

# **'A DEGENERATE RACE': CRICKET AND RUGBY CROWDS IN SYDNEY 1890-1912**

**MARTIN SHARP  
CANBERRA**

## I

Between 1890 and 1912 cricket and rugby emerged as mass spectacles in Sydney. In 1890, after an overabundance of international cricket in the 1880s, cricket held little interest for the public and rugby had not yet emerged as a major spectacle. By 1912 crowds of over 35,000 could be expected to watch the Saturday play in a cricket test match between Australia and England; crowds of 15,000 had been recorded at local club cricket matches; 52,000 had watched a rugby match between Australia and New Zealand; and an aggregate of over 350,000 could be expected to watch a season's first grade rugby league and rugby union club matches.

The *Australasian Medical Gazette* was alarmed at this growth. It said the real value of these sports was in playing rather than watching and expressed 'the gravest doubts' as to whether Australia could really be considered a sporting nation:

Can the dense crowds who pass their time, Saturday afternoon after Saturday afternoon, taking exercise and athleticism by proxy, in watching a cricket or football match, be called true sportsmen? They are a degenerate race, preferring to see others do what they should themselves be doing.<sup>1</sup>

Some papers agreed. In December 1902 the *Daily Telegraph* complained that instead of participating in games themselves, people now paid to see specialists playing cricket and rugby. The *Sydney Morning Herald* was also worried and, in a series of editorials entitled 'Vanishing athletics', 'Is sport degenerating', 'Athletics as a spectacle', and 'Lookers-on at games', concluded that 'If Waterloo was won on the playing fields of Eton, it was certainly not won there by lookers-on'.<sup>2</sup> The aim of this article is to examine the social composition and behaviour of this 'degenerate race'.

What sort of people went to cricket and rugby matches! Richard Cashman concludes that in the 1870s there were two distinct tendencies among Australian cricket crowds: 'One was patrician, and drew more on English example: it was found in the Members' Reserves'. The other 'the plebian tradition, more visible in the Outer, was much less imitative and more indigenous'.<sup>3</sup> Cashman believes that the patrician element dominated because officials promoted cricket as a fashionable and even exclusive game. The plebians were welcome as paying spectators but remained secondary to the patricians. He supports this claim with evidence of entry charges to important matches. When W.G. Grace's team played against NSW at the Albert ground in 1874 spectators were charged two shillings and sixpence to enter the ground and as much again if they wanted to sit in the grandstand.<sup>4</sup> The ground entry alone represented over a third of a labourer's daily wage.<sup>5</sup> A reduction to one shilling for ground entry in the early 1880s changed this and by November 1884 the *Sydney Mail* was able to remark on a match between England and NSW that 'One has but to stroll among the spectators to see representatives of every class of society watching the...game'.<sup>6</sup> There is other evidence to suggest that by the 1890s crowds had become more representative. First, there was the magnitude of the increase in attendances, from five percent of Sydney's metropolitan population for the highest daily attendance at a test match in 1891/2 to eight percent in 1897/8. Second, there were calls in the early 1890s for shelter for patrons of the outer ground of the Sydney Cricket Ground (SCG) 'who cannot afford or otherwise will not patronise the grandstand'.<sup>7</sup> Third, greater attention was paid to sport by the Sydney labour paper, the *Australian Worker*. In the early 1890s the *Worker* did not report sport but by 1899 it ran a column entitled 'Sundry Sports'.

Photographs are a good source for establishing the social composition of crowds. From 1897 high definition photographs of crowds at representative cricket and rugby matches were a regular feature in the *Sydney Mail*. The task of identifying particular types at cricket matches is made easier as this photographic evidence is supplemented by the detailed impressions of Leslie Poidevin, a NSW cricketer who acted as the Board of Control's representative in

London between 1907 and 1911. When he returned to Sydney in 1911 Poidevin wrote an article for the Herald comparing cricket crowds in England and Australia. It included a discussion of crowds at the SCG:

In the 'members' you will see most of the 'big wigs', past and present...as well as many of the old time cricket champions...The 'millinery department' next door, or ladies' reserve, easily eclipses anything of its kind elsewhere not only in the brightness of its colouring, but also in the keen and demonstrative interest with which every incident of the play is followed...

The grandstand and lawn differ very little from other places in their 'aristocratic' occupants...but the new stand [the Sheridan] noted for its 'what did I tell you?' type of criticism, whence the game is viewed through the added haze of tobacco smoke, offer a big contrast...

