
Celebrating Violent Masculinities: The Boxing Death of Luther McCarty*

by Kevin B. Wamsley

SCHOOL OF KINESIOLOGY

THE UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN ONTARIO

and

David Whitson

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

INTRODUCTION

It has long been argued that sports have sustained and reproduced particular types of masculinity and have served to naturalize a variety of forms of male violence.¹ Historically, the sport of boxing has provoked recurring controversies around these and related issues. Boxing injuries have repeatedly raised important questions about the “legitimacy” of violence that takes place in sanctioned sporting contests and about public attitudes toward violence as entertainment. Boxing has a long history as a popular form of male entertainment, but with the growth of national media and especially popular tabloids in the late nineteenth century, national and world “championships” became objects of widespread popular fascination.² Some boxing matches, particularly in the heavyweight division, became national, even international, events. In this context, the social meanings attached to boxing, and the popular identifications that were mobilized around particular fighters, became the focus of considerable public debate.

This paper examines some of these issues, with reference to a fight that took place in Calgary in 1913—a fight that was supposed to produce a white challenger for Jack Johnson’s world title, but ended in the death of one contestant and manslaughter charges against the winner. One of the ensuing controversies was about the place of the law and the courts in the regulation of sporting violence.

Attitudes toward this matter, however, and attitudes toward boxing more generally were closely connected with other social agendas having to do with gender, race, and civic status, as well as with popular ideas about science and modernity. An examination of the public rhetoric that surrounded the Arthur Pelkey-Luther McCarty match and its aftermath offers some insights into the social climate of the early twentieth century and the ideological campaigns that characterized this period.

BOXING, PUBLIC ATTITUDES, AND SOCIAL CHANGE

In the popular media debates that developed around boxing, the sport was both widely celebrated and heavily criticized. It is important to understand some of the ways in which boxing became a vehicle for the articulation and valorization of particular, and sometimes competing, social ideas. Boxing has always exemplified what Connell et al.³ call a “confrontative sport.” In confrontative sports, it is not only legitimate but necessary for men to dominate opponents by force and violence—behavior that became increasingly illegitimate outside the ritualized contexts of sports. Thus, champions in confrontative sports became popular exemplars of a rough version of masculinity that was still widely respected, even as they were criticized by moralists and social reformers.⁴ However, the models of masculinity that were traditionally valorized in boxing became further complicated, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, by changing middle- and upper-class ideas about masculinity and by ethnic rivalries and racial tensions. All of these factors affected both official and popular attitudes toward boxing, and some were mobilized by boxing proponents to try to legitimize the sport beyond its core audience of working-class men.

At one level, what was at stake can be illustrated by the struggle between amateur boxing and professional prize fighting, itself an example of the larger struggle for authority and control in sports between “moral entrepreneurs” who promoted the moral and social instruction of young men through amateur sporting participation, and economic entrepreneurs whose interests lay in the development of commercial spectator entertainment. It is evident that many turn-of-the-century prize fights attracted enthusiastic public interest. Concerns about brutality and corruption were raised in influential sectors, though, and prize fighting was banned in Canada by a federal statute passed in 1881.⁵ Yet, despite this legislation, prize fights continued to attract audiences across the country, and although the law legitimized police raids, in most jurisdictions only minor charges were laid, and convictions were few.⁶

This official tolerance, which effectively circumvented the law, deserves some comment. In the first place, it was socially legitimate for boys to learn boxing and compete in amateur bouts under the auspices of organizations like the Y.M.C.A. Indeed, boxing at the turn of the century was widely seen as consistent with the moral and social purposes of “muscular Christianity,” and Donnelly argues that for many middle-class men, boxing was understood “as an activity that would promote manliness and character, morality and patriotism.”⁷ Manliness here

defined a particular middle-class kind of masculinity, and boxing was considered to offer important socialization for youths into manly ideals, habits, and norms of courage.⁸ Thus, support for boxing, often grounded in youthful experience, was not at all uncommon among those men—city officials and police, as well as businessmen and politicians—whose role it was to enforce the statutes.⁹

