

THE MARSH-MACLAREN DISPUTE AT BATHURST, 1902, AND THE POLITICS OF SELECTION

**Bernard Whimpress
Department of History
Flinders University of South Australia**

Of the few Aboriginal first-class cricketers, Jack Marsh's talents were probably the least appreciated when it came to selection at the highest level of the game. Some cricket judges considered him the world's best bowler and yet he was unable to get a regular game for New South Wales (NSW). The dispute over his selection for the Western Cricket Union to play against Archie MacLaren's English team at Bathurst in February 1902 was important for several reasons. It brought to a head much debate and discussion about Marsh's omission from the NSW side and needs to be understood in connection with his possible selection in the Australian side for the Fourth Test Match at Sydney immediately to follow. It pitted national against imperial loyalties. It measured economic concerns against moral concerns and those of team morale. It raised questions of discrimination against Marsh including the possibility that these were racially motivated. The principal actors in the drama were Marsh and MacLaren but Montague Alfred Noble was an unseen hand operating in the shadows.

As a piece of Aboriginal cricket history this article seeks to go beyond racism as an explanation of discrimination against Jack Marsh. This is part of a revisionist phase of Aboriginal sports history that considers Marsh not merely as a victim of white sports administration but as one who struggles to accommodate white sports values. At the first-class level Marsh failed to break through barriers at the top of the Australian cricket hierarchy because, as will be suggested, the odds were stacked against him. This

interpretation leads to revised views of previously-revered key figures in Australian cricket such as Noble and the umpire Bob Crockett. MacLaren who has had a reputation for deviousness simply ends up with a few extra demerit points.

Jack Marsh, born in Yulgilbar on the Clarence River in 1874, was a member of the Badjalang tribe. Along with his elder brother, Larry, he became a prominent professional sprinter in Sydney in the early 1890s before switching to cricket with the South Sydney and Sydney district clubs. Selected for NSW in 1900/01 he took twenty-two wickets in four matches in his first interstate season (twice as many as any of his teammates) but significantly was continually no-balled for throwing by Victorian umpire Bob Crockett in the NSW-Victoria Sheffield Shield match in Sydney in February 1901, the last game of the year.

Doubts about Marsh's action resurfaced in the 1901/02 season and particularly produced friction when MacLaren objected to playing against him in the Bathurst match. Although he had been bowling with conspicuous success for the Sydney District Club, it was evident that in the opinion of the sole selector for NSW, M A Noble, his delivery was suspicious and, therefore, he had been excluded from representative elevens. Since it was obvious that there was strong public opposition to Noble's opinion, the Bathurst selection was viewed, in Sydney at least, as subversive in its intent.¹

MacLaren's principal objection to Marsh was that he was wary of losing players through injury before the Fourth Test but he also stressed Marsh's suspect action, that he was not a native of the Bathurst district, and that the match was designed to be an 'easy' one. These objections were contained in a letter by the English team's manager, Major Wardill, to the Bathurst Association. The letter also contained a warning:

You should also take into consideration the new rule, which provides that the umpire at the batsmen's end can no-ball a bowler if the umpire at the bowlers end does not, so Marsh may be useless to you if one umpire considers him unfair.²

This was tantamount to suggesting that MacLaren would bring an umpire especially instructed to no-ball Marsh, but it was an opening volley that was never tested.

As matters turned out, the Bathurst Association relented but not without much equivocation. In the beginning there was resentment towards the Englishmen for expecting nothing more than a 'Tom Fool' game that would be better abandoned but instead a number of Citizens' Committee meetings followed.³ The first of these came after MacLaren and his team declined to visit Bathurst unless Marsh was withdrawn; the second was to discuss the legal implications of cancelling the match; and the third to discuss what measures to take when MacLaren notified that he and his team would not be coming.

At the first meeting it was reported that Major Wardill had offered to pay Marsh's match fee if he was withdrawn. The meeting also received a telegram from Marsh stating that he desired to play even if he was not allowed to bowl.⁴ Marsh, it seems, was certainly well aware that he was surrounded by conspirators. However, the meeting voted by ten votes to two to retain him in the team. During the meeting some argued that the Bathurst Association should control its own match while others contended that MacLaren's objections were paltry. The dissenting voters favoured withdrawing Marsh out of courtesy to the Englishmen although one of those had second thoughts: 'To do so would be to lose all British pluck. In the interests of British fair play they should retain Marsh'.⁵

