

Review Symposium Reply

*Writing Sports History for
'Non-Specialists':
a Reply to the Review Symposium
on Adair and Vamplew's Sport in
Australian History, and the
State of Australian Sports History*¹

Daryl Adair
Department of Human Movement Studies
The University of Queensland

I welcome the proposal for regular review symposia in *Sporting Traditions*. It is an ideal forum in which to debate problems and possibilities associated with the writing of sports history in Australia and New Zealand, the official member regions of ASSH. In selecting *Sport in Australian History* as the first book under focus, Reviews Editor John Nauright has been most generous. It is an unexpected honour to have a text written for 'non-specialist' readers peer reviewed in such a prominent way. I presume this to be welcome confirmation that academic sports historians accept the need for a two-fold publishing role: first, to produce scholarly manuscripts and journal articles for a specialist audience; second, to convey aspects of their work to non-specialist audiences — the general public, upper secondary school students, and first year university undergraduates. I begin this article by discussing problems of writing sports history for public consumption. Then, with the blessing of co-author Wray Vamplew, follows a reply to the May 1997 Review Symposium. Hopefully, this will help to stimulate constructive debate about the state of Australian sports history.

The Fireside Chat: Australian Sports History for the Classroom and the Pub

Sport in Australian History was started in freezing weather just before Christmas 1994, while my proof-reading of the text was finished in

glorious sunshine almost two years after. Such contrasting weather appears puzzling until it is explained that the authors wrote the book at De Montfort University's International Centre for Sports History and Culture, Leicester. When the manuscript proofs appeared in late 1996, Wray Vamplew scanned his copy beside a fire, while I avoided the heat by reading under the shade of a gum tree at The University of Queensland. During two years in England as a Research Fellow in Sports History I found it hard to acclimatise to sub-zero temperatures, but I was welcomed warmly into the British sports history community, whose camaraderie and courtesy I admired. Leicester is something of a focal point for sports history and sociology in England, so I had the pleasure of meeting a succession of visiting speakers at seminars.

While these formal occasions were instructive, I found that yams over a few ales at the Swan and Rushes pub, or chatter over a curry at one of Leicester's fine Indian restaurants, were most rewarding. But whether informal academic commentaries were appreciated or, for that matter, comprehended by patrons within earshot was a question that troubled me. For many of these punters, sport was part of everyday language, with weekends the testing ground for their predictions of victory or defeat. Beyond that little seemed to matter; or, put another way, why the critical study of sport should matter to *academics* puzzled them. What was critical to *them* was that 'City beat United at Filbert Street this Sat'dy'; and that fans could watch the game 'live' courtesy of BSKyB at the local pub. I have sympathy for such self indulgence: my rejoicing after an Adelaide (AFL) premiership and a Norwood (SANFL) premiership this year did much to reinforce my reputation as a mad Aussie Rules supporter. Lurking behind the bespectacled person of Dr Jeckyl Adair (a softly-spoken sports history lecturer by week day) can be found a ranting Mr Hyde (an avid sports fan by weekend). I am reliably informed that when Barnsley made it to the Premier League in English football this season Vamplew was struck by similar delirium.

These confessions are offered for good reason. When Vamplew was approached by Oxford University Press (OUP) to contribute a book on sport to their 'Australian Retrospectives Series', he looked to recruit a co-author of equal height (always an important consideration for professors) and similar passion for the subject. With my fly-weight frame and form guide in hip pocket I was really the only choice. Our series brief seemed clear enough: we were invited 'to address major questions in a brisk and

intelligently speculative manner' and to 'treat major themes over an extended period', thereby bringing 'a historical perspective to bear on matters of vital concern to Australians in the 1990s'. Books in this series were not 'designed to be the last word' on their subject, but to honour the 'intelligent interest' of readers by providing them with 'intellectual nourishment _ at a time when the nation is calling for new ideas and new ways of communicating them'. Heading all this was Professor David Walker's opening gambit: 'we have invited authors to examine formative issues in our national history in a style accessible to non-specialists'.²

We were left in no doubt that this book would be an issue-based introduction to sport in Australian history, with no space for the usual overview of previous literature. We had just 50 000 words in which to work, and were advised to keep endnotes to a bare minimum (as was the pattern with previous books in this series). To OUP's credit, they eventually allowed fourteen pages of notes, and a two-page list of major readings, which extended the length of the text well beyond what they had originally anticipated. But the book still contains only 145 pages of prose, which makes it 30 pages smaller than the May 1997 issue of *Sporting Traditions*. Experienced writers know how difficult it is to discuss major themes and ideas in any depth or breadth given such constraints. We also faced the responsibility of writing for non-specialist audiences. In our view this curtailed the overt use of conventional academic devices, such as theoretical models or technical language — both of which are difficult to grasp without requisite training. Instead our approach would be narrative, thematic, and deliberately simple.

Underpinning this declaration of reader accessibility was a message to non-specialist audiences that the Adair/Vamplew book would be a critical, rather than celebratory account. Our stated purpose in adopting such a stance was 'to stimulate *public* debate about the past, present and future of Australian sport'.³ This was necessary, we argued, because (a) sport has widely been viewed as a subject that neither requires nor deserves academic interest; and (b) sports writers have typically eulogised rather than critically analysed the nation's sporting past. In other words, academia has tended to turn up its nose at sport, while the media has basked in the reflected glory of sport-as-drama.⁴ This has left sports fans well informed about on-field winners and losers, but poorly informed about ways in which the values and structures of Australian society have been reflected in the nation's sporting culture.

None of this, of course, is new to specialist readers. Indeed, our reference to sport as a 'sacred cow' of Australian society harks back to Brian Stoddart's path-breaking sociological study, *Saturday Afternoon Fever* (1986), a point we acknowledged by way of endnote. And, as reviewers feel compelled to remind us, ASSH has produced a highly respected academic journal since 1984; the field of sports history is now accepted much more widely as an area of scholarly endeavour; and there have been a number of good quality books published on the history and sociology of Australian sport (each of which appear under our list of main readings). But there must be at least a handful of ordinary punters out there who are blissfully ignorant of the fine work of Stoddart, Cashman, O'Hara, and others since the mid- 1980s; and at least a couple more Australians yet to sign on as ASSH members. So Vamplew and I felt it best to emphasise our 'critical message' for non-specialist readers.

