

that he was the first foreigner to be inducted after World War II. Yonamine was preceded by another Nisei from Hawaii, Henry Tadashi “Bozo” Wakabayashi, who in his sixteen-year pitching career won 243 games and was inducted in 1964.

More substantial and distressing errors occur in Cisco’s account of major league junkets to Hawaii in the 1930s. He states that a team composed of major league all-stars visited Hawaii in 1931 (“The all-stars featured the immortal Yankee duo of Babe Ruth and Lou Gehrig” (30)). Cisco maintains that after playing a game in Honolulu, the team went to Hilo on the island of Hawaii for another exhibition game. But, in fact, the 1931 all-stars played only one game in Honolulu and twelve in Japan, and Ruth was not with the team at all. Babe Ruth did not come to Hawaii until 1933, when he arrived with his wife Claire and daughter Julia for a two-week solo barnstorming tour of Honolulu and Hilo. Thus, Gehrig was not with Ruth on this trip, as Cisco has it; but the “Iron Horse” did accompany Ruth and another all-star contingent to the Islands and Japan in 1934.

It is difficult to determine what sources Cisco used to obtain information on these junkets. The book concludes with a comprehensive bibliography, but it is impossible to place specific entries with their related chapters. In a future edition, it would be better to list or discuss the pertinent bibliographic sources at the end of each chapter, so that the readers could pursue further information on sports of particular interest.

—FRANK ARDOLINO
University of Hawaii

BOOTH, DOUGLAS, AND COLIN TATZ. *One-Eyed A View of Australian Sport*. St. Leonards, NSW, Australia: Allen & Unwin, 2000. Pp xvi, 262. Illustrated. Notes, index. A\$24.95 pb.

“One-eyed’ in an Australian sporting context implies bias in support of one particular team and, in this book, prejudice for a particular point of view or interpretation. This Booth and Tatz supply in abundance. They eschew any claim to producing a “neutral, objective history” (xv). What they have delivered is a contribution to what they label the genre of *sporting criticism*, a form that “examines, assesses, questions, debates, praises quality, denigrates the shoddy” (xiii).

The book is a social and political history of sport in Australia from the European invasion to Sydney 2000. The approach is chronological, though with repeated themes, especially race, class, gender, and other aspects of exclusion. Some perceptive points are made about Australia’s history. Are many outside the nation aware how the continual immigration from changing sources has brought constant social flux? They emphasize that sport should not be seen in isolation and that, although national success at sport contributed to the development of nationalism in the late nineteenth century, there were other factors at work, including economic development, political confrontations with the outside world, and the establishment of nationwide labor and employer institutions.

Let me start my sporting criticism with the pedantic bits. As a protest against the rampant commercialism and associated corruption of the modern Olympics, the authors, unlike spellchecks worldwide, refuse to endorse the word Olympics by the use of an initial capital letter. This is schoolyard stuff. Why then do they not put [*sic*] after the normal

usage by others of “Olympics” in quotations? It was the Union flag, not the Union Jack, that was hoisted when Great Britain won a medal at the Berlin Olympic Games (82). The years 1939-45 are missing from the chronology of the book. Although the First World War warrants a chapter of its own, the second such conflagration does not even find a place in the index. An opportunity was missed here for some needed comparative historical analysis. Although it is implicit that the list of approved recreation for middle-class women in the 1880s did not include energetic activities, surely some of them, including “forfeits,” “schoolmaster” and “cotton flies” need explanation.

This is not a work of research drawing upon primary sources—save for references to the studies undertaken by the authors themselves—but one of synthesis and interpretation of the published writings. Hence it relies on the research expertise of those who have gone before and, more critically, on the evidence that these previous writers have provided or relied upon—without any test of its validity. They give due acknowledgement to these authors, but the referencing occasionally lacks page numbers. At times they interpret the evidence to their advantage. Was there “*clearly...* a strong sense of guilt about Aboriginal treatment” (154) on the day a quarter of a million Australians welcomed home world boxing champion Lionel Rose after he beat Fighting Harada in Tokyo in 1968?

The authors offer some correction to the conventional wisdom on Australian sport, most notably in giving more credence than do many historians to Jim Poulter’s assertion that Australian Rules Football might have emerged from an Aboriginal game. They also point out that Marian Stell’s claim that some early colonial women participated in leisure and recreational activities independently of men is erroneous, and note that pigeon shooter Donald Mackenzie, now eulogized as a gold medalist at the 1900 Olympics, died never even aware that he had been an Olympian. The authors place even more emphasis on dismissing the idea that sport is free of politics and discrimination; for them, sport is a major case study in racism. Anyone who has read other works of the authors know that they are intense in their feelings on race and this shows in their choice of sporting heroes. They approve not of the personalities glorified by the press, but instead those who “display courage or perform outstandingly in adversity... have visions of the way life ought to be lived, and often show greater concern for humanity than about competing in their chosen areas” (211). Of the ten that they list, five are Aborigines. What emerges is a book written by two men who care. They care for athletes made to play on while injured; they care for Aboriginal sportspersons whose lack of facilities mean that they never achieve their potential; and they care that some Australian sports administrators are corrupt and hypocritical.

In the last chapter, the authors ask if there is a distinctive Australian sporting identity. Two criticisms can be raised here. First, they do not ask if there is a distinctive Australian anything else—be it a leisure ethic, a racial view, or a gendered prejudice. Second, they are far too sweeping in finding “little to celebrate in the Australian sporting character, propped up as it is by pampered and temperamental ‘stars,’ uncharitable and biased journalism, unprincipled, unscrupulous and over-indulged officials, and increasingly obnoxious crowds” (210). This perhaps says more about their attitudes than about Australian sport. But then, they never claim to be more than one-eyed.

—WRAY VAMPLEW
De Montfort University