England, Australia, and the West Indies over what values should be emblematic of true manhood. Notions of class and race prevalent at that time strongly influenced this debate.

Richard Holt has written that the Bodyline affair was “probably the best-researched controversy in the history of sport.” The controversy excited not only an outpouring of literature at the time, but has continued to interest historians ever since.⁴ While the contemporary books and articles largely either chose sides in order to assign blame or attempted to point a way out of the imperial quagmire, secondary sources have tended to give causal significance to nationalistic feelings. However, nationalism alone cannot explain the significance attached to the incident at the time. Class, race, and gender considerations were equally to blame for the passions stirred by a simple dispute over a game. For many white Britons and Australians, defending their respective visions of cricket became nothing less than the defense of their visions of white manhood, an undertaking made all the more urgent by the floundering economies ineffectively coping with the Great Depression and sapping national morale.

The determination to win that the English took to Australia in 1932 and the subsequent support that the English public gave its team and captain in the face of all logic and tradition leads one to the conclusion that much more was at stake than a mere desire to avenge a series loss in 1930. The English had lost series numerous times before and did not resort to questionable tactics to restore their athletic pride. Of course, part of their resolve to stop the Australians can be traced to the unprecedented debut of Bradman who presented the possibility of stymieing the British for the next 15 years. However, it would appear that this alone was not sufficient to account for the English acceptance of the turmoil that ensued. Rather, the perception of crises of masculinities in both Australia and England set the stage for an imperial conflict that would be hard to imagine in any other time.

Ric Sissons and Brian Stoddart argue that “while political and economic tensions might strain good will in restricted circles, cricket was general

currency... [the Bodyline affair] might be equated with the damage done to British prestige at the popular level by the supposed inefficiencies in its generals' disposition of Australian troops during the First World War."⁵ Interest in the tour was widespread and went far beyond the restricted cricketing community that followed English county cricket, the nominally premier domestic county cricket competition.⁶ The public fascination with international Tests between England and Australia dwarfed the attention given to domestic games to the extent that the biannual Ashes tours went a long way toward subsidizing the regular season county matches. Newspapers devoted extensive coverage to the tour, its buildup, and its aftermath. Newspapers from England, Scotland, Wales, Australia, and the West Indies all placed tour news in the main news section rather than with the other sports. Furthermore, even many papers that did not normally cover cricket, like the *Football Post* of Nottingham, for example, placed tour information and Bodyline-related stories as lead news items. Reporters cabled over 300,000 words, a small fortune in telegraph charges, out of Adelaide during the five days of the third Test to all parts of the Empire.⁷

In his seminal autobiography-cum-cricket book, *Beyond a Boundary*, the great West Indian intellectual and cricket writer for the *Manchester Guardian* C.L.R. James wrote about Bodyline in a chapter entitled "Decline of the West." He described the affair as "the blow from which 'It isn't cricket' never recovered."⁸ Although Jardine comes in for particular criticism, James viewed the controversy as something much larger than clash between a handful of personalities. Rather, James wrote, "Body-line was not an incident, it was not an accident, it was not a temporary aberration. It was the violence and ferocity of our age expressing itself in cricket... It began in World War I. Exhaustion and a fictitious prosperity in the late 1920s delayed its maturity. It came into its own in 1929. Cricket could no more resist than other organizations and values of the nineteenth century were able to resist."⁹

It is undoubtedly true that cricket was not immune to the changing world in which it existed. It should perhaps have been expected that public school boys who viewed the war in 1914 as a great game, would eventually come to view their games as war in the aftermath. Nonetheless, the controversy cannot be reduced solely to a reflection of the violence of World War I. Bodyline was the product of a specific historical moment in which economic, social, and gender tensions explosively combined for a brief period that forever changed the institution of cricket and in the process enflamed a generation of men for whom the game was a significant building block in their self-perceptions as men.

Cricket in the Interwar Empire

In the midst of the Great Depression and struggling with calls for the devolution of imperial power, the British Empire, which had seemed unshakable to much of the world in the three decades before the Great War,

was increasingly unstable in 1933. The British Parliament passed the Statute of Westminster, which gave legislative independence to the parliaments of New Zealand, Canada, Newfoundland, the Union of South Africa, the Irish Free State, and Australia, in 1931. In India, the independence movement was in full swing. In addition to the ongoing transformation from Empire to the Commonwealth of Nations, Britain was also experiencing a period of notable flux in gender relations in the interwar years.

The aftershocks of the Great War had left the national psyche of Britain badly scarred and the gender status quo shaken. The psychological and demographic disruptions did not end overnight; in 1933 there were still 8.7 percent more females in England and Wales than males, which fed concerns of gender imbalance.¹⁰ Elite British manhood was particularly unstable. University and public school educated upper-middle-class men were the most likely to have been front-line junior officers, and consequently suffered the greatest proportional losses during the war. Men of this class, like Siegfried Sassoon, Robert Graves, and Edmund Blunden, produced most of the published war poetry and memoirs that helped to shape and articulate English memories of the war and helped cement the myth of the “Lost Generation,” which referred not to the mass of British dead—Britain suffered proportionately smaller losses than Germany or France—but rather to the loss of the upper echelon of British manhood. That so many young men from the relatively small, cohesive English elite died or were psychologically or physically wounded, produced a mass trauma and cult of the dead for the country’s leadership. The interwar period was infused with the popular myth that the cream of England’s youth had been killed in the war, murdered not so much by the Germans, but by an older generation of their own countrymen.¹¹ War poems such as Wilfred Owen’s “Parable of the Old Man and the Young,” which concluded that the older generation had ignored God’s will and sent “half the seed of Europe, one by one” to slaughter, dramatized this intergenerational conflict.¹² Although the trauma was indeed great, one should not exaggerate the extent to which the generation and its successors turned their backs on the Victorian and Edwardian world. England in 1919 was after all more similar than dissimilar to England in 1914. However, a break with the past had occurred, and Victorian ideals were dramatically opened to criticism and revision by the postwar generation.

The class that formed the basis of the Lost Generation myth was the same class that dominated the cricketing establishment of England. The gentleman amateurs, who were the backbone of English county and Test cricket in the 1930s, were the younger brothers of the war generation. Jardine, for example, was born in 1900, and was too young to serve in the war but old enough to live through the aftermath and for a time be the *ex officio* standard bearer of his class’s manhood. The tenacity with which the English defenders of the Bodyline tactics argued their case could be attributed to a siege mentality engendered by the horrific losses of the war and the destabilized position of the public school elite in British society.

Joanna Bourke has argued that the interwar years saw the emergence of new masculinities or new masculine ideals "as a response to the perceived need to reassert manliness in a society undergoing rapid change."¹³ One of these responses was the attempt by the MCC to reestablish English cricketing superiority, and by extension the control and superiority of the MCC-led elite; however they pursued these ends with the adoption of unprecedented means, namely Bodyline.

While the war had disrupted and tarnished old expressions of manliness, English men still looked to the past for guidance in their attempts to remake their world. This nostalgic yearning took many forms: the pressure on women to leave the workforce, animosity toward flappers and New Women, the reassertion of traditional maternal and domestic roles, and fanatical attachment to English victory over Australia at cricket.¹⁴ They simultaneously reached back to the past for comforting images of docile women, pastoral games, and Victorian certainty, while grasping with the other hand for the future that would help them forget the horrors of the war. This desire to reassert the old by resorting to new tactics would come to a head in the Bodyline series. The humiliating loss to the Australians in 1930 came directly on the heels of the great outpouring of war memoirs in 1929 and their renunciation of pre-1914 ideals of valor and honor, which had led so many public school Old Boys to enlist enthusiastically in 1914.

The economy of Great Britain was another obvious concern that shook the English elite and masses alike. The Depression was severely affecting the entire Empire; unemployment in Britain was hovering around 20 percent and between 29 and 34 percent in Australia. British exports had dropped by almost 70 percent between 1920 and 1933.¹⁵ In Australia, there was a widespread belief that the Australian government's decision to follow the advice of the Bank of England to cut expenditures and continue paying debts owed to English banks had worsened the Depression.¹⁶ For example, in 1913, 9.5 percent of Australian export earnings went to repay overseas debt; that figure had climbed to 25.8 percent in 1931 and to a full third by 1933.¹⁷ Australia had become legislatively independent, strategically irrelevant to imperial defense, and economically remote from British interests, but British culture remained one of the prime bonds of Empire. Although the homogeneity and unity of such a far-flung Empire have often been overdrawn, it has been argued that the common ideological beliefs, most notably the tenets of the "civilizing mission" bound the Empire together.¹⁸

Within the British context, perhaps no institution characterized or proselytized the ideological underpinnings of British rule across its diverse collection of colonial possessions more than the sport of cricket. Robert Graves and Alan Hodge wrote that after the Crown, a common Anglo-Australian devotion to cricket "was the chief sentimental link that bound the two countries together."¹⁹ The game of cricket was central to the training and worldviews of British and colonial elites and was seen to

embody the masculine values that had created the Empire. Harold Larwood, the English fast bowler at the center of the controversy, wrote that any attempt to curtail Bodyline bowling would "make of cricket a less manly game. That would be an Imperial disaster."²⁰ A belief that any alteration to the game of cricket would have imperial consequences was such a widespread elite sentiment in the Victorian and Edwardian Empire that Altham and Swanton in their *A History of Cricket* (1938) could state without hyperbole that cricket was "simply the most catholic and diffused, the most innocent, kindly, and manly of popular pleasures. It is a liberal education in itself, and demands temper and justice and perseverance. There is more teaching in the playground than in the school rooms, and a lesson better worth learning very often."²¹ Specifically, these were the values thought to be necessary to make men out of the boys, both British and colonial, who would eventually run the Empire. English control of the organization and administration of the game at the international level was complete until the Australians protested the lack of sportsmanship in the bowling tactics endorsed by Jardine. By questioning the ethical limits of the English pursuit of victory and the right of the MCC to dictate the laws of cricket, their Australian opponents challenged the prevailing English hegemony in sport and culture, and metaphorically, imperial relations in general.