...the 'crowd on the hill'...is a very mixed company, as may be judged by a glance at the miscellaneous nature of the prevailing headwear.<sup>8</sup>

Poidevin's mention of headwear is important - during this period hats were an accurate indicator of social class. The inhabitants of the Members' and Ladies' pavilions were clearly of the middle and upper middle classes. In the Members' top hats and bowler hats abound; and the Northern Stand, between the Members' pavilion and the Paddington hill, was also inhabited by bowler and boater-hatted men and well dressed women.<sup>9</sup> The boater was the commonest of hats in Sydney during this period and judging from photographs of other scenes was worn by young to middle-aged clerical workers.<sup>10</sup> The grandstand [that is the Brewongle stand] was similarly well-to-do -- boaters abound and there were substantial numbers of women and children.<sup>11</sup> Indeed the number of women at cricket matches is in itself noteworthy, and reflects the *Herald's* comment in 1896 on 'the growing interest of the ladies in many branches of sport'.<sup>12</sup> Some women watched cricket from the unsheltered outer parts of the ground and presumably only serious students of the game, or those not so well-off, would have forsaken the greater comforts of the Ladies' pavilion or grandstand.<sup>13</sup>

The status of spectators in the Smokers' reserve and Sheridan Stand which replaced it in 1909 is less clear. These stands were built specially for smokers, to minimize inconvenience to patrons of Ladies' pavilion and grandstand. The additional entry charge

probably deterred workers from entering these stands but Poidevin's remark suggest that spectators there were not quite of the same social position as spectators in the neighbouring stands.

Photographs and articles appearing in the *Herald* support Poidevin's conclusion that the outer ground was 'a very mixed company'. Boater-headed clerks rubbed shoulders with less elaborately dressed workers in roughly equal numbers, while bowler-hatted middle-class men, uniformed sailors and soldiers, and women were also in evidence on the Paddington Hill, in the Bob Stand and on the Hill.<sup>14</sup>

The entry charge for club matches at enclosed grounds was sixpence but at unenclosed suburban grounds it cost nothing to watch, unless one chose to pay sixpence entry into the small grandstand. The only two photographs of grade matches suggest a fairly mixed attendance. One, of a match between Waverley and Paddington at Waverley Oval in 1899 shows about equal numbers of men and women mingling around the unenclosed park. The other, showing a section of the crowd at the grade final at the SCG in 1912 shows middle and working class men in the smoking reserve and on the Hill.<sup>15</sup>

Evidence for the social composition of rugby crowds is solely photographic. The inhabitants of the Members' and ladies pavilions for representative matches at the SCG were similar to those for cricket. In the Grandstand boaters and bowler hats predominated and school boys were commonplace, but there were less women than appeared at cricket matches, and in the outer ground there were more workers and far fewer women than at big cricket matches. At club rugby matches and at representative matches played on the Royal Agricultural Society Ground and at University Oval middle class and working class men and boys and the few women appear to have mingled freely.<sup>16</sup>

Photographs of rugby league crowds suggest that their social composition was the same as for rugby union matches. The crowd for the opening match of the 1910 season between Balmain and South Sydney at Birchgrove [the largest rugby league crowd then recorded for a club match] included probably equal numbers of middle and working class men and a fair sprinkling of women. A photograph of a densely packed crowd at the western end of the Sydney Sports Ground for a match between South Sydney and Newtown in 1912, shows

that although exclusively male, the spectators were both middle and working class.<sup>17</sup>

### III

According to journalist J.C. Davis, not only did cricket and rugby attract different types of spectators, the crowds behaved differently too:

Cricket barrackers are just as enthusiastic as the football species, but they have neither the cause nor the desire to lose control of themselves so prominently evinced by the average football follower.

