

From the Bank to the Baron (1694-1896): A 200 year history of amateurism embedded in the Olympic Ideal

Simon B. Eassom
De Montfort University Bedford

In a recent series of articles on the topic of amateurism, published together in the journal *Quest* (November, 1993), several authors have contributed their expertise in both history and philosophy to a reappraisal of the appropriateness or worthiness of the term 'amateur' in contemporary sporting parlance. Schneider and Butcher (15), and Morgan (12), in particular attempt to re-conceptualise an ideal of amateurism that represents a contemporary sporting ethic, thus saving it from its anachronistic associations with prize-money and wages and the corruptions that assumedly follow: associations that Schneider and Butcher see as, "unfortunate because the concept of amateurism has now been completely abandoned, and with it has gone an opportunity to continue to articulate the value of the intrinsic goods of sport" (15: p.468). Morgan, in the title of his paper, sees amateurism and professionalism as "moral languages", and his conceptual analysis as one "in search of a moral image for sport" (12).

Whilst the series of articles contribute much to an interesting and worthy topic, as a whole they leave out more of importance from a historical dimension than they include. They represent excursions into philosophical analysis of a concept that cannot be divorced from its historical conceptions. What counts as history in Smith's (16) and Schneider's (15) papers are moments of time taken from their context and placed into a debate without the benefit of the sequence of events that make any historical unit intelligible in itself. In his essay, *The Use and Abuse of History*, Nietzsche is particularly scathing of those "who write history in the naive faith that justice resides in the popular view of their time". He suggests that they "only adapt the past to the present triviality" (13: p.38). Whilst this may be a harsh

criticism of the papers in question, it illustrates a point that this paper attempts to make.

As with most commentaries on amateurism, the modern Olympic Games and the work of Baron Pierre de Coubertin in establishing the Olympic ideal have been the focus of much of the debate on the problematic nature of amateurism. As a practical issue, because of the difficulties with the spirit of amateurism as encoded in the International Olympic Committee rules and sporting practices themselves, the definition of amateurism has been the source of much debate. But as such, it has not been 'amateurism' itself that has been debated, but the inability of an edict cast in stone to do a job that is very much different from the one it set out to do 100 years previously. The contention here is that the mistake that has been made is to interpret 'amateurism' literally in the way that it appears to have been presented by De Coubertin and his predecessors in the sporting governing bodies of Britain. The description has come to be the definition itself. Amateur clauses represented an ideal by exemplifying those instances that at that time would not be in the spirit of that ideal. De Coubertin spoke of defending against the "spirit of lucre and professionalism" (cited in 15: p.461).

Here is the starting point, and end point, of some notes on amateurism that make an attempt at historical unity; and a theory that the concept of amateurism has less to do specifically with prize-money and wages, and more to do with the reinforcement of a usurpation by the middle classes of the aristocracy's mantle of gentility. From the foundation of the Bank of England to Baron Pierre de Coubertin's inauguration of the modern Olympic Games is two hundred years of amateurism's history forgotten by those homeless amateur clauses plucked from their historical meaningfulness into a conceptual limbo.

In November 1699 the Drury Lane Theatre Company in London first performed George Farquhar's restoration comedy *The Constant Couple (A Trip to the Jubilee)* against a social and political climate that indicated the first signs of antagonism between the ruling aristocratic elite and the emerging business class. The Bank of England had been founded in 1694 and represented a shift from the measurement of wealth in terms of gold coinage to the new currency of paper money. Wealth, status and power could now be measured by a bank balance: numbers on a balance sheet rather than acres of property. The

play's main protagonist is Sir Harry Wildair, a beau. Whilst Colonel Standard is the second son of a gentleman, who without the inheritance of his father's estate must do what all second sons did: take a commission in the army.

ACT FOUR: Scene One

Covent Garden. *Wildair and Standard meeting*

Colonel Standard: I hope you're no coward, sir.

Sir Harry Wildair: Coward, sir! I have eight thousand pounds a year, sir.

Colonel Standard: You fought in Flanders to my knowledge.

Sir Harry Wildair: Ay, for the same reason that I wore a red coat, because 'twas fashionable.

Colonel Standard: Sir, you fought a French count in Paris.

Sir Harry Wildair: True, sir; he was a beau like myself. Now you're a soldier, Colonel, and fighting's your trade; and I think it downright madness to contend with any man in his profession.

