

Rex Harcourt Melbourne

I think the volume is splendid and all associated with its publication deserve the highest praise. If I were asked to give it a mark, I would suggest around 95 per cent. That being so, my present assignment is to concentrate on the 5 per cent deficit so that any future revisions might bring the standard closer to 100 per cent. My comments are of course selective being related to those sports with which I am familiar or the few I have selected for closer scrutiny.

My first criticism is lack of balance. This can best be illustrated by comparing men's basketball with cricket. Basketball is a relatively new sport and by world standards Australia is in the process of establishing its position below the top international teams. Probably no Australian would even come into consideration for selection in (say) the top three or four world teams.

In that context it is doubtful whether *any* Australian player deserves an entry in his own right and all that it warranted is for a mention of them in the general entry on 'Basketball' (as was done for Aboriginal Sportsmen).

It is ludicrous that Phil Smyth should have an entry almost as long as Bradman's, more than twice as long as Woodfull's and superlatives like 'one of the most gifted' and 'the complete player' should be used.

On Aboriginal sport there is considerable repetition. In the general entry too much detail is given about individual players who have entries in other parts of the volume - there being some minor differences and some omissions. The entry for Sir Douglas Nicholls is not up to standard. It is a general biographic entry based mainly on Mavis Latham's biography *Pastor Doug* which is somewhat weak on his sporting life.

Doug is included not because of his sporting prowess *per se* but because he was the Aboriginal sportsman who paved the way for other

Aboriginal sportsmen to make their mark and for the development of Aboriginal sport. Both the general entry on Aboriginal Sport and on Doug himself fail to highlight the enormous contributions he made in a quiet personal and 'unofficial' way by organising sports nights, carnivals, championship meetings and the like which later became formalised into the structures and activities of the Government Departments and agencies.

In Australian Rules football there is a bias towards players of the modern era with a corresponding neglect of early champions. Men like Coulthard and Pat O'Dea deserve entries in their own right. For many years Coulthard was considered the champion of the colony and was involved in cricket. O'Dea was an Australian Rules player who took up gridiron when he settled in the USA and so dominated the game that the rules were altered in order to curb his brilliance. As far as I know he is the only Australian sportsman to be included in the US Sporting Hall of fame. What about an entry for the Norm Smith Medal?

In baseball I would have thought some individual entries were warranted such as Ross and Lyn Straw and Jack Ellis who captained the only Australian team to defeat an American team in the 1920s.

Important omissions are the Australian College of Sports Physicians formed in the 1980s to oversee the practice of Sports Medicine in Australia and the Melbourne Amateur Athletics Sports Committee which was established as a 'sub-Committee' of the Melbourne Cricket Club to foster the development of mainly sport in Australia. It became the forerunner of many major organising bodies in athletics, cricket, tennis, cycling etc., which are included in the *Companion*. It also introduced some of the major sports into Australia.