In addition, from the mid-1890s, boxing clubs and advocates increasingly made the argument that when properly conducted and adjudicated, prize fights should be understood as scientific exhibitions of technical skills and physical discipline. The discipline of the body, of course, had always been central to the Victorian belief in the educational value of sports. When this was articulated with the idea of technique, however, an association was also being claimed with explicitly “modern” forms of excellence. Ideas about progress through scientific analysis and technical advances were central to popular notions about modernity, and that these ideas would have influential proponents in various sports was entirely consistent with ascendant ideas of the day.¹⁰ The association of boxing with modern technique was usually just rhetoric on the part of fight promoters who sought to widen the social range of those interested in boxing. Yet, it worked because it associated the sport with the new religion of an industrializing society—science. In describing successful prize fighters as exemplars of tactics, technique, and fitness, in other words, of disciplined achievement, this discourse articulated the preferred self-image of newly ascendant middle-class males. The scientifically trained body was something “the modern man” was proud of and respected in others. Consequently, boxing came to be socially rationalized through what Early refers to as an “obsessive quest for more reified technique and rules.”¹¹

However, there were other discourses in the promotion of prize fights that spoke to more traditional kinds of identifications and visceral kinds of desires. First, it should be noted that the celebration of violence did not disappear, nor was it confined to the “rough” working class. Indeed, spectator fascination with violence was as likely to be found among businessmen and professionals as among working men, and Gruneau and Whitson have noted in their discussion of violence in hockey that the celebration of force, as well as skill, in sport has historically brought together, through a widely shared response, men of very different social backgrounds who might have little else in common.¹² This is a point we shall return to later. In addition, prize fights offered obvious focal points for civic rivalries, and fight promotion was often bound up with civic boosterism.

Most important for the events we are about to examine, however, was that after Jack Johnson won the heavyweight title from Tommy Burns in 1908, the rhetoric of race presented itself as a readily exploited discourse of rivalry for fight promoters across North America. Even before this, prize fighters had often been matched so that promoters could appeal to ethnic identifications and rivalries (e.g., Jewish, Irish, Italian). The promoters of interracial bouts took this a step further, building popular support for “white hopes” and appealing openly to white supremacist sentiments.¹³ In the standard storyline that surrounded interracial fights, moreover, the supposed tactics and science of the white man were typically

pitted against the “natural” qualities (including “brute” force) of his black antagonist.

BOXING IN CALGARY AND TOMMY BURNS¹⁴

The above discussion provides some general background to the Pelkey-McCarty fight promotion of 1913. In spite of the federal statutes referred to, and the laws of the North West Territories, Western Canadian centers like Calgary regularly hosted the matches of local fighters. For town councillors and especially law enforcement officers, these were occasions for ambivalence and contradictions. Some matches were raided, while others received praise in the local papers for their fine displays of athletic skills. It is evident from many reports that prominent city officials, police and firemen, and business leaders regularly legitimated matches with their attendance. In particular, Calgary fire chief Cappy Smart was known to be an avid fight fan and sometimes referee. Historian Grant MacEwan describes some of Smart's escapades:

Nobody suggested that Cappy Smart was a saint but to most Calgarians, he was a hero and a very human one. He had his fun and sometimes it was dangerously close to the limit of city council's patience and tolerance. His drinking habits didn't escape attention but aldermen knew that any attempt to remove this man from office would have brought public rebellion.¹⁵

At one match in 1903, Smart is reported to have escaped through a window while police were raiding the event.¹⁶

By 1910, ex-champion Tommy Burns had “set up shop” in Calgary, hoping to establish the city as one of the leading fight locations in North America. Burns organized boxing exhibitions, built an arena on the outskirts of the city, and even fought a few times himself. It was soon evident to him that Calgarians were well-informed on boxing news, that fans were keenly interested in the current state of the heavyweight division, and that it was with some excitement that they anticipated hosting future bouts in the city. In a letter to his friend Bob Edwards, editor of the *Calgary Eyeopener* newspaper, Burns wrote:

My present plans are primarily to arrange a ten to twenty round contest with Jack Johnson whom I am confident I can defeat with clean breaks. A clean break contest is absolutely devoid of brutality and thus [there] should be no reasonable objection to having such an event pulled off in Calgary...Few people seem to think or realize the amount of advertising such sporting events give a young city all over the world. All I ask is permission to stage one contest here. After that I feel sure that the authorities will freely admit that there are no objectionable features to the fighting game when conducted under clean management.¹⁷

We can see here that Burns appealed to the boosterism and dreams of civic repute that were very much part of the Calgary of that period. However, at the same time, Burns attempted to distance his promotions from the familiar negative stereotypes of brutality and corruption that some associated with prize fighting.