Colonel Standard: Come, sir, no more dallying: I shall take very unseemly methods if you don't show yourself a gentleman.

Sir Harry Wildair: A gentleman! why there again now? A gentleman! I tell you once more, Colonel, that I am a baronet, and have eight thousand pounds a year. I can dance, sing, ride, fence, understand the languages. Now, I can't conceive how running you through the body should contribute one jot more to my gentility.

Although *The Constant Couple* pokes fun at the aristocracy in the form of Wildair as the beau, the court dandy, the satire is mainly directed at the growing middle class or 'nouveau riche' depicted in the play as borish fools without class or culture. Writing some 5 years after the foundation of the Bank of England in 1694 and 2 years after Goldsmith's unsuccessful 'run' on the Bank in 1697, Farquhar recognises the creation of class distinction as it was to become: the result of a whole group of the populace desiring to distance themselves from whence they came by associating themselves with what they would aspire to. Emulation of the aristocracy's tastes, fashions, and culture helped them to escape from their more humble roots. Stow's *Survey of London* in 1700 reports on how,

The lower classes divert themselves at football, wrestling, cudgels, ninepins, shovel-board, cricket, stowball, ringing of bells, quoits, pitching the bar, bull and bear baitings, throwing at cocks and lying in ale-houses (6: p.205)

The new middle class sought to improve themselves through a broad and liberal education and to adopt the interests of the nobility. It became a matter of necessity to "dance, sing, ride, fence, understand the languages". Such an association of nobility and class with a multiplicity of interests and pursuits, none to the excess of specialism, became so entrenched in the notion of gentility that by the end of Victorian England it had become *de facto* the very definition of a 'gentleman'. Whigham states in 1909,

Now there are certain attributes that are supposed to belong to those of high birth. The fact that a man is born into the society of gentlemen imposes upon him certain duties and, to some extent the ideas of his class. He is expected to have a broad education, catholic tastes, and a multiplicity of pursuits. He must not do anything for pecuniary gain; and it can easily be seen that he must not specialise. It is essentially the mark of a bourgeois mind to specialise. (4: p. 16)

For Farquhar in 1699 this comedy of manners provides rich pickings: when accused by Lady Lurewell of dishonour in his business dealings, Sir Harry finds the reference to business far more unpalatable than the reference to dishonour, "Why, madam, I never had any business in my life".

200 years on and the aristocratic sportsmen's desire to distinguish themselves from the new gentry led to them pursuing newer and more elite leisure activities, such as skiing. And when the business classes followed, the gentlemen amateurs distinguished themselves in other ways,

There was a touch of 'effortless superiority' about all this; champions were not supposed to toil for their laurels; they ought not to practise too much. Most of all they had to look like gentlemen, not 'tourists', wearing their oldest clothes for skiing as a country squire might wear shabby tweeds for shooting. . . . Among gentlemen, on the ski slopes as on the grouse moors, only the

nouveau riches were smart. These early skiers were supposed to be 'gentlemen amateurs', not the sons (and daughters) of 'new money' who went to Switzerland as a form of conspicuous consumption (5: pp.425-426).

In no other area was the new business class' attempts to take on the lifestyle of the aristocracy more pronounced than in the mimicry of their recreations and pastimes. "That the aristocracy were the 'leisured class' was axiomatic", points out Rule in his survey of life and work in eighteenth century England,

Although some in the upper reaches of a few select professions, notably the law, the Church and the Army, might be considered 'honorary' holders of that status, it was the ability to live from property without working which was the fundamental mark of the 'gentleman'. (14: p.44)

As Sir Harry Wildair puts it, ". . . a gentleman is distinguished precisely by his unalleviated leisure". From the end of the seventeenth century onwards, this appropriation of aristocratic leisure by the new 'middle' class has done much to confuse the issue of just what was aristocratic about sport 100 years later, 200 years later, or even today. For example, hunting has long been considered a traditional aristocratic sport. Indeed, hunting had always been an important status symbol. Yet whilst the destruction of the forests, enclosures of wastes and encroachments of arable farming had all but killed off the regal sport of deer hunting, chasing vermin such as foxes and hares behind slow plodding hounds had little appeal to the aristocracy. They had little interest in chasing something wholly inedible for the vague pleasure of letting a pack of dogs hound it to death. Whilst they took to the new vogue of shooting, the new gentry took to horseback and ironically the aristocracy joined them much later when Hugo Meynell began breeding a faster more exciting hound for his Quorn hunt in Leicestershire and the Duke of Beaufort turned his Badminton pack over to fox-hunting in 1762, as did the Duke of Rutland (2: p.132). Such was the fashion for the hunt that Henry Fielding's villainous Squire Western in *Tom Jones* (1749) chased foxes with as much vigour as he chased wenches and downed spirits. However, it was Fielding's bipolar Squire Alworthy - cultured, refined,

charitable and honourable - who was to become the stereotype of the middle-class gentleman by the later eighteenth century (14).