Writing for the *Australasian* in 1892, 'Felix' made the same point about Melbourne crowds: 'the "barracker" at a cricket match is not in the same street with the football "barracker" for vicious and very vulgar vernacular'.<sup>18</sup>

Between 1890 and 1912 there was only one serious disturbance at a major cricket match in Sydney. One the Saturday of the Fourth test in 1904 nearly 35,000 gathered to watch Australia bat. If the Englishmen won the match they would win the series so the spectators were keen to see a win for the home side, but light rain interrupted play twice during the day, once for 10 minutes and later for 80 minutes. According to the *Herald* [a paper unlikely to condone civil disorder]:

A few drops of rain fell, and the players disappeared from view. The rain cleared, and yet there was no appearance of the players...In the circumstances some resentment was only to be expected, and we make no doubt that nearly everybody on the ground was dissatisfied at the delay in resuming the game.<sup>12</sup>

This dissatisfaction took shape when spectators started throwing watermelon skins and bottles onto the asphalt cycling track that surrounded the ground, and some of the bottles broke. Cashman cites Sir William McKell, a regular spectator on the Hill, as saying that the incident began as a 'humourous diversion'. According to McKell one spectator rolled a bottle onto the asphalt track and this was retrieved by a ground attendant. Another bottle followed, which was also retrieved by an attendant, and very soon a hail of bottles was raining on the track and the attendants took shelter. McKell and the *Herald* both said there was no malice in the crowd's behaviour,

and that they simply wanted to salvage some entertainment from an otherwise disappointing day.

A less physical but generally widespread practice among Sydney cricket crowds was barracking. The expression 'to barrack' apparently originated in Melbourne in the 1880s but similar behaviour certainly occurred at cricket matches in Sydney in the 1870s.<sup>20</sup> Before a match between NSW and W.G. Grace's Englishmen in 1874, the *Herald* hoped 'that the section of the public who occasionally give somewhat unpleasant expression to their sympathies and prejudices, will keep within the bounds of decorum'.<sup>21</sup>

The English team which toured Australia captained by A.E. Stoddart in 1894/5 suffered what the *Daily Telegraph* called 'the unpleasant side of the cricket revival', when it was barracked during the first match against NSW. According to the English wicket keeper, William Brockwell:

The Australian spectator is apparently overstrung, and, as a consequence is impatient and intolerant- The crowd thoroughly understands the game, and yet will let any little wave of peevishness overcome its judgement. The spectators are good critics, but they indulge in loud-voiced satire and banter, levelled at some individual player, usually one of their own side. The banter is good humoured but disconcerting.<sup>22</sup>

When Stoddart returned with the 1897/8 English team the problem of barracking was so bad that he was moved to complain publicly. After the Fifth test at Sydney the SCG Trustees and Melbourne CC (joint organisers of the tour) presented the English captain with a gold watch. While grateful for the presentation (which replaced a similar one stolen while he was in Victoria) Stoddart 'felt it his absolute duty' to refer to the barracking which his team had been subjected to. The team had been 'hooted and hissed in every match and on every ground without exception', and he asked the ground authorities to 'at once check this fast growing evil'.<sup>23</sup> Despite his remarks, officials were apparently unmoved and at the annual meeting of the Australasian Cricket Council in 1898, chairman William Whitridge reported that:

If a critical examination were made of the conduct of crowds in England perhaps very little difference would be found. The 'barracking' in many instances is simply an indication of keenness.<sup>24</sup>

Barracking continued in the 1900s. In January 1903 the *Herald* complained of 'rowdiness at cricket matches' after a match between NSW and Victoria and again during the First Test of the 1903/4 series when the crowd heckled the umpire for giving Australian batsman Clem Hill run out. Both the NSW premier, George Reid, also president of the NSW Cricket Association, and the English captain, Pelham Warner, spoke out against barracking. But the habit continued and the crowd was especially hard on the slow batting of Englishman George Gunn in a match against NSW in November 1911, even though he had received a nasty blow on the hand early in the innings.<sup>25</sup>

Poor cricket and bad umpiring were not the only causes of barracking at the SCG. Spectators who blocked the view of others were likely to be pelted not only with verbal abuse, but with orange peels and other missiles. Commenting on the widespread use of umbrellas the *Bulletin* declared: 'The ladies are still privileged. A parasol may shut out the view of a cricket-match, but if a man holds up an umbrella -- well, Heaven help that man! Bricks, flour, oranges, stale sandwiches. Biff!'<sup>26</sup> It was perhaps under such provocation that James Cullen, a 40 year old labourer, was arrested and charged with 'throwing missiles to the annoyance of the public' during the Fourth Test in February 1902. He was fined one pound, or in default seven days hard labour, for filling two large paper bags and throwing them at fellow spectators on the Hill.