Alas, we were well aware that readers even remotely interested in the nation's sporting history have been raised on a diet of golden syrup. For years on the airwaves they were indoctrinated with Norman May's 'Gold, gold, gold for Australia'; the nation's leading female athletes of the 1950s were dubbed the 'golden girls'; while the 'bronzed Aussies' in the swimming pool actually raced for gold. Aside from this interest in alchemy, Australian readers of sports newspapers and magazines have sought to predict the fortunes of football teams and race horses by shuffling pages as though they were Tarot cards. Meanwhile, purchasers of more substantial reading material have spent their hard-earned money on books that remind them of the glory days: biographies of Dennis Lillee and Merv Hughes; encyclopedias of various football codes (complete with revered statistical records of team achievement); and, for the adventurous, *End of the Colliwobbles: the Magpies as a Force in the New Millennium* (yet to be published). In response to this tidal wave of hero worship we harbingers of the 'truth' — the so-called educated elite — could organise a blockade of bookstores, urging proprietors to never again sell sycophantic biographies of sports stars nor encomiastic histories of golf, motor-racing, and the like. But who are we kidding? I know of at least two academic sports historians who freely admit to being part of the madding crowd at horse racing, football, etc., and very much couch potatoes during Test cricket, Wimbledon, and the like. One of them subscribes to pay television in the UK so as to be sure to catch the replay when *any* team defeats Manchester United; while the other has framed

photographs of a winning race horse adorning his St Lucia apartment. How could these guys argue for an avowedly critical perspective without being hypocritical?

Yet that is precisely where Donald Home's maxim 'to celebrate is also to criticise' becomes instructive.⁵ A critic need not be a detached cynic, but can be an analyst literally immersed in, and ensconced by, their subject matter. Such a person may, in fact, be in an advantageous position from which to convey both laudable and lamentable features of sport to readers. Not that Vamplew and I have been 'insiders' in quite the same way as elite-level athletes or sports journalists. To them we may seem very much 'outsiders' poking our academic noses into their profession. But a large part of *our* profession is the study of sport. By virtue of our formal training, academics like us have a knowledge base and technical skills that empower us to teach others about Australian society and the role of sport in its history. Of course, this pedagogical authority hardly means that our views will be accepted uncritically by either sports history novices or our specialist peers. Nor *should* they be. Yet within this framework, we felt (as others have before us) a responsibility as educators to provide some correctives to popular misconceptions about the history of sport in Australian society. In doing so we never pretended to provide the 'last word' on the subject, but rather intended to promote debate among our readers — whether they be sports fans, students, the young and the old, new arrivals to Australia, indigenous peoples, or whatever.

In order to achieve this goal of stirring up public discussion we felt a need, where appropriate, to be provocative and to challenge conventional wisdom. Hence one of the rationales for writing *Sport in Australian History* was to debunk what we considered to be three big myths: first, that sport in Australia has been essentially egalitarian in spirit or structure; second, that Australians have been unusually obsessed by sport; and third, that the 'good old days' were free of player violence, spectator disorder, monetary gain, and other 'recent problems' of sport. None of this, we repeat, will seem particularly new to specialist readers, but we can assure you that much of it comes across as iconoclastic to sports history novices. We know that because we have taught Australian sports history to first year students, and we have offered informal talks on the subject to schoolchildren. Just as importantly, in our capacities as ardent sports fans, we converse routinely with non-specialist 'others' about Australia's sporting past.

Yet according to some critics, so-called sports studies ‘experts’ like us ought to be very careful when writing about their subject for non-specialist audiences. Two themes stand out. First, objections about the style of the message. In a review entitled ‘Big Serve of Double-Faults’, Ken Inglis complains that Vamplew and Stoddart’s edited volume *Sport in Australia: A Social History* (1994) contains ‘the prose of people whose income does not depend on selling it’. According to him the contributors are ‘writers-up rather than writers’ who over-indulge their study with endnotes. He insists that ‘reading about play should not be such hard work’, and concludes that the best ‘writing in the book was quotations from nineteenth-century sports journalists.’⁶ His general argument seems to be that because the subject is sport then the message ought to be delivered ‘line and length’. Second, there are objections about the nature of the message. In a review entitled ‘Condescending Look at Sport’ Rick Bouwman complains that Jim McKay’s sociological study *No Pain, No Gain?* (1991) is ‘almost evangelistic’ in its ‘confronting’ pedagogic style, and he charges the author with ‘talking down to people’ rather than to them. He worries that McKay’s consciousness-raising style ‘offends many of the people it seeks to improve or enlighten, and often also provokes hostility and defensiveness’. Bouwman’s general argument seems to be that because sport is part of everyday existence, then those who actively engage in physical culture have much to say about it. In other words, their responses ought to be nurtured rather than trampled upon by what he sees as ‘all-knowing cynicism’.⁷

These two captious messages about style and substance cannot be dismissed out of hand. If sports history is to reach non-specialist audiences in a meaningful and fertile manner then it ought to be accessible by way of language and thought-provoking in argument — in other words a ‘good read’. Yet it is our opinion that both of the above mentioned books were, albeit in different ways, most valuable contributions to that cause. It is not our task to defend these studies here, but rather to suggest that many of the problems and possibilities these authors faced were, as one would expect, also before Vamplew and me as we embarked upon *Sport in Australian History*. Adding to this, though, was an awareness that as we were in the midst of tackling our book, Richard Cashman was in the process of proof-reading *Paradise of Sport* (1995), a far more ambitious and detailed work than our project, and of special importance as the first large-scale academic synthesis of Australian sports history.

In collegial manner, Cashman quickly made his manuscript available: that enabled us to confirm how and where our study differed from *Paradise of Sport*, while allowing us to draw upon this source to bolster areas of common interest. Astute readers will be aware that Adair and Vamplew, perhaps influenced by their location in Euro' 96 Britain, called into question Cashman's claim that Australians have been unusual in their fascination with sport. Moreover, while Cashman's sports history volume is exhaustive in scope and theme, we were especially interested in the position of groups on the margins of Australian sporting culture, such as people with disabilities, the aged, and ethnic 'minorities'. Additionally, we considered that science and technology have been fundamental to elite-level sports performance. On that basis we devoted a chapter to the question of whether sport has tended to be an artistic or a scientific activity in Australia. At the risk of labouring the point, we have largely followed in Cashman's footsteps, but where possible strove to walk a different path. In one sense this was an awkward objective because of the logistics of producing Australian history from abroad. From a practical point of view, Vamplew and I were very grateful for the wealth of secondary material published by various sports historians and sociologists since the mid-1980s. Without this body of literature, as well as Vamplew's personal archive of primary sources, it is difficult to see how *Sport in Australian History* could have been written from England. We even resorted to having the *Australian* and *Age* newspapers sent over each week by sea mail. The news was three months old by the time we received it, but it helped to keep us posted about fast-changing developments, such as the ARL-Super League split and the AFL's responses to racial vilification.