A Burns promotion would be a clean fight with clean management. Burns also sought to legitimate his fights, while adding to his audiences, by encouraging women to attend pre-fight exhibitions. Newspaper promotions for Burns' first lecture and exhibition at the Sherman auditorium made it clear that his presentations were always well received by packed houses and the audience was usually composed of at least one-third women.¹⁸ Before a later fight that Burns arranged between himself and Arthur Pelkey, he held a special "Ladies' Day" for women who had never viewed a boxing contest. As part of Burns' usual campaign style and, more importantly, to position women as the philanthropic and moral guardians of society, all donations collected were to be distributed to local charities. It was obvious that boxing supporters believed that the presence and endorsement of women would enhance the reputation of the sport in the community,

The promotional rhetoric used to interest local men during the lead-up to the championship fight included no references to charity, but did feature repeated assurances that the boxers were in excellent physical condition and that they were men of good character. Reacting to resistance to boxing from some Calgarians, Burns regularly defended what he claimed to be the manly and honorable character of his fighters. In fact, despite his earlier interest in fighting Johnson himself, Burns refused in 1913 to accept the challenge of Jack Johnson to fight Luther McCarty in Calgary:

There is absolutely no reason why I should make this match. Johnson has not conducted himself in a gentlemanly manner at all since gaining the title, and now that I am a match-maker I am only putting on matches which are between men of good character and clean-living fellows. I have started the game in this city and am doing my very utmost to keep it clean. In refusing to make this match it was not through mere race prejudice but for the good of the game in Calgary. So far it has been clean boxing and clean boys. While I am here it will remain that way.¹⁹

Clearly, neither Burns nor the local media viewed Johnson as a "clean boy." Stereotypical comments about blacks were common in Calgary newspapers. For example, the *Calgary Daily Herald* reported on the "Colored Ball" that when the music played, "the musical natures of the colored people would be clamorous for expression" but that "the blithsome hearts of colored people delight not alone of music—they do like chicken."²⁰ The same newspaper had reported the previous year of Jack Johnson, "[the] big tar baby has a new white wife."²¹ Johnson was also made a figure of racist humor in both the *Calgary Daily Herald* and the *Calgary Eyeopener* in what Wiggins refers to as "Samba" cartoons.²² Calgary was by no means unique in this open circulation of racial caricatures and attacks.

Indeed, it was evident across North America that in his victories over the top white fighters of the day, in his uncompromising attitude outside the ring, and in his open liaison with a white woman, Jack Johnson had become a symbol for the fears and animosities many whites harbored toward blacks.²³ The desire to see Johnson put back "in his place" was widespread, and heavyweight boxer Jim Corbett, for example, announced that "[n]obody who knows boxing is more anxious to see a white fighter at the head of pugilism than I."²⁴ Under the headline

“Black Clouds,” the *Calgary Daily Herald* stated that “[t]hings are looking very dark indeed when every class of pugilism is threatened with a leader of the negro race.”²⁵ Johnson’s position as champion was a continuing affront to the well-established notions of white supremacy, and Burns was not the only fight promoter seeking to find a credible contender around whom white hopes could be mobilized. In this context, he was also very aware that his promotion of the Pelkey-McCarty fight could only benefit from the promotion of anti-Johnson, anti-black sentiment, as white fans were invited to participate in the coronation the next “white hope.”