Who were the barrackers? Stoddart believed that only a 'section' of the crowd was responsible for barracking his 1897/8 team, though he did not name it. The *Daily Telegraph* was more specific in 1894 when it said 'there happened to be an occasional handful of larrikins, who yelled and barked at whatever did not happen to favour their own notions'. Then in 1911 the *Herald* pointed to the outer ground as the principle source of barracking:

. . . 'Barracking' has been regarded as a sort of inalienable right of a section of the spectators who assemble on the terraces of the enclosure. The basis of their argument appears to be that having paid a shilling for the privilege of seeing a game of cricket, they are entitled to have that game played in accordance with their own tastes and predilections. Of course the basis of argument is flimsy, for on such reasoning the spectator's claim to the style of cricket he most desires would be at its strongest in the stands and at its weakest on the hill.<sup>27</sup>

Leslie Poidevin also believed that barracking at the SCG was limited to a few 'weeds' who 'sheltered in the crowd', hurled 'contemptuous comments at fellow-men undefended and without the opportunity of striking back'. Beyond these 'barrackers' Poidevin thought Sydney crowds were more liberal in their applause than most.<sup>28</sup>

In Sydney, as in Britain during this period, disorder in cricket crowds was verbal rather than physical, but rugby crowds were more aggressive and in some matches referees were even physically assaulted.<sup>29</sup> Without exception, extreme barracking and crowd violence at rugby matches was directed against the referee.

Discussing a series between NSW and New Zealand in 1893 the *Referee* declared that 'An umpire's lot is not a happy one'. In the first match the referee was barracked and hooted for paying too strict attention to the rules and in the third match the referee, a different one, was 'howled at over and over again by those assuredly in no position to see whether his rulings were correct or not'. The paper concluded sadly that 'Of late years this senseless and manifestly unfair barracking has grown in Sydney until it promises to be as bad as that of Melbourne crowds'.<sup>30</sup> NSW lost both these matches and the *Referee* noted that it was only a section of the crowd who barracked, the bulk of the audience warmly applauding the play. In the second match of the series, won by NSW, there were no disturbances.

Barracking was not confined to representative matches and two years later the *Bulletin* declared that '"Barracking"...is becoming a public disgrace in Sydney'. The weekly painted a bleak picture of chaos at some of the unenclosed suburban grounds where many of the club matches were played:

Players threaten to 'break the referee's blanky nose unless he blows the whistle', and the mobs that barrack threaten to 'pull the referee's blanky liver out' if he orders a player off the field.<sup>31</sup>

Sometimes threats turned to actions. In July 1894 the NSW Rugby Football Union's committee heard how a referee was attacked during a club match at Ashfield:

Immediately after the conclusion of the match the 'barrackers', incited by the players, attacked and struck me about the head and face (I could not say with what), and rendered me insensible for upwards of an hour.

The referee called for the disqualification of the ground in fashionable Ashfield because 'no team will get a fair deal at the hands of the barrackers, who are there in hundreds whenever a match is being played there'. Apparently nothing was done though, because two years later another referee complained of 'a number of barrackers who, armed with sticks and whips' interrupted a match on the same ground'.<sup>32</sup>

Barracking was at its worst at club rugby matches in the 1890s when a low standard of refereeing combined with some rough play at unenclosed grounds to produce a serious problem of crowd control. The formation in 1893 of the NSW Referee's Association did much to raise the standard of refereeing. By 1900 the Association had 60 members and its success in training referees is shown by the fact that in the 236 matches played under its control in 1899 only one protest was entered against a referee's decision and that was dismissed. The Association thought that 'this, in itself, proves the high state of efficiency members have reached in their labors on the field'.<sup>33</sup>

The introduction of local or 'electorate' rugby in 1900 held another peril for referees. In 1896 Albert Sefton, a NSWRFU committeeman, noted the 'terrible following' for junior clubs, most of which were based on localities. Referring to the quality rather than the quantity of support for these junior clubs, Sefton said 'When a suburban club leaves to play another suburb you will see 10 to 13 coaches conveying its followers, and some of these followers would think little of knifing a referee'.<sup>34</sup> Local loyalties were inflamed in the very first round of electorate in May 1900 when Balmain lost to North Sydney at home. According to the *Bulletin* 'Balmain barrackers made a dead set against the referee and gave him a parlous time from end to end. At the close he had to be escorted away, and could only get out of the suburb disguised'.<sup>35</sup>