In the 1930s, the exclusive MCC, which is headquartered in St. John's Wood, London, controlled and administered English and imperial cricket. The MCC began sending representative teams of "English" cricketers abroad in the 1870s.²² When a nation had developed a sufficient standard of play in the MCC's opinion, the MCC awarded that country "test" status, a term, which refers to an official match between the representative teams of two nations. This normative concept of competence, and by extension "civilization," was applied to white settler colonies, India, and tropical dependencies alike. However, it was hardly applied consistently, as white colonies achieved Test status much more easily than did colonies dominated by people of color. Australia was the first nation to participate in official Test matches, followed by South Africa, New Zealand, Canada, India, and the West Indies. Test matches were, as a matter of course, held up to be a bond of Empire; likewise they retained an air of tutelage in which the English passed on behavioral norms to the colonies and dominions.²³ The Anglo-Australian cricket rivalry was by far the most intense and the most important to both nations. Altham and Swanton argued that with the proliferation of Test nations, "Nearly every county team contains several England blazers. Test finery is cheap, yet to have played against Australia remains, as, perhaps it will always remain, the hall-mark of English cricketing ability."²⁴

By the interwar period, the English and Australians had developed a standard schedule of alternating tours every other year or so. The touring sides usually played five Test matches and between two and three-dozen matches against county and benefit teams. Victory in the Anglo-Australian

Test series was and is known as the "Ashes," a term that originated after the first Australian Test victory on English soil in 1882.²⁵ The 1930 Ashes tour was particularly devastating for the English, as the Australians unveiled the young batting prodigy (later Sir) Donald Bradman, who remains to this day arguably the best batsman of all time.

It has become a truism that by the interwar period, cricket was an "imperial religion." This religion was complete with rituals and relics. For English cricketers going out to the colonies, tours resembled a missionary society executive reviewing the work of his missionaries in a semicivilized society. For the Australians, the trip "Home" was more of a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, the originative sites of the religion. The ceremonies associated with this imperial religion were as choreographed and unalterable as a Roman Catholic mass. The tour included civic welcomes, games with tea and luncheon breaks, post-game dinners with good fellowship, toasts and paeans to imperial vigor and unity. The rites of a first-class cricket tour did not, until 1932–33, include adopting a hostile and physically dangerous tactics and ignoring the protests of your honorable opponents. This deviation from tradition was partly at the root of the vehemence of the Australian outcry over Bodyline.

Although the Bodyline scandal was initially an Anglo-Australian dispute, the West Indies came to play an important role in the unfolding affair, which was far from settled when the West Indies team toured England in the northern hemisphere spring and summer of 1933 (see chapter four). The presence on the West Indies team of several extraordinary black cricketers, and their willingness to "follow the English example" and employ tactics of disputed ethical character not only induced the English to ban the tactics, but also foregrounded issues of race and gender in the world of imperial sport.

At the root of the controversy was an international debate over the relative strength of manhood of the English, Australian, and West Indian nations.²⁶ Through several different, and at times contradictory, discourses including "manliness," "civilization," "athleticism," and "good form," the debate surrounding Bodyline and nationalism came to encompass not only gender but race and class as well. The scandal marked the end of the golden age of imperial sporting relations and the end of the dominance of the English sporting ethic, which never recovered from the controversy.

Cricket fans and historians have endlessly debated the technical and tactical aspects of Bodyline, the repercussions of this technique for the sport, and some of the wider implications of the affair. However, that the cricketing establishments in England and Australia, but not the West Indies, eventually renounced the practice has been largely ignored. This is not an insignificant development, as the West Indian refusal to renounce these tactics and the Anglo-Australian abandonment of them were at the root of their relative claims of superior manhood with regard to cricket.

On a purely cricketing level, there were supporters throughout the Empire of all points of view as to whether this was a legitimate tactic or

not. However, events which call into question the relative manliness of two nations are rarely evaluated on a rational and objective level. Generally, regardless of an individual's personal views on the merits of Bodyline as a tactic, in the first few months of the controversy, there were few Englishmen who publicly disowned Jardine and Larwood for unsportsmanlike behavior and even fewer Australians who publicly sided with the English. One contemporary account noted that "though now and then an Australian was found to criticize the resource if not the courage of their batsmen, the cricketers of that country were as a whole absolutely united in its denunciation."²⁷ In contrast, *The Times* could argue unequivocally in January 1933 that "there was nothing unfair or unsportsmanlike or contrary to the spirit of the game in the tactic of the English captain and his men."²⁸

The Australians claimed that the English team was not playing fair and had disgraced the game by adopting these tactics, which in their opinion were clearly not ethical or sporting. In contrast, the English initially claimed that the Australians were simply squealing effeminately and behaving like petulant schoolboys and poor losers. English commentators often blamed Australian "democracy" for contributing to both Australian effeminacy and juvenility. After the English unilaterally decided in late 1933 that this form of attack would not be allowed in cricket, the majority of English commentators began to argue that it was fair but aesthetically unpleasant and therefore not in the best interests of the game. Meanwhile, the only group, which did not reject the tactics in principle, were the West Indians, who maintained that bowling fast bumpers inside the leg stump was standard practice in the West Indies and that the others were simply afraid of injury.

The Controversy Erupts

Although the component parts of Bodyline were in themselves nothing new, their combination produced a novel bowling attack that was effective, nearly unplayable when bowled at the velocity of a Larwood or Bill Voce, England's main fast bowlers, and ethically questionable. Bodyline consisted of fast, short-pitched balls (called "bumpers" or "bouncers") bowled often at chest-to-head height, on or inside the leg stump while the field was set with up to five men crowding around the batsman on the leg side with two more on the leg side boundary. This, in short, left the batsman with no real shot to play and therein lies the essentially unsporting character of the tactic. The pace of the English bowling limited the batsmen to a split second decision whether they should duck, be hit, or play defensively, and risk being caught by the array of close fielders. While the English did not bowl this form of attack constantly, they bowled it enough to unsettle the Australian batsmen and in the end, easily won the Ashes back. The question being asked around the Empire was, "At what cost?"

With the series tied at one match apiece, the teams met at Adelaide on January 13, 1933 for what would turn out to be the fateful third Test. *The Times* described the Test as "the most disagreeable match that has been played since the game began."²⁹ During play, English bowlers hit and injured two Australian batsmen, including a fractured skull for Australian wicket keeper Bert Oldfield. Incidentally, neither batsman was injured while Bodyline was being bowled, but the fact that Jardine and Larwood switched to a Bodyline field placement directly after Australian captain W.M. Woodfull was "struck over the heart" (as it was always reported) infuriated the Australian spectators.³⁰ *The Australian Worker* commented that "among Australian cricketers there is an unwritten law not to take advantage of an injury which a player may sustain. Evidently it has no place in English cricket ethics."³¹ The ferocity of the crowd's response to Jardine's tactics led the members of the Australian Board of Control (ABC) present at Adelaide to decide that some action was necessary to curtail the bowling tactics, which were enflaming the Australian crowds and causing widespread fear of violence. The situation worsened when the Australian press, thanks to a leak in Australian dressing room, reported that the Australian captain Woodfull rebuffed the English manager Pelham Warner when the latter came to inquire after the injured Australian. Woodfull declined to converse with Warner telling him that there were two teams out on the field and only one was endeavoring to play cricket.

In what can at best be described as a less than diplomatic or even realistic protest, although one widely supported in Australia, the ABC cabled the MCC protesting that the English tactics were unsportsmanlike and that Bodyline bowling threatened the heretofore good relations between Australia and England. The MCC had neither seen the bowling nor ever heard of the term "Bodyline," which had only recently been coined in Australia. Consequently, they had no real option but to support their managers, captain, and team fully and express their disgust at the charge of unsportsmanlike behavior.³² This began the confrontation that would be fought over the telegraph lines as much as on the field of play for most of 1933. Once the Australians explicitly stated that they considered the English team's actions, and by extension the English team, to be unsportsmanlike, all possibility of a quick and simple solution vanished.³³ The English would not continue the series until the charge had been withdrawn, which it diplomatically was by the ABC. However, it was difficult for the Australians to make their case to the English, when the latter had through years of convention circumscribed what language could be employed and still permit dialogue to continue. On the surface of the matter, as far as the English were concerned, this was an argument over language.

The press took considerable interest in and hotly debated the nomenclature used to technically describe the tactics. What was simply an abbreviation for "bowling in the line of the body" invented by an Australian journalist hoping to save cable charges, was viewed by most English

commentators as a deliberate Australian plot to mislead and incite an Australian mob into intimidating the English team into acquiescence. Larwood wrote in his autobiography that the term Bodyline "was maliciously coined by a cute Australian journalist for the express purpose of misleading, and for obscuring the issue, which it did with great success. The mere use of the word 'Body' was meant to damn me, and damn me it did."³⁴ The English term, "fast leg theory," inaccurately implied that this form of attack was simply a variation of an older and vastly more benign bowling attack which included balls bowled inside the leg stump, but without the pace, distance, and field setting of Bodyline. English journalist Bruce Harris reduced the difference in terminology to simply a matter of manners. He referred to what was "politely described as 'leg theory' and impolitely as 'body line.'"³⁵ However, accuracy, rather than etiquette, dictates the use of the term "Bodyline."

An exchange of cables between the MCC and the ABC ensued and the teams concluded the series under an uneasy truce, but not before the English threatened to cancel the tour and the Australians threatened to break off cricket relations with England. On the field, the English won the series easily. The question of the legitimacy of the tactic was not decided finally for eight more months until a West Indies team, featuring fast bowlers E.A. Martindale and Learie Constantine, came and bowled Bodyline against the English at Old Trafford. Although this display was only a pale imitation of Larwood due to the slowness of the Manchester pitch, the heavier atmosphere in England and the fact that the West Indian bowlers were slightly slower than Larwood, it was still an effective enough display to change the minds of many English commentators who had until then been perfectly in favor of these tactics despite never having seen them in person. Shortly after the Old Trafford Test, the MCC, who still maintained that these tactics were completely fair, decided that they were not in the best interests of the game and should therefore be banned from cricket.

The Men who Made the Controversy

Many English commentators before and after the 1932-33 Ashes campaign have denigrated the Australian Bradman's achievements by arguing, as F.J.C. Gustard did in his book previewing the 1934 Ashes tour, that "[Bradman] is the greatest run-getter in the history of the game, an expression which is not necessarily synonymous with the greatest batsman."³⁶ C.L.R. James, mocked this (usually English) stance by writing that Bradman "has been blamed for machine-like play. He has been blamed for the ruthlessness with which he piled up big scores. This is absurd. . . people speak of Sir Donald's heavy scoring as if each and every great batsman was able to do the same but refrained for aesthetic or chivalrous reasons which Sir Donald ignored."³⁷ Bradman's average over a 21-year career was 95.14 runs per innings in first-class cricket (and 99.94 in Test matches).³⁸

The next closest is V.M. Merchant with 71.22 in first-class cricket. Only three other players in history have averages over 60 and two of them, W.H. Ponsford and W.M. Woodfull, played with Bradman for Australia in 1932–33.³⁹ This gives some indication of how innovative and unplayable Jardine's Bodyline tactics were to render these great batsmen impotent as happened during the tour; Bradman averaged a full 44 runs below his career average during the 1932–33 Ashes campaign.