In an earlier heading we used 'fireside chat' as a metaphor to describe the process of trying to convey sports history to non-specialist audiences in classrooms and pubs. We cannot claim credit for this phrase — it was coined by John Harms when review-ing our book for *Journal of Australian Studies*.⁸ But it encapsulates our best intentions. Harms writes that Adair and Vamplew set out to 'challenge what might be described as the Everyman understanding of sport _ presented in pubs, clubs, on trains, on picnics, outside churches, and at sports events themselves, which may (or may not) help to perpetuate myths about sport'. He agrees that 'such sports fans often have an idealistic view of what sport is, or should be', but is relieved that 'the authors are not dismissive of such understandings

... as they are able to empathise with readers who have a passion for sport'. Harms astutely points out that Adair and Vamplew are, to an extent, also guilty — if that is the right word — of taking an idealistic stance about what sport might offer Australians. His thoughts on this are worth quoting:

They [the authors] come from a position which suggests that there is some ideal notion of sport for which the community might strive. They take a strong editorial position and there is a number of places where they suggest the way things 'should' and occasionally 'must' be, notably when referring to women, children, Aborigines and corruption. While this may make sections of the book sound like a fireside chat to some, it does suggest a sense of mission in the text, and at least acts to promote discussion.⁹

With our knowledge base and pedagogical authority we set out to both inform and guide non-specialist readers, who we invited to huddle around the symbolic fireside to hear our story. There is certainly a paternalistic relationship here, but that is also true of any tutorial session. Our hope is that for sports history novices the experience has, or will be, worthwhile. We are also conscious that the current generation of academics has barely scratched the surface of Australian sports history and sociology. Alongside that admission is an assumption that this book (along with texts published previously by ASSH members) will in some way inspire non-specialist 'others' to consider more seriously the structure and values of the sports they experience as players or spectators. Perhaps, too, a new generation of academic sports analysts may emerge from such a process. We trust that they will be bolder and better than those who have gone before them.

Reviewers, Readings and Audiences

Although we have been asked to respond to reviewers' comments in the May 1997 symposium we take this opportunity to also make mention of other reviews. This helps to convey some of the diverse ways in which the book has been read. It also allows us to pursue more broadly several of the problems we have just outlined —reaching non-specialist readers, raising critical awareness, pedagogical responsibility, and the like. But the main focus will be with issues raised by reviewers Rob Hess, Doug Booth and Tara Magdalinski.

In a concise discussion, Hess concludes that Adair and Vamplew's

study has made 'a useful addition to the field of sports history _ in terms of the new audience it intelligently targets'.¹⁰ Since this was our goal such comments are most welcome, especially from someone currently teaching Australian sports history. Hess is nonetheless right to express disappointment that we did not discuss the creation story of Australian Rules football. In particular, reference to studies by both Gillian Hibbins and Geoffrey Blainey could have bolstered our opening chapter on myths about Australian sport. In 1859 this Melbourne-invented pastime was adapted from various (as yet to be codified) styles of English football; so, contrary to popular assumption, the birth of the great Australian game was hardly an effort on the part of Melburnians to be distinctly different from Britons.¹¹ Continuing the topic of Aussie Rules, reviewer Dawn Penney regrets that we did not discuss positive elements of spectating at footy matches, which she describes as 'a more welcoming advert for sport' than many crowd cultures in European football.¹² This is sound criticism: English-born Penney has first-hand knowledge of the fears and risks associated with attending soccer matches in Britain during the last two decades. And, since residing Downunder, she has expressed both surprise and delight that Aussie Rules crowds are not formally segregated according to team affiliation, nor do they contain organised, sub-cultural fan groups who share an explicit goal of provoking physical violence among rival supporters. Another feature of Aussie Rules crowds has long been the relatively high proportion of female spectators (around 40 per cent in the 1990s). To American readers this may not seem particularly novel, but Penney's joy at not feeling out of place at the family atmosphere of Aussie Rules tells us more about the historically male-dominated culture of British soccer. There is, in other words, an urgent need for international comparisons about a whole range of issues in sport.¹³ That was a point we stressed in chapter 1 of our study but had no scope to develop, largely because, as Hess has charitably put it, of the 'brevity' and 'condensed' nature of the book.¹⁴

Booth sees a number of problems with *Sport in Australian History*, the most serious of which appear to be charges of 'lack of opinion and critical analysis'. He complains that the authors either 'avoid personal judgement' or show a 'refusal to cast judgement'.¹⁵ These comments will seem particularly odd to Harms, who is convinced that we took 'a strong editorial position' and demonstrated an idealist 'sense of mission'.¹⁶ Doubtless they will also perplex Martin Crotty, who in a review in

Melbourne Historical Journal, describes the book as ‘essentially an assault upon mythologies’, and concludes that ‘the result is a rather negative and cynical portrayal of the part sport has played in Australian history, a black armband history _ of our sporting past’.¹⁷ From a different vantage point sports journalist Peter Fitzsimons admits that people in his profession ‘sometimes get lost in the emotion of it all — spending our lives in the belly of the beast and sometimes not seeing clearly because of it’, so he is pleased that ‘the authors have provided an entirely different and refreshing view from the top floor of their own ivory towers’. Yet he finds that a ‘fault of the book is that occasionally, out of a clear blue sky, a storm of patronising lecturing breaks upon our heads and we are drenched’. Fitzsimons is annoyed, for example, when we link claims of social justice for Aborigines with the staging of the Sydney 2000 Olympics, and he is mortified when we raise discussion about homophobia in sport. This leads him to conclude that ‘the authors are at their best when taking us on an unemotive intellectual journey _ from an analytical perspective, and at their worst when relentlessly displaying their small ‘1’ liberal credentials’.¹⁸ Booth even seems at odds with Magdalinski, who, while dismissive of the authors’ efforts to — as she puts it — ‘de-nostalgise’ sport, seems at least to have recognised editorial intent:

There is an overriding message in this book that although sport has... bad and negative elements, there is a greater ideal, a greater meaning for sport, that must not be forgotten and one of the main themes is that sport SHOULD be doing certain things, for example ‘it should be health promoting and fun’ (p. 61).¹⁹

Booth concludes that *Sport in Australian History* ‘never realises the authors’ object-ive of presenting a true critical perspective on Australian sport’.²⁰ This statement will probably sound rather comical to ardent postmodernists, and to the many historians who now write within a conceptual framework of competing representations and provisional truths about the past.²¹ But we doubt whether Booth intended his words to be interpreted as naively positivist. His express concern seems to be that while the authors have provided ‘good historical *descriptions* of the relationships between sport and society’ they have provided ‘no *analysis* of the interrelationships’.²² Booth begins by acknowledging that ‘Adair and Vamplew use the historical approach to good effect’, and accepts that we ‘highlight the continuities and discontinuities in sport over the last

century; every theme and issue comes complete with its own mini history'. He concludes: 'This is the book's strength'.²³ Where we go wrong, he tells us, is that our writing is descriptive, not analytical.