The second meeting ended without a resolution but it determined that the Western Cricket Union and the Melbourne Cricket Club were parties to the agreement to play, and the Citizens' Committee had merely ratified the agreement. It contained much lively discussion, however. One of the members of the Citizens' Committee, Mr Webb, resented Wardill's letter pointing out that the change in the no-ball rule was insulting in that it demeaned the committee implying that they were rogues. He also suggested that there was an unseen hand behind the scenes pulling strings

because Wardill, a Victorian, and the Englishmen, must have been unfamiliar with the politics behind the Marsh situation. A number of other issues were raised at the meeting: it was suggested that the English team were divided along amateur/professional lines about playing (with the amateurs supporting MacLaren and the professionals opting to play); that there would be an injustice in bringing a team to Bathurst without play; that money would have to be refunded if there was no match; and, for the first time, the question of race was brought up. Some thought the colour question was the main difficulty and that it would be an injustice to withdraw Marsh simply because MacLaren objected to him on colour lines. Overall, the tone of the second meeting was favourable to Marsh with the Chairman stating that if they withdrew Marsh they would be doing a wrong. The Chairman added that it was 'all moonshine' to suggest that the Englishmen were afraid of being injured and that, if it was because of Marsh's colour, it would be a disgrace to the community. He asserted that he was prepared to lose his money if Marsh was not included.⁶

The third meeting resolved by seven votes to four to exclude Marsh after a telegram notifying MacLaren's further refusal to play was received. This represented an undignified retreat. It also involved some rapid footwork because as soon as the vote was taken two Committee members contacted Major Wardill and MacLaren on the telephone. When asked if the English team would be prepared to come to Bathurst if Marsh was withdrawn from the team MacLaren responded, 'Yes', and the match was on again.⁷

According to one of the Bathurst papers, the *National Advocate*, some of this humiliation might have been avoided at the first meeting had the motion, to withdraw Marsh's name 'out of courtesy to the Englishmen', been adopted. But when the Committee decided to retain Marsh and MacLaren maintained his attitude, neither side could back down gracefully. The compromise that was reached ensured that economic and social arrangements would be met even if moral arguments were put aside. The

Committee concluded that as considerable expense had been incurred, the match extensively advertised, all arrangements completed, and the people in the district were expecting to witness the play, it would be wise to withdraw the player objected to and proceed with the match. At the third meeting commercial interests prevailed when members of the committee, who had not previously attended meetings, appeared advocating the exclusion of Marsh. It seemed clear that lobbying had taken place in the meantime.⁸

The loser out of all this was Marsh. MacLaren was accused of behaving like an autocrat⁹ and taking an untenable position but he was the victor. Marsh was simply expendable.¹⁰

The Marsh withdrawal created interest well beyond Bathurst. There were those who were critical of the 'capitulation' to MacLaren because they believed that the Australians had already given way to him on too many matters and that this decision represented a major loss of dignity.¹¹ McLaren's objection to his players being hurt was also seen as being 'wimpish' since Sydney cricketers played against Marsh every Saturday without being injured. Besides the Bathurst wicket was regarded as an excellent piece of turf.¹²

MacLaren was the epitome of the Golden Age English cricketer, an opening batsman in the 'grand manner' who played the ball with a full back-lift and had a glorious array of strokes all round the wicket. As a captain, he was authoritarian and a calculating risk-taker¹³ but what sort of man was he? According to his biographer, Michael Down, he was a mass of contradictions: he could be warm and amusing, but also awkward and high-handed; he could be charming and optimistic but rude and pessimistic as well. With a wealthy commercial background, he was educated at Harrow but his manner on and off the field was often aristocratic.¹⁴ It appears most likely that his objection to Marsh was based on the fact that he liked getting his own way, and being two Tests to one down in the series he made the calculated decision that avoiding Marsh would enable him to maintain team morale for the Fourth Test.