MANSLAUGHTER

Local interest for the bout of May 24, 1913, at Burns’ Manchester arena, just outside the city limits, was overwhelming. Tickets, ranging in price from two to six dollars, were only available at Tommy Burns’ clothing store, and it was estimated that 3,000 fans attended.²⁶ Burns hired special streetcars to deliver fans to the arena. Following some preliminary contests, Arthur Pelkey and Luther McCarty entered the ring with referee Ed Smith, a sportswriter from Chicago. The Reverend William Walker reminded the two boxers that “the great referee stood over them in this bout, all powerful above the man selected by them to see fair play.”²⁷ The much anticipated contest lasted only one minute and 46 seconds, however. The men circled, they clinched briefly, a few blows were exchanged, and then Pelkey struck McCarty with an “arm blow” to the right cheek McCarty looked at his trainer and winked, the fighters stepped back, and Luther McCarty slumped and fell to the mat.²⁸ He was counted out, Smith raised Pelkey’s arm in victory, and several doctors worked for 30 minutes to revive the fallen boxer. A local photographer captured the moment as McCarty lay on his back and the sun shone through the glass roof of the arena, briefly forming a “halo” around the fallen boxer’s head before it disappeared back into the clouds.²⁹ Although McCarty had fallen seconds after a blow he had apparently shrugged off, he never regained consciousness, and Luther McCarty was the first boxer to be killed in a boxing ring in Canada. A coroner’s jury exonerated Pelkey from any responsibility for McCarty’s death, but he was immediately arrested by the North West Mounted Police and formally charged with manslaughter.³⁰ Tommy Burns’ Manchester arena was mysteriously burned to the ground 36 hours after the match.

Chief Justice Harvey presided over the well-publicized trial, asking the jurors to decide if the contest had been a prize fight and, if so, was Pelkey responsible for the death of McCarty? The medical opinions as to the cause of death conflicted in the courtroom, but doctors agreed from the autopsy that McCarty suffered a blood clot in his brain and a partial dislocation of his neck. Without understanding at the time that the force of the blows exchanged in the bout were not as important as the way in which they were delivered, witnesses denied that any of the punches could have killed McCarty. It was also suggested that McCarty might have injured himself when riding a horse a few days before the fight or that he may have been suffering trauma from previous fights. Despite the inconclusiveness of the medical

testimony, however, it was evident that the immediate catalyst to McCarty's death were blows received to his head during the fight.

On the lesser question of whether the bout was an illegal prize fight, it was clearly evident from cross examination that this was the case. The promotion for the fight itself, the advertising, gate receipts, the public proclamation of Pelkey as champion both in the newspapers and in the courthouse rendered the denials of several witnesses as bordering on the ridiculous. All those who organized, participated, or took a genuine interest in the fight were well-versed in the particularities of the law with regard to prize fighting. They were familiar with popular attitudes, which they themselves had influenced considerably, about the distinction between prize fighting and scientific boxing. Yet, at no point during the trial was the question of the social legitimacy of amateur or scientific boxing raised until, in his closing remarks to the jury, Chief Justice Harvey suggested that the definition of prize fighting:

would not include boxing when it is carried on as an exemplification of what has been called the manly art of self defence though it might if the contest was typical of what might be designated as the brutal science of attack. It appears that if the purpose is an exhibition of sparring or boxing on its scientific side it is...unobjectionable...³¹

It is interesting to note how the members of the boxing community called to the witness stand, and even court officials themselves, trivialized the social implications of violence and implicitly challenged the idea of trying a boxer in a court of law. The Chief Justice himself even suggested that participation in boxing as a manly sport was unobjectionable. The same ideas and language were used to define the issues in the media. The *Calgary Daily Herald*, for example, editorialized that Pelkey's "arrest after the fight must have been a legal formality, for it is not conceivable that a charge of manslaughter should be proceeded against him."³²

The charges against Pelkey represented a direct challenge to some of the popularly held beliefs about sport in the community. Violent sports like hockey, boxing, and lacrosse had been part of local cultural practices for more than twenty years. While it was readily admitted that McCarty's death was indeed a tragedy, few Calgarians argued that anyone had done anything wrong or illegal. The trial, based on a physical assault during a sport contest, raised two related issues for sportsmen and spectators. In the first instance, legal intervention in a properly conducted sporting event was questioned by all those (mostly male) who believed that violence in confrontative sports was simply part of the sport and therefore legitimate. In addition, the intervention of the law implicitly challenged some of the commonly held values that linked participation in rule-bound confrontative sports to the development of manly character. A legal decision would impact all "manly" sports in the community and the promotion of similar activities among Calgary's young men.