In offering this criticism Booth makes an example of our point that 'the attitudes of male sports administrators towards sportswomen began to harden by the 1930s'.²⁴ This change of mood meant that female inroads into sporting events involving both men and women were under threat. Booth's concern (though unfounded) is that we do not spell out adequately why male administrators took this view. He suggests that their attitude was most likely caused by 'social changes during the Great War which freed women from the home and to subsequent attempts by men to force them back'.²⁵ This is a common and usually reliable hypothesis in gender history, but it does not apply in the case of Australian sport. The physical activity we were referring to particularly in this instance was rowing. During the 1920s there was an increase in women's involvement at regattas organised by men. By the 1930s, though, men were less accepting of women's events at rowing carnivals. We found that this hardening of attitude was a direct outcome of the fact that the number of regatta races had grown so much that male officials were less willing to share their program time with women's rowing associations. Hence their policy of 'no room for the ladies' was not a consequence of post-War gender insecurity on the part of male organisers; instead it was a pragmatic decision. Yet the policy also reflected *longstanding* attitudes among male rowers that female athletes were inferior, and that events for women at male organised regattas were a token gesture of male appreciation. None of this supports Booth's theory that World War I was especially pivotal in terms of male backlashes against women's involvement in sport.²⁶

Much like beauty, depth and level of critical analysis seem to be very much in the eye of the beholder. While Booth describes *Sport in Australian History* as uncritical, descriptive, and passionless, Harms reads it as critical, analytical, and celebratory. Whereas Crotty views the book as negative, cynical, and a black arm-band view of the past, Magdalinski considers that although the text 'is written under the guise of social awareness', the authors are mistaken to presume they have offered much that is really critical. According to her, the book has 'clearly _ been a simplistic and unconvincing description'.²⁷ Little did Vamplew and I anticipate that this introductory reader would provoke such dramatically different responses among our academic peers. Yet there is a sense in

which it is irrelevant how these experts view the book. It is, after all, a text for non-specialist readers, so how *those* types of people respond to the study is of most interest to us. Our prime concern, in other words, has been to connect with target audiences.

Curiously, we found a parallel to our position in the context of novice versus expert responses to pianist David Helfgott's recent tour of Britain. The life of Helfgott — a person with schizo-effective disorder — has, of course, been the subject of a critically-acclaimed *and* popular film, *Shine*. That success provided a springboard for Helfgott to make public performances of his own to new audiences. This extremely talented, though at times erratic, pianist has since played to packed houses in Britain. According to a recent television documentary about Helfgott's British tour,²⁸ a large proportion of the audience was people who had come to hear classical piano for the first time. Several of them revealed that it was the man as much as his music that appealed. They knew virtually nothing about technical aspects of classical performance, but appreciated Helfgott as a performer and considered his music to be worthy of their attention. In making this analogy we are hardly suggesting we have the literary equivalent of Helfgott's talent, or that we have a story of triumph over adversity to match. Rather, our interest is with the volatility of critical responses to Helfgott's British tour. In brief, his piano playing was slated by many expert critics, each of whom read his performances within an essentialist, operational, classical paradigm of technique and sound. They were quite entitled to review Helfgott's work in that format, as they felt compelled by their own professional standards to criticise his performance as simplistic when compared with other leading pianists. But some expert critics took a more flexible approach to the musical text, also reading success or failure by whether Helfgott connected with *the audience*. Essentialist experts may well dismiss the audience as a factor in performance, but in doing so they miss the special context in which Helfgott's music was played. He sought more than anything to appeal to *the public*; whether expert listeners were taken by his performance was not nearly as important to him.

Vamplew and I have taken a similar approach: we have tried to pitch our book at a level that is accessible to 'ordinary' readers, and we have tried to balance criticism and celebration, analysis and description, in such a way that will make the text worthy of public attention, and interesting to intelligent non-specialist readers. In this regard we trusted

that expert reviewers would not simply read the book from an essentialist, operational paradigm, but would also read *into* the text our aim of connecting with new readers in this way. Yet, as part of this process, we certainly accept that *Sport in Australian History* makes claims to pedagogic value. On that basis (and unlike the situation with Helfgott) the opinions of our fellow teachers are of considerable importance. Unfortunately, though, only Hess and Harms among current reviewers have given sufficient thought to this aspect of the text. So informed opinion on whether the book serves as a useful teaching tool will have to wait. But one preliminary report looks promising: *Sport in Australian History* has been adopted as a recommended text by a British Examination Board as part of an 'A' level subject comparing physical culture in Britain, the United States, and Australia. With this recommendation the book will probably sell more copies in the UK than at home, which is some irony.

'Men Behaving Badly': Two Patronising, Sexist, Racist, Humourless, White Males

After reading comments by Magdalinski, and to a lesser degree Booth, Vamplew and I started to wonder whether we might actually be Gary and Tony, lead characters in an English sitcom about two blokes who, in social terms, are politically incorrect — and brazenly so. We did try our hand at humour in the book, but alas it found little favour with either Booth or Magdalinski. Rather than adding to their reading pleasure, the occasional pun and joke seems only to have irritated them. So we take this opportunity, on Booth's advice, to apologise to all New Zealanders for daring to poke a little fun across the Tasman. In return Booth might like to reconsider calling Adair the 'little runt' — though we're pretty confident this has been meant, in typically Australian fashion, as a backhanded compliment. There is always tension or a dilemma when comedy or irony are used — usually over the intent of the text versus its reception.

Magdalinski seems most concerned that we have examined the experiences of minority social groups and women, respectively, in self-contained chapters. She complains that we are therefore 'recentering Anglo-Celtic males' while 'decentering the Other(s)'. We would prefer that history had been far kinder to Aborigines, ethnic 'minorities', people with disabilities, gay and lesbian communities, the aged, and women, but each of these groups has certainly been 'on the margins' during the last 200 years of Australian sport. This outcome of distance, while varying both between and within these groups, provided us with a thematic basis

upon which to consider causes of, and changes to, group marginalisation in sport and society over time. Rather than ‘dumping’ minority groups into one chapter, as Magdalinski puts it,²⁹ our position was that they all shared something very important — being discriminat-ed against. The nature and extent of suffering among these people differed; and, even as victims of marginalisation they were hardly beyond treating other types of sufferers with disdain. But it was suffering they had in common. Hence we were concerned with social justice for people on the margins. We therefore disagree with Magdalinski that the tone of the book is patronising.