The adoption of the aristocracy's leisure and lifestyle and the sanitising of it to meet the demands of the Methodist and Anglican lobbies took place over a long period, from the mid-eighteenth to mid-nineteenth centuries. McIntosh, in his *Sport and Society* oversimplifies the case when he states that,

at the beginning of the (19th) century all that was prominent and all that was organized in British sport was Barbarian (Aristocratic), but the Barbarians made no attempt to hand down their sports to the populace, nor to organize them for participation by a wider clientele. At the end of the (19th) century the pattern of sport was predominantly Philistine (8: p.64, parenthesis mine).

For the most part McIntosh's statement, that the organisation of sport for a wider clientele was sponsored by the middle classes in the later nineteenth century, is true. Surprisingly then, many commentators continue to mistakenly attribute the amateur paragraphs in the bye-laws, that served as a measure to exclude the working classes, with some form of *aristocratic* control and manipulation. Smith talks about, "the upper-class British concept of amateurism" (15: p.430) and Morgan, in his typology of "six related senses of amateurism" talks about the "British aristocratic sense" as, "a socially elitist one tailored to rid sport of any and all social inferiors" (12: p.475). However, despite the example of sports such as rowing attempting as early as the 1920s to rule out manual workers and labourers, most of these amateur clauses were initiated by the newly formed 'Associations' of the latter half the nineteenth Century: organisations that bore little or no relationship to the aristocratic clubs of 100 years earlier.

Ironically, these clubs - the Jockey Club and the Royal and Ancient Golf Club, both founded in the 1750s and the Marylebone Cricket Club, founded in 1788 (8) - were completely exclusive: but, not by virtue of rules and clauses controlling admission. Like the smart gentlemen's clubs of London (Boodle's, Brook's, White's) in St. James's Street, their membership was determined by nomination and ballot of the existing members. And herein lies the difference. The genuine aristocratic governing body performed very much as a gentlemen's club and the

exclusion of unwanted parties was exclusion from the club, not from participation in the sport.

Apart from the Alpine Club (a governing body along the lines of the earlier Clubs), founded in 1857, the later organisations are significantly differentiated by the use of Association in their title. The one exception, the Amateur Athletic Club founded in 1866, changed its name to the Amateur Athletic Association in 1880. The Alpine Club exists out of synchronisation from the others for the simple reason that mountaineering only really expanded as a sport in the early 1800s. The first climb of significance was Balmat and Paccard's ascent of Mont Blanc in 1786 (motivated purely by the promise of a financial prize). Only when the English gentry became involved, inspired as much by the writing of romantics such as John Ruskin (1819-1900), did interest in the sport grow. The culminating of this enthusiasm was Sir Alfred Wills' ascent of the Wetterhorn in 1854 heralding the 'Golden Age' in the decade up to 1865 ending with Whymper's conquest of the Matterhorn, by which time nearly every major Alpine peak had been scaled. The Swiss did not have their own Alpine Club until 1863; the German and French not until 1869 and 1874 respectively (3: p. 118). Interestingly, these early gentleman amateur climbers were always led by local guides in their employ, despite the clear reality that many of them exceeded in both knowledge and skill the professional climbers.

However, the same voices that praised the manly conquest of these summits were persistently hostile to the growing cult of organised games. Ruskin, along with Matthew Arnold and the popular writer Wilkie Collins, were few among many who attacked the worship-of athletics as a serious threat to society. For Collins the sportsman represented a new breed: the 'rough in broadcloth' (1: p. 133). The initial founders of the associations met with some resistance in their attempt to persuade a critical public that athletic sports, practised outside the walls of the public schools and universities, were not morally damaging at worst or vulgar at the very least.