It was argued in defense that this fight and other professional boxing matches were carried out in the same manner as those at the local Y.M.C.A., where Tommy Burns had been an honorary president.³³ In this general defense of boxing, it was

an article of faith that the sport promoted manliness and character-building among young men in the community.³⁴ As indicated above, moreover, Burns claimed that he only promoted fights between men of good character; Y.M.C.A. administrators similarly suggested that boxing programs under their auspices provided Calgary boys “with healthful recreation, educational features, good companionship, and the opportunity of associating with trained leaders who are picked for their manly qualities.”³⁵ Chief Justice Harvey himself was revealed to have made annual contributions to the Y.M.C.A.³⁶ What was implied by extension was that any criticism of a Burns’ boxing match was also a censure of the valuable programs conducted at the Y.M.C.A.

Another theme in the testimonies of witnesses during the trial, and in some of the popular attitudes about violent sports expressed in other Canadian newspapers and courtrooms, was that officials of various sports were quite capable of policing their own problems.³⁷ Accidents and serious injuries in confrontative sports were positioned as unfortunate but “natural” occurrences. It was claimed that they were freakish exceptions in activities with adequate regulations and safeguards, and they were viewed as a small price to pay for the development of manly character. What many considered to be the place of the law in sport was made quite clear by Judge Snider during another boxing case in 1911 when he stated that,

it will be a long time before Parliament will think it wise to so hedge in young men and boys by legislation that all sports that are rough and strenuous or even dangerous must be given up. Virility in young men would soon be lessened and self-reliant manliness a thing of the past.³⁸

These beliefs about the value of sport in the production and reproduction of particular types of masculinity were commonly held in the Calgary sporting community and by some of the city’s most prominent men. Members of the courtroom burst into laughter when witness Major Ross testified that the Crown Prosecutor himself had been present at numerous local boxing matches.³⁹ And when Tommy Burns arrived in 1910, according to the *Calgary Daily Herald*, the dinner given in his honor “looked more like a professional and businessmen’s banquet for practically every seat was occupied by a lawyer or physician, while the remainder of guests were businessmen.”⁴⁰ As respected members of the community and spectators at the Pelkey-McCarty fight, many professional men were called to the stand during the trial. Through the course of the proceedings, it was evident that a particular male solidarity emerged when questions about the social value of boxing were raised.

The discourses of science connected to the rational pursuit of manly sport were repeatedly expressed by witnesses and court officials who sought to excuse and obfuscate the tragedy and blatant violence of the event. When the legitimacy of the kind of masculinity that was being promoted in the match, in boxing, and through sport more broadly was occasionally challenged, witnesses tended to humorize and dismiss the whole affair. A Dr. Spankle, who admitted to attending at least twenty-five matches in his lifetime, was asked if he attended the fight

and retorted, "No, I was at the boxing contest." He further suggested that he would not be afraid to stand up against the heaviest blow struck on the fatal night. When asked if he had ever seen a knockout blow delivered, he responded amid much courtroom laughter, "I have delivered one myself once."⁴¹ Another witness, Dr. Ing, was asked to determine which sport was more dangerous, hockey or boxing. He replied, "[w]ell I would rather have six rounds with Pelkey than a game with the Ottawa hockey team."⁴²

Hockey itself was more violent in the 1900s than is widely recognized today, but these testimonies spoke explicitly to codes of masculinity, understood within the sporting community, that identified violent confrontations within sporting contests as legitimate and valuable social interactions between consenting men. At one point during an adjournment in the trial, court sheriff Graham and lawyer E.L. Harvey "caused much amusement by engaging in a short boxing match" in the courtroom.⁴³ During the staged exchange, the mock combatants made light of the medical descriptions of McCarty's death. These attempts at humor appeared to provide some sort of relief for the tension that had been created within the sporting community and in the city more broadly. At the same time, however, the relaxed and even skeptical behavior toward the proceedings on the part of officers of the court demonstrated the ambivalence of these men toward the legitimacy of the intervention of the law into sporting events. It also demonstrated how widely respected among middle-class men were the kinds of masculinity celebrated in confrontational sports.⁴⁴