An intriguing question is whether there was a hidden agenda and whether 'an unseen hand was pulling the strings'. One sinister accusation was that Noble had influenced MacLaren on the matter presumably to deflect some of the criticism aimed at him for not selecting Marsh for NSW and while the evidence is circumstantial it is persuasive. Under the headline, 'Marsh v MacLaren', the *Sydney Sportsman* stated that *the* reason for MacLaren's objection was that 'the almighty Noble has persistently ignored the darkie's claims on the false ground that he chucks, [and] thinks it only right to refuse to meet him'. It went on to say that a number of competent umpires had passed Marsh and that it was time to find a more justifiable reason for his omission from representative teams.¹⁵ According to J C Davis in the *Referee* this accusation was 'senselessly unfair' but was it? The phrase had an air of too much protest and Davis' defence of Noble on the basis that he had selected Marsh for the Next Fifteen v NSW proved nothing.¹⁶ Indeed as Dr Arthur Palmer pointed out in a letter to the *Sydney Morning Herald* his selection in the Next Fifteen was an admission of his eligibility for selection for NSW.¹⁷

What can be deduced from this? Why should MacLaren and Noble collude against Marsh? The reasons why Noble might act in such a way are as follows. It has been established that Noble would not pick Marsh for NSW. The Next Fifteen were sometimes picked by other selectors¹⁸ and although this was not the case in 1901/02 Noble might have considered that his opinion was doubted not only by some elements of the press and the crowds, but also by the NSW Cricket Association. By playing at Bathurst, Marsh would have the opportunity to reveal his skills in an international match and further embarrass Noble. The question of why MacLaren might be party to such an arrangement might seem complex given that he and Noble were opposing each other in a Test series. Instead, it seems relatively straightforward: by not facing Marsh in Bathurst, MacLaren was not only protecting his own players but effectively denying the man felt to be Australia's best bowler the chance to be selected in the remaining Test matches and the upcoming Australian tour of England.

The evidence against Noble in the affair relies principally on hints: against MacLaren, it is more obvious. Marsh, however, attributed MacLaren's objection to him to the influence of Noble.¹⁹ As far as MacLaren was concerned, although a team-mate Arthur Jones, the Cambridge and Nottinghamshire amateur, attempted to explain (in a published letter) that MacLaren objected to Marsh because he had been no-balled seventeen times in one innings, this admission only made matters worse as the English captain's duplicity was well and truly exposed.²⁰ MacLaren could not have everything his own way and the Sydney weekly, *Town and Country Journal*, delighted in pointing out that since the State teams had taken no action to bar Marsh, and since MacLaren himself had accused umpire Crockett of 'incompetency', it was fair to assume that the Aboriginal bowler 'had been unjustly condemned'.²¹

Of all the arguments that led to Marsh being withdrawn from the Bathurst game the racial one is the weakest as the evidence is tenuous. Nevertheless, it cannot be discounted entirely. There is the opinion of one of the members of the Bathurst Citizens' Committee and the fears of its Chairman; hints of the colour line being drawn are suggested in the *Bulletin*;²² and when the Bathurst *National Advocate*²³ stated that MacLaren's final decision not to explain his objections to Marsh were wise in view of Australia's libel laws, the racial content of such an objection became even more credible.

Whatever the reason or combination of reasons for Marsh's exclusion from the Bathurst team it served to focus public clamour for his inclusion in the Australian side for the Fourth Test in Sydney even though he was unable to win State representation. The controversy over the Bathurst match did not appear to have affected Marsh's form in district cricket. In a club match for Sydney against Burwood he bowled his break-backs with such 'irresistible style' that he took the first five wickets for no runs and finished with 8/32 on what was regarded as a perfect batting strip,²⁴ and his supposedly suspect action was increasingly seen as a red herring.²⁵

An interesting (if minor development) at this point was that Marsh himself became actively involved in plans for his rehabilitation. His appearance at the office of the *Town and Country Journal's* cricket correspondent 'Stumps', was surprising, the more so because Marsh took with him the splints he wore to demonstrate to umpire William Curran the fairness of his delivery. Marsh clearly wanted any doubts about his action dispelled and achieved some satisfaction because it was reported that Umpire Curran changed his opinion, admitting that his style of bowling was quite legal and would satisfy any umpire.²⁶

Unfortunately for Marsh, however, his chance of Test selection was dogged by another matter, the engagement of Crockett by MacLaren as his umpire on tour. Umpiring appointments for Australia were made by agreement between the participating teams up to the 1901/02 season. Each team appointed one with the visiting team more often than not including an umpire with their touring party. There was a move, pioneered by the NSW Cricket Association during the 1901/02 season, for umpiring appointments to be made by the host body. This procedure was proposed for the match between MacLaren's team and NSW in November 1901. This did not eventuate because MacLaren insisted that one appointment remain his prerogative and all other appointments during the season followed the old formula Marsh's stocks might have risen slightly when MacLaren and Crockett fell out mid-tour and Crockett was replaced by Charles Bannerman for the remainder of the program except that Crockett was later appointed as the 'home' umpire for the final Test.