Bradman's scorching performance and Australia's resounding victory in the 1930 series had encouraged the English selectors to attempt to recapture the Ashes by any means necessary. This mercenary determination to win led to the selection of Jardine as captain.⁴⁰ Jardine was a grim barrister of Scotch-Indian descent, who played with a professional's intensity despite his gentlemanly amateur status. On the previous English tour to Australia in 1928–29, Jardine had come to detest Australian crowd behavior, which was notably more boisterous than the austere behavior in first-class English ovals. There are two often-repeated stories about the severe skipper. The first is a remark made by the West Indian-born manager of the 1932–33 English team, Pelham Warner, who believed that "when [Jardine] sees a cricket field with an Australian on it, he goes mad."⁴¹ The second, which may be more myth than reality, relates that upon learning that the MCC had selected Jardine captain of England, an old schoolmaster of his at Winchester remarked, "Well, we shall win the Ashes—but we may lose a Dominion."⁴²

Despite the apocryphal foresight of this caustic remark, it does illustrate the nature of the man, as well as the fact that the selection of a skipper who forthrightly eschewed the traditional diplomatic and ambassadorial duties of the English captaincy, was a significant departure from tradition in the pursuit of revenge and would result in almost destroying the sporting relations with England's closest dominion. His selection may also be indicative of the growing insecurity of the imperial edifice and the public school Old Boy elite which constructed and maintained it. By the inter-war period, as the economic and political dominance of Great Britain became more precarious, many in Britain attached increasing significance to victory in Test matches, rather than just participation. Previously, a cricketing tour for the English was viewed somewhat as a long holiday filled with leisurely cruises and dinners, pleasantly interrupted by cricket matches played against members of a colonial elite. Normally there would be a good deal of fellowship and camaraderie, or at least civility, between the opposing players. Bradman bemoaned the fact that the friendliness of previous and later tours was completely absent during the acrimonious Bodyline tour. In his autobiography he recounted how by the middle of the tour, "Players of both sides got to passing each other without a word of greeting. . . . Oh, that cricket should ever have got to that."⁴³

The Board of the MCC chose the captain of the English cricket team and this selection was traditionally determined in equal measure by a candidate's cricketing, social, and class qualifications. Superb strategic or batting

acumen were by no means sufficient to earn one the position of the captaincy. Jardine's batting form in 1932 was outstanding and he should certainly have been included in the team for his batting alone. However, it was his appointment as captain that should and did raise eyebrows in English cricketing circles. The first qualification necessary was the appropriate class status proven largely by one's public school education and amateur status. English cricketers were divided into two categories: gentlemen and players. The former were nominal amateurs who officially were only reimbursed for travel expenses incurred while playing for a county or England side. "Amateur" did not denote an inferior level of play necessarily, but rather signified that the player was wealthy enough to play for the love of the game without being paid. Some amateurs had professions; Jardine was a barrister for example, while others like A.W. Carr were full-time gentlemen.

Iftikhar Ali Khan, the Nawab of Pataudi (who was known as "Pat" to his teammates and Australian barrackers alike), was an Indian prince, graduate of Balliol College Oxford, and member of the English side. As such, he occupied a unique position on the English side; elevated because of his wealth and amateur status, but somewhat subordinate because of his being Indian. Despite hitting a century in his Test debut in Sydney, he only appeared in one other Test for the remainder of the tour. Although it has been argued that he was dropped because of the incredibly slow pace of his innings, more commonly, it is attributed to his resistance to support Jardine's Bodyline tactics. In the Melbourne Test, Pataudi refused to move from the off to the legside and take up a Bodyline fielding position, at which Jardine reportedly remarked, "I see His Highness is a conscientious objector today."⁴⁴

In contrast to the Gentlemen, were the professionals who were paid on a per-game or per-tour basis and who were known as "Players." The amateur-professional divide was pronounced. Professionals and amateurs on the same team dressed in different changing rooms, entered the pitch from different gates, and ate lunch separately. Likewise, English amateurs were referred to as "Mr." on the scoreboard and in programs and the professionals were addressed simply by their initials. This split remained in effect in English cricket until 1962 when repeated failures to field a competitive amateur side in the annual Gentlemen versus Players match led to the abandonment of the system. Despite this, it was not until 1968 that *The Times*, the clearinghouse for all-important discussion about cricket in England, deigned to publish a letter from an acknowledged professional cricketer.⁴⁵ All Australian visitors, although officially "honoured guests," were listed only with their initials, like English professionals.

Patsy Hendren, a well-regarded professional batsman from the 1920s and 1930s, wrote in 1934 that there had been "one man who might have captained England for the past twenty years—who should certainly have captained England often. I refer to Jack Hobbs. But he was a 'pro' and I take it that on this account he was never even considered as a possible."⁴⁶

It is conceivable that some of the more liberal amateurs might have accepted Hobbs as captain; however it is unthinkable that the administrators of English cricket would have countenanced a professional captain. A.W. Carr, English gentleman and captain of Nottingham at the time of Bodyline, gave English professionals a backhanded compliment in the process of criticizing the Australians:

It is all very regrettable in a lot of ways, but there it is and despite the democracy of Australia socially many of their so-called amateur cricketers cannot compare with many of our English paid players. I know plenty of professionals whom I would delight to have as guests in my own home, but I am afraid I cannot say the same thing about most of the Australians whom I have met. But the Australians when they come here are made a great fuss of and given privileges which are denied to our own professionals.⁴⁷

The treatment of working class and lower-middle-class Australians as equals to English amateurs galled Carr, as it did many upper middle-class and aristocratic Englishmen. For English amateurs, professionals were a necessary tool for winning, but certainly not to be confused with the gentlemen anymore than one would confuse a landlord who owned 50,000 acres in Kent with the people who picked the hops.

Throughout the Bodyline Affair, there was a perception that the egalitarianism of the Australians was at the root of all the trouble. Bruce Harris, the correspondent covering the tour for the London *Evening Standard* and author of a book defending the English tactics, echoed a common establishment sentiment when he stated that the English amateurs should not be expected to put up with Australian barrackers.⁴⁸ He warned that "the time may come when English cricketers—and especially amateurs financially independent of cricket tours—will quite reasonably decline to face the raucous music . . . Conceivably it may be necessary eventually to send out a team under a professional captain. His will be a difficult task, for necessarily he will not possess the independence which fortifies an amateur leader."⁴⁹ The English cricketing establishment generally considered amateur leadership essential for English cricket.

This phenomenon was mirrored in the colonies of India, where princely leadership was standard and unquestioned for decades, and the West Indies, where a white man skippered the side until the C.L.R. James-led campaign for a black captain resulted in (later Sir) Frank Worrell being appointed West Indies captain in 1960. While Australian teams were more egalitarian in class terms, there was for many decades sectarian discrimination in the selection of a captain. The preferred criteria for an Australian captain for many years were that a candidate be Protestant and a Mason. Despite the large number of Catholics playing elite Australian cricket at the time, there were no Catholic captains between 1888 and 1951.⁵⁰ The importance attached to amateur leadership in England, princely leadership

in India, white leadership in the West Indies, and to a somewhat lesser degree Protestant leadership in Australia is indicative of national conceptions of masculinity as well. All men were clearly not created equal, or at least the cricketing establishments would not allow all men to be seen as equal. A cricket captain was allegedly the best man on the team *ex officio* and the cricketing establishments were not about to allow that position of prominence to go to a person from an undesirable class, race, religion, or caste as the case may be.

English captains had important diplomatic and social obligations that were deemed central to a tour's success. These duties included civic welcomes, teas, balls, and dinners, all of which required speeches by the captain and the manager. As a result, the tour captain regardless of nationality was traditionally a hail-fellow-well-met sort who could rattle off a few humorous remarks and praise the Empire and the good sportsmanship and hospitality of the hosts endlessly. Jardine, unlike previous captains such as his most recent predecessor Percy Chapman, did not fit this mold whatsoever as long as he was in Australia. Interestingly, during a post-Australian tour of New Zealand, Jardine proved to be a jovial and gracious guest, albeit only when the outcome of the series was secure. Upon reaching New Zealand, Jardine commented, "We have just come from a country where our parentage was regarded as doubtful, but our ultimate destination absolutely certain"; thereby filling the traditional role of a captain more in one sentence in New Zealand than he had in five months in Australia.⁵¹

After the controversial third Test in Adelaide, the post-game remarks of the two captains highlight the irregular nature of a Jardine-led English team. Woodfull, the Australian captain and one of the injured players, spoke in the normal and accepted manner of the imperial unity engendered by the game and the importance of sportsmanship. Jardine, on the other hand, commented only that the crowd had gotten what they had paid for. This commercial attitude was in direct contradistinction of decades of cricketing rhetoric. These remarks also highlight the different attitudes toward manhood informing the two captains' approaches to the series. Woodfull, ever the gentleman, was referring to Victorian manliness with its attendant moral values and obligations. Jardine, by commenting explicitly on the commercial imperative and alluding to the voyeuristic delight the crowd had taken in the display of violence, was speaking not of a moral ideal, but rather of what was seen as the gritty reality of modern masculinity.

The incongruities within the ever-mutating discourses of manhood in Britain and the Empire made the debate surrounding Bodyline possible. The Victorian conception of an "English gentleman" possessed many traits which had increasingly come to be viewed as effeminate; thus what in the nineteenth century was considered "manly," losing gracefully and with humility, for example, did not always sit well with twentieth-century conceptions of virile masculinity, such as the dogged pursuit of victory at any

cost and the acceptance of "primitive" violence. Likewise, other attributes associated with an English gentleman, such as effeteness, attention to dress, and dandyism in general, had increasingly become associated with homosexuality and womanliness. The growing dominance of a masculinity which encompassed acceptance of previously working-class traits like violence and ruthlessness, opened the door for upper- and middle-class men to embrace "beastliness" or "savagery" associated with less "civilized" men in certain circumstances. This acceptance of the "uncivilized" was also a trait of artistic modernism as well. Within the furor over Bodyline, different groups of West Indians, Englishmen, and Australians employed different and often opposing attributes that were considered "masculine" and/or "manly" to justify their actions.