The Calgary newspapers reported that the entire city breathed a sigh of relief after the jury determined that indeed a prize fight had taken place, but that it was not clear if Pelkey was responsible for McCarty's death. Pelkey was immediately released and charges that had been laid against Tommy Burns for organizing the whole affair were dropped later in the year. After leaving Calgary, the promotional career of Burns and the boxing career of Arthur Pelkey fizzled quietly. Tommy Burns' brother Eddie Brusso continued to offer boxing instruction at the Calgary Y.M.C.A. after McCarty's death.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The events leading up to the Pelkey-McCarty boxing match and the manslaughter trial in Calgary raise some interesting questions about the contested meanings of sport in an early twentieth-century community. In a city where sport had quickly become an important part of community life and where, before that, fighting had always been (for men, at least) an accepted practice in a "wild West" culture, prize fighting was promoted in particular ways that sought to maximize interest and create business opportunities. Visiting celebrities like Jack Johnson, John L. Sullivan, and Jim Corbett, a series of boxing-related entertainments and championship matches, and extensive newspaper coverage all contributed to constructing a reputation for Calgary as a "fight town." In this context, Tommy Burns' promotions brought international attention to Calgary, albeit not, ultimately, as he had intended. His efforts, nevertheless, were appreciated by

Calgary boosters who saw publicity for the city in his activities. His efforts were also appreciated, of course, by fight fans. Burns was thus very successful in winning attention and support in the Calgary community. It has been central to our discussion of the Pelkey-McCarty fight that there were important subtexts in boxing promotions in the early twentieth century that spoke to popular ideas about both race and masculinity and invited support among white male workers and professionals, based both in racial and masculine solidarities.

The death of Luther McCarty and the trial that followed, however, brought male solidarity into play in ways that the match itself did not require. What is clear from all accounts is that McCarty's death did not bring about any reappraisal of the attitudes and values that were widely shared among men of all social classes, and that violence in sport was seen as a legitimate masculinizing practice. Indeed, the trial provided a public forum for the expression of support by influential men in the community for boxing in particular and for confrontative sports in general. It could be argued that during the Pelkey trial, the societal condemnation of violence embodied in law was qualified and even ridiculed by respected community figures. Laws are unlikely to be taken seriously when they are visibly violated by public officials, and when individuals like the Chief Justice, the Crown Prosecutor, and prominent newspaper editors were all involved in sanctioning and valorizing the kind of masculinity that was taught in boxing, it can be argued that men were closing ranks in defense of a masculinity that was deeply rooted in force.

At one level, these events can be read as the story of a specific fight, in a specific city, at a specific time in the history of race relations in North America. As such, they illustrate several recurring themes in the history of North American sport in the early twentieth century. These would include the association of improved sporting performance with technique and science, the mutual interests of sporting promoters and civic boosters, and the several ways that sports promotions sought to trade on ethnic and racial (as well as civic) rivalries. However, perhaps the most interesting and enduring aspect of the Pelkey-McCarty fight, and the trial of Pelkey (and of boxing) that followed it, is how ready men from all segments of society were to come together in defense of the value of confrontative sports.

This can only be understood, we suggest, in the larger context of historical changes in what has been called the gender order, a structure of socially constructed patterns that reproduces, on balance, the social power and privileges of men.⁴⁵ However, gender relations involve not only male-female relations but also hierarchies among men and among different ways of being male. There are clearly many ways of being a man, but pride of place in the eyes of many men still goes to the men who embody force and aggression and who show that they can dominate other people physically. Thus, the celebration of violence in sport, like the celebration of toughness of men who excel in body contact sports, is an opportunity to publicly reaffirm the value of physical domination—something that appeals viscerally to many men even as it is constrained by law in social contexts.⁴⁶ The male violence that is routinely sanctioned in sport and the aggressive men who are often glorified for their sporting exploits have together

made sport one of the few surviving areas of social life that legitimate the use of force and promote respect for “forceful” men. In the discourse that surrounded the Pelkey trial, a violent act committed under sporting conditions was given social legitimacy, and considerable male solidarity was demonstrated. In the testimony and asides attributed to many of the leading men in Calgary, we can see that the “modern” respect for skill and competitive achievement did not supplant belief in the value of a more traditional version of masculinity and the value of social practices that reproduced it.