Marsh's support came chiefly from a number of newspapers. The *Evening News* ran a story which stressed that he had only been no-balled twice during a four year career, repeated Curran's change of view as an umpire, and added that Crockett's dictum should not be accepted as final.²⁷ *The Bulletin*²⁸ called for Marsh's inclusion on the basis that a fresh and effective bowler was an urgent need in view of the huge score of 769 the Englishmen had just made against NSW when the other bowlers seemed

to lack sting.²⁹ The *Daily Telegraph* seemed to prevaricate on the issue in an editorial,³⁰ ‘Cricket Criticism’, before calling upon the selectors to put aside any historic connections’ which Marsh may have had with throwing. The comment was made in another part of the newspaper that ‘as a fast bowler at the present time he has probably no equal -certainly no superior in Australia’.

A number of letters to newspaper editors carried on the argument, with several calling for explanations. Some asked Noble to provide the true reason for his disqualification of Marsh³¹ and others called for justice and fair play for Marsh.³²

In the end, the selectors, Hill, Noble and Trumble, were swayed neither by the media nor the public. But, if Marsh was left out of the Test side because of throwing (as English papers were reported to have said) this was ironic given that Noble himself was not above suspicion. The *Sydney Sportsman* may have represented a subversive voice but it claimed Noble’s deliveries had been challenged and went so far as to say that ‘seven out of nine authorities swear his slower ball is a throw’.³³ More importantly, Sammy Woods, the Somerset Captain who had also played for Cambridge University, the Gentlemen, and in Test cricket for both Australia and England, described Noble in the *Wellington Evening Post* as being ‘the most deliberate and palpable thrower he ever saw’.

These accusations beg a number of questions. Was Noble severe on Marsh because of sensitivity regarding his own action? MacLaren writing in the *Manchester Courier* in January 1901 makes the useful point that the throw has a natural break of its own.³⁴ One of Noble’s best deliveries was a curve ball that he had picked up from baseball.³⁵ One of Marsh’s best deliveries was this curve ball which according to J C Davis was his most suspect and which he had discarded.³⁶ Both Noble and Marsh were able to break this ball considerably from the off-side. Davis at the time was one of

Noble's supporters yet he wrote that 'there are times when a glimmer of suspicion crosses one's mind as to the legality of a ball delivered by M A but I have never met an umpire who considered that he really transgressed the law'.³⁷

Let us think about this for a moment. What is the difference between a 'glimmer of suspicion' and a 'doubtful delivery' according to the no-ball law? Let us also consider the meaning of 'really transgressed'? Does this mean there were a number of umpires who had their doubts about Noble but gave him the benefit of the doubt that they were not supposed to do. Let us remember that the former Australian all-rounder and then Victorian captain, John Worrall also questioned Noble's action in April 1902 when he wrote a letter to James Phillips and an article in the *London Sportsman* stating that everyone in the 1899 Australian team knew that Noble transgressed the law. In what became a major controversy Worrall called upon Phillips to make a name for himself by no-balling both Noble and Saunders.³⁸ Let us also remember that only umpires Curran and Crockett had called Marsh and that all others had passed him. Perhaps Crockett' as a Victorian, had ulterior motives! There appear grounds for believing that if both bowlers were suspect one was nevertheless getting different treatment. One was permanently under suspicion: the other able to carve his name in cricket history as one of Australia's premier all-rounders.

There is a hint in the newspapers that Marsh's omission from the Test side may have been for reasons other than cricket and the *Evening News* uses the word 'prejudice' though without specifying what type of prejudice. The Sydney Club Committee unanimously supported Marsh and its Secretary stated that the whole time Marsh had been connected with the club his conduct, both on and off the field, had won him the plaudits not only of his own side, but also of opposing players.³⁹

The question of race prejudice is not clear and perhaps would not be readily admitted but it is raised in the *Sydney Sportsman*:

If the color [*sic*] line be an obstacle, what is the difference between Marsh and Ranji. This certainly may be a point of education as even Ranji's contemporaries describe him as a beautiful bowler [*sic*, batsman], yet it does not keep him out of the team and he is not a native, while Marsh most certainly is.⁴⁰

The *Sydney Sportsman* added:

Every man has his day, and some of our popular cricketers of today, who are on a pedestal, like Charlie Spraggs, will come a cropper, and what a blooming thudful cropper it will be!

Noble has maintained his place on a pedestal - until now!