A leading English cricket authority at the time, Neville Cardus, wrote,

the Australian plays cricket to win . . . One summer we decided in this simple old land to put an end to all that. We decided to have for our captain a man who had a rare capacity for unsentimental leadership. Jardine will go down in the history of the game as one of the strongest and sternest and most realistic of all English captains . . . For my part I admire Jardine beyond words. I dislike his view of cricket. I believe that the qualities of character he possesses would suit better a leader of armies than a leader of cricketers . . . his influence on modern cricket has been sanitary; he has cleared away the cant. To the Australians he has returned tit for tat.⁵²

Of course, Jardine is first a Scot, and during the after-game speeches in Adelaide it was the Australian Woodfull who made the Empire-binding speech and Jardine who crassly spoke of money. In addition to being factually questionable, Cardus' statement is a significant departure from a "traditional," that is, pre-1914, view of cricket. It would have been logically impossible for an adherent of the ethos of sportsmanship in the nineteenth-century tradition to admire a man whose view of cricket one detested, as the latter was seen as entirely representative of his worldview and morality. It is this newly found ability to rationalize transgressions against their own code, which opened the English up for criticism from the West Indians and the Australians.

Cowardice, Effeminacy, and Childishness in Bodyline

Throughout Bodyline, the English claimed that they were the best men due to their success as cricketers and due to their willingness to employ hard-nosed tactics to win regardless of the popularity of those tactics. Herbert Sutcliffe, a professional batsman on the England side summed up the lesson he took from the tour as follows: "I learned that Jardine was one of the greatest men I have ever met. A stern master but every inch a man and as straight as they make 'em. Jardine had the courage of his

convictions; it was unfortunate for him that they did not meet with general approval, but that did not alter his outlook.”⁵³ In contrast, the English nearly universally derided the Australian players and public as “squealers” for not accepting their defeat with dignity; the fans were criticized for barracking the English players, and the batsmen were ridiculed for being afraid of injury. Carr, in discussing the intimidating nature of the Australian J.M. Gregory’s bowling in the 1920s, wrote: “It needed a lot of ‘guts’ to stand up to Gregory; and I often wonder what the Australians would have said about him if he had happened to be an Englishman . . . Lord! what a row there would have been if Gregory and [E.A.] McDonald had been on our side instead of theirs! The trouble about Larwood was, of course, that he was the right bowler on the wrong side.”⁵⁴

“Squealing,” which was the most frequent charge leveled against the Australians, was deemed terrible form and its existence could only be explained, according to the English, by a decidedly deficient sense of honor and manliness on the part of the Australians, who would rather blame someone else for their shortcomings than own up to them. Carr believed that the Australians lacked a sufficient sense of gentlemanliness and had a mercenary approach to cricket; he commented: “My own experience of the Australians is that if they cannot win they will not stand to be beaten if they can help or avoid it. They will go to almost any length to dodge defeat. I am perfectly sure that I can say that this is also the opinion of a very great many people in this country. To the Australians cricket is a business almost pure and simple—a matter of money—and success is all that matters to them. We have a different view of things; to most Englishmen it is primarily a game.”⁵⁵ The British press ceaselessly leveled the charge that the Australians simply did not want to accept being beaten. The *Morning Post* posited that it would have been more efficient and straightforward if the Australian cricket authorities simply proposed an “Act in the Australian Legislature rendering any English bowler who hit an Australian’s batsman’s wicket without the latter’s written consent liable to instant deportation.”⁵⁶

In rebuttal, one Australian expatriate in England suggested that “cricketing traditions are nothing here [in England]. I find it a land as unsportsmanlike as possible . . . The Aussie is first a man. He demands what he pays for—sport. The present English team has given him other than sport. It was not a beating he feared.”⁵⁷ Being given to excessive complaining, or in Australian parlance, being a “whinger,” is particularly hated among Australians. That Australian men found themselves openly and unabashedly (and perhaps not unfairly) charged with being whingers, was certainly extremely irksome to them, as much as being called unsportsmanlike was to the English. This may have contributed to the Australian resolve to resist compromise with the English.

Fear of injury was at the heart of the Bodyline claims of effeminacy. The English, and later the West Indians, insisted that the Australians (and later

the English) were simply afraid of getting hurt. This charge was usually followed by the claim that in the past the accuser had played bumpers without fear or complaint. In innumerable letters to the press and in articles and memoirs the accusation repeatedly was one of Australian fearfulness. The great English batsman Jack Hobbs, who was on tour as a journalist, managed to insult Bradman's bravery while nominally complementing him for his sensible thinking and willingness to "courageously" admit that he was not as much of a man as his English adversary, Larwood. In his book about the tour, *Fight for the Ashes*, Hobbs wrote,

It looked to me as if Bradman had a little inquest in his mind, and returned this verdict: "If am hit by a ball traveling as fast as Larwood can make it travel my career may be finished. That isn't going to happen." The outcome was that Don played a gamblers' innings . . . He took not the faintest risk of injury, and, in view of his slight physique, I do not blame him. But there were times when he need not have surrendered quite so wholeheartedly as he did . . . I want to pay a tribute to him, because he had the courage to follow his convictions. It could not have been easy for Don to give in to Harold Larwood, especially as he had such a big reputation. But, having made up his mind not to get injured, he stuck to and followed out his view, a procedure requiring great moral courage, especially as his own supporters, those how made him an national idol, called him very hard names.⁵⁸

This commentary was particularly strange since Hobbs had been the center of a small controversy the previous season when he was roundly criticized for complaining that a bowler was bowling short in a county match.

In response to English charges of cowardice, the Australians asserted endlessly that they were not afraid, but affronted by the attack's lack of sportsmanship. It would seem to a neutral observer, that of course part of the issue was fear of injury, especially a debilitating injury that might end a career. After all, Oldfield did have his skull fractured, which can hardly be dismissed as a minor injury, and broken arms are not uncommon in cricket even when the batsmen are not explicit targets. With that said, it is likely that the Australians would have been just as outraged had it come out that the English had illegally doctored the ball to obtain an advantage. However, what is interesting in the context of this discussion is the absolute urgency to deny fearfulness that all parties demonstrated. That is, even though clearly part of the animosity engendered by the English tactic was based on the fear of severe injury, no one arguing in Australia's defense would admit that the possibility existed that Australian batsmen were afraid of being hurt. Except for Englishman Patsy Hendren, who despite heavy criticism donned a prototypical batting helmet when he faced the fast bowling West Indians, not a single batsman admitted that he was afraid of injury. Indeed, Jack Fingleton, Australia's opening batsman

in the first three Tests, was well-regarded by Australians for his stoic masculinity in the face of Bodyline bowling which left him bruised and battered, but unbowed. The only explanation for this insistence was that the imagery of masculinity was at stake in this imperial confrontation.

The British press and public commentators used both the trope of civilized manliness (i.e., that they were the keepers of the traditions of gentlemanly manliness) and that of virile masculinity simultaneously in criticizing the Australians, who allegedly were not brave enough to stand up to fast bowling the way the English had to J.M. Gregory and E.A. McDonald and then were so puerile as to blame others for their failures. When Jardine made this point, he also managed to allude to the suspiciously Irish character of Australia, by stating:

Unlike most Englishmen, the Australian, while impatient of criticism from without, is not given to criticizing either himself or his country. He reserves his criticisms for direction against other countries and their inhabitants. His general attitude is too frequently that of the Irishman who said 'My mother, right or wrong; my wife, drunk or sober'—Australia can do no wrong in his eyes.⁵⁹

The alleged effeminacy of the Australian response was highlighted in many English comments. For example, one letter to the *Manchester Guardian* captured the mood of many when the author suggested the following: "Roll, Bowl, or Pitch, a proprietor of a coconut-shy booth and therefore a sportsman, has always recognised the 'fair and weaker' sex by letting them throw from half way. Surely the same concession can be adopted when we are batting in the Tests and so prevent this feeling of unfairness that the Australian Board of Control is displaying."⁶⁰ A similar attitude was displayed in a cartoon published in the *South Wales Football Echo and Express*, a paper that normally did not even cover cricket. The cartoon depicts a rustic village cricket match; the wicketkeeper asks the batsman why he is wearing his wife's frock, to which the batsman replied, "Our side do tell me that there leg theory bowler of yours is going to bowl at my legs, so I'm not going to show them!"⁶¹

For their part, the Australians insisted that they were the true gentlemen because they were not willing to contravene the spirit of cricket for the mere pursuit of victory, which traditionally was ancillary to participation. For example, in a letter to *The Advertiser* of Adelaide, one Australian wrote, "I like many others, for a brief period, thought that Woodfull should introduce reprisals against the Englishmen by giving them some of their own medicine, but am thankful to say that the thought was only temporary, and that Woodfull's gentlemanly attitude is absolutely in keeping with what we believe to be the glorious traditions so long attached to cricket. What a fine example he is setting the rising generation to 'play the game,' however great the sacrifice."⁶² Moreover, Australians viewed the eventual English reversal on the matter of Bodyline

as hypocritical, thus further evidencing the alleged English abandonment of gentlemanliness.

In the imperial lexicon, the phrase “not cricket” denoted far more than extralegal practices. Rather, “not cricket” encompassed any action on the field or off that was unethical, devious, cowardly, unmanly, and perhaps above all, un-English. Indeed, Pelham Warner stated that cricket was “a name synonymous with all that is fair, and kindly noble, and upright.”⁶³ As the arbiters of Anglo-Saxonism and ethics, for the English to be accused of unsportsmanlike behavior and to admit eventually, albeit tacitly, that their actions were indeed “not cricket” was highly significant for it represented a colonial challenge to the very core of the English right to impose behavioral standards on the colonies and dominions. For example, Jardine suggested that the “Australians . . . would do well to remember sometimes that there are other standards of behaviour besides their own, and that it is possible that there is much to be said in favour of those other standards.”⁶⁴ Of course, that the English might follow this admonition clearly did not occur to Jardine, or many other Englishmen for that matter, since the English positioned themselves as the sole arbiters of civilized behavior.

Continually, the English stated or implied that the whole problem with Australians was that they were simply not manly enough to take what they had so freely dealt out in the past. Manliness is usually contrasted with either womanliness or alternately childishness; both implications are present in many attacks on the Australians. Larwood claimed, “If certain critics had not made such an effeminate outcry about it during and after the third Test the whole bother would be too childishly ludicrous to merit further consideration by grown-up men.”⁶⁵ Likewise, Carr reminded his English readers, “You cannot play cricket with a soft ball or without taking some sort of physical risk. The game was never intended for namby-pambies.”⁶⁶ In a line of argument that was typical of the general English tone of reporting, one columnist asked, “Would they have us believe that the manly game of cricket must, to suit their taste, be mutilated to be fit for eunuchs, not men?”⁶⁷

These attacks on Australian manhood came at a time when the national morale regarding manhood was low and many commentators were particularly sensitive to charges of emasculation. The Depression had caused high unemployment and had pushed many men on to the dole while increasing the number of women who were the main breadwinners for their families. Patricia Grimshaw writes that “Unemployment and receipt of the dole were experienced by many men as emasculating. Equality, independence, and activity—the attributes of men—has been ignominiously snatched away and they felt keenly their sudden inferiority [to those with employment].”⁶⁸ This dynamic was not unheard of in Britain of course and it affected perceptions of manhood there as well. Joanna Bourke has argued that while employment levels were high, such as was the norm between 1870–1914, wage earning was the primary basis for gauging masculinity for working-class British males. However, once

the economic downturn came and unemployment rose, the connection between masculinity and physical strength became increasingly more important.⁶⁹ Attendance at sporting events was seen by many as an escape from the grim realities of life, thereby explaining why cricket attendance went up in the Depression years despite the lack of disposable income many experienced. However, when the sporting event becomes simply a reminder of the inequities and shortcomings of everyday life, this is distressing for many.