The significant changes that mark the emergence of 'middle-class' sport owe much to the period of Anglican evangelicalism from the mid-eighteenth to mid-nineteenth centuries, in conjunction with a growing industrial economy and the advance of free, mobile, wage labour. John Wesley had attacked popular recreational forms from the early days of his

mission. In 1766 he wrote of the Otley feast day that found the town, "gone mad in noise, hurry, drunkenness, rioting, confusion, to the shame of a Christian country" (cited in 14: p.164).

It became a matter of concern for many that the new demand for a conspicuous consumption of leisure was leading the lower classes into idleness and crime and the middle classes into a neglect of their businesses and a frittering away of their fortunes. The growth of the spa towns in the eighteenth century is testimony to the new gentry's desire to follow the urban style of the aristocracy whose wealth, largely derived from the country, was being increasingly lost in the towns. The consumer revolution that followed them saw the harmless gatherings of the working classes at rural events around the agricultural calendar become interpreted as threatening masses of unruly yobs at organised events in the towns, revolving around drinking and gambling. Where once the new gentry, like the aristocracy before them, openly patronised the populace's vulgar pastimes of football, bull baiting, pugilism, and cock fighting, the new breed of entrepreneurs and profit-minded promoters moved in.

Historians such as Hans Medick have gone so far as to use the increasing consumption of gin as a measure of the shift from a rural based labour economy to an urban wage based industrial society (11). Whereas earlier the new gentry tolerated and enjoyed involvement with the plebeian sports of the early eighteenth century, they now generally withdrew their patronage with the result that, as Malcomson puts it, "a solid barrier so developed between the culture of gentility and the culture of the people" (9: p. 167).

Whilst the church, both Methodist and Anglican, grew as a determining force in the gentry's distancing of itself from traditional pastimes, it also led to a new image for the gentry itself. By the time of Queen Victoria, the 'gentleman' was no longer Farquhar's man of unalleviated leisure. His gentility became measured by his conduct and manner. Samuel Smiles, writing in 1859, expounds the myth of the English gentleman as a paragon of virtue,

Above all, the Gentleman is truthful. He feels that truth is the 'summit of being,' and the soul of rectitude in human affairs. Lord Chesterfield, with all his French leanings, when he came to define a gentleman, declared that Truth made his

success; and nothing that he ever said commanded the more hearty suffrage of his nation. The Duke of Wellington, who had an inflexible horror of falsehood, writing to Kellerman, when that general was opposed to him in the Peninsula, told him that, if there was one thing on which an English officer prided himself more than another, excepting his courage, it was his truthfulness. 'When English officers,' said he, 'have given their parole of honour not to escape, be sure they will not break it. Believe me - trust to their word; the word of an English officer is a surer guarantee than the vigilance of sentinels.' (10: p.391)

These middle-class gentlemen made great efforts to maintain a distance from the exclusive clubs and societies of the aristocracy whose *raison d'être* was largely seen to be excessive gambling and betting. Rather than distancing themselves from the working classes, the aristocracy had a history of association revolving around the promotion of events where they either gambled on their 'man' at fisticuffs, or played alongside them at the wicket. The eighteenth century growth in cricket's popularity owes much to the patronage of such nobility as the Duke of Richmond, Frederick Louis the Prince of Wales, the Earl of Sandwich, and the Duke of Cumberland (the King's second son). The latter in particular was game for any sport worthy of a wager. It was largely due to their insatiable quest for new and exciting forms of gambling that horse racing grew and flourished. In 1729 the *London Journal* reported on the prowess of the Duke of Richmond's groom, Thomas Waymark, who turned the game in favour of the Duke's side and won the 100 guinea purse (2: p. 115). In 1743 the *Gentleman's Magazine* railed against the aristocracy's indulgence in cricket on social and legal grounds,

Noblemen, gentlemen and clergymen have certainly a right to divert themselves in what manner they think fit, nor do I dispute their privilege of making butchers, cobblers or tinkers their companions, provided they are gratified to keep them company. But I very much doubt whether they have any right to invite thousands of people to be spectators of their agility (cited in 2: p. 120).