Two incidents in 1909 and 1910 showed that improvements in refereeing and, in one case, the provision of enclosed grounds, were not enough to stop crowd violence. The first incident happened at the RAS Ground in July 1909 after a rugby league match between Australia and a Maori team, when a disallowed try toward the end of the game cost the home side victory. After the match feelings ran high and when the Maoris jubilantly took possession of their trophy

and danced a haka the final touch was added to what the *Herald* called 'a situation charged with the dynamite of displeasure and the high tension of crowd hysteria'. With cries of 'Australia was cheated' and 'stronger expressions from the lips of a few', 5-6000 spectators pulled down fences and rushed the referee and the Maori players, while 'many other thousands of cooler heads remained round the ground... to watch the happenings'. No one was seriously hurt but for a while 'the small body of police had their work cut out for them'.<sup>36</sup> The other incident happened in August 1911 at Hampden Park after a minor club match between Darlinghurst and Waratah. According to the *Herald* the teams were 'great rivals', and as a result a fair number of barrackers appeared. Some vigorous play 'met with unqualified approval from the spectators...(who) spurred (the players) on to further efforts'. The referee awarded a try to Darlinghurst towards the end of the match even though the ball had been forced into touch and Waratah lost by five points to four. As the teams left the ground several hundred spectators surged towards them:

Party spirit was running high, and it was but a matter of a few moments before high words were being exchanged. Words led to blows, and in less time than it takes to tell a free fight had started, in which fists, sticks, umbrellas and feet all played their respective parts.

The 'couple of police' at the ground were powerless to intervene, and were 'tossed hither and thither like corks'.<sup>37</sup>

One should not think that Sydney rugby was a scene of constant crowd violence -- the incidents mentioned here are all that I have found between 1890 and 1912. Nor is it clear how many spectators became involved once such incidents began at club matches, though the incidents at major games were limited to small sections of the crowd.

#### IV

Vamplew has suggested three reasons why, in England, cricket crowds were less violent than crowds at race-meetings and soccer matches. First, there was more gambling at race-meetings and soccer matches. This was true in Sydney too -- by 1890 gambling on cricket matches appears to have been rare but it continued on rugby matches throughout the period. Second, there was a larger middle class element at cricket compared with rugby matches, 'for whom structural

strains relating to social or economic tensions might be less than for working class football fans'. We have seen that in Sydney, although there was not a great difference between the social make-up of cricket and rugby crowds, more women and fewer workers appear to have watched the cricket. Perhaps the fact that most of the violence at rugby matches in Sydney was directed towards the referee reveals a desire to release frustrations and oppose authority in a manner not possible in the work place. Thirdly, Vamplew points to the relatively drawn-out nature of cricket matches which generally saw less tension in the crowd, 'particularly among one which usually was seated, thereby lessening body contact between the spectators and also clearly demarcating personal territory'.<sup>38</sup> This last point is especially important -- the record crowd for a cricket match at the SCG during this period was 36,222 in 1897/8 while the record for a rugby match was 52,000 on 1907. A crowd of spectators comfortably seated with plenty of room to watch a cricket match was less likely to become irritable than one jammed together in the high excitement of the final minutes of a rugby match.<sup>39</sup>

By 1900 authorities in Britain had devised five methods of crowd control -- 'Improvements in the conduct of the sport, improvements in the organisation of the sports events, segregation within the crowd, control of ancilliary activities, and the use of controlling agents'.<sup>40</sup> In Sydney, although the SCG was effectively socially segregated, there is no evidence that officials saw segregation as a means of crowd control. However, the other four methods of control were employed.

The formation of the NSW Referees' Association in 1893 remedied the main cause of disturbances at club rugby matches, although, as the 1909 riot showed, referees were still likely to make mistakes no matter how competent they were. The NSW Referees' Association was nevertheless a success, and cricket umpires followed its lead by forming the NSW Umpires Association in 1904. Officials also tackled another cause of crowd dissatisfaction -- the problem of starting matches at the advertised time. In November 1873 about 600 were present for the start of a cricket match between the University and Albert CCs at the Albert CCs at the Albert Ground, and when the match was delayed 'some dissatisfaction was expressed at the want of punctuality in commencing.' The *Herald* thought that if

admission to the ground had been free spectators would have no cause for complaint but that 'when the public have to pay to witness the game, the elevens ought to make an effort to consult their convenience'.<sup>41</sup> Cricket and rugby officials took the point and between 1890 and 1912 there was no record of any disturbance due to late starts.