Along with the common discussion and charges of effeminacy, there was also a widespread discourse of youth and age. John Gillis, in talking about young nations and old nations, has posited that "youth" was seen as the antidote to decrepitness, which could come to plague nations that rested on their laurels and did not actively renew themselves. He writes: "The myth of progress, which endowed each [nation] with a glorious past and a great future . . . at the same time utterly denied the possibility of degeneration or death that its own understanding of itself as a living body implied." For European nations, it was not enough to have a future, but a nation also needed a bright future.⁷⁰ The English obviously had no difficulty drawing on a past full of glorious achievements, but their belief in a glorious future was much less tenable. Bodyline and the victory over their youthful dominion were one way in which they could reassert the strength of their past while nominally utilizing the attitudes and determination of the modern age. The Australian attitude seemed to naturally focus more on the future than on the past, but they still resented charges of infantilism. Where the English tended to write of the Australians as willful and difficult children or young adolescents, the Australians spoke of their nation as a young, full-grown man with a bright future and the capacities to fulfill his potential. J.C. Davis, an Australian journalist writing in *The Referee* hypothesized that "if Wilhelm Hohenzoller were still Kaiser, he might interpret these things to mean that the British Empire was at war with itself, tearing out its own vitals, that Australia, the independent youngster, was at the throat of Old Mother-land, and that now was the time to strike across the Channel, strike boldly and hotly."⁷¹

According to Alistair Thomson, the "test of Australian manhood" at Gallipoli during World War I, not the official transfer of power in 1901, marked the maturation and realization of the Australian nation. Australian war correspondent Charles Bean was instrumental in spreading a vision of the campaign and the Australian soldiers which came to be taken as emblematic of all true Australian men: loyal, cheerfully cheeky, and irreverent when out of the line, courageous, resourceful, and independent. Thomson contends: "These qualities, fostered in the Australian bush, discovered and immortalized in war, were said to typify Australians and Australian society, a frontier land of equal opportunity in which enterprising people could make good. This was the nation which 'came of age' at Gallipoli."⁷² Thomson concludes that while class differences between Australians was often noted in memorials to the Australia New Zealand

Army Corps (ANZACs), it was only in the context of heralding the union between all Australian men against a common enemy. As far as the myths of the ANZAC legend go, the common class enemies of all Australians were the British generals who had been cavalier with Australian lives.⁷³

Jardine also evoked the imagery of adulthood and childishness when he stated that any attempt on the part of the MCC to dictate tactics to a cricket captain was unthinkable for a true man. Perhaps the Australians thought it was proper to direct play from the boardroom, but Jardine refused to acknowledge this as a possibility. He wrote: "It is all very well for school boys to have their bowling changes dictated from the pavilion, but it is hard to imagine this type of control being exercised in international cricket."⁷⁴ More often, however, the Australians claimed to find themselves being treated like school children. Bill O'Reilly, the great slow bowler for the Australians in the 1930s, argued that "the M.C.C. had assumed the righteous attitude of a worthless headmaster dealing with a school scene about which he had taken not the slightest trouble to become conversant."⁷⁵ A letter to the *Liverpool Post & Mercury* stated: "A number of urchins playing cricket with a box as a wicket and any old piece of wood as a bat, may squeal when they miss a ball on the leg side with the bat and top it with their anatomy, but the squeal is frequently a threat as to what will happen to the next ball so pitched. One can get a good deal of amusement out of this. But the squeals from Australia are getting on people's nerves."⁷⁶ In other words, even British children, as members of an ancient race, were more adult than grown Australians as members of an infant nation. Similarly, one letter to *The Morning Post* stated that the Australians "must learn to accept defeat in a more sporting spirit, and that dreadful barracking should be sternly discouraged. The only excuse is that Australia is a young country, she has not the splendid traditions that England has behind her."⁷⁷ Likewise, a letter to the editor of the *Liverpool Post and Mercury* argued that "it is not what the Australians have said, but the time chosen to say it (in the middle of a series of Test matches), which seems to me so nervy and childish."⁷⁸ The recurrent reference to childishness became even more pronounced when it came to English attitudes toward the black cricketers from the West Indies.

While the Australians seemed to resent being compared to willful children, they displayed no real yearning to be an "old country" like England. Their strength and vitality came from their youth and their golden era was the present and future, unlike the British who were seen as slightly past their prime. The rough egalitarianism and refusal to bow to many older forms of etiquette set Australians apart from Britain and of this they were justifiably proud. *The Referee* of Sydney defended the Australian departure from staid tradition, contending that it was less than manly to follow tradition for tradition's sake when there were more important matters at hand. "Many have criticised the Board of Control for the use of undiplomatic terms in its message to the M.C.C.," argued the lead

article on February 1, 1933. "There are times for the exercise of the most delicate diplomacy. But, delicacy even in diplomacy may become effeminate, or it may become a vice by clothing the false of the sinister with the garb of the truth. Diplomacy, by reason of its delicacy, its lack of honest outspokenness, helped to create the cataclysm into which the world fell in 1914, and from which it is still struggling to rise."⁷⁹

Elite Englishmen, like elite Europeans generally, often claimed that issues of character, and not race or class, were at the root of the exalted status of Europeans and colonial elites.⁸⁰ However, in imperial cricket, character was assessed not by some objective standard but by the degree of Englishness and whiteness. Even after colonial cricketers had achieved apparent parity on the scoreboard by beating British or producing outstanding individual players, the English simply emphasized a different aspect of their tradition and claimed colonial deficiencies, whether it be in behavior, tactics, or dress. This is illustrated by English charges of misbehavior by Australian crowds and by English critiques of West Indian cricketing brilliance being too sporadic, undisciplined, and overly emotional to match in innate quality that of the English. Not coincidentally, the inconsistency, irrationality, and over-emotionality ascribed to the West Indian cricketers are also character traits associated with women in this period, furthering the process of effeminization of colonial subjects by the dominant power as a justification for continued subjugation.

Class and Bodyline

Much English criticism of the Australians, while purportedly based on national distinctions, was in fact based on class divisions. The cricketing establishment of England abhorred the disregard with which most Australians treated class distinctions that were deemed sacrosanct by middle-class Englishmen. Furthermore, it is possible that domestic English class tensions were being displaced on to the Australians, who could possibly serve as a dangerous model for the English working class. As stated earlier, cricket in Australia was infinitely more egalitarian than English cricket. However, even as the Australians subverted the class-based nature of cricket by doing away with the gentleman/player divide and other overt class markers, they still supported the wider public school ethos that had permeated the English middle- and upper-classes world-views since the mid-Victorian era. The ideal of being a "good sport" and showing "good form" was instilled through games as boys and came to be seen as required for all phases of life from warfare to gambling to cricket to parliamentary politics. This sporting ethos, which grew out of the games revolution, was founded on the creation, stabilization, and maintenance of hierarchical relations of power.⁸¹ The games at the center of public school education endeavored to separate men from women, strong from weak, rich from poor, and British from colonial. Not only were many imperial administrators trained on the cricket and rugby pitches of

Eton and Harrow and the other public schools of England, but also imperialism was in part justified by the values inculcated on the playing fields. These values included honesty, fair play, fearlessness, unflappability, quick wittedness, and observance of hierarchies based on strength.

The German "rape of Belgium" in 1914 was, for example, seen as an outrage by the British because it broke the rules of war and was therefore not "sporting." The imagery of an unsporting Germany was prevalent in Australia as well; J.C. Davis in *The Referee* wrote:

Real action must be taken by real fighting men to preserve the game's pleasant, personal and international relationships from utter discord, if not utter disruption . . . the feeling is that the English tactics in this direction are what Britishers often described the German tactics in the war. Those tactics, in the end, helped to defeat those who used them. It will be the same in this cricket business, but the effects will last for generations, and the men responsible will not be held up as paragons in pushing their game forward as a great Empire-builder.⁸²

The public school ethos was encapsulated in the notion and term, "good form," which was, at its most basic level, a worldview encompassing the intertwined ideals of masculinity, class, and race. Good form was defined as the accepted behavior for English middle-class white males who were educated at a public school and/or university. In the case of the socially inferior professional cricketers, good form manifested itself as the willingness to know one's place and act accordingly. Normally, the working classes did not have to worry about the concept of good form, but since working-class professional cricketers were in such close contact with their social betters, a manner of good form developed. According to their beliefs, the English should have been the arbiters and exemplars of good form, and therefore by extension the exemplars of manliness, but their old ideals were no longer sufficient to achieve their desired ends. This realization that their so-called social inferiors had better form than they, created a crisis of sorts for the English and opened the possibility for an Empire-wide debate of what constituted manliness and "cricket."

What the English found most distasteful about Australians and about playing cricket in Australia was largely the Australians' disregard for class conventions which for the most part remained widely accepted in England. Australians lacked any distinction between "gentlemen" and "players"; the players were all paid small sums for play above a certain level but few if any did not have another career at the same time. The easy familiarity common in Australian society, founded as it was, on a myth of universal egalitarianism, led to the complete disregard of a professional-amateur divide. Despite widespread social inequality throughout Australian society, the Pacific nation was still dangerously classless for many English commentators. For example, Harris described Australia as a place where "free-and-easiness runs

riot.”⁸³ However, it was this democratic streak in the Australian character which Australians perceived to be the strength of their cricket teams, and by extension their nation. *The Argus* of Melbourne argued that the reported dissension on the English team was due to class divisions; the paper argued “as long as the wide margin between amateur and professional continues no team will be a happy family. Can anyone imagine one of our Australians who always calls his captain ‘Bill’ daring to disobey him on tour? It would be preposterous to think of it.”⁸⁴

The purportedly ill-bred nature of Australians manifested itself most dramatically in their proclivity for “barracking,” or yelling, often vulgarly, at the players on the pitch. This was not confined simply to the cheap seats; rather the members (i.e., the wealthier section of the crowd) also barracked. For the English, this was conclusive evidence, even to a former professional like Hobbs that the democratic nature of Australia was at the root of all of its problems. Hobbs described the manner in which “Sometimes the Australian club members joined in the barracking, and I thought that was discreditable. In England, we do not expect this, even if the crowd shows displeasure The average Australian is far more partisan and antagonistic to opponents than the average Englishman.”⁸⁵ *The New Statesman* described “the tedium [for the English players] inspired by the raucous jests of the barrackers. The whole atmosphere must be intolerable to a civilised man.”⁸⁶ The debate surrounding Bodyline allowed the English finally (and angrily) to vent their frustrations with what were seen as decades of Australian misbehavior, which was often described as insolence or cockiness thereby reinforcing the supposed hierarchy of the mother country and the former colony, since only an inferior could be insolent. Every Australian protest regarding Bodyline was countered with an English charge of poor behavior or poor form on the part of the Australians.