As far as Noble's failure to select Marsh for NSW was concerned and Marsh's non-selection for Australia' race itself may not be a sufficient explanation but it could be a contributing factor. Moreover, the story related by Noble's nephew, George Noble, concerning Marsh hints at it:

As uncle went into bat he remarked 'I'll show them his chap can't bowl'. A sympathiser up a tree kept calling 'What about Marsh, Mary Ann?' Uncle answered by hitting the dark bowler all over the ground in a century that silenced the tree-dweller.⁴¹

Noble's powerful position, particularly as NSW sole selector, ensured that Marsh would be targeted rather than himself. He may have also had influence over umpiring appointments at the first-class level. Finally, it seems that there may be grounds for believing that Noble was jealous of Marsh since he could not only bowl Noble's outcurve but a number of other variations. If Marsh's action was legitimate, while Noble's was suspect (as Davis notes in April 1902) there were even more grounds for jealousy.

Unfortunately, then as now, the press was interested only in the issues of the moment, Although the *Sydney Morning Herald* of 15 February reported that a section of the crowd had enquired where Marsh was when the England score had reached 1/122 in the Fourth Test the

question was raised and disposed of within two lines. By the end of the match (at least in the *Herald*) Marsh was forgotten as he was not discussed in relation to the side selected for the Fifth Test in Melbourne, nor was he considered for the coming tour of England.⁴² There was a conspiracy of silence. That Noble felt the need to justify his State selections on the basis of form, at an end of season meeting of the NSWCA, may suggest that Marsh was omitted for other reasons, none of which were satisfactorily explained. The Australian cricket crowd (as Cashman has suggested) occasionally was able to provide evidence of a subversive alternative to the mainstream cricket tradition when this was believed to offend against fair play but this was rarely reported.⁴³

At the summer's end those opposed to Marsh had their way. By denying him the opportunity to perform at Bathurst the move to have him included in the Australian Test side was thwarted and when the Australian and English teams departed Adelaide on board the *Omrah* on 20 March 1902 Marsh was not among their number.

It is interesting to reflect on the brief remainder of Marsh's first-class career. When MacLaren and Noble were ten days at sea Marsh took the field in his only interstate match for the summer against Queensland in Brisbane. Although the NSW side was a virtual second eleven, it could be seen as significant for Marsh for two reasons. First' as a protest vote by the selectors in Noble's absence; and, second, because it was the first occasion when two Aboriginal players - he and Albert Henry - were opposed, and in which each bowled the other out for nine runs.⁴⁴ Marsh's last first-class game was also against Queensland in Brisbane in November 1902, a month before the Australian Test side had returned from England and South Africa. Marsh played for a NSW Thirteen against the Australian team in Sydney in December 1902 and was chosen for the Sheffield Shield matches against South Australia and Victoria in Adelaide and Melbourne which followed. By then, however, Noble had assumed the NSW captaincy and Marsh was twelfth man in both games.⁴⁵

Finally, there was an interesting postscript regarding Bathurst. Two years later, in February 1904, Pelham Warner's English team played there and Jack Marsh was in the opposing side, in his only appearance against an international team. Marsh took 5/55 and 1/36 bowling a mixture of pace and off-breaks and again there were calls for his Test selection. Although his action was passed in the match, the throwing bogey was again raised against him, and the harshest criticism came from Warner. In remarks made to the *National Advocate* Warner stated that no English umpire would stand Marsh and that Crockett would no-ball him.⁴⁶