*The authors wish to thank Terry Jackson for sharing his expertise on Tommy Burns, his insight into the case, and for sharing his research files and photographs.

1. Michael A. Messner, “When Bodies are Weapons: Masculinity and Violence in Sport,” *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 25, (1990), 203-219; David Whitson, “Sport in the Social Construction of Masculinity” in Michael A. Messner and Donald F. Sabo, eds., *Sport, Men and the Gender Order: Critical Feminist Perspectives* (Champaign, Ill.: Human Kinetics, 1990), 19-30; Kevin Young, “Violence, Risk, and Liability in Male Sports Culture,” *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 10 (1993): 373-396.
2. See Paul Rutherford, *The Making of the Canadian Media* (Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1978) and Elliott J. Gorn, *The Manly Art: Bare-Knuckle Prize Fighting in America* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1986).
3. Robert W. Connell, D.J. Ashenden, S. Kessler, and G.W. Dowsett, *Making the Difference: Schools, Families and Social Division* (Sydney: Allen and Unwin, 1982).
4. See for example, Michael Oriard’s discussion on the relationships between sports, masculinity, and violence in *Reading Football: How the Popular Press Created an American Spectacle* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1993).
5. For brief discussions of this legislation, see Bruce Kidd, “Capturing the Provincial State for Amateur Sport: The Ontario Athletic Commission in the Interwar Period” in Kevin B. Wamsley, ed., *Method and Methodology in Sport and Cultural History* (Dubuque, IA: Brown and Benchmark, 1995), 203-234; Kevin B. Wamsley, “Legislation and Leisure in 19th Century Canada,” unpublished doctoral dissertation (University of Alberta, 1992).
6. See Kevin Young and Kevin B. Wamsley, “State Complicity in Sports Assault and the Gender Order in 20th Century Canada: Preliminary Observations,” *AVANTE*, 2 (1996): 51-69.
7. Peter Donnelly, “On Boxing: Notes on the Past, Present and Future of a Sport in Transition,” *Current Psychology*, 7 (1988-89): 339. On urban sport and moral imperatives, see Steven A. Riess, *City Games: The Evolution of American Urban Society and the Rise of Sports* (Champaign, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1989); Paul S. Boyer, *Urban Masses and Moral Order in America, 1820-1920* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1978).
8. On “Muscular Christianity” and the role of sport in promoting “manliness,” see J. Anthony Mangan, *Manliness and Morality: Middle-Class Masculinity in Britain and North America, 1800-1940* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1987). Also on sports and the idea of “manliness,” see Morris Mott, “One Solution to the Urban Crisis: Manly Sports and Winnipeggers, 1900-1914,” *Urban History Review*, 12 (1983), 57-70; Morris Mott, “The British Protestant Pioneers and the Establishment of Manly Sports in Manitoba, 1870-1886,” *Journal of Sport History*, 7 (1980), 25-36. See also Norman Vance, *The Sinews of the Spirit: The Ideal of Christian Manliness in Victorian Literature and Religious Thought* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1985).