One journalist who traveled with the English team asked of the Board of Control’s cable, “Could anything be more tactless than this blunt and clumsy challenge? Accuse any Englishman of being impolite, dishonest, even immoral, and he may hold in his anger. Accuse him of being unsportsmanlike and you wound his deepest susceptibilities.”⁸⁷ Likewise, Jardine stated, “It is often suggested in Australia that . . . every free-born Australian has an absolute and inalienable right to self-expression. Whether one subscribes to this Article of Faith is not of much importance. My objection is limited to the hostility and lack of taste to which this self-assumed license gives rise.”⁸⁸ “Taste” is of course decided by its relative proximity to middle-class English mores. In an article in *The Argus* Pelham Warner while discussing barracking condescendingly and patronizingly asked the Australians if they wouldn’t be happier if they behaved the way the English do. He stated, “I am not criticising, but I am speaking for the good of the game, and I ask again ‘Do you think the greatest match in the world should be interrupted by a lot of noise?’ ”⁸⁹

Likewise, Jardine expounded more fully on a widely held English attitude toward the Australian practice of barracking.

No doubt a lot of barracking is thoughtless, nor is it to be expected that Australia should appreciate the Imperial responsibilities of cricket as deeply as we do at home; but a consideration of these responsibilities should prove a great incentive to action on the part of those who are determined that their painful exhibitions of hooliganism shall be suppressed. It is only too seldom appreciated in England, let alone Australia, that there are millions of British citizens throughout the world who take their cue, so far as behaviour at cricket matches is concerned, from Test Matches between England and Australia—matches which have so much in their part history to appeal to all of us, irrespective of colour, creed, or race.⁹⁰

The Australians opposed these claims of bad behavior at every opportunity. In one letter from an Australian reader of a London paper, the letter writer stated: "I have seen cricket both here [in England] and there, and defend the Australian barracker. He is clever, witty, alive, smart, manly, and extremely fair. He is not dull. He does not sit through a match puffing a pipe and grumbling his dissent. A game of cricket without him is a dull affair."⁹¹ Although many women attended cricket matches (especially, it was noted, when the heart-throb Bradman was due to bat), the public activity of barracking was a male domain.⁹² The papers often mocked women for being at the matches for social rather than sporting reasons.⁹³ It is doubtful of course that the men were only interested in the game and not the excitement of a day out and the camaraderie evinced by a day at the cricket. In fact, men were often at the games for a variety of reasons in addition to the sport, such as interacting with other spectators, picnicking, drinking, and relaxing. Ironically, despite the often derogatory nature of comments regarding heavily female crowds, *The Referee* of Sydney argued that the only thing that saved Adelaide from having a riot the day Woodfull and Oldfield were felled by Larwood was that there had been a great proportion of women at the match.⁹⁴ This might have been as much an excuse for Australian lack of action, as a statement of relief.

The description of a pipe-smoking English observer would most likely be happily accepted by many English men as appropriate behavior for a cricket fan; however it only describes a middle-class, county cricket fan, not the lower-class Lancashire League cricket fans of the North nor the fans of local cricket in mining villages and collieries throughout the midlands and north of England. In the North, cricket was generally more rough and tumble as discussed earlier. Jim Bullock wrote that in mining village cricket fierce fast bowling was the order of the day and that slow bowling was dismissed as an old man's necessity. He recalled: "The young men tried constantly to increase their bowling speed, but not much attention was paid to length, variation, or swing. Speed was the thing that mattered."⁹⁵ Not coincidentally, mining village cricket produced some of

the nation's most ferocious fast bowlers, like Larwood, who had been a miner when young.

Likewise, most first-class cricket spectators would also quickly distinguish themselves from their working-class brethren who followed football. One prominent sportswriter argued, "The two publics [i.e., football fans and cricket fans] are not comparable. The football public is a cloth-capped, fried-fish lot, and why some newspapers give more space to football than to cricket I cannot understand. The cricket public is on an altogether higher plane. Cricket attracts the intelligentsia—a word which I hate, but I cannot think of another."⁹⁶ In elite English eyes, Australians of all walks of life would more closely resemble the English working class in manners, sporting ethics, dress, and worldview.

Despite the claim by the English to a higher standard of spectatorship, by defending the ideal that cricket is not war, it was the Australians who seized the moral high ground from the English beginning with the opening salvos fired by Woodfull after the third Test. Australians, for the most part, resented the widespread and pronounced snobbery of the English. One English expatriate who lived in Australia believed that class differences were at the base of Australian anger over Bodyline. He reminded English readers that "as long as Englishmen take to Australia that public school manner which has rightly earned reprobation in other countries the present hostility will remain."⁹⁷ Throughout the tour, the outstanding emblem of English aristocratic disdain for Australian democracy was Jardine's multicolored Harlequin cap, which caused fetishistic hatred among the Australian public. For many Australians "Jardine in his harlequin cap and his ever-present silk neck-choker" was the embodiment of the English establishment and therefore an object of derision.⁹⁸ In a similar manner to the way in which a Wilhelmine spiked army helmet seemed to sum up all that was both wrong and quintessentially Teutonic about Germans in English eyes, so the Harlequin cap was an instantly recognizable icon of aristocratic English disdain for Australians and simultaneously for English effeminacy. In a letter to *The Times* about the Ashes campaign, the children's author and war poet A.A. Milne called for calm heads to consider the English tactics since the "bitter feeling already aroused by the colour of Mr. Jardine's cap has been so intensified by the direction of Mr. Larwood's bowling as to impair friendly relations between England and Australia."⁹⁹ According to Larwood, Jardine donned this multihued hat just to annoy the Australian crowds.¹⁰⁰

A small, but vocal minority of English commentary on the subject, while stopping short of supporting the Australians, found the whole controversy distasteful and beneath the dignity of English cricket. One letter that is representative of this view was printed in the *Morning Post* and stated that the English should not "worry about what Australia did in 1921. If one side or another thinks that the tactics of its opponents are 'not cricket' in any sense of the word, that should be quite sufficient for those tactics to be dropped. After all, cricket is a game, and while it

remains a game it does not matter who wins."¹⁰¹ The quintessential stiff-upper-lipped Englishman should have been above squabbling over a cricket result. While the game and its cherished traditions were perhaps worth going to war over, a simple result, even of an international match or series, should never be worth even raising one's voice. In its review of Jardine's first book on the tour, *In Quest of the Ashes*, the *Daily Telegraph* wrote: "To go to the root of the matter, cricket ceases to be a game when players have to write books in order to explain their tactics on the field."¹⁰² This view, despite being the quintessence of good form, did not win widespread support in England. Similarly, those Australians who felt that the country was embarrassing itself by complaining did not win far-reaching support in Australia.

Finally, many English critics based their arguments on the premise that it is inconceivable for the tactics to be unsportsmanlike simply because they have been used by an English captain, which in the minds of many English, by definition made them fair. Larwood argued that if he was not a fair bowler then the MCC would not have selected him and his captain would not have continued to play him.¹⁰³ Likewise, general English opinion held that the English bowlers must have bowled at the stumps and not at the man (as was alleged by the Australians) or else Jardine would have taken them off. Likewise, P.G.H. Fender, former Surrey captain and England batsman, argued: "Neither facts nor the imagination can substantiate any charge that bowlers . . . bowl with the intent to maim. The bowlers are men, and their captains cannot be charged with permitting such methods. Such inventions are mischievous."¹⁰⁴ That an English captain would employ unfair tactics did not seem to enter their realm of possibilities. In their history of Great Britain between the wars, Robert Graves and Alan Hodge put an interesting, if erroneous, twist on Bodyline by blaming ruthless professionalism among the English "Players" for the emergence of the tactic, as if the bowler could have employed Bodyline of his own volition.

Even the Australians were not immune to the traditional truism that an English cricket team was the embodiment of sportsmanship; a fact that accounts for the widespread sense of betrayal displayed by the Australians. In December 1932, after the English bowled a version of Bodyline against the Australians but before its full force was brought to bear, even many Australians refused to believe that the English would resort to unsportsmanlike conduct. In response to initial grumblings in the Australian press that the glimpses they had seen of Bodyline had been unfair, *The Advertiser* editorialized that "The Englishmen have the reputation, and deservedly so, of being true sportsmen, and would not adopt what are not sporting methods."¹⁰⁵ For the Australians and other cricketers from around the Empire however, English underhandedness was a distinct possibility from this point forward.