Yet we do not seek to dismiss Magdalinski’s criticisms. We are pleased to have the opportunity to engage with them. First, she accuses us of ‘providing a bleached view of Australian history’ because we attribute Aboriginal loss of life to violent conflict with settlers and the impact of European diseases, ‘rather than the overt and deliberate attempts to wipe out the “race”’.³⁰ We did not present the case this way. Our position was that indigenous depopulation took place through a range of factors: frontier violence, epidemiological factors, and a serious decline in Aboriginal economies. These factors combined to such a degree that by the late nineteenth century it was widely thought that Aborigines were a primitive race whose fate in the modern world *was* to die out. We never denied that whites were active agents in that process. Second, Magdalinski claims that we are guilty of ‘biological determinist notions of race’ by our suggestion that the ‘characteristic athleticism and creative ball skills of many Aboriginal players’ account for why they are valued and selected for elite-level football. At no stage did we infer that these attributes were, in essence, biological. These characteristics of Aboriginal sportspeople are cultural, as Colin Tatz has demonstrated in detail, and as Booth has summarised neatly since.³¹ Body shape and size are, nonetheless, factors that help to determine the positions that all footballers play, so there is certainly a sense in which biological factors do impact upon selection. But the manner in which a person plays a game is cultural; it is shaped socially. So attitude, style, and approach are just as important as physical frame. And none of these need relate to race. What ought to be avoided is crude determinist assumptions of any ilk — racial, biological, or cultural.

Third, Magdalinski is disturbed that we urge Aboriginal sports stars to take a more active political role in helping to bring about changes to the dire socio-economic circumstances of many indigenous people. She sees

this as making the ‘victims of marginalisation _ responsible for their own oppression’.³² Yet, as we pointed out in the book, Colin Tatz has on many occasions argued that it is not enough for Aboriginal sports stars to be role models — they also need to be activists for the cause of underprivileged indigenous people.³³ Magdalinski would have a case against us if we then failed to urge white Australians to support this cause, and if we glossed over the need to alter fundamentally the underlying structures and attitudes that sustain Aboriginal socio-economic deprivation. But we made several powerful statements, influenced by the work of Booth and Tatz,³⁴ about a unique political opportunity before the Sydney 2000 Olympics for Aborigines; in that white Australians, perhaps compelled by the brightening international spotlight, might be persuaded to make ‘substantive changes’ to the condition and position of indigenous people. To our surprise, though, Magdalinski believes that our remarks ‘border on overt racism’, while Booth suggests that we ‘adopt a patronising tone’.³⁵ Central to their claims are the following sentences: ‘Any changes must, however, be substantive; Aboriginal people will not tolerate token reforms or window-dressing. And neither should whites: that is, of course, if Aborigines are *truly* our brother and sister Australians.’³⁶

It was never our intention to be either racist or patronising, so we apologise to readers who share the reviewers’ opinions. Our strategy was to point sharply, and with deliberate and cutting irony, to a key issue in righting historical injustices against Aborigines. For it is surely the case that many white Australians have never even considered, let alone treated, Aborigines as equals. In making our comments we addressed two audiences: indigenous people (of whom we said would not tolerate tokenism), and whites (of whom we implied, through the literary device of irony, that many were unwilling to embrace Aborigines as fellow Australians). The reason why we used the term ‘our’ when referring to whites is to convey to readers that we are, in fact, of European descent. Some historians deliberately avoid making a connection between themselves and the text, assuming that this protects them from charges of bias. We do not feel threatened by an admission that historians inevitably write themselves into the narrative. Indeed, in this instance we felt compelled to do our best to identify ourselves, and to state in very strong terms where we stood on issues of black-white reconciliation and social justice for indigenous people. In this respect Magdalinski is quite right, subsequently, to wonder whether we ever intended to be racist.³⁷

But we would argue with her assertion that the slur is even implied. Can the review-ers themselves identify a discourse of racism or a patronising tone in concrete terms from the text? This is not a trivial matter: racial vilification is enshrined in Australian law. And, as authors, our professional reputations have been called into question on the very issue of racism. Frustratingly, Booth claims that the book contains ‘no discussion of racial vilification by spectators’.³⁸ This is nonsense. First, we discussed the Nicky Winmar incident of 1993 where, after racist taunting by a group of Colling-wood fans, the champion Aboriginal player raised his guernsey to reveal his black torso, pointing to the skin proudly. Second, we argued that ‘Aboriginal footballers in the AFL continue to face a barrage of racial abuse from some spectators, although others in the audience are increasingly objecting to this behaviour’. We then recommended that ‘these counter-offensives are important since [sports] crowds almost always involve a vocal and bigoted minority who need to be “persuaded” to be silent’.³⁹ On an issue as sensitive as this, and in a subject area where Booth has done some fine work, we find it particularly distressing to be misrepresented.

In addition to issues of race, Magdalinski is also offended by our discussion of ethnic ‘minorities’. She is not convinced we believe in multiculturalism for, as she puts it, we imply that ethnic minorities and their social practices are inferior. As evidence for this she tells readers that the authors ‘suggest that soccer in Australia should become a melting pot for all cultures’, which, she reminds us all, ‘is a dangerous assimilationist approach in the current climate’.⁴⁰ By making reference to the current climate we presume she means the birth of Pauline Hanson’s right-wing One Nation party and the so-called ‘race debate’ about the ethnic and racial composition of Australia. Notwithstanding that her point is ahistorical in that we wrote the book before the current climate, we repudiate her labelling us as assimilationist. First, at no stage did we say, or even imply, that soccer ‘should become a melting pot for all cultures’. A melting pot connotes the abandonment of ethnic heritage. Instead, and in light of relatively low attendances at soccer matches, we argued for a more broadly-based approach to community involvement in soccer, suggesting that locality, *as well as* ethnicity, might be a useful way of bringing more people to the game — particularly as sport in Australia has long been organised around region. This proposal is hardly unusual, for soccer teams in Europe have been structured around a complex mix of

nation, ethnicity, and region.

Second, we noted that the banning of ethnic insignia at Australian soccer has recently been part of a ‘solution’ to spectator hostility between teams representing historically antagonistic national groups, such as Serbs and Croats, Macedonians and Greeks. We considered this to be an ironical response, in that a crack down against ethnic symbols was taking place in ‘a supposedly multicultural Australia’.⁴¹ But we then reminded readers that a cornerstone of multiculturalism is acceptance of, and tolerance for, other ethnic groups. That needs to be practised by *all* Australians, including Serbs towards Croats, Croats towards Serbs, and so on. With that guiding principle we then stressed that ethnic insignia ‘will be welcome in all Australian sportsgrounds’ so long as their bearers enjoy their sport as every spectator is obliged to —with due regard of the law and respect for the individual rights of others. Yet Magdalinski reads cultural imperialism into this theme, arguing that our position is that ‘if you come to Australia, you should act like “Australians”’. At no stage did we offer a definition of what it is to be Australian in cultural terms, though Magdalinski appears to have a fixed idea in her own mind about what that is. She also wonders whether we are ‘perpetuating the stereotype of wogball’ by its inclusion in a section on ethnic ‘minorities’.⁴² Quite apart from the fact that soccer is the most favoured sport among these groups (which means that we could hardly ignore links between ethnicity and soccer), Magdalinski provides a distorted picture of our treatment of this game. She alleges that one of our ‘few [further] references to soccer is in a section that discussed ethnic violence’.⁴³ We suggest that Magdalinski reads Chapter 2, ‘The Sports Industry’ in which soccer is central to Vamplew’s analysis of national sporting competitions (soccer provided the first in Australia in 1977); trade unionism in sport (NSW soccer players led the way in 1959); and player payment (the market for soccer in Australia has simply not been large enough to sustain much more than semi-professional players, unlike other football codes).