The control of ancilliary activities such as gambling and drinking was another factor in crowd behaviour. During the 1870s betting on cricket was widespread in Australia, prompting one English cricketer, Charles Absolom, to comment that 'Unfortunately for colonial cricket it is generally treated (more especially in New South Wales) in much the same way as horse racing is in this country [England], viz., as a regular medium for gambling'. Absolom's remark prompted by a riot during a match between NSW and England in 1879 which the English players and press agreed was sparked by betting. With NSW in a poor position on the second day of the match, a Saturday, the English umpire, George Coulthard, a professional cricketer and footballer from Melbourne, ruled William Murdoch, the only NSW player to make a decent score, out l.b.w. for 82, 2-3,000 spectators rushed on to the ground and remained there while the NSW captain, Dave Gregory, demanded that the English captain, Lord Harris, replace Coulthard with another umpire. Harris refused and after two attempts to re-start play, punctuated by another pitch invasion, play was abandoned for the day when spectators again rushed the field and remained there until 6 o'clock. According to the *Herald* 'a well known betting man' incited the riot, having presumably bet heavily on the home side, a view supported by 'Roundarm' in the weekly *Town and Country Journal*. The SCG Trustees responded to the riot and charges of betting by expelling a number of members and banning book makers from the ground but 'Roundarm' thought these measures would not prevent betting as it was:

well known that, so far from the bookmakers plying their trade uproariously, or loudly offering wagers, all betting is done in town, and will continue to be, whether the metallicians are allowed the privileges of membership...or not.<sup>42</sup>

'Roundarm's' reservations were well-founded but it appears that the SCG Trustees and the NSWCA successfully excluded bookmakers from the ground. When rumours of gambling in Melbourne and Adelaide were

widespread in 1882 the *Sydney Mail* announced proudly that in Sydney the NSWCA 'strongly objected to betting on cricket' and that any bookmakers found on the SCG would be 'promptly dealt with' by the Trustees.<sup>43</sup> By 1890 there appears to have been little or no direct gambling on cricket in Sydney, but in rugby there was considerable betting throughout the period and perhaps this was another factor in the more boisterous character of rugby crowds. Debating an unsuccessful attempt to introduce a bill into the NSW Parliament to ban athletic sports on Sundays, Hugh Mac Donald, a journalist and member for Coonamble, said in 1899:

When I was out on the Cricket Ground the other day, I heard quite sufficient around me to show me the evils of football associated betting. There is no doubt that a man's feelings are greatly affected if he has a pound or two on the game...<sup>44</sup>

As well as straight out betting, sweeps were common on both representative and club rugby matches, and in 1904 the NSWRFU sought the aid of ground authorities to prevent sweeps on matches. However, it is not clear how successful officials were in eliminating betting, but if the experience of one bookmaker at a match between NSW and New Zealand in July 1907 is indicative, then they had some success.

Evidence for the degree of drinking is at best fragmentary, but there can be little doubt that it went on. Reporting on an incident during the First Test of the 1903/4 series when the umpire was severely barracked for giving the Australian Clem Hill run out, the *Herald* noted that:

The crowds thickened after the midday adjournment, and empty bottles rolled wonderingly down the slope, impelled by the feet of spectators on the hill. Black bottles most of them were, and they smelt not of milk.<sup>45</sup>

The final type of crowd control, the use of 'controlling agents' such as police, was not common in Sydney -- or at least they were never used in significant numbers. Crowd violence was very rare and it seems that because the possibility of violence at any one game was remote police presence was minimal. After the 1879 riot, George Reid reported that 'a movement of that kind always gathers strength, especially when there are no policemen to nip it in the bud'.<sup>46</sup> Similarly, the number of policemen on duty at the RAS Ground in 1909 was quite inadequate to deal with the riot, as were the two at Hampden Park in 1917, while the unfortunate referees at

Ashfield in 1894 and 1896 and at Balmain in 1900 had to rely on the assistance of sympathetic spectators and players for protection,

V

The lack of police at cricket and rugby matches shows that the prospect of crowd violence was not a concern for authorities in Sydney. The *Australasian Medical Gazette* might well have labelled spectators 'a degenerate race', but it could not point to any real crime other than a desire to watch cricket and rugby., Nevertheless, the experience of the unfortunate Cullen showed that at least some measure of crowd control was exercised and that any spectator acting antisocially risked at least some chance of being punished.