9. From content surveys of the *Calgary Daily Herald* and the *Calgary Eyeopener* (1895-1914), it is evident that this is particularly accurate for the city of Calgary during the early twentieth century. Showing support for local bouts, and providing legitimacy for the sport of boxing, newspapers often provided the names of prominent men in attendance.
10. See John Hoberman, *Mortal Engines: The Science of Performance and the Dehumanization of Sport* (New York, N.Y.: Free Press, 1992), 33-61.
11. Gerald Early, *The Culture of Bruising: Essays on Prizefighting, Literature, and Modern American Culture* (Hopewell, NJ.: Ecco Press, 1994), 6.
12. Earl, (1994): XIII-XV, Richard Gruneau and David Whitson, *Hockey Night in Canada* (Toronto: Garamond Press, 1993), 189-190.
13. See Randy Roberts, *Papa Jack Jack Johnson and the Era of White Hopes* (New York: The Free Press, Macmillan, 1983).
14. For the most extensive source on Tommy Burns, see Terry Jackson, "Tommy Burns: World Heavyweight Boxing Champion," unpublished master's thesis (University of Western Ontario, 1985). See also Don Morrow and Terry Jackson, "Boxing's Interregnum: How Good Was Tommy Burns, World Heavyweight Boxing Champion 1906-1908," *Canadian Journal of History of Sport*, XXIV (1993), 30-46.
15. Grant MacEwan, "The Firehall Legend. Calgary's 'Cappy' Smart," in *Citymakers: Calgaryans After the Frontier*, Max Foran and Sheila S. Jameson eds., (The Historical Society of Alberta, 1987): 73.
16. William M. McLennan, *Sport in Early Calgary*, (Calgary: Fort Brisbois Publishing, 1983), 192.
17. *Calgary Eyeopener*, March 23, 1912.
18. *Calgary Daily Herald*, Oct. 19, 1910.
19. *Calgary Daily Herald*, May 17, 1913.
20. *Calgary Daily Herald*, Oct. 11, 1910.
21. *Calgary Daily Herald*, March 10, 1909.
22. William H. Wiggins, Jr., "Boxing's Sambo Twins: Racial Stereotypes in Jack Johnson and Joe Louis Newspaper Cartoons, 1908 to 1938," *Journal of Sport History*, 15 (1988), 242-254.
23. See Roberts, (1983); Al-Tony Gilmour, *Bad Nigger: The National Impact of Jack Johnson* (Port Washington, N.Y.: Kenniket Press, 1975); and Jeffrey Sammons, *Beyond the Ring: The Role of Boxing in American Society* (Urbana and Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1988).
24. *Calgary Daily Herald*, May 17, 1913. See also Michael Dinning, "The Search for the Great White Hope: Heavyweight Boxing in Canada—1908-1915. Arthur Pelkey—His Rise and Demise," unpublished paper (University of Western Ontario, date unknown).
25. *Calgary Daily Herald*, Oct. 26, 1910.
26. *Judge Harvey's Notebooks*, 68.302, Box No. 3, No. 54, p. 185. (Provincial Archives of Alberta, Edmonton).
27. *Calgary Daily Herald*, May 26, 1913.
28. *Judge Harvey's Notebooks*, 68.302, Box No. 3, No. 54, pp. 186-7 (Provincial Archives of Alberta, Edmonton).
29. Photograph, Copyright 1913, Reeves, Calgary. Copy from The Sports Nostalgia Store, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey, from the personal collection of Terry Jackson, London, Ontario.
30. *Calgary Daily Herald*, May 27, 1913.
31. *R. vs. Pelkey*, Alberta Law Reports, VI, 1913, p. 107.
32. *Calgary Daily Herald*, May 26, 1912.

33. McLennan (1983): p. 204.
34. *Judge Harvey's Notebook*, p. 208; *Calgary Daily Herald*, June 23, 1913.
35. Letter from W.T. Tait to Chief Justice Harvey, Mar. 19, 1913. National Archives of Canada, M.G. 30, E-87, vol. 10, W,Y.
36. Letter from W.T. Tait to Chief Justice Harvey, Apr. 3, 1913.
37. See Young and Wamsley (1996).
38. *R. v. Wildfong and Lang*, 1911, 17, C.C.C.256, Ontario County Court.
39. *Calgary Daily Herald*, June 23, 1913.
40. *Calgary Daily Herald*, Oct. 29, 1910.
41. *Calgary Daily Herald*, June 21, 1913.
42. *Calgary Daily Herald*, June 6, 1913.
43. *Calgary Daily Herald*, June 20, 1913.
44. For further discussion of this issue, see Young and Wamsley, (1996).
45. Robert W. Connell, *Gender and Power* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1987).
46. See Whitson and Gruneau (1993).