A further way in which we have displeased Magdalinski is with our decision to devote a chapter to women. We have already explained our rationale for this in the book, so there is no need to repeat it here. Curiously, though, Magdalinski’s strident criticism of our approach seems at odds with her more empathising comments in a similar forum. When reviewing *Sport in Australian History* she chides: ‘Is it not time that we stop assuming that the history of sport is the history of men’s sport with

the provision of a neat little chapter to deal with all the obligatory women's issues?⁴⁴ Yet in a very recent review of Alan Klein's *Little Big Men: Bodybuilding Subculture and Gender Construction* (1993), Magdalinski is far more conciliatory. Although she is disappointed that Klein allocates only a single chapter to women, and his book makes only 'passing reference to the construction or debunking of femininity', she concedes that 'this is partly a result of the male domination of bodybuilding'.⁴⁵ But is it not the case that, like bodybuilding, sport *in general* has been male dominated? Yet we agree firmly with Magdalinski that readers need to be made aware of the construction of gender, both male and female. This was a theme we pursued briefly in a later chapter that considered the socialisation of children in Australian sport. Addition-ally, we discussed the use of rugby football to promote manliness, with the culture of this game eschewing femininity and homosexuality.⁴⁶ We have no qualms about stating that given more space we would have devoted far more attention to these issues, as Cashman did with a chapter on gender in *Paradise of Sport*.

Still, there is a need to respond to other criticisms about the discussion of gender in *Sport in Australian History*. First, Magdalinski describes our critique of Marion Stell's claims of women's participation levels in sport as 'over-pedantic carping'.⁴⁷ This view is particularly puzzling to Vamplew: as a specialist in the economic history of sport he considers that statistical analysis and quantitative data are very valuable explanatory tools. Surprisingly, Magdalinski herself offers no analysis of Stell's claims; instead she focuses on trying to find fault in our historical methodology. And she claims to have struck gold. Magdalinski's key point is that we have criticised Stell for using articles from the *Australian Women's Weekly* to support a claim of 'well over one million amateur sportswomen' participating in organised sport in Australia by 1939. Magdalinski then highlights our use of a single newspaper article to support a discussion of osteoporosis and elite female athletes.⁴⁸ Obliging-ly, though, Magda-linski makes the obvious point that there is a 'vast scientific literature on this topic' to which we might also have referred readers (but did not do so because of space limitations and the defined nature of the book). Unfortunately, Stell is hardly in this comfortable position. She relies *solely* on journalist (and avid sportswoman) Ruth Preddey's guess. And, regrettably for Stell, she is virtually bound to take the estimate on board as there is little else upon which to draw. As feminist historian Leonie

Randall laments, there is scant empirical data about female sports participation rates throughout Australian history.⁴⁹

Second, Magdalinski worries about Adair and Vamplew's readiness to accept a news-paper source, compared with our scepticism of reports from a women's magazine. But an important distinction can be made between these *two* texts. The *Australian* offered a brief summary of an opinion by a medical specialist who was analysing gymnastics, female athletes, and their physical condition. By contrast, the *Australian Women's Weekly* offered readers an estimate of numbers of sportswomen based, not on first-hand research, but guesswork. This does not mean that Preddey's claim of one million female athletes should be rejected out of hand. Indeed, we took the suggestion very seriously; so much so that we decided to investigate for ourselves whether, on the basis of 1930s demographic factors and reported participation levels of Australian sportswomen today, such a figure was likely. Unfortunately, we found no basis upon which to accept Preddey's claim; and, just as seriously, we concluded that her estimate probably overstated considerably the level of women's involvement in Australian sport during the 1930s. Not that this disproportion can be attributed solely to Preddey: an anonymous article in 1934 in the *Australian Women's Weekly* stated that 'a majority of Australian women are actively participating in organised sport'.⁵⁰ This claim even makes Preddey's guess look tame. Our wider message from all this is that for historians to rely upon texts to support their case, they need to consider seriously the value of various texts for their specific purposes, and the particular contexts in which they were written. Only scholars from an extreme postmodern perspective would accept the possibility of equal validity or value among texts, contexts, and viewpoints.

Third, Magdalinski is concerned that in a preface to our discussion of the social construction of gender, we make the following observation: 'experimental scientists claim to have identified genes that drive particular forms of behaviour, some of which are said to be sex-specific'.⁵¹ Magdalinski wonders why a biological disclaimer should follow a socio-cultural claim, and she quite properly asks what evidence there might be to support such a proposition. There is now a significant body of literature about genetics and sexual preference; gender differences in genetically inherited depressive disorders; genetics and gender predispositions to deviant behaviour, and so on.⁵² These are highly complex issues, and our sports history book was hardly the place in which to outline such research.

So we offered a very cautious approach, stating that this type of scientific inquiry 'has been largely speculative or inconclusive, while by comparison we have a reasonable understanding of ways in which gender has been constructed socially'.⁵³ Yet we were entitled to mention that the 'nature-nurture' debate continues.⁵⁴ Indeed, the major aetiological paradigms of gender/sex difference are (a) cultural determinism, (b) biological determinism, and (c) biocultural interactionism.⁵⁵ Many behavioural scientists now believe that personality is shaped to a significant (though varying) degree by genetic factors, with the balance of influences depending very much on the specific type of behaviour in question; for example, cognitive or criminal.⁵⁶ Typically, it is argued that within the context of one's environmental circumstances, individuals tend to create a lifestyle, hobbies, interests, and so on, that reflect their genotype. The outcome is the phenotype (of an individual or group): a set of observable characteristics that result from interaction between environmental and genetic influences. In light of this type of research, historians and sociologists may have to reappraise a *singular* reliance on social construction models.