NOTES AND REFERENCES:

1. *Australasian Medical Gazette*, 20 Feb. 1911.
2. *Daily Telegraph*, 27 Dec. 1902 and *SMH*, 25 July 1903, 12 Mar and 9 July 1904 and 23 June 1906.
3. R. Cashman, *Ave a go, yer mug! Australian crowds from larrikin to ocker*, Sydney 1984, p.11.
4. *Ibid.*, p.40.
5. T.A. Coghlan, *The wealth and progress of NSW 1900/1*, Sydney 1902, p.758. In 1874 a labourer earned about 7 shillings per day.
6. *Sydney Mail*, 29 Nov. 1884.
7. *SMH*, 4 Jan. 1894.
8. *SMH*, 9 Dec. 1911.
9. *Sydney Mail*, 5 Mar. 1898, 30 Nov, 1901 and 25 Nov. 1903.
10. See E. Russell, *Victorian and Edwardian Sydney from old photographs*, Sydney 1975.
11. *Sydney Mail*, 5 Mar. 1898 and 22 Feb. 1902 and M. Vaniman's photograph of cricket at the SCG, 1903, held by the Dixon Library.

12. *SMH*, 11 May 1896.
13. *Sydney Mail*, 5 Mar. 1898, 21 Dec. 1901 and 2 Mar. 1904.
14. *Ibid.*, 21 Mar. 1901, 25 Nov. 1903 and 2 Mar. 1904 and *Referee*, 23 Nov. 1910.
15. *Sydney Mail*, 11 Feb. 1899 and *Referee*, 8 May 1912.
16. *Referee*, 27 Apr. 1910, *Sydney Mail*, 5 Aug. 1899, 27 July 1901, 31 May and 19 July 1902, 13 May, 22 July and 5 Aug. 1903, 6 July 1904 and 26 July 1905, and photograph taken by M. Vaniman of a rugby match at the SCG in 1903, Dixson Library.
17. *Referee*, 4 May 1910 and 15 May 1912.
18. *Ibid.*, 10 June 1896, and *Australasian*, 1 Oct. 1892.
19. *SMH*, 1 Mar. 1904.
20. L.H. Evans (ed.), *Brewer's dictionary of phrase and fable*, London 1983, suggests that used in its Australian sporting context, the term 'to barrack' came into use in the 1880s and 'stems from the days when army supporters of the Victoria barracks team entered the South Melbourne cricket ground and were greeted with shouts of 'here come the barrackers'.
21. *SMH*, 24 Jan. 1874.
22. *Daily Telegraph*, 28 Nov. 1894 and W. Brockwell, 'Australasian cricket through English spectacles', *Review of Reviews: Australasian edition*, Feb. 1895, pp.166-7.
23. *SMH*, 3 Mar. 1898.
24. *Australasian Cricket Council Minutes*, 29 July 1898.
25. *SMH*, 30 Jan., 16 and 18 Dec. 1903 and 1 Dec. 1911.
26. *Bulletin*, 12 Jan. 1895.
27. *SMH*, 3 Mar. 1898 and 1 Dec. 1911 and *Daily Telegraph*, 28 Nov. 1894.
28. *SMH*, 9 Dec. 1911.
29. W. Vamplew reaches the same conclusion for English cricket crowds in 'Sports crowd disorder in Britain, 1870-1914', *Journal of sport history*, 7/1, 1980, pp.5-20.
30. *Referee*, 2 Aug. 1893.

31. *Bulletin*, 8 and 22 June 1895.
32. *SMH*, 10 July 1894 and 30 June 1896.
33. *Ibid.*, 7 Apr. 1894 and *Referee*, 9 May 1900.
34. *Sydney Mail*, 8 Aug. 1896.
35. *Bulletin*, 26 May 1900.
36. *SMH*, 2 Aug. 1909.
37. *Ibid.*, 21 Aug. 1911.
38. Vamplew, *op.cit.*, p.16.
39. However, it should also be mentioned that fieldwork at the SCG during VFL matches shows that small crowds do provide greater mobility for irate spectators annoyed by bad umpiring.
40. Vamplew, *op.cit.*, p. 11.
41. *SMH*, 7 Dec. 1873.
42. *Ibid.* and *Town and Country Journal*, 22 Feb, 1879.
43. *Sydney Mail*, 7 Jan. and 14 Oct. 1879.
44. *NSW Parliamentary Debates*, third session, 1899, vol.99, p.718.
45. *SMH*, 16 Dec. 1903.
46. *Town and Country Journal*, 15 Feb. 1879.