These butchers, cobblers, and tinkers were the first professional sportsmen, along with the landed gen-

try's servants and footmen who were sent to the contests as messengers to lay wagers of considerable amounts, or to take part as jockeys, pedestrian runners, boxers and cricketers. Such relationships continued long into the present century. Lord Tennyson, one time captain of England's cricket team in the 1930s and batsman for Hampshire, deferred in crick-eting stature to the long-standing England wicket-keeper and Hampshire's opening bat, Walter Livesey. Livesey just so happened to be M'Lord's chauffer and valet. According to the renowned sports-writer Frank Keating, on many occasion Livesey would charge down, what is now, the M3 in the Bentley, with Tennyson in the back, from London's gaming tables to Southampton in time for his Lordship to take the toss. Duly won, Livesey would change his chauffer's outfit for his whites, run his Lordship's bath, and pad up to open the batting. If he wasn't 'out' by midday, Tennyson would summon a boy runner from the press box to take a telegram out to the crease: livesy stop i'm ready to bat stop get out at once (7: p.39).

But in the mid-eighteenth century, whilst acknowledging the debt owed to the aristocratic clubs and the role that gambling had played in the pioneering work of regulating, rationalizing, and institutionalising these early sports, betting and gaming were condemned by the middle-classes in the most vitriolic terms (8). Even in Parliament, the new gentlemen supported popular opinion and criticised gambling for seducing individuals away from rational behaviour and reasoned action. The popular novels of the time were replete with the victims of betting whose fortunes were lost, or, like Thackeray's Lord Sterne in *Vanity Fair*, were symbols of corruption and vice.

The main concern of the gentleman amateur was that money in general, whether in the form of wagers or wages, destroyed the framework of healthy competition. The new Victorian gentleman praised honour and fair play far more than the aristocracy had ever cared for it. When the Football Association introduced the penalty kick in 1891, for an intentional foul in front of the goal, many former public school players were offended by the suggestion that one gentleman would intentionally foul another (8: p.33). As C.B. Fry, one of the grand old Corinthians and England amateur soccer player and cricketer, remarked on the issue,

Sir, it remains a standing insult to my honour and integrity to play under a rule which assumes a player might intend to trip, hack, or push his opponent and to behave like a cad of the most unscrupulous kidney. Not only that, but the lines marking the boundaries of this 'penalty area' are a disgrace to any playing field (cited in 7: p.38).

As Samuel Smiles had made clear, to call into question a man's honesty and fairness was to call into question his gentility. If sport was to remain fair and friendly, and conducted in an honest and honourable way, it had to be played by gentlemen. For the founders of the Associations, the fear was that the professionals, drawn wholly from the waged classes, would not play as gentlemen. If professional sportsmen could not be abolished, they at least could be prevented from taking part in the middle class's amateur sports.

It is worth pointing out that in the commentaries of Smith, Schneider & Butcher, and Morgan (16, 15, 12) in the *Quest* articles on amateurism (November 1993), no mention is made of the strong association between being an 'amateur' and being a 'gentleman'. So inextricably intertwined are the two concepts that they are almost synonymous. This recognition is vital to the understanding of the perpetuation of the amateur ideal into the later twentieth century. Only in 1962 did the MCC reluctantly agree to surrender their divisive split between the amateurs and the professionals, known since 1806 as "gentlemen" and "players", respectively. The spirit nevertheless lived on. As the Duke of Beaufort demonstrates in 1978,

One point I find lacking in sport today is gentlemen vs. players. It is not easy to find a team of gentlemen (6: pp.194-195).

The problem for the founding associations in the latter half of the nineteenth century was that, in stark contrast to the aristocratic clubs one hundred years earlier, their membership was not overtly exclusive but based on universal admittance, managed by democratically elected committees. At the same time they were struggling for establishment in the face of some criticism that these sports should remain where they belonged: on the school and university playing fields. It was imperative to maintain

their gentlemanly character. Even if the reality of the public school sports arena did not match up to the 'muscular Christian' image, in principle sport should be friendly and fair. In the minds of the gentlemen amateurs, the advent of professionalism brought with it the prospects of bribery and corruption, fixing of results in advance, protests and arguments with the officials, and intentional fouling and breaking of the rules. As custodians of gentlemanly sport, they cultivated a defense against such possibilities by the establishment of an amateur code that intended to symbolise the attitude that winning did not matter. Of course winning mattered. It always had. For the aristocracy it had always been the whole point of the exercise: albeit for no other reason than the boast, the challenge, the wager. Winning and losing have little to do with amateurism, but have achieved mythical status with De Coubertin's revival of Olympism.

The quasi-historical version of events leading up to Harold Abraham's sprint victory at the 1924 Paris Olympics as represented in the film *Chariots of Fire*, illustrates exactly this attitude to professionalism and amateurism. After the Master of Trinity chastises Abrahams over dinner for his employment of a professional coach, adding his view that the way of the amateur is the correct path, the Master of Caius adds,

M. of Caius: Your aim is to win at all costs, is it not?

Abrahams: At all costs, no! But I do aim to win within the rules. Perhaps Sir you would rather I play the gentleman and lost?

M. of Caius: To playing the tradesman, yes!

M. of Trinity: My dear boy, your approach has been, if I may say so, a little too plebian. You are the elite and are therefore expected to behave as such.

De Coubertin entered the scene from a private box in the circle, not from the stage door. He shared the English middle-class's broadly imperialist and paternalist views of a social elite trying to come to terms with the growing calls for democratic reform. He firmly believed in the role of the privileged as defenders of all that was good in the hierarchical social structure against the invasive demands of the populist ideologies of the day. The net result was an ideal of sport entrenched in his vision for an Olympic Games. He was a man of his time, whose views have long since decayed to leave behind a whiff of Victorian hypocrisy. Nevertheless, to see amateur-

ism as anachronistic is to interpret it purely in terms of a dead concept, frozen in time as an icon of middle-class anxiety about the unreliable morals of those seen to be different by birth. De Coubertin's model of amateurism represents just one moment in time of a complex struggle for domination between a declining aristocracy and the children of the industrial revolution. Frozen at that moment as a concept represented by concerns about money and payments, wages and occupations, the term 'amateur' has indeed become anachronistic. Ironically, the ideals behind its history and evolution are alive and well within the institutions that first manifested them, such as golf and cricket. The revolution has occurred at the wicket and on the green, but not in the clubhouse.

References

1. Bailey, P. (1978) **Leisure and Class in Victorian England: Rational Recreation and the Contest for Control 1830-1885**. London: Methuen & Co.
2. Birley, D. (1993) **Sport and the making of Britain**. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
3. Eassom, S.B. (1989) *Sport as Moral Educator: Reason and Habit on the School Playing Field*, in C. Barrett and T.J. Winniffrith (Eds.) **The Philosophy of Leisure**, London: MacMillan, pp. 114-135.
4. Glader, E. (1978) **Amateurism and Athletics**. Leisure Press.
5. Holt, R. (1992) *An Englishman in the Alps: Arnold Lunn, Amateurism and the Invention of Alpine Ski Racing*, **International Journal of the History of Sport**, Vol.9 No.3, December, 421-432.
6. Jarman, C. (1990) **The Guinness Dictionary of Sports Quotations**. London: Guinness Publishing Ltd.
7. Keating, F. (1990) *Gentlemen and Players*, **The Guardian Impact**, No.7, Autumn, London: Guardian Media Group.
8. McIntosh, P.C. (1963) **Sport in Society**. London: Watts.
9. Malcomson, R.W. (1981) **Popular recreations in English Society 1700-1850**. London: Hutchinson.
10. Marwick, A. (1970) **The Nature of History**. London: Macmillan.
11. Medick, H. (1982) *Plebeian Culture in the Transition to Capitalism*, in R. Samuel and G. Stedman Jones (Eds.) **Culture, Ideology and Politics**. London: Routledge.
12. Morgan, W.J. (1993) *Amateurism and Professionalism as Moral Languages: In Search of a Moral Image for Sport*, **Quest**, No.45, November, 470-493.
13. Nietzsche, F. (1957/0874) **The Use and Abuse of History**, (tr. Adrian Collins). New York: Bobbs-Merrill.
14. Rule, J. (1992) **Albion's People: English Society, 1714-1815**. London: Longman.
15. Schneider, A.J. and Butcher, R.B. (1993) *For the Love of the Game: A Philosophical Defense of Amateurism*, **Quest**, No.45, November, 460-469.
16. Smith, R.A. (1993) *History of Amateurism in Men's Intercollegiate Athletics: The Continuance of a 19th-Century Anachronism in America*, **Quest**, No.45, November, 430-447.
17. Vamplew, W. (1988) *Sport and Industrialization: An Economic Interpretation of the Changes in Popular Sports in Nineteenth-Century England*, in J.A. Mangan (Ed.) **Pleasure, Profit, Proselytism: British Culture and Sport at Home and Abroad 1700-1914**, London: Frank Cass, pp.7-21.