Fourth, Magdalinski is concerned about the way in which we have discussed health problems among sportswomen. We mentioned that in high stress or endurance sports, women athletes may stop menstruating for years, with medical experts unsure about any long-term health consequences.⁵⁷ Magdalinski regrets that in discussing these issues we use the phrase 'temporary infertility', rather than amenorrhoea, to describe the physical condition that is absence of menstruation among post-menarche females. Magdalinski is, of course, right to emphasise that amenorrhoea does not mean 'infertility, temporary or otherwise'.⁵⁸ Indeed, when a woman has amenorrhoea unexpectedly, the first procedure that a doctor follows is to check whether the patient is pregnant. Yet this very point underscores a further need for qualification. That is, both medical practitioners and exercise physiologists have expressed concern about links between *long term* amenorrhoea and the development of osteoporosis among women.⁵⁹ In the context of sport, a recently-published coaching manual on health issues states that 'non-menstruating' female athletes are at higher risk of developing stress fractures, spinal curvatures, and osteoporosis.⁶⁰ Surely what the editors of this book mean, more precisely, is *chronic* amenorrhoea. It seems, therefore, that some discussion is required to decide on terminology. We fully accept that our use of

‘temporary infertility’ was manifestly inappropriate, but we wonder whether Magdalinski would be willing to accept a technical phrase adopted in a New Zealand *Sports Medicine* journal — ‘menstrual dysfunction’.⁶¹ This seems value-laden too.

Fifth, Magdalinski accuses us of being ‘patronising’ when stating that women ‘ought to consider what modes of sports participation best suit their individual needs’.⁶² We were stressing that women should have choices, and that sport could only be a ‘liberating experience’ if female freedom of expression is nurtured. Magdalinski seems a little inflexible in appreciating the variety of sporting experiences that involve women, some of whom prefer non-competitive sport in a recreational setting rather than the strain of performance-based physical activity. Not that informal sporting practices are unsuited to men; but it has been women who have largely led the way in the promotion of sport as a form of play, as fun. Women have also been keen to use non-competitive physical activity as a form of health promotion, with females leading the aerobics movement of recent years and males following in their wake. Given our discussion of this change, it seems puzzling that Magdalinski claims that we ‘do not question the role of sport in the construction of idealised body images’.⁶³ We certainly did discuss the down side to aerobics culture among women; the promotion of ‘ideal’ (yet completely unrealistic) body shapes via female role models (and supermodels), which has made many women feel inadequate by comparison. As a consequence they have either turned their backs on physical activity; or, in a pattern of self-deprecation, tried to re-shape their bodies according to the promoted ‘ideal’. As part of this process, women with obsessive-compulsive behaviour and eating disorders may actually be doing themselves harm by exercising inappropriately to the needs of their body. The health of people involved in physical activity — whether women or men — must be of prime concern.

By saying how things ‘should’ or ‘must’ be in sport we are not trying to separate sport from life’s realities. Rather, we are suggesting that, like life, there are key values and aspirations associated with physical culture. How sport is experienced obviously tells us much about Australian society. In writing *Sport in Australian History* we had a modest enough, though very important goal — to reach, and in some respects teach, ‘ordinary’ people. It is our hope that in similar spirit ASSH will look increasingly to recruit members from the general public. This would, of

course, offer a stronger financial base for the society as it heads towards the next century. But there is a broader issue at stake. It is, in our view, facile to debate sports history and sociology solely within the halls of academia. We need strategies to either engage with the public, or to bring the public to us. Tatz and Booth are leading the way with their monthly article in the magazine *Inside Sport*; Harms has for several years had regular columns on sport and society in major newspapers; while the *Bulletin of Sport and Culture* is pitched at a level that is widely accessible. Perhaps the signs are there already.

NOTES:

- 1 Review Symposium, 'Assessing the State of Australian Sports History'; T Magdalinski, 'Sport in Australian History: Recentring Anglo-Celtic Males, Decentering the Other(s)'; R Hess, 'A Thought Provoking History for "Non-Specialists"'; D Booth, 'Descriptive History and Passionless Sport in Contemporary Australian Sports History', *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 13, no. 2, May 1997, pp. 99-115.
- 2 D Adair and W Vamplew, *Sport in Australian History*, OUP, Melbourne, 1997, p. v.
- 3 Adair and Vamplew, *Sport in Australian History*, p. xiii (emphasis added to the original).
- 4 This complaint has recently been echoed in England, despite the fact that the academic analysis of sport has attracted many practitioners there. Andrew Blake points out that 'sport is one prominent absence from the roster of activities normally considered by cultural studies work. The notion of "popular culture" adopted by cultural studies focuses in the main on media production and related activity such as music, and has continued to marginalise sporting activity'. A Blake, *The Body Language: The Meaning of Modern Sport*, London, 1996, p. 13.
- 5 D Home, *Ideas for a Nation*, Sydney, 1989, p. 259, cited in Adair and Vamplew, *Sport in Australian History*, p. xiv.
- 6 K Inglis, 'Big Serve of Double Faults', *Weekend Australian*, 28-9 Jan. 1995.
- 7 R Bouwman, 'Condescending Look at Sport', *Age*, 2 July 1991.
- 8 J Harms, 'Review of Sport in Australian History', *Journal of Australian Studies* (forthcoming 1997).
- 9 Harms, 'Review of Sport in Australian History'.
- 10 Hess, 'Thought Provoking History', p. 110.
- 11 G M Hibbins, 'The Cambridge Connection: The English Origins of Australian Rules Football', in J A Mangan, ed., *The Cultural Bond: Sport, Empire, Society*, London, 1992, pp. 108-28; G Blainey, *A Game of Our Own: The Origins of Australian Rules Football*, Melbourne, 1990.
- 12 D Penney, *Sport, Education and Society* (forthcoming 1998).
- 13 This was also a theme in Richard Cashman's recent keynote address to a session on sport at the conference *Everyday Wonders: Popular Culture Past and Present*, Brisbane, 1997. The paper will appear in a book to be edited by Ian Jobling, and published by University of Queensland Press (1998).
- 14 Hess, 'Thought Provoking History', p. 110.
- 15 Booth, 'Descriptive History and Passionless Sport', pp. 114-5.
- 16 Harms, 'Review of Sport in Australian History'.
- 17 M Crotty, *Melbourne Historical Journal*, vol. 25, 1997, pp. 89-91.
- 18 P Fitzsimons, 'At Last, a Refreshing View From the Top Floor', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 1 Mar. 1997.