NOTES

1. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 3 Feb. 1902.
2. Wardill's letter dated 30 Jan. 1902 and reprinted in the *Bathurst Daily Free Press and Mining Journal*, 4 Feb. 1902.
3. *Bathurst Daily Free Press and Mining Journal*, 4 Feb. 1902.
4. *Bathurst Daily Free Press and Mining Journal*, 5 Feb. 1902.
5. *Bathurst Daily Free Press and Mining Journal*, 5 Feb. 1902.
6. *Bathurst Daily Free Press and Mining Journal*, 5 Feb. 1902.
7. *Bathurst Daily Free Press and Mining Journal*, 6 Feb. 1902.
8. *National Advocate*, 7 Feb. 1902.
9. *Referee*, 12 Feb. 1902.
10. *Bathurst Daily Free Press and Mining Journal*, 6 Feb. 1902.
11. Letter of H F Wickham, *Sydney Morning Herald*, 4 Feb. 1902.
12. *Referee*, 5 Feb. 1902.
13. Christopher Martin-Jenkins, *The Complete Who's Who of Test Cricketers*, Rigby, 1980, pp. 89-90.
14. Michael Down, *Archie: A Biography of A C MacLaren*, Allen and Unwin, 1981, ch. 1.
15. *Sydney Sportsman* reprinted in *Bathurst Daily Free Press and Mining Journal*, 6 Feb. 1902.
16. *Referee*, 12 Feb. 1902.
17. Letter reprinted in *Referee*, 12 Feb. 1902.
18. The number varied but to give an example for a State trial match in 1904/05 the NSW Eleven was picked by Noble, Frank Iredale and G P Barbour; and the Next Thirteen by A Diamond, E Hume and J C Davis. For further details see *Referee*, 9 Nov. 1904.
19. *Town and Country Journal*, 15 Feb. 1902 noted that Noble had opposed Marsh's selection in the NSW team in 1900/01 but was over-ruled by the other selectors, Tom Garrett and E J Briscoe.
20. The meeting of county captains in December 1900 decided to prohibit Mold, the Lancashire fast bowler, from playing county cricket but MacLaren as Lancashire Captain declined to accept the verdict of his fellow captains with the result that Mold's sentence of banishment

- was suspended for the 1901 season. It could thus be seen that MacLaren had one code of ethics when playing against Marsh but was not so sensitive when Mold was required to bowl for Lancashire. For further discussion of this see *Town and Country Journal*, 1 March 1902.
21. *Town and Country Journal*, 1 March 1902. Umpire Bob Crockett had 'called' Marsh seventeen times in one innings for throwing the previous season.
 22. *Bulletin*, 8 Feb. 1902.
 23. *National Advocate*, 7 Feb. 1902.
 24. *Referee*, 12 Feb. 1902.
 25. *Bulletin*, 15 Feb. 1902.
 26. The splints refer to a match in Nov. 1900 between a NSW Second Fifteen and a First Eleven in which Marsh was no-balled for throwing by umpire William Curran and subsequently wore the splints to attempt to prove the legitimacy of his action. Umpire Curran later umpired two Tests, against South Africa (1910/11) and England (1911/12).
 27. *Evening News* reprinted in *Bathurst Daily Free Mail and Mining Journal*, 12 Feb. 1902.
 28. *Bulletin*, 15 Feb. 1902.
 29. In the Tests series the Australians led two matches to one but the Englishmen had won the First Test in Sydney with an innings to spare.
 30. *Daily Telegraph (Sydney)*, 13 Feb. 1902.
 31. *Letters to Daily Telegraph*, 5 and 12 Feb. 1902.
 32. *Letters of 'Fair Play' and 'Redfern' to Daily Telegraph*, 13 Feb. 1902 and from J A Dobbie to *Sydney Morning Herald*, 14 Feb. 1902. Dobbie edited *Australian Cricket: A Weekly Record* with Test opening bowler C T B Turner in 1896/97.
 33. *Sydney Sportsman* reprinted in *Bathurst Daily Free Press and Mining Journal*, 6 Feb. 1902.
 34. Reprinted in *Town and Country Journal*, 16 Feb. 1902.
 35. Ray Robinson, *On Top Down Under*, Cassell, Stanmore, 1975, p. 90.
 36. *Referee*, 12 Feb. 1902.
 37. *Referee*, 2 Apr. 1902
 38. This admission was brought to light following the refusal of most members of the 1902 Australian side to play against Worrall in the 1902/03 season and led to Worrall pleading a special hearing before the Victorian Cricket Association prior to his enforced retirement. For further details see the reports in the *Melbourne Age* and *Argus* on 23 Dec. 1902.
 39. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 12 Feb. 1902; *Daily Telegraph*, 12 Feb. 1902.
 40. *Quoted in Bathurst Daily Free Press and Mining Journal*, 6 Feb. 1902.
 41. Quoted in Robinson, *On Top Down Under*, p. 96.
 42. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 19 Feb. 1902.
 43. Richard Cashman, 'Cricket and Colonialism: Colonial Hegemony and Indigenous Subversion?' in J A Mangan, ed., *Pleasure, Profit, Proselytism: British Culture and Sport at Home and Abroad 1700-1914*, Cass, London, 1988, p. 263.
 44. Ray Webster, *First-Class Cricket in Australia, Vol. 1850-51 to 1941-42*, the author, Glen Waverley, 1991, p. 301.
 45. Webster, *First-Class Cricket*, pp. 304-05.
 46. *National Advocate*, 22 Feb. 1904.