For all the English charges that the Australians were simply squealing or were acting hysterically, the Australian response was as a rule well considered and fair. Apart from that is, the Board of Control's first rash

telegram and the more radical writers who called for Australia to withdraw from the Commonwealth in protest. Despite their fairness, the Australian response was vehement, as in an article in *The Referee* that was headlined "Australians are not Squealing! They Want Cricket to Live!" That article quotes an English newspaper that asked: "What kind of effeminacy has entered Australian cricket that relations are supposed to be jeopardised by such trivialities?" In response, the Australian wrote that the English attitude is "suggestive of a bitter bigotry that condemns itself. If he thinks that Oldfield's battered temple is a trivial injury, one would like to know what particular stuff his own head is composed of."¹⁰⁶

For the most part, the Australian outcry was that the English were simply not playing in the spirit of the game that they had given to the world. Overall, the Australians positioned themselves as the true bearers of the ideals of sportsmanship, and by extension Anglo-Saxonism, which had degenerated in Europe. O'Reilly remarked that Woodfull's decision to continue batting after being struck "was the stuff that Empires were made of... [and] Woodfull knew, and through him we knew, that we were being called upon to make a colossal sacrifice for the good of the game."¹⁰⁷

Australian Test player Alan Kippax took a very reasonable view of the affair which made the Australian case without descending to mere name-calling as so much of the English criticism did. This does not seem to be posturing; rather, it appears to be a sincerely widely held belief on the part of the Australians. In his book, *Anti-Bodyline*, Kippax diplomatically wrote: "I don't think any reasonable person, however partisan, has in cold blood accused either bowler, or Jardine, of wishing to injure a batsman. Such a suggestion is unthinkable; but I state without reservation that I believe that the campaign was from the first one of intimidation, aimed in the first place at Bradman and Woodfull, and, secondly, when it began to prove successful, at all the recognized Australian batsmen."¹⁰⁸ Kippax took a remarkably long-sighted view of the affair and argued that it is possible for two sportsmanlike parties to disagree on whether a tactic is sportsmanlike or not. If, after a debate it is deemed unsportsmanlike, the original practitioners should not necessarily be condemned. He wrote: "Sportsmanship is not a strictly defined and absolute code... It is, in fact, a convention, established by public opinion as a result of experience. Occasionally there crops up in the arena of sport something new, something which public opinion has not yet been able to label."¹⁰⁹

Conclusion

In the end the nations settled the dispute with a gentleman's agreement which stated that the "the type of bowling in Australia to which exception had been taken by Australia" was not in the best interest of the game and would not be used against the Australians in the future. The MCC banned

“direct attack” bowling, which was defined as “persistent and systematic bowling of fast, short-pitched balls at the batsman standing clear of his wicket.” The MCC statement continued, “The M.C.C. Committee have always considered this type of bowling to be unfair, and that it must be eliminated from the game. Umpires are the sole judges of fair and unfair play . . . and are therefore empowered to deal with ‘direct attack.’”¹¹⁰

Jardine never captained an Ashes campaign again and Larwood never bowled for an English representative cricket team again. After the English had seen a West Indian simulation of what the Australians had faced and the excitement over the charges of unsportsmanslike conduct had died down, the Australians and the English were in broad general agreement on the matter. While most commentators in both countries agreed that bowling at the body, while technically within the laws of the game, was contrary to the spirit of the game, this does not mean that the English people renounced it. Moreover, Larwood and Jardine continued to receive widespread support and acclaim nationally for their unrepentant stances. The English refusal to admit their own bad form (i.e., to admit publicly that they had been unsportsmanlike) led them to in effect ban Jardine and Larwood, the two English players most responsible for the Ashes victory regardless of Bodyline, and lose the Ashes in 1934. Perhaps most damaging to their reputation was that they behaved in a blatantly hypocritical manner just to keep up the pretense that they had acted appropriately.

Ashis Nandy argued in his book *The Tao of Cricket* that “Imperial Britain . . . judged itself on the norms of cricket and the colonies by their actual ways of life, exactly the way it judged Western Christianity by its philosophy and Hinduism or Islam by the way real life Hindus or Muslims lived.”¹¹¹ Bodyline could be seen as the moment when the underside of imperial reality caught up with the overlaying discourse of enlightened English beneficence. The discourses that contributed to the social significance of cricket were normally hidden behind the technical language of cricket reporting, obscured by the idyllic words of celebratory cricketing books, or drown in after match toasts of imperial good fellowship. However, because of the empire-wide coverage of these unprecedented events, these underlying discourses were brought to the forefront of public consciousness.

Repeatedly those trying to diffuse the controversy called upon Australia and England to remember their common history, especially their alleged common racial makeup and their common experience on various fields of battle. An English commentator defended the Australians by stating “Some are sneering at Australian courage. Well, 1914–1918 is not far distant. They took their whippings with as much whine as Tommy Atkins.”¹¹² This was not simply in response to the divisive controversy. Before the English bowling attack had even been unveiled, Jardine spoke of the common Anglo-Australian racial tie as a great bulwark of the Empire. In reference to the uncertain economic situation in which

the world then found itself, he stated: "Both countries have been passing through bad times, but both seem to be coming through them in a manner worthy of our race."¹¹³

The cricketing establishments of England and Australia had vested interests in retaining the status quo of Test cricket and imperial relations. On the most practical level, the revenue generated by the tours was the lifeblood of the counties' and states' cricket boards. More importantly, Test cricket bolstered England's and Australia's standing within the Empire. When the Australians instituted a new law for Australian cricket and forwarded their suggestions to the Imperial Cricket Conference, they ignored the MCC's dictatorial power to legislate the rules of cricket and by extension imperial relations. An article in the *Australian Cricketer* which was picked up and reprinted in the *Barbados Advocates* makes this argument explicitly by stating "Australia, by practically claiming the right to make laws, automatically ranked herself as equal first in cricketing nations."¹¹⁴ The debacle that was Bodyline and the English tacit admission of wrongdoing allowed Australia to promote itself as an equal (or even superior) in every way to the "Mother Country." Although Australians were more egalitarian on the field than the English were, the game was still administered generally by men drawn from the elites of society, who were more likely than the average Australian to desire the retention of the social benefits attached to Test cricket. Bruce Harris, for example, commented on the fact that tour social life continued unabated at the elite level despite the animosity at large.¹¹⁵

Although the Australian reaction to Bodyline was undoubtedly an act of resistance, it was resistance only within a relationship in which Australia was seeking to be an equal partner at the top of the imperial power hierarchy. By protesting as they did and calling for a committee made up of English, Australian, and South African representatives to rule on the dispute, they did not reject the total English imperial project, just their subservient position within it despite three decades of political independence. Furthermore, they reinforced the wider imperial subjugation of the colonies of India and the West Indies, by denying them a vote in the matter.

The Bodyline controversy is important for historians of Britain, Australia, and the Empire because it was a key moment when popular culture was a reflection and engine of social consciousness, and when imperial values were contested and propagated. People in Britain did not think about Australia on a daily basis; nor did they regularly consciously articulate prevailing notions of masculinity, race, or class. These things were just part of their existence, part of the background to their lives. However, through a reading of Bodyline we are able to glimpse a snapshot of a moment in imperial history when those different threads of imperial existence came together and became visible.

34. *The Age*, December 28, 1908.
35. *The Observer*, January 2, 1909.36. *Tasmanian Mail*, January 2, 1909.
37. *Sydney Morning Herald*, December 28, 1908.
38. *The Observer*, January 2, 1909.
39. *Punch* (Melbourne) July 14, 1910.
40. *Sydney Morning Herald*, December 29, 1908.
41. *Sydney Morning Herald*, December 30, 1908.
42. *Sydney Morning Herald*, December 30, 1908.
43. *Sydney Morning Herald*, December 30, 1908.
44. *Sydney Morning Herald*, December 30, 1908.
45. *Punch* (Melbourne) December 31, 1908.
46. *The Argus*, December 28, 1908.
47. *The Argus*, December 28, 1908.
48. *Sporting Life*, December 28, 1908.
49. *Sporting Life*, December 28, 1908.
50. *The Referee* (London) July 10, 1910.
51. *Boxing*, July 9, 1910.
52. *The Parliamentary Debates (Official Report)* (London: HM Stationary Office, 1910, v. 19), 19.
53. *Sports Times*, July 9, 1910.
54. *The Referee* (London) July 10, 1910.
55. *The Referee* (London) July 10, 1910.
56. *Sports Times*, July 2, 1910.
57. *Boxing*, July 9, 1910.
58. *Boxing World and Athletic Chronicle*, July 14, 1910.
59. *Boxing World and Athletic Chronicle*, July 14, 1910.
60. Scobie, *Black Britannia*, 124.
61. Scobie, *Black Britannia*, 128.
62. Gail Bederman, *Manliness and Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States 1880–1917* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 8.
63. Letter dated September 21, 1922 in PRO MEPO 2/1474.
64. Letter dated August 30, 1911 in PRO MEPO 2/1474.
65. September 10, 1911, Report summation in PRO MEPO 2/1474.
66. September 20, 1911, Letter/memo from Under Secretary of State PRO MEPO 2/1474.
67. Memo dated September 22, 1911 PRO HO 45/11880.
68. PRO HO 45/11880.
69. Letter dated January 29, 1923 PRO HO 45/11880.
70. Letter dated November 1, 1922 PRO HO 45/11880.
71. Letter dated January 1, 1923 PRO HO 45/11880.
72. For example, the *Licensed Victualler's Gazette and Hotel Courier* of London May 24, 1901 carried a report on a fight that had occurred in 1790.

Chapter Five Defending White Manhood:

The Bodyline Affair in England and Australia

1. "Gryllus," *Homage to Cricket* (London: Desmond Harmsworth, 1933), 2.
2. Horace, *Epistle* 19.
3. "Bowling" is the action by which the team in the field delivers the ball to the batsman standing at "wicket," which is comprised of three stakes stuck in the ground. In essence the bowler is analogous to the pitcher in baseball and the wicket or "stumps" are roughly analogous to home plate. Since the bowler usually delivers the ball so that it bounces once before it gets to the batsman, bowling "short" makes the ball bounce high on the batsman's body. The three stumps are called leg, middle, and off stumps as they move away from the batsman.
4. Richard Holt, *Sport and the British* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), 233. See Ric Sissons and Brian Stoddart, *Cricket and Empire: The 1932–33 Bodyline Tour of Australia* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1984); Laurence Le Quesne, *The Bodyline Controversy* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1983);

- R. Mason, *Ashes in the Mouth: The Story of the Bodyline Tour 1932–1933* (London: Hambledon, 1982); Gilbert Mant, *A Cuckoo in the Bodyline Nest* (Kenthurst, New South Wales: Kangaroo Press, 1992); Brian Stoddart, "Cricket's Imperial Crisis: The 1932–33 MCC Tour of Australia," in Richard Cashman and Michael McKernan, eds., *Sport in History: The Making of Modern Sporting History* (St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1979); Phillip Derriman, *Bodyline* (London: Grafton, 1986); Edward Wyburgh Docker, *Bradman and the Bodyline* (London: Angus & Robertson, 1983); Jack Fingleton, *Cricketing Crisis: Bodyline and Other Lines* (London: Pavilion, 1984, originally 1947); J.B. Hobbs, *The Fight for the Ashes 1932–33: A Critical Account of the English Tour in Australia* (London: George G. Harrap, 1933); Harold Larwood, *Body-Line?* (London: Elkin Matthews & Marrot, 1933); Arthur Mailey—*And Then Came Larwood: An Account of the Test Matches 1932–33* (London: John Lane The Bodley Head, 1933); D.R. Jardine *Ashes—And Dust* (London: Hutchinson, 1934); Bruce Harris, *Jardine Justified: The Truth about the Ashes* (London: Chapman & Hall, 1933), and Richard S. Whittington, *Bodyline Umpire* (Adelaide: Rigby, 1974).
5. Sissons and Stoddart, *Cricket and Empire*, 21.
6. County cricket was the premier cricket competition in the same way that major league baseball was the premier baseball competition in this period. Similar to the Negro League in America, the Lancashire League of professional cricketers offered play at a level often equal to that of county teams, but was deemed inferior because of the prominence of professionalism and the lower class status of the players, organizers, and fans in the northern league. See Jeffrey Hill, "Reading the Stars: A Post-Modernist Approach to Sports History," *The Sport Historian: The Journal of the British Society of Sports History* 14 (1994), 50–52.
7. *Nottingham Evening Post*, January 19, 1933.
8. C.L.R. James, *Beyond a Boundary* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1993), 187.
9. James, *Beyond a Boundary*, 188.
10. League of Nations, *Statistical Year-Book of the League of Nations* (Geneva, 1934).
11. Robert Wohl, *The Generation of 1914* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979), 84–121; Fussell, Paul, *The Great War and Modern Memory* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1975), 75–113.
12. Wohl, *The Generation of 1914*, 105.
13. Joanna Bourke, *Dismembering the Male: Men's Bodies, Britain and the Great War* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), 14.
14. For a wide-ranging discussion of the conflicts and debates surrounding interwar gender and sexuality, see Susan Kingsley Kent, *Making Peace: The Reconstruction of Gender in Interwar Britain* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993).
15. League of Nations, *International Statistics Yearbook*, 1926; *Statistical Year-Book of the League of Nations*, (Geneva, 1934).
16. Roland Perry, *The Don* (London: Sidgwick & Jackson, 1996), 286–87.
17. Patricia Grimshaw, et al., *Creating a Nation* (New York: Viking Penguin, 1994), 241.
18. For a European-wide perspective on this, see Michael Adas, "'High' Imperialism and 'New History,'" in Adas, Michael, ed., *Islamic and European Expansion: The Forging of a Global Order* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1993), 326.
19. Robert Graves and Alan Hodge, *The Long Week-End: A Social History of Great Britain, 1918–1939* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1940), 295.
20. Larwood, *Body-line?*, 44–45.
21. H.S. Altham and E.W. Swanton, *A History of Cricket* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1938), 436.
22. Teams representing the MCC and England often were comprised of players who were English on the cricketing field only. Some prominent examples of this include the Indians K.S. Ranjitsinhji, K.S. Duleepsinhji, and the Nawab of Patudi, the Trinidadian Pelham Warner, the Australian G.O. Allen, and the Scotsman Jardine, to name just a few.
23. Sissons/Stoddart, *Cricket and Empire*, 35.
24. Altham/Swanton, *A History of Cricket*, 360–61.
25. The name comes from a *faux* obituary published in the *Sporting Times* on September 2, 1882 which announced "In Affectionate Remembrance of ENGLISH CRICKET, which died at the Oval on 29 August, 1882. Deeply lamented by a large circle of Sorrowing Friends and Acquaintances, R.I.P.—The body will be cremated, and the Ashes taken to Australia."
26. While the West Indies were not actually a "nation," they are generally referred to as such in cricketing matters since the cricketers from the colonies of Jamaica, Barbados, Trinidad and Tobago, British Guiana, the Leeward and Windward Islands play as one team.
27. Altham/Swanton, *A History of Cricket*, 337.

28. *The Times*, January 24, 1933.
29. *The Times*, January 24, 1933.
30. Curiously, Woodfull is nearly always described by Australian sources as being struck "over the heart" which is I believe meant to make it sound worse than just being struck in the chest.
31. *The Australian Worker*, February 8, 1933.
32. *Wisden* (1934) has all the cables' texts in their entirety. 1328–331.
33. The control of language is central to the success of any hegemonic system. T.J. Jackson Lears wrote: "The available vocabulary helps mark the boundaries of permissible discourse, discourages the clarification of social alternatives, and makes it difficult for the dispossessed to locate the source of their unease, let alone remedy it." T.J. Jackson Lears, "The Concept of Cultural Hegemony: Problems and Possibilities," *American Historical Review* 90 (1985), 569–70.
34. Larwood, *Body-line?*, 16.
35. Harris, *Jardine Justified*, 3.
36. F.J.C. Gustard, *England v. Australia: A Guide to the Tests 1934* (London: Herbert Joseph, 1934), 24–26.
37. James, *Beyond a Boundary*, 189.
38. Put in a baseball context, this might be the equivalent of maintaining a .425 batting average over a 20-year career.
39. Matthew Engel, ed., *Wisden Cricketer's Almanack*, 133rd edition (Guilford: John Wisden, 1996), 119.
40. A cricket captain is responsible for all on the field decisions regarding personal changes, tactics, and strategies. In essence, the captain acts as a player/coach in American parlance.
41. Le Quesne, *The Bodyline Controversy*, 34.
42. Stoddart, "Cricket's Imperial Crisis," 132.
43. Donald Bradman, *My Cricketing Life* (London: Stanley Paul, 1938), 96.
44. Mant, *A Cuckoo in the Bodyline Nest*, 81, 111.
45. Williams, Marcus, ed., *The Way to Lord's: Cricketing Letters to the Times* (London: Willow Books, 1983), 6.
46. Patsy Hendren, *Big Cricket* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1934), 104–05.
47. A.W. Carr, *Cricket with the Lid Off* (London: Hutchinson, 1938), 67.
48. "Barracking" is the practice of spectators actively participating in the game by usually loudly critiquing, cajoling, insulting the players, umpires, or games in general. While first class English cricket was played in virtual silence, not unlike a modern tennis match, Australian and West Indian cricket was played in a more carnival atmosphere.
49. Harris, *Jardine Justified*, 66.
50. Richard Cashman, "Cricket," in Wray Vamplew and Brian Stoddart, eds., *Sport in Australia: A Social History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 72.
51. *Sydney Morning Herald*, May 9, 1933.
52. Neville Cardus, *Good Days: A Book of Cricket* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1934), 26–27.
53. Herbert Sutcliffe, *For England and Yorkshire* (London: Edward Arnold, 1935), 117.
54. Carr, *Cricket with the Lid Off*, 42.
55. Carr, *Cricket with the Lid Off*, 47.
56. *Morning Post*, January 21, 1933.
57. *Morning Post*, January 24, 1933.
58. Hobbs, *Fight for the Ashes*, 238–39.
59. Jardine, *In Quest of the Ashes*, 196–97.
60. *Manchester Guardian*, January 20, 1933.
61. *South Wales Football Echo and Express*, May 6, 1933.
62. *The Advertiser*, January 18, 1933.
63. *The Daily Telegraph*, July 29, 1933.
64. Jardine, *In Quest of the Ashes*, 198.
65. Larwood, *Body-line?*, 33.
66. Carr, *Cricket with the Lid Off*, 44.
67. "Is Cricket This?" *The Saturday Review*, January 21, 1933.
68. Grimshaw, *Creating a Nation*, 242–43.
69. Joanna Bourke, *Working Class Cultures in Britain 1890–1960: Gender, Class & Ethnicity* (London: Routledge, 1994), 44.

70. John Gillis, "Vanishing Youth: The Uncertain Place of the Young in a Global Age," *Young: Nordic Journal of Youth Research* 1 (1993), 5–7.
71. *The Referee* (Sydney), January 25, 1933.
72. Alistair Thomson, "The Anzac Legend: Exploring National Myth and Memory in Australia" in Raphael Samuel and Paul Thompson, ed., *The Myths We Live By* (London: Routledge, 1990), 74.
73. Thomson *The Myths We Live By*, 74–75.
74. Jardine, *Ashes and Dust*, 90–91.
75. Bill O'Reilly, "Tiger" (Sydney: William Collins Pty., 1985), 93.
76. *Liverpool Post & Mercury*, January 17, 1933.
77. *Morning Post*, January 24, 1933.
78. *Liverpool Post & Mercury*, January 21, 1933.
79. *The Referee*, February 1, 1933.
80. See Ann Laura Stoler, "Rethinking Colonial Categories: European Communities and the Boundaries of Rule," *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 31 (1989).
81. See J.A. Mangan, *Athleticism in the Victorian and Edwardian Public School: The Emergence and Consolidation of an Educational Ideology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), and idem. *The Imperial Curriculum: Racial Images and Education in the British Colonial Experience* (New York: Routledge, 1993).
82. *The Referee*, January 18, 1933.
83. Harris, *Jardine Justified*, 69.
84. *The Argus*, January 17, 1933.
85. Hobbs, *Fight for the Ashes*, 255.
86. *The New Statesman*, August 5, 1933, 170.
87. Harris, *Jardine Justified*, 19.
88. Jardine, *In Quest of the Ashes*, 209–10.
89. *The Argus*, November 11, 1932.
90. Jardine, *In Quest of the Ashes*, 212.
91. *Morning Post*, January 24, 1933.
92. Irving Rosenwater, *Sir Donald Bradman: A Biography* (London: B.T. Batsford, 1978), 257.
93. For some examples, see *The Argus*, January 5, 1933 and Derriman, Phillip, ed., *Our Don Bradman: Sixty Years of Writings About Sir Donald Bradman* (Melbourne: The Macmillan Company of Australia, 1987), 73–74.
94. *The Referee*, January 18, 1933.
95. Jim Bullock, O.B.E., *Bowers Row: Recollections of a Mining Village* (London: EP Publishing, 1976), 77.
96. William Pollock, *The Cream of Cricket* (London: Methuen, 1934), 70.
97. *The New Statesman*, July 1, 1933.
98. Perry, *The Don*, 287.
99. *The Times*, January 20, 1933.
100. R.S. Whittington, *Time of the Tiger: The Bill O'Reilly Story* (London: Stanley Paul, 1970), 187.
101. *Morning Post*, January 24, 1933.
102. *Daily Telegraph*, July 28, 1933.
103. Larwood, *Body-line?*, 20.
104. *Daily Telegraph*, January 19, 1933.
105. *The Advertiser*, December 30, 1932.
106. *The Referee*, January 25, 1933.
107. O'Reilly, *Tiger*, 195.
108. Alan Kippax, *Anti Body-Line* (London: Hurst & Blackett, 1933), 19–20.
109. Kippax, *Anti Body-Line*, 82–83, 86–87.
110. Carr, *Cricket with the Lid Off*, 45–46.
111. Nandy, *Tao of Cricket*, 5.
112. *Morning Post*, January 24, 1933.
113. *The Argus*, November 11, 1932.
114. *Barbados Advocate*, August 2, 1933.
115. Harris, *Jardine Justified*, 55.