- 19 Magdalinski, 'Recentring Anglo-Celtic Males', p. 107 (emphasis in the original).
- 20 Booth, 'Descriptive History and Passionless Sport', p. 115 (emphasis added to the original).
- 21 For an excellent survey, see B Southgate, *History: What and Why? Ancient, Modern, and Postmodern Perspectives*, Routledge, London, 1996.
- 22 Booth, 'Descriptive History and Passionless Sport', p. 115 (emphases in the original).
- 23 Booth, 'Descriptive History and Passionless Sport', pp. 111-2.
- 24 Adair and Vamplew, *Sport in Australian History*, p. 53.
- 25 Booth, 'Descriptive History and Passionless Sport', p. 115.
- 26 Given an opportunity to develop this topic further, we would suggest two additional explanatory factors. First, the 1920s was a period in which women organised a multitude of amateur sporting organisations of their own, some of which were subordinate to mens' controlling bodies, while others were autonomous. On the whole, though, the rise of representative organisations for women's sport posed a threat to male autocracy in the establishment of rules, conditions of play, and rights of participation. Women were becoming more assertive in sport internationally, with the Federation Sportive Feminine Internationale pressuring the IOC to add athletics to the small range of Olympic sports that females could enter. By the late 1920s therefore, men had to contend increasingly with the idea that women were athletes of calibre, and this thought was disturbing to some. Second, the 1930s Depression had a dire effect on the capacity of consumers to purchase sporting equipment, or to pay membership fees to a sports club. This problem was not gender-specific, but when it came to events involving both men and women, such as rowing regattas or cycling meetings, it was all too easy for male organisers to leave off the women because of fiscal constraints. So we thank Booth for raising this matter: it has provided a spring-board for further analysis of sport and gender relations between the World wars.
- 27 Magdalinski, 'Recentring Anglo-Celtic Males', pp. 107-8.
- 28 David Helfgott in Britain', *Inside Story*, NVC Arts, 1997.
- 29 Magdalinski, 'Recentring Anglo-Celtic Males', p. 105.
- 30 Magdalinski, 'Recentring Anglo-Celtic Males', p. 105.
- 31 C Tatz, *Obstacle Race: Aborigines in Sport*, NSWUP, Sydney, 1995, pp.185, 328, 385; D Booth, 'The Poverty of Logic: William Morgan's Theory of Sport', *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 12, no. 1, Nov. 1995, p. 140.
- 32 Magdalinski, 'Recentring Anglo-Celtic Males', p. 106.
- 33 Adair and Vamplew, *Sport in Australian History*, p. 69.
- 34 D Booth and C Tatz, 'Swimming with the Big Boys? The Politics of Sydney's 2000 Olympics Bid', *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 11, no. 1, Nov. 1994, pp. 3-29.
- 35 Magdalinski, 'Recentring Anglo-Celtic Males', p. 105; Booth, 'Descriptive History and Passionless Sport', p. 113.
- 36 Adair and Vamplew, *Sport in Australian History*, p. 70 (emphasis in the original).
- 37 Magdalinski, 'Recentring Anglo-Celtic Males', p. 105.
- 38 Booth, 'Descriptive History and Passionless Sport', p. 114.
- 39 Adair and Vamplew, *Sport in Australian History*, pp. 68-9, 129.
- 40 Magdalinski, 'Recentring Anglo-Celtic Males', p. 106.
- 41 Adair and Vamplew, *Sport in Australian History*, p. 131.
- 42 Magdalinski, 'Recentring Anglo-Celtic Males', p. 106.
- 43 Magdalinski, 'Recentring Anglo-Celtic Males', p. 106.
- 44 Magdalinski, 'Recentring Anglo-Celtic Males', p. 103.
- 45 T Magdalinski, 'Review of A Klein, *Little Big Men: Bodybuilding and Gender Construction*, *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 13, no. 2, May 1997, pp. 152-3.
- 46 Adair and Vamplew, *Sport in Australian History*, pp. 77-9; 134-7.

- 47 Magdalinski, 'Recentring Anglo-Celtic Males', p. 103.
- 48 Adair and Vamplew, *Sport in Australian History*, pp. 54, 60.
- 49 L Randall, 'Women's Sport: A Review of Three Works', *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 8, no. 2, May 1992, p. 210.
- 50 'Grudging Attitude to Women in Sport', (no author), *Australian Women's Weekly*, 17 Feb. 1934, p. 4 (emphasis added to the original).
- 51 Adair and Vamplew, *Sport in Australian History*, pp. 49-50.
- 52 Compare J E Mitchell, L A Baker, and C N Jacklin, 'Masculinity and Femininity in Twin Children: Genetic and Environmental Factors', *Child Development*, vol. 60, no. 6, Dec. 1989, pp. 1475-85; S Scarr, E Scarf and R A Weinberg, 'Perceived and Actual Similarities in Biological and Adoptive Families: Does Perceived Similarity Bias Genetic Inferences?', *Behaviour Genetics*, vol. 10, no. 5, Sept. 1980, pp. 445-58; D J West, 'Homosexuality and Lesbianism', *British Journal of Psychiatry*, vol. 143, Sept. 1983, pp. 221-6; L. Risdale, 'Women and Depression', *Women's Studies International Forum*, vol. 9, nos 5-6, 1986, pp. 555-9; S Sigvardsson et al, 'Predisposition to Petty Criminality in Swedish Adoptees, III: Sex Differences and Validation of the Male Typology', *Archive of General Psychiatry*, vol. 30, 1982, pp. 1248-53; T A Widiger et al, 'Antisocial Personality Disorder, in A Tasman and M B Riba, eds, *American Psychiatric Press Review of Psychiatry*, vol. 11, Washington DC, 1992, pp. 63-78.
- 53 Adair and Vamplew, *Sport in Australian History*, p. 50.
- 54 For a survey, see J Money, 'Gender: History, Theory and Usage of the Term Sexology and its Relation-ship to Nature/Nurture', *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy*, vol. 11, no. 2, Summer 1985, pp. 71-9.
- 55 J Sidanius, B J Cling, and F Pratto, 'Ranking and Linking as a Function of Sex and Gender Role Attitudes', *Journal of Social Issues*, vol. 47, no. 3, 1991, pp. 131-49.
- 56 See, for example, J T Bouchard, 'Genes, Environment and Personality', *Science*, vol. 264, no. 5166, June 1994, pp. 1700-01.
- 57 Adair and Vamplew, *Sport in Australian History*, pp. 60, 153-4.
- 58 Magdalinski, 'Recentring Anglo-Celtic Males', p. 104.
- 59 D Llewellyn-Jones, *Everywoman: A Gynaecological Guide for Life*, Melbourne, 1992, pp. 132-3, 344, 388-9; B B Copley, 'Women in Sport', *New Zealand Journal of Sports Medicine*, vol. 13, no. 1, Mar. 1985, pp. 21-3.
- 60 J Phillips, C Martin, and K Baker, eds, *In the Dark About Eating Disorders? Answers for the Coach*, Adelaide, 1997, p. 11.
- 61 W E Sinning and K D Little, 'Body Composition and Menstrual Function in Athletes', *Sports Medicine* (Auckland), vol. 4, no. 1, Jan.-Feb. 1987, pp. 34-45.
- 62 Magdalinski, 'Recentring Anglo-Celtic Males', p. 104.
- 63 Magdalinski, 'Recentring Anglo-Celtic Males